

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Theology Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1995

The Lord's Prayer-Its Interpretation and a Reassessment of an Eschatological Orientation, Favoring the Prayer's Primary Application as Being for the Present Gospel Age

David Fielding

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, irfieldingd@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/thd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fielding, David, "The Lord's Prayer-Its Interpretation and a Reassessment of an Eschatological Orientation, Favoring the Prayer's Primary Application as Being for the Present Gospel Age" (1995). *Doctor of Theology Dissertation*. 111.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/thd/111>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Theology Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE LORD'S PRAYER: ITS INTERPRETATION AND A
REASSESSMENT OF AN ESCHATOLOGICAL ORIENTATION,
FAVORING THE PRAYER'S PRIMARY APPLICATION
AS BEING FOR THE PRESENT GOSPEL AGE

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

by

David Elbert Fielding

May 1995

Approved by:

Ernst A. Kuhl
Advisor

Thomas Mantel
Reader

George Robert
Reader

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Gratitude is expressed to the advisor and readers of this dissertation for their helpful direction: the Rev. Profs. Erich Kiehl, Th.D., Thomas Manteufel, Ph.D., and George Robbert, Ph.D.; to the Rev. Prof. Wayne Schmidt, Ph.D., Director of Graduate Studies, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.; to the members of the committee for the oral examination, in addition to the preceding names, the Rev. Profs. Paul Schrieber, Th.D., and Robert Weise, Ph.D.; to the Rev. Robert Roethemeyer, M.Div., M.A.L.S., of the Concordia Seminary Library, for securing inter-library loans; to the Rev. Ingvar Fløysvik, Th.D., sometime fellow of the graduate school at Concordia Seminary, for help in foreign language translations; to the Rev. Christopher Mitchell, Ph.D., of Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., for helpful suggestions; to Mrs. Ruth Jacobs for thesis proofreading; and most of all, to Connie, David, and Sarah, without whose cooperation and encouragement given to a pastor laboring under the responsibilities of a parish this project would never have been possible (for which reason the indulgence of the reader is asked for factual and technical mistakes made in haste).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii
 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS vi
 TEXTS OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN GREEK vii
 ABSTRACT viii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 Preliminary Considerations 3
 Statement of the Problem 9
 Statement of the Purpose 18
 Statement of Methodology and Scope 19

II. SUMMARY OF INTERPRETATION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER 22

 Patristic Literature 22
 Select Greek Fathers 23
 Origen 185-253 23
 Cyril of Jerusalem 315-386 32
 Gregory of Nyssa 335-394 35
 Chrysostom 345-407 38
 Theodore of Mopsuestia 350-428 43
 Summary 46
 Select Latin Fathers 48
 Tertullian 155-220 48
 Cyprian ca. 200-258 50
 Ambrose 330-374 54
 Augustine 354-430 57
 John Cassian ca. 360-435 65
 Peter Chrysologus 406-450 68
 Summary 70
 Reformation Era 72
 Luther 72
 1519 - An Exposition 73
 1522 - Personal Prayer Book 77
 1526 - The German Mass 78
 1528 - Ten Sermons 79
 1529 - Large Catechism 82
 Later Writings 84
 The Reformed Tradition 87
 John Calvin 1509-1564 87
 The King's Book, 1543 90
 The Heidelberg Catechism, 1562 91
 Larger Westminster Catechism, 1647 91
 Summary 91

Significant Modern Studies	97
Eschatological Orientation	97
1946 - Lohmeyer.	97
1964 - Jeremias.	101
Noneschatological Orientation.	108
1969 - Carmignac	108
Summary.	117
III. THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY CONTEXT	121
Theological and Conceptual Background.	121
Soteriological Blessings	121
Terminology and Meaning of Kingdom	123
The Kingdom of Grace	136
The Kingdom of Glory	143
Temporal Blessings for God's People.	151
Divine Paternity	151
Greco-Roman Ideas.	151
Biblical Milieu.	153
Food and Manna	158
God's Providential Care.	159
Manna	162
Feeding the Multitudes	168
The Gift of Prayer	179
Prayers in Judaism	180
The Shema.	183
The Eighteen Benedictions.	186
The Kaddish.	192
Other Examples	193
Summary.	195
New Testament Prayer Aorist.	199
Literary and Textual Framework	202
Synoptic Setting of the Lord's Prayer.	202
Teaching How To Pray	205
The Lord's Prayer Is the Center of the Sermon on the Mount.	211
Conclusion	219
Establishing the Text.	221
Matthean Version	222
Luke's Version	229
Excursus: Luke and the Holy Spirit.	235
Excursus: The Majority Text Tradition	243
Excursus: Language	250
Views on Its Origin and Forms	262
Conclusion	271

IV. EXEGESIS AND INTERPRETATION	275
Introduction: The Address	275
Father	275
In heaven.	286
Interpretation	291
The Petitions.	300
1. God's Name.	301
Name	302
To Hallow.	306
Interpretation.	314
2. God's Kingdom	319
Kingdom.	320
To Come.	325
Interpretation	330
3. God's Will.	340
Will	340
On Earth	347
Interpretation	359
4. Our Bread	369
Bread.	370
Epiousios.	378
Interpretation	424
5. Our Forgiveness	432
Sin.	433
Forgiveness.	447
Interpretation	456
6. Our Temptation.	467
Temptation.	468
Lead Us Not.	486
Interpretation	497
7. Our Deliverance	509
To Deliver	514
Evil	519
Interpretation	531
The Conclusion	541
The Question of Authenticity	542
The Form of Doxology	548
The Kingdom, Power, and Glory.	553
Forever and Ever. Amen!.	558
V. CONCLUSION	564
Interpretation for the Present Gospel Age.	564
Reassessment of an Eschatological Orientation.	571
BIBLIOGRAPHY	580

ABBREVIATIONS

- AE Luther's Works, American Edition
- BAG Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament
- Bek. Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche
- BDF Blass, DeBrunner, Funk. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament
- ET English Translation
- IDB The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
- (N)KJV (New) King James Version
- LC *Large Catechism* (Luther)
- LXX The Septuagint (Greek Old Testament)
- MS(S) Manuscript(s)
- NIV New International Version
- NPNF Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church
- PG Migne, ed. Patrologiae Graeca
- PL Migne, ed. Patrologiae Latina
- SC *Small Catechism* (Luther)
- Tapp. Tappert, ed. The Book of Concord.
- TDNT Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
- UBS United Bible Societies (Greek New Testament)
- WA Weimar Ausgabe [edition] (Luther's Works)
- WATr Idem, *Tischreden* (Luther's "Table Talk")
- Nota bene: When capitalized, Prayer = the Lord's Prayer

TEXTS OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN GREEK

9a "Pray then like this:" (Matthew 6:9b-13c)

b Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

c ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

10a ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

b γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου

c ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ (τῆς) γῆς

11 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον

12a καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν

b ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν (ἀφίεμεν) τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν

13a καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν

b ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ

c (ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν)

2a "When you pray, say:" (Luke 11:2b-4d)

b Πάτερ (ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς)

c ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

d ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

e (γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου

f ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς)

3 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν

4a καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν

b καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν (ἀφίεμεν) παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν

c καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν

d (ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ)

ABSTRACT

"The Lord's Prayer: Its Interpretation and a Reassessment of an Eschatological Orientation, Favoring the Prayer's Primary Application as Being for the Present Gospel Age"

This dissertation (633 pp.) by David Fielding, Th.D., 1995, NT Exegetical Theology, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., defends the applicability of the LP for the present Gospel age on the basis of its seven imperative verbs understood as typical "prayer aorists." Therefore a strictly future-eschatological interpretation restricts the rich meaning of this Prayer, taught by Jesus on more than one occasion. The orientation of the LP primarily to the present is also supported by its context in the Matthean Sermon on the Mount where it is not seen as an intrusion but rather as the center of the SM. The "Thy petitions" of the first strophe are best understood in terms of justification and sanctification (what God does *for* us and what he does *in* us). Further, the *hapax, ton epiousion*, occupies the center of the fourth petition, the center of the LP, and therefore the center of the SM. The incarnational, soteriological dimensions of the SM impact upon interpretation of the LP warranting its orientation primarily for the here and now. Other significant conclusions are that the word *epiousios* does not refer to tomorrow's bread, although this is a common trend in scholarship, but to bread coming to us as a gift from a benevolent and loving God. Philologically, the form is surely built upon *epi + ienai*. The sixth petition probably reflects a Semitic construction whereby in a negative causative construction (usually the Hb. *hiphil*) the negation sometimes can gravitate to the cause rather than to the effect and therefore an interpretation that shifts the negation away from the verb similar to the following is proposed: "Bring us away from temptation." A reassessment of a strictly eschatological position leads to the conclusion that the LP is intended *primarily* for the present. Also, this has been the basic position of the Reformers. The English liturgical version adequately renders the original texts.

KEYWORDS FOR INDEXING: Lord's Prayer; Matt. 6:9-13; Eschatology; Carmignac (Jean); Epiousios; Luke 11:2-4; Aorist impv in Grk prayer; Doxology (Lord's Prayer); Jeremias (Joachim); Pater Noster; Reformers; Luther; Hebrew negative "causative"; Sermon on the Mount; Temptation

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The words of the Lord's Prayer may well be the verses of the Holy Scriptures that are among the most familiar to the general public and to Christians alike. What is less frequently understood is that these words of Jesus, the Lord and Savior, reported in Matt. 6:9-13 and Luke 11:2-4, teach the Gospel of divine grace and they also teach Christians how to pray. Its petitions comprehensively summarize the message and ministry of Jesus. The petitions of the Lord's Prayer cover the whole range of topics associated with Christian life and doctrine, such as the glory of God, his kingdom, his will, and mankind's need of daily blessing, forgiveness, and protection against the assaults of the devil, the world, and sinful flesh. Through Jesus, the kingdom and the power and the glory are God's, now and forever. At the consummation, the children of the heavenly Father will behold the Lord Jesus in his full glory. God's will and glory will be perfected. But until then, Christians wait for the expected eschatological future in faith, hope, and trust.

Christians live in the existential "here and now" of created space and time awaiting their future and final adoption as sons. That adoption has already begun. Jesus, God's only-begotten and incarnate Son, came to redeem the

world and to claim his own. The family of God lives under salvific grace now. Further, God's children are invited to pray to their heavenly Father now in time. This privilege given by God is a gracious blessing for the present time of "inaugurated eschatology," the "now" of the Gospel Age, the Messianic Age, the "time of grace," the time of the church. After this earthly existence, believers will be gathered for eternal worship of him whose nature transcends earthly forms.

While located in this world, Christians employ literal words and forms to express the soul's yearnings. To that end Jesus taught the "Lord's Prayer." His Prayer is a salutary gift to learn, to use, and to cherish for now, in finite time. It is a model for proper prayer. It has also become cherished by Christians as a prayer formula. This Prayer is oriented to the daily needs of Christians living now. It is best understood incarnationally; as with the sacraments and the Scriptures, so also with the Lord's Prayer, the divine reaches down to the earthly. Jesus gave the words and Christians, learning to live the Gospel by those words, then return those words back to God in humble petition.

Three commands of Jesus have molded the liturgical worship of the Christian church. Christians baptize (μαθητεύσατε ... βαπτίζοντες, Matt. 28:19), they observe the Lord's Supper (λάβετε, φάγετε ... πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, Matt. 26:26-28), and they pray the Lord's Prayer (οὕτως ... προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς, Matt. 6:9). This *mandatum Dei*, the Lord's Prayer, has always played a vital role in Christian worship and catechesis.

Preliminary Considerations

The usual common and liturgical wording of the Lord's Prayer in English appears as follows, with minor variations:¹

Address: Our Father who art in heaven,

Petition 1: hallowed be thy name,
 Petition 2: thy kingdom come,
 Petition 3: thy will be done
 on earth as it is in heaven.

Petition 4: Give us this day our daily bread;
 Petition 5: and forgive us our trespasses
 as we forgive those
 who trespass against us;
 Petition 6: and lead us not into temptation,
 Petition 7: but deliver us from evil.

Conclusion: For thine is the kingdom
 and the power and the glory
 forever and ever. Amen

¹ Lutheran Worship (St. Louis: Concordia, 1982), 201, *et passim*. This "traditional" wording is essentially identical to that of the *Book of Common Prayer*, except for minor emendations, which undoubtedly provided the model for early English translations from German, reflected in the retention of the word "trespasses" and "forever and ever" in the conclusion; these two notable expressions do not appear in the German, Latin, or Greek versions of the Prayer (see below), although the word "trespasses" is used in the addendum to the Prayer at Matt. 6:14-15. The "debt" words are generally preferred among the Reformed.

The principle liturgical text of the English Lord's Prayer dates from the 1549 *Prayer Book of Edward VI*, which was essentially also that of the *King's Book* of 1543 (see Chapter II, *infra*). According to Francis Procter and Walter Howard Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1955), 374, the *Book of Common Prayer* version of the Prayer did not include the termination until the revision of 1662, dated considerably after the appearance of the KJV of 1611. The addition of the conclusion was introduced apparently as a compromise to accommodate Presbyterian demands (*ibid.*, 155, 169, 172, 176, 209). The more full termination "forever and ever" was advanced by the English "Churchmen" (Anglicans, perhaps reacting to pressure from Dissenters and nonconformists for its inclusion) in imitation of Oriental models (*ibid.*, 167, 374); for more information about the conclusion see Chap. IV, fn. 487, *infra*. The familiar pronoun "who" in the address replaced the original "which" in the American revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1789 (*ibid.*, 242). A more detailed study of these historical developments would be fruitful.

Throughout this study, references will be made to the petitions of the Lord's Prayer as divided and outlined above. Notice that a break has been placed at natural divisions. These divisions will be conveniently identified as "strophes" on the principle that the Lord's Prayer may be constructed on a quasi-poetic scheme, although this may be more inferential than explicit. The first strophe relates to God's concerns (the "Thy petitions"), and the second strophe relates to man's concerns (the "us petitions"). The termination will usually be called the "conclusion" instead of the "doxology"; the latter term will occasionally be used, however, especially in the context of reports from other studies. The word "man" will often be used in this study to indicate the Christian, the true believer, for whom Jesus gave this Prayer (Matt. 5:1b; 6:8; Luke 11:1); "gender inclusive language" is not necessary.

Other versions and translations of the Lord's Prayer exist. Usually the liturgical versions follow the Matthean wording rather than the shorter Lukan version. These versions often are based on the "Received Text" tradition. The *Didache* (8.2) essentially follows the Matthean version.² The familiar German (Lutheran) version is very similar to this standard pattern determined by the "Received Text" and colored by the Latin tradition, especially with regard to the word order of Luther's address:

² Kirsopp Lake, tr., "The *Didache*," in *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1965), 320. The *Didache* puts the second verb in the fifth petition in the present tense and provides a two-member conclusion (power and glory).

Vater unser, der du bist in Himmel, geheiligt werde dein Name, dein Reich komme, dein Wille geschehe, wie im Himmel, also auch auf Erden. Unser täglich Brot gib uns heute. Und vergib uns unsere Schuld, als wir vergeben unsern Schuldigern. Und führe uns nicht in Versuchung, sondern erlöse uns von dem übel. Denn dein ist das Reich und die Kraft, und die Herrlichkeit in Ewigkeit. Amen.³

Likewise, the common Latin version differs slightly from the Vulgate. The familiar "liturgical" version is as follows:

Pater noster, qui es in coelis.
 Sanctificetur nomen tuum.
 Adveniat regnum tuum.
 Fiat voluntas tua,
 sicut in coelo et in terra.
 Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie,
 et dimitte nobis debita nostra,
 sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.
 Et ne nos inducas in tentationem,
 sed libera nos a malo.⁴

Notice that the beginning words of both the Latin and German reflect their parallel in the original Greek of Matthew's Prayer. Those two opening words provide the Prayer with one of its familiar titles, the "Pater Noster" or the "Vater Unser." The Latin tradition generally does not add the conclusion. Since the Latin form of the Prayer has exerted significant influence over early vernacular translations, it cannot, consequently, be considered unimportant.

A contemporary of Luther, William Tyndale presented an

³ Kirchengesangbuch für Evangelisch-Lutherische Gemeinden. (St. Louis: Concordia, n.d.), p. V. Note that *übel* is not capitalized.

⁴ Nicholas Ayo, The Lord's Prayer: A Survey Theological and Literary (Notre Dame: University Press, 1992), 216. At the fourth petition Jerome used *quotidianum* (*cotidianum*) in Luke but *supersubstantialem* in Matthew. The "liturgical version" is an example showing how the Old Latin prevailed against Jerome's Vulgate.

early English Matthean version (1534 revision) which interestingly used the word "trespasses" in the fifth petition:

O oure father which arte in heven, halowed be thy name.
 Let thy kyngdome come.
 Thy wyll be fulfilled, as well in erth, as it ys in
 heven.
 Geve vs thisdaye [sic] oure dayly breede.
 And forgeve vs oure treaspases, even as we forgeve oure
 trespacers (them which treaspas vs).
 And leade vs not into temptacion: but delyvre vs from
 evell.
 For thyne is the kyngedome and the power, and the glorye
 for ever. Amen.⁵

Tyndale's versions of 1525-1526 and 1534 were intended as translations from original Greek manuscripts which contained the conclusion, first published by Desiderius Erasmus in his Greek Testament of 1522, and popularly received by various reformers.⁶ Tyndale's Prayer is significant for its use of "trespasses" in the fifth petition. Although the *Great Bible* of 1539 used the word "debts," the *Primer of Henry VIII* of 1545 employed the word "trespasses."⁷ The matter of standardization was urgent during these formative years in England. The *Primer* changed Tyndale's "thy will be fulfilled" to "thy will be dooen." The *First Prayer Book of Edward VI* (1549) changed the "let us not be led into

⁵ William Tyndale, *The New Testament*, 1534 edition, ed. N. Hardy Wallis, (Cambridge, University Press, 1938), 34; see p. 153 for Lukan orthographic and translational variations. See James W. Thirtle, *The Lord's Prayer: An Interpretation Critical and Expository* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1915), 214, for Tyndale's 1525 ed., where the significant difference is at the fifth petition, in parentheses above.

⁶ Ayo, 221.

⁷ Thirtle, 215-16.

temptation" of the *Primer* to "lead us not into temptation."⁸ Such changes and developments evolved into the form popularized by the *Book of Common Prayer* (trespasses), and essentially that used by the King James Version of 1611 (debts). The wording of the English Lord's Prayer made great progress towards uniformity, although perfect unanimity was, and never has been, achieved.

More recently, the *International Consultation on English Texts* (ICET) offered the following version for general contemporary use, accompanied by ample notes justifying particular choices of wording of the Prayer:

Our Father in heaven,
 holy be your Name,
 your kingdom come,
 your will be done,
 on earth as in heaven.
 Give us today our daily bread.
 Forgive us our sins
 as we forgive those who sin against us.
 Do not bring us to the test
 but deliver us from evil.
 For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours now
 and for ever.⁹

⁸ *Ibid.*, 216.

⁹ Prayers We Have in Common (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 2-3; on p. 7 an alternate is provided: "Save us from the time of trial." The comma in the third petition and the conjunctions have been omitted. Many have objected to these proposals; see e.g. Paul G. Bretscher, "The Lord's Prayer in Worship and Catechism," Lutheran Forum 22 (1988): 12-14. For this "ecumenical" wording in German, see Joseph Pascher, "Das Vaterunser der Christen des Deutschen Sprachgebietes," Liturgisches Jahrbuch 18 (1968): 65-71; in French, Pierre Bonnard, Jacques Dupont, and François Refoulé, Notre Père Qui Es Aux Cieux: La Prière oecuménique (Maubourg: Du Cerf, 1968); also see Carmignac's objections in Chapter II, *infra*. Lutheran Worship, 201, *et passim*, has reproduced as a second option the ICET version next to the traditional text, except for the theologically difficult sixth petition for which judicious recourse has been made to the traditional wording.

The above survey of versions of the Prayer illustrates that the form of this Prayer has always been dependent on preceding translational efforts and that the most familiar vernacular versions reflect a traditional textual background. The Lord's Prayer is so entrenched and engraved in the piety of most Christians that alternate versions to the familiar form are often poorly accepted. This study is not intended to unseat familiar usage; rather, it seeks to interpret the Lord's Prayer on the basis of the original Greek texts as best as possible and according to the literal sense of those texts.¹⁰ In fact, it will be demonstrated that the common vernacular form of the prayer more adequately represents the Greek text, for the most part, over against most contemporary versions. The position of this study is that this Prayer was taught by Jesus and it is part of the inspired and revealed written record of Holy Scripture. The information already provided will serve as an introduction to an exegetical study of the Lord's Prayer whose ultimate purpose is to understand this "breviary" of prayers along "historical-grammatical" lines.

The Lord's Prayer has been subjected to various interpretations which need to be reassessed. It will be maintained that the primary interpretation and application of

¹⁰ A Greek text is provided in Chapter III, *infra*. The use of a common "liturgical text" of the Lord's Prayer, while departing slightly from the KJV of Matt. 6:9-13, nevertheless can be defended, explained, and justified on the basis of the Bible's two versions and Jesus' instruction, "pray like this" in Matt. 6:9a. Variations in wording or verbatim conformity to one particular standard or norm is clearly not an issue.

the Lord's Prayer is intended for God's people (Christians) who live in the present Gospel age. This prayer is prayed by them in the "here and now" of their present life and needs, before the end of this age will come (the Last Day). Jesus gave the prayer to his followers for that purpose.

Statement of the Problem

Martin Luther provided interpretations of the Lord's Prayer in his two catechisms of 1529 which were oriented to the "here and now." Luther introduced the Lord's Prayer in the third chief part of his catechisms, following the sections on the Ten Commandments and the Apostles' Creed. The *Small Catechism* provides insights into Luther's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. In his Introduction, Luther pointed out that this Prayer teaches that the believer stands in a relationship of faith with God who "would encourage us to believe that He is truly our Father."¹¹ The first petition asserts that even though God's name is already holy, it should be holy *among* Christians who respect the integrity of God's word and "lead holy lives in accordance with it."¹² The second petition recognizes that God's kingdom comes of itself, but the concern is that it come to

¹¹ *Small Catechism* 3.2 [hereafter SC]; Hans Lietzmann, Heinrich Bornkamm, Hans Volz, and Ernst Wolf, eds., Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 512 [hereafter Bek.]; Theodore Tappert, Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, and Arthur C. Piepkorn, eds., The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 346 [hereafter Tapp.].

¹² SC 3.4; Bek., 512; Tapp., 346; "bei uns," "apud nos."

God's people, especially by means of his grace "both here in time and hereafter forever."¹³ The third petition tells that God's will also is done by itself, but this prayer asks that it be done *among* God's people.¹⁴ In particular, Luther taught under the third petition that the will of the "unholy three," the devil, the world, and the flesh, is broken by God. In the fourth petition, the needs of mankind are supplied by God, but the Christian asks God to cause him to be aware of divine blessings and to thankfully acknowledge them.¹⁵ "Daily bread" is defined broadly as "everything required to satisfy our bodily needs."¹⁶ The fifth petition pleads for the same forgiveness for oneself from God that one promises to others, even though the believer is undeserving of such grace of God. Luther stated that "we sin daily."¹⁷ In the sixth petition, Luther returned to the three adversaries of God and man, the devil, the world, and the flesh as the direct cause of temptation. He interpreted this petition to mean that God would "guard and preserve" his people from succumbing to temptation so that they would

¹³ SC 3.7, 8; Bek., 513; Tapp., 346; "zu uns," "ad nos."

¹⁴ SC 3.10, 11; Bek., 513; Tapp., 347; "bei uns," "apud nos."

¹⁵ SC 3.13; Bek., 513; Tapp., 347.

¹⁶ SC 3.14; Bek., 514; Tapp., 347.

¹⁷ SC 3.16; Bek., 514; Tapp., 347.

obtain the victory. God, by the way, "tempts no one."¹⁸ Luther counted seven petitions. The last was seen as a "summary of all" asking God for deliverance from "all manner of evil," unlike his Large Catechism in which reference was made to the devil.¹⁹ The believer also asks God in this petition for a blessed end to this life. Luther's conclusion centered around the single word "Amen" where he made reference to God's command to pray and his promise to hear prayer.²⁰ As such, believers should take recourse in God for *all* their needs.

Luther had very much in mind the present existence of the Christian. He related the first strophe, the "Thy petitions," to God, who alone acts on behalf of the believer and for his benefit. The believer's responsiveness through the Holy Spirit's work to hallow God's name and to do God's will never distracts from God's monergism. God always takes the initiative and receives the credit for hallowing his name, sending his kingdom, and causing his will to be done among his people. The relationship of the first three petitions to God's people by characteristic prepositions such as "to," "by," or "among" is very common in patristic expositions of the Lord's Prayer. In the second strophe, the

¹⁸ SC 3.18; Bek., 514; Tapp., 347-48; "Gott versucht zwar niemand . . . Deus quidem neminem tentat . . . ob wir damit angefochten würden . . . Et ut maxime ejus modi tentationibus sollicitemur, ne succumbamus" (this final "lest" phrase is not in the German!).

¹⁹ SC 3.20; Bek., 514-15; Tapp., 348.

²⁰ SC 3.21; Bek., 515; Tapp., 348.

"us petitions," Luther focused attention particularly on everyday struggles of the believer in this sinful world. Again, God alone acts to provide daily nourishment, daily forgiveness, daily protection from temptations, and daily deliverance from the assaults of the evil foe. God's activity on behalf of the believer is related to his role of being a benevolent and salvation-giving Father.

In contrast to Luther's emphasis on the present existential relationship of the believer to God and the world, an eschatological, future-oriented interpretation of the Lord's Prayer is also possible. Raymond E. Brown, a prominent Biblical scholar, presented a journal study in 1961 which is illustrative of an eschatological reading of the Lord's Prayer.²¹ His monograph presents a typical eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, completely oriented to the future. His article is unusually well-written and should ably serve to represent and illustrate an eschatological point of view in interpreting the Lord's Prayer.

Brown specifically laid out the two alternative and contrasting interpretations of the Lord's Prayer that are possible when he stated "that the petitions of the PN [Pater Noster] do not refer to daily circumstances but to the final times."²² Brown believed that the Matthean Prayer is more conducive to an eschatological reading than Luke's which

²¹ Raymond E. Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," Theological Studies 22 (1961): 175-208; reissued in idem, New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965), 217-53 (citations are taken from the latter).

²² Ibid., 218.

manifests accommodation to the delayed return of Jesus "whose intensity of eschatological aspiration has begun to yield to the hard facts of daily Christian living."²³ Against popular use and perhaps misuse of the term "eschatological" to refer broadly to the present existence of the believer in the Gospel age after the first advent of Jesus, Brown rightly distinguished between present and future eschatology:

At the outset we should make clear that by "eschatological" we refer to the period of the last days, involving the return of Christ, the destruction of the forces of evil, and the definite establishment of God's rule. We are defining the limits of our use of the word because in a broader sense the whole Christian period can be called eschatological, since God's kingdom has already been partially established in this world through Jesus, who by His death and Resurrection has won a victory over Satan. In this broader sense, the PN could be interpreted of the everyday aspirations and needs of the Christian and still be called eschatological.²⁴

This quotation from Brown's article explains the more closely defined future orientation that a purely eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer takes.

According to Brown, the address "Father" gives an eschatological tone to the prayer. Since becoming sons of God is something that is expected to happen in the last days, the ability to address God as Father is an anticipation of the state of perfection that will belong to God's children at the close of the age.²⁵ The Lord's Prayer urges God to

²³ Ibid., 253.

²⁴ Ibid., 217-18. Throughout this study, with Brown, the broader definition of the term "eschatology" will also be avoided.

²⁵ Ibid., 227.

"hasten the perfection of sonship" which will belong to the Kingdom.²⁶ Brown solicited the use of the Greek aorist imperatives used in the verbs of the prayer in support of comprehending the once-for-all aspect of the prayer.²⁷ The passive of the first and third petitions are "surrogates" of the divine name; consequently, the petitions ask God alone to act in a single, unique and final way at the end of the ages. His interpretation of the entire first strophe of the prayer is summarized as follows:

It is a prayer that God accomplish the ultimate sanctification of His name, the complete manifestation of His holiness, the last of His salvific acts. As we shall see in Petitions 2 and 3, this sanctification consists in the final coming of God's kingdom and the perfection of the plan that God has willed.²⁸

According to Brown, the second petition is not concerned with "everyday growth of the kingdom" but with the "definitive reign of God at the end of the world."²⁹ The third petition emphasizes God's salvific will as being revealed in the eschatological glory of God at the eschaton in heaven and on earth, that is, everywhere.³⁰

Brown recognized that it is possible to treat the second strophe of the Prayer partially in terms of daily

²⁶ Ibid., 231.

²⁷ Ibid., 228.

²⁸ Ibid., 231.

²⁹ Ibid., 233.

³⁰ Ibid., 237.

needs, especially in view of the conclusion to the third petition which leads to matters related to "this earth," although he preferred not to abandon his strictly eschatological interpretation.³¹ In order to continue his eschatological interpretation, Brown confined his study to the Matthean prayer, since Luke's prayer "is definitely continuative and noneschatological."³² He explained that "those who interpret the [fourth] petition noneschatologically . . . make this a prayer of *daily need*" while those who favor the eschatological interpretation make the petition "a request for the bread of tomorrow, the bread of the future."³³ The request for tomorrow's bread "today" expresses the nuance of urgency for the eschatological banquet. Brown drew attention to the miracle of the manna feeding in the Old Testament as being the proper background for understanding the fourth petition.³⁴ In that account Moses told the people that the manna would come on the morrow, making "it a good figure of the bread of the heavenly future for which the Christians yearned."³⁵ On the basis of the discourse of John 6, Brown asserted that Jesus is the bread of spiritual nourishment as well as eucharistic bread

³¹ Ibid., 238.

³² Ibid., 239.

³³ Ibid., 240.

³⁴ Ibid., 242.

³⁵ Ibid.

from heaven so that those who eat of Christ's flesh will be raised on the Last Day (John 6:54). The bread of the fourth petition, then, is also for him the eucharistic bread that serves as an eschatological pledge.

For Christians living "in expectancy of imminent divine judgment" the fifth petition is used to request final forgiveness on the Last Day of all debts incurred against one's neighbor.³⁶ The sixth petition does not concern daily deliverance from temptation but it refers to the final battle between God and Satan, consistent with Jesus' own struggle in Gethsemane which had cosmic overtones of a final battle. The second part of his sixth petition, asking for deliverance from the "Evil One," reflects a confrontation with the devil. For Brown, a personal instead of abstract interpretation of the original Greek word *ponerou* is most fitting in the context of the final trial brought on by Satan's attack.³⁷ As is evident, Brown saw an eschatological unity underlying the Lord's Prayer.

Therefore, two contrasting approaches to the Lord's Prayer are possible, the future eschatological and the noneschatological. In the address, the eschatological interpretation sees the sovereignty of God over all creation which will only be fully appreciated at the *eschaton*. The everyday reading emphasizes God as the loving, heavenly Father of his children in this world to whom prayer may be

³⁶ Ibid., 245.

³⁷ Ibid., 252.

addressed. An eschatological approach to the first strophe emphasizes the coming of God's perfect kingdom after this life, when divine salvation for man will be fully revealed and God will be fully vindicated as Lord and King. A temporal understanding of this strophe sees God's reign unfolding and being realized among men, especially through the preaching of the Gospel. Further, it is incumbent among believers to hallow God's name and to do his will. The kingdom comes to believers through the word of God. To give the fourth petition a temporal cast means that God even now providentially cares for his children in the Gospel age before the consummation, whereas the eschatological view not only projects forward to the future coming of Christ as the "bread of life," but as a corollary, is also compatible with a sacramental view of the bread. In fact, the fourth petition has often been subject to spiritualization. The fifth petition, according to the everyday interpretation, requests forgiveness for daily sins. The eschatological interpretation asks for final forgiveness that applies to the Last Judgment. The sixth petition asks God for daily strength against temptation according to the noneschatological interpretation, whereas the eschatological interpretation assumes that that petition refers to the final assault of Satan at the end of the Gospel age, often called "the test" or "the trial." The last petition interpreted for the here and now usually asks for rescue from all evils surrounding the believer's present existence, whereas the eschatological interpretation usually prefers to pray for

deliverance from the final assault of Satan himself.

The main problem confronting understanding the Lord's Prayer properly must be resolved by deciding whether the Prayer is eschatological or noneschatological. This problem raises an exegetical issue concerning the way the Prayer is interpreted. How literally are the words to be understood? Current scholarship tends to favor the eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. However, the position of this study is that the application of the Lord's Prayer to the daily circumstances of the believer is not to be disparaged. This position assumes that a literal reading of Matt. 6:9-13 and Luke 11:2-4 urges the conclusion that a noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer flows from its original intention and is the best way of understanding it. As a corollary, spiritualized and/or sacramental interpretations of the Lord's Prayer are generally inconsistent with a literal sense.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study will be to show the basis for the traditional noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, notwithstanding the challenge of much current scholarship. The primary application of the Lord's Prayer is for the here and now. Such an approach takes the literal meaning of the texts seriously. Completely to adopt an eschatological approach to the Prayer means that a presupposition is introduced that may be foreign to the texts, and which might better be reserved to serve as a

secondary theme. Future eschatology, of course, is in distant view, but this is not to be taken as the primary orientation of the Lord's Prayer; further definition will be provided in Chapter V. This study will seek to interpret the Lord's Prayer for the here and now of Christian existence. By the nature of prayer, the one praying is included; in the second strophe, this becomes paramount where the individual believer's needs are addressed. Thus the Prayer implores divine rescue from hunger, sin, temptation, and evil for the here and now. All of man's needs are within purview of the benevolence and beneficence of God. No less than spiritual needs, even daily needs are satisfied by the same divine blessing as attended Jesus' feeding of the multitudes.

The fact that Luther accented the latter interpretation in his more mature years is not without significance. Earlier in Luther's career, he had followed the typical spiritual exposition of the Middle Ages and the church fathers. Later, he restored the "here and now," temporal interpretation, whereby the Prayer's application was primarily oriented to the present life of the believer. This study will also seek to document this significant change.

Statement of Methodology and Scope

Luther was surely a child of his times and influenced by patristic literature. It is very possible that his interpretations of the Lord's Prayer, both in his earlier years as well as in his later years, were influenced by traditional expositions with which he was acquainted.

Certainly, the theological environment in which he lived was endowed by various traditions. As such, this study will commence by reporting various key interpretations of pre-Chalcedonian church fathers who produced several exegetical treatises on the Lord's Prayer. Afterwards, accessible and significant selections from Luther's works will be evaluated, especially to discover what was his more mature and final orientation towards the Prayer. Brief selections will also be examined from the Protestant Reformed tradition, subsequent to Luther and the Lutheran Reformation. Finally, significant modern studies will be reported. A large amount of literature is available on the Lord's Prayer. Many of these studies, books, and monographs since the nineteenth century are quite valuable and contribute significantly towards understanding the Lord's Prayer.

Next, the theological and literary context of the Prayer will be investigated. The general theme of the kingdom of God from the first strophe and the theme of daily providential care, represented by the fourth petition in the second strophe, are particularly telling. These themes will be explored. Patterns of prayer in Judaism provide background material for understanding the setting of the Lord's Prayer. The "then-ness" of such theological and conceptual background studies contributes towards interpreting the Lord's Prayer. It will also be necessary to report on the literary and textual framework of the Prayer, since conclusions from this material will also be valuable for understanding the Prayer.

Finally, the "now-ness" of this Christian Prayer will be studied to determine its meaning and application for believers today. This will be done by examining each of its parts individually especially within the context of the entire canonical Scriptures.

The literature on the Lord's Prayer is so vast, that it is impossible to do it all justice. This study will be limited to seeking the meaning of the Lord's Prayer within the confines set by the stated purpose, namely, to provide an exegetical basis for interpreting the Lord's Prayer oriented to the present existence of the believer living in the New Testament age. The eschatological interpretation of the Prayer, along with adjunct emphases such as the sacramental and spiritual in the fourth petition, need to be assessed and evaluated. Of course, a much broader study is possible. For that reason, for example, the survey of patristic literature is not intended to report everything taught by the early church fathers about this Prayer and the meaning of its individual petitions, but to report that which is specifically pertinent to the task at hand, or that which is illustrative of its general meaning. Therefore the reader is not to expect a new vernacular translation of the Lord's Prayer, although conclusions will be reached that will favor certain versions over others.

May Christians continue to use these dominical words both as a pattern and a model of their own prayers spoken daily in this present Gospel age before the throne of all grace and to learn the Gospel by these words.

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF INTERPRETATION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER

The Lord's Prayer has been the subject of many expositions since the time of Jesus. The most significant ones for the purposes of this study are those stemming from early Christianity, from the period of the Reformation, and from the last century and a half. These studies will provide the background for later interpretations in Chapter IV.

Patristic Literature

The Greek and Latin fathers of the church often prepared expositions of the Lord's Prayer.¹ Some of these were shorter homiletical treatments, some were part of commentaries on the Scriptures, others were a part of catechesis; in some cases, more lengthy treatises were published. A representative selection has been made for this study which presents the more significant treatments of the Lord's Prayer.²

¹ The primary sources are Jacques Paul Migne, ed., Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca (Paris: Migne, 1857-66) [hereafter PG]; and, series Latina (Paris: Garnier, 1844-1900) [hereafter PL].

² The selection of expositions and dates was made from lists provided by Robert L. Simpson, The Interpretation of Prayer in the Early Church (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 176-77; Clement M. O'Donnell, St. Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer, The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, Second Series, no. 124A (Washington, D.C.: University Press, 1960), 1-28; Adalbert G. Hamman, Le Pater expliqué par

Select Greek Fathers

Origen 185-253

Origen of Alexandria and Caesarea wrote his *De Oratone* or *Peri Euches* in Caesarea about A.D. 233. This is the first lengthy treatise on the Lord's Prayer surviving from the Greek church. As is commonly known, Origen himself was "the most famous representative of Alexandrian theology, which aimed at a reconciliation of Christianity and Hellenistic thought."³ He was known for his erudition and faith, although his character as a Christian was marred by questions about his orthodoxy, and by his allegorizing and speculative tendencies. His treatise on the Lord's Prayer, however, has enjoyed general acceptance and is rather invulnerable to negative criticisms. The treatise is divided into three parts, of which the middle, part two, offers a commentary on the Lord's Prayer.⁴

Origen reported the Matthean text without a conclusion.

les Pères (Paris: Franciscaines, 1962); Karlfried Froehlich, "The Lord's Prayer in Patristic Literature," The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue, no. 2. (1992): 71-72; Klaus Bernhard Schnurr, Hören und handeln: Lateinische Auslegungen des Vaterunser in der Alten Kirche bis zum 5. Jahrhundert (Freiburg: Herder, 1985), 8-16; Georg Walther, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Griechischen Vaterunser-Exegese. Texte und Untersuchungen, 40/3 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914); and, Berthold Altaner, Patrology, tr. Hilda Graef (New York: Herder, 1961).

³ Erwin L. Lueker, ed., Lutheran Cyclopedia (St. Louis: Concordia, 1954), 767.

⁴ *De Oratone* 18-30; PG 11:416-562; ET used was, Origen, "On Prayer," in Origen, Classics of Western Spirituality, tr. Rowan A. Greer (New York: Paulist, 1979), 81-170. See bibliography for other sources of translations for all the church fathers reported in this study.

His Lukan text omitted the third and seventh petitions.⁵ Because of these two different versions and also because of the different settings, Origen stated that "it is better to suppose that the prayers are different."⁶ It is noteworthy that God is called "our Father." Origen observed that in the Old Testament instances can be cited calling God Father or which speak of believers as being sons of God but nowhere is the "boldness proclaimed by the Savior in calling God Father" to be found.⁷ Origen showed that the privilege of addressing God in prayer as Father can result only from those who have become genuine sons of God by faith.⁸ Rom. 8:15-16 is cited: "For you did not receive the spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received the spirit of sonship. When we cry, 'Abba! Father!' it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God." "Constant prayer" (1 Thess. 5:17) includes the thought that the believer's commonwealth is not on earth but in heaven.⁹ Heaven is not to be defined spatially, for that would establish a corporeal limitation on God.¹⁰ In fact when Jesus, called the "Word of God" by Origen, condescended to

⁵ 18.2; PG 11:475; Greer, 118.

⁶ 18.3; PG 11:476; Greer, 118.

⁷ 22.1; PG 11:481; Greer, 123.

⁸ 22.2; PG 11:484; Greer, 123.

⁹ 22.5; PG 11:485; Greer, 125.

¹⁰ 23.1; PG 11:485; Greer, 126.

this earth, the result was to see his divine fullness.¹¹ To pray "Our Father in heaven" teaches that "the being of God is distinct from everything generated. And those who do not share His being, nonetheless have a certain glory of God."¹²

The "name" in the first petition is a designation that sums up and describes the particular quality of the one named.¹³ Those who pray the first petition ask that they would be included in hallowing God's name, as Ps. 34:3 illustrates: "Let us exalt His name together," with the result that they themselves "attain to the true and lofty knowledge of the special character of God."¹⁴ Origen noted the verbal imperatives in the Prayer that ask God to act.¹⁵ The kingdom in the second petition is a spiritual kingdom of the word of God; Origen cited Luke 17:20-21; Deut. 30:14; Rom. 10:8.¹⁶ He understood the kingdom of God to be a blessing for God's people: "The one who prays that the kingdom of God may come prays that the kingdom of God may spring up in him, bear fruit, and be rightly perfected."¹⁷

¹¹ 23.2; PG 11:488; Greer, 126.

¹² 23.5; PG 11:492; Greer, 128. Origen, as is commonly known of most Alexandrians, was favorably predisposed to neoplatonic expressions.

¹³ 24.2; PG 11:492; Greer, 129.

¹⁴ 24.4; PG 11:493; Greer, 130.

¹⁵ 24.5; PG 11:493; Greer, 131.

¹⁶ 25.1; PG 11:496; Greer, 132.

¹⁷ Ibid.

He added that the kingdom of Christ consists of the saving words of life which deliver from the tyranny of the Prince of this age.¹⁸ These two petitions pray for the perfect hallowing of God's name and the perfect coming of his kingdom; the believer makes continual progress, always being on the road toward perfection.¹⁹ "The kingdom of sin cannot coexist with the kingdom of God."²⁰ Origen also identified the third petition with the kingdom:

While we who pray are still on earth, since we understand that the will of God is done in heaven by all His own in heaven, let us pray that in everything the will of God may be done by us (ἡμῶν) on earth just as it is done by them. This will happen when none of us do anything contrary to His will. And when the will of God is established "as in heaven" so also for us (ἡμῶν) "on earth," then we shall inherit the kingdom of heaven.²¹

The Christian is involved in all three "Thy petitions" by this prayer that "all these things, while lacking to us on earth, can become ours."²² Origen saw the clause "on earth (ἐπιγῆς) as it is in heaven" as applying to all three earlier petitions.²³ The Christian seeks to do God's will just as

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ 25.2; PG 11:497; Greer, 133; ὁδεύομεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα.

²⁰ 25.3; PG 11:497; Greer, 134.

²¹ 26.1; PG 11.500; Greer, 134.

²² Ibid.

²³ 26.2; PG 11.500; Greer, 134.

Christ came to do the Father's will (John 4:34).²⁴ Christ's disciples become "fellow workers (συνεργούς) with the Father."²⁵ Once again, Origen asserted that earth and heaven are not spatial places. Those who do the will of God are in a sense already in heaven, while those rebellious spirits, even if "in heaven" (Eph. 6:12), have their wicked disposition on earth.²⁶ The third petition asks that the baser things of earth become like the nobler things of heaven (Phil. 3:20).²⁷ Origen reflected an evangelistic spirit when he urged in the words of the third petition intercessory prayer to "make earth heaven" among sinners.²⁸

Origen dwelled at length on the fourth petition, which he interpreted spiritually. He rejected the notion that this petition refers solely to corporeal bread, scorning bread as being such an "earthly and small thing."²⁹ He appealed to John 6:27, "Do not labor for the food that perishes, but for the food that endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give to you."³⁰ Jesus is the true bread who nourishes

²⁴ 26.3; PG 11:501; Greer, 135.

²⁵ 26.4; PG 11:501; Greer, 135.

²⁶ 26.5; PG 11:501; Greer, 136.

²⁷ 26.6; PG 11:504; Greer, 137.

²⁸ 26.6; PG 11:504; Greer, 137.

²⁹ 27.1; PG 11:505; Greer, 137; ἐπίγειου καὶ μικροῦ.

³⁰ 27.2; PG 11:505; Greer, 137.

the true man made in the image of God.³¹ Here Origen's neo-platonic philosophy is patent. He saw Christ as the Wisdom of God. Jesus conforms to the rational nature of man and is therefore more honorable than mundane daily bread.³² He quoted John 6:32, 34-35, 51 to show the superiority of spiritual bread. On the basis of 1 Cor. 3:1, 3; Heb. 5:12-14; and even Rom. 14:2, Origen demonstrated that spiritual food is superior to the corporeal food that nourishes the body.³³

Origen diverged to consider what "daily" means. He stated that the expression *epiousios* in the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer "is not employed by any of the Greeks or of the wise, nor is it in colloquial use among the common people. Rather, it seems to have been invented by the evangelists."³⁴ He conjectured that the word was coined in the manner of *periousios*, used in Ex. 19:5-6, "You shall be to me a people for possession." Both words were formed with reference to "being" (*ousia*).³⁵ Since *periousios* would mean a people dwelling around "being," *epiousios* would then mean the bread that is for "being." Origen made the typical neo-platonic dualistic claim that "being" refers to the

³¹ 27.2; PG 11:505; Greer, 138.

³² Ibid.

³³ 27.5; PG 11:508; Greer, 139.

³⁴ 27.7; PG 11:509; Greer, 140; ἀλλ' εἴκει πεπλάσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν.

³⁵ 27.7; PG 11:509; Greer, 140; περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν and ἐπι τὴν οὐσίαν.

incorporeal realm of ideas, that is, that which is "real" exists beyond the material world of sense perception. As bread gives daily physical nourishment, the living bread is given to the mind and soul and shares its power and gives immortality. Therefore, it is "daily" insofar that it is "bread for being." Origen entertained a further possibility for the meaning of the word *epiousios* stating that it may be derived from *epienai* (παρὰ τὸ ἐπιέναι) meaning "coming." If "coming" is given the nuance of coming ahead of time, that is, to the future (rather than "coming here"), consistent with his spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition, then the prayer asks for tomorrow's bread to be given today.³⁶ Evidently Origen was aware of the possibility that the word *epiousios* might have been understood as "tomorrow." The bread was spiritual for Origen, whether it is "for being" (existence) or "tomorrow's."

Origen commented on the word "debts" of the fifth petition: "Either we pay what is ordered by the divine Law by discharging it in full or, if we do not pay them [debts] because we despise the wholesome Word, we remain in debt."³⁷ He explained that debts are both against God and one another. He cited the parable of the Unmerciful Servant in Matt. 18:21-35 and Jesus' teaching on the need to forgive from Luke 17:3-4 to exemplify the meaning of this petition. Origen

³⁶ 27.13; PG 11:516; Greer, 144. Origen preferred his first interpretation. A more complete etymological review will be provided in Chapter III.

³⁷ 28.1; PG 11:521; Greer, 147.

noted that Luke used the word "sins" instead of Matthew's "debts" which essentially teaches the same thing, although Luke's version "does not seem to leave room for the person who wishes to forgive debtors only if they repent."³⁸

Origen wrote extensively on the difficult sixth petition. He clearly demonstrated that the whole life of man on earth is under temptation, proved by copious Bible verses, as for example, "Through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22), and "Many are the afflictions of the righteous" (Ps. 34:19). Origen described how some have succumbed to temptation: "And many by fleeing contempt have fallen into eternal shame, since they have been ashamed of bearing Christ's name nobly."³⁹ Therefore, the Christian should avoid a false sense of spiritual security:

Let us pray to be delivered from temptation not by avoiding temptation (for that is impossible, especially for those on earth), but by not being defeated (ἡττᾶσθαι) when we are tempted. Now I suppose that the person defeated in temptation enters *into* temptation.⁴⁰

Origen raised the query concerning how a good God could lead his own people into temptation.⁴¹ He acknowledged that there are some examples in the Bible which show that a good God has

³⁸ 28.8; PG 11:528; Greer, 150. By this Origen seems to have been defending the rigorist notion of the impossibility of forgiveness for extreme, deliberate and mortal sins; he appealed to 1 John 5:16 at 28.10.

³⁹ 29.7; PG 11:536; Greer, 154.

⁴⁰ 29.9; PG 11:536; Greer, 155.

⁴¹ 29.11; PG 11:537; Greer, 156.

acted in a way that may be perceived as an evil intention on the part of God.⁴² Origen believed that God allows some to continue in evil so that once they have become satiated, they may acknowledge their folly and repent (see Numbers 11, where God fed the grumbling Israelites).⁴³ Essentially Origen saw that temptation was an instrument of God for the perfecting of men. The sixth petition does not ask God to spare Christians of temptation, but that they may not be engulfed by temptation.⁴⁴ In the convoluted rhetoric of this section, Origen maintained that the true character of the Christian is manifested in temptation, of which a good God can be the source.⁴⁵ God will strengthen the Christian in temptation.⁴⁶ Origen apparently thought that temptation comes both from the evil surrounding the Christian in this world and from God in the form of "testing." This view was expanded in his comments on the seventh petition. He believed that the seventh petition was not a part of Luke's Prayer because this

⁴² For example, Rom. 1:22-24, 26-28, where God gave the reprobate up to their sin. Eric George Jay, Origen's Treatise on Prayer (London: SPCK, 1954), 198, fns. 1 & 2, explains that Origen had the Marcionites in mind. Marcion asserted that suffering was inconsistent with a God of love, and therefore he "invented" another God, one of justice, to account for injustice. For Origen, the good God who has the potential of leading into temptation is nevertheless the good God addressed as "Father."

⁴³ 29.13-15; PG 11:540; Greer, 157-160.

⁴⁴ 29.11; PG 11:537; Greer, 156; περιβληθῶμεν.

⁴⁵ 29.16-18; PG 11:537; Greer, 160-61.

⁴⁶ 29.19; PG 11:545; Greer, 161.

petition is an elaboration of the sixth.⁴⁷ The *disciples* in Luke's account did not need further elaboration of the sixth petition, but the *crowds* in Matthew's account did need more ample clarification. Origen believed that God delivers from the evil one, not by causing the evil foe to cease his attacks, but by giving the Christian strength to withstand them. The examples of Job in his trials and of Jesus at his temptation illustrate how God gives strength against the temptations of the "evil one."⁴⁸

By way of evaluation, it appears that Origen's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer seriously reckoned with the believer's present life in the Gospel age. His interpretation was not eschatological. He adumbrated an eschatological possibility at only one place, that of "tomorrow's bread" in the fourth petition, though he himself rejected that possibility in lieu of an interpretation of the bread required for present, but spiritual, nourishment. In the crucial second petition, he viewed the kingdom as a gift of God's grace for the believer here and now. The sixth and seventh petitions had reference to the present circumstances of Christians.

Cyril of Jerusalem 315-386

Cyril was an orthodox bishop of Jerusalem famous for his twenty-four catechetical lectures for neophytes before and after their baptisms. The last five are called the

⁴⁷ 30.1; PG 11:545; Greer, 162.

⁴⁸ 30.2; PG 11:548; Greer, 162.

Mystagogical Catecheses, delivered to the newly-baptized during the paschal octave of perhaps A.D. 347.⁴⁹ In his "Fifth Lecture on the Mysteries," that is, in the last lecture, Cyril explained the eucharistic rite which contained the Lord's Prayer. He diverged to provide an exposition of that Prayer.

Cyril explained that God is a benevolent and gracious heavenly Father. He can be called Father by the believer on the basis of the complete forgiveness of sin which in turn establishes a heavenly relationship. Interestingly, the believer himself can be the heaven in whom God exists.⁵⁰ The name of God is holy, but since sinners often profane it, the first petition asks that "in us God's name may be hallowed."⁵¹ The second petition is briefly explained as a prayer that arises from "a clean soul."⁵² The third petition is summarized: "as Thy will is done by the Angels, so be it done on earth also by me, Lord."⁵³

⁴⁹ PG 33:1117-1124; ET used, Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments: The Procatechesis and the Five Mystagogical Catecheses, ed. F. L. Cross (London: SPCK, 1951), 11-18, pp. 34-37; ET, pp. 75-78. The exposition of the Lord's Prayer is in the Fifth Lecture, sections 11-18. See bibliography for additional sources. The Five Mystagogical Catechetical lectures are numbered 19-23. For data regarding the possible date of their delivery, see Cross, p. xxii.

⁵⁰ 5.11; PG 33:1117; Cross, 75.

⁵¹ 5.12; PG 33:1120; Cross, 75; ἐν ἡμῖν.

⁵² 5.13; PG 33:1120; Cross, 76.

⁵³ 5.14; PG 33:1120; Cross, 76; ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . . ἐν ἐμοί γένοιντο.

The bread petition was understood spiritually by Cyril. For him, it was not common bread, but bread for the soul.⁵⁴ Cyril called attention to the fact that the "daily" of Matthew means the same as "day by day" of Luke; both have the present in view.⁵⁵ The "debts" of the fifth petition are simply called "sins" by Cyril.⁵⁶ He emphasized the necessity of being forgiving so that God's forgiveness of the believer is not jeopardized.⁵⁷ Cyril claimed that the sixth petition does not ask God to spare the believer from temptation, implying "testing" from the context, but for strength from being overwhelmed by temptation.⁵⁸ Cyril numbered seven petitions, though the seventh is an elaboration of the sixth. He explained it this way: "If *Lead us not into temptation* had implied the not being tempted at all, He would not have said, 'But deliver us from the evil.'"⁵⁹ Cyril considered the word *ponerou* in the seventh petition to be the devil, "the wicked devil, the adversary."⁶⁰

He concluded: "After completing the prayer, Thou

⁵⁴ 5.15; PG 33:1120; Cross, 76; "ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ὁ κοινὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιούσιος. But this *epiousios* bread is holy, by this (ἀντὶ τοῦ) it is appointed ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν."

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ 5.16; PG 33:1120; Cross, 76.

⁵⁷ 5.16; PG 33:1120; Cross, 77.

⁵⁸ 5.17; PG 33:1120; Cross, 77; καταβαλπισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πειρασμοῦ.

⁵⁹ 5.18; PG 33:1123; Cross, 78.

⁶⁰ 5.18; PG 33:1121; Cross, 78; πονηρὸς δὲ ὁ ἀντικείμενος δαίμων.

sayest, AMEN." which means "so be it."⁶¹ It is unclear whether the "Amen" follows the seventh petition or a conclusion; the first is more likely. This "Amen" puts a seal on the petitions spoken.⁶²

Cyril interpreted the Prayer noneschatologically. He gave the fourth petition a spiritual interpretation.

Gregory of Nyssa 335-394

Gregory was appointed bishop of the small see of Nyssa in the district of Caesarea in Cappadocia by his famous brother Basil. He was a champion of the orthodox Nicean faith, and author of several important works, including in about A.D. 380 the *De Oratione Dominica*.⁶³ This treatise on prayer consisted of five sermons of which the last four gave an exposition of the Lord's Prayer.

Gregory pointed out that the Christian can call God in heaven "Father" on the basis of a virtuous life.⁶⁴ The one called Father is "King" and heaven is the believer's fatherland.⁶⁵ Since God's name is always holy and everything

⁶¹ Ibid.; γένουτο.

⁶² Ibid.; ἑπισφραγίζων διὰ τοῦ ἁμῆν. Note that after the Lord's Prayer the famous words before the sacrament are spoken (5.19) by the officiant: "Holy things to holy people."

⁶³ PG 44:1119-1194; "The Lord's Prayer," tr. Hilda C. Graef, in Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 18. (Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1954), 21-84.

⁶⁴ PG 44:1145.2; Graef, 42.

⁶⁵ PG 44:1145.2; Graef, 44.

is under his dominion (kingdom), the first two petitions of the Lord's Prayer ask for divine aid for human nature too weak to achieve anything good by itself.⁶⁶ Gregory explained that these petitions ask that God's name be hallowed in, and the kingdom come to, the one praying.⁶⁷ Such a prayer seems to assume that God will overcome the forces of evil resident in the believer. The coming of the kingdom seems to be an equation for the work of the Holy Spirit. Gregory cited his text of Luke, which reads, "May Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us."⁶⁸ As the work of the spirit is to cleanse from sin, Gregory maintained that the coming of the kingdom also means cleansing from sin.⁶⁹ Further, the will of God in the third petition is the salvation of men.⁷⁰ This prayer asks, "Therefore let Thy Will be done so that the will of the devil may be destroyed."⁷¹ The phrase, "on earth as it is in heaven," "teaches us to purify our life from evil that the will of God may rule in us without hindrance."⁷²

In the fourth petition, Gregory significantly abandoned

⁶⁶ PG 44:1152.3; Graef, 48.

⁶⁷ PG 44:1153.3; Graef, 49-50; Ἐν ἐμοὶ οὖν.

⁶⁸ PG 44:1157.3; Graef, 52. See Chapter III, Excursus: Luke and the Holy Spirit, *infra*.

⁶⁹ PG 44:1157.3; Graef, 53.

⁷⁰ PG 44:1161.4; Graef, 59.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² PG 44:1164.4; Graef, 62; ἡμῶν ἀνεμποδίστως τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πολιτεύσασθαι.

the spiritual interpretation in favor of material bread. Gregory clarified what bread is. It refers to the needs of life, not to superfluous and luxurious amenities.⁷³ Further, it is acquired by honest labor.⁷⁴ Jesus adds "today" since God forbids his children to be solicitous of the future. Worry for the next day is avoided.⁷⁵ This petition is ultimately concerned with "everlasting realities" which can occupy the believer once his bodily requirements are taken care of.⁷⁶ The believer is rendered able to serve God once daily needs are satisfied.

The topic of forgiveness in the fifth petition was treated as the peak of virtue.⁷⁷ Man lives indebted to God because he has separated himself from God and therefore has become God's enemy. Further, he has given up his free will in exchange for wicked slavery to, and tyranny of, sin.⁷⁸ Of course, Gregory enjoined the believer to be forgiving of others: "By the disposition you show to him who is under obligation to you you pronounce the judgement [*sic*] of Heaven on yourself."⁷⁹ The sixth and seventh petitions were

⁷³ PG 44:1169.4; Graef, 64.

⁷⁴ PG 44:1172.4, Graef, 67.

⁷⁵ PG 44:1175.4, Graef, 68.

⁷⁶ PG 44:1176.4; Graef, 70; πρὸς τὸ δεινέκες τε καὶ ἀτελεύτητον.

⁷⁷ PG 44:1177.5; Graef, 71.

⁷⁸ PG 44:1181.5; Graef, 74.

⁷⁹ PG 44:1188.5; Graef, 80.

considered together with very brief comments. Gregory considered the "evil" to be personal, with "temptation" being an alternative for the devil; hence, the prayer asks God to keep the believer from succumbing to the "tempter" and for deliverance from the "tempter."⁸⁰ His Trinitarian final clause reflected the existence of a two-member conclusion: ". . . for His is the power and glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always, and for ever and ever. Amen."⁸¹

Gregory's exposition of the Lord's Prayer is significant for its noneschatological orientation. He broke with the popular Origenist allegorical-mystical tradition in his interpretation of the fourth petition. For him, the bread was material bread coming from a gracious and benevolent God. His Greek Biblical manuscript of Luke significantly retained a variant reading replacing the kingdom with the Holy Spirit in the second petition. Much of Gregory's exposition seems to have emphasized sanctified living based on the pretext of his six petitions. His exegesis was not so much that of a Prayer to be prayed; rather, he appears to have used the petitions as lessons for teaching patterns of Christian conduct, morality, and attitudes.

Chrysostom 345-407

John Chrysostom of Constantinople had formerly served for twelve years in Antioch. He became noted for his sermons

⁸⁰ PG 44:1192.5; Graef, 84.

⁸¹ PG 44:1193.5; Graef, 84. A dative of ascription rather than a genitive is used in the conclusion.

delivered while at Antioch of which "Homily 19" is a commentary on the sixth chapter of Matthew dated about A.D. 380.⁸²

Chrysostom noted the relationship which the Christian has with God. This relationship enables him to address God as Father in the Lord's Prayer:

For he who calls God Father, by him both remission of sins, and taking away of punishment, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, and adoption, and inheritance, and brotherhood with the Only-Begotten, and the supply of the Spirit, are acknowledged in this single title.⁸³

The phrase "in heaven" does not locate God spatially, but lifts the one praying from earth.⁸⁴ The plural "our" requires the removal of envy, jealousy, and inequalities among Christians.⁸⁵

The first petition seeks God's glory, "for 'hallowed' is glorified."⁸⁶ Chrysostom acknowledged that God's glory is complete, but this petition requires the believer to glorify God (Matt. 5:16 was quoted, "Let your light so shine").⁸⁷ The important second petition emphasized the importance of

⁸² *In Matthaëum homilia* 19.4-6; PG 57:278-82; ET in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, tr. George Prevost, rev. by M. B. Riddle, vol. 10, first series, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950 repr.), 130-40 [hereafter NPNF¹].

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 19.6; PG 57:278; NPNF¹ 10:134.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ 19.7; PG 57:279; NPNF¹ 10:134.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

longing "for the things to come."⁸⁸ This may superficially appear to reflect an eschatological interpretation, although Chrysostom's third petition definitely pointed to the here and now. He considered the third petition to be an extension of the thought of the second petition:

. . . and, till that may be, even while we abide here, so long to be earnest in showing forth the same conversation as those above. For ye must long . . . for heaven . . . however, even before heaven, He hath bidden us make the earth a heaven.⁸⁹

The third petition prays that as God's will is done by the obedient angels in heaven "vouchsafe that we men may not do Thy will by halves, but perform all things as Thou willest."⁹⁰ God's will on earth is not to be done "in us" but everywhere "on the earth" by eradicating error and wickedness with the result that there would be no difference between heaven and earth.⁹¹ Believers are to be subservient to God much as the angels of heaven who do his will.

Chrysostom's comments on the fourth petition are especially valuable. He began by asking: "What is 'daily bread'? That for one day."⁹² He seems deliberately to have

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ 19.7; PG 57:279; NPNF¹ 10:135.

⁹⁰ 19.7; PG 57:280; NPNF¹ 10:135; μή ἐξ ἡμῶν.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² 19.8; PG 57:280; NPNF¹ 10:135; Τι ἔστι, τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον; τὸν ἐφημέριον. In his *In Orationem Dominicam* (PG 51:47) the bread is Ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ σώματος διαβαίνοντα (id est, qui in substantiam corporis transit).

broken with the tradition of a spiritual interpretation, shifting the application of this petition to man's earthly situation. God condescends to the infirmity of human nature.⁹³ He explained that this petition does not ask God for more than basic requirements: "For it is neither for riches, nor for delicate living (ὑπὲρ τρυφῆς), nor for costly raiment, nor for any other such thing, but for bread only, that He hath commanded us to make our prayer."⁹⁴ He evidently understood the difficult Greek word *epiousios* in the fourth petition as "daily," or, "bread for one day." Chrysostom explained that Jesus added the definition "this day" (σήμερον) to further emphasize that the believer should not be encumbered with worry about the following day's cares, citing Matt. 6:34.⁹⁵ Chrysostom's fifth petition read: "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive (present tense) our debtors."⁹⁶ He assumed that only a Christian could pray the Lord's Prayer since God had been addressed earlier as "Father." Chrysostom recognized that even after baptism there remained a need for repentance of sin, for which this petition asks. The one who prays promises also to forgive others. God could forgive sin without man promising also to

⁹³ 19.8; PG 57:280; *NPNF*¹ 10:135.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*; ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἄρτου μόνον ἐκέλευσε τὴν εὐχὴν ποιῆσθαι, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄρτου τοῦ ἐφημέρου. In his *In Orationem Dominicam*, op. cit., he wrote aphoristically: οὐ τρυφήν, ἀλλὰ τροφήν.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*; Δὸς ἡμῖν σημερον.

⁹⁶ 19.9; PG 57:281; *NPNF*¹ 10:135.

forgive, but God provides occasions for the Christian to show love to his fellowman by means of offering him forgiveness.⁹⁷ Consequently, "the beginning is of us, and we ourselves have control over the judgment that is to be passed upon us."⁹⁸ Chrysostom added that only when the Christian is willing to do his part can his prayers reasonably be expected to be heard and answered by God.

Chrysostom concluded his exposition briefly as follows: "And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from the evil one: for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen."⁹⁹ Chrysostom commented on the last two petitions together, indicating that the Christian will be victorious against the devil. He assumed that the devil is referred to in the seventh petition since he is "himself the cause of all our wrongs."¹⁰⁰ Turning to the conclusion following immediately upon the reference to the enemy, he explained that God's kingdom is putting Satan's kingdom under subjection.¹⁰¹ The believer may be weak, but God is powerful.¹⁰² The "glory" in the three-membered conclusion belongs to God, but God is willing to make his people

⁹⁷ 19.9; PG 57:281; NPNE¹ 10:136.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ 19.9; PG 57:282; NPNE¹ 10:137.

¹⁰⁰ 19.10; PG 57:281; NPNE¹ 10:136.

¹⁰¹ 19.10; PG 57:282; NPNE¹ 10:137.

¹⁰² Ibid.

glorious. Nothing was said about the "Amen."

Chrysostom's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer is significant. He definitely applied it to the believer's present life situation. He saw the Christian involved in the fulfilment of the petitions of the first strophe. If his interpretation of the second petition was not clear, though suggestive of an eschatological interpretation, this tendency was arrested by his exposition of the third petition. In the fourth petition, he completely abandoned any spiritual understanding; indeed, his second strophe and conclusion are clearly applied to the believer living now, before the *eschaton*. Chrysostom attested to a three-member conclusion in use by A.D. 380.

Theodore of Mopsuestia 350-428

Theodore was one of the most profound thinkers of the Golden Age of Christianity. Representing the "Antiochian School" of literal interpretation, he presented six discourses in his *Liber ad Baptizandos* of which chapter one treats the Lord's Prayer. This catechetical presentation may be dated about A.D. 390, written in Greek, although a Syriac translation is the only source extant for the document today.¹⁰³

His text of the Lord's Prayer read at the fifth petition, "And forgive us our debts and our sins as we have forgiven our debtors," and included an elaborate three-member

¹⁰³ Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, tr. A. Mingana, Woodbrooke Studies 6 (Cambridge: Heffer, 1933), 1-16.

conclusion, "For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory now, always, and for ever and ever. Amen."¹⁰⁴

Theodore stated that prayer is connected with good works.¹⁰⁵ Such works stem from the fact that Christians live under the Spirit: "Those who have received the Holy Spirit by whom they necessarily expect immortality, while still in this world, it is fitting that they should live in the Spirit . . . that they should flee the works of sin."¹⁰⁶ This attitude is congruent with calling God "Father." Theodore taught at the first petition: "You should strive to do the things by which the name of God will be glorified by all men."¹⁰⁷ The Christian should think and do "the things that are congruous to the heavenly citizenship."¹⁰⁸ Under the third petition, he declared that, "In this world we ought to persevere as much as possible in the will of God and not to will or do things that are against Him."¹⁰⁹ Lest it appear that Theodore encouraged Christian sanctification on the basis of the themes reported in the Lord's Prayer, but ignored the fact of prayer itself, he explained that no one can do the things mentioned in the first three petitions

¹⁰⁴ Mingana, 3.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 7.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 8.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 9.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 9-10.

without prayer.¹¹⁰

Bread in the fourth petition is that which is necessary for the "maintenance and sustenance of this earthly life."¹¹¹ The "today" means "now" and not "tomorrow."¹¹² His fourth petition read: "Give us today our necessary bread."¹¹³ Hoarding and the desire for more than is necessary is not desirable for those striving for perfection.¹¹⁴ When failing in the aim toward perfection, the Christian turns to the fifth petition to beg forgiveness of involuntary sins.¹¹⁵ The ability or willingness to forgive others is necessary for one's own forgiveness: "If we forgive those who trespass against us we have confidence that we will undoubtedly receive, in the same way, forgiveness of our trespasses from God."¹¹⁶ With reference to the sixth petition, Theodore disavowed that God leads to temptation; instead these arise from sinful surroundings: "We must pray to God that no temptation should come near us, but if we should be led into it let us bear it with courage and pray that it should come

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 11.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid., 13.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 12.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 13. Note that Theodore assumed that a Christian who strives for perfection should not be expected to commit voluntary sins.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 14.

speedily to an end."¹¹⁷ The seventh petition definitely refers to the devil, who diverts "us from our love and choice of duty."¹¹⁸

Theodore's Prayer had seven petitions, of which the final one referred to the personification of evil, the devil. In conformity with the Antiochian School of literal interpretation, Theodore took the petitions at their face value and applied them to the present experience of the Christian. This is evident in the fourth petition. His bread was material sustenance. There was no spiritualization of the bread. Throughout his exposition, Theodore stressed man's activity in sanctification. Subsequently, his treatment of the second petition, for example, is disconcerting; this petition requires thinking of things worthy of the kingdom.¹¹⁹ In general, it may be questioned whether the Lord's Prayer was interpreted as a prayer as such, or as a springboard for Christian *paranesis*. To be sure, Theodore's admonitory orientation to the Prayer was noneschatological; it stressed the Prayer's application for the here and now.

Summary

The most complete expositional prototype of the Lord's Prayer among the Greek Fathers is that of Origen. It should

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 15.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 9. Theodore's assertions, like those of other church fathers, occasionally appear to border on work-righteousness, that is, man's obedience commands salvation.

be noted that he tackled an explanation of the difficult word *epiousios* in the fourth petition. Even though he was known for his erudition and comprehension of his native Greek tongue he was unable to settle the meaning of that word satisfactorily. Other Greek Fathers alluded to the use of "daily" in conjunction with the fourth petition, but did not attempt saying more than that, except Theodore who gave it the meaning "necessary." All the above fathers, hailing from areas as diverse as Syria and Alexandria, interpreted the Lord's Prayer noneschatologically. Two, Origen and Cyril, viewed the fourth petition spiritually; the others viewed the bread of the fourth petition materially. All indicated that the Father in heaven is not to be understood spatially or locally. Each in his way spoke of the grace and benevolence of God with regard to each of the petitions, including the significant second and fourth petitions. In the first strophe, most expositions emphasized that God's name, kingdom, and will could not be increased by man, yet believers were to be instrumental in their fulfilment. All the above commentators except possibly Theodore took the sixth and seventh petitions together, thus yielding a total of six petitions in the Lord's Prayer. All interpreted the *ponerou* personally, as the "evil one." Several Greek fathers attested to some form of concluding doxology, although in the cases where commentary or references to it were absent, it cannot be fully determined that such a conclusion was unknown. All of the expositions basically followed the more complete Matthean form of the Prayer rather than the shorter

Lukan version. From early on, the former apparently became the liturgical and commonly preferred version of the Prayer.

Select Latin Fathers

Tertullian 155-220

Tertullian of Carthage wrote his treatise on the Lord's Prayer sometime around A.D. 200. His *De Oratione* is the earliest extant exposition of the Lord's Prayer.¹²⁰ Of note is his text of the Lord's Prayer in which the second and third petitions are inexplicably reversed.¹²¹ This treatise consists of twenty-nine chapters, of which two through eleven are devoted to the Lord's Prayer.

The address allows the believer to confess his faith.¹²² The Son, Jesus, is the Father's new name.¹²³ This name is to be hallowed, "Our petition is for it to be hallowed in us."¹²⁴ The will of God is to be done in us.¹²⁵ Further, the will of God is that Christians be saved.

¹²⁰ *De Oratione* 2-9; PL 1:1256-1268; ET, Tertullian's Tract on the Prayer, tr. Ernest Evans (London: SPCK, 1953). See bibliography for other sources.

¹²¹ This apparently deliberate reversal probably was intended to serve his needs (Evans, 11): ". . . after heavenly things, that is, after God's name, God's will, and God's kingdom, it should make place for petition for earthly necessities too."

¹²² 2.2; PL 1:1256; Evans, 5.

¹²³ 3.3; PL 1:1257; Evans, 7; "enim filius novum patris nomen est."

¹²⁴ 3.18; PL 1:1259; Evans, 7; "in nobis."

¹²⁵ 4.7; PL 1:1260; Evans, 9; "in nobis fiat voluntas dei."

Tertullian stated that Jesus is the one who endured God's will in the flesh.¹²⁶ This same application to the "in us" applies to the kingdom.¹²⁷ The kingdom petition asks for the swift arrival of the kingdom of God.¹²⁸ As such this petition is directed towards the consummation.¹²⁹ The kingdom petition does not assume a prolongation (*protractum*) of the time of the Gospel age.¹³⁰

Tertullian preferred a spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition. For him Christ was the bread of life.¹³¹ Yet the necessities of life are also embraced by this petition.¹³² The fifth petition, as a request for pardon, is also a confession of wrongdoing.¹³³ Tertullian explained this petition in terms of Matt. 18:23-36 (the Unmerciful Servant). The next petition asks not only for forgiveness but the total removal of wrongdoings and not to be allowed to

¹²⁶ 4.24; PL 1:1260; Evans, 9.

¹²⁷ 5.2; PL 1:1261; Evans, 9.

¹²⁸ 5.15; PL 1:1261; Evans, 10; "immo quam celeriter veniat."

¹²⁹ 5.9; PL 1:1261; Evans, 9; "ad consummationem saeculi."

¹³⁰ 5.6; PL 1:1261; Evans, 9.

¹³¹ 6.5-7; PL 1:1263; Evans, 10; "Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus et vita panis."

¹³² 6.3; PL 1:1262; Evans, 10; "terrenis quoque necessitatibus."

¹³³ 7.5; PL 1:1264; Evans, 13.

be led by the tempter.¹³⁴ God, of course, does not tempt; weakness and malice belong to the devil.¹³⁵ The seventh petition interprets the meaning of the sixth; it means, "But remove us from the evil."¹³⁶ Notice that Latin has no article and a *malo* could be taken as either "from evil" or "from the evil one." Probably for Tertullian the latter was in view in light of the *diaboli* above.

Tertullian does not appear to be susceptible of an eschatological tendency, except possibly in connection with the kingdom petition in terms of its looking toward the final goal of Christian life. He gave the fourth petition both a temporal and a spiritual meaning. His intended meaning for the seventh petition was ambiguous. No conclusion was mentioned; he called the seventh petition the conclusion.¹³⁷

Cyprian of Carthage 200-258?

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, is accepted as an orthodox churchman of the ante-Nicean period. He penned his treatise *De Oratione Dominica* about A.D. 252, containing thirty-six

¹³⁴ 8.3-4; PL 1:1266; Evans, 15; "Ne nos inducas in temptationem, id est, ne nos patiaris induci, ab eo utique qui temptat."

¹³⁵ 8.6; PL 1:1267; Evans, 15; "diaboli est et infirmitas et malitia."

¹³⁶ 8.14-15; PL 1:1267; Evans, 15; "sed devehe nos a malo."

¹³⁷ 8.13; PL 1:1267; Evans, 15; "clausula."

chapters.¹³⁸ The center chapters of the document explained the Lord's Prayer itself. Cyprian's work was dependent on that of Tertullian before him, yet his exposition was original, having often departed from Tertullian's.¹³⁹ Cyprian's commentary on the Lord's Prayer was accorded wide circulation for centuries. It occupied a similar position of respect in Latin Christianity as that accorded to Origen in Greek Christianity.

Cyprian began his exposition by noting that Christians are taught to pray together: "Our prayer is public and common, and when we pray, we pray not for one but for the whole people, because we, the whole people, are one."¹⁴⁰ Those who pray address God as Father, because they have become sons; John 1:11-12 was cited.¹⁴¹

In the first petition, the believer asks God to hallow his name "in us."¹⁴² The Christian should be moved toward daily sanctification, so that his life hallows God.¹⁴³ The second petition asks God to manifest his kingdom "to us" just

¹³⁸ *De Oratione Dominica* 7-27; PL 4:535-62; ET in Saint Cyprian Treatises, tr. Roy J. Ferrari, in The Fathers of the Church, vol. 36 (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1958), 127-59. See bibliography for other resources.

¹³⁹ O'Donnell, op. cit., 38.

¹⁴⁰ *De Orat. Dom.* 8; PL 4:541; Deferrari, 132.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 9; PL 4:542; Deferrari, 133.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 12; PL 4:544; Deferrari, 136; "in nobis."

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

as the first activity was "in us."¹⁴⁴ Cyprian defined the kingdom as being Christ himself.¹⁴⁵ In addition, the third petition asks "not that God may do what He wishes [since his will is done anyway], but that we may be able to do what God wishes."¹⁴⁶ The devil hinders God's will being done "in us."¹⁴⁷ Therefore, "That it [God's will] may be done in us, there is need of God's will, that is, of His help and protection, because no one is strong in his own strength."¹⁴⁸ Christ accomplished the will of God by his gentleness and humility.¹⁴⁹ Cyprian understood the last line of the third petition as a reference to the totality of creation, understanding that God's will is to be done in heaven and in earth. "Heaven and earth" suggests a struggle between flesh and spirit. God's will is that the earthly give way to the heavenly.¹⁵⁰

Cyprian understood the fourth petition physically, spiritually, and sacramentally. The bread is nourishment,

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 13; PL 4:544; Deferrari, 137; a simple dative, "nobis."

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 13; PL 4:545; Deferrari, 138; "ipse Christus esse regnum Dei."

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 14; PL 4:545; Deferrari, 138.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.; "in nobis."

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 15; PL 4:546; Deferrari, 140.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 15; PL 4:547; Deferrari, 141.

the bread of life, and the daily communion.¹⁵¹ Surprisingly, Cyprian did not pursue a spiritual interpretation of this petition any further, but spent the next three chapters discussing the physical interpretation of the bread petition. The believer, having renounced the world with its "riches and pomps," naturally turns to God for sustenance.¹⁵² Christians are not to worry about the future (*de crastino*), nor should they be desirous of having more.¹⁵³ Actually, Cyprian shifted spiritual needs to the fifth petition:

After the subsistence of food the pardon of sin is also asked so that he who is fed by God may live in God, and so that not only the present and temporal life may be provided for but also the eternal, to which we may come if our sins are forgiven, which the Lord calls debts.¹⁵⁴

It is necessary that those who receive God's forgiveness be forgiving of others; God looks to such an attitude of the heart rather than desiring the "gift at the altar."¹⁵⁵

Cyprian stated, under the sixth petition, that "the adversary has no power against us, unless God has previously permitted it."¹⁵⁶ Cyprian believed that God does not cause evil, but sometimes permits it for the believer's good and for his

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 18; PL 4:548-49; Deferrari, 142; "spiritaliter et simpliciter . . . et Eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus."

¹⁵² Ibid., 19; PL 4:550; Deferrari, 143.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 22; PL 4:552; Deferrari, 146.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 23; PL 4:553; Deferrari, 148.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 25; PL 4:554; Deferrari, 149; Cyprian reads "et ne patiaris nos induci" instead of "et ne nos inducas."

strengthening, or as a result of sins.¹⁵⁷ The seventh petition was considered a separate petition. All adversities of the enemy are embraced by the last petition. Cyprian defined "evil" as "all the works of the devil and of the world."¹⁵⁸

Cyprian said nothing of a conclusion to the Prayer. His exposition is well-written, practical, and devoid of the speculation sometimes seen in the Greek Fathers. His commentary directed attention to the life of the believer in this world, especially as seen in the lengthy paragraphs under the fourth petition. Under the second petition, a brief reference was made concerning the Christian's hope for Christ or for the kingdom "to be quickly presented to us."¹⁵⁹ Cyprian's commentary is essentially noneschatological.

Ambrose of Milan 340-397

Ambrose made comments in several places of his writings on the Lord's Prayer, including brief notes in chapter six of his *The Sacraments*. His more important comments appear in chapter five, however.¹⁶⁰ This important leader of the Western Church may have delivered this address to the newly

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 26; PL 4:555; Deferrari, 150.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 27; PL 4:555; Deferrari, 151.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 13; PL 4:545; Deferrari, 138.

¹⁶⁰ *De Sacramentis* 5.4.18-30; PL 16:469-74; ET in Roy J. Deferrari, "The Sacraments," in Saint Ambrose. Theological and Dogmatic Works, in The Fathers of the Church, vol. 44 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1963), 314-18.

baptized about A.D. 390.

The Christian addresses God as Father, because of a kind of sonship that lays no claim on itself.¹⁶¹ No one can contribute to God's holiness; therefore, the first petition asks God to let Himself be hallowed "in us."¹⁶² The kingdom's coming was defined as God's grace.¹⁶³ Under the third petition, heaven is hallowed by the casting out of the devil and now peace is requested on earth.¹⁶⁴

Ambrose devoted three sections to the important fourth petition. He interpreted the bread both spiritually as the bread of eternal life and sacramentally as the daily communion of which he encouraged daily reception.¹⁶⁵ He mentioned that the Greek word *epiousios* was constructed from the phrase ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν meaning the "coming day" (*advenientem diem*) while the Latin uses *quotidianum*, daily. Yet he also gave the meaning for *epiousios* "super-substantial."¹⁶⁶ These comments show that Ambrose was uncertain of the derivation of the Greek *hapax legomenon* used

¹⁶¹ *De Sac.* 5.4.18; PL 16:469; Deferrari, 314.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 5.4.21; PL 16:470; Deferrari, 316; "in nobis."

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 5.4.22; PL 16:471; Deferrari, 316.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 5.4.23; PL 16:471; Deferrari, 316.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.4.25; PL 16:471; Deferrari, 317. In light of the Western predilection for daily communion, the Eastern practice to commune less frequently was considered to be neglect of the sacrament.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 5.4.24; PL 16:471; Deferrari, 316-17.

in the fourth petition (*epiousios*). He appears to have preferred "substantial" rather than "tomorrow's" bread. His comments show that the Latin tradition was comfortable with the word "daily" as an adopted standard reading for *epiousios*. His comments also show that Ambrose with latitude could accept any suitable meaning for this famous *hapax legomenon*: "Thus what the Latin has said and what the Greek, both seem useful."¹⁶⁷

Ambrose explained that "sin" and "debt" in the fifth petition are nearly synonymous.¹⁶⁸ He saw that sinners are held in debt to the devil, but Christ destroyed this debt by his blood.¹⁶⁹ Of course, forgiveness of others cannot be disregarded. His final petition prays, "And suffer us not to be led into temptation, but deliver us from evil."¹⁷⁰

Ambrose did not say that God causes evil, but he saw these petitions as a request from God for strength against sin, human nature, and the Devil.¹⁷¹ He concluded: "So praise and glory be to Him from the ages and now and always, and

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 5.4.27; PL 16:472; Deferrari, 317; "Debitum quid est, nisi peccatum?"

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 5.4.29; PL 16:473; Deferrari, 318; "Et ne patiaris induci nos in tentationem."

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 5.4.29-30; PL 16:473-74; Deferrari, 318.

forever and ever. Amen."¹⁷²

Augustine 354-430

St. Augustine of Hippo is the outstanding churchman before the Reformation, having influenced many theologians after him, including Luther. Several references are made to the Lord's Prayer among his voluminous works.¹⁷³ Two of his significant treatments of the Lord's Prayer will be reported, taken chronologically.¹⁷⁴

The Sermon on the Mount, A.D. 393-4

Augustine's commentary on Matthew's Gospel presented a text similar to the liturgical Latin text. Augustine noted that the Israelites addressed God as "Lord" whereas in the New Testament Christians are directed to call him "Father"; Augustine cited the passages about the adoption of sons (Rom. 8:15-23 and Gal. 4:1-6).¹⁷⁵ He emphasized that the blessed

¹⁷² Ibid., 5.4.30; PL 16:474; Deferrari, 318; "Ipsi ergo laus et gloria a saeculis, et nunc, et semper, et in omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen."

¹⁷³ See for example 130. Letter to Proba, in Saint Augustine: Letters, vol. 2, The Fathers of the Church. Vol. 3, tr. Wilfrid Parsons (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953), 392-95; and, Enchiridion, in NPNF¹, tr. J. F. Shaw (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988 repr.), 3:274.

¹⁷⁴ De Sermone Domini 2.4.15-2.11.38; PL 34:1275-87; "Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount," tr. William Findlay, in NPNF¹ (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 38-46. Sermo 56-59; PL 38:377-402; "Sermons. 56-59," in The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, vol. 3, tr. Edmund Hill (New York: City Press, 1991), 95-131.

¹⁷⁵ De Serm. Dom. 2.4.15; PL 34:1276; NPNF¹ 6:39.

condition of sonship is a result of God's grace.¹⁷⁶

Corporate sonship places all believers on equal terms.¹⁷⁷

God's grace can be extended to believers since they are the dwelling places of God's Spirit.¹⁷⁸ The address "Father in heaven" then does not refer to God's location, but to the condition of grace.

The first petition recognizes that the name of God is already holy, "but that it may be held holy by men."¹⁷⁹ Under the second petition, the kingdom will come after the Gospel has been preached among the nations.¹⁸⁰ To pray "come" does not imply that God does not indeed reign now, but "come" rather implies the manifestation of his reign to believers. On the Last Day all will see Jesus' visible coming.¹⁸¹ The third petition relates man's obedience to God's precepts, so they are done as by the angels in heaven.¹⁸² This petition also embraces the prayer for the conversion of sinners that they might be led to obedience.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 2.4.16; PL 34:1276; NPNF¹ 6:39.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 2.5.17; PL 34:1277; NPNF¹ 6:39.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 2.5.19; PL 34:1277; NPNF¹ 6:40.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 2.6.20; PL 34:1278; NPNF¹ 6:40.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Ibid., 2.6.21; PL 34:1278; NPNF¹ 6:41.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 2.6.22; PL 34:1279; NPNF¹ 6:41.

It also includes the notion of the Final Judgment, when those having lived on earth receive their just deserts.¹⁸⁴

Further, it includes the idea that Jesus fulfilled the will of God and now that will should be done also in the church, by God's people on earth.¹⁸⁵

The fourth petition can include the physical, the spiritual, and the sacramental meanings according to Augustine.¹⁸⁶ The physical includes the things necessary for life such as food and clothing.¹⁸⁷ *Material bread* has in its favor the word "daily," for in the Eastern Churches the *sacrament* is not given daily.¹⁸⁸ However, Augustine seems to have preferred the spiritual meaning on this basis, that Christians should be nourished daily with the word of God.¹⁸⁹ The fifth petition received typical exposition, based especially on the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, with the additional thought that the believers are admonished to be forgiving of others before they themselves have asked for forgiveness. The second part of the clause becomes a test of the ability to forgive even one's enemies.¹⁹⁰ Augustine

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 2.6.24; PL 34:1279; NPNF¹ 6:41.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 2.7.25, 27; PL 34:1280; NPNF¹ 6:41-42.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 2.7.26; PL 34:1280; NPNF¹ 6:42.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 2.7.27; PL 34:1281; NPNF¹ 6:42.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 2.8.29; PL 34:1282; NPNF¹ 6:43.

recognized that many Latin texts read *inferas*, "bring," in place of *inducas*, "lead," for the sixth petition. They mean the same thing. This prayer asks God to "suffer us not to be led into temptation."¹⁹¹ Augustine subscribed to the view that does not implicate God in causing evil and temptation. God does not lead anyone into temptation, but God does allow temptation, especially to test a person.¹⁹² This petition asks God to keep his children from entering the ruin of temptation, from adversity that cannot be borne without defeat (1 Cor. 10:13 was cited to show that the prayer is concerned, not with being tempted and tried, but with succumbing to temptation, that is, being led into temptation).¹⁹³ This petition asks not that the believer be spared of being tested, which is often ordered by God, but from succumbing to temptation which comes from Satan.¹⁹⁴ The seventh petition asks for deliverance "from that into which we have been already led."¹⁹⁵ The "evil" is abstract.

Augustine drew specific attention to the petitions as being seven in number, with the first three pertaining to "eternal things" which "begin to be answered in this life."¹⁹⁶

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 2.9.30; PL 34:1282; NPNF¹ 6:43.

¹⁹² Ibid., 2.9.30, 32; PL 34:1282; NPNF¹ 6:43-44.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 2.9.34; PL 34:1284; NPNF¹ 6:45.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 2.9.32; PL 34:1282; NPNF¹ 6:44.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 2.9.35; PL 34:1285; NPNF¹ 6:45.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 2.10.36; PL 34:1285; NPNF¹ 6:45.

The last four petitions refer to everyday needs.¹⁹⁷ He also pointed out that an internal harmony is to be observed in the Matthean Sermon on the Mount, whereby the seven petitions correspond to the seven Beatitudes.¹⁹⁸

Sermons 56-59, A.D. 412-16

Augustine delivered a series of catechetical sermons based on the Lord's Prayer to candidates for baptism (*competentes*). Part of new converts' "scrutinies" or examinations included the handing over to them of the unwritten Lord's Prayer (*traditio*) and then a week later they had to give it back, or recite it by memory (*redditio*).¹⁹⁹ These four sermons are very similar. The first is the longest and most representative of them; pertinent details from the others will be cited when important.

The creed was "given" in the course of preparation for baptism in order for the faith to be imparted to converts, new believers. Then, the Lord's Prayer was "given" to them

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 2.10.37; PL 34:1285; NPNF¹ 6:45.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 2.11.38; PL 34:1286; NPNF¹ 6:46. Some parallels are very clear; for example, "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness" (Matt. 5:6), and "Blessed are the merciful" (Matt. 5:7), easily parallel the fourth and fifth petitions. His second and third petitions are the most strained partly because the Vulgate and Western texts which Augustine evidently used reverse Matt. 5:4 and 5. Interestingly, the first macarism alludes to "heaven" in the standard text, and the third ends with "earth." According to this scheme, Matt. 5:10-12 must not be included in the corpus of the Beatitudes. For a complete comparison, see John Peter Lange, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, tr. Philip Schaff, vol. 8 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1960), 124.

¹⁹⁹ This process is explained by Hill, 106, fn. 1; in the same note and at 117, fn. 117, he provides evidence in support that these sermons were delivered in successive years up to the year A.D. 416.

in order to know to whom to pray.²⁰⁰ Augustine stated that the Lord's Prayer is short and to the point, prayed by one who now knows God as Father.²⁰¹ Augustine provided commentary to each of the petitions. God's name is already holy, but the prayer is that it may be hallowed "in you."²⁰² God's kingdom will come at the end of the world, but the second petition is essentially concerned about God's grace (Matt. 25:34 is cited). This petition asks that God's kingdom come "among us."²⁰³ It is asked that the believer belong to the kingdom by "a good life."²⁰⁴ More is said in *Sermon 58*: "To desire and pray for his kingdom to come is nothing more than to desire him to make us worthy of his kingdom," lest when it comes, it does not come "for us."²⁰⁵ The will of God is done by God himself, but it is also to be done "by you."²⁰⁶ This includes imitating the perfection of

²⁰⁰ *Sermo* 56.1; PL 38:377; Hill, 95. The heading may very well be an editorial gloss: "Symbolum et Oratio christianis traditur."

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 56.5; PL 38:379; Hill, 97.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 56.6; PL 38:379; Hill, 97; "in te."

²⁰³ *Ibid.*; "Ut in nobis veniat, optamus; ut in illo inveniamur, optamus."

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 56.6; PL 38:379; Hill, 98; "ut bene vivas."

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 58.3; PL 38:394; Hill, 119; "tunc enim nobis veniet."

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 56.8; PL 38:380; Hill, 99. "It will be done in you; but let it be done by you" (*fiat in te; sed fiat et a te*). Augustine acknowledged that when God's will is done by the believer, even then it is God who is at work: ". . . never, though, is anything done by you if he doesn't do it in you" (*numquam autem aliquid fit a te, si ne facit in te*), *ibid.*, 56.7; PL 38:380; Hill, 98.

heaven among all on earth, even among God's enemies, for whom prayer for their conversion is necessary in order that total obedience may be rendered to God.²⁰⁷ *Sermon 57* elaborated on this point:

The Church of God is heaven, its enemies are earth. We do well to desire for our enemies that they too may believe, and become Christians, and that God's will may be done, as in heaven, so also on earth.²⁰⁸

The fourth petition asks God for the daily nourishment necessary for the soul. "The beggar stands at the rich man's door."²⁰⁹ Since God feeds the "just and unjust" alike, this petition must refer primarily to the daily food on earth which is the word of God.²¹⁰ Yet all material daily needs are also included in the fourth petition as *Sermon 57* showed: "When we ask for bread, we receive everything with it."²¹¹ Under the fifth petition, Augustine emphasized prayer for one's enemies, and that forgiveness looks to one's past sins. The last two petitions look to the possibility of falling into temptation again in the future.²¹² *Sermon 57* illustrates this:

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 57.6; PL 38:388; Hill, 111.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 56.9; PL 38:381; Hill, 99; "Stat mendicus ante domum divitis."

²¹⁰ Ibid., 56.10; PL 38:381; Hill, 100; "Cibus noster quotidianus in hac terra, sermo Dei est."

²¹¹ Ibid., 57.7; PL 38:389; Hill, 112.

²¹² Ibid., 56.18; PL 38:386; Hill, 105.

With the sort of temptation by which people are deceived and led astray, God tempts nobody, but he does, certainly, according to his deep and inscrutable judgment, forsake some. When he has forsaken a person, the tempter discovers what he can do.²¹³

Therefore, the sixth petition asks that God may not forsake the believer. The difference between testing or proving and temptation is explained in *Sermon 59*:

You are brought into temptation if you give your consent to the tempter. You see, it's useful to be tempted [i.e., tested] in this life, but it's not a good thing to be brought into temptation.²¹⁴

Although Augustine counted seven petitions, he acknowledged a kinship between the last two in *Sermon 57* by saying: "By delivering us from evil he brings us not into temptation, by not bringing us into temptation he delivers us from evil."²¹⁵

Augustine did not view the first strophe eschatologically.²¹⁶ The kingdom, for example, would come at the Last Day; yet, he always kept in mind the believer's relationship to the consummation, trusting that the believer would be included in the kingdom by virtue of his *present status* (of grace) before God. The first and third petitions were definitely related to the Christian who was living in

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 57.9; PL 38:390; Hill, 113.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 59.8; PL 38:402; Hill, 129. The evil for Augustine was temptation itself ("sed libera nos a malo; hoc est, ab ipsa tentatione"), *ibid.*, 56.18; PL 38:386; Hill, 105.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 57.10; PL 38:391; Hill, 114.

²¹⁶ Augustine claimed that men always ("semper") should be hallowing the name, being in the kingdom, and doing his will; and the other petitions apply to the present also ("ad praesentia vitae"), *ibid.*, 56.19; PL 38:386; Hill, 119.

the present Gospel age. The fourth petition encompassed physical, spiritual, and sacramental interpretations. The seventh petition had all evil in view.²¹⁷

John Cassian ca. 360-435

Cassian of Gaul was a contemporary of Augustine, familiar with the Christian world of his day, and ordained a deacon by Chrysostom. He lived for ten years in Egypt and was later ordained a priest in the Roman church. Hence he was familiar with tendencies in both Eastern and Western branches of Christianity. He probably wrote his twenty-four "Conferences" in Marseilles. Conference 9 explains the Lord's Prayer.²¹⁸

The address "Father in heaven" not only refers to the sonship through adoption that believers enjoy, but it also marks their distance from God while they are delayed on their exile here on earth.²¹⁹ All zeal should be poured out for the sake of the Father's glory.²²⁰ "When we say 'hallowed be your name' to Him what we are really saying is . . . let your

²¹⁷ Ibid. 56.19; PL 38:390; Hill, 106; "hic ut liberemur a malo; quia in illa vita malum nullum."

²¹⁸ *De Oratione*, Collatio 9.18-25; PL 49:788-802; ET in Colm Luibheid, John Cassian: Conferences. Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist, 1985), 101-24. It should be noted that the doctrinal aberration called "semi-Pelagianism" is attributed to Cassian (see Lutheran Cyclopedia, 801).

²¹⁹ *De Orat.* Coll. 9.18; PL 49:789-90; Luibheid, 112.

²²⁰ Ibid.

holiness shine forth in the spiritual lives we lead."²²¹ The second petition acknowledges "that Christ should reign among holy men. And this happens when the devil's power has been driven out of our hearts."²²² The fulfillment of the kingdom is yet to come at the Last Day as a reward and invitation (Matt. 25:34).²²³ The third petition requests that the things of earth be put on a level with the things of heaven, so that all men (not only Christians) do God's will.²²⁴ Further, the will of God refers to God's gift of salvation (1 Tim. 2:4).²²⁵ *Daily* bread refers to man's daily spiritual need for the word of God.²²⁶ The bread was also given a material signification. The word "daily" signifies the bread necessary to sustain the Christian lingering in this world, "for he who has not received it in this life will not be able to partake of it in the next life."²²⁷ Of the fifth petition, Cassian said:

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² Ibid., 9.19; PL 49:792; Luibheid, 113; "Christus regnat in sanctis."

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Ibid., 9.20; PL 49:793; Luibheid, 113.

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Ibid., 9.21; PL 49:794-95; Luibheid, 114. The bread was *supersubstantialem* according to Cassian, probably under the influence of the Vg. (A.D. 388?).

²²⁷ Ibid.; ". . . ad praesentem vitam . . . dum in hoc saeculo commoramur . . ."

If, then, we wish to be judged mercifully we must show ourselves to be merciful to those who have done us wrong. We shall be forgiven proportionately with the forgiveness we display to those who, whatever their malice, have injured us.²²⁸

The sixth petition was explained this way: "It is not 'do not allow us ever to be tempted' but rather 'do not allow us to be overcome when we are tempted.'"²²⁹ The last petition asks that the believer not be tempted "beyond endurance by the devil."²³⁰

Cassian essentially provided a noneschatological interpretation for the Lord's Prayer, although he thought it improper to petition God "for what is transitory and perishable" in the sense of overshadowing the more important eternal things.²³¹ He did refer to the coming of the kingdom on the Last Day in the second petition. The bread petition was given completely to a spiritual meaning, that petition addressing the needs of the spiritually hungry believer now. His seventh petition is unique in the Latin tradition to definitely refer to the devil as a personal being, instead of evil in general. Cassian's exposition is marked by a strong sense of humble spirituality and it also shares affinities with emphases seen in the Greek fathers.

²²⁸ Ibid., 9.22; PL 49:797; Luibheid, 115.

²²⁹ Ibid., 9.23; PL 49:799; Luibheid, 115; not "non permittas nos aliquando tentari, sed ne permittas in tentatione positos superari."

²³⁰ Ibid., 9.23; PL 49:799; Luibheid, 116; "a diabolo."

²³¹ Ibid., 9.24; PL 49:801; Luibheid, 116.

Peter Chrysologus 406-450

The "golden orator" Peter of Ravenna was known for his pastoral concern for the ordinary folk of northern Italy. In his collection of sermons dated about 432-440, he expounded the Lord's Prayer (*Sermons* 67-72) given to catechumens as preparation for baptism.²³²

In *Sermon* 67, Peter taught that the address "Father in heaven" should cause the believer to realize that he has a lineage derived from heaven.²³³ He continued to say that God's name "which is holy in itself" must be "treated as holy by us."²³⁴ God's kingdom should reign in his people so that they may reign with him.²³⁵ Without God's reign, the human race is held captive by the reign of the devil, sin, and death.²³⁶ The third petition looks to the accomplishment of the second petition: "This is the kingdom of God, when no other will than God's prevails, either in heaven or on earth."²³⁷ On the basis of Matt. 6:31, which teaches not to

²³² *Sermo* 67-72 (*In Orationem Dominicam*); PL 52:390-406. Sermons 67 and 70 are available in ET in Saint Peter Chrysologus. Selected Sermons and Saint Valerian Homilies, tr. George E. Ganss, in The Fathers of the Church, vol. 17 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953), 115-123.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 67; PL 52:391; Ganss, 115.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 67; PL 52:391; Ganss, 116; "rogamus ergo ut nomen ejus quod in se et per se sanctum est sanctificetur in nobis."

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 67; PL 52:392; Ganss, 116; or, "in him" (in illo).

²³⁶ *Ibid.*

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 67; PL 52:392; Ganss, 117.

be anxious for earthly needs, Peter avoided a material interpretation and preferred to understand the bread petition both spiritually as Jesus and sacramentally as daily food on the altar.²³⁸ At the fifth petition he said: "Understand that by forgiving others you have given forgiveness to yourself."²³⁹ Chrysologus viewed the sixth petition as an acknowledgement of human weakness, therefore believers need God's strength in the face of temptation.²⁴⁰ The seventh petition refers to evil, which comes from the devil.²⁴¹

Peter recognized that the believer was included in the first strophe. In *Sermon 70*, Peter added this thought to the kingdom petition: "It is present by faith, by hope, and by expectations, but we now pray that it may come in fact."²⁴² He appears to be describing what is sometimes identified as the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory, without using those words. In the third petition of *Sermon 70*, Peter saw hostile powers raised against God's will.²⁴³ True to the Latin tradition, Peter remarked in *Sermon 70* that the Prayer uses "evil" in the final petition since that word broadly

²³⁸ Ibid.; "coelestem panem."

²³⁹ Ibid., 67; PL 52:392; Ganss, 118.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 67; PL 52:393; Ganss, 118.

²⁴¹ Ibid.; "a diabolo quippe, ex quo est omne malum."

²⁴² Ibid., 70; PL 52:399; Ganss, 121; "Est in fide, est in spe, est in expectatione, sed ut in re veniat . . . sed veniat nobis."

²⁴³ Ibid., 70; PL 52:400; Ganss, 121.

reveals the result of the devil: "Consequently he is called not precisely 'an evil one' but merely 'evil' from which everything evil springs."²⁴⁴ Chrysologus applied the "brief instruction" on the Lord's Prayer to the daily needs of the believer.²⁴⁵

Summary

Tertullian, and Cyprian who followed him, represent early Latin Christianity in Africa. The exposition of Cyprian especially came to occupy a position of authority and influence. These expositions demand respect owing to their antiquity and their completeness. Latin Christianity, both African and European, saw many expositions on the Lord's Prayer of which the more important ones have been reported. Cassian, among others, being acquainted with Eastern Christianity, was undoubtedly influenced by it. He probably introduced some Eastern as well as African interpretations of the Lord's Prayer into Europe.

It may be assumed that many expositors built upon the tradition of their predecessors with their works contributing to, and being a part of, a continuum of interpretation. Therefore, not everything said by them was new and original. For example, most Western expositions of the Lord's Prayer

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 70; PL 52:400; Ganss, 122; "unde non jam malus, sed malum dicitur, a quo est omne quod malum est." Incidentally, Chrysologus viewed Christ's coming as a vindication over the devil on man's behalf: "God loaned Christ to the earth in order that He might conquer the Devil" (Ganss, 123).

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 70; PL 52:400; Ganss, 123; "brevissimo majesterio orandi."

came to accept the sevenfold division of the Prayer, a spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition, and the abstract meaning of "evil" for the last petition. None comment on the doxology, although that is probably because it did not appear in early Latin versions (Vulgate and *Itala*). The tendency in the Latin tradition was to comment on the Prayer on the basis of the Latin liturgical text rather than on the basis of the Greek text. As a result, none but Ambrose attempted to seek a meaning for the difficult word *epiousios* in the fourth petition. All understood the fourth petition at least partly spiritually, although not all included a sacramental understanding with the spiritual interpretation. That may be surprising in light of the practice of daily communions in Western Christianity. Some expositions included a temporal interpretation along with the spiritual understanding of the bread petition. Most expositors were keen on using the Prayer's petitions as a pretext for teaching Christian morality and behavior, rather than to have allowed the petitions to serve in the capacity of true prayer. In fairness, this tendency may have stemmed from the insight that the Lord's Prayer was not necessarily given by Jesus as a prayer formulation, but as a model for teaching how to pray! Nearly all interpretations of the Lord's Prayer originated in the context of catechesis as preparation for baptism.²⁴⁶ None of the commentators were oriented to an

²⁴⁶ Therefore Tertullian could label the Lord's Prayer a "breviary of the whole Gospel" ("in oratione breviarium totius Evangelii comprehendatur"), *PL* 1:1255 (sec. 1.36).

overtly eschatological interpretation, although nearly all do refer to the consummation with the second petition.

The Reformation Era

The early reformers such as Martin Luther worked under the influences of the theological streams of their day.²⁴⁷ Luther was heir to typical interpretations of the Lord's Prayer.²⁴⁸ It is significant that at the time of the Reformation, however, many of the reformers abandoned the spiritualizing trend previously popular in interpretations of the Lord's Prayer.²⁴⁹ Certainly this was the case with Luther (1483-1546), the great champion of the Reformation.

Luther

Later in his career, Luther abandoned a spiritual

²⁴⁷ See Jaroslav Pelikan, Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings. Luther's Works, American Edition, Companion Volume (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), 114.

²⁴⁸ Otto Dibelius, Das Vaterunser: Umriss zu einer Geschichte des Gebets in der Alten und Mittleren Kirche (Giessen: Ricker [Töpelmann], 1903), 86-112, has shown that the astonishing closeness of Luther's catechetical explanations of the Prayer to earlier patristic and medieval expositions should be attributed not to direct borrowing but to a common traditional source. Luther relied heavily on patristic and to a lesser extent on Old High German expositions. Cf. fn. 341 below.

²⁴⁹ Many have observed Luther's development of thought in this respect. See, e.g., Albrecht Peters, Kommentar zu Luthers Katechismen, vol. 3, Das Vaterunser (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 117-22; Johannes Meyer, Historischer Kommentar zu Luthers Kleinem Katechismus (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929), 408-18; Gerhard Ebeling, Luther: An Introduction to his Thought, tr. R. A. Wilson (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 107; Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic, tr. Talcott Parsons, (London: Allen & Unwin, 1930), 80-81; Willy Rordorf, "Le 'pain quotidien' (Matth. 6,11) dans l'histoire de l'exégèse," Didaskalia 6 (1976): 221-36; Dibelius, 108; Jan Milič Lochman, The Lord's Prayer, tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 85.

interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, preferring an application of the Prayer to the present life of the Christian. The claim that Luther's earlier interpretation of the Lord's Prayer shifted in his mature years must be documented. Several of his earlier works will be compared with his later catechetical work of 1529 and mature treatises. Luther was apparently fond of giving expositions of the Lord's Prayer, having evidently considered this Prayer to be very important for Christians.²⁵⁰

1519 - An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer

Luther published "An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer for Simple Laymen" in 1519, based on a sermon series two years earlier, which became very popular.²⁵¹ The text of this Prayer consisted of an address and seven petitions, following Augustine.²⁵²

Luther asserted that the address "Father" is "sweet by nature" and is more comforting than to call God "Lord" or

²⁵⁰ A representative list of Luther's works on the Lord's Prayer has been selected from the helpful list provided by Peters, 39-40. To that list should be added the Small and Large Catechisms of 1529; incidental references such as in his "sermons" on John 16, and other later references could also profitably be added for further study.

²⁵¹ "Auslegung deutsch des Vaterunsers für die einfältigen Laien. 1519," in D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 61 vols. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau and successors, 1883-1983), 2:80-130 [hereafter WA]; and "An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer for Simple Laymen," tr. Martin H. Bertram, in Luther's Works, American Edition, 55 vols., ed. Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress, and St. Louis: Concordia, 1959-86), 42:15-91 [hereafter AE].

²⁵² *Enchiridion* 30:115-116 in PL 40.285; NPNF¹, tr. J. F. Shaw, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988 repr.), 274.

"God" or "Judge."²⁵³ The address of the Lord's Prayer shows that the poor, miserable child of God on earth who is "surrounded by many perils, in need and want" prays in confidence to his Father in heaven.²⁵⁴ "No other can assist us to get to heaven than this one Father (Luther cited John 3:13)."²⁵⁵ Under the first petition, Luther taught that although "God's name is holy in itself," it must be "hallowed in us" and not profaned and dishonored.²⁵⁶ He added that the Scriptures equate a good name with honor and praise, which this petition seeks.²⁵⁷ The kingdom of the second petition is primarily the kingdom of grace and freedom from the devil's kingdom:

Therefore we do not pray, "Dear Father, let us come into your kingdom," as though we might journey toward it. But we do say, "May thy kingdom come to us." If we are to receive it at all, God's grace and his kingdom, together with all virtues, must come to us. . . . Similarly, Christ came to us from heaven to earth; we did not ascend from earth into heaven to him.²⁵⁸

God's kingdom will grow here on earth, but it will only be perfected in heaven.²⁵⁹ God's judgment and mercy, Law and Gospel, are especially elucidated under the third petition.

²⁵³ "An Exposition"; WA 2:83.15-17; AE 42:22.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.; WA 2:83.30-32, 84.1-2; AE 42:23.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.; WA 2:84.5; AE 42:23.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.; WA 2:87.12, 14; AE 42:27; "in sich selbs heilig ist . . . yn [sic] uns."

²⁵⁷ Ibid.; WA 2:94.10; AE 42:36.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.; WA 2:98.23-28; AE 42:42.

²⁵⁹ Ibid.; WA 2:97.35; AE 42:40.

The Law shows man's disobedience against the will of God; the Gospel shows the deliverance of God "from our disobedience to his will."²⁶⁰ Man's free will is nothing but his own sinful will.²⁶¹ Therefore, this petition bids prayer "against ourselves."²⁶² It asks for the cross and sufferings "since these serve the destruction of our will."²⁶³

The bread of the fourth petition in this "early Luther" is Jesus himself.²⁶⁴ He comes in word and sacrament.²⁶⁵ The word "today" is a recognition of man's continual need, one day at a time.²⁶⁶ Luther acknowledged that the fourth petition could also include temporal needs: "But do we not also pray for our physical bread? Answer: Yes, this too, may well be included in this petition. However, this petition refers principally to Christ, the spiritual bread of the soul."²⁶⁷ Luther's fifth petition tackled the problem of false forgiveness through indulgences. He contrasted the verses following the Matthean Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:14-15)

²⁶⁰ Ibid.; WA 2:100.15; AE 42:43.

²⁶¹ Ibid.; WA 2:104.36; AE 42:48.

²⁶² Ibid.; WA 2:105.1; AE 42:48.

²⁶³ Ibid.; WA 2:105.12; AE 42:49.

²⁶⁴ Ibid.; WA 2:111.27-29; AE 42:56.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.; WA 2:112.9-10; AE 42:57.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.; WA 2:115.12-15; AE 42:61.

²⁶⁷ Ibid.; WA 2:115.27-29; AE 42:61.

with the ecclesiastical practice of selling indulgences with a parody: "This [God's] letter of indulgence reads, 'If you forgive them their trespasses, your heavenly Father also will forgive you.'²⁶⁸ At the sixth petition Luther, assumed that temptation surrounded this whole present existence:

Therefore we do not say, "Spare us the trial," but, "Do not lead us into it." It is as if we were to say, "We are surrounded on all sides by trials and cannot avoid them; however, dear Father, help us so that we do not fall prey to them and yield to them, and thus be overcome and vanquished."²⁶⁹

The trials of the "left side" are the common and daily occurrences in this life imposed by God or the devil; the trials of the "right side" are specific temptations of the devil.²⁷⁰ God does not cause the latter. With regard to all temptations, they show man his weakness and his need of the grace of God (James 1:12 is cited).²⁷¹ Luther accepted the sixth petition as a proper guard against a relapse to the sins forgiven in the fifth petition.²⁷² Under the seventh petition, Luther counted all evil, such as strife, famine, war, pestilence, plagues, and so forth.²⁷³ These things hinder God's will from being done and his kingdom from

²⁶⁸ Ibid.; WA 2:118.4-6; AE 42:64-65.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.; WA 2:123.5-9; AE 42:71; his "trial" is "Anfechtung."

²⁷⁰ Ibid.; WA 2:123.30, 124.33; AE 42:72-73.

²⁷¹ Ibid.; WA 2:125.19-22; AE 42:74.

²⁷² Ibid.; WA 2:125.29; AE 42:74.

²⁷³ Ibid.; WA 2:126.7; AE 42:75.

coming, which is to his glory, making reference to the first strophe.²⁷⁴ The Prayer concludes with "Amen," a word of confidence and faith, as Luther explained it.²⁷⁵

1522 - Personal Prayer Book

Luther's "Prayer Book" (*Betbüchlein*) was the result of earlier works published, edited, improved, and republished under various titles.²⁷⁶ It represented advancements in Luther's expressions and thought. The *Prayerbook* itself was intended as an evangelical substitution for the many legalistic and moralistic prayerbooks before that time. In it, Luther commented on the Lord's Prayer, the Commandments and the Creed; as such, it was a forerunner of his published catechisms of 1529.

Luther taught how to pray the Lord's Prayer as the only necessary prayer of the Christian; illustrations from Luther follow. With regard to the first petition, Luther taught that the believer should do everything to glorify God's name: "Help us conduct all our life in such a way that we may be found to be true children of God, lest we call you Father falsely or in vain."²⁷⁷ The second petition related God's kingdom to salvific grace: "Grant that we may thus remain

²⁷⁴ Ibid.; WA 2:126.27; AE 42:76.

²⁷⁵ Ibid.; WA 2:127.4; AE 42:76.

²⁷⁶ *Betbüchlein. 1522,* in WA 10.2:395-407; "Personal Prayer Book," tr. Martin H. Bertram, in AE 43:29-38.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.; WA 10.2:398.4-5; AE 43:31.

steadfast and that your future kingdom may be the end and consummation of the kingdom you have begun in us."²⁷⁸

Regarding the fourth petition, Luther still maintained:

"This bread is our Lord Jesus Christ who feeds and comforts the soul."²⁷⁹ Thus, Luther retained a spiritual, though not sacramental, interpretation of this petition. In this exposition Luther interpreted the sixth petition in light of the temptations of the flesh, the world and the devil.²⁸⁰ The seventh asked for deliverance from temporal ills.

1526 - The German Mass

Luther offered a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer that would follow the sermon in this popular communion liturgy.²⁸¹

Some of his statements from the "German Mass" (*Deutsche Messe*) follow. Since they were in the form of admonitions, they are not in complete sentence form, as follows. "That God, our Father in heaven, may look with mercy on us, his needy children on earth, and grant us grace so that his holy name be hallowed by us."²⁸² "That his kingdom may come to us and expand; that transgressors . . . be brought to know Jesus

²⁷⁸ Ibid.; WA 10.2:399.18-19; AE 43:32.

²⁷⁹ Ibid.; WA 10.2:401.24; AE 43:34.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.; WA 10.2:405.6-7; AE 43:37.

²⁸¹ "Deutsche Messe. 1526," in WA 19:95-97; "The German Mass and Order of Service," tr. August Steimle, rev. Ulrich Leupold in AE 53:78-80.

²⁸² Ibid.; WA 19:95.26-28; AE 53:79.

Christ his Son by faith."²⁸³ "That he would also give us our daily bread, preserve us from greed and selfish care, and help us to trust that he will provide for all our needs."²⁸⁴ "That he would not lead us into temptation but help us by his Spirit to subdue the flesh."²⁸⁵

In the "German Mass," for his first time, Luther gave a material interpretation to the fourth petition. Bolder statements were to follow in 1528.

1528 - Ten Sermons on the Catechism

Luther preached three series on the catechism in the year before his catechisms of 1529 were published in which his thought and teaching were further developed. The following comments report on the section of the Lord's Prayer from the third series of these 1528 sermons.²⁸⁶

To hallow the name of God means that "our teaching and life are Christian and godly."²⁸⁷ He also referred there to the second commandment (not taking the name of the Lord in vain). The second petition of the Lord's Prayer asks that the "kingdom come in us and we become members of his

²⁸³ Ibid.; WA 19:96.1-3; AE 53:79.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.; WA 19:96.7-8; AE 53:79.

²⁸⁵ Ibid.; WA 19:96.12-14; AE 53:79; "Anfechtung."

²⁸⁶ "Vaterunser. 14 Dezember" in WA 30.1:95-105; "Ten Sermons on the Catechism, 1528," tr. John Doberstein, in AE 51:169-82.

²⁸⁷ Ibid.; WA 30.1:99.6-7; AE 51:173.

kingdom."²⁸⁸ Luther referred to a twofold coming, the coming now through God's word and in the future with eternal life. Luther explained that the petitions of the third strophe ask "that God's kingdom may come in me, that God's will may be done in me, and his name be hallowed in me."²⁸⁹ He added that this happens when the sinful wills of the flesh and the devil are broken.

With the fourth petition, Luther completely broke from his former teaching and gave a temporal interpretation to the bread. He began by saying, perhaps about himself, "This is beginning to be understood, though there are few who do understand it."²⁹⁰ Luther included such blessings as peace and government within the scope of bread, since without these God's gift of bread may be hindered. He explained: "The Lord does indeed give bread, but he also wants us to pray, in order that we acknowledge it as his gift. This again is a great need, which pertains to the body."²⁹¹ Luther urged under the fifth petition that sinners also forgive their neighbor. God's forgiveness is a "promise" and man's

²⁸⁸ Ibid.; WA 30.1:100.21; AE 51:174.

²⁸⁹ Ibid.; WA 30.1:102.2-4; AE 51:175.

²⁹⁰ Ibid.; WA 30.1:102.13-14; AE 51:176. In his Sept. 23 sermon Luther also gave a temporal meaning to the fourth petition (WA 30.1:48.27-28): "Quando igitur panem peto, victum pro corporis sustentatione peto." He was much more hesitant in the first sermon of May 26, where bread was both "spiritualis panis" and "corporalium necessitatum" (WA 30.1:14.22-26).

²⁹¹ Ibid.; WA 30.1:104.20-22; AE 51:178.

forgiveness of others is a "sign" of one's own forgiveness.²⁹² Under the sixth petition, Luther taught that God will deliver the Christian from the temptations of the flesh, the world, and the devil. He employed the following words: *Anfechtung* for trial, *Versuchung* for temptation, and *böse Bekörung* for evil enticement. Luther said with regard to the sixth petition that God would deliver from the flesh, the world and the devil.²⁹³ Luther interpreted the "evil" of the seventh petition literally as the devil, for he viewed the Greek word *poneros* as being masculine and added that this means *Teufel* and *diabolus*.²⁹⁴ Yet he added that this word includes everything such as sickness, poverty, death, and so forth which comes from Satan.²⁹⁵

Luther mentioned that prayer is incited owing to God's command, God's promise, and man's needs.²⁹⁶ He concluded by stating that this *sermon* presented teachings simplified for catechesis, just as a mother gives milk before later substantial food.²⁹⁷ What is unknown is whether the temporal

²⁹² Ibid.; WA 30.1:106.5-6; AE 51:179.

²⁹³ Ibid.; WA 30.1:107.14-15; AE 51:180; "quod deus velit liberare te a tentatione carnis, mundi, et Satanae." In his catechisms of 1529 the allusion to the "unholy three" is first made under the *third* petition.

²⁹⁴ Ibid.; WA 30.1:108.1-3; AE 51:180.

²⁹⁵ Ibid.; WA 30.1:108.5-6; AE 51:180.

²⁹⁶ Ibid.; WA 30.1:108.10; AE 51:180.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.; WA 30.1:180.19; AE 51:180.

explanation of the fourth petition was Luther's final and complete understanding, or whether it was a pedagogical simplification. The position taken in this paper prefers the former of these two possibilities, on the basis of a theologically maturing Luther.

1529 - The Large Catechism

Both catechisms were published nearly simultaneously. Since the *Small Catechism* was summarized in Chapter I, this section will report on the *Large Catechism*.²⁹⁸

By virtue of baptism, God's name is given to the Christian as "Father" and is to be honored and kept holy.²⁹⁹ Luther contended for the first petition: "This petition is for ourselves."³⁰⁰ Luther defined the kingdom Christocentrically:

This we ask, both in order that we who have accepted it [the kingdom] may remain faithful and grow daily in it and in order that it may gain recognition and followers that, led by the Holy Spirit, many may come into the kingdom of grace and become partakers of salvation.³⁰¹

He also explained apropos the third petition that, while the

²⁹⁸ *Large Catechism* [hereafter LC]; Hans Lietzmann, Heinrich Bornkamm, Hans Volz, and Ernst Wolf, eds., Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 543-736 [hereafter Bek.]; Theodore Tappert, Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, and Arthur C. Piepkorn, eds., The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 357-461 [hereafter Tapp.].

²⁹⁹ LC 3.36-37; Bek., 670; Tapp., 425.

³⁰⁰ LC 3.47; Bek., 672; Tapp., 427.

³⁰¹ LC 3.52; Bek., 673; Tapp., 427.

petitions of the first strophe concern God, they nevertheless include the Christian: "What we pray for concerns only ourselves when we ask that what otherwise must be done without us may also be done in us."³⁰² The third petition was interpreted against the background of the activity of the devil, the world, and the flesh which could suppress and hinder the kingdom of God. Notice that Luther always made sure to explain that God acts monergistically "in us" (*in nobis*); these petitions are not done "by us" directly.

The fourth petition was viewed entirely temporally. He began this section by stating its theme, "Here we consider the poor bread-basket--the needs of our body and our life on earth."³⁰³ Later, Luther elaborated on the many blessings for everyday life that this petition embraced. Those who receive these blessings are led to "recognize in them his fatherly goodness toward us."³⁰⁴ This petition is especially necessary in view of inequitable distribution of goods, bad government, and the propensities of evil people, according to Luther. He explained that believers should not hesitate praying to God about smaller matters as suggested by *this* petition, if indeed they are encouraged to ask for great things under the *second* petition! He queried at the end of his exposition of the kingdom petition: "For how could God allow us to suffer want in temporal things when he promises

³⁰² LC 3.68; Bek., 678; Tapp., 429.

³⁰³ LC 3.72; Bek., 679; Tapp., 430.

³⁰⁴ LC 3.83; Bek., 682; Tapp., 431.

that which is eternal and imperishable?"³⁰⁵

With the fifth petition Luther taught that God deals graciously with his children.³⁰⁶ He added, "God has . . . forgiven and pardoned, yet on the condition that we also forgive our neighbor."³⁰⁷ Under the sixth petition, Luther repeated much of what he had said in the 1528 *Sermons*, but more clearly. For Luther, God was sovereign. Luther did not accept a bilateral dualism of good and evil. For him, God was always superior to evil and the devil. He never ascribed to God the source of evil; rather, God helps the believer to overcome temptation:

This, then, is "leading us not into temptation" when God gives us power and strength to resist, even though the tribulation is not removed or ended We cannot help but suffer tribulations . . . but we pray here that we may not fall into them and be overwhelmed by them.³⁰⁸

The seventh petition accepts the masculine form of the "evil [one]" but it is applied to all evil resulting from the devil.³⁰⁹ The Prayer closes with a confident "Amen."

Later Writings

So far, it has been seen that Luther's expositions of the Lord's Prayer are filled with an evangelical tenderness

³⁰⁵ LC 3.58; Bek., 675; Tapp., 428.

³⁰⁶ LC 3.92; Bek., 684; Tapp., 432.

³⁰⁷ LC 3.93; Bek., 684; Tapp., 433.

³⁰⁸ LC 3.106 (cf. 3.110); Bek., 687; Tapp., 434.

³⁰⁹ LC 3.113, 115; Bek., 689; Tapp., 435.

and sympathy for the daily needs of God's people living under the sway of the devil. He viewed the Lord's Prayer as a true prayer form, from which valuable lessons can be drawn.

Beginning with 1526, a gravitation away from a spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition can be observed. This shift did not take place overnight. It was considered and deliberate. It was not at all an impetuous and rambunctious decision. Luther's interpretation of the Prayer was not eschatological in the sense that it looks only to the future *eschaton*. It was quite the opposite. Luther applied the Lord's Prayer to the present life of the believer, who is led to pray because of God's command, God's promise, and his own needs. It is in the present time that the believer lives under God's kingdom of grace. Through Christ, the Christian knows God as a kind heavenly Father. Luther's Christocentrism informed his teaching about the Father's salvific grace as well as his confidence in God's daily guidance. To be sure, God's love and blessing has an eye on eternity, but the stress on the present is preeminent. What of later writings?

Luther's commentary *The Sermon on the Mount* dates from 1532.³¹⁰ The main thing to observe is that he maintained his

³¹⁰ "Wochenpredigten über Matth. 5-7," WA 32:413-27; "The Sermon on the Mount," tr. Jaroslav Pelikan, in AE 21:141-55. Note that this exposition was not based on the liturgical Latin text of the Lord's Prayer, but on the Greek text of Erasmus. Therefore, unlike his previous expositions, it began with "Unser Vater" and concluded with a three member "doxology" (WA 32:416.34-39; AE 21:416). Albrecht Peters, 14, explained over against "Reformed" objections to Luther's customary "Vater unser" that "sie ist nicht eine sklavische Übertragung des lateinischen 'Pater noster', sondern ein altdeutscher Sprachgebrauch, welcher beim Vokative gerne das Adjektiv dem Substantiv folgen läßt." Luther's "Vater unser" is obviously not objectionable.

previous despiritualized posture with regard to the fourth petition.³¹¹ He did clarify with regard to the fifth petition that forgiveness is directly dependent on faith and that forgiveness is not given on the condition that the believer first offers forgiveness to others.

In 1535, Luther wrote a brief tract for Peter his barber entitled, "A Simple Way to Pray For a Good Friend."³¹² By this monograph, Luther meant to provide a simple explanation of the Lord's Prayer for a lay friend. The tenor of the work is similar to that of the *Small Catechism*. The bread petition was interpreted solely temporally.

Scattered references to the Lord's Prayer appear elsewhere, such as in Luther's 1537 commentary on the Gospel of John (at 16:23). Luther's hymn on the Lord's Prayer in 1539, *Vater unser im Himmelreich*, also took the view that the fourth petition addresses the believer's daily needs. Pause may be taken at Luther's *Tischreden* 4190, dated 1538, where he criticized those *sancti patres* who say that the physical meaning is not to be sought since Christ forbade solicitude for daily needs (Matt. 6:25).³¹³ In fact, Luther thought that the reference to "daily" suggested the very opposite,

³¹¹ WA 32:421.1-2; AE 21:147; "das ist alles was uns not ist zu erhaltung dieses lebens [*sic*, no capitalizations!]."

³¹² "Eine einfältige Weise zu beten für einen guten Freund. 1535," WA 38:358-375; "A Simple Way to Pray [for a Good Friend]," tr. Karl J. Schindler, in AE 43:193-211.

³¹³ *Tischreden*, 6 vols. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1912-21), 4:190, No. 4190.4-29 [hereafter WATr]. Luther indicted traditional spiritual interpretations which were nothing more than the final result of a long line of accretions built upon previous commentaries.

namely, that one never has to worry about his needs. In *Tischreden* 5318, dated 1540, Luther stated that the bread is to be understood physically, substantively, presently. Luther added that even if it were conceded that the bread might also include a spiritual meaning, it would be improper to change it to "supersubstantial" as Jerome did in the Vulgate at Matthew 6:11.³¹⁴

The data reported above from various writings of Luther should adequately document the shift in Luther's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, especially relative to the fourth petition. Clearly, Luther applied the Lord's Prayer to the present life of the believer in the Gospel age. The theologically mature Luther never again reverted to a spiritual interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. The general strength of Luther's expositions is evident in this primary application for the present Gospel age.

The Reformed Tradition

Luther was not the only one to have applied the Lord's Prayer to the everyday needs of the Christian in the world in which he lived. Other reformers followed Luther in this vein. Several representatives from the non-Lutheran Reformation will be cited.

John Calvin 1509-1564

In his famous *Institutes* Calvin presented an exposition

³¹⁴ Ibid., WATr 5:57, No. 5318.11-29: "Inepti fuere, qui verterunt supersubstantialem" (lines 19-20).

of the Lord's Prayer.³¹⁵ That God is Father in heaven shows his transcendence and ineffable glory.³¹⁶ The first petition prays that God "receive all the honour that he deserves."³¹⁷ The "kingdom" suggests submission to the righteousness of God.³¹⁸ While this "submission" may strike one as sounding "perfectionistic" and bordering on work-righteousness, it certainly is a noneschatological view of the second petition! Calvin definitely referred the fourth petition to the physical requirements of life.³¹⁹ He rejected the notion as unbecoming of God that this petition should be understood spiritually. For Calvin, Jesus taught to pray this petition so that temptation to steal or to doubt God would be removed. Further, Jesus specifically placed this petition first in the second strophe, so that, once earthly needs are met, one can pray for the more necessary spiritual ones: "Christ has given the first place to the inferior blessing, that he might gradually raise us to the two remaining petitions, which properly pertain to the heavenly life."³²⁰ Citing God's feeding with the manna in the desert, Calvin concluded that

³¹⁵ John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, John Allen, tr. from final edition of 1559, and prepared by Benjamin B. Warfield, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 3.20.34-48.

³¹⁶ Ibid., 3.20.40.

³¹⁷ Ibid., 3.20.41.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 3.20.42.

³¹⁹ Ibid., 3.20.54.

³²⁰ Ibid.

"it is his power alone by which our life and strength are sustained, although he communicates it to us by corporeal means."³²¹ Calvin took the last two petitions together, yielding a total of six petitions. He stated that it did not matter whether the "evil" were general or specific (Satan).³²² He included the conclusion, which indicates the "solid and secure basis for our faith; for if our prayers were to be recommended to God by our own merit, who could dare pray?"³²³

Calvin also produced a commentary and harmony of the synoptic Gospels.³²⁴ There he stated more clearly than in his *Institutes* what the kingdom of God is. It is "the commencement of the reign of God in us" through the preaching of the word and the Spirit, working the destruction of the old man and renewal to a new life.³²⁵ As such, it is continually growing and advancing, but its perfection is still to come. At the fourth petition, he remarked that it is "our" bread, not by right, "but because the fatherly kindness of God has set it apart for our use. It becomes ours, because our Heavenly Father freely bestows it on us for

³²¹ Ibid.

³²² Ibid., 3.20.56.

³²³ Ibid., 3.20.57. Obviously Calvin employed a Greek text which contained the conclusion.

³²⁴ John Calvin, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke (1555), tr. William Pringle, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 315-329.

³²⁵ Ibid., 320.

the supply of our necessities."³²⁶ Calvin spoke of the propriety of this interpretation of the fourth petition since, without the fourth petition, the Prayer would be incomplete; a perfect prayer embraces all needs, including present needs.³²⁷ He stated that the word *epiousios* pictures God's "uninterrupted succession to feed us," therefore it means, "continual."³²⁸

The King's Book of 1543

King Henry VIII and representatives of the Church of England prepared a manual for understanding the Lord's Prayer and to seek uniformity of wording and meaning. Probably under Lutheran influence, the Prayer was structured by seven petitions. The fourth petition was interpreted physically, sacramentally, and spiritually of the word of God.³²⁹ However, greater emphasis was placed on the physical inter-

³²⁶ Ibid., 325.

³²⁷ Ibid., 323. Calvin made negative reference to Erasmus on p. 322: "The reason assigned by Erasmus [for *supersubstantial* bread] is not only frivolous, but inconsistent with piety. He reckons it improbable that, when we come into the presence of God, Christ should enjoin us to make mention of food." See Desiderius Erasmus, A Deuout Treatise vpon the Pater Noster [Precatio Dominica]. A Quincentennial Symposium, tr. Margaret More Roper, ed. Richard L. DeMolen (New York: Twane, 1971), 117-18.

³²⁸ Ibid., "superveniens."

³²⁹ The King's Book or A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, 1543 (London: SPCK, 1932), 130-34. Five years later Cranmer produced an exposition that was completely oriented to the present; see his A Short Instruction Into Christian Religion Being a Catechism Set Forth by Archbishop Cranmer in MDXLVIII: Together with the Same in Latin, Translated from the German by Justus Jonas in MDXXXIX (Oxford: University Press, 1829), Part 1, 155-61.

pretation as being that bread which is necessary for life.

The Heidelberg Catechism of 1562

The catechism of Ursinus and Olevianus has enjoyed an influential position and prestigious stature in many Reformed Churches even into modern times. Question 125 explains the fourth petition:

Be pleased to provide us with all things necessary for the body, that we may thereby acknowledge Thee to be the only fountain of all good, and that neither our care nor industry, nor even Thy gifts, can profit us without Thy blessing, and therefore that we may withdraw our trust from all creatures, and place it alone in Thee.³³⁰

The Larger Westminster Catechism of 1647

This historically significant catechism likewise interpreted the fourth petition in a non-spiritual way. This petition is a prayer, according to Question 193, that the believer "enjoy a competent portion" of "all the outward blessings of this life" and "be kept from all things that are contrary to our temporal support and comfort."³³¹

Summary

It has been demonstrated that interpretation of the Lord's Prayer is divided. Among patristic and reformation expositions, interpretation that might be called "eschatological" is primarily limited to the kingdom petition, though even here, efforts are made to relate it to

³³⁰ The Heidelberg Catechism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), 115.

³³¹ The Larger Catechism of the Westminster Assembly (Philadelphia: Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1925), 155.

present and future salvific promises for the believer. The fourth petition has often been given a spiritual interpretation especially in the pre-Reformation Latin tradition. An eschatological interpretation has sometimes been projected onto the spiritual "bread of life." Not all spiritual interpretations of the bread petition are sacramental. On the other hand, many exegetes have tended toward a noneschatological interpretation, usually with a temporal meaning being assigned to the fourth petition. The reformers tended toward the latter direction. Luther often served as the mentor for later reformers such as John Calvin. In doing so, the reformers by and large abandoned earlier popular spiritual interpretations, though certainly, their tendency was not new. Several early expositions especially among the Eastern fathers of the church preferred to interpret the Lord's Prayer, to a greater or lesser extent, for the present needs of the believer.

One may engage in speculations about the reformers' tendency for their preference of a temporal interpretation.³³² To suggest experiential factors is nebulous and impossible to document. Surely practical conditions such as the

³³² One suggestion made is that Luther structured the Lord's Prayer by analogy with the Decalogue. Ingemar Furberg, Das Pater Noster in der [Lutheran] Messe (Lund: Gleerup, 1968), was of the opinion that, like the second table of the law, the second strophe of the Lord's Prayer was limited to the social context of God's people. Max Weber, 80-81, contended that Luther's thought developed in the period 1519-28 along the lines of seeing the importance of "vocation"; faced with the peasant revolts, he saw societal structures as an expression of God's will. Thus, his theology definitely took on a more temporal outlook.

responsibilities of the family life of married clerics, communion celebrations less than daily, and a nonsacramental interpretation of John 6 with Jesus as the "Bread of life" could have severally contributed to this tendency for a present orientation of the Lord's Prayer. However, it is apparent that the main motivation for seriously despiritualizing the Prayer's orientation stems from the reformers' view of Holy Scripture.³³³

The words of the Greek Scriptures were for the reformers the word of God, or at least reasonable copies of the original *autographs*. Unless warranted otherwise, they generally attempted to interpret the word of God literally. The reformers were in the midst of freeing themselves from the shackles of allegory and speculative exegesis. Luther maintained that the Scriptures were sufficiently clear and they did not need to be understood by philosophy or allegory. He believed in the authority of Scripture alone. Traditional

³³³ Ebeling, 107, maintained that Luther's hermeneutical method developed along these lines: "The hermeneutic principle which he laid down in his early period implicitly and inevitably implied the abandonment of the fourfold meaning of scripture. Once its meaning was reduced to the relationship between Christ, the word and faith, the whole mighty [former] hermeneutic system became meaningless, and was quite clearly replaced by concern for the fundamental theme of the scripture in its literal sense." See also Julius Köstlin, The Theology of Luther, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1897; repr. St. Louis: Concordia, 1986), 257-73; and, Frederic W. Farrar, History of Interpretation (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961 repr. of 1886 ed.), 327-38.

interpretation often impeded the Scripture's clarity.³³⁴ Luther's fundamental hermeneutical principle was this: "A text of the Scriptures had to be taken as it stood unless there were compelling reasons for taking it otherwise."³³⁵ Robert M. Grant has pointed out, "The reformers insisted on an historical, literal, grammatical understanding of the Bible as they came to believe that a new authority must be set up to oppose the authority of the Church."³³⁶ The "incarnational" dynamic, whereby God does not disdain his creation and places value on everyday life, was a part of Luther's exegetical approach. One historian explained it this way: "Luther's exegesis kept creature and Creator together in the paradox of the incarnation."³³⁷

In his simplified history of interpretation Bernard Ramm described the early schools of Biblical interpretation. The Hebrew and Christian exegetes from Alexandria of Egypt were fond of spiritualizing texts and of using allegorical methods of interpretation. Ramm defined allegorism as "the method of interpreting a literary text that regards the

³³⁴ Pelikan, *AE, Companion Volume*, 78, demonstrated that Luther polemicized against the philosophizing approach usually taken by the church fathers, and that traditionalism only muddied the clarity of the Scriptures. The tendency toward spiritualizing and allegorizing has been given supreme documentation and analysis in Origen by R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (Richmond: Knox, 1959); see pp. 326-27 for his analysis of Origen's spiritual interpretation of the Lord's Prayer.

³³⁵ Pelikan, *AE, Companion Volume*, 126.

³³⁶ Robert M. Grant, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible* (New York: Macmillan, 1948, 1963), 129.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, 149.

literal sense as the vehicle for a secondary more spiritual and more profound sense."³³⁸ Such a method was often given to license and exaggeration, effectively obscuring the true meaning of God's word. It was a subjective method. This method remained alive throughout the Western Church and Luther was acquainted with the influence of Alexandrian neoplatonism, advanced by Origen and others. On the other hand, an objective and more literal approach to interpretation was possible. This method was fostered by the so-called "school" of Antioch of Syria, founded by Lucian.³³⁹ Its principal figures included Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom. This school of thought was not influential in the Western church, possibly owing to its Nestorian connections.³⁴⁰ Nevertheless, this school represented an important way of interpreting Scripture. Luther probably arrived at what might be called a literal, historical-grammatical method of interpretation independent of the School of Antioch. But, contrasting possibilities for exegesis are illustrated by reference to these two schools of interpretation. Interpretations of the Lord's Prayer with which Luther was familiar originated from partisans of either one or another

³³⁸ Bernard Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston: Wilde, 1950), 21.

³³⁹ Ibid., 29; Farrar, History, 216, stated: "The Syrian school held that the Scriptures are the basis of knowledge, and not either the esoteric Gnosis to which the Alexandrians had attached so much importance [was a basis of knowledge], nor the ecclesiastical tradition to which Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian had appealed."

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

of these two schools.

It would be difficult and not germane to this topic to assess each of the Church Fathers in terms of their own individual hermeneutical principles. But it is important to keep in mind that Luther both abandoned some of the traditional interpretations of the Lord's Prayer with which he was acquainted, and on the other hand, was indebted in many ways to previous efforts and retained many traditional expressions.³⁴¹ Although Luther was acquainted with the possibility of literal interpretation, especially relative to the fourth petition, he did not follow literal interpretation until later, with such an understanding surfacing in the years 1526-28. The only possibility that remains for explaining Luther's shift in thought rests on his decided departure from allegory and figurative interpretation. Luther's shift in interpreting the Lord's Prayer demonstrates that he was in process of theological maturation.

As with Luther, even today, much can be learned about the Lord's Prayer from these early exegetical efforts. One firm conclusion can be established so far; namely, that Luther's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer became gradually

³⁴¹ See translator's (Martin H. Bertram) fn. 26 in AE 42:60. In fact, the above examples have illustrated that many expressions are common to patristic expositions as well as to Luther. For example, note the affinities of Luther especially with Cyprian and Augustine. In the first strophe, it was very common to explain those petitions as being done "in us" or "among us." Such stock expressions reveal the consensus of many expositors that through the centuries the Lord's Prayer was oriented to the present life of God's people rather than being strictly applied to the future. Luther frequently used such similar expressions, for example, at LC 3.68; Bek., 678; Tapp., 429; at LC 3.118; Bek., 690; Tapp., 436; and elsewhere.

more oriented to the here and now.

Significant Modern Studies

Much modern scholarship on the Lord's Prayer can be divided between an eschatological and a noneschatological orientation. Many studies also fall somewhere on a spectrum between these two possibilities. To report these significant studies will help understand the Lord's Prayer better. Three typical, representative, major contributions to modern discussions on the Lord's Prayer will be reported.

Eschatological Orientation

1946 - Lohmeyer

Ernst Lohmeyer was a prominent pre-war "Lutheran" theologian in Germany. His 1946 study of the Lord's Prayer, published in English translation in 1965, is foundational to modern study of the topic.³⁴² The results of his investigations are invaluable, but they must be accepted with caution; he was prone to conjecture and he often imposed a philosophic veneer over his approach to exegesis.

Lohmeyer accepted both the Matthean and Lukan versions of the Lord's Prayer, although he obviously favored the fuller Matthean form of the Prayer. He believed that the two versions originated from two different early Christian centers. The Matthean community used the Prayer, not in view of the necessities of everyday human life, "but for the

³⁴² Ernst Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer, tr. John Bowden (New York: Harper, 1965); originally Das Vater-unser (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946, 1952); Lohmeyer died in 1946, a "martyr" of the War.

requirements of the life of a disciple, life in this eschatological time" which was soon to unfold at the consummation.³⁴³ The Jewish character of the Prayer, especially that of Matthew, suggests its Aramaic background. The two different but well-designed poetic forms warns against an assumption that one form arose from the other through abbreviation or expansion.³⁴⁴ The Matthean Prayer reveals Galilean Aramaic and the Lukan betrays Palestinian Aramaic. The two Prayers then are, respectively, Galilean and Jerusalem recensions which were used from the earliest Christian traditions.³⁴⁵

Lohmeyer's eschatological interpretation was not as extreme as Raymond Brown's interpretation of the Prayer. The Matthean aorist verb forms provided the impetus for Lohmeyer's eschatological interpretation. For him, Christians were living in a time of transition prior to the age to come. The second strophe, especially, asked for sustenance now until the "morrow" should come.³⁴⁶ Lohmeyer basically took an eschatological approach to understanding the Lord's Prayer, but he conceded here and there to a more present orientation. Thus, the bread of the fourth petition became for him a sign of eschatological grace already

³⁴³ Ibid., 21.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 30.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., 294.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., 274.

manifest now.³⁴⁷ Inexplicably, he claimed that this was future bread now. His general eschatological approach led him to say that the whole Prayer is a longing for the day of the consummation.³⁴⁸ Lohmeyer never used the term "imminent eschatology," but it is likely that this would describe his stance part of the time. At other times his eschatology is totally oriented to the future. Ultimately, eschatology for Lohmeyer meant that God acts and not man.

In regard to the address, he stated that those who "call on God as the Father are or may be called the children of God [and this] is not itself a fact of the present, but a promise of eschatological future."³⁴⁹ The ability to address God as *Abba*, Father, is a promise of the eschatological future and not a fact now.³⁵⁰ This privilege was not taught by Jesus but was a conclusion reached by early Christians.³⁵¹ The first petition looks to a single decisive event, an act of God to hallow his name.³⁵² This same sense of a perfect eschatological "coming of the kingdom" will take place at the *eschaton*.³⁵³ For him, God's will will be done perfectly only

³⁴⁷ Ibid.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 277.

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 36.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 48.

³⁵¹ Ibid., 49.

³⁵² Ibid., 80.

³⁵³ Ibid., 94, 101, 102.

at the end of this age when the disparity between heaven and earth will be abolished.³⁵⁴ The third petition asks God to achieve the consummation.³⁵⁵

Lohmeyer considered the fourth petition to be the center of the Prayer, marking the transition to the second strophe.³⁵⁶ The fourth petition was significant for Lohmeyer. As already mentioned, he viewed the eating of bread as a sign or foretaste of the eschatological future. His bread was future bread given today.³⁵⁷ That does not rob it of its earthly reality, but it becomes a vessel of eschatological communion.³⁵⁸ On the other hand, the Lukan Prayer is noneschatological. It asks for today's daily nourishment instead of future eschatological bread.³⁵⁹ Luke's is not sacramental bread.³⁶⁰ The forgiveness of the fifth petition refers primarily to the final forgiveness necessary on the Last Day.³⁶¹ The temptation of the sixth petition refers to a single event, a final concrete Satanic

³⁵⁴ Ibid., 126.

³⁵⁵ Ibid., 129.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., 254.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 155.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., 155, 157.

³⁵⁹ Ibid., 251.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 157.

³⁶¹ Ibid., 179.

onslaught.³⁶² It is the final encounter between God and the evil one.³⁶³ The seventh petition is concerned about the final defeat of the devil: "Now if the sixth petition refers to eschatological temptation, the last onslaught and the final defeat of the devil, there is little doubt that the seventh petition similarly speaks personally of this 'evil one.'"³⁶⁴ The aorist verb again signifies one decisive, final eschatological act.³⁶⁵

Lohmeyer's work on the Lord's Prayer has dominated the field with an unquestioned authority. While he gave the Prayer of Jesus a serious theological and Biblical treatment, his imminent or future eschatological approach slants his interpretation.

1964 - Jeremias

The "Lutheran" Joachim Jeremias has done much valuable work on the Lord's Prayer.³⁶⁶ He must be appreciated for many valuable insights, although he tended toward hyperbole and exaggeration. Jeremias also contended that an

³⁶² Ibid., 195, 204.

³⁶³ Ibid., 206.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 216.

³⁶⁵ Ibid., 226.

³⁶⁶ Joachim Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, Facet Books, Biblical Series 8, tr. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964); see bibliographical notes and also translator's notes on p. xiii of said book to understand the evolution of this English volume.

eschatological orientation to the Lord's Prayer was proper. He maintained that the *eschaton* was in the process of being realized, or actualized, in the person of Jesus and even today. He proposed using the formula *sich realisierende Eschatologie*. By that he meant that the "decisive event came in Jesus Christ, but the full consummation lies in the future."³⁶⁷

Jeremias believed that as a whole the shorter Lukan Prayer was more original, but the Matthean wording was more authentic.³⁶⁸ The Matthean Prayer was intended for "people who have learned to pray in childhood but whose prayer stands in danger of becoming routine."³⁶⁹ The Lukan Prayer was "addressed to people who must for the first time learn to pray and whose courage to pray must be roused."³⁷⁰ Therefore, Matthew's Prayer was intended for Jewish-Christians, while Luke's was meant for Gentile Christians.³⁷¹ The two Prayers originated from two different early Christian churches.³⁷² The Matthean form is not original, since "No one would have dared to shorten a sacred text like the Lord's

³⁶⁷ Ibid., 32, fn. 27.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., 17.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 9.

³⁷⁰ Ibid.

³⁷¹ Ibid., 10.

³⁷² Ibid.

Prayer."³⁷³ The tendency, as Jeremias saw it, was to embellish liturgical texts. This can be illustrated by the use of the elongated Matthean address.³⁷⁴ However, Jeremias claimed that it is obvious that Luke has polished some of the wording, such as "this day" to "day by day."

The term "Father" is seldom applied to God in the Old Testament and never is *Abba* used in Jewish prayer of God.³⁷⁵ On the other hand, in the New Testament Jesus originated the use of the term *Abba* for God, viewed as being the *ipsissima* vox of Jesus.³⁷⁶ Jeremias compared the first two petitions of the Lord's Prayer with the Jewish *Kaddish* and concluded that they were eschatological since similar petitions in the *Kaddish* were eschatological.³⁷⁷ As far as the entire first strophe is concerned, Jeremias asserted that the "Thy petitions" thus "make entreaty for the final consummation."³⁷⁸

Turning to the bread petition in the second strophe, Jeremias preferred to interpret it according to a suggestion made by Jerome on the evidence of a lost copy of the *Gospel*

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, 11.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 21. But what kind of eschatology does the *Kaddish* imply? Judaism requests God's hallowing and kingdom "in your days" and "soon," differentiated from the Christian message that already now in time (not promise, but Messianic fulfilment) God is active! See Chapter III, *infra*, for study of the *Kaddish*, as also section on the Kingdom.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 22.

According to the Hebrews meaning "bread of tomorrow."³⁷⁹ He assumed that this lost Gospel succeeded the present Greek Gospels. When the Gospel was translated from the Greek into Aramaic, the translator stopped translating at Matt. 6:9-13; "he simply wrote down the holy words in the form in which he prayed them day by day."³⁸⁰ Jeremias maintained that this bread was not meant as earthly bread, but as the bread of life.³⁸¹ The "tomorrow" referred to the final consummation.³⁸² Jeremias did not totally exclude material bread, for earthly and heavenly bread are not antithetical; God hallows all things.³⁸³ Jeremias stated:

Jesus grants to them, as the children of God, the privilege of stretching forth their hands to grasp the glory of the consummation, to fetch it down, to "believe it down," to pray it down--right into their poor lives, even now, even here, today.³⁸⁴

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 23.

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 24.

³⁸¹ Ibid., 25.

³⁸² Ibid.

³⁸³ Ibid. However, this is a minor point; his eschatological theme is dominant. In idem, The Prayers of Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology 2/6, tr. John Bowden, et al. (London: SCM, 1967), 101-2, he confused the material, spiritual, and sacramental: "The bread which he proffered when he sat at table with publicans and sinners was everyday bread, and yet it was more: The bread of life . . . Every meal his disciples had with him was a usual eating and drinking, and yet it was more: a meal of salvation, a messianic meal, image and anticipation of the meal at the consummation."

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 27.

Jeremias' eschatological interpretation of the fourth petition shaded his approach to the remaining petitions. The fifth petition asks for God's mercy at the Last Judgment.³⁸⁵ Matthew's unique word for sins, "debts," enables one to see that the Lord's Prayer went back to an original Aramaic, not Hebrew, version.³⁸⁶ The word "as" in the fifth petition does not imply a comparison; it is causal.³⁸⁷ The disciple must be willing to forgive others in order to receive forgiveness. Matthew's wording is preferable, since his is the more difficult reading. His aorist suggests that one must forgive before divine forgiveness can be received. Jeremias pointed out that behind the aorist (historic) tense lay a Semitic "present perfect" tense which referred to a present action.³⁸⁸ Luke's version captured more properly the sense of this present tense. The sixth and, for him, final petition concludes the Lukan Prayer. The causative verb has a permissive nuance.³⁸⁹ It asks not for preservation from temptation but preservation in temptation.³⁹⁰ This is corroborated by an extra-canonical saying of Jesus: "No one can obtain the kingdom of heaven who has not passed through

³⁸⁵ Ibid.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 14.

³⁸⁷ Ibid., 27.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 14. See Chapter IV, *sub loc.*, for more information.

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 30.

³⁹⁰ Ibid.

temptation."³⁹¹ Therefore the believer will be tempted; the petition asks that it be overcome. For Jeremias, "temptation" means more than the temptations belonging to everyday life; the temptation of the sixth petition refers to "the final great Testing," the "final trial at the end."³⁹² Matthew's "expansion" (evil, in the seventh petition) supports this interpretation. The final conclusion was added later when the church used the Prayer in corporate worship and it was felt necessary to establish a fixed formulaic "seal" with which to conclude the Prayer.³⁹³

Like Lohmeyer, Jeremias attempted an Aramaic reconstruction for the Lord's Prayer. This attempt resulted from his false assumption that it is possible to reach back to the authentic and original teachings of Jesus (*ipsissima vox*) to derive the best possible meaning of a supposed original Lord's Prayer since the two Greek versions reflect later developments and modifications from the early church. Such later development of the Prayer is evidenced, for example, in the effort of de-eschatologization seen in Luke's version. Jeremias' mediating position of lending integrity to both versions (Luke's *form* being original, but Matthew's *wording* being more authentic) is specious since no data can be elicited in support of his conjectures. Many of his statements are exaggerated (God the Father being practically

³⁹¹ Ibid.

³⁹² Ibid.

³⁹³ Ibid., 31-32.

equivalent to "Daddy"). Jeremias left the distinct impression that the Greek canonical Prayer is spurious. He attempted to shave the words of Jesus in the Lord's Prayer to a bare minimum and to restrict its interpretation to his proposed reconstruction of an original version (the *ipsissima vox*). The tentative nature of this effort is clarified by his use of *vox* instead of *verba*. Thus it becomes clear why Jeremias favored the Lukan form of the Lord's Prayer, even if isolated differences in wording latent in the Matthean version struck him as potentially more authentic. Jeremias was concerned to determine the original, authentic form of the Lord's Prayer of Jesus. While Jeremias' use of critical methodology can assist better understanding of the Lord's Prayer, it is proper to accept the canonical text of the Prayer (*verba*) as representing the final form of the Prayer which, by inspiration, has been revealed in Scripture.

In spite of these criticisms, he often illustrated certain details relating to the Prayer very well in terms of the actual situation contemporary with Jesus. Many of his insights serve as valuable contributions for understanding the Lord's Prayer. Jeremias did not urge Christians to pray for blessings now which will sustain faith and life before, and for, eternity on the basis of the Lord's Prayer but, peculiarly, he taught to pray for the blessings of the eschatological consummation to come now into time. For example, the fourth petition implied more than nourishing bread, but for him it was the spiritual bread of life; it was "tomorrow's bread," the bread of the age of salvation.

Noneschatological Orientation

1969 - Carmignac

Probably the most exhaustive, magisterial study of the Lord's Prayer that exists was completed by the Roman Catholic Jean Carmignac.³⁹⁴ No study of the topic today can afford to neglect his fundamental research. He approached his topic piously and yet with erudition. Carmignac's sincere desire was to render adequately and faithfully the Lord's Prayer into modern French language. He had disapproved of a French ecumenical version, particularly at the sixth petition, which then precipitated his tackling a complete study of the Lord's Prayer. His study is marked by a sincere pastoral concern and fairness to Protestant scholarship. Partisanship is absent. He often cited Luther and other reformers, although generally preferring Luther's earlier works. He did rely heavily on Patristic expositions of the Lord's Prayer.

Carmignac was a recognized authority on the Dead Sea scrolls. As such, his study went beyond the problems of vernacular translation. He undertook a minute study of the meaning of the Lord's Prayer in light of advancements in modern Semitic studies. Carmignac tried to integrate the evidence of the Dead Sea scrolls into his exegesis of the Lord's Prayer, although he concluded that the parallels between the scrolls and the Lord's Prayer should not be exag-

³⁹⁴ Jean Carmignac, Recherches sur le "Notre Père" (Paris: Letouzey, 1969). Note that this work is only available in French. Unfortunately, the frequent references to Hebrew and Aramaic are not provided in Semitic characters, but only in transliteration. Throughout this paper, all translations are by the present writer; the originals will be cited only when particularly interesting or significant.

gerated. What he did conclude was that the Lord's Prayer was probably originally spoken in and translated from Hebrew.³⁹⁵ Carmignac maintained that the scrolls show that in first century Palestine, Hebrew was still habitually read and written for religious purposes. His point of view is more recent than the older and more prevalent theory of an Aramaic substrate for the Lord's Prayer.³⁹⁶ However, his thesis is not free of difficulties, and in fact, may tend to cloud his otherwise noble endeavor. His proposition is linked with the questionable theory of an original *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*.³⁹⁷ Many scholars today, Catholic or Protestant, would not accept the hypothesis that Matthew had at hand a (now non-existent) collection of Hebrew sayings of Jesus or that Matthew's Gospel derived from the lost *Gospel According to the Hebrews* (or of the Nazareans or of the Ebionites).³⁹⁸

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 31, 32, 51, 52.

³⁹⁶ E.g., Lohmeyer and Jeremias, above. Certain scholars who have worked in this area such as Matthew Black have faced problems determining what form of Aramaic may have been prevalent. These scholars are also hampered by the paucity of Aramaic literature extant with which to arrive at more certain results in translating the Lord's Prayer, for example, back into Aramaic. None of the retroversions agree (see next chapter), but neither do Hebrew retroversions! Carmignac, 396, provided a well-defended Hebrew translation of the Lord's Prayer. Since the Dead Sea scroll discoveries, the possibility of Hebrew as a spoken language, at least for religious purposes, has been renewed; see "Excursus: Language" in the next chapter.

³⁹⁷ Ibid., 28.

³⁹⁸ For information about this Gospel and fragments, see Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhem Schneemelcher, tr. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963-64), 1:117-65, especially p. 139; or, Morton Scott Enslin, "Hebrews, Gospel According to," in *The*

Carmignac avoided an eschatological approach to the Lord's Prayer. The typical defense of an eschatological interpretation based on the nuance of *Einmaligkeit* by the use of the Matthean aorist imperatives, especially in the first strophe, was refuted on the grounds that the underlying Hebrew or Aramaic iussive which was undoubtedly used does not carry this nuance.³⁹⁹ Part of the reason that Carmignac applied the Prayer to the here and now is simply because that is the way Jesus presented it. Carmignac did not make a distinction as much modern hyper-critical scholarship does, that Jesus' outlook was different from the teachings and Christology of the later church whence the Gospels are often claimed to have originated. He claimed that the Evangelists essentially presented the very words of the very Prayer that Jesus taught, albeit in Greek translation, and with some slight modifications especially by Luke. Jesus intended its use by his followers for their own needs and in their own times. As such, Carmignac tended to be more "conservative" and to run against the stream of some modern scholarship.

Carmignac divided the Lord's Prayer into seven petitions. He reluctantly excluded the conclusion. His acceptance of the more full address was in keeping with his preference for the more complete Matthean version of the Prayer. Matthew's version is more susceptible of rhythm, balance, and *parallelismus membrorum*, and thus is in harmony

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 2:570-71.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 88.

with typical Semitic practices. The short Lukan address "Father" reveals Pauline influence; some other modifications were also made by Luke in the Prayer he transmitted.⁴⁰⁰

Carmignac asserted that the sanctifying or glorifying of the name of God in the first petition results from both divine and human activity.⁴⁰¹ Under the second petition, the kingdom or dominion of God should come about (in French *arriver* rather than *venir*) for it is already penetrating men's hearts through the Gospel.⁴⁰² In the third petition, it is not God's will so much as the object of his (especially salvific) will or pleasure that should be done. God's will is done on earth by both divine intervention and human action.⁴⁰³ Carmignac claimed that Luke suppressed the third petition because to him it appeared repetitious of the first two petitions. The additional clause "on earth as it is in heaven" applies to all three petitions of the first strophe, and not to the third petition alone.⁴⁰⁴

Carmignac devoted over one hundred pages to the important fourth petition, and concluded that bread was practically equivalent to *manna* and that *epiousios* signified

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid., 75.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., 83.

⁴⁰² Ibid., 98.

⁴⁰³ Ibid., 106.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 112.

"for" or "until tomorrow."⁴⁰⁵ He broadened the bread/manna motif to include physical, spiritual, and sacramental meanings (but not eschatological).⁴⁰⁶ It appears that he supported such a polysemous interpretation on the grounds that, while material bread might be the most obvious meaning, the spiritual dimensions must be entertained since all the other petitions speak of spiritual matters. Otherwise the fourth petition would be the only petition excluding a spiritual dimension.⁴⁰⁷ The fifth petition presents the least difficulties and therefore probably the smallest amount of comment in nearly all exegesis of the Lord's Prayer, even in Carmignac's book.

On the other hand, the sixth petition was given lengthy treatment. In 1965 Carmignac had published an article in which he attempted to unravel the ambiguity of the sixth petition.⁴⁰⁸ He contended that the ambiguity arose from the construction of the underlying Hebrew. In that language a negative before a causative verb creates two possible meanings; either "cause us not to come" or "do not cause us to come." He pleaded for the first of these possibilities.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 218. For more, see Chapter IV, *sub loc.*

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 189-91.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., 195-96; 221. Carmignac may have slavishly followed much Roman Catholic tendency toward a spiritual *and* sacramental interpretation of the fourth petition.

⁴⁰⁸ Jean Carmignac, "Fais que nous n'entrions pas dans la tentation. La portée d'une négation devant un verbe au causatif," Revue Biblique 72 (1965): 218-26.

Then in 1966 a French ecumenical but ambiguous translation was recommended: "et ne nous soumetts pas à la tentation."⁴⁰⁹ Carmignac vehemently protested that to allude to God's submitting his people to temptation was tantamount to blasphemy. This prompted him to undertake his full scale study of the Lord's Prayer. His suggestion for the sixth petition was "Garde-nous (or Gardez-nous) de consentir à la tentation."⁴¹⁰ Carmignac definitely gave the sixth petition a present-day interpretation. For him, sin should be considered a present reality and which leads to temptation and ultimately apostasy.⁴¹¹ While "temptation" can be subject to broader meanings, including testing by God and a final trial by Satan, in the sixth petition it definitely referred to temptation to evil from sinful influences surrounding the Christian (cf. Luther's "unholy three"). He concluded that the "evil one" was the object of the seventh petition since a definite article modified the word for the devil.⁴¹²

⁴⁰⁹ It should be added that whatever is said in the context of a French background can usually be applied to English versions of the Lord's Prayer. See Prayers We Have in Common: Agreed Liturgical Texts Proposed by the International Consultation on English Texts (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 2-3, 7, for possible English wordings of the sixth petition, against which objection is made in the course of this study.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., 397.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., 267.

⁴¹² Ibid., 313, 318.

Carmignac tackled the question of an eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. His division of the question into the actual original intention of the Prayer as taught by Jesus and the present use of the Prayer was not very helpful, especially since he arrived at the same conclusions regarding both ways of looking at the question. At any rate, the daily needs of bread/manna (whether material, spiritual, and/or sacramental) belonged to Jesus and his disciples then as well as to God's people today.⁴¹³ This present orientation applies to the entire second strophe. The sixth petition, for example, prays for help against today's temptations since that word, having no article, is general. That word in the sixth petition does not specifically refer to a final temptation. Likewise, to regard the first strophe solely eschatologically would restrict and limit its application. The concerns of the first strophe apply to "an actual and concrete situation," that is, to the actual lives of God's people.⁴¹⁴

Carmignac perceptively raised the question as to why in more recent years, an eschatological interpretation is often being preferred for the Lord's Prayer when that orientation is so foreign to the text and spirit of the Prayer.⁴¹⁵ He

⁴¹³ Ibid., 139.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., 343.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid. See Jean Carmignac, "Les Dangers de L'Eschatologie," New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71): 365-90, in which he deplores the term eschatology being loosely used in reference to the present Gospel age instead of its original and literal use being reserved for future events.

commented on the specious assertion that the aorist verb forms used in the Lord's Prayer, for many, imply a single, decisive, future eschatological event. According to him, in Biblical Greek the distinction between the aorist imperative and present imperative tense forms used in prayer cannot be pressed.⁴¹⁶ Carmignac accepted the aorist imperatives of the verbs of the Lord's Prayer as signifying the immediacy of prayer. He rejected the argument that the aorists demand an eschatological interpretation:

For nothing proves that the historic moment needs to be reported at the end of the world (of which nothing is said in the context). Why would this not be very simply the very instant when the prayer is addressed to God? . . . If the prayer is sincere, should it not require an accomplishment as quickly as possible?⁴¹⁷

Lest it be objected that a noneschatological interpretation tends to ignore "eschatology," Carmignac acknowledged that, indeed, at the *parousia* there will be a full and complete accomplishment of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. The consummation is not ignored! He taught: "It is then only at the *parousia* that our prayers will be fully heard. But that is even more reason for desiring that, for the present time, the will of God would be already

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 343; 344, fn. 7; 84, fn. 7.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., 344: "Mais rien ne prouve que ce moment historique doive être reporté à la fin du monde (dont rien ne parle dans le contexte). Pourquoi ne serait-ce pas tout simplement l'instant même où la prière est adressée à Dieu? . . . Si la prière est sincère, ne requiert-elle pas un accomplissement aussi rapide que possible?"

realized as much as possible."⁴¹⁸ He added: "Basically, to limit the 'Our Father' to the end of the world is to partly devalue it; to the contrary, it does not acquire its full meaning unless our prayer is aimed at the actual moment now."⁴¹⁹

He continued by showing that the present tense verbs in the Lukan fourth and fifth petitions do not support a later de-eschatologization of the Prayer in the primitive church. Carmignac believed that the Lukan adaptations went back to modifications typical of Luke, and which were accommodations for Gentile usage. Whether or not his explanation for the Lukan present tense verbs in the fourth and fifth petitions is correct, they do reflect the same spirit as the aorists in the Matthean petitions (as will be shown in Chapter IV). Therefore, actually Matthew's and Luke's Prayers are practically identical theologically and both versions of the Lord's Prayer embrace a noneschatological orientation.

Carmignac has rendered an unmatched service to scholarship on the Lord's Prayer. On the basis of an exacting investigation, his conclusions deserve consideration. Clearly, he advocated the primary application of the Lord's Prayer as being for the present circumstances of God's people, in

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., "C'est donc seulement à la parousie que notre prière sera pleinement exaucée. Mais raison de plus pour désirer que, dès la minute présente, ce plan de Dieu soit déjà réalisé aussi totalement que possible."

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., "Au fond, limiter le "Notre Père" à la fin du monde, c'est le dévaluer en partie; au contraire, il n'acquiert sa pleine valeur que si notre prière vise déjà le moment actuel."

contrast to both Lohmeyer and Jeremias, for whom the primary orientation was to final events associated with the eschaton.

Summary

A review of the literature from patristic expositions, from the reformers, and from modern works, reveals that the primary orientation for interpretation of the Lord's Prayer has been for the here and now of the present Gospel age. Only more recently has the tendency developed to interpret the Lord's Prayer eschatologically. Historically, the usual point of view has been what may be described as "now in grace, then in glory." That is, the Prayer addresses the needs of the Christian now. Now the believer can serve God. Now in time the offer of the grace of God comes to satisfy spiritual needs. Yet, what is received and done by believers always remains incomplete on this side of glory.

Nowadays it is necessary to ascertain an author's assumptions and presuppositions. In short, most modern commentators of the Lord's Prayer may be classified as either taking a future eschatological approach to the Lord's Prayer or a noneschatological one emphasizing the Prayer's primary application for the here and now. Typical modern studies of the Lord's Prayer, particularly, represent one or the other of two ways of interpreting the Prayer, or at least, a mediation between these viewpoints. It should be said that a noneschatological approach does not ignore doctrines related to Christian future eschatology; it simply accepts the primary application of the Prayer for the here and now of the

present Gospel age.⁴²⁰

Although most patristic exegesis of the Lord's Prayer applied it to the present life of the believer, many expositions were fond of interpreting the fourth petition spiritually and, by extension, sacramentally. Luther and

⁴²⁰ A number of scholars of course view the Lord's Prayer noneschatologically, though perhaps few have submitted the Prayer to such rigorous examination and detailed exegesis as Carmignac has done. Among these, not all have consciously dealt with the issue of the hermeneutical role of its eschatology and few have dealt with the issue of the aorist in support of, or denial of, an eschatological interpretation. Mention may be made of several standard modern semi-popular treatments of the Lord's Prayer in English which take primarily a noneschatological view: Leonardo Boff [Roman Catholic], The Lord's Prayer: The Prayer of Integral Liberation, tr. Theodore Morrow (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1983); Philip Harner [Reformed], Understanding the Lord's Prayer (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975); H. van den Bussche [Roman Catholic], Understanding the Lord's Prayer, tr. Charles Schaldenbrand (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963); Lochman [Reformed], op. cit.; John Lowe [Anglican], The Lord's Prayer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962); Walter Lüthi [Reformed], The Lord's Prayer: An Exposition, tr. Kurt Schoenenberger (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961); Heinz Schürmann [Roman Catholic], Praying with Christ: The Our Father for Today, tr. William Ducey and Alphonse Simon (New York: Herder, 1964); E. F. Scott [Reformed], The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Scribner's, 1952); G. H. Smukal [Lutheran, included because of its worth], "The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer," Concordia Theological Monthly 16 (1945): 145-53, 236-49, 301-306, 396-404, 466-73, 505-13, 583-91, 661-72, 757-65, 842-48; Georg F. Vicedom [Lutheran], A Prayer for the World: The Lord's Prayer--A Prayer for Mission, tr. Edward and Marie Schroeder (St. Louis: Concordia, 1967).

With regard to a known representative of the movement known as "liberation theology," Boff correctly saw the incarnational dimension of the Lord's Prayer (p. 2): "Everything belongs in some way to the kingdom of God, because everything is objectively connected with God and is called to belong to the reality of God's kingdom. Thus the Christian faith is not just interested in those realities described as spiritual and supernatural. It also places a value on the material and the historical." But Boff unfortunately transferred these divine concerns for man to a commitment to political activity in order to liberate the oppressed. Boff applied divine grace primarily toward alleviating human conditions. In fairness, he claimed to have tried to avoid the antithetical extremes of orientation either to the future or to society now, hence "integral (future and present) liberation." Happily, the end result is that for the most part Boff did provide adequate theological expression to the present values connected with the Lord's Prayer.

most of the reformers preferred to emphasize a material interpretation of that petition. Generally speaking, the spiritual, though not always the sacramental, interpretation of this petition is more compatible with an eschatological interpretation, whereas a material understanding of the bread usually corresponds more with an everyday reading of the Lord's Prayer.

The basis for recent eschatological interpretations depends largely on the use of the aorist verb forms in the Lord's Prayer. Yet that specious contention is not universally accepted as seen, for example, in Carmignac's rejection of it. Some modern exegetes defend the notion that the Matthean Lord's Prayer has an eschatological thrust, whereas the Lukan Prayer is more oriented to the everyday life of the Christian. Actually, this assertion cannot be carried to its logical conclusion without first making the assumption that the two Prayers represent different senses. In fact, early Christians preferred using the Matthean version for their daily individual and corporate praying (viz. the *Didache*). This would suggest that the Matthean version as well as the Lukan both applied alike to the present life of the believer! It cannot be assumed that the Matthean version is eschatological and the Lukan version is noneschatological.⁴²¹

Ultimately the issue at hand is one of the vitality of the Lord's Prayer to serve the Christian today and in every

⁴²¹ As Raymond E. Brown, New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965), 253, for example, has done.

age. It is very possible that an extreme eschatological orientation of the Lord's Prayer would lead to the notion among some Christians that the Lord's Prayer is out of touch with reality and everyday life. While it is undeniable that only after this age will there be such perfection as the Lord's Prayer asks, the expectations of the petitions of the Dominical Prayer are related to God's grace now in time. This Prayer does not speak in terms of Platonic spiritualization, but of the real here and now of everyday existence. It definitely possesses an incarnational value. That is why Luther could apply the Prayer to the life now in which the believer lives by faith in God. God's infinite love and grace hallows everyday existence. So understood and applied to the present Gospel age, even a child can pray the Lord's Prayer and meaningfully use it. Probably it would be fair to say that most commentators historically have unconsciously understood the Lord's Prayer in this way. The exceptions are among those who have consciously and deliberately tried artificially to impose an extraneous and narrow future eschatological interpretation upon the Prayer taught by the Lord Jesus.

CHAPTER III

THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY CONTEXT

In order to study the Lord's Prayer properly it will be helpful to understand its theological and literary background. This includes appreciating the disposition of a gracious God who confers soteriological and temporal blessings upon his people. It also includes recognizing the use of prayer which God has commanded and to which he has attached a promise. A study of the literary and textual framework of the Lord's Prayer will also help to appreciate and interpret it. These contextual and background studies belong to the "then-ness" of the Lord's Prayer, based on the soteriological concerns of God for man in the first strophe, and the temporal concerns and spiritual needs of man in the second strophe.

Theological and Conceptual Background

Soteriological Blessings

The term "eschatology" refers to the "last things" of this Gospel age, such as the second coming of Jesus, the resurrection of the dead, the Day of Judgment, and life of the world to come. Therefore it points to the future. Christians, justified by faith and sanctified by the Spirit of God, believe that the joys connected with this life are a prelude to a more glorious life hereafter.

The soteriological blessings received during the time of the present age are a "down payment" (ἀρραβών) of greater future blessings (2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:14). There is a tension between present fulfilment and future hope, the "already, but not yet."¹ The blessings of the future are based on the events of Christ *in history*. God revealed his plan of salvation centered in his Son, Jesus Christ. Jesus suffered and died "under Pontius Pilate." The canonical Scriptures were delivered by inspiration at appointed times in history to reveal to man God's gracious salvific and temporal will. Truly, God rules and directs everything in the world (Ps. 103:19; 2 Chron. 20:6; Is. 60:12; Acts 4:27-28; 17:26; Eph. 1:11). George Ladd remarked, "God is King and acts in history to bring history to a divinely directed goal."² That is why the Christian can agree with St. Paul that "in everything God works together for good" (Rom. 8:28). As a major theme in the Bible, the concepts of God as King or of his rule in a kingdom can summarize God's soteriological blessings given to his people now and in the future. God, King of heaven and earth, is not only sovereign Ruler; he is

¹ Oscar Cullmann, Salvation in History, tr. Sidney G. Sowers (London: SCM, 1967), 172. Of course, many commentators recognize both present and future, or temporal and eschatological, dimensions associated with the concept of the kingdom of God; e.g., see B. C. Butler, "God's Kingdom: Future or Present?" Downside Review 95 (1977): 164-175, in which he calls the kingdom of grace the "seed" of the kingdom of glory (p. 175) and the offer of the kingdom by the Gospel *in actu primo* and its reception by the believer in faith *in actu secundo*.

² George Eldon Ladd, The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 331.

also the gracious King and Lord of salvation through Jesus.

Terminology and Meaning of the Kingdom

The theme of the "kingdom of God" predominates in the Lord's Prayer, where a contrast is drawn between God's realm of activity and the powers of this age. God's kingdom, then, provides an underlying theme for the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer.³ For God's name to be truly hallowed means that his kingdom must come. When his kingdom comes, then and only then, will *his will* be done completely.

The term used for the kingdom is that commonly used throughout the Greek Bible: βασιλεία. The synonymous expressions used in the Gospels ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ or ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν represent ideas deeply rooted in the Old Testament, and which constitute a significant theme in the Bible.⁴ In the Old Testament, however, the actual phrase, the "kingdom of God [Yahweh]," only occurs once, in 1 Chron.

³ Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (San Francisco: Harper, 1976), 55.

⁴ The two terms are generally taken to be synonymous and interchangeable; see, e.g., Anthony A. Hoekema, The Bible and the Future (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 44. On the other hand, see Karl Georg Kuhn, and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "βασιλεύς, κτλ," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament [hereafter TDNT], 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-74), 1:582; Schmidt asserted that the "kingdom of heaven" may refer to "the lordship which comes down from heaven into this world"; if so, it may highlight the notion of grace or the soteriological gift of God. The term "kingdom of heaven" occurs only in Matthew (except for the textually uncertain reading in John 3:5), who prefers it to the phrase "kingdom of God," although the latter is also occasionally used by him. Incidentally, in Matthew the term "kingdom of heaven" is mentioned 32 times (with "heaven" being a probable circumlocution for God), the term

28:5.⁵ The single term "kingdom" occurs in several places when used in relation to God: מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ (1 Chron. 17:14; Ps. 45:6, 103:19; 145:11, 12, 13). Other Hebrew words used include מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ , מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ (1 Chron. 29:11), מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ (1 Sam. 15:28, 2 Sam. 16:3). In the Aramaic portion of Daniel, מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ occurs (2:44; 4:3, 34 [MT 3:33; 4:32]; 7:14, 27). These various words have as their primary meaning the abstract idea of kingship, sovereignty, or kingly rule, rather than the realm or place of rule, unless the context specifically requires the latter. The theme of God's kingdom or ruling is common in the Old Testament (Ex. 15:18: "The Lord will reign for ever and ever"); see also 1 Kings 22:19; 1 Chron. 29:11; Is. 6:5. God is ascribed as king of Israel (Num. 23:21). He also will rule through the Davidic throne (2 Sam. 7:13-16). His reign over Israel was to be eternal (Ps. 145:11, 13). The sovereignty of God over Israel was intended to be absolute ("You shall have no other gods before me (Ex. 20:3).") God was able to cause other nations such as the Persian Empire to serve his purposes vicariously and Cyrus was spoken of as God's "shepherd" and "anointed" one (Is. 41:1-7; 44:24-25:25). Of course, God's perfect rule was not always manifest.

kingdom with other modifiers 14 times, and the "kingdom of God" 4 times; see Otto Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1989), 79-81, *sub loc.* The Semitic expressions are in Hebrew מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ , and in Aramaic מְלִיכָוֶתָּהּ .

⁵ Owen E. Evans, "Kingdom of God," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (hereafter IDB). 4 vols. with supplement, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962 and 1976), 3:17.

This reality led to the expectation of future blessings connected with God's kingship. In the future, what was under partial or total failure now would finally be fully realized (Is. 24:23; 52:7; Mic. 4:7; Ob. 21; Zech. 14:9). The Old Testament prophets looked forward to the day when God's rule would be fully experienced for Israel and for the world (Is. 56:1, 6-8). God himself would be king. Israel particularly would be blessed by future restoration of the theocracy lost at the time of the Exile. The promise and hope of a remnant was kept alive by the prophetic word (Is. 11:11; Jer. 23:3; Ezek. 36:24-28). The reality of evil and suffering led many to think that God did not have full sway among the nations; therefore an eschatological "Day of the Lord" was expected in the future. After that the Jews would hope for a golden age under God's rule (Is:2-4; 11:6-9; Mic. 4:1-4). Apocalyptic literature developed subsequent to the experience of the Exile. Such literature reckoned with the reality of counterforces to God's kingdom this way:

The solution it offered to this problem involved a qualified dualism, which saw a spiritual kingdom of evil, headed by Satan, at war with the kingdom, or rule of God. This powerfully organized kingdom of evil, though it often appeared to be in the ascendant in this world, existed only by the permission of God, and would ultimately be overthrown.⁶

Aspects of future hope also included the prospect of a messianic Son of Man, epitomized in Dan. 7:13. This glorious Son of Man was linked with the concept of the kingdom. It is generally considered important to include the Son of Man and

⁶ Ibid., 19.

the Suffering Servant idea within the conception of the kingdom of God by Jesus.

The message of Jesus was preached by him in an inter-testamental milieu where the reign of God or of the "kingdom of heaven" (מְלִכְוּת שְׁמַיָּא) was familiar to all. The latter expression was often employed as a periphrasis for the divine name. The Targum of Is. 40:9 substituted for "Behold your God" the phrase "The kingdom of your God has become manifest."⁷ The non-canonical Psalm of Solomon speaks of the βασιλεια of God as a present reality (Ps. Sol. 2:32; 5:18; 17:3, 46). Praise formulae also contained references to God's reign; the Jewish morning and evening *Shema* began: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe."⁸ For later Judaism, a natural development of the Biblical teaching of God's reign included the fact that he set about establishing a subject people belonging to him.

The average Jew was taught that he could participate in God's kingdom, hoping thereby to bring virtually into reality a physical theocracy by taking "the yoke of the kingdom upon oneself." The recitation of the *Shema* was the method for

⁷ Ibid., 17.

⁸ See Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, "Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Munich: Beck, 1926-28; 1956), 1:184; the translation appears in the section on "Prayers in Judaism"; see *infra*. See also *The Eighteen*, *infra*, where at petition nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 16 and 18, God is called "King."

taking on this yoke.⁹ By the recitation of the *Shema*, the Jew placed himself under the obedience of the law. This had the unfortunate result of men placing themselves at the center of the founding of God's kingdom.

Later Jewish religion and rabbinism also began interpreting the kingdom in a nationalistic way. Thus, "Israel must be set free from the sway of the peoples and the Gentile world be subjugated to God."¹⁰ Against such self-righteous and nationalistic coloration given to the concept the "kingdom of God," Jesus taught a different message.

Jesus' coming chronologically followed the intertestamental developments described above. The term "kingdom of heaven" or "kingdom of God" was familiar to the ears of those living in first-century A.D. Palestine.¹¹ However, generally speaking, the yearning for God's kingdom during the intertestamental period grew and developed along national and particularistic lines. The hope for a

⁹ Gustaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus, tr. D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: Clark, 1902), 98.

¹⁰ Ibid. Solomon Schechter, (Some) Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: Macmillan, 1923, 1961), 47-115, described this nationalistic emphasis in Judaism.

¹¹ Schmidt, "βασιλεία," in TDNT 1:584. There is a sense that the soteriological blessings of God to his people in the fulfilled present of the Gospel age can be called eschatological. Citing Joel 2:29 (3:2 MT) in Acts 2:17, Peter described the time of the New Testament by employing the cognate *eschat-*: "'And in the last days (ἐν ταῖς ἑσχαταῖς ἡμέραις) it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh . . .'" As will be further delineated in the Conclusion (q.v. Chapter V) the term noneschatological, understood correctly, also can be used to describe the reality of soteriological grace made possible on account of Jesus for the present time. For the purposes of this study the term eschatological is reserved more strictly for end-time events.

messianic, quasi-political, deliverer was keen.¹² Against this background, the message of the Gospel was startling. The New Testament teaches that the future expectations of the Old Testament were satisfied in the person of Jesus (Rom. 10:4). Old covenantal forms were abrogated by the advent of the new age introduced by Jesus (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:8-12). The evangelists report Jesus employing "kingdom" terms in order to make this identification between himself and God's reign of grace. Other kingdom expressions include "your kingdom" (Matt. 6:30; 11:2), "his kingdom" (Matt. 6:33; Luke 12:31), "the kingdom" (Matt. 4:23; 8:12; 9:35; 13:19, 38; 24:14; 25:34; Luke 12:32), "the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. 13:43), "my Father's kingdom" (Matt. 26:29). These references regard the kingdom as belonging to God, or to Jesus the Son of Man (Matt. 13:41; 16:28), or simply to Jesus (Matt. 20:21; Luke 1:33; 22:29-30; 23:42). In John's Gospel, the term kingdom of God occurs twice (3:3, 5) and "my kingdom" is used at 18:36.

At Jesus' coming, many people were certainly prepared to hear his message about God's kingdom (Mark 15:43; Luke 2:25, 38; 15:15; 17:20; 19:11; 23:51). Unfortunately, many Jews expected Jesus' kingdom to be characterized by secular

¹² For a description of such "eschatological" expectations, see Henry R. Moeller, ed., The Legacy of Zion: Intertestamental Texts Related to the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), 148-49; secs. 52-54; also, T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1953, 1984 repr.), 1-35. Manson, 32-33, summarized Messianic hopes as including security against attacks from wild beasts, cessation of war along with the moral and physical superiority of Israel, material prosperity, long life and physical blessings, and the restoration of exiles to their homeland. These and other expectations were centered on a Davidic servant-messiah.

concerns, such as peace and prosperity. Such typical messianic expectations did not belong to Jesus' spiritual mission. Contrary to expectations of a glorious temporal kingdom, John the Baptizer began his message this way: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:2). For John the Baptizer the soon-expected Messiah would come preeminently as one who would forgive sin or judge sinners (Matt. 3:12; Luke 3:17). Like John, Jesus also inaugurated his public ministry in a "kingdom" way: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 4:17; cf. Mark 1:15: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel"). Jesus proclaimed the soteriological blessing of God in terms of present grace: "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12:32).

In order to understand better the term "kingdom of God" four major views of when the kingdom of God should come will be reported. These represent the main trends or tendencies of modern discussions of the concept.¹³ The kingdom can hardly be understood apart from some concept of eschatology. The kingdom and eschatology will be discussed in tandem in the following paragraphs.

First, nineteenth-century liberal theology conceived of

¹³ Several studies summarize the various theological views. See, e.g., Hoekema, The Bible and the Future, 288-316; Ladd, The Presence of the Future, 1-42; Norman Perrin, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 1-83; perhaps best of all is the succinct summary by Ladd, "Eschatology," in The International Standard Dictionary of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 2:130-42.

the kingdom presented in the Gospels as applying to the potential for fulfillment by humanity in the present world motivated by the standards of divine love as taught by Jesus the great exemplar.¹⁴ Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) and Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930) were leading proponents of this interpretation. Jesus reduced Christianity to a brotherhood under God's Fatherhood. According to Harnack, for example, Jesus mainly gave the Lord's Prayer as a fine moral expression.¹⁵ For this school, the present was emphasized at the expense of the future. Mankind's abilities were emphasized over God's sovereign activity.

Second, Ritschl's son-in-law, Johannes Weiss, led a reactionary protest by publishing his *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God* in 1892. Weiss (1863-1914) taught that Jesus proclaimed a radical, eschatologically-oriented salvation. Jesus expected it in the near future. It would erupt suddenly as a work of God alone making a complete break with the present age. When Jesus spoke of it as having arrived, it was only in an anticipatory way.¹⁶ Albert Schweitzer (1875-1966) expanded on this theme, especially in his *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* introduced in 1906.

¹⁴ Hoekema, 288.

¹⁵ Adolf von Harnack, *What is Christianity?*, tr. Thomas Bailey Saunders (New York: Harper, 1957), 65: "It [the Lord's Prayer] shows the Gospel to be the Fatherhood of God applied to the whole of life; to be an inner union with God's will and God's kingdom, and a joyous certainty of the possession of eternal blessings and protection from evil." For Harnack, the Lord's Prayer partakes of ethical qualities at soteriological expense.

¹⁶ Hoekema, 290.

Such a thorough-going imminent eschatology became known as "consequent" or "consistent" eschatology.¹⁷ Schweitzer taught that Jesus expected the eschaton soon; when it did not materialize, Jesus was left disappointed and mistaken. By his death, then, he alone would hope to usher the kingdom into existence. This did not happen. His life and mission ended in disillusionment. Jesus was a tragic figure. For this interpretation of Jesus' mission, Schweitzer, too, was left a tragic figure, although he rendered the service of demonstrating that Jesus' life and teaching was dominated by a fixed eschatological expectation over against the liberal ethical interpretation of Jesus in vogue earlier.¹⁸

Third, in reaction to the unrealized eschatology of Schweitzer, C. H. Dodd (1884-1973) defended "realized eschatology." He taught that the kingdom had come in the person of Jesus, relying heavily on the argument that the verbs ἐγγίξεν of Mark 1:15 and φθόνην of Matt. 12:28 and Luke 11:20 should both be translated "the kingdom of God has come upon you."¹⁹ Dodd's position argued "that for Jesus the kingdom was present, that Jesus taught the reality of the Kingdom as realized in his own ministry."²⁰ Unfortunately,

¹⁷ Hoekema, 291.

¹⁸ Ibid., 292; a contemporary proponent of this view is: Richard H. Hiers, Jesus and the Future (Atlanta: Knox, 1981).

¹⁹ Hoekema, 293. Millar Burrows, "Thy Kingdom Come," Journal of Biblical Literature 74 (1955): 5, saw the last verb as future-oriented.

²⁰ Perrin, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, 58.

Dodd was unable fully to sustain his argument in the face of clear teachings relating the kingdom to the future. Werner Georg Kümmel shattered Dodd's defense.²¹ Dodd made a vain effort at ascribing Jesus' allusions to the future to false and inferior claims of Jewish apocalyptic.²² Dodd's position fortunately did serve as a corrective to the extreme future orientation of "consistent eschatology," although he undoubtedly "overplayed his hand" in the other direction.²³

Fourth, more recently a number of voices have expressed the probability that the New Testament speaks of a "both-and" in regard to the kingdom of God. Oscar Cullmann, for example, showed that the kingdom that was introduced in the preaching of Jesus could be understood best by the image of a time line, whereon Christ won the victory, but the final consummation of the kingdom is still coming.²⁴ He employed the terms "already and not yet" with reference to the above line of history.²⁵ For many commentators, the delay of the *parousia* was no problem for the early Christians; since Jesus came once, he would certainly return, and he was always

²¹ Werner Georg Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus, tr. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM, 1956), 24; see more below.

²² Hoekema, 294.

²³ Ibid., 296.

²⁴ Cullmann, Salvation, 84.

²⁵ Ibid., 32.

spiritually near.²⁶ The "Bultmann school" accepted the present orientation of the kingdom. This school believes that the kingdom is existentially experienced when the demand of God makes a claim on the old life and the person responding to God's claim then enters new life.²⁷ Another highly influential work synthesizing the present and future dimensions of the kingdom is Werner Kümmel's *Promise and Fulfillment*, mentioned earlier in a different context. He saw the present and the future embodied in the person of Jesus.²⁸ Norman Perrin's 1967 book *Rediscovering the*

²⁶ Ibid., 32, 181. For example, C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1962), 102, emphasized the present dimensions associated with the kingdom of God: "Both the expectation of a *parousia* the day after tomorrow and its postponement *sine die* seem to have led to unfruitful conclusions. But neither of these is characteristic of New Testament thought, which concentrates far more on the *datum*--on the fact that already the Kingship of Christ has been established, already the Kingdom of God has been inaugurated, and that the responsibility of the children of the Kingdom is to act here and now as those who are charged to bear witness to its reality."

²⁷ Ladd, "Eschatology," 131.

²⁸ Kümmel, 39, 105-107; for him, the kingdom was "among us" (ἐντός - Luke 17:20-21), not "upon you" or "here" as Dodd taught, p. 35. Although this phrase has received considerable discussion, it is clear that in some way, as Evans said, 22, "it means that the kingdom is already 'in the midst of' men, in his own [Jesus'] person and ministry." Schmoller, 172 *sub loc.*, wisely showed that the Greek word implied *intra*, not *inter*. William F. Arndt, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956), 373, focused attention on the Good News that with the person of Jesus, God's kingdom is really present: "The rule of God is already here, in your midst; of course, since it comes without fanfare, you are not aware of its presence." Similarly, Ladd, *Presence*, 164 *et passim*, held to the future *and* present aspects of the kingdom; he styled its coming with Jesus' words and deeds as a "dynamic" view of the kingdom.

Teaching of Jesus dealt with the kingdom of God.²⁹ Perrin claimed that the "future act of God is conceived in terms analogous to those used of his past acts, but different in that it will be final and decisive."³⁰ In Jesus' teaching the kingdom of God refers to the blessings of salvation.³¹ Perrin pointed out that the word "eschatology" used in conjunction with Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of God can simply mean something "new"; it is a comprehensive term often broadly used for the blessings of salvation associated with Jesus.³² But the proper and narrow use of the term "eschatology" refers to the final decisive activity of God at the end of history.³³ Perrin held that Jesus' teaching about

²⁹ Ladd, Presence, 39, showed that Perrin held to a presuppositional error, namely, that the Son of Man sayings and eschatological sayings were later church creations.

³⁰ Perrin, Rediscovering, 56.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

³² This is the very point made by Heinrich Greeven, Gebet und Eschatologie im Neuen Testament, Neutestamentliche Forschungen, Dritte Reihe, no. 1 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann [Werner], 1930), 86, who claimed that the proper understanding of Christian eschatology relates to the present. An eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer means that it is removed from the nationalistic and particularistic background of Judaism, and it accepts the mission of Jesus as the eschatological inbreaking into this world. His "eschatological interpretation" of the Lord's Prayer, 72-132, is oriented to the present and not to the future! While the position of this paper would agree with Greeven in substance, as stated earlier, a more narrowly defined use of the term "eschatology" is preferable. Cf. fn. 11, above.

³³ Perrin, Rediscovering, 56; see also Raymond E. Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," in New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965), 217-18.

the kingdom of God embraced both present experience and future consummation.³⁴

Several authorities are difficult to categorize within the above typical outline. Joachim Jeremias, for example, held that the kingdom of God was to be in the eschatological future, but that it would be soon.³⁵ On the other hand, an engaging journal article by Marcus Borg challenged the conception that Jesus' mission and ministry should be interpreted only within the framework of an imminent expectation of the end of the world.³⁶ For him, Jesus' message was not oriented to future eschatology. Other authorities, too numerous to report, have done yeomen's work in the area of the kingdom of God and eschatology.³⁷ The

³⁴ Ibid., 161. Perrin, 191-201, interpreted the Lord's Prayer as present and future.

³⁵ Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, tr. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1971), 103, 139. See the reference to his "self-realizing" or "proleptic eschatology" in the previous chapter, fn. 367. G. B. Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), 254, demonstrated that Jeremias' definition of eschatology, by which a process was initiated which would be only continuously realized until its culmination on the Last Day, omits the complete and perfect accomplishment of salvation by Jesus that was once for all (Heb. 9:26; 1 Pet. 3:18); similarly, Ladd, Presence, 27, n. 109.

³⁶ Marcus Borg, "A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus," Foundations and Facets Forum 2/3 (1986): 81-102; other idiosyncratic conclusions reached by him (theology by consensus) do not concern this study.

³⁷ Especial mention should be made of Herman Ridderbos, The Coming of the Kingdom, tr. H. de Jongste (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1962); Rudolf Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom, tr. John Murray (New York: Herder, 1968); Hoekema, The Bible and the Future; Ladd, The Presence of the Future; and Colin Brown, "Parousia and Eschatology in the NT," in The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 2:901-31.

above review should illustrate how the pendulum of theology has swung.

Nowadays, most authorities, recognizing the paradox between the future and the present dimensions of the teachings about Jesus' kingdom, acknowledge both present and future aspects in a balanced way that is responsible and faithful to Holy Scripture.

The Kingdom of Grace

The message of Jesus in the Gospels is intended to be a blessing for God's people. The concept of the kingdom of God as employed by Jesus tells that God rules in a certain way, namely for the salvation of his people. The time-honored category "the kingdom of grace" describes the activity of the message of Jesus' Gospel.³⁸ This phrase usefully illustrates and communicates the present orientation of the teaching that the promised Redeemer of the Old Testament had now come. Jesus was the end and the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies. His appearance meant that sins had been atoned for by his death "once for all" (Heb. 10:10; 1 Pet. 3:18). The term "kingdom of glory" describes the eschatological

³⁸ In the vast literature on the Lord's Prayer, it appears that the useful categories "kingdom of grace" and "kingdom of glory" are seldom employed; the terms, however, are utilized to advantage by some of the older authorities such as Thomas Watson, The Lord's Prayer (Edinburgh: n.p., 1692; repr., London: Banner of Truth, 1965), 54-150; Adolph Saphir, Our Lord's Pattern for Prayer (London: Nisbet, 1872; repr. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1984), 163-82 *et passim*; and G. H. Smukal, "The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer," Concordia Theological Monthly 16 (1945): 397. Incidentally, these resources are among the best expositions of the Lord's Prayer available!

return of Jesus in glory and blessed judgment for his elect at the Last Day in order to give them eternal life, and further, the enjoyment of the blessings of eternal life by the elect. Proponents of "consistent eschatology" tend to disregard the present blessings realized under the kingdom of grace.³⁹ The concept of the kingdom of grace refers to soteriological blessings associated with the present Gospel age. This blessed and present reality cannot be ignored.

This is the preeminent message of the entire New Testament. At the same time, God's grace is the message of the kingdom of God. Perhaps the most clear evidence for this is in Acts 8:12, where by *hendiadys* the kingdom is equated with Christ, "But when they believed Philip as he preached good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized."⁴⁰ Similarly, Jesus and the kingdom are equated by thoroughly comparing the Palm Sunday accounts. Mark 11:10 reports, "Blessed is the *kingdom* of our father David that is coming!" Luke 19:38 says, "Blessed is the *King* who comes in the name of the Lord!" John 12:13 says, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, even the *King* of Israel!" Matthew 21:9 simply says, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!" All the Evangelists, then, but Mark most explicitly, show that the kingdom comes

³⁹ Ernst Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer, tr. John Bowden (New York: Harper, 1965), 102, for example, affirmed that because the kingdom is expected to come once, yet in the future, that the concept resists being split into the kingdom of grace *and* glory.

⁴⁰ Schmidt, "βασιλεία," in TDNT 1:589.

with "King" Jesus.⁴¹ Jesus identified himself as King in Matt. 21:5 and John 12:15 (based on Zech. 9:9 and Is. 62:11).

Several New Testament passages clearly portray the blessings connected with the kingdom of grace. For example, Col. 1:13-14 says, "He has delivered us from the dominion (ἐξουσίας) of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom (βασιλείαν) of his Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." Eph. 1:9-10 describes the new life under the Gospel:

For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will, according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fulness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on the earth.

Eph. 2:5 says, "even when we were dead through our trespasses, [God] made us alive together with Christ (by grace you have been saved)." Certainly the concept of the kingdom of grace can be a valid and useful category for describing the work and purpose of God's Son, Jesus, the Christ.

Numerous passages in the New Testament associate Jesus with the kingdom. They report his claims to the kingdom, or that the kingdom comes because of him. A random sampling will illustrate the importance that this concept holds and will provide insights into its significance. Jesus spoke before Pontius Pilate at his trial, identifying himself with

⁴¹ Ibid., 584, shows that the motif of Jesus and his coming with the kingdom is associated with the word group ἔρχομαι. See, e.g., Luke 22:18, "I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes" (so the RSV; literally, the aorist "has come" ἔλθη).

the kingdom which is spiritual: "My kingship is not of this world; if my kingship were of this world, my servants would fight" (John 18:36). Jesus told Nicodemus in John 3:3, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew (ἀνωθεν) he cannot see the kingdom of God"; and at verse 5, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter (εἰσελθεῖν) the kingdom of God."⁴²

Entering the kingdom, of course is a common theme, as the words of Jesus on the Mount indicate (Matt. 5:20): "For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter (εἰσεέλθητε) the kingdom of heaven" (see Mark 9:47; 10:14-15, 23-24; 11:10). In fact, the Sermon on the Mount is replete with references to the kingdom (Matt. 5:3, 10, 19, 20; 6:33; 7:21; cf. Luke 6:20). The present tense verb in Matt. 21:31 is relevant. The statement of Jesus, "Truly, I say to you, the tax collectors and harlots go into (προάγουσιν) the kingdom of God before you," shows that social outcasts were entering the kingdom of God owing to the ministry of Jesus. Luke described the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus in terms of present Gospel grace, realized by the Advent of Jesus. See Acts 1:3: "To them he presented himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing to them during forty days, and speaking of the kingdom of God" (see Acts 8:12; 14:22; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23, 31).

⁴² Sinaiticus, "he cannot see the kingdom of heaven."

Paul spoke of the kingdom of God at Rom. 14:17; 1 Cor. 4:20; 6:9; 15:24, 50; Col. 1:13; 4:11. Paul stated in 2 Tim. 4:18, "The Lord will rescue me from every evil and save me for his heavenly kingdom. To him be glory for ever and ever. Amen." Other New Testament writers also refer to the kingdom of God: James 2:5; 2 Pet. 1:11 (εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν). At Matt. 16:19, the *Gospel* is the veritable key to the kingdom of heaven. Jesus is the King in the kingdom, according to the words from the Parable of the Pounds (Luke 19:27): "But as for those enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them . . ." (μὴ . . . με βασιλεύσαι ἐπ' αὐτούς). On account of, and for the sake of, Jesus the kingdom suffers violence according to Luke 16:16 and Matt. 11:12.⁴³

⁴³ These two verses show with their violent reaction that the kingdom of God has indeed come in connection with Jesus, regardless of how these verses may be interpreted. Several possibilities exist for their interpretation. 1. The verb may be taken as a passive, meaning the kingdom sadly suffers hostility from its adversaries, or that it has been wrenched by John and Jesus from the Old Covenant as the New Testament was introduced. 2. If the verb is a middle reflexive, it exerts itself with power. 3. If it is a middle in an active sense, it can be entered by enthusiasts, in a positive sense with joy and energetic faith according to the preached word (so, Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961], 840; and Francis Pieper, Christian Dogmatics [St. Louis: Concordia, 2:435, 3:241]), or, in a negative way, referring to forced entry without repentance or, from the Pharisees' point of view, without regard for Old Testament conditions for membership. Arndt, Luke, 361, provided the following interpretative insights: "What in the Old Covenant was anticipated and foreshadowed has now been made a reality. In the hearts of men the gracious reign of God . . . has begun . . . βιάζεται is best taken in the conative sense and as a middle. The proclamation of the coming of the kingdom created excitement, and everybody desired to get the benefit of its divine sway and blessings. However the gate to that kingdom, if we conceive of it as a city, is narrow. One must repent to enter, and many try to rush into the region of bliss without passing through that gate. They think they can force their way into it, taking along all filthy *impedimenta*, their favorite

The kingdom of grace includes the following features present in the ministry of Jesus.⁴⁴

1. The casting out of demons by Jesus. This activity demonstrated that Jesus had gained the victory over the devil, as so clearly claimed by him, "If it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Matt. 12:28).⁴⁵

2. The fall of Satan. Jesus announced after the return of the mission of the seventy, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (Luke 10:18). The ministry of the word of God had such an effect! Of course, the victory is not final, but Satan is restricted for the present time (see Rev. 20:2). The Jews had generally looked forward to God's imminent coming to destroy the powers of evil at the end of time and to bring Israel to final blessedness.⁴⁶ Indeed, that is what Jesus, God's Messiah, did for the Israel of faith.

sins, their evil associations and habits. As a result great numbers have to remain outside The form in which this saying appears [in] Mt 11:12, 'From the days of John the Baptist till now the kingdom of the heavens is treated with violence, and violent persons seize it,' that is, try to enter it, has the same meaning as the passage here in Lk."

⁴⁴ Hoekema, 46-47. See the list of Messianic expectations in fn. 12, above.

⁴⁵ Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr.), 479-80, prefers to translate φθάνω as "to reach or arrive." Jesus' exorcistic power was a demonstration that the kingdom had come with him. The kingdom of grace has a present orientation. It was as near as Jesus.

⁴⁶ Ladd, "Eschatology," 134.

3. The performance of miracles. Miracles had the purpose of pointing to the kingdom of God, as Jesus implied, "Go and tell John [the Baptizer] what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them" (Matt. 11:4-5).

4. The preaching of the Gospel. The salvation preached through the Gospel was superior to miracles. This is clearly enunciated in Luke's report of the return from the mission of the seventy, "Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Luke 10:20).

5. The bestowal of the forgiveness of sins. This is one of the blessings expected of the Messianic Age, according to the Old Testament (Is. 33:24; Jer. 31:34; Mic. 7:18-20; Zech. 13:1). Jesus not only proclaimed forgiveness, but also forgave sinners himself, since the kingdom of God had come among men in his person. After the healing of the paralytic, Jesus declared, "The Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins" (Mark 2:10).

As a result of the coming of Jesus, evangelism becomes a priority (Matt. 24:14; 28:19-20; 2 Pet. 3:9). Moreover, the believer is not to think that he is totally free of sin's influence (Matt. 13:24-43) even though the kingdom, as *summum bonum Dei*, has been made present with the coming of Jesus.

Judaism tended to expect an eschatological kingdom which would mark the end of the present age. Unlike Judaism, the kingdom for Jesus was not exclusively futuristic. It

embraces the present Gospel age. The kingdom, from the New Testament point of view, must be understood and defined specifically in terms of Jesus' "coming" into human history on earth. The kingdom of God and the coming of Jesus are nearly coterminous expressions for the new Messianic age inaugurated by Jesus, and which much of his message described. Jesus' gospel invites sinners to enter the kingdom of God. Through faith in Jesus, God's son, they are received into this spiritual kingdom. This dynamic soteriological activity is often called the "kingdom of grace" and is central to the Christian message proclaimed in the present Gospel age.

The Kingdom of Glory

The New Testament speaks of two ages: this age (both in terms of its sinfulness, yet also in terms of Messianic grace in the time of the Gospel) and the age of the world to come. The natural outcome of this life, for the Christian, is to enjoy life eternal. The "age to come" is a glorious hope. Some of the contrasts between these ages, present and future, can be seen in the following verses. Matt. 12:32 reports the words of Jesus, "whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come" (οὐτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὐτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι). Luke 22:16 (cf. 22:18) reports Jesus' words at the Lord's Supper, "For I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῃ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ). Rev. 11:15 prophecies: "The kingdom of this world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for

ever and ever." Paul said in 1 Cor. 2:8, "None of the rulers of *this age* understood this [wisdom of God]; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory," and at 3:18, "If any one among you thinks that he is wise in *this age*, let him become a fool that he may become wise." 2 Cor. 4:4 declares, "In their case the god of *this world* has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ." Jesus "gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the *present evil age* (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ), according to the will of our God and Father" (Gal. 1:4). Two ages are contrasted in Eph. 1:21, ". . . and above every name that is named, not only in *this age* but also in *that which is to come*" (οὐ μόνου ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι). See also Rom. 12:2; Eph. 2:2; 6:12; 1 Tim. 6:17; 2 Tim. 4:10; Tit. 2:12. The future life is especially mentioned in Luke 18:30 ("who will not receive manifold more in *this time*, and in the *age to come*" [ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον]); 20:35; Eph. 2:7 (ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις); Heb. 6:5. Familiar expressions for the future include "the last day" (ἔσχατη ἡμέρα, John 6:39) and the "end of the age" (συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. 28:20).

The first coming or advent of the Savior in history meant grace. His return or *parousia* at the end of the ages, at his second coming, will be one of judgment. For true believers it will be a gracious judgment, one of acquittal.

In the sense that his coming was the inbreaking of God into the historical reality of this age, his advent, ministry, and mission are often termed eschatological. However, it is probably best, as maintained earlier, to reserve the usage of the term "eschatological" primarily for the future, identifying it more literally with the final consummation or "last things."⁴⁷ Many passages speak of the eschatological events still to come. Jesus spoke of the future dimension of the kingdom as a *fait accompli* in Luke 22:29: "I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." Several verses from Matthew's Gospel are illustrative. "Jesus said to them, 'Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel'" (19:28). The Final "Sheep-goat" Judgment is taught in Matt. 25:31-46.⁴⁸ Note the destruction of Satan and the "eternal fire" of Matt. 25:41. Matt. 25:12 tells of the exclusion of the unrighteous and the uncertain hour of the Last Day (see Matt. 7:23). Reference to the Final Judgment is also made in Matt. 13:42, 50.

⁴⁷ See fn. 33, *supra*. The term "eschatological" is not used in the broad or looser sense in this paper so as to avoid confusion. Of course, the message of the New Testament is eschatological with reference to God's activity in the Gospel age in view of Jesus' first advent.

⁴⁸ Ladd, "Eschatology," 136, observed: "A common sight in Palestine is a small flock of sheep and goats mixed together, which are separated at night. Jesus announced that the eschatological consummation will witness a separation of all people."

In heaven there will be a restoration of perfect communion broken by sin. For example, from Matthew's Gospel the glories of heaven are depicted in association with an amelioration of earth's sad conditions: "moths nor rust will consume" (6:20); "many from east and west will sit at table" (8:11); the wheat will be gathered in a final harvest (13:30); there will be treasures in heaven (19:21); the marriage feast will be ready (22:3). John is fond of using the term "eternal life." This can refer to present as well as future blessings related to the kingdom of God and the gift of soteriological grace (3:36; 4:14, 36; 5:29, 39; 6:27; 12:25). The Second Coming of Jesus is taught in many places (see Acts 1:7; 9:11; John 5:28, 29; 1 Thess. 4:16; 5:2). Pauline terminology for the second coming of Jesus includes *parousia* (Phil. 2:2; 1 Cor. 16:17; 2 Cor. 7:7); *apokalypsis* (2 Thess. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:7); and *epiphaneia* (2 Thess. 2:8; Tit. 2:13). The resurrection of the dead is taught in such passages as Acts 17:32; Rom. 4:7; 1 Cor. 15:20-22, 35, 42-45, 51-52; 2 Cor. 1:9; Rev. 20:12. The Final Judgment is reported in Acts 10:42; 17:34; Rom. 14:10; 2 Cor. 5:20; Rev. 2:10. In fact, in many places the New Testament looks forward to the eschatological end of all things (Rom. 13:11; 1 Cor. 15:50; 2 Cor. 5:4; Gal. 76:8; 2 Tim. 4:8).

The child of God anticipates the future blessings belonging to the kingdom of glory now, by faith (2 Cor. 5:7). The kingdom of glory will be enjoyed only by those who first, now in time, receive the blessings belonging to the kingdom of grace. The blessings of the Gospel age are intended to

continue into eternity where the present imperfections of this life will no longer exist. By the term "kingdom of God" the Bible apprises the believer of his soteriological blessings derived from a loving God, whose offer of forgiveness from all sin(s) is accomplished through his Son, Jesus. The terms "kingdom of grace" and "kingdom of glory" are useful categories for organizing the present and future realities of faith. This terminology captures the present and the future aspects of the kingdom. As "eschatological" is appropriately associated with the kingdom of glory, then "soteriological" and "incarnational" would be properly associated with the kingdom of grace. The soteriological blessings of this age are a "foretaste" of the eschatological feast to come.

Many scholars have observed the "noneschatological" orientation of the Lord's Prayer and that the important "kingdom petition" emphasizes what has traditionally been called the "kingdom of grace." God's kingdom of grace that promises *forgiveness of sin* on account of and for the sake of Jesus the Christ, man's *spiritual healing*, and the offer of *new life* are necessarily received before the "kingdom of glory" can be entered. David Tiede recently put it this way:

The [Lord's] prayer is decisively about this world. Matthew's version, which speaks about God "in heaven," is even more emphatic that the prayer is for God's will and reign "on earth as in heaven" (Mt 6:9-13). Neither Jesus nor his followers needed to pray for God's will or reign to come in heaven. It was already there. But earth needed the prayer because it needed the Kingdom. The petitions for daily bread, forgiveness as we have forgiven, and freedom from temptation all indicate the sub-

stance of God's Rule in contrast to the present order.⁴⁹ Along these same lines, a significant journal article addressed this very issue of eschatology in relation to the Lord's Prayer.⁵⁰ G. Miegge maintained that the emphasis in the Prayer was on the present rather than on the future. The present age is the proper setting for praying the Lord's Prayer and expecting its petitions to come about, since the Messianic age was present in Jesus.⁵¹ Old Testament prophecies, according to Miegge, such as Is. 65:24 ("Before they call I will answer . . . I will hear") speak of the joyful privilege of Christian prayer during the present Messianic age. He said,

The classic prophets announced that a time would come, when righteousness, peace, and God's comfort would be realized; that would be a special time, characterized by the presence and grace of God; but nothing indicates that that time of fulfilment should be chronologically different from that of history.⁵²

Christ's first advent brought the fulfilment of the Old Testament. He was the promised Messiah. For Miegge, the

⁴⁹ David Tiede, Jesus and the Future (Cambridge: University Press, 1990), 43.

⁵⁰ G. Miegge, "Le 'Notre Père, prière du temps présent,'" Études théologiques et religieuses 35 (1960): 237-253.

⁵¹ Ibid., 242, "Or, Jésus a transporté cette promesse tout simplement au moment où il parle."

⁵² Ibid., 248, "Les prophètes de l'époque classique annoncent qu'un temps viendra, où la justice, la paix, la consolation de Dieu seront réalisées; ce sera un temps incomparable, caractérisé par la présence et la grâce de Dieu; mais rien n'indique que ce temps de plénitude doive être chronologiquement différent de celui de l'histoire."

"eschatological" promises of God are fulfilled in the church of Christ, which is filled with poor souls in need of nourishment, forgiveness, and deliverance now.⁵³ The fifth petition is especially clear in this regard, for example, since that petition underscores the need of practicing forgiveness among God's people within the fellowship of the Christian community: "It is not necessary to think [only] of the Final Judgment, nor with the sixth petition of the final temptation."⁵⁴ The second petition with its reference to the kingdom of God is the key for understanding the Lord's Prayer: "It is because God reigns that one can ask him to establish his kingdom in history. He is there after all, as its Creator."⁵⁵ Miegge had set about to determine the answer to the question "what is the eschatology of the Lord's Prayer" and concluded that a future eschatological interpretation was improper.⁵⁶ His position could probably be described as "inaugurated eschatology" whereby the "reign of God" has already begun. At any rate, he rescued the

⁵³ Ibid., 250: "Le Notre Père est la prière du temps présent, qui est le temps de la disponibilité de l'Eglise Toutes les explications des Pères de l'Église s'accordent à reconnaître, que dans le Notre Père l'Eglise se met à la disposition de Dieu: 'Que ton nom soit sanctifié *par nous*, que ton règne vienne *en nous*, que ta volonté soit faite *par nous*': c'est l'application traditionnelle du Notre Père, dans la prédication chrétienne, dans l'instruction des néophytes, jusqu'au Petit Catéchisme de Luther, et au-delà."

⁵⁴ Ibid., 252-53.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 253, "C'est bien parce que Dieu règne, qu'on peut le prier d'établir son royaume dans l'histoire: Il y est chez lui, après tout, comme son Créateur."

⁵⁶ Ibid., 241.

Prayer for the use of the Christian here and now rather than reserving it solely for concerns related to the Final End.⁵⁷

The Lord's Prayer is noneschatological in the sense that it belongs to the present Gospel age. Its Gospel-words tell of God's favorable, gracious disposition toward his children living now. God's expected future fulfilment and perfect kingdom of glory is active already now in the Christian community of believers who are the new Israel of God, living in the present Gospel age between Jesus' resurrection and his return. While the "kingdom of God" should not be directly equated with the Christian church, since they are two different terms, nevertheless, it should be recognized that the new life in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17) is mediated through the church (properly, through God's word and sacraments in the church) and it is within the Christian assembly that believers live as members of the body of Christ. In a sense, the church is an extension of the incarnation of Jesus. It is the body of Christ and the present manifestation of the kingdom of God (Col. 4:11). The formation and existence of the Christian church, mentioned already by Jesus (Matt. 16:18; 18:17), regardless of how "loose" its original organization, presupposed an understanding of the kingdom as God's grace on earth actualized by Jesus. The history of the development and growth of this church presented in the rest of the New Testament confirms

⁵⁷ Ibid., 240. See Chapter V, *infra*, for a full description of "inaugurated eschatology" favored by the "noneschatological" orientation of this study, in antithesis to exclusively future eschatology.

the present nature of the kingdom of God. Its visible manifestation is located (imperfectly) in the new congregation of Israel (Rom. 4:16; Gal. 3:29; 6:16). This church, qua true believers, is the body of Christ (Eph. 1:22-23; 4:12, 15-16; 5:23; Col. 1:18, 24).

Temporal Blessings For God's People

Divine Paternity

The Lord's Prayer begins at the address with the premise that the one who prays stands before God as his child by adoption. God has shown his love to the one who has the right of access by prayer. He has put the believer in a relationship of faith and trust. Early Christians lived in a Greco-Roman milieu where prayer and divine fatherhood was understood far differently.

Greco-Roman Ideas

In the Greco-Roman world, the public worship of the official gods was an accepted way of life.⁵⁸ Each of the deities had their tradition of stories and legends. Some of the qualities of their gods were not always moral or wholesome. The deities often partook of unbecoming activities. Pagan deities in the classical age were often associated with fertility cults, deceptions, emotional and moral weaknesses, and the gamut of human frailty. It is not surprising then that later on a moral void left by the gods

⁵⁸ John E. Stambaugh and David L. Balch, The New Testament in Its Social Environment (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 127, outlines the "pantheon" of "Olympian" gods.

was filled by the ethical teachings of the Stoics and others.

Typically, sacrifices were accompanied by prayers which were intended to "strike a bargain with the divinity."⁵⁹ Zeus (Jupiter) was the chief of the Olympian pantheon. A work by Pseudo-Aristotle entitled "On the Universe" taught the typical classical view that "God" was the preserver (soter) and creator (genetor) of all things as well as the cause (aitios) of all things.⁶⁰ In fact, Zeus could be at times viewed as the progenitor and father of the whole human race. C. F. D. Moule attested to this general notion by saying, "Indeed, outside Judaism also, the idea was common enough [of understanding the deity as a father], whether in polytheistic mythology (Homer's 'Father Zeus') or in philosophical thought (Plato's 'Maker and Father of this universe' [*Timaeus* 28C])."⁶¹ Greco-Roman religion was prone to ascribing to Zeus the fatherhood of the universe. Mankind was often taken to be children of the deity. Individuals could turn to a particular deity for care and providence. Cleanthes' (b. 330 B.C.) "Hymn to Zeus" reflects this typical Stoic teaching:

But, Zeus, thou giver of every gift,
Who dwellest within the dark clouds, wielding still
The flashing stroke of lightning, save, we pray,
Thy children from this boundless misery.
Scatter, O Father, the darkness from their souls,
Grant them to find true understanding--

⁵⁹ Ibid., 129.

⁶⁰ Robert M. Grant, Gods and the One God (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 178-79.

⁶¹ C. F. D. Moule, "God, NT," in IDB 2:432.

On which relying thou justly rulest all.⁶²

Later "religion" at Rome devolved into a strong ruler-cult, which by the time of Augustus, expected of its citizens emperor-worship.⁶³ In fact, the tendency towards deification of rulers had always been tempting in the pagan Mediterranean world.⁶⁴ The concept of calling a god "father" may not have been derived initially from ideas of procreative "descent" so much as that of the *paterfamilias*, the protector and ruler of the family.⁶⁵

God is considered as a Father in the Bible, but in a completely different sense from pagan conceptions of divine fatherhood. Man's physical descent from the gods and subsequently of his divinely-based kinship with others, especially by virtue of membership in a particular religio-ethnic grouping is not taught in the canonical Scriptures. In the Bible, the fatherhood of God is based on the exclusive relationship of election by grace; not on clan leadership or procreation but on divine creation and re-creation.

Biblical Milieu

Man's relationship to God in the revealed religion of

⁶² Quoted from Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, tr. Irene and Fraser McLuskey and James M. Robinson (New York: Harper, 1966), 124.

⁶³ Stambauch and Balch, 131.

⁶⁴ Grant, 60.

⁶⁵ See The Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949), s.v. "Zeus," 966, where the idea of the head of the family may be more Latin than Greek, however, thus confirming the prevalent Hellenistic notion of divine procreative paternity over mortals.

the Bible is based upon relationship and adoption; among natural religions in the Hellenistic world, the key themes were often appeasement and descent.

Before turning to Old Testament teachings about God's Fatherhood, it would be enlightening to note that, in general, ancient monarchs often were accorded the role of being the beneficent provider and, by virtue of their own perceived relationship of sonship to a deity, were expected to act benevolently toward their subjects. For example, from Canaanite and Aramaic inscriptions, a certain Azitawadda made this vainglorious claim:

Ba'l made me a father and a mother to the Danunites. I have restored the Danunites. I have expanded the country of the plain of Adana from the rising of the sun to its setting. In my days, the Danunites had everything good and plenty to eat and well-being.⁶⁶

Another discovery in northwest Syria dating from the ninth century B.C. records the boast of a certain King Kilamuwa whose relationship to his subjects was based on his supposed physical relationship and descent from the deity: "I, however, to some I was a father. To some I was a mother. To some I was a brother They were disposed (toward me) as an orphan is to his mother."⁶⁷ In these near-eastern texts, the king exercised paternal prerogatives as divine.

Some similarities can be seen in the Old Testament, where the king was seen as the son of God and the father of

⁶⁶ James B. Pritchard, ed., The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures (Princeton: University Press, 1958), 218.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 218.

Israel. The word "father" (אב) in the Old Testament may refer to the forefather of a clan or a country, as well as to one's immediate natural father (Gen. 28:13; 32:9; 1 Kings 15:11; 19:4; 2 Kings 19:12). Abraham (*ab-raham*) means the "father of a multitude" (Gen. 17:4-5). In fact, several theophoric names occur in the Scriptures (e.g., Abimelech, Absalom). "To be gathered to one's fathers" was a frequent expression for death (Deut. 31:16; 1 Kings 2:10; 2 Kings 22:20). The term "father" usually was one of respect. Elisha addressed Elijah, "My father" (2 Kings 2:12). David called Saul his father (1 Sam. 24:11). See also Judges 17:10; 18:19; 2 Kings 5:13; 6:21; 13:14; Is. 22:21. Abraham is the father of all who believe, according to Rom. 4:11, 16-17. Note in contrast that the devil is considered to be the father of lies (John 8:44).

Family solidarity was a hallmark of ancient Biblical Judaism. The extended family often included not only spouse and children, but brothers and sisters, other relatives and servants, and even at times sojourners (Gen. 17:23, 27; 46:5-7, 26; Is. 49:23). One commandment enjoins obedience to father and mother: "Honor your father and your mother" (Ex. 20:12; Deut. 5:16). The head of the household functioned to preserve and encourage religious instruction in *Torah* (Prov. 1:8; Deut. 6:20-24; Ps. 78:3-7).⁶⁸ God was conceptualized in

⁶⁸ Joachim Jeremias, The Prayers of Jesus: Studies in Biblical Theology, Second series 6, tr. John Bowden, John Reumann, and Christoph Burchard (London: SCM, 1967), 11, explained: "For the orientals, the word 'Father', as applied to God, thus encompasses, from earliest times, something of what the word 'Mother' signifies among us."

terms of the benevolent role he exercised on behalf of the poor and godly (Ps. 68:5; 89:26; 103:13). It was on the basis of God's goodness that the true believer entered a personal relationship with him (Ex. 3:14; 6:2-7). Of course, the holy name(s) of God must be held in reverence (Ex. 20:7; Deut. 5:11, "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain"). This information carries implications for understanding the Lord's Prayer better. This Prayer is the family prayer of the people of God. The right of family relationship has been established by Jesus.

Among the patriarchs of the Old Testament, the customs of Semitic culture are mirrored. One's relationship to God often depended on membership in the family of the father by natural descent.⁶⁹ The father's blessings were handed down to the eldest sons. The natural descendants were the beneficiaries of the blessings.⁷⁰ A significant verse in the context of family life, then, is Ps. 26:6 which promises that God sets the "solitary in families." The Nathan oracle of 2 Sam. 7:8-16 is a significant prophecy promising to maintain the Davidic throne (see 1 Chron. 17:13; 22:10; 28:6; Ps. 2:7; 89:26). This oracle proclaimed a father-son relationship between God and the king: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." This doctrine was not based on secular ideas of divine paternity, but on divine adoption, that is,

⁶⁹ Robert Hamerton-Kelly, God the Father (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 30.

⁷⁰ Ibid. This custom guarded against land being held by strangers and/or gentiles.

on grace, on calling, election, and covenant.

The people of Israel are called the firstborn son of God (Ex. 4:22) and God is called the Father of Israel, or he is indirectly alluded to by such references (Is. 63:16; 64:8 "thou art our Father; we are the clay"; Mal. 1:6; 2:10; Jer. 3:4, 19; 31:9; Ps. 89:26; Sir. 23:1; Tob. 13:4). God forbade idolatry, the giving of worship to "another father" (Jer. 2:27). God the Creator is honored as the Father of the nation of Israelites as noted above in Mal. 2:10, "Have we not all one father? Has not one God created us?" (see Deut. 32:6). God is also considered King: "The Lord is our king; he will save us" (Is. 33:22). These references show that the conception of God as Father was not foreign to the Old Testament, yet often indirect. As Günther Bornkamm said, "Jesus' use of the name 'Father' for God cannot therefore be taken as the introduction of a new idea of God. It reveals peculiarities, however, which have the closest connection with Jesus' message as a whole."⁷¹ Its uniqueness is that Jesus used the term as an address in prayer. It should be noted that Israel was reluctant to apply the name "Father" to God.⁷² What was intimated in the Old Testament is assumed in the New Testament. The spiritual paternity of the Father over Christians is enunciated in 2 Cor. 6:18, for example:

⁷¹ Bornkamm, 126.

⁷² Leonardo Boff, The Lord's Prayer: The Prayer of Integral Liberation, tr. Theodore Morrow (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1983), 25. It should be noted that the concept of divine paternity, teaching the Fatherhood of God, did emerge, but slowly, in late Judaism; see Sir. 23:14; Wis. Sol. 2:16; 14:3; Tob. 13:4; 3 Macc. 5:7; 6:3, 8; Jub. 1:24.

"and I will be a father to you" (for the sources of this quotation, cf. 2 Sam. 7:8, 14; Is. 43:6-7; Jer. 31:9; Hos. 1:10). The meaningful term "Father" is also employed in the Christian baptismal formula of Matt. 28:19; new Christians become sons of the Father by faith through regeneration and adoption.

The privilege of using the unique address "Father" used by Jesus, and shared by Jesus with his followers, should be appreciated and valued. God's children who address him in prayer do so in the knowledge of what that privilege cost Jesus. Jesus died because he claimed to be the Son of God the Father: Matt. 11:26-27; 24:36; 27:43; Mark 13:32; Luke 10:22; John 5:17; 7:1, 30; 9:16; 10:7; and so forth. Jesus' relationship to the Father was judged blasphemous by the Jews; yet the punishment of death he suffered for making this claim brought salvation to all who believe in him. The result is that Christians can implore God as Father, too, without blasphemy, but as a *nomen sacrum et salutaris* (Matt. 6:9; Luke 11:2; Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6; 1 Pet. 1:17).

Food and Manna

God taught his people to look to him for temporal blessings. As a kind God who brought his children into a gracious covenant relationship by the adoption of sons, his children were to trust in him, as a Father, for everything. God's people were not to look to their own strength; their sufficiency was of God. God's providential care became the object of their prayers. God's temporal care for his beloved

covenant people was his gift which they humbly received as part of their life of faith. This was stated in the final injunctions before Israel's acceptance of the covenant (Ex. 23:25): "You shall serve the Lord your God, and I will bless your bread and your water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of you."

God's Providential Care

The Psalms are replete with references to God's temporal providential care. See, for example, Pss. 8:3-9; 23; 37:25. Ps. 40:17 says, "As for me, I am poor and needy; but the Lord takes thought for me." Ps. 55:22 says, "Cast your burden on the Lord, and he will sustain you; he will never permit the righteous to be moved." Ps. 65:9-13, like so many, employs an agricultural theme to express God's benevolence: "Thou visitest the earth and waterest it, . . . thou providest their grain, . . . Thou crownest the year with thy bounty." Likewise, Ps. 72:12-19 adds, "May prayer be made for him continually, and blessings invoked May there be abundance of grain in the land." Ps. 91:1-6 promises: He who dwells in the shelter of the Most High, . . . will say . . . 'my God, in whom I trust' . . . he will cover you with his pinions, and under his wings you will find refuge." Ps. 103:1-5 is unequalled:

Bless the Lord, O my soul;
 and all that is within me, bless his holy name!
 Bless the Lord, O my soul,
 and forget not all his benefits,
 who forgives all your iniquity,
 who heals all your diseases,
 who redeems your life from the Pit,
 who crowns you with steadfast love and mercy,

who satisfies you with good as long as you live
so that your youth is renewed like the eagle's.

Ps. 104:14-15 also speaks of God's care:

Thou dost cause the grass to grow for the cattle,
and plants for man to cultivate,
that he may bring forth food from the earth,
and wine to gladden the heart of man,
oil to make his face shine,
and bread to strengthen man's heart.

Creation looks to God as Provider (Ps. 104:27): "These all look to thee, to give them their food in due season." In the following Psalms God is said to bless the earth (107:35-38); to give children (127:3-5); to bless family life (128); to bless the poor with bread (132:15); to declare that his steadfast love endures forever (136); to have created and valued man from the point of his conception (139:13-18); to give happiness (144:15). In Ps. 146:5-10 several statements are made: "Happy is he whose help is the God of Jacob, . . . who made heaven and earth, . . . who executes justice for the oppressed; who gives food to the hungry. The Lord sets the prisoners free; the Lord opens the eyes of the blind." From the words of Ps. 147:10-11, a common table prayer has been created: "His delight is not in the strength of the horse, nor his pleasure in the legs of a man; but the Lord takes pleasure in those who fear him, in those who hope in his steadfast love."

Other scattered examples of God's providential care can be cited. God appointed Joseph to supervise the storing of grain during the "fat years" so there would be no starvation during seven "lean years" (Gen. 41:35-36). The promised land

of Canaan was given by God to his covenant people, the Israelites, until their disobedience voided the promise (Matt. 21:43; see also Matt. 23:38; Mark 12:9; 13:2; Luke 13:35; 21:20-24). This land was described as a land "flowing with milk and honey" (Ex. 3:8, 17; 13:5; 33:3; Lev. 20:24; Num. 13:27; 14:8; 16:13, 14; Deut. 6:3; 8:7-10; 11:9; 26:9, 15; 27:3; 31:20; Joshua 5:6; Jer. 11:5; 32:22; Ezek. 20:6, 15). The pastoral setting of the story of Ruth provides a glimpse into God's gracious provision for food (Ruth 1:6). Naomi exulted, "Blessed be . . . the Lord, whose kindness has not forsaken the living or the dead!" God supported Elijah and the widow of Zarephath so that the jar of meal would not be spent and the cruse of oil should not fail (1 Kings 17:15). It should also be added that the blessings of the kingdom are often pictured in the familiar terms of banqueting (Is. 25:6-8).

In the New Testament, Jesus specifically taught in the Sermon on the Mount in Matt. 7:11, "If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask him!" Earlier Jesus had remarked, "But if God so clothes the grass of the field . . . will he not much more clothe you, O men of little faith (Matt. 6:30)?" At 6:33 Jesus added, "and all these things shall be yours as well." Jesus promised in Luke 21:18 regarding the persecution of Christians, "But not a hair of your head will perish." Paul included these words in his sermon at Lystra: "For he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons,

satisfying your hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14:17). According to Paul in 2 Cor. 9:9-11, God "gives to the poor" even "bread for food."

God's blessing which contributes toward contentment, but not excess, is promised in 1 Tim. 6:8 when Paul said, "But if we have food and clothing, with these we shall be content." A similar theme is enunciated in Heb. 13:5, "Keep your life free from love of money, and be content with what you have; for he said, 'I will never fail you nor forsake you.'" See also James 1:18 ("Every good gift comes from above") and 1 Cor. 4:7 ("What have you that you did not receive?"). Temporal blessings in general, food, and especially bread, were tangible reminders of God's gracious providence and care for his people.

A notable description of the blessings of the Messianic age is depicted in Is. 65:17-21 (cf. v. 17, "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth"). In particular, the Messianic age is characterized in terms of God's providential care for believers: "They shall build houses and inhabit them; they shall plant vineyards and eat their fruit" (v. 21). Temporal blessings indicated the arrival of the Messianic age, redemption through Christ Jesus. As such, earthly blessings for Christians carry soteriological significance (Matt. 22:1-14; Luke 14:15-24; Rev. 19:9).

Manna

In the ancient Mediterranean world, bread was a staple of everyday diet. Breads were made from various grains

(Ezek. 4:9), although most often loaves were baked from barley (2 Kings 4:42) or wheat (Ex. 29:2). Leavening was often added (Ex. 12:39). Loaves were baked (Lev. 23:17; 2 Sam. 13:8; Ez. 4:12) into various shapes (flat, Ex. 16:31; ring-shaped, 2 Sam. 6:19; wafers, Ex. 29:23). The term "bread" could signify food in general. The expression "staff of bread" occurs in several places (לֶחֶם אֵל: Lev. 26:26; Ps. 105:16; Ezek. 4:16; 5:16; 14:13). To "eat bread" meant to share a meal (Gen. 31:54; 37:25; Is. 58:7; see Luke 24:35; John 21:13). Edwin Yamauchi stated, "In antiquity much of the food, such as bread, was prepared daily and would be apportioned daily. Thus daily bread was the very symbol for subsistence, representing the minimal need for existence."⁷³

In Bible times every day was baking day.⁷⁴ First the grain (wheat, barley, or bran) had to be ground into meal, then the meal was mixed with salt and water and made into dough. Unleavened "cakes" were easiest to make, but generally the mixture was leavened with some of the fermented dough kept from the previous day. Bread could be baked over hot stones heated by a wood and dung fire, or preferably in a communal oven constructed of earthenware over which or into which the cakes could be placed for baking after the fire had died down somewhat. There is no doubt that the women worked hard and bread was appreciated as a staple food. Certainly

⁷³ Edwin M. Yamauchi, "The 'Daily Bread' Motif in Antiquity," Westminster Theological Journal 28 (1966): 148.

⁷⁴ Eric William Heaton, Everyday Life in the Old Testament Times (New York: Scribner's, 1956), 82, from which the following descriptions are largely derived.

the true believer "knew that land, fertility, rain, and productive labor were all essential for production of grain (Gen. 3:19; Is. 30:23)."⁷⁵ To eke out a living was not easy in first century A.D. Palestine. Wages were low and life precarious. Believers knew that they themselves could not control all these factors, and therefore they depended on God's blessings (Ps. 127:1-2). Yamauchi commented on this domestic need:

The eschatological interpretation has been attractively presented by Jeremias, for example, as adding the element of mystical profundity to the petition for bread. Even, however, in its most mundane sense, that petition as seen in the light of the associations of "daily bread" in antiquity is not lacking in spiritual significance. It teaches the lessons of dependence upon a Father who provides for his children their basic needs, of confidence that day by day without fail he will provide, and of contentment with all that he does provide.⁷⁶

Several observations can be made about bread, this important commodity.

1. Prov. 30:8 states that bread is basic and necessary, "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with the food that is needful for me" ($\cdot 1 \downarrow \rho \pi \quad \bar{\rho} \pi \zeta$).

2. Job 23:12b (NIV) says, "I have treasured the words of his mouth more than my daily bread ($\cdot \rho \pi \zeta \Delta$)." That same word (*chugqi*) is used also in Ezek. 16:27 and Prov. 31:15 of that which is "necessary" for existence.

3. Jer. 37:21 (Jer. 44 LXX) reports,

⁷⁵ Stephen A. Reed, "Bread," in The Anchor Bible Dictionary, vol. 1:777-80, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 779.

⁷⁶ Yamauchi, 155-56.

So King Zedekiah gave orders, and they committed Jeremiah to the court of the guard; and a loaf of bread was given him daily ($\text{בִּלְחֵם יְמֵיָוָם}$, ἄρτον ἕνα τῆς ἡμέρας) from the bakers' street, until all the bread of the city was gone.

The idea of "daily" bread is mentioned also in Dan. 1:5; Neh. 5:18; Ezra. 6:9.

4. The idea of "continual" bread (לֶחֶם יְמֵיָוָם) appears in 2 Sam. 9:7; 2 Kings 25:29, 30; cf. Jer. 52:33, 34).

5. James 2:15 speaks of daily food (τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς).

In Acts 6:1, the "administration" was daily (καθημερινῆ).

In summation, bread was considered in the Bible to be necessary, daily, and allotted, an important provision and blessing. As such it was called the "staff of bread," a phrase similar to the "staff of life" (Lev. 26:26; Ps. 105:16; Ezek. 4:16; 5:16; 14:13). God's miraculous feeding of the Israelites in the wilderness by *manna* was likened to bread. Bread was a basic daily commodity especially for the poor.

A special "bread" from God, the manna was first given after the Exodus when the Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin in response to their murmuring (Ex. 16:1-3).⁷⁷ God announced to Moses in Ex. 16:4-5,

⁷⁷ R. F. Cyster, "The Lord's Prayer and the Exodus Tradition," *Theology* 64 (1961): 377-381, brilliantly grounded the entire second strophe of the Lord's Prayer in the Exodus tradition. The fourth petition is related to the manna, the fifth to the Israelites' sin, the sixth to their tempting of God, and the seventh to their deliverance and victory over Amalek. Incidentally, if this theory is valid, then the seventh petition is patently autonomous and not merely a positive

Behold, I will rain bread from heaven (ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, אֲרֹתִים מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם) for you; and the people shall go out and gather a day's portion every day (τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν, יְצֵאוּ וְקָבְצוּ יְצֵאוּ וְקָבְצוּ), that I may prove them (πειράσω, אֲנִי אֶפְרָא) whether they will walk in my law or not. On the sixth day, when they prepare what they bring in, it will be twice as much as they gather daily (literally, "for the day, daily," τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν εἰς ἡμέραν, בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְכִּי יֵצְאוּ).

Notice the fact of God's care for his hungry people. He "gave" the manna (vv. 8, 15) in order that the Israelites would know God's goodness (vv. 7, 11). Moses called it "bread" after the children of Israel asked what it was:

When the people of Israel saw it, they said to one another, "What is it?" (כִּי רָאוּ אֶת הַמָּן) For they did not know what it was. And Moses said to them, "It is the bread which the Lord has given you to eat."

Incidentally, "manna" is only used five times in this account in Exodus 16, while "bread" is used more often, eight times. This manna was to be a daily portion.⁷⁸ It was to "prove" the people because of their complaining, which is reported to have happened at the waters of Marah ("bitterness") in Ex. 15:23 and again happened, by the way, at Rephidim according to Ex. 17:7 (Massah ["proof"] and Meribah ["contention"]). From the daily manna the people were to learn to trust God, for hoarding the daily provision reflected a lack of trust

reiteration of the negative sixth petition. For other possible Old Testament parallels, see fn. 193, *infra*.

⁷⁸ Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael, ed. Jacob Z. Lauterbach, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933-35), *Tractate Vayassa*, 2:103, reports, "He who created the day has also created its sustenance. Hence R. Eleazar used to say: He who has enough to eat for today and says: 'What will I eat tomorrow?' Behold he is of little faith."

(vv. 12b, 20).⁷⁹ They were to gather an extra portion on the eve of the sabbath, in order to avoid working on the sabbath (16:23-30). This bread, fine as hoarfrost (v. 14), gathered each morning (v. 21), sustained the Israelites for forty years (16:35). It would not survive into another day except on the eve of the sabbath (v. 24). It could be cooked, perhaps into loaves or "cakes" (v. 23, 31; Num. 11:7-8). God ordained that an omer of manna should be preserved for future generations (v. 32-34).

Manna is mentioned in Exodus 16; Num. 11:6-9; Deut. 3:16; Joshua 5:12; Neh. 9:20; Ps. 78:24; and alluded to in Ps. 105:40 (bread from heaven). In the New Testament, it is mentioned in John 6:31, 49, 58; Heb. 9:4; Rev. 2:17; and in 1 Cor. 10:3, where Paul calls it a "supernatural food" (πνευματικὸν βρῶμα). God's feeding of the Israelites with the gift of manna was a stellar manifestation of his benevolence.

Among rabbinic traditions, Moses, manna, Torah, and Logos/wisdom often were often woven into a common theme.⁸⁰ Thus, a connection existed between the manna of Exodus and Jesus' claim to be the bread of life in John 6:41. This claim will be evaluated presently.

⁷⁹ Cyster, 380. Some scholars do not view the manna as a special divine creation so much as an abundant appearance of natural substances in the Sinai region; see Joseph L. Mihelic, "Manna," in IDB 3:259-60, for proposals. It is the position of this study that manna was a special divine creation to provide miraculously for the needs of God's people.

⁸⁰ See Peder Borgen, Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Conception of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo (Leiden: Brill, 1965).

Feeding the Multitudes

God not only fed the hungry Israelites through Moses of old, but Jesus fed the multitudes on two different occasions. The feeding of the four thousand is recorded in Matt. 15:29-39 and Mark 8:1-10, and that of the five thousand in Matt. 14:13-21; Mark 6:30-44; Luke 9:10-17; and John 6:1-13. The latter miracle is recorded in all four evangelists. Moreover, John also reported Jesus' discourse on the "bread of life" after the feeding of the five thousand. For these reasons, the feeding of the five thousand, especially in the Johannine account, is significant.

This miracle was performed by Jesus during the springtime, since it took place near a Passover (John 6:4) and the area had "much grass" (v. 10). A. T. Robertson noted that this event was one year before the crucifixion and that Jesus had withdrawn to the east side of the Sea of Galilee for several possible reasons.⁸¹ Undoubtedly Jesus relocated on account of the jealousy of Herod Antipas who had returned to the area near Tiberias on the western side of the Sea of Galilee after having wintered at Machaerus near the Dead Sea, from the fanaticism of the crowds (v. 15), because of the hostility of Jewish leaders, and for needed rest (Mark 6:31). Jesus' retreat from Galilee was somewhere in the vicinity of the "eastern" Bethsaida Julias (Luke 9:10). Many made their way to this region from "all the towns" (Matt. 14:13; Mark 6:33) having been attracted primarily to Jesus' healing

⁸¹ A. T. Robertson, A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ (New York: Harper, 1950), 85.

ministry (John 6:2). Jesus taught the crowd "who were as sheep having no shepherd" (Mark 6:34) and he spoke to them of the kingdom of God (Luke 9:11). Indeed, *their* leaders were no longer spiritual shepherds who conscientiously led their flocks to the pastures of the word but lured them toward human doctrines and traditions.

As the day waned (Matt. 14:15; Mark 6:35; Luke 9:12), Jesus knew that the crowds should eat. In fact, the synoptic accounts report that the disciples were the ones who alerted Jesus to the need of dismissing the crowds early enough to enable them to find food and lodging before too late in the day. John's Gospel reports that Jesus then asked Philip (John 6:5), "How are we to buy bread, so that these people may eat?" Of course, the omniscient Jesus would know either where to make such a purchase, or of the impossibility of securing enough provisions to serve more than some five thousand people. Obviously, then, Jesus posed the question for another reason. John 6:6 gives the reason. Jesus said this to test Philip (πειράζων) for Jesus himself "knew what he would do."⁸² The lesson of dependence on God to be learned by Philip would not be lost on him alone, but it was intended also for Andrew (see John 6:8) and the other disciples, if not for the whole crowd. Philip rightly calculated that two hundred denarii would be insufficient to purchase "enough

⁸² Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 343, adds furthermore that Philip, being a native of nearby Bethsaida, would be familiar with the area.

bread for each of them to get a little" [literally, 'breads of two hundred denarii would not be sufficient for them'].⁸³ John 6:8-9 reports that Andrew desperately provided the information about the scanty amount of food that was available, "There is a lad here who has five barley loaves and two fish; but what are they among so many?" Evidently, Andrew had thought the situation was hopeless. Note that the barley bread was "poor man's food," but in hunger, any food would be acceptable. The translation "loaves" is based on the plural of bread (ἄρτους). The "two fish" is ἰχθύες in the Synoptics, but ὀψάρια in John.⁸⁴ Jesus instructed the crowd to sit by companies (the "men" in John 6:10) while he looked to heaven to the Giver of all blessing and in prayer blessed the lad's meager provisions.⁸⁵ Then he broke the bread, and "gave" (διέδωκεν, 6:11) the food to the disciples for the people. They were filled and satisfied. Twelve basketsful of leftovers remained, revealing the magnitude of this

⁸³ Ibid., Philip's reply stressed the hopelessness of the situation and his mental arithmetic (John 6:7) estimated on the minimal, not maximal, needs of the crowd. Morris agreed that a denarius was a "day's wage" but recognized the futility of trying to calculate the amount into modern monetary standards beset with inflation. Morris, *ibid.*, 344, pointed out that the barley bread, instead of wheat bread, indicated that the lad was poor.

⁸⁴ Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, tr. and adapted by William F. Arndt and Wilbur F. Gingrich (Chicago: The University Press, 1957), 606 [hereafter BAG], the latter meaning probably a "tidbit."

⁸⁵ Note that there is little difference between "giving thanks" in John and "blessing" in the Synoptics. To pray at mealtime became customary among Christians (Luke 24:30; Acts 27:35; 1 Tim. 4:4).

miracle.⁸⁶

John 6:14 reports that when the people saw the "sign" that Jesus performed (σημείον) they said, "This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world!" They were referring to Deut. 18:15, the prophet of whom Moses spoke. That he was the "coming one" is based on Mal. 3:1. For them, the miracle proved that he must be the coming King of the Jews. John 6:15 demonstrates that they were wrongly willing to make Jesus their "bread-king" under whom they would no longer need to work and who could readily feed them and lead the Jewish nation into desired freedom from the Romans and into autonomous self-rule and glory.⁸⁷ Their attention was arrested by Jesus who had satisfied their temporal needs. On one hand they regarded Christ as the prophet, yet on the other hand, they were less willing to heed his words about a spiritual kingdom than they were to follow him as a bread-king who provided temporal benefits.⁸⁸ The fact is that Jesus graciously conferred temporal benefits on a hungry crowd. Additionally, he used this miracle in order to direct attention to spiritual blessings, as the following discourse

⁸⁶ Consequently, Christians never worry about food shortages and global overpopulation, nor are Christians wasteful; Jesus set the example by exercising good stewardship of divine blessings. Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr.), 437, adds to the lesson against wastefulness that Jesus did not intend to *continue* feeding the crowds for this was not his primary mission.

⁸⁷ Morris, 346.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 361, 363 and note. Giving manna was one of the expectations of the Messianic age.

on the Bread of Life clearly shows. Jesus' "signs" were designed to manifest his deity, which would result in faith in him.⁸⁹

The account of the feeding of the multitude presents Jesus as the divine Provider, even for the needs and wants of everyday life. Jesus miraculously and graciously fed the hungry crowds. Christians trusting in him need not fear hunger, thirst, sickness, and so forth (Matt. 25:34-36; Rom. 8:35). It cannot be said that it is unfitting of God to be concerned about the mundane needs of man. That actions and terms associated with holy communion such as blessing, breaking, and distributing bread, appear in this account does not warrant giving it a sacramental interpretation.⁹⁰ It is best to take these words in their one literal sense. He did not say that this was a sacramental feeding, nor were the elements bread and wine which elsewhere were ordained for the sacrament. Jesus did not institute this feeding as his "Lord's Supper." Jesus multiplied bread and fish, and with these, fed the multitude. The bread was literal bread, provided for the express purpose of alleviating hunger. It was not given any other symbolic or spiritual value here.⁹¹ That God's blessings and beneficence encourage faith and

⁸⁹ Ibid., 686.

⁹⁰ For a typical *sacramental* interpretation, see Bertil Gärtner, John 6 and the Jewish Passover. *Coniectanea Neotestamentica XVII* (Lund: Gleerup, 1959).

⁹¹ For a typical *spiritual* interpretation, see Geza Vermes, "He is the Bread," in Neotestamentica et Semitica, Matthew Black FS, ed. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: Clark, 1969), 256-63.

trust in him, which this miracle surely was intended to accomplish, no less diminishes the temporal nature of the feeding itself.

The next day Jesus presented a lengthy discourse on the Bread of Life (John 6:22-65), based on the events of the preceding day. Notice that during the night he had joined the disciples on their boat after weathering the storm and now was at Capernaum where many people followed him by boat and found him (vv. 22-25). Jesus did not answer the unimportant question, "Rabbi, when did you come here?" (v. 25). Instead, he used the question as an introduction to his discourse:

Truly, truly, I say to you, you seek me, not because you saw signs, but because you ate your fill of the loaves. Do not labor for the food (βρώσις not βρῶμα) which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life, which the Son of man will give you (vv. 26-27).

Jesus taught, in other words, that as eating must be done daily, so also believers should nourish themselves on an eating which was of faith. The emphasis was not on the food, which might have pointed to Christ, but on the act of eating food, which points to faith.⁹² Further, his chief object was to cause people to believe in him for their salvation (v. 29).⁹³ His object was to point people to the kingdom of God. He did not intend to be a temporal bread-king. The multitude, astonished by Jesus' miracle of feeding so many

⁹² Lenski, John, 451.

⁹³ Ibid. Lenski pointed out that even "earthly food for bodily eating we do not produce by any 'working' of ours, it is God's creature and gift." The believer does not work for spiritual blessings of God; every Pelagian and synergistic notion is ruled out. As he asserted, 452, spiritual blessings are the highest gift of the grace of Jesus.

people, was swept away by a wave of enthusiasm that hinted at making Jesus their leader in Jewish revolt against Rome. Jesus' miracle may have easily inspired and satisfied their hope for a temporal King or political leader, but his kingdom was of a spiritual nature.⁹⁴ If the crowd were to respond to Jesus' spiritual message, they would need more proof. They demanded another sign, "Then what sign do you do, that we may see, and believe you? What work do you perform?" (v. 30). They had hoped that Jesus would perform a more outstanding miracle than Moses' giving of the manna in the wilderness (v. 31). Evidently they credited the giving of manna in the wilderness to the intervention of Moses, for Jesus corrected them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven; my Father gives you the true bread from heaven" (v. 32). The manna was a type of the true bread (v. 32) which gives life to the world (v. 33) so that no one would die eternally (v. 50, 51). The Jews then requested this bread always, thereby showing their continued failure of comprehending what Jesus was actually speaking about (v. 34). They were requesting another "type," when the "antitype" or

⁹⁴ The work of God (John 6:29) and the will of God (John 6:40) are salvific. Lenski, John, 455, said about man doing the work of God, "All Christian good works do, indeed, spring from faith, like fruit from a good tree, but always and only from a faith which already has Christ, salvation, life eternal, and needs no good works to merit these treasures which can never be merited."

fulfilment had already come. Jesus was the Bread of Life.⁹⁵ Jesus' Christological claim to be the bread of life was reported at verse 35.⁹⁶ Jesus came down from heaven for the world's salvation. Faith in Jesus results in eternal life (v. 35). Man's salvation is the will of God, which Jesus came to fulfil (v. 38). God's will is salvific: "For this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (v. 40).

Faith in Jesus is faith in the human person of Jesus, his flesh. This subject is discussed in verses 41-51. The Jews found it impossible to believe in the one whose parents were known (v. 42). Christ spoke of his state of humiliation and of their believing in him, when he promised at v. 51, "If any one eats of this bread, he will live for ever." The word "flesh" in v. 51 is best understood in the sense of John

⁹⁵ In the cases of the copulative use of a verb in a metaphor such as "I am the bread of life," "I am the door," "I am the vine," the particular truth invoked is claimed and carried by the metaphoric use of the attributive, not the verb. Thus Christ is indeed the entrance (door) to eternal life. He provides life and nourishment (vine) for the believer. Here he is spiritual nourishment for the soul, by faith. Lenski, 460-61, stated: "'The Bread of Life,' like 'the water of life' in chapter 4, is Biblical allegory which unites the figure 'Bread' with the reality 'Life' and thus always interprets itself The figure 'Bread' connotes eating, which in the reality 'Life' means coming to Jesus and trusting in him." For further definition and the two levels of meaning of the predicate and attributive (material bread and Christ/life), see Pieper, 3:306, 310.

⁹⁶ See Is. 49:10, "they shall not hunger or thirst," and 55:1-2, "Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread?"

1:14, "And the Word became flesh."⁹⁷ Although Jesus amplified the thought to include his blood in vv. 53-56, he was not suggesting the sacrament.⁹⁸ The Lord's Supper was not instituted until later at the next Passover. Further, since the "unworthy" may unfortunately eat the flesh of Christ in the sacrament to their own judgment (1 Cor. 11:29), it is best to accept the one literal sense of the words in John 6. The context demands that the references to "eating" the flesh of Christ (bread, flesh, blood) refer to faith in the Jesus who stood squarely in front of the very eyes of the murmuring Jews (v. 41).

The Jews' questioning at verse 52 suggests that they had failed to understand that Jesus indeed had been speaking about faith; they wrongly concluded that he was speaking of natural eating. Jesus was speaking of the spiritual eating of faith, whose object is the human person and work of Jesus. Sacramental eating was not introduced into this passage.⁹⁹ Jesus' addition of the "blood" (v. 53) served to correct the Jews' completely natural understanding of Jesus' words. Eating blood was abhorrent to the Jew (Acts 15:20). Therefore Jesus made it as plain as he could that he was

⁹⁷ Morris, 374, astutely demonstrated that "flesh" is used here; elsewhere, "body" is used of the sacrament; hence, the sacrament is hardly in view in John 6.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 379, suggested that the additional thought of "drinking the blood" pointed to the atonement to be made at Calvary.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 377, ruled out the sacramental intention of this passage, and aptly said that it speaks of appropriating Christ by faith. In agreement is Lenski, John, 502.

referring to faith in the human nature of the Son of God, who would give eternal life (v. 54). The discourse was brought to a conclusion at verse 58.

Jesus is the bread of life. For sinful mankind, no Moses, no earthly religious system, no birthright, nothing will save. Faith in Jesus alone is man's only hope. The impossible has been made possible in him. Of course this was a "hard saying" and offensive for many in Jesus' day as it has always been (v. 60-61). At verse 62 Jesus referred to his eventual ascension. The point is that if many were offended at his claims then, sadly they would also take offense when they would see him at his return, not in humiliation, but in glory. The only real way to accept the life-giving words of Jesus by faith is through the Holy Spirit (v. 63). The word flesh in the context of verse 63 does not refer to the flesh of Christ as it did earlier, but now it is used to describe man's depraved human nature. Natural man cannot prompt belief. Human reason is of no avail. Sinful man cannot have faith in Jesus except by the Holy Spirit, whom the Father sends for that purpose (v. 65).

In John 6:22-65 Jesus explained this profound Christological claim about himself as being the Bread of Life, the object of man's faith. This discourse was on a different day and at a different place from the feeding of the more than five thousand. Just as an effective preacher or teacher will often use an illustration in order to present an important truth, Jesus utilized the events of the feeding to teach about the Bread of Life. Incidentally, this account

illustrates the claim that Jesus was a skillful teacher. He knew that many people could more easily understand spiritual truths by the use of lessons drawn from everyday life. Everyone appreciated the need and value of daily bread. Good Jews were also familiar with the manna and bread of life traditions of which Jesus claimed to be the fulfilment. They were types; he was the reality, or antitype.¹⁰⁰

It is important to remember that the bread was spiritual in verses 22-65, but it was literal in verses 1-15! The five loaves of bread and two fish of verses 1-15 was real, physical, material, ordinary bread. It pointed to a different truth than that of verses 22-65. The former pointed to God's temporal blessings; the latter pointed to the spiritual blessing of faith which results in eternal life. The two should not be mixed or confounded. One is not justified in concluding that every mention of bread in the Bible must be "spiritualized." Bread, representing temporal blessings derived from God's goodness, should occupy a legitimate place in Christian life. God's blessings are temporal and spiritual. He offers daily providential care as well as forgiveness of sins, life and salvation.

¹⁰⁰ Manna foreshadowed Jesus the word/bread of life (John 6:22-65; 1 Cor. 10:3-4). The historical events associated with the giving of the manna tradition in Exodus 16 and elsewhere were understood as fulfilled in Jesus (1 Cor. 10:1-13). Further, the giving of manna taught God's providential love and care. It was analogous to Jesus' feeding of the multitude (John 6:1-15), to the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer and to other teachings regarding God's benevolence. As such, the manna possessed a double teleological significance; on one level it was a "type" of Christ when specifically so claimed, and on another level it served simply as an "analogy" of God's goodness. For these distinctions, see Walter R. Roehrs, "The Typological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," Concordia Journal 10 (Nov. 1984): 204-16.

The Lord's Prayer recognizes both spheres of God's benevolence toward his people. God continues to govern and preserve his creation. An "incarnational" view of God's activity recognizes that God is concerned for the needs of his creation and his elect ones especially. In love, God deigns to condescend to man on earth. It is not improper to ask God to be concerned about daily needs. It was he who gave the command and the promise to turn to him in prayer. Prayer is for the here and now of the Christian life. The greatest blessings, though, concern the kingdom of God. The child of God is a part of that kingdom by God's grace. He joyfully and thankfully lives in that kingdom now in time as a result of the activity of the Holy Spirit, who uses the means of grace, the preached and sacramental word (*viz.* baptism). By faith in Jesus he will also live in that kingdom forever (John 6:51, 54). God's temporal benevolence points to his eternal salvific blessings. Temporal blessings are not an end in themselves. Jesus is more than a bread-kneader; he is the King and Lord of salvation. Daily bread, daily forgiveness, daily strength against temptation, daily deliverance from evil, all serve the Christian living today in the kingdom of grace before the kingdom of glory comes. God's present goodness points to the Christian's eternal good.

The Gift of Prayer

Prayer is commanded and promised for God's people living in this present age (Ps. 50:15; Matt. 7:7-8; 21:22;

1 Thess. 5:16-18; 1 John 5:14). As such it is salutary. In the sense that its privilege is given as a temporal gift by the heavenly Father to his children on earth, it may even be called sacramental.¹⁰¹ God's children of all ages have enjoyed its use. The Lord's Prayer to a large extent reflects, or is conceptually and verbally similar to, some of the liturgical materials of Judaism. It is deeply rooted in Judaism, if not literally, at least thematically.

Prayers in Judaism

However, the problem with demonstrating parallels between the Lord's Prayer and liturgical components of the Jewish cultus is twofold. First, many examples of Jewish prayer developed later than the time of Christ. To use them as illustrations to help explain the Lord's Prayer must be done cautiously and with reservation.¹⁰² Second, few parallels with the Lord's Prayer can be cited in any one

¹⁰¹ Thus, Robert L. Simpson, The Interpretation of Prayer in the Early Church (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 115-36. See fn. 177, below.

¹⁰² Especially Philip S. Alexander, "Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 74 (1983): 237-46. He warned that dating Jewish liturgical materials is questionable (240), that many references are inaccurate (241), that Gerhardsson's famous glowing picture of the rabbis' supermemory is exaggerated (241), and he cautioned against "parallelomania" (245).

given Jewish liturgical unit.¹⁰³ According to the notion of some authorities then, Jesus, or the church later, synthetically composed the Lord's Prayer from scattered Jewish sources. The concepts most representative of his teaching were succinctly woven together. His genius lay in the composition of a concatenation of petitions known as the Lord's Prayer.¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, certain authorities have pointed out the deficiency of finding few if any of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer in Rabbinic literature before

¹⁰³ For brief studies of the parallels between the Lord's Prayer and Jewish liturgical material, several authorities have collected scattered references; hence, see C. G. Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings (New York: KTAV, 1970), 125-135; Charles Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers: Pirge Aboth (Cambridge: University Press, 1877; repr. New York: KTAV, 1969), 124-130; Eberhard Nestle, "Lord's Prayer," in Encyclopedia Biblica, ed. T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 3:2821-23; Johannes Herrmann, "Der alttestamentliche Urgrund des Vaterunser," Festschrift Otto Procksch (Leipzig: Deichert and Hinrichs, 1934), 71-98; somewhat longer is Paul Fiebig, Das Vaterunser: Ursprung, Sinn und Bedeutung des christlichen Hauptgebetes (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1927), especially 63-94.

¹⁰⁴ Israel Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, first series (Cambridge: University Press, 1924; repr. KTAV, 1967), 98-99, quoted a cento or pastiche of the Lord's Prayer assembled *ex formulis Hebraeorum*: "Our Father, who art in Heaven. Hallowed be Thine exalted Name in the world which Thou didst create according to Thy will. May Thy Kingdom and Thy lordship come speedily, and be acknowledged by all the world, that Thy Name may be praised in all eternity. May Thy will be done in Heaven, and also on earth give tranquillity of spirit to those that fear Thee, yet in all things do what seemeth good to Thee. Let us enjoy the bread daily apportioned to us. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; forgive also all who have done us injury; even as we also forgive all. And lead us not into temptation, but keep us far from all evil. For thine is the greatness, the power and the dominion, the victory and the majesty, yea all in Heaven and on earth. Thine is the Kingdom, and Thou art Lord of all beings for ever! Amen."

the time of Christ.¹⁰⁵

A better course to follow would be to realize that *both* Jesus and Rabbinic Judaism taught doctrines and practices naturally springing from the Old Testament Scriptures. This would also be true of much of the apocryphal and pseudo-epigraphical literature as well as that discovered at Qumran. Such literature also reflects the Old Testament Scriptures. Jesus' creativity depended on his usage of the Old Testament rather than dependency on late parochial Jewish literature.

Study of the Lord's Prayer must also take account of the "fulfilment" brought about by Jesus. The Old Testament pointed to him. He was the "end of the law" (Rom. 10:4; 16:15-26), its goal, and the One who fulfilled it in every way (Matt. 5:17-20). Since Jesus' teachings as well as concepts held in late Judaism developed from the Old Testament it is to be expected that similarities abound. In fact, that common background can be utilized at least to a limited degree to help explicate the meaning of the Lord's Prayer. Several prayer texts stemming from Judaism will be reported.

¹⁰⁵ Moses Margoliouth, The Lord's Prayer: No Adaptation of Existing Jewish Petitions (London: Bagster, 1876), 63, commented in regard to the third petition: "I must appeal once more to expositors and preachers who espouse the preposterous idea, that our Blessed Lord utilised an existing Jewish prayer for the construction of the Prayer which He taught His Disciples, to point out anything similar in any Jewish Liturgy, ancient and modern, to the third petition in that comprehensive supplication." His premise was that perceived parallels to the Lord's Prayer in Judaism in fact originated in the New Testament age in imitation of Jesus' teachings; Margoliouth explained on p. 67: ". . . but rather Jewish prayer-compilers have borrowed ideas and sentiments from His Divine Dictations . . . the borrowers have so overladen with heaps of words of their own that it is difficult to discern the gems in their hay and stubble."

Jewish prayer was structured around *Berakah* (praise) and petition. The latter relates man's needs to God's promises to hear supplication; prayer petition belongs to "unredeemed time."¹⁰⁶ The former, praise formulae, usually takes a personal or impersonal form. The first addresses God directly and personally ("Blessed art thou, O Lord," or "You are praised, O Lord"); the second addresses God indirectly and impersonally (e.g., "who has hallowed us").¹⁰⁷ The most well-known form of Jewish *Berakah* is the *Shema*.

The Shema

The *Shema* is composed of three passages from the Bible with several benedictions before and after it, proper for morning or evening use. This prayer was required twice daily on the basis of Deut. 6:6-7. The nucleus is the verse from Deut. 6:4, whence it derives its name: "Hear [*Shema*], O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One." Because of their length these Biblical verses will not be fully printed here. Complete texts are conveniently available, from which the following data is taken.¹⁰⁸ The Morning *Shema* with its benedictions is structured as follows.

¹⁰⁶ That is, to the present age; thus, Carmine Di Sante, Jewish Prayer: The Origins of the Christian Liturgy, tr. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Paulist, 1985), 47.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 49.

¹⁰⁸ Joseph Heinemann, and Jakob J. Petuchowski, Literature of the Synagogue (New York: Behrman House, 1975), 21-28; detailed information also in Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, rev. and ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973-87), 2:454-55.

1. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who formedst light and createst darkness, who makest peace and createst all things. All shall thank thee All shall extol thee for ever there is none but thee, our Redeemer, in the days of the Messiah; neither is there any like thee, our Deliverer, in the resurrection of the dead Thy name, Lord our God, shall be hallowed, and thy remembrance, our King, shall be glorified in heaven above and on the earth below Blessed art thou, O Lord, Creator of the lights.

2. With abounding love (*Ahava Rabbah*) hast thou loved us, Lord our God, great and exceeding mercy hast thou bestowed upon us. Our Father, our King O bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth, and make us go upright to our land Blessed be the name of his glorious kingdom for ever and ever.¹⁰⁹

The *Shema*

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is One. Blessed be the name of his glorious kingdom for ever and ever. Then are recited: Deut. 6:5-9; 11:13-21; Num. 15:37-41.

3. True and firm, established and enduring, right and faithful True it is that thou art indeed the Lord our God and the God of our fathers, our King, our fathers' King, our Redeemer, the Redeemer of our fathers, our Maker and besides thee we have no King, Redeemer, and Deliverer Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast redeemed Israel.

The Evening *Shema* with its benedictions is as follows.

1. Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the universe, who at thy word bringest on the evening twilight

2. With everlasting love thou hast loved the house of Israel, thy people; Torah and commandments, . . . thou hast taught us. Therefore, O Lord our God, when we lie down and when we rise up we will meditate on thy law Blessed art thou, O Lord, who lovest thy people Israel.

¹⁰⁹ Jeremias, *Prayers*, 25, pronounced this benediction as being very ancient. Here God is called Father ("Our Father, our King,") which is rare in Judaism.

The *Shema* [see the preceding Morning *Shema* for the three texts]

3. True and trustworthy is all this, and it is established with us that he is the Lord our God, and there is none besides him, and that we, Israel, are his people Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast redeemed Israel.

4. Grant, Lord our God, that we lie down in peace, and raise us again, our King, to life Spread over us the tabernacle of thy peace. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who spreadest the tabernacle of peace over us and over all thy people Israel, and over Jerusalem.

The *Shema* was the most important prayer and confession of ancient Judaism. Its antiquity is evidenced by the opinions of the schools of Hillel and Shammai who debated whether the duty of reciting it every morning and evening should be by standing or reclining.¹¹⁰ These two great teachers lived during the reign of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.) and thus provide a pointer to its antiquity. To confess God's oneness in the *Shema* meant to take upon oneself the "Yoke of the Kingdom of God." The length and repetitiousness of the benedictions surrounding the *Shema* causes its recitation twice daily to appear tedious. The morning prayer has three sets of benedictions, the evening has four. They dwell on the themes of creation, revelation, and redemption, which are "the three cornerstones of the traditional Jewish view of history, designating its beginning,

¹¹⁰ b. *Ber.* 1:1-3; Herbert Danby, tr., The Mishnah (London: Oxford, 1950), 2; and, Eugene J. Lipman, The Mishnah (New York: Schocken, 1974), 32-33. It should be noted that the subject of *Berakoth* 1-5 concerns the *Shema* and *Tefillah*; see Danby, pp. 1-6.

its great turning point, and its goal."¹¹¹ Their content is very nationalistic as is evident from the above display.

The Eighteen Benedictions, Amidah,
Tefillah or Shemoneh Esreh

This prayer, identified by several different names, was prescribed for recitation thrice daily on the basis of Dan. 6:10, 13. For certain occasions such as the sabbath it was shortened to the first three and last three petitions with a center "summary" petition, yielding a total of seven petitions.¹¹² Even though called the "Eighteen" after the number of its petitions, many versions contain nineteen. The additional petition occupies the twelfth position. The Babylonian Talmud reported that the additional petition was the "Benediction Concerning the Heretics."¹¹³ This

¹¹¹ Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns (New York: De Gruyter, 1977), 20.

¹¹² W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), 313, defended the thesis that the Gospel of Matthew was written against the efforts of reconsolidation of Judaism under the aegis of Pharisaism at Jamnia after A.D. 70. After analyzing the *Shemoneh Esreh* and the "Abbreviated Eighteen" he concluded that the Matthean Lord's Prayer was the Christian counterpart to the abbreviated *Tefillah*. While many of his conclusions are incompatible with the position of this paper, his allusion to the aforesaid abbreviation and his analysis of the new demands made by, and in reaction to, the synogogue is documented, as well as the explanations he gave for tensions between Christianity and "modern" Judaism. Davies implied that some developments in Judaism arose in imitation of the teaching of Jesus. The "abbreviated Eighteen" is called the *Habinenu*, for which, see *Berakoth* 4.3 (Danby, 5); Strack-Billerbeck 4:222; Charles W. F. Smith, "Lord's Prayer," in *IDB* 3:155; The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1912), 6:126; or, Abraham E. Millgram, Jewish Worship (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1977), 140.

¹¹³ b. *Ber.* 23b; see Heinemann, 33.

benediction, actually a malediction (*Birkat ha-minim*), was probably directed against Jewish Christians (the *minim* or heretics), designed to expel them from the synagogue.¹¹⁴ The petitions are couched in the plural, since the *Eighteen* assumes that it is the community praying together even when members of the Jewish community say the prayer at home. Carmine Di Sante provided the following outline summary of the Babylonian *Eighteen*:¹¹⁵

- | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| A. Opening | 1. Thou art God | } | | |
| | 2. Thou art mighty | } | Praise of God | |
| | 3. Thou art holy | } | | |
| B. Petitions | 4. Understanding | } | | |
| | 5. Repentance | } | Spiritual blessings | |
| | 6. Forgiveness | } | | |
| | 7. Personal freedom | } | | |
| | 8. Health | } | | |
| | 9. Well-being | } | Material blessings | |
| | 10. Reunification of
the scattered | } | | |
| | 11. Integral justice | } | | |
| | 12. Punishment of enemies | } | | |
| | 13. Reward of the just | } | Social blessings | |
| | 14. The new Jerusalem | } | | |
| | 15. The Messiah | } | | |
| | 16. Hearing of prayers | } | | |
| | C. Final | 17. Restore worship | } | |
| | | 18. Accept our gratitude | } | Thanksgiving to God |
| | | 19. Grant us peace | } | |

¹¹⁴ See Davies, 272-77; Davies' conclusion about the reason for the 12th benediction is given (p. 276): "In any case, a petition, either against heretics, including Jewish Christians, or against heretics and specifically Jewish Christians, was introduced into the Tefillah at Jamnia, at what date exactly we cannot ascertain. It was probably somewhere around A.D. 85."

¹¹⁵ Di Sante, 87.

Emil Schürer dated this prayer as being very old, although he acknowledged that it did not reach its final form until after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, since petition nos. 14 and 17 presuppose the cessation of sacrifices.¹¹⁶ Notice that the *Eighteen* consists of three parts: opening praise (first three petitions), the several petitions, and concluding thanksgiving (the last three petitions). Adalbert Hamman pointed out that the following petitions have particular coincidence with the Lord's Prayer:¹¹⁷

- No. 3 You are holy - first petition
- No. 6 We have sinned - fifth petition
- No. 7 Deliver us - seventh petition
- No. 9 Bless this year - fourth petition

Whether the argument can be sustained that this prayer, typical of Judaism, inordinately places man's concerns before God's is difficult to assess. If spiritual and material blessings are considered in petitions 4 - 10 as relating to man, and "social blessings" (petitions 11-16) pertain to God, then, indeed, man's concerns are placed first. "The *Eighteen*" (Babylonian recension) will be presented below.¹¹⁸ Notice that each petition concludes with a *Berakah*.

¹¹⁶ Schürer, 459.

¹¹⁷ Adalbert G. Hamman, *Prayer: The New Testament*, tr. Paul Oligny (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1971), 105-108. In addition, the Lord's Prayer, like the *Eighteen* can be roughly outlined with an opening, the several petitions, and a final conclusion. Incidentally, two authorities on the topic of prayer in general are A. G. Hamman and Friedrich Heiler (see bibliography).

¹¹⁸ Schürer, 456-59.

1. Blessed art thou, Lord our God and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob, great, mighty and fearful God, most high God, who bestowest abundant grace and createst all things and rememberest the promises of grace to the fathers and bringest a Redeemer to their children's children for thy Name's sake out of love. O king, who bringest help and salvation and who art a shield. *Blessed art thou, Lord, shield of Abraham.*

2. Lord, thou art almighty for ever, who makest the dead alive. Thou art mighty to help, thou who sustainest the living out of grace, makest the dead alive out of great mercy, supportest those who fall, healest the sick, freest the captive, and keepest thy word faithfully to them who sleep in the dust. And who is like thee, Lord of mighty deeds, and who is comparable to thee, King, who makest dead and alive and causest help to spring forth. And thou art faithful to make the dead alive. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who makest the dead alive.*

3. Thou art holy and thy Name is holy and the holy praise thee every day. *Blessed art thou, Lord, holy God.*

4. Thou grantest knowledge to mankind and teachest men understanding. Grant us the knowledge, understanding and discernment (which come) from thee. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who grantest knowledge.*

5. Lead us back, our Father, to thy Torah; and bring us, our King, to thy service, and cause us to return in perfect repentance to thy presence. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who delightest in repentance.*

6. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed. For thou forgivest and pardonest. *Blessed art thou, Lord, gracious, rich in forgiveness.*

7. Look on our affliction and plead our cause, and redeem us speedily for thy Name's sake; for thou art a mighty redeemer. *Blessed art thou, Lord, redeemer of Israel.*

8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed, save us and we shall be saved; for thou art our praise. And bring perfect healing to all our wounds. For thou art a God and King who heals, faithful and merciful. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who healest the sick of thy people Israel.*

9. Bless this year for us, Lord our God, and cause all its produce to prosper; and bless the land; and satisfy

us with goodness; and bless our year as the good years. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who blessest the years.*

10. Proclaim our liberation with the great trumpet, and raise a banner to gather together our dispersed, and assemble us from the four corners of the earth. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who gatherest the banished of thy people Israel.*

11. Restore our judges as in former times and our counsellors as in the beginning; and take from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, thou Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us in judgement. *Blessed art thou, Lord, King, who lovest justice and judgement [sic].*

12. And for informers let there be no hope; and let all who do wickedness quickly perish; and let them all be speedily destroyed; and uproot and crush and hurl down and humble the insolent, speedily in our days. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who crushest enemies and humblest the insolent.*

13. Over the righteous and over the pious; and over the elders of thy people of the house of Israel; and over the remnant of their Torah scholars; and over the righteous proselytes; and over us, may thy mercy shower down, Lord our God. And give a rich reward to all who faithfully trust in thy Name. And cause our portion to be with them for ever, that we may not be put to shame. For we have trusted in thee. *Blessed art thou, Lord, support and trust of the righteous.*

14. And to Jerusalem, thy city, return with mercy and dwell in its midsts as thou has spoke; and build it soon in our days to be an everlasting building; and raise up quickly in its midst the throne of David. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who buildest Jersuaem.*

15. Cause the shoot of David to shoot forth quickly, and raise up his horn by thy salvation. For we wait on thy salvation all the day. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to shoot forth.*

16. Hear our voice, Lord our God; spare us and have mercy on us, and accept our prayer with mercy and pleasure. For thou art a God who hearest prayers and supplication; and let us not return empty, our King, from before thy Face. For thou hearest the prayer of thy people Israel with mercy. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who hearest prayer.*

17. Be pleased, Lord our God, with thy people Israel and with their prayer. Bring back the worship into the Holy

of Holies of thy house and accept in love and pleasure the sacrifices of Israel and her prayer. And may the worship offered by Israel thy people be pleasing to thee always. O that our eyes might see thy return with mercy to Zion. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who causest thy presence (shekinah) to return to Zion.*

18. We praise thee, for thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers for ever and ever, the rock of our life, the shield of our salvation from generation to generation. We praise thee and recount thy praise, for our life that is given into thy hand and for our souls which are in thy charge; and for thy wonders to us every day; and for thy marvels; and for thy deeds of goodness at every time, at evening and morning and midday. All-Good, of whose mercy there is no end, Merciful One, whose grace increases, we wait on thee forever. And for all this be praised and thy Name be exalted, our King, forever in all eternity. And may all that lives praise thee, *selah*, and praise thy Name in truth, thou God, our salvation and our help, *selah*. *Blessed art thou, Lord, All-Good is thy Name, and it is fitting to praise thee.*

19. Bring peace, goodness and blessing, grace and favour and mercy over us and over all Israel, thy people. Bless us our Father, all of us together, with the light of thy Face. For by the light of thy Face thou hast given us Lord our God, the Torah of life and loving kindness and righteousness and blessing and mercy and life and peace. And may it be good in thine eyes to bless thy people Israel at all times and in every hour with thy peace. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who blessest thy people Israel with peace. Amen.*

The Palestinian recension of *The Eighteen* is very similar to the Babylonian recension. The Palestinian recension was discovered in the Cairo Geniza and published by Solomon Schechter in 1898.¹¹⁹ All its *Berakoth* correspond to those of the Babylonian recension. It is slightly shorter. The most important difference is that the contents of the fifteenth petition for the coming of the Messiah in the Babylonian recension is combined with the 14th in the

¹¹⁹ Information in Schürer, 459-63.

Palestinian, thus yielding exactly eighteen petitions for the latter. Schürer cautiously claimed that the Palestinian recension could be the slightly older of the two, although he indicated that "the textual tradition continued to be elastic."¹²⁰ Both recensions as they now appear are no older than the beginning of the second century A.D., although both have earlier foundations.¹²¹ It appears that this important prayer grew by accretions through the years.¹²²

The Kaddish

The third important prayer that should be reported is the *Kaddish*. Like other prayers, there are variations (the complete, the half, the rabbis', the burial *Kaddish*). The *Kaddish* is a typical synagogal doxological response with which to conclude a sermon or a service. Nearly all variations begin the same way, even if different endings are

¹²⁰ Ibid., 462; "slightly older" but not dating before the second century A.D. On the other hand, Schürer, 459, pointed out that the Babylonian recension was mentioned in the *Mishnah*, meaning that its earlier versions could date A.D. 70-100.

¹²¹ Ibid. Di Sante, 81-81, more fully explained than Davies, *supra*, that the prayer may have begun to be formed around A.D. 70 at Jamnia (Jabneh) after the destruction of the second temple, with the final editing ca. A.D. 100 under the direction of Gamaliel II.

¹²² One may wonder how vital this lengthy prayer was to the worshiping communities if the Palestinian version fell into such disuse that its only reliable witness today came from the Cairo Geniza. It is difficult to believe that many Jews would have used such a lengthy prayer on a regular basis, three times a day, at home. That the Babylonian recension may have been more viable and that its malediction in the 12th benediction is more elaborate governed the choice as to which of the two recensions to print in this section for illustrating the content of the *Eighteen*. Many commentators prefer to use the Palestinian recension for illustrative purposes for equally good reasons (briefer, possible greater fidelity to a Palestinian provenance).

supplied. This typical beginning is reported as follows.¹²³

Exalted and *hallowed* be His great Name in the world which he created according to His *will*. May He establish His *kingdom* in your lifetime and in your days, and in the lifetime of the whole household of Israel, speedily and at a near time. And say: Amen.¹²⁴

Other Examples of Prayer Formulas

Several versions of the "Our Father, Our King" (*Abhinu Malkenu*) are given in the literature.¹²⁵ This acclamation reads: "Our Father, our King, we have no King but You. Our Father, our King, for Your sake have mercy on us." Its use is associated with the New Year and Day of Atonement, as well as in the second benediction of the morning *Shema*, cited earlier.¹²⁶

Prayer before meals consists of this *berakah*: "You are praised, O Lord our God, Sovereign of the Universe, who brings forth bread from the earth."¹²⁷ After the meal, prayers praised God "for food, for the land, for the building

¹²³ Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Jewish Prayer Texts of the Rabbinic Period," in The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy, ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke (London: Burns & Oates, 1978), 50.

¹²⁴ Jeremias, New Testament Theology, 198, has shown that this prayer is similar to the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer and that its petitions, like the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer, also stand in asyndeton. Note: the present writer has italicized the thematic words.

¹²⁵ Petuchowski, 39.

¹²⁶ Jeremias, Prayers, 29, made the proposal that some forms of *abi*, such as here and in Sirach 23:1, 4, are not vocative, but should be translated "God of my Father(s)."

¹²⁷ Petuchowski, 50.

of Jerusalem, and for being good and doing good."¹²⁸

The prayer called the *Alenu* was a special one appointed also for use in the New Year service (*Rosh Hashanah*). Its conclusion is as follows:

For Yours is the kingdom, And unto all eternity You will reign in glory. As it is written in Your Torah: "The Lord shall reign forever and ever." And it is said: "The Lord shall be King over the whole earth. On that day the Lord shall be One And His Name One."¹²⁹

The Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer are as follows:¹³⁰

Blessed be he who removes sleep from my eyes and slumber from my lids. And may it please thee, Eternal One, my God, to guide my feet in thy law, and let me cling to thy law, and to thy commandments. And bring me not into the hands of sin, or into the hands of transgression, or into the hands of temptation, or into the hands of dishonor; and humble my spirit, to submit to thee. And keep me far from an evil man and from an evil companion; and let me cling to the good impulse and to a good companion in this world. And grant me today and every day favor and grace and mercy in thine eyes and in the eyes of everyone who sees me; and bestow kindness upon me. Blessed art thou, Eternal One, who bestowest kindness upon thy people Israel.

He who lowers the bonds of sleep upon my eyes and slumber upon my lids, and grants light to the eye: may it please thee, Eternal One, my God, to let me lie down in peace, and give me my share in your law. And guide my foot to

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 44. Note the affinities of the *Alenu* to the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer as well as to the traditional conclusion.

¹³⁰ ET in Philip B. Harner, Understanding the Lord's Prayer (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 126-27; German and Hebrew texts in Paul Fiebig, Jesus Bergpredigt: Rabbinische Texte zum Verständnis dargeboten und mit Erläuterungen und Lesarten versehen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), 119, and pt. 2, 54-55. Notice the similarity of these prayers to the sixth and seventh petitions of the Lord's Prayer; "evil" is general, and God is requested "not to bring" the believer into temptation.

fulfill a commandment, and guide my foot not to commit a transgression. And bring me not into the hands of sin, or into the hands of dishonor. And may the good impulse rule over me, and may the evil impulse not rule over me. And protect me from an evil occurrence and from evil illnesses; and may evil dreams and evil thoughts not disturb me. And may my bed be pure before thee; and enlighten my eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death. Blessed art thou, Eternal One, who givest light to the whole world by thy glory.

Summary

Many of these beloved and statutory prayer forms reflect the Old Testament, of course. However, unlike the Lord's Prayer which consists of succinct expressions, they are marked by much repetitious verbosity. Their taxing wordiness could only be appreciated by those having the necessary leisure such as the Pharisees. Many of them represent later developments after the time of Jesus. For example, the first written references to the *Kaddish* come from about A.D. 600.¹³¹ It is impossible, then, to assess their real worth in terms of influence upon Jesus.

God's name, kingdom, and to a lesser extent his will, are themes common to these prayers. References are often made to God as "King" more frequently than to the kingdom. They are filled with frequent praise petitions. These Jewish prayers tend to be nationalistic and particularistic. They ask God for protection, deliverance, and restoration of Israel. In a sense they are very parochial and exclusivistic, not being concerned for others outside the

¹³¹ Baruch Graubard, "The *Kaddish* Prayer," in The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy, ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke (London: Burns & Oates, 1978), 60.

household of Israel. In fact they bear the marks of human composition. Jesus' inspired Prayer assumes that the believer is bold to pray on the basis of a personal faith relationship which God has established. This filial/paternal relationship based on faith is seldom evinced among the Jewish prayers. Further, Jesus' Prayer is true petition, whereas so many of the Jewish prayers are what might be called "confessions" or declarations of faith. For example, the *Kaddish* is framed in the third person, whereas the petitions of the Lord's Prayer are in the bolder second person.¹³² This is especially true with the *Shema*. The malediction of the twelfth petition is hardly suitable for reflecting God's love toward others, so clearly taught by Jesus (Matt. 22:39). The prayers of Judaism only provide random background parallels for the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. For example, the *Eighteen* contains nothing similar to the second, third, and sixth petitions of the Lord's Prayer. Even the themes of the first, fourth, fifth, and seventh petitions are not stated in the concise, clear and compact way that Jesus did in his Prayer. For another example, the ninth benediction asks for divine blessings on the year instead of a specific blessing of *daily bread*.

The Prayer taught by Jesus, while reflecting themes prominent in Jewish prayer and theology, nevertheless is his own Prayer. It can only be fully and properly appreciated when the unique themes of Jesus' message are understood.

¹³² See the theme of the "boldness" of faith in Eph. 3:11-12.

Spiritual and temporal values pertaining to the coming of Jesus, the divine Son of God and Savior of men, must be necessarily assumed as the background for understanding the Lord's Prayer. A chasm separates the Prayer of Jesus from the prayers of Judaism. The presence of the Messianic age having come with Jesus makes rejection of the idea of Jesus' utter dependency on earlier forms crucial. He did not modify statutory prayers, so much as to have invested his Prayer with his own message and ministry, the Gospel's particularity. In sum, the Lord's Prayer must be understood Christologically *sui generis*.

It should be noted that the *Eighteen* provides the following prayer scheme: praise, petition, thanksgiving. The Lord's Prayer begins with an address that is filled with the element of praise, followed by specific petitions, and the liturgical version terminates with a thankful conclusion (whether written or spoken is an open question to be treated later). The spirit of Jewish prayer, familiar to Jesus and his contemporaries, was not lacking in seriousness and reverence.¹³³ Jeremias reported that ordinarily the *Shema*

¹³³ Jeremias, *Prayers*, 66. At this point, it should be granted in fairness to Judaism that prayer and acceptance of the "yoke of the kingdom" are viewed much more favorably by E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977). According to him, 212-38, prayer was not meant to gain God's favor, but to serve for the preservation of the individual within "covenantal nomism" wherein God first placed him by election and grace. Prayer, then, was not intended to gain merit. However, Sanders' positive reassessment must be tempered by acknowledging popular conceptions of prayer as merit, by the fact of the human authorship of prayers stemming from later Tannaitic and Amoraic rabbinism, and by the overall provincial exclusiveness of typical Jewish prayers.

and the *Eighteen* were Hebrew prayers. The *Kaddish* was permitted in Aramaic, since it concluded the synagogue worship.¹³⁴ Jesus' innovation in teaching the Lord's Prayer included couching it in the vernacular which was an appealing form for the masses. Its putative Aramaic origin is substantiated by the use of the Aramaisms *Abba* and "debts" in the Matthean fifth petition. The popular *Kaddish* also reports the themes of the holy name, kingdom, and will that belong to the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer. This prompted the comment of Jeremias that Jesus "removes prayer from the liturgical sphere of sacred language and places it right in the midst of everyday life."¹³⁵

Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer more closely adheres to the pattern expected in Jewish forms of prayer.¹³⁶ G. Klein, on the basis of Ps. 119:164, asserted the propriety of prayer as having seven members. Also, prayer should begin with praise, then allow personal petitions to follow, closing with a final thanksgiving. He solicited the "cry" and the "prayer" of 1 Kings 8:28 to demonstrate that the Lord's Prayer should begin with three petitions relating to praise, three petitions to follow relating to the individual, and the "doxology" being the seventh and concluding member of this septenary form. For the precedent of connecting the name,

¹³⁴ Ibid., 76.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ G. Klein, "Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 7 (1906): 34-50.

the kingdom, and the will, he cited *Tr. Soph.* 14.22:
 "Exalted and praised and hallowed . . . be the name of the
 King of the kingdom . . . in the world, which he created
 . . . according to his will and the will of all the people of
 Israel. May his kingdom appear and be revealed."¹³⁷ Jewish
 prayer should generally be in the plural form.¹³⁸

New Testament Prayer Aorist

Prayer of course includes petition. In fact, the bulk of prayer is petition. That is evident in the Lord's Prayer and, for example, in Jesus' "High Priestly Prayer" of John 17. All of the verb forms in the Matthean Lord's Prayer use the Greek aorist tense. In the Lukan version secondary thematic reasons dictate using present tenses in the fourth and second part of the fifth petitions. John 17 also may serve to illustrate the many aorist imperatives that are typically used in prayer in Greek.¹³⁹

The aorist is usually simply explained as the Greek

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 35-36.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹³⁹ For example, see John 17:1, 5, 11, 24, 25. Other "prayer aorists" include: Matt. 11:25-26 (ἔκρυψας, ἀπεκάλυψας), 18:26 (μακροθύμησον), 26:39 (παρελθάτω), Mark 14:36 (παρένεγκε), 15:34 (ἐγκατελίπες), Luke 15:18 (ἥμαρτον), 16:24 (ἐλέησόν με καὶ πέμψον), 17:12 (ἐλέησόν με), 18:13 (ἰλάσθητί μοι), 23:34 (ἄφες), and many others.

verb tense that describes a single (historical) event.¹⁴⁰ The frequent characteristic of the aorist to describe one single action has given rise to the claim that the petitions in the Lord's Prayer are to be answered at only one single time, in one way. Eschatological interpretations of the Prayer that ask for God's inbreaking kingdom at the end of the age, or for the revealing of Jesus as the Bread of Life at the consummation, for example, solicit the aorist for support. Carried to the extreme, such a future eschatological interpretation would exclude any other answer from God except for the accomplishment of the requests at the eschaton. An exclusively eschatological interpretation limits the application of the Lord's Prayer strictly and only for the future. This deliberate and narrow delineation results in the failure of allowing the Prayer to address the spiritual and temporal needs of the believer who is totally dependent on God now in the present time.

However, the aorist exercises other verbal aspects besides its common "punctiliar" tense. It is the preferred tense of prayer, especially in "koine Greek." This nuance has often been overlooked. Its deployment in the service of prayer must be appreciated. This subject is adumbrated in the grammar of Blass and Debrunner with a citation from the

¹⁴⁰ See F. Blass, and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, tr. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University Press, 1961), 166, sec. 318, which describes the primary features of the aorist as reflecting either punctiliar action (a single action) or an action conceived of as a whole irrespective of its duration (constative or complexive aorist).

Lord's Prayer.¹⁴¹ That grammar also points out that the aorist used in prayer is preponderant in early liturgies since it is a more definite tense.

It must be remembered that the aorist is a verb tense that is related to aspect, not to time. This "sense" of aspect was treated in a significant study by W. F. Bakker, who, having carefully studied the use of the aorist in Greek prayers, explicated this dynamic more fully. He wrote:

The ancient Greeks, when directing prayers to the gods, already used the aorist stem in the majority of cases. In the later stages of the Greek language, however, the aorist stem actually has the hegemony. The principal cause of this phenomenon lies in the continuous evolution of aspect.¹⁴²

He continued to say:

In Judaeo-Christian literature, God is treated very differently from the heathen gods, . . . The Jew and the Christian visualize God as the Almighty, the Sublime; they approach Him as miserable, guilty sinners, who expect everything from Him, without being able to assert their rights . . . It is obvious that such a feeling of dependence practically excludes the use of the direct, urging present stem. The aorist stem, however, is extremely apposite to voicing such feelings.¹⁴³

Bakker's study followed upon his initial observation that the aorist was the preferred tense for prayer petitions

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 173, sec. 337; 174, sec. 335.4. See also A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 851-52; especially p. 852, where he spoke of the propriety of the aorist in prayer in general, with reference being made also to the Lord's Prayer; and, James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: Clark, 1908; 1963 repr.), 1:173; and 3:77.

¹⁴² Willem Frederik Bakker, The Greek Imperative (Amsterdam: Bakker, 1966), 137.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 139.

and that the aorist imperative was practically the only imperative used in Greek prayer petitions.¹⁴⁴ The conclusions of his study carry important implications for the study of the Lord's Prayer. In short, one cannot plead on the basis of the use of the aorist imperatives in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer that they should receive an unequivocally eschatological interpretation. The facts easily demonstrate that the aorist is a regular feature of prayer spoken in the Greek language. The use of the aorist *per se* should not dictate interpretation in the direction of a single, final event.

Obviously, the case defending the eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer based on the use of the aorist verb forms must be reassessed, and will be found wanting.¹⁴⁵ Aorist verb forms cannot be pressed into the service of a unilateral eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer.

Literary and Textual Framework

Synoptic Setting of the Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer is presented twice in the Bible. Its first appearance is in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 17. For further information on the development of the aorist and applications of *Aktionsart*, see James W. Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament," in Austieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, 25/2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984), 966-70. See also fn. 135, Chapter IV, *infra*.

¹⁴⁵ See Chapter II, *supra*, for a general summary of Jean Carmignac, Recherches sur le "Notre Père" (Paris: Letouzey, 1969), 337-47, who is in agreement to the extent that the Greek "prayer aorist" need not require future eschatological conclusions.

5-7). Matthew's Gospel begins by reporting Jesus' genealogy (chapter 1), nativity (chapter 2), the ministry of John the Baptizer (chapter 3), Jesus' temptation (4:1-11), his baptism and inauguration into his public ministry (4:12-17), and the call of James and John (4:18-25). Activities relating to his "great Galilean ministry" are described especially in Matt. 4:23-25, including "preaching the gospel of the kingdom" and performing healing miracles. Great crowds formed to follow Jesus (4:25). To these, then, he delivered the "Sermon on the Mount" which in Matthew's account included the Lord's Prayer. This sermon was delivered to the assembled audience that followed Jesus to this particular τὸ ὄρος (Matt. 5:1) where evidently a highland plain (ἐπὶ τοῦ πεδινῶ, Luke 6:17) existed which facilitated his "preaching" (Matt. 5:1; 7:28; 8:1; Luke 6:17). Of the two accounts of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7; Luke 6:17-49), the shorter Lukan "Sermon" does not report the Lord's Prayer. In his Gospel harmony, A. T. Robertson provided the following information about Jesus' "sermon" and the Lord's Prayer:

There is little doubt that the discourses given by Matthew and Luke are the same, Matthew locating it on "the mountain," and Luke "on a level place," which might easily be a level spot on a mountain. (See note at end of this book, note 9.) Observe that they begin and end alike, and pursue the same general order. Luke omits various matters of special interest to Matthew's Jewish readers (e.g. Matt. 5:17-42), and other matters that he himself will give elsewhere (e.g. Luke 11:1-4; 12:22-31; while Luke has a few sentences (as ver. 24-26, 38-40), which are not given by Matthew.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ Robertson, Harmony, 48; emphasis added.

Further, he pointed out in reference to his "note 9" the supposition concerning Matthew's Sermon on the Mount that

inasmuch as Matthew's arrangement in ch. 8-13 is not chronological, but topical, it is entirely possible, even likely, that the same arrangement should prevail in ch. 5-7. It is perfectly natural that Matthew, writing for Jewish readers and about the Messianic reign, should give at the beginning of his account of that reign the formal principles that rule in this new state of affairs, as proclaimed by Jesus on a later occasion.¹⁴⁷

From this information it is likely that Matthew's account was arranged topically, serving as a kind of preamble to introduce the ministry of Jesus. That the Lord's Prayer should occupy a central position there, as will be seen later, is significant.

The Lukan Lord's Prayer was taught during Jesus' "late Judean ministry" nearer his passion; it is not presented in the Lukan "Sermon on the Mount." Luke reported that Jesus began his peregrination toward Jerusalem near the end of his public ministry. In the "central section" of 9:52-18:14 a number of disconnected teachings are recounted which are not contained in the other Gospels.¹⁴⁸ Periodic reminders are included so the reader does not forget that Jesus intended to

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 273.

¹⁴⁸ Smukal, 151, indicated concerning the accounts of the Lord's Prayer: "The first instruction was given in Galilee after the second Passover; the second in the vicinity of Jerusalem, some six days before the fourth Passover. Hence far more than a year elapsed between the two instructions." A very interesting study of the "travel narrative" of Luke was made by C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 37-53, in which he compared this section with the Exodus to the Promised Land of the Israelites, a "journey to the borders of the Promised Land, a journey which follows

head toward Jerusalem soon (9:51; 10:38; 13:22; 17:11). The teaching on prayer in Luke 11 is reported after the mission of the seventy disciples (10:1-24) and the teaching of the "one thing needful" (10:38-42). Lessons on prayer follow the Lord's Prayer: the exhortation to importunity ("The Friend at Midnight," 11:5-8) and perseverance in prayer (11:9-13).

Teaching How to Pray

Luke introduced the Lord's Prayer this way: "He was praying in a certain place, and when he ceased, one of his disciples said to him, 'Lord teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples.' And he said to them, 'When you pray, say:'" (Luke 11:1-2a). Luke did not give further specific details about the occasion, although it is evident that Jesus had secluded himself in order to have time to pray.¹⁴⁹ The disciple who requested instruction about prayer may not have been one of the Twelve, but someone from the wider circle of

that of Deuteronomy" (p. 51). This data should be remembered to help elucidate the interpretation of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer in Chapter IV. See further comments at fn. 193, *infra*.

¹⁴⁹ An ancient but unfounded tradition holds that the Lukan Lord's Prayer was taught on the Mount of Olives; see Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Apropos of the Lord's Prayer," and, "The Lord's Prayer and the Hill of Olives," The Heythrop Journal 3 (1962): 51-60, 169-71. Further, an excursus is included in Frederic Henry Chase, The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church, Texts and Studies, vol. 1, no. 3, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: University Press, 1891), 123-25, in which Robinson proposed Gethsemane as the location of Luke 11:1; the account of Mary and Martha who lived in Bethany preceded the transmission of the Lord's Prayer in Luke. According to John's accurate statement (11:18), Bethany was fifteen furlongs (two miles) from Jerusalem, on the other side of the Mount of Olives. Hence, the "certain place" of Luke 11:1 could have been Gethsemane according to this tradition.

disciples.¹⁵⁰ This would easily account for the fact that a follower of Jesus lacked instruction about prayer that was given earlier in Galilee, directed there both to "crowds" and to "disciples" (Matt. 4:25; 5:1; 7:28). At that time, four had specifically received Jesus' call to discipleship (Matt. 4:18-22; cf. 10:1). In Luke's Gospel, the Twelve had already been chosen from a larger group of followers (Luke 6:13). At the request, then, of some unnamed disciple Jesus repeated his instruction on how to pray. That Jesus provided a model prayer in the manner of the prayers of other teachers is probable. Evidently John the Baptizer had taught his disciples a prayer (Luke 11:1).¹⁵¹ Such a prayer identified the disciple with his master. It is plausible, then, that Jesus willingly taught this important prayer on several occasions, more often than the Gospels report (John 21:25), as the different contexts show (Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, Luke's "central section," and possibly even Mark's Passion Week Account [Mark 11:25-26]). Alfred Plummer, as many others have, raised this possibility: "Christ may have delivered the Prayer once spontaneously to a large number of disciples, and again at the request of a disciple to a smaller group, who were not present on the first occasion."¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ Lenski, Luke, 620.

¹⁵¹ Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1910), 294.

¹⁵² Ibid., 293. Bo Reicke, The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 53, cogently reasoned, "In some cases Jesus may actually have used the same words in different parts of the country."

Variations between the two Prayers demonstrate that Jesus' intention was not to give a verbatim prayer. The spirit of Jesus' prayer instruction was that this Prayer should serve as a pattern or model for prayer (see Matt. 6:9).¹⁵³ It is also possible that the Dominical Prayer was intended to replace Jewish prayers required twice or thrice a day.¹⁵⁴

Jesus introduced his "catechesis" on prayer in general and the Lord's Prayer specifically in his Matthean Sermon on the Mount, by saying:

And when you pray,¹⁵⁵ you must not be like the hypocrites; for they love to stand and pray in the synagogues and at the street corners, that they may be seen by men. Truly, I say to you, they have received their reward. But when you pray, go into your room and shut the door and pray to your Father who is in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you (Matt. 6:5-6).

Jesus continued by making reference to a practice customary among both Jewish and Gentile people:

And in praying do not heap up empty phrases (βατταλογήσητε) as the Gentiles (ἔθνηκοί) do;¹⁵⁶ for they think that they

¹⁵³ The Western text D inserts words from Matt. 6:7 to introduce the Prayer in Luke 11:2: "putant enim quidam quia in multiloquentia sua exaudientur." This shows the general tendency of assimilation toward the Lukan text from that of Matthew.

¹⁵⁴ *Didache* 8.3 gave directions that the Lord's Prayer should be prayed three times a day. This early directive apparently follows the custom of praying the *Eighteen* thrice daily; see Jeremias, *Prayers*, 77.

¹⁵⁵ Editors generally make this "you" plural, following Codex B and other versions, but fairly strong attestation prefers the singular "you": corrected Aleph, D, L, W, et al.; possibly the singular is preferable in view of the singular in the following verses, but the plural makes sense in context. Note the emphatic οὐδέ at verse 6.

¹⁵⁶ Instead of "Gentiles" Codex B and a few other MSS read "hypocrites."

will be heard for their many words (πολυλογία). Do not be like them, for your Father knows what you need before you ask him. Pray then like this: (Matt. 6:7-9a).¹⁵⁷

Jesus indicted the Gentiles for lengthy verbose praying. The Jews were guilty of ostentatious prayer. Praying from false motives was wrong. This included the love of being seen by men in order to appear righteous before them or to appear as being better than others. Jews, especially the Pharisees, could "accidentally on purpose" appear in public when one of the three regular hours of prayer occurred (Acts 2:15; 3:1; 10:3, 9). Often their intention was to have been seen by men (Matt. 6:5). Insofar as their intentions were accomplished, they enjoyed their personal reward. In contrast, Jesus taught that it is better to pray privately, behind the "closed door." Πολυλογία is "wordiness." This may shed light on the difficult word βαττολογεῖν in verse 7. That word may mean "babbling" or "prattle."¹⁵⁸ The Pharisees also were known to make long prayers (Matt. 23:15; cf. Eccl. 5:2; Sirach 7:14).

¹⁵⁷ Thirtle, 31-33, contended that the word βαττολογεῖω translated "empty phrases" was coined from the idea "to speak long prayers alphabetically" ("from A to Z"), i.e., "to speak from Beth to Tau." He provided several examples of such "battologising" one of which is taken from the Service of the Day of Atonement, provided in part here: (Aleph) We have trespassed--(Beth) We have been faithless--(Gimel) We have robbed--(Daleth) We have spoken basely . . . (Tau) We have committed abomination; we have gone astray; we have led astray." Thirtle said, 33, "By these words, many and various, and embedded in thousands more, the Jew says he is a sinner. In the Lord's Prayer, the same is said IN LESS THAN ONE WORD [sic; forgive]."

¹⁵⁸ BAG, 137; see also previous fn.

Jesus taught that prayer does not consist of verbosity, length or show. Instead, prayer is a reflection of an inner spirit disposed toward God. Faith in the Savior leads the child of God to engage in prayerful conversation with his heavenly Father (Gal. 3:25; 4:5-6; Rom. 8:9-11, 13b-17a). The majority of pronouns in Matt. 6:5-8 are singular in number. This suggests the personal and individual nature of Christian prayer. It tells how important it is for the individual to employ prayer in a humble manner, congruent with Jesus' instructions. Then the promise that prayers are heard and answered is assured (contrast Matt. 6:6, καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἁποδώσει σοι, with the same words spoken at 6:4 which refer to the human reward or payment hoped for from men). That God commands prayer, and promises to hear and answer prayer, encourages the believer to embrace the kind of prayer life that Jesus taught. The subjects and verbs are plural in the Lord's Prayer itself (Matt. 6:9-13); afterwards the verbs revert to the singular number (see vv. 14-15). This reflects the truth that individual Christians may humbly and without ostentation pray with their own needs in mind, yet at the same time, they are mystically bound to one another in the body of Christ which is exemplified by corporate prayer.¹⁵⁹

Three religious observances are brought together in the Sermon on the Mount: almsgiving (6:2), prayer (6:5), and

¹⁵⁹ See Matt. 18:15-20 where corporate prayer is connected with instruction about discipline and forgiveness in the context of the Christian assembly (cf. also Matt 16:18-19; John 20:23).

fasting (6:16). Each of them must be observed in a humble and quiet manner, that is, "in secret" (vv. 3, 6, 18). For Jesus, one's attitude was important.

Significantly, Jesus taught that even before praying, God knows "of what you have need" (6:8). This teaching harmonizes with Matt. 6:32, ". . . and your heavenly Father (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος) knows that you need them all," and 7:11, "How much more will your Father who is in heaven (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) give good things (δώσει ἀγαθὰ) to those who ask him!" A benevolent and gracious God in heaven, as a Father, will provide for the needs of his children. He is willing to reveal his goodness here in time and hereafter in eternity. Prayer is commanded for those living in the present Gospel age. Christians should live in expectation of the future blessings of the consummation and even pray for the *eschaton* (*maranatha*, 1 Cor. 16:22; cf. Rev. 22:20). Nevertheless, while along the path to eternity they also pray for divine assistance *hic et nunc*. Prayer, indeed, is a gift to be used by the true believer during this earthly pilgrimage (Ps. 50:15; Matt. 5:44; Luke 18:1; John 14:13-14; 15:7; Phil. 4:6; 1 Thess. 5:16-18; 1 Tim. 2:1-2, 8; 1 John 5:14). For this reason it is very likely that from Apostolic times the Lord's Prayer was used in Christian catechesis.¹⁶⁰

¹⁶⁰ Johann Albrecht Bengel, *Gnomon* (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1915; 1742 ed.), 970-71, saw the following parallels between the Lord's Prayer and the First Epistle of Peter. Note that this epistle has frequently been viewed as a compendium of the faith, and was

Jesus gave the Lord's Prayer beginning with an ingress, οὕτως in Matt. 6:9a, and καθὼς in Luke 11:1, thereby indicating that he was not delivering a form for believers to use but a model, an exemplar.¹⁶¹ Christians may employ any of the versions (Matthew, Luke, or various translated versions) without compunction. Jesus did not emphasize the wording. He was more concerned to teach how to pray and for what to pray. The variations in the Prayer between Matthew and Luke illustrate this basic assumption of freedom in the matter of outward forms. The modern so-called liturgical version is not necessarily an attempt to replicate verbatim the models given in Matthew or Luke.

The Lord's Prayer Is the Center of the Sermon on the Mount

Some scholars despair of finding a definite outline for the Matthean Sermon on the Mount. For example, Krister

historically used during the octave following the baptism of catechumens (see Martin Franzmann, The Word of the Lord Grows [St. Louis: Concordia, 1961], 224); cf. the address: 1:3, 14, 17, 23: 2:2; 1:4; first petition: 1:15, 16; 3:15; second petition: 2:9; third petition: 2:15; 3:17; 4:2, 19; fourth petition: 5:7; fifth petition: 4:1, 8; sixth petition: 4:12; seventh petition: 4:18. Incidentally, it should be added that parallels are seen between the Lord's Prayer and John 17 also; see George Brocke, "The Lord's Prayer Interpreted Through John and Paul," The Downside Review 98 (1980): 298-311; William O. Walker, "The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in John," New Testament Studies 28 (1982): 237-56; and, in the chart by J. L. Houlden, "The Lord's Prayer," in The Anchor Bible Dictionary, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 4:357. See also fn. 193 for possible Old Testament parallels.

¹⁶¹ The traditional introduction of the Lord's Prayer in the communion liturgy is in the East (from the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom): "Grant that we may dare to call on thee as Father and to say, 'Our Father . . .'" or in the West (from the Roman Mass), "We are bold to say, 'Our Father . . .'" (from Jeremias, Theology, 197).

Stendahl is quoted: "VI.19-VII.29 offers material which has been brought into the Sermon on the Mount by Matthew in such a manner that we find no clue as to his arrangement."¹⁶²

Others have seen, however, that the Lord's Prayer occupies the Center of the Sermon on the Mount. For example, Walter Grundmann stated in his commentary that the Lord's Prayer occupies its center: "Überschaut man das Ganze der Bergpredigt, dann ergibt sich die Beobachtung, daß das Unser-Vater in ihrer Mitte steht."¹⁶³ Eduard Schweizer thought that the Sermon was built around the Lord's Prayer, exemplifying the double themes of the Kingdom of God and his righteousness.¹⁶⁴

The Lord's Prayer occupies the center of the Sermon. The unit of material in which the Lord's Prayer is contained has its own introduction (6:7-9a) and its own concluding addendum (6:14-15) based on the fifth petition, according to

¹⁶² Krister Stendahl, "Matthew," in Peake's Commentary on the Bible (London: Nelson, 1962), 779. Likewise, Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, tr. John Moore Trout, et al. (New York: Scribner's, 1909; 1917), 2:559, said, "The Lord's Prayer . . . spoils the perfect symmetry of the three parts of the discourse concerning alms, prayer, and fasting." Ernst von Dobschütz, "The Lord's Prayer," Harvard Theological Review 7 (1914): 301, claimed that the intrusion of the Lord's Prayer destroyed the harmonious structure of the passage.

¹⁶³ Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 205.

¹⁶⁴ Eduard Schweizer, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 422.

Hans Dieter Betz.¹⁶⁵ In a most helpful article by Günther Bornkamm, it was shown that expressions and themes taught in the Lord's Prayer serve as a *leitmotif* throughout the entire Sermon.¹⁶⁶ This has the effect of unifying the whole and bringing it together as a planned composition, or sermon. The Sermon on the Mount possesses a unity consisting of more than disconnected references. The unity of the entire Sermon on the Mount can be understood as constructed around the Lord's Prayer.

Some of the Sermon's teachings are illustrative of its unity. The address, "Our Father who art in heaven" highlights the fatherly relationship of God with his children. For example, the phrase "your Father who is in heaven" is employed elsewhere in the Sermon on the Mount at 5:16, 45; 6:1; 7:11. A variation, "my Father who is in heaven" is used at 7:21 (cf. 7:26 where Jesus, concluding the Sermon, also used "my"). The phrase "your heavenly Father" is used at 5:47; 6:26, 32. The center of the Sermon uses "your Father" (6:4, 6 *bis*, 8, 18 *bis*).

The theme of God's holiness is taught in 5:33-37 (not swearing) and 7:22-23 (miracles in God's name). The kingdom theme of the second petition is mentioned at 5:3, 10, 19, 20.

¹⁶⁵ Hans Dieter Betz, "A Jewish-Christian Cultic Didache in Matt. 6:1-18: Reflections and Questions on the Problem of the Historical Jesus," chap. 4 in Essays on the Sermon on the Mount, tr. L. L. Welborn (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 55-70. Betz however did not believe that Jesus taught the Prayer but that it originated from a Christian-Jewish community, 67.

¹⁶⁶ Günther Bornkamm, "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt," New Testament Studies 24 (1977-78): 419-432.

Doing the will of God apropos of the third petition is broached at 7:12, 24-27. The combination of heaven and earth appears at 5:18, 34-35; 6:19-20. Themes correlative with the fourth petition include 5:6 (blessed are the hungry), 5:45 (rain on the just and unjust); 6:19-21 (abandon earthly treasures and cares), 6:25-34 (do not be anxious about tomorrow); 7:7-11 (ask in prayer for the good gifts [literally, "good things"; cf. Luke 11:13, "good gifts"]). It should be observed that Matt. 6:33 may well represent the theme of the whole Sermon, "But seek first (πρῶτον) his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well." The "first" suggests priority. God's concerns (spiritual matters) take a superior position over man's concerns. This is the very order of the first and second strophes of the Lord's Prayer. Furthermore, Matthew emphasizes the theme of "one day at a time" in the next verse (v. 34; see the contrast between concern about "tomorrow" and "today": αὐριον - ἄρκετὸν τῆ ἡμέρᾳ).

The fifth petition's forgiveness is the concern of 5:7 (blessed are the merciful), 5:21-25 (be reconciled and not angry with one's brother), 5:38-42 (retaliation, giving and sharing), 5:43-48 (perfect love of others [cf. Luke's Sermon at Luke 6:27-36]); 6:14-15 (the one petition that is elaborated upon); 7:1-5 (judge not [cf. Luke 6:37-42]); 7:12 (the "Golden Rule"; par. Luke 6:31). Themes related to the last two petitions are raised in 5:10-12 (persecution), 27-30 (avoiding lust and sin); 7:6 (apostasy), 15-20 (false

prophets and fruits of faith). It may be possible to assign some material differently, but the general lines of correspondence are clear. The Lord's Prayer is not an intrusion but an integral part of the Sermon on the Mount.

Scholars have tried to discover what the organizing principle of the Sermon on the Mount is. Perhaps the most popular and widely accepted solution is the "Pentateuchal theory."¹⁶⁷ This theory originated from the five statements which describe previous sections of material by such similar words as, "Jesus finished these." (7:28-9; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1). Note that these sections alternate between narrative and discourse.¹⁶⁸ One problem with this theory is whether indeed Jesus himself really meant to present himself as a new "law giver" in the style of Moses. For this reason, other organizing principles have been sought for Matthew's Gospel. Jack Kingsbury preferred a tripartite division. His solution was based on the reported statements at 4:17 and 16:21 (ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς), yielding this plan: 1:1-4:16, the person of Jesus; 4:17-16:20, the proclamation of Jesus the Messiah;

¹⁶⁷ Perhaps the best explication and analysis of the "Pentateuchal theory" of B. W. Bacon and this whole approach is in Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, 14-108. His analysis, 108, led to the conclusion, that the "Mosaic theme" could have been developed more fully, but in fact it was not; the effect, then, is to negate that theme.

¹⁶⁸ Franzmann, 174-178.

16:21-28:20, the passion and resurrection.¹⁶⁹ Another organizing effort was that of M. D. Goulder who, following the divisions of Codex A, tried to show that Matthew wrote his Gospel in order to provide his church with a lectionary for public worship.¹⁷⁰ His study, though highly innovative, has not found general acceptance from Biblical scholarship. It is too hypothetical.

What may well be the safest course is to follow the suggestions of W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison who recognized at least five Matthean discourses alternating between discourse and narrative.¹⁷¹ Matthew displays a penchant for using triads, according to Davies, who stated that Matthew was "thinking in triplicate as he composed his first discourse."¹⁷² Davies produced a detailed outline of

¹⁶⁹ See Jack Dean Kingsbury, Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

¹⁷⁰ See M. D. Goulder, The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture (London: SPCK, 1978).

¹⁷¹ W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, ICC, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1988), 62-65.

¹⁷² Ibid., 62. The following schema is based on this concept:

5:3-12 Beatitudes and Addendum (5:13-16)	{Introduction
Note: 5:17-20, The Law	{1.
	{2.
5:21-48 Life {1-4 Alms {5-8 Instruction	{3. [τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν
6:1-18 <u>Cult</u> {5-15 <u>Prayer</u> {9-13 <u>Lord's Prayer</u>	{4. τὸν ἐπιούσιον
6:19-7:12 Life {16-18 Fasting {14-15 Addendum	{5. δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον]
	{6.
Note: 7:12, The Golden Rule	{7.
7:13-23 Warnings and Addendum (7:24-27)	{Conclusion

the Sermon on the Mount showing it to be a well-balanced structure illustrating his theory.¹⁷³ The Sermon is framed chiastically by reference to the "law" of the Old Testament at the beginning (5:17) and the law of the "Golden Rule" at the end (7:12). There are nine Beatitudes (3 times 3) for the people of God at the beginning of the Sermon (5:3-12) which are Gospel pronouncements and three warnings of judgment at the end (7:13-23), with three major themes in *inclusio*: Jesus and the Torah, 5:17-48; the Christian cult, 6:1-18; and social issues, 6:19-7:12. The center section (6:1-18) gives instruction on three themes: almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. The Lord's Prayer is placed at the center of this triad. Going beyond Davies' descriptions, it should be added that the fourth petition enjoys the status of occupying the center of the Prayer, if indeed the Lord's Prayer were constructed according to a septenary division. It would be interesting and intriguing to claim that τὸν

¹⁷³ Ibid., 63. See similar arrangements in Francis Wright Beare, The Gospel According to Matthew (San Francisco: Harper, 1981), 123; Hans Dieter Betz, "Cult-Didache," 63; and Jack Dean Kingsbury, "The Place, Structure, and Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount Within Matthew," Interpretation 41 (1987): 131-43. Kingsbury divided the Sermon on the Mount into five parts (5:3-16; 5:17-45; 6:1-18; 6:19-7:12; 7:13-27) and asserted, 140, "As Jesus takes up the third part of the Sermon on the Mount (6:1-18), he has arrived at its center." He added, 141, "By the same token, the third part itself contains three parts: It treats of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. What is more, at the center of the middle part, on prayer, is the Lord's Prayer. Formally, therefore, the Lord's Prayer can be seen to lie at the very heart of the Sermon on the Mount." He described the Lord's Prayer, 141, as the "centerpiece of the Lord's Prayer." In agreement is Ulrich Luz, Matthew 1-7: A Commentary, tr. Wilhelm C. Linss (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 40, 388, who used the Lord's Prayer as a parade example of chiastic ring composition. For him, the Lord's Prayer was the center of the Sermon on the Mount.

ἐπιούσιον stands at the very center of the Prayer, and therefore that it even occupies a position of centrality in the entire Sermon on the Mount!¹⁷⁴ If that were true, what would be the significance of this central placement of a problematical expression?¹⁷⁵ What can be said with assurance at least, is that this enigmatic word *epiousios* has the appearance of being important and was surely so understood at the time that Jesus taught the Lord's Prayer. The theme "daily" dominates the Prayer, if indeed that is an acceptable translation (which is yet to be investigated in the next chapter). This word, central to the fourth petition and to the entire Sermon on the Mount, establishes the theme in the Lord's Prayer of God's love being regularly channeled to the believer for his daily needs on earth.

Rather than dismissing the Lord's Prayer as an outside intrusion into the Sermon on the Mount, its "axial symmetry" or perfect chiastic arrangement demonstrates that the Sermon is a unified and well-planned discourse constructed formally

¹⁷⁴ This possibility was suggested at fn. 172, above. Hubert Frankemölle, Jahwebund und Kirche Christi (Münster: Aschendorff, 1973), 275, has followed this line of thinking except that he placed the *third* petition in the center of the Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount, with the idea that doing God's will fulfilled the righteousness that is the theme of the Sermon. While the fourth petition seems to be a more appropriate candidate for the center of the Lord's Prayer, Frankemölle did support a noneschatological interpretation!

¹⁷⁵ The way Ernst Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer (New York: Harper, 1965), 26, organized the structure of the Lord's Prayer is commendable. The bread petition was the center; the two "as" petitions (3 and 5) surround the fourth; the first and second are paired together, as also the sixth and seventh, with these initial and final pairs framing the Prayer *in inclusio*. He too placed the fourth petition in the center.

and materially around the Lord's Prayer as its very center.¹⁷⁶ This observation will permit other verses in the Sermon on the Mount to explicate the petitions of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:34b). Further, the accent on the "now-ness" of the Prayer, based on the centrality of the focus on "today" in the fourth petition, is legitimized.

Conclusion

The Sermon on the Mount teaches that Jesus is the Messiah, at whose advent the Old Testament was fulfilled (Matt. 5:17-18; 7:12) and at whose first coming the kingdom of God is forever present for his followers (7:21-28). The basis for righteous living lies in the new relationship which God established through the ministry of Jesus with his

¹⁷⁶ This possibility is strengthened by certain scholars who have recognized common themes between the Lord's Prayer in the center of the Sermon on the Mount and the Beatitudes which form a preamble to the Sermon. For a detailed study between the Beatitudes and Lord's Prayer, see Andreij Kodjak, A Structural Analysis of the Sermon on the Mount (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986), 116. The correspondences highlighting the general unity of the Sermon show the failure of the "Source Document Theory" of comprehending Synoptic relationships. For the destructive nature of such studies, see Alfred M. Perry, "The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount," Journal of Biblical Literature 54 (1935): 114, where he placed the Lord's Prayer in the "scrap-basket," and who hesitatingly assigned it to Streeter's "Q" source; or, C. G. Sheward, "The Lord's Prayer: A Study in Sources," The Expository Times 52 (1940): 119-20. Those who follow the "source theory" differ among themselves as to whether the Lord's Prayer in Matthew or Luke should belong to Q material or to the Evangelists' supposed special M or L material; q.v. Adolf von Harnack, New Testament Studies II: The Sayings of Jesus, the Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke, tr. J. R. Wilkinson (New York: Putnam, 1908), 63-66. The safest course to follow is to simply accept the statements of the canonical Scriptures! This is the gist of a penetrating study by A. M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," in Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 55-88. See also fn. 273, *infra*.

people. Righteous conduct and sincere devotion (almsgiving, prayer, fasting) are indicative of the true believer's personal relationship with the heavenly Father. This filial relationship, incidentally, still continues to be established under the ministry of grace during the present New Testament age. If the Sermon on the Mount served a didactic purpose, then even its section on the Lord's Prayer must be assumed to have served a didactic purpose.

The sentiments contained in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer have become the automatic desires of the new man in whom the spirit of Christ would dwell as Jeremiah prophesied in Jer. 31:31-34. Verse 33b promised: "And I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Jesus extended grace and every blessing to those who stood in a responsive faith relationship with him (cf. the Beatitudes' repetitive "Blessed are . . ."). Christians' conduct and devotion are the fruit of faith (Matt. 7:20). Their willingness to pray points to their new relationship with Jesus the Savior. Faith is first; good works follow. Prayer is a good work, insofar as it is commanded.¹⁷⁷ Discipleship now in time relates to future eschatological events. Those who reject God's activity through Jesus now in time will cause his final judgment to be pronounced against them. A gracious acquittal at the final assize is possible for those

¹⁷⁷ William Frederick Arndt, Christian Prayer (St. Louis: Concordia, 1937), 23, explained that prayer pertains to sanctification, not justification. Of course, as prayer's answers are received, prayer approaches the sacramental conception of God's "giving" attribute.

who place faith in Jesus the Savior. This future eschatological blessing will transpire by virtue of Jesus' first advent in history when he appeared in the world to pay for man's sins by his own death at Calvary. The believer lives in the here and now. Prayer is addressed to God and a hearing is expected according to his promises (Matt. 6:7-8; 7:7-11). God's name is hallowed, his kingdom comes, and his will is done through his followers, and also for his followers' benefit, in anticipation of the final consummation (Matt. 6:33). The Lord's Prayer is a gift given to God's children to pray in the here and now, on this side of eternity, to help them in their passage towards eternity.¹⁷⁸ Engaging in praying the Lord's Prayer has always followed the full knowledge and faith that God is at work in Jesus to accomplish his redemptive purposes for mankind (Matt. 7:21, 23)

Establishing the Text

The two accounts of the Lord's Prayer usually appear in the edited Greek Testaments such as Nestle's (26th ed.) or that of the United Bible Societies (3rd ed.), or newer editions, as follows. The account from Matthew 6 will be presented first and the one in Luke 11 next. The version reported by the "Majority Text" tradition is included with its modifications in parentheses. Versification is indicated, but not any punctuation. Some words appear

¹⁷⁸ For the use of the Lord's Prayer in catechesis, see Günther Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, ed. Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, tr. Percy Scott (London: SCM, 1963), 15-51.

underlined or in italic print for illustrative purposes.

- 9a "Pray then like this:" (Matthew 6:9b-13c) final letter:
- | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|--------|---|
| b | Πάτερ <u>ἡμῶν</u> ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς | ημων | | ς |
| c | ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά <u>σου</u> | σου | | υ |
| 10a | ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία <u>σου</u> | σου | | υ |
| b | γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά <u>σου</u> | σου | | υ |
| c | ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ (τῆς) γῆς | | | |
| 11 | τὸν ἄρτον <u>ἡμῶν</u> τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς <u>ἡμῖν</u> σήμερον | ημων | ημιν | ν |
| 12a | καὶ ἄφες <u>ἡμῖν</u> τὰ ὀφειλήματα <u>ἡμῶν</u> | ημων | ημιν | ν |
| b | ὡς καὶ <u>ἡμεῖς</u> ἀφήκαμεν (ἀφίεμεν) τοῖς ὀφειλέταις <u>ἡμῶν</u> | | ημεις | ν |
| 13a | καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς <u>ἡμᾶς</u> εἰς πειρασμόν | ημας | | ν |
| b | ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι <u>ἡμᾶς</u> ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ | ημας | | υ |
| c | (ὅτι <u>σου</u> ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. | σου | | ς |
| | | | [Ἀμήν) | |
- 2a "When you pray, say:" (Luke 11:2b-4d)
- | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| b | Πάτερ (ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) | | | |
| c | ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου | | | |
| d | ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου | | | |
| e | (γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου | | | |
| f | ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) | | | |
- 3 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν
- | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 4a | καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν | | | |
| b | καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν (ἀφίεμεν) παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν | | | |
| c | καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν | | | |
| d | (ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ) | | | |

Matthean Version

The literary schematization of Matthew's version should

be noted. It appears that at the ends of *stichoi* the Prayer is framed by Greek *sigmas*, *nus*, and *upsilons* in equal numbers. Also pronouns (9 first person plurals!) and prepositional phrases tend to bind the composition together. A thematic progression appears to be developed between the address and the third and fourth petitions (more will be said of this later). The Matthean version, particularly, reveals signs of being a complex literary composition.

Several textual problems accompany a study of the Lord's Prayer. It should be observed that the Codex A, or Alexandrian uncial manuscript, is deficient in the early portion of the Gospel According to St. Matthew and therefore it can offer no textual support.

At Matt. 6:10c, "on earth as it is in heaven," the word for "as" ($\omega\varsigma$) is missing in the western text D* (the first hand), several Old Latin witnesses, Bohairic MSS, Tertullian and Cyprian. Its omission may be a simplification. The effect of the omission, however, is to join heaven and earth together so that the prayer would request God's will to be done everywhere, throughout the universe; obviously this assumes that it is not being obeyed yet even in heaven. Strong manuscript, structural, and theological reasons compel retention of the word for "as." In the same verse the definite article $\tau\eta\varsigma$ modifying "earth" is inserted by D, L, Θ , family 13, and the "Majority Text Tradition" but omitted by the early uncials Aleph, B, W, Z, Δ , family 1, and others. Its presence may be intended to make the phrase conform to

the "in the heaven(s)" of the address (9b) which carries the article, or its absence may be in conformity with the previous phrase of the third petition ("in heaven") which has no article. Its retention or omission does not affect translation.

At verse 12, "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors" (which is a more literal translation than the use of the word "trespasses" in the liturgical English Prayer), Matthew's well-attested aorist verb (12b) has fairly strong support from the first hand of Aleph, B, Z, family 1, the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac, and Gregory of Nyssa. The first person plural first aorist indicative of ἀφίημι which is ἀφίκαμεν conforms to the other aorist verbs in the Matthean Prayer. Translated literally, it would ask for forgiveness "as we have forgiven"; this would imply that God will forgive only after we have forgiven (*do ut des* or *quid pro quo*). However, if the aorist is retained, a better and legitimate translation would be to put the action in the present since the other aorist imperatives in prayer make their requests irrespective of time ("aspect"!). Sensing the need for a present tense, the Majority Tradition, along with the first corrector of Aleph, family 13, the Curetonian Syriac, the *Didache*, and others read ἀφίμεν. The western tradition D, and some others, read a more "koine," alternate present form: ἀφίομεν. The aorist reading at verse 12b is preferable.

The "edited texts" of Matthew's version do not provide

for a conclusion or Amen (13c), based on the witness of the Alexandrian manuscripts (Aleph, B), the Western D, Z (Dublinensis), 1070 (5th cent. Princeton), family 1 (the Lake group), the Latin tradition, and many church fathers. A variety of manuscript attestation occurs for the conclusion with some witnesses providing three-member doxologies, and others with omissions of one or the other of the members, or showing other slight variations, with or without the final Amen. The Majority Tradition gives the conclusion and Amen, as also does the *Didache* (omitting the "kingdom" and "Amen"), which can be dated about A.D. 100.¹⁷⁹ Actually most (quantitatively) manuscripts contain the conclusion and Amen, although many of them are not early. The conclusion is given completely or in part by the uncials K of the 9th cent., L of the 8th cent., W of the 5th cent., Δ of the 9th cent., Θ of the 9th cent., Π of the 9th cent., 0233 of the 8th cent., the 9th cent. miniscules of family 13, part of the African and Italic Latin tradition, Syriac, Sahidic, part of the Boharic, and many more traditions and manuscripts. The "kingdom" is omitted by the African Latin k (4th cent. Bobiensis), the Sahidic, and as already mentioned, the *Didache*. The "power"

¹⁷⁹ Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. Kurt Aland, et alii, 26th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979), 62. Reicke, 153, supposed that the version of the Lord's Prayer presented in *Didache* 8.2 was not directly dependent on a written text of Matthew's Gospel, but approximated the Lord's Prayer already current ca. A.D. 100. If Reicke is correct that the *Didache* is an independent witness of the text of the Lord's Prayer, then the value of the witness of the *Didache* is enhanced. J. A. T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament (London: SCM, 1976), 324, concurs; he proposed the dates A.D. 40-60.

is omitted by the Curetonian Syriac. The "glory" is omitted by k. The 15th cent. 1253 gives: "For yours is the kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit for ever. Amen." The Leningrad 2148 dated A.D. 1337 and African Latin k add ". . . forever and ever" before the Amen.

Carmignac provided a summary of witnesses containing the Matthean conclusion, categorized according to the following helpful scheme.¹⁸⁰

1. It is included in Caesarean or Palestinian manuscripts in the uncials Rossanensis (6th cent.), Beratinus (6th cent.), Koridethi, Campianus, Nanianus (9th cent.), miniscules, and the Ferrar group (family 13).
2. The Antiochian or Byzantine texts include it in early uncials such as W (4/5th cent.) and miniscules.
3. Alexandrian manuscripts include it, although these are later, such as L (8th cent.). The earlier Alexandrian tradition omits it.
4. It is contained in the *Apostolic Constitutions* 3.18.2 and 7.24.1 (ca. 380 or earlier) and in several early versions such as the Gothic,¹⁸¹ Curetonian, Peshitta, Harclean revision, Armenian, Georgic, and Ethiopic.
5. Early fathers attest to the conclusion such as Chrysostom (d. 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum* (ca. 416-427), Isidore of Pelusium (ca. 435).

¹⁸⁰ Carmignac, 321-22. A review of arguments defending or rejecting the conclusion will be reported in Chapter IV, *ad loc.*

¹⁸¹ See Albert S. Cook, "The Evolution of the Lord's Prayer in English," *The American Journal of Philology* 12 (1891): 59-66; the conclusion was included as early as pre-A.D. 380 in Gothic English.

By way of summary the conclusion has stronger textual attestation than usually accorded it in edited Greek texts of the Westcott and Hort tradition. The generally accepted notion is that the conclusion is a liturgical accretion. This idea is given additional support by the wide variety of its wording, and therefore the conclusion is often rejected as being inauthentic. On the other hand, liturgical usage may have contributed to its variety or even omission in some manuscripts. A simplified report of the data indicates that it was generally omitted by the Alexandrian and Latin traditions, but nearly always was included in the Byzantine tradition.

On the basis of its widespread familiarity, its retention in the Majority Text tradition, and its early attestation in the *Didache*, there is ample justification for considering it in conjunction with the traditional text of the Lord's Prayer. If it is authentic, it should be retained; if it is a liturgical addition to the text, it still possesses intrinsic integrity as a prayer suitable with which to conclude the Lord's Prayer. It ought to be appreciated, to say the least. The Jewish prayer, the *Eighteen*, concluded with petitions of thanksgiving. Accordingly, the Lord's Prayer also can conclude with an affirmation that prevents terminating it with the word "evil."

A few more words should be said about the Prayer in the *Didache* (8.2). The Lord's Prayer in the *Didache* is similar to that of Matthew with minor alterations. The word "heaven"

in the address is singular in number. The customary Semitic "heavens" was undoubtedly original, although the plural formation is always translated in the singular. This alteration in the *Didache* may not represent a textual harmonization to accommodate the demands of meaning, so much as a modification in order to create a parallel with the singular "heaven" in the third petition. As already reported, the present tense "as we forgive" is used in the fifth petition. The conclusion consists of two members, "For thine is the power and the glory for ever." There is no final "Amen" although that final word may simply have not been reported in the format in which the *Didache* at 8.2 presents the Lord's Prayer. The Lord's Prayer appears in the *Didache* between chapter 7 on baptism and chapter 9 on the Lord's Supper. Directions are given to pray the Lord's Prayer thrice daily (8.3). Interestingly, this section of the *Didache* contains several doxologies, with a number of variations: 9.2, 3, 4; 10.4, 5. The sequence of words "kingdom, power, and glory" appears at 10.5 in an elaboration on the doxology. In that same chapter (10.5) the seventh petition of the Lord's Prayer is explicated with reference to "evil" (not the "devil") by these words: "deliver it [the church] from all evil (ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ)." This understanding of the word for "evil" in the Lord's Prayer not many decades after it was taught by Jesus is not without significance! In general, the *Didache* supports the Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer with some minor variations, and it provides a conclusion.

Luke's Version

Apparent manuscript assimilation of the Matthean Lord's Prayer to the Lukan version has compounded the problem of ascertaining the correct text of the Lord's Prayer in Luke. In Luke, the Majority Tradition presents a text similar to that of Matthew, but without the conclusion. The edited texts of Luke also omit the full address, giving only "Father," with the third and seventh petitions also being omitted. Most Lukan texts, besides not having a conclusion, also report the verbs in the fourth and the second part of the fifth petitions in the present tense. In the fourth petition, the adverb "today" in Matthew (σήμερον) is replaced by τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν in Luke, meaning "day by day." Thus, in Luke the Prayer provides an interpretation whereby the believer expects to receive God's blessings every day until the end of time. This alteration naturally necessitated a change in the verb to a present tense (δίδου). In the fifth petition, "debts" is changed to the broader "sins" (ἁμαρτίας) but the "debt" stem had to be retained in order to express the notion of forgiving others. No other concise expression was available with which to render the apodosis by using some formation constructed on the word ἁμαρτία. Therefore a present participle was used (ὀφείλοντι), which betrays the presence of the word "debts" in the original protasis. This observation reveals that the original form of the Prayer as

taught by Jesus may have been Semitic (probably Aramaic) and the Evangelists' inspired versions represent orthodox and canonical Greek translations. The beginning words of the protasis in the same petition are reported as καὶ γάρ in Luke instead of ὡς καὶ as in Matthew. Luke's version also intensifies the "we" by adding αὐτοί. In Luke the word παντί is added, yielding the rather awkward wording: "Forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone who is indebted to us." Yet the sentiment is correct and clear, namely, that forgiveness from God is not conditional on man's ability to forgive. Such forgiveness flows simultaneously from the forgiven sinner as he is forgiving to his neighbor.

The fuller address containing the words "our . . . who art in heaven" is omitted in most edited texts owing to its absence in the old uncials Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, the 3rd cent. p75, and a few others. The full address is carried in most other manuscripts, including the Majority Tradition, uncials Alexandrinus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, the Western (Bezae), 5th cent. Freer, Θ, Ψ, family 13, the *Itala*, the Syriac (Curetonian, Peshitta, Harclean revision), Coptic, and others. A variation shows up in the Armenian and L (8th cent. Regius) reading only "our Father." The manuscript weight is in favor of retaining the fuller address, notwithstanding the strength of the witnesses for the shorter address (especially p75). A strong case could be made for either reading though. The problem that is impossible to

solve is whether and to what extent Luke's version in any of the manuscript tradition represents assimilation from Matthew's Prayer. It is possible that the original Prayer taught by Jesus and reported in Luke was shorter; in which case, augmented assimilation from Matthew contributed to manuscript readings which are identical. The possibility of assimilation may have naturally compelled the editors to favor the shorter readings in Luke. On the other hand, it is possible that Jesus' two renditions were very similar and some inexplicable reasons resulted in the transmission of two slightly different versions. Because this may be true, and because of varying manuscript evidence, both versions must be accorded respect. In fact, Luke's version is useful toward interpreting the meaning and emphases of the Matthean Prayer.

Noteworthy variations exist among some manuscripts with regard to the second petition in Luke. The familiar reading, "Thy kingdom come" (ἐλθέτω) is supported by Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, K, L, X, other uncials, including the Byzantine tradition, the Latin tradition, the Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, Georgic, and Origen. Actually, most manuscripts support the reading (albeit with the form ἐλθάτω in Aleph, Ephraemi, p75, et al.). However, the reading "Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us" is given by Marcion (reported via Tertullian), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), Maximus Confessor (d. 662) omitting "upon us," MS 162 (dated A.D. 1153) lacking "upon us," and MS 700 (dated from the 11th cent). In short, Gregory is identical with miniscule 700, and Maximus is

identical with Codex 162. The Western (Bezae D) gives the variation, "May Thy kingdom come upon us." The latter can easily be dismissed on the grounds of slim support and of a reading that has all the appearance of conflation. Marcion's reading cited above, but appearing in place of the first petition before the kingdom petition, is rejected by most scholars because of its weak attestation. However, it will be shown later that scholars are by no means unanimous in rejecting this reading. The antiquity of that reading and its persistence in a few witnesses for a thousand years poses an enigma. This reading possesses the character of a liturgical interpretation that has entered the Prayer. This is made likely in terms of the customary identification of the Prayer with baptism.¹⁸²

While the edited texts usually omit the third Lukan petition following p75, B, L, family 1, the Latin tradition, and others, as well as many church fathers, the following supplies it in whole or in part: Aleph, A, C, D, W, the Majority Tradition, and some others. Within the latter group giving the third petition, some variations occur. Several inferior manuscripts read "May Thy will be done" without the apodosis. The first hand of Sinaiticus reads οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς;

¹⁸² T. M. Taylor, "'Abba, Father' and Baptism," Scottish Journal of Theology 11 (1958): 62-71; Willy Rordorf, "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of Its Liturgical Use in the Early Church," Studia Liturgica 14 (1980-81): 1-19; Dikran Y. Hadidian, "The Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper in the Early Church," Studia Liturgica 15 (1982-83): 132-44; and, James Swetnam, "Hallowed Be Thy Name," Biblica 52 (1971): 556-63.

the third corrector of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, C, D, and others omit τῆς.¹⁸³ It should be added that Tertullian reversed the second and third petition, possibly to serve his own preconceptions.

Marcion's version, which was only dependent on Luke and not on Matthew, changed "our bread" to "your bread" in the fourth petition, which probably reflects a spiritual interpretation of the bread. The Western Text D and just a few other witnesses introduce changes in the fourth petition to conform to Matthew's version. Likewise, in the fifth petition, D assimilates Luke's "sins" to Matthew's "debts" (family 1 gives τὰ ἁμαρτήματα). The first hand of Sinaiticus reads "as also" along with Matthew; D, *Itala*, and part of the Syriac tradition agree, but with the additional pronoun ἡμεῖς. A few manuscripts offer ἀφίμεν instead of ἀφίομεν. For the sixth petition Marcion reads, "Do not permit (ἀφεῖς) us to be led into temptation." The seventh petition is absent in *p75*, the first hand of Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and so forth, but present in many manuscripts: A, C, D, the Majority tradition, and others.

Luke's version is clearly considered to be an improved version in the sense that it more clearly than Matthew's

¹⁸³ Does the fact that τῆς was removed mean that it was more original? Or had it originally been added by assimilation from Matthew? If so, was it original in Matthew? Its presence or absence is, of course, immaterial to the sense, as noted earlier.

delineates the everyday needs of the Christian. It asks for bread daily, and pointedly begs for the forgiveness of "sins" instead of spiritual "debts" on an ongoing basis; the present tense is used in the fourth and second part of the fifth petitions. The Greek expressions τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, αὐτοί, and παντί are very characteristic of Lukan style.¹⁸⁴ Luke's smoother version is generally conceded to reflect an improved style.

In the course of manuscript transmission Luke's version has obviously suffered assimilation and other damage during the course of its transmission. Its textual position is not as secure as that of Matthew. After twenty centuries, it is impossible to judge whether the shorter address, and the omission of the third and seventh petitions are authentic.

That a traditional and common prayer text emerged in the early churches based on Matthew's version suggests the propriety of using the more complete Lord's Prayer of Matthew for liturgical and personal prayer. However, there is no reason to believe that Jesus could not have taught the Prayer in two slightly different forms on two different occasions. No reason exists for not believing that the inspired Evangelist Luke could have chosen to report an abridged version of the Prayer taught by Jesus, preferring only to give its essence. That so many textual variations occur with respect to the Lord's Prayer indicates the extreme value

¹⁸⁴ Plummer, 293. See Chapter IV, fn. 256, for a further note on Luke's adverbial expression "daily."

placed on it in Christian tradition. The assimilation of texts to one another, conforming texts to memorized common versions, deliberate or unintentional alterations to express the meaning better, adaptations to current liturgical needs, and possibly even deliberate abridgment for the sake of protecting a sacred formulation from profanation (although this possibility has not been raised elsewhere in the literature and may not be demonstrable) may have all figured in the final form of Luke's Prayer in the manuscripts. If Jesus himself did not teach variant versions, surely such alterations were made in good faith owing to the honor accorded this Prayer taught by Jesus. The end result is that Luke's Prayer reveals greater diversity. Why two versions and other minor variations appear in the textual transmission is hidden in the secret recesses of divine knowledge and are beyond our ken. Ultimately, any attempt to solve this mystery is conjecture.

Excursus: Luke and the Holy Spirit

That Marcion, according to Tertullian, attested to the possibility that Luke's original form of the Lord's Prayer contained a petition for the Holy Spirit has generated abundant literature. Tertullian first made reference to an alternate reading in Luke implying that Luke transmitted, instead of the second petition, these words reported by Gregory of Nyssa and others: "May thy holy spirit come upon us and cleanse us" (ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ

καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς).¹⁸⁵ Further, Jesus' teaching about the "importunity of prayer" which followed immediately upon the Lukan Lord's Prayer gives warrant for reference to the Holy Spirit. In Luke 11:13, Jesus asked, "If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit (δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον) to those who ask him!" This parallel in Matthew 7:11 simply states that God will give "good things" (δώσει ἀγαθά).

Discussion was kept alive particularly by Adolf von Harnack, who insisted that a few manuscripts preserve the petition allegedly attested by Marcion.¹⁸⁶ Curiously,

¹⁸⁵ Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4.26; PL 2:425. See comments in the previous section apropos textual variations; or Bruce Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1974), 156. This textual variant in the Lukan Lord's Prayer is attested by MSS 162, 700, Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus of Turin, and probably by Marcion (for his reconstructed text, see next footnote). Codex Bezae reads ἁγιασθήτω ὄνομα (sic) σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐλθέτω σου ἡ βασιλεία κτλ. Does the "upon us" belong to the first or the second petition? A further crux, does a trace of the reading in question survive in this "upon us" of Codex Bezae? The whole notion of the Holy Spirit coming upon God's people is an intriguing one. Reference should be made to the *Acts of Thomas* where such allusions are also made; see Edgar Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, tr. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 2:456-57, where this invocation appears at no. 27: "Come, holy name of Christ that is above every name Come, Holy Spirit, and purify their reins and their heart And give them the added seal in the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit"; see also nos. 50 and 144.

¹⁸⁶ Adolf von Harnack, Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott (Berlin: Akademie, 1960 repr.). Harnack maintained that Luke's original Prayer was leaner until later when many manuscripts assimilated Matthew's Prayer. The Matthean additions were made to Jesus' short

however, it appears that in Marcion's Gospel this sentence took the place of the entire first strophe instead of the second petition as in other witnesses. It appears that the majority of scholars reject this reading, seeing in it merely an adaptation for use in baptismal liturgies.¹⁸⁷ Yet, the reading does reflect typical Lukan motifs.¹⁸⁸

simple prayer by Jewish Christian congregations later, making the shorter personal prayer in Luke suitable for corporate use. His proposal for reconstructing the original Lukan Prayer is available in "2. Der ursprüngliche Text des Vater-Unsers und seine älteste Geschichte," in Erforschtes und Erlebtes (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1923), 28; and, New Testament Studies II: The Sayings of Jesus, the Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke, tr. J. R. Wilkinson (New York: Putnam, 1908), 63-64. His proposal: "Father, May thy holy Spirit come over us and cleanse us, Thy kingdom come (?), Our bread for the coming day give us today, And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone who is indebted to us, and lead us not into temptation." J. Delobel, "The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition: A Critique of Recent Theories and Their View on Marcion's Role," in The New Testament in Early Christianity (Louvain: University Press, 1989), 297, takes issue with Tertullian's statement; he claimed that upon close analysis, Marcion's "Spirit petition" indeed replaced the first, not second petition. Yet it is impossible to restore Marcion's text with confidence. Delobel doubts that Marcion's emendations in any way later appreciably effected the Lukan recension by making it a shorter prayer than it was originally. For more, see Dobschütz, 295-97. Notably, Hermann Freiherr von Soden, "Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers," Die Christliche Welt 18 (March 3 1904): col. 218-24, suggested that this petition originated with John the Baptizer.

¹⁸⁷ So Metzger, A Textual Commentary, 156. Gerhard von Schneider, "Die Bitte um das Kommen des Geistes im lukanischen Vaterunser (Lk 11,2 v.1.)," in Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments, ed. Wolfgang Schrage, Heinrich Greeven FS (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 358, provided a comprehensive list of those rejecting the variant reading.

¹⁸⁸ For this reason, Robert Leaney, in agreement with Harnack, defended its originality, "The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer (LK xi 2-4)," Novum Testamentum 1 (1956): 103-111. He added that it was fitting for use at the baptism of new converts, and agreed that the "white stone" of Rev. 2:17 might be the Lord's Prayer being passed on to catechumens. Gerhard Schneider thought that the "Spirit petition" was very early, but that it was not originally in the Lukan Lord's Prayer, 371.

The coming of the Spirit as a promise and expectation of the Messianic age can be seen in Num. 11:29; Ezek. 36:25-27; 37:14; 39:29; Is. 32:15; 44:3; Joel 3:1. For example, Ezek. 37:14 promises, "And I will put my Spirit within you, and you will live." New life was related to the Messianic hope: "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). Repentance was seen as necessary preparation in order to partake of Messianic blessings (Is. 59:20). The Messiah was expected to appear as an Elijah *redidivus*: "Behold, I will send Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes" (Mal. 4:5 [Heb. 3:23]). The use of water was often the method of showing repentance in the Old Testament. In Ex. 19:10, God told Moses, "Go to the people and consecrate them today and tomorrow ($\gamma \pi \eta \iota \cdot \mu \iota \nu \bar{\nu}$), and let them wash their garments." 1 Sam. 7:6 also connects water with repentance. When Samuel gathered the Israelites at Mizpah, they poured water out before the Lord, fasted, and confessed their sins. John the Baptizer appeared in the wilderness preaching baptism for the repentance of sins (Matt. 3:6, 11; Mark 1:4, 8; Luke 3:3, 8; John 1:33). The connection between new life and water is made in Ezek. 36:25-27:

I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you And I will put my spirit within you.

Among intertestamental writings, *Sibylline Oracle* 4.40 warned that the godless would be cast into everlasting fire,

but the godly would remain on productive firm ground where "God would give them Spirit and life and also grace."¹⁸⁹

During Jesus' public ministry, he proclaimed that the resurrection and new life were marks of the coming of the kingdom to this world.¹⁹⁰ Mark 9:1 reports, "The kingdom of God has come with power" (cf. Matt. 16:28; Luke 9:27). Jesus described his coming to the disciples of John this way: "The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them" (Matt. 11:5; cf. Luke 4:18-19; 7:22). The Christology of John 5:21 is also apropos: "For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will." John 11:25 also reports Jesus' claim, "I am the resurrection and the life."¹⁹¹ John 3:5 clearly connects water baptism and the conferring of the Holy Spirit.

In view of the above expectations and acknowledging that such Messianic hopes would center in Jesus the Messiah,

¹⁸⁹ Quotation from Rudolf Freudenberger, "Zum Text der zweiten Vaterunserbitte," New Testament Studies 15 (1968-69): 429.

¹⁹⁰ James D. G. Dunn, "Spirit and Kingdom," The Expository Times 82 (1970-71): 36-40; Heinrich Greeven, Gebet und Eschatologie im Neuen Testament, in Neutestamentliche Forschungen, Dritte Reihe, no. 1 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1931), 86; Geoffrey W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," in Studies in the Gospel: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 168-71.

¹⁹¹ G. Klein, "Die ursprüngliche Gestalt," 43, pointed out that in the *Kaddish* for mourning, the prayer for the sanctifying of God's name and the coming of the kingdom is followed by the hope of resurrection to life.

several writers have suggested that the petition in the Lord's Prayer for God's Spirit to come for cleansing, maintained by Marcion and a few other witnesses, reflects a prayer stemming from John the Baptizer.¹⁹² This connection surfaces at Luke 11:1, "One of his disciples said to him, 'Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples.'" Further, according to these proponents, John's prayer may have been based in a rudimentary way on the following verses from chapter 36 of Ezekiel:¹⁹³

- 23 - first petition (God's name vindicated)
- 24 - second petition (gathering from nations)
- 25-27 - petition for cleansing through the spirit
- 28 - third petition (you will be my people)
- 29-30 - fourth petition (fruit and abundance)
- 29 - fifth petition (deliverance from uncleanness)
- 31 - sixth petition (deliverance from evil ways)

G. Klein demonstrated that the original petition for the Holy Spirit in John the Baptist's prayer could have originated

¹⁹² Klein, 44; James Keith Elliott, "Did the Lord's Prayer Originate with John the Baptist?" Theologische Zeitschrift 29 (1973): 215; see Dobschütz and von Soden, fn. 186, *supra*.

¹⁹³ This data is gleaned from Klein, 45-46; note that his 6th and 7th petitions were combined. For other possible Old Testament parallels see Cyster, "Exodus," *op. cit.*; Carl Umhau Wolf, "Daniel and the Lord's Prayer: A Synthesis of the Theology of the Book of Daniel," Interpretation 15 (1961): 398-410; and, Evans, "Central Section," *op. cit.*, 43, who draws parallels between Luke 11:1-13 and Deut. 8. Cf. also Johannes Herrmann, "Der alttestamentliche Urgrund des Vaterunsers," in Festschrift Otto Procksch (Leipzig: Deichert and Hinrichs, 1934), 71-98.

from Ezekiel 36. He concluded that both John's and Jesus' prayers came from the same roots.¹⁹⁴ Klein contended that if Jesus adapted the prayer from John, his modification consisted mainly in removing John's reference to the Holy Spirit, since the Spirit was active in and through Jesus himself at that particular time of history. That petition, remembered by some later, may have survived and may have easily been reintroduced into the Lord's Prayer later when used in connection with baptism.

Harnack conjectured that for Marcion, the phrase was more suitable for reintroduction in place of the first petition of the Lord's Prayer which otherwise might appear too prone to endorse the Old Testament name "Jehovah." Marcion was adverse to "Jewish elements" and, as is well known, purged and exterminated such. Klein also believed this alteration and the emphasis on the Holy Spirit and water baptism accounts for the change in the text of Luke 11:13 to

¹⁹⁴ Klein, 46: "Sie besagt nichts anderes, als daß die beiden Gebete einen Wurzel entstammen." Klein's analysis is brilliant; but, could not Ezekiel 36 have directly informed Jesus' own instruction on prayer instead of serving as a model which had been channeled through John the Baptizer? It should be noted that Luke's version of the Prayer corresponds more closely than the Matthean to the themes covered in Ezekiel 36. The form of the Lord's Prayer that Luke reports may have more closely resembled the Baptizer's prayer than the Matthean Prayer, which may have more faithfully reported Jesus' own mature finishing touches. Matthew has obviously included material in the Sermon on the Mount from other occasions. The Sermon of Matthew 5-7 is not completely chronological. In the context of Jesus' teachings in Transjordan and at Luke 9:51; 11:1; 13:22; 17:11, and the promiximity of John's ministry to Jordan (Luke 3:3), it is fair to conclude the possibility that Jesus' brief instruction in Luke 11:1-4 was patterned closely after the prayers of John the Baptizer. Bo Reicke, Roots, 121, 125, 170-74, believed that Luke's source of information of the didactic material in his "travel narrative" (Luke 9:51-18:14) was largely supplied by connections with Hellenistic "traditionists" in Jerusalem, originally from Transjordan,

"Spirit" instead of the "good things" in the parallel in Matt. 7:11.¹⁹⁵ The theology of the Holy Spirit at baptism may have sustained this alternate reading for centuries. Ernst von Dobschütz concluded, probably correctly, that the petition for the Holy Spirit would have been appropriate for the Lukan Lord's Prayer, but it is not authentic:

It is obvious that the petition for the Spirit fits in well here; but the argument can be turned in the opposite direction, for it may be said that the very fact that the Holy Spirit is so often mentioned in these chapters [of Luke] led someone to introduce this petition here.¹⁹⁶

What Klein succeeded in demonstrating is that the petition was introduced into some texts of Luke very early, but it was not part of the original Prayer taught by Jesus as Marcion maintained. The altered Lukan text was appreciated in limited circles, surfacing occasionally in manuscripts such as that of Gregory of Nyssa. Whether the "Spirit petition" may have originated, at least in germ, with John

such as Philip, who had contacts in this area (Acts 8:6, 40). In sum, Ezekiel 36 is more congenial to Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer than to Matthew's.

¹⁹⁵ Klein, 47, fn. 2. Dunn, 38, asserted that the Spirit and the kingdom are related ("the presence of the Spirit is the 'already' of the Kingdom"). Yet, the Spirit is present in Jesus, since Pentecost had not yet come. Jesus did not want to give the impression that the Spirit was already subordinate to him, nor to be thought of as the instrument of Jesus' power; hence, Luke 11:20 preferred to report that Jesus cast out demons by the "finger of God" rather than by the "Spirit of God" as in the parallel at Matt. 12:28. Dobschütz, 298, in agreement with von Soden rejected the variant reading under question for Luke on this basis, that it does not conform to Luke's "style of diction and thought." He claimed that Luke never used the word "cleansing" to refer to inner cleansing of the Spirit, but only to outward Levitical cleanness.

¹⁹⁶ Dobschütz, 298.

the Baptizer will never be known. Yet, this variant reading conforms to mainstream emphases in the New Testament and draws attention to the propriety of interpreting the Lord's Prayer noneschatologically, adapting it and applying it for congregational use especially in the context of baptism, but also for the service of holy communion.¹⁹⁷ Indeed, the office and work of the Holy Spirit is especially amenable to the concerns of the first strophe.

Excursus: The Majority Text Tradition

Most modern critical editions of the Greek Testament have at their base the primary presuppositions and divisions of manuscript families introduced by the "Westcott and Hort" Tradition.¹⁹⁸ The text of the UBS, for example, is close to that of the old uncial Codex Vaticanus.¹⁹⁹ The antiquity of this text-type can be pushed back as far as the second

¹⁹⁷ Klein, 49: "Aber auch die drei resp. vier letzten sind für die Gegenwart, and zwar für die allernächste, berechnet. Jesus bittet um das nötige Brot für heute. Um sich würdig für das Gottesreich vorzubereiten, muß man seinen Schuldnern bereits vergeben haben. Auch das letzte Hindernis, der 'böse Trieb', muß vorerst beseitigt sein. Und das wird und muß geschehen; denn Gott gehört die Kraft und Herrlichkeit in Ewigkeit." Freudenberger, 426, 432, agreed that this variant was not original, but circulated from early on, proper for baptismal usage, and reflective of the present-day, noneschatological emphasis of the Lord's Prayer according to Luke.

¹⁹⁸ Jay Eldon Epp, "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism," Journal of Biblical Literature 93 (1973): 389 stated: "The Nestle-Aland . . . editions form a group fairly close to Westcott-Hort in textual character."

¹⁹⁹ This claim is made in The Greek New Testament, ed. Kurt Aland, et al. (London: United Bible Societies, 1966), p. V.

century on the support of the discovery of the 3rd cent. Bodmer Papyrus, p75. The 4th cent. Vaticanus "B" has been considered the most "neutral" text, presumed to be uninfluenced by Western, Alexandrian, and Byzantine readings. On the other hand, however, Herman C. Hoskier attempted to show that Vaticanus is marked by conflations and revisions.²⁰⁰ The "edited" Greek Testaments have been unanimous in rejecting the received text tradition, variously called the Lucian, the Antiochian, the Byzantine, the Constantinian, the Syrian, the Imperial, the Koine, the Received Text, or the Majority Text. The usual assumption made of edited texts in the Westcott and Hort tradition is that so-called neutral or Alexandrian uncial types, primarily Sinaiticus (Aleph) and Vaticanus (B), were in competition with the Western text-types and either of these had greater claim to originality than the Byzantine type which was viewed as an ecclesiastical text. On the other hand, supporters of the Byzantine text-type believe that this type owes its existence to a conservative approach described by Harry Sturz:

The Byzantine text may be unedited in the Westcott and Hort sense because its users appear conservative in their view of Scripture as compared with some of those who used the Alexandrian and Western texts The attitude of the Antiochians toward Scripture seems to suggest that they were jealous in the care of it. It will be remembered that the school of Antioch was the school of "literal" interpretation, while the school in Alexandria championed the allegorical method. This is not to imply that the Alexandrian Christians had a low opinion of Scripture. Antioch, however, had a much narrower and more conservative view of the canon than

²⁰⁰ H. C. Hoskier, Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment (London: Quaritch, 1914), 1-13.

Alexandria.²⁰¹

Sturz defended the Byzantine text type as a reliable independent text-type.²⁰² In fact, there appears to be a minor resurgence today toward reassessing and appreciating the Majority Text tradition.²⁰³

One leading proponent advocating a return to the Majority Text for equal consideration with other text families is Zane C. Hodges. He dismissed several arguments frequently cited against the inferior status of the Majority Text.²⁰⁴ For example, critics often wrongly assume that the oldest manuscripts do not support the Majority Text. He demonstrated that the Majority Text can in fact present more superior readings and that numerous agreements against the Majority Text may be simply the reproduction of readings of a single ancient copy "the extent of whose errors and revision we do not know."²⁰⁵ Hodges, for example, cited John 5:2. The reading "Bethesda" is found in a copper scroll (Qumran Cave III), with the Aramaic counterpart "Bethzatha"; hence the Bethsaida of p66, p75, and Vaticanus is spurious. The

²⁰¹ Harry A. Sturz, The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism (New York: Nelson, 1984), 115.

²⁰² Ibid., 128.

²⁰³ Epp, 405; Sturz, 56.

²⁰⁴ Zane C. Hodges, "The Greek Text of the King James Version," in Which Bible?, ed. David Otis Fuller (Grand Rapids: International, 1970), 27.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 31.

Greek "Bethesda" of the Majority Text is the authentic reading. Hodges also believed that critics tend to reject the Majority Text on grounds that it is a revised text.²⁰⁶ However, critics have been unable to explain satisfactorily the origin, dominance, and relative uniformity of the Majority Text tradition derided as being a revision.²⁰⁷

With specific reference to the Lord's Prayer, John Burgon wrote extensively near the end of the nineteenth century, objecting to the Westcott-Hort theory of dependence primarily on Alexandrian witnesses, especially Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.²⁰⁸ Burgon drew attention to the disagreements among these uncials in the Lukan Lord's Prayer and concluded that the manuscript evidence for a shortened prayer in Luke was not unanimous.²⁰⁹ For example, Codex B omits the third petition but Aleph retains it, adding "so" before "also," but along with A, C, and D, omitting the article τῆς. Aleph and D write δός for δίδου in the fourth petition. In the fifth petition D gives ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς from Matthew, instead of καὶ γὰρ αὐτοί. Aleph borrows from both to read "ὡς καὶ αὐτοί" and B

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ For more information on this topic, see James A. Borland, "Re-Examining New Testament Textual-Critical Principles and Practices Used to Negate Inerrancy," in The King James Version Defended, ed. Edward F. Hills (Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984), 46-190.

²⁰⁸ John William Burgon, The Revision Revised (London: Murray, 1883), 33.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 34-35.

omits the seventh petition, disagreeing with A, C, and D. Burgon reached this conclusion about the uncials: "They are never able to agree among themselves as to any single variant reading."²¹⁰ Burgon presented one of the strongest defenses for the retention of the conclusion at Matt. 6:13c.²¹¹ He blamed its loss on liturgical influence.²¹² Some form of this conclusion is included in the Peshitta, Old Latin versions (k, f, g¹, q,), Sy^C, Sahidic, Gothic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgic, Slavonic, Harclean, Palestinian, Arabic, Persian, *Didache* (with variations), *Apostolic Constitutions* (3.18-7.25 with variations), Ambrose (*De Sacr.* 6.5.24), Caesarius (*Dial.* 1.29), Chrysostom (*passim*), and other patristic Fathers, in most Greek manuscripts including Φ (fifth cent.) and Σ (6th cent.). On the other hand, the conclusion is deficient in only four uncials (Aleph, B, D, Z), several cursives, and the Latin tradition except in the four Old Latin versions named above.²¹³ Burgon asked whether it is credible that so many witnesses, and some of them earlier than the fourth century, could have been "corrupted" by the superfluous addition of the doxology. According to

²¹⁰ Ibid., 35.

²¹¹ Ibid., The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels (London: Bell, 1896).

²¹² Contra most authorities who blame its presence in Matthew on liturgical influence!

²¹³ Ibid., 81-82. Latin k is particularly significant.

Burgon, the assumption that the conclusion represented an interpolation from the liturgy is improper. He pointed out that in the Greek churches, the priest recites the doxology after the choir has said the seventh petition. Consequently copyists mistakenly omitted the doxology, having failed to understand it to have been part of the original Lord's Prayer.²¹⁴ He pointed out that the wording of the doxology varies considerably in Eastern liturgies; hence, it could not result in the unvarying formula of Matt. 6:13c.²¹⁵ The doxology must have been omitted under liturgical influence, owing to the fact that the choir broke off after the seventh petition. He reasons thus:

They never pronounced the doxology. The doxology must for that reason have been omitted by the critical owner of the archetypal copy of St. Matthew from which nine extant Evangelia, Origen, and the Old Latin version originally derived their text. This is the sum of the matter. There can be no simpler solution of the alleged difficulty. That Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose recognize no more of the Lord's Prayer than they found in their Latin copies, cannot create surprise.²¹⁶

The conversation has continued. More recently, Jakob Van Bruggen provided evidence supporting the retention of the conclusion: "Little weight is usually attached to the support of the Dublin codex (Z), Family 1 and others."²¹⁷

²¹⁴ Ibid., 83.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 84. Burgon intended to say that once the conclusion, originally a constant Biblical formula, was separated from the corpus of the Prayer, liturgical variations were introduced.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 85.

²¹⁷ Quoted in Andrew J. Bandstra, "The Original Form of the Lord's Prayer," Calvin Theological Journal 16 (1981): 19-20.

Further, Aleph and B are culpable of philological reworkings.²¹⁸ Van Bruggen claimed a strong case for the retention of the conclusion. Andrew Bandstra replied in an exchange with Van Bruggen in a series of articles in which a debate was conducted in the *Calvin Theological Journal*.²¹⁹ Bandstra's reponse, representing current "critical" views, stated that the case for omitting the doxology deserved consideration and support on account of the wide textual diversity of the omission, that is, Alexandrian (Aleph, B), Western (D), the Old Latin, and pre-Caesarian (family 1) manuscripts, and also from the testimony of many Fathers.

The case is surely not closed. Weighty arguments exist both for the retention or for the omission of the conclusion in Matthew's Prayer. The fact that one whole family of manuscripts usually includes it, the Antiochian or Majority Text tradition, means that it should at least be given serious consideration.

Van Bruggen also commented about the Lukan Lord's Prayer in general. He lent his support in favor of the longer Lukan form given in the Byzantine texts.²²⁰ Those who

²¹⁸ Ibid., 20.

²¹⁹ This conversation progressed as follows: **1979**: Jakob Van Bruggen, *Abba, Vader! Tekst en toonhoogte van het Onze Vader in De biddende Kerk*, ed. C. Trimp (Gronigen: De Vuurbaak, 1979), 9-42; **1981**: Andrew J. Bandstra, "The Original Form of the Lord's Prayer" op. cit., 15-32; **1982**: Jakob van Bruggen, "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism," *Calvin Theological Journal* 17 (1982): 78-87; **1982**: Bandstra, "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism: A Response," op. cit., 88-97.

²²⁰ In Bandstra, "The Original Form," 27.

criticize this view point to the probability that the Lukan form is longer in the Majority Text tradition owing to assimilation or borrowing from Matthew. However, he pointed out that blind assimilation would not have preserved the unique Lukan particularities in the fourth and fifth petitions, and the doxology would surely have been added. Van Bruggen rejected the notion of assimilation of Matthew to Luke. For him, the longer Lukan version in the Majority Text tradition was as original as Matthew's.

It appears that Van Bruggen's argument could be reversed. That Luke's particular shorter version was preserved in the Alexandrian, Western, Caesarian, and Old Latin traditions, shows that an original short form of the Lukan Prayer resisted, and survived intact, tendencies toward assimilation to Matthew in several manuscript traditions. This objection to Van Bruggen is strengthened by the fact that Luke's Prayer does not uniformly report a conclusion in most manuscript traditions.

In sum, any study and interpretation of the Lord's Prayer in all fairness must reckon with all textual traditions, including the valor of the Majority Text tradition. In fact, the latter deserves recognition since it is the basis for the common form of the Lord's Prayer prayed by countless Christians.

Excursus: Language

The Lord's Prayer is given in the New Testament in two forms, Matthew's and Luke's. Of course, the language of the

New Testament canon is Greek. Ultimately, the Greek versions are the basis for exegesis and interpretation of the Prayer. Yet, attempts at retroversion of the Lord's Prayer into Aramaic or Hebrew are enlightening and references to these and other early versions often help to understand the meaning of the Greek words. An understanding of possible patterns of structure also helps to accurately translate the Lord's Prayer into Hebrew or Aramaic.²²¹

Obviously, several languages were employed in and about the Levant in the first century A.D.²²² Two questions are raised by an investigation into the use of languages in the Holy Land at the time of Christ and soon thereafter: What language did Jesus speak, and, in what language was the Lord's Prayer originally known? A formidable literature has developed on this topic making valuable contributions toward improved understanding of the multilingual milieu of first century A.D. Palestine (the "then-ness"). The second of the above questions is within the scope of this study.

Three possibilities exist regarding the language of the original Lord's Prayer. It may have been originally Greek. If so, the Matthean and Lukan forms represent essentially what Jesus taught. Secondly, the original Lord's Prayer may have been taught by Jesus in an Aramaic dialect. If so, then

²²¹ James Barr, "Which Language Did Jesus Speak? - Some Remarks of a Semitist," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 53 (1970-71): 5.

²²² See the superb summary by Joseph Fitzmeyer, "The Language of Palestine in the First Century A.D.," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1970): 510-31.

the Evangelists' versions represent either their inspired translations, or that of standard current versions in familiar use. Thirdly, if the original Prayer was in Hebrew, the Evangelists likewise provide translations. In any case, it must not be forgotten that exegesis must be based primarily on the extant Greek canonical Scriptures.

The assertion that the Greek forms of the Lord's Prayer were original has had some adherents. Alexander Roberts published a study in 1888 stressing the priority and prevalence of Greek in Palestine. His thesis is stated:

My hypothesis, then, is simply this: The Lord Jesus Christ spoke in Greek, and the evangelists independently narrated His actions and reported His discourses in the same language which He had Himself employed.²²³

Roberts believed that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Greek. It was not a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original. In fact, all other early versions (*viz.*, the *Gospel According to the Hebrews*, Syriac Matthew) are based on, and later than, the Greek Matthew.²²⁴ None of them were the original Matthew. He demonstrated that Greek had become the *lingua franca* in the Levant, citing, for example, Josephus, who claimed that even slaves understood Greek and he pointed out that on the first Pentecost inhabitants both of Jerusalem and of Galilee understood Greek.²²⁵ When the remark was made in several places that the Hebrew language

²²³ Alexander Roberts, Greek: The Language of Christ and His Apostles (London: Longmans & Green, 1888), 400.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 381.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 388.

was used (see Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14), this was because the Jews had expected to be addressed ordinarily in Greek.²²⁶

Roberts presented his theme in a compelling way:

Their [holy writers'] inspiration consisted not, as has been thought, in being enabled to give perfect translations, either of discourses delivered, or of documents written in the Hebrew language, but in being led, under divine guidance, to transfer to paper, for the benefit of all coming ages, those words of the Great Teacher which they had heard from His own lips in the Greek language.²²⁷

Roberts' is an old work, but very compelling and worthy of further study. Yet it appears idiosyncratic against the more common assumption that Jesus spoke a Semitic vernacular.

Another representative of the view that Jesus spoke Greek is George Smith. He made this plea in his presentation:

It is fashionable, at present, to assume that our Lord spoke Aramaic, and only Aramaic. But one may ask, Is this more than an assumption? Is it based on ascertained facts? It must be acknowledged that it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the facts in detail. But it is nevertheless true that much is known which makes it highly probable that Greek was commonly used in Palestine in the first century, and there were certain facts which render it more than probable that our Lord Himself spoke it naturally and frequently, if not habitually.²²⁸

He cited the early education of Jesus in a milieu where Greek was common, and where the extent of Hellenization extended as

²²⁶ Ibid., 469.

²²⁷ Ibid., 476-77.

²²⁸ George Albert Smith, "Did Our Lord Speak Greek?" in The Groundwork of the Gospels, Collected papers by Robert Oswald Taylor (Oxford: Blackwell, 1946), 91.

far as Egypt, proved by papyral discoveries.²²⁹ He appealed to the extensive knowledge of the Septuagint and many Greek inscriptions. He even showed that Semitic writings would have had limited use. He based this observation on Eusebius' reference to the fact that Matthew wrote in Hebrew and "every one translated as he was able."²³⁰

Since only the Greek versions of the Prayer are known, scholars have attempted retranslating the Lord's Prayer from Greek into Hebrew or Aramaic either to assist comprehension or to attempt discovering the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus.²³¹

In response to nebulous efforts at retroversion from the Greek into Hebrew or Aramaic, Donald Riddle of the University of Chicago has also challenged the hypothesis of Semitic sources. He claimed that Bible scholars should be satisfied with the texts as given (that is, the Greek Testament). In short he warned against casting doubt on the extant Greek texts, especially if one lacks competence, when "the exponents of the theory [of Semitic originals] assume that Greek should be tested by the reconstructed Semitic originals which they exhibit."²³² Yet the fact remains that competent scholars have attempted Semitic reconstructions of

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Ibid., 93.

²³¹ Robert H. Gundry, "The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine," Journal of Biblical Literature 83 (1964): 408, suggested that scholars content themselves with the Greek for Jesus' very words.

²³² Donald W. Riddle, "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek," Journal of Biblical Literature 51 (1932): 27.

the Lord's Prayer.

The predominant theory has been that Jesus taught in Aramaic. This view probably dominated the field because of the weight lent to it by Gustaf Dalman.²³³ The "Aramaic theory" claims that Hebrew had ceased to be used by the average people of the time of Christ. The Hebrew of the *Mishnah* was only a scholarly language and Old Testament Hebrew was viewed as being "obsolete." Dalman pointed out that in the synagogue the prayers and the *Shema* could be recited in any language.²³⁴ Dalman showed that the introductory formula of the *Kaddish* was of Palestinian origin.²³⁵ He cited the Christian use of the Aramaic *abba*.²³⁶ From all this data he concluded that the Lord's Prayer must have been originally spoken in Aramaic.²³⁷

C. F. Burney, in *The Poetry of our Lord*, drew attention to features in sayings of Jesus that reflected Semitic language, especially parallelism, rhythmic structure, and

²³³ Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels, tr. Paul G. Levertoff (New York: Macmillan, 1929). Jeremias, Theology, 7, 13, also strongly defended Aramaic as Jesus' mother tongue.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

even rhyme.²³⁸ Charles C. Torrey also elaborated on the value of understanding the Aramaic background of the Gospels.²³⁹ Torrey maintained that the Gospels first appeared in "Western Aramaic" dress and later were translated.²⁴⁰ A corollary to his hypothesis was that all four Gospels are to be dated early during the time that a need for Aramaic Gospels still existed.²⁴¹ One useful comment will be reported here: Torrey demonstrated that the verb in the sixth petition in Aramaic is *al* (in Hebrew *bo*) which is used in the causative stem *afel* meaning to "fail, succumb, yield" and which is not done justice in Greek translation.²⁴² Torrey inadequately explained by whom the translation into Greek might have been made. Cogent reasons demand cautious acceptance of his work; much of what he said appears philologically conjectural.

Some ten years later, Matthew Black presented his studies on the Aramaic background for the Gospels. He preferred a more positive approach than his predecessors such as Torrey had taken; the following quotation is helpful:

²³⁸ C. F. Burney, The Poetry of Our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925).

²³⁹ Charles C. Torrey, Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence (New York: Harper, 1936).

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 249, 253.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 255.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, 292. See Chap. IV, fn. 369, *infra*.

With the exception of a few outstanding examples, the assumption of mistranslation of an original Aramaic, has not proved the most successful line of approach to the Aramaic problems of the Gospels. From the very nature of such evidence the element of conjecture may be reduced but cannot be eliminated.²⁴³

A third candidate for the original words of Jesus and of the original Lord's Prayer is Hebrew. The case for Hebrew was "reopened" by the Scandinavian Semitist Harris Birkeland in 1954.²⁴⁴ His proposal has gained no small following. Birkeland maintained that Jesus spoke Hebrew. The Greek Gospels are translations of Hebrew. On exception, certain Aramaic words were used and those were not translated; they remained in the Aramaic idiom. To clinch the case, the Dead Sea discoveries have revealed a quantity of material in classical and Mishnaic Hebrew in common use. Documents from the Dead Sea discoveries have "convinced many that Hebrew was still alive as a language in some kind of general use in the time of Jesus."²⁴⁵ The rise of Aramaic Targums of the Hebrew Bible do not prove that Hebrew had become obsolete, according to one well-known scholar, James Barr. Further, Aramaic Targums functioned, not to replace Hebrew Scripture, except in isolated cases such as the Elephantine papyri may have

²⁴³ Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 143. Note that the third edition took into consideration many findings from the Dead Sea discoveries.

²⁴⁴ Harris Birkeland, "The Language of Jesus," in Avhandlingar utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse. 1954, no. 1 (Oslo: Jacob Kyrwad, 1954). An original Hebrew has historically had its proponents; e.g., Margoliouth, 2.

²⁴⁵ Barr, "Semitist," 20.

done, but to interpret the Hebrew Bible paraphrastically. Barr maintained that ". . . we have to distinguish between . . . difficulty in understanding the Old Testament . . . and complete ignorance of Hebrew."²⁴⁶ Peshar commentary existed, but not modernizations of the actual text.²⁴⁷ Barr showed that even *abba* may better be understood as Hebrew than Aramaic. Those who believe *abba* is Aramaic take the final *-a* in a sense similar to the definite article and view the word *abba* as "status emphaticus." But, asked Barr, is this the best way to make a vocative? Barr preferred to say that the final *-a* is a proto-Semitic vocative occurring in cases where "my" is implied; thus, it is the equivalent of the first singular "my father" and *abba* does not always necessarily represent a vocative case, nor need it be an Aramaic word.²⁴⁸

Others have carried the task farther.²⁴⁹ Some have tried to see certain words in the New Testament usually perceived as Aramaic as actually being Hebrew. Isaac Rabinowitz maintained, for example, that *ephphatha* was not

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 25.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ Barr, "Semitist," 16. See further Chap. IV, sec. "Father," *infra*.

²⁴⁹ See J. A. Emerton, "MARANATHA and EPHPHATHA," The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 18 (1967): 427-31; Jehoshua M. Grintz, "Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple," Journal of Biblical Literature 79 (1960): 32-47.

Aramaic but a Hebrew niph'al imperative.²⁵⁰ Rabinowitz attempted to posit a Hebrew *Vorlage* for the Gospels. He cited the characteristic Semitic plural, especially in Matthew (e.g., βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), and the method of reckoning time and dates (cf. Matt. 28:1, Ὅψε δὲ σαββάτων τῆ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, literally, "Late of sabbath in the dawning to the first of sabbaths), and other examples to support the widespread general use of Hebrew in the vernacular of the first century.

The most well-known reasoned defense of the use of Hebrew is by the Qumran scholar Jean Carmignac.²⁵¹ Others have joined in accepting this hypothesis.²⁵² Carmignac's research on the Lord's Prayer assumed, as a corollary, the prevalence of an original Hebrew Lord's Prayer. Like others who defend Hebrew vernacular, his chief support was furnished by data from Qumran that shows that Hebrew had not become obsolete.²⁵³ Carmignac assumed that Matthew wrote his

²⁵⁰ Isaac Rabinowitz, "'Be opened' = 'Ἐφφαθά' (Mark 7,34): Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?" Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 53 (1962): 229-38. See the reply by S. Morag, "'Ἐφφαθά' (Mark VII.34): Certainly Hebrew, Not Aramaic?" Journal of Semitic Studies 17 (1972): 198-202, in which he concluded the word could be either Hebrew or Aramaic.

²⁵¹ Carmignac, Recherches, *in toto*.

²⁵² James Barr, "Semitist."

²⁵³ Carmignac, "Hebrew Translations of the Lord's Prayer: An Historical Survey," in Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor, ed. Gary A. Tuttle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 18-79.

original Gospel in Hebrew, pleading that over thirty different authorities have made this assertion (Papias, Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, *inter alii*).²⁵⁴ These witnesses ought not be lightly dismissed.

In conclusion, from the above observations it appears that since no known Semitic original prototypes of the Lord's Prayer are known, the extant canonical Greek versions are the primary sources for study. The similarities of the Matthean and Lukan forms of the Prayer with each other present a strong case for accepting the Greek texts. If Matthew's, for example, were merely a Greek translation, its wording could have been radically different from that of Luke. A strong case can be made for the claim that Jesus was trilingual and versed in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek. That all four Gospels were written in Greek suggests that the task of the inspired Evangelists consisted in reporting in Greek the words and activities of Jesus even when the original words were not Greek, as undoubtedly was the case with the Lord's Prayer. That Luke and Matthew both were impelled by divine inspiration is assumed. This activity resulted in the canonical Greek Scriptures. The similarities of the two Prayers, especially with regard to the key word *epiousios*,

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 70. Carmignac called attention to the scores of glosses cited in Kurt Aland, Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964), 585, which make reference to a Hebrew Matthew which he understood to be original. The famous quotation of Papias claiming that Matthew wrote Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ is conveniently printed in idem, 531. Carmignac asserted that Matthew composed his Gospel in Hebrew and Luke wrote in Greek while consulting Hebrew documents.

suggest that a common denominator existed between them. That Luke consulted with Matthew's Prayer is possible. That Jesus taught the Lord's Prayer on several occasions with slightly different wording and that two such variations were recorded by the Evangelists Matthew and Luke is very likely. These assumptions explain why the Matthean and Lukan versions provide similar wording.

Hence, in the final analysis, only the extant Greek forms of the Prayer are intended to serve as the basis for translation into other languages, either by retroversion into ancient Hebrew and Aramaic, or by modern translational efforts into current vernacular languages. To attempt basing a study of the Lord's Prayer on dubious and hypothetical efforts at retroversion which in some ways claim similarity to a supposed Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage* is to enter uncertain territory. On the other hand, efforts at retroversion are helpful toward the illumination of the Greek texts, since the latter are probably translations of Semitic originals.²⁵⁵ To what extent, writing under inspiration, Matthew and Luke may have consulted with, and imported into, their autographs standard wording already familiar to early Greek speaking

²⁵⁵ The following have attempted Semitic retroversions of the Lord's Prayer: C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925), 112-13; Jean Carmignac, "Hebrew Translations of the Lord's Prayer: An Historical Survey," in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, ed. Gary A. Tuttle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), #67; in idem, Franz Delitzsch, #64; Joseph Fitzmeyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 901; Pierre Grelot, "L'Arrière-Plan Araméen du 'Pater'," *Revue Biblique* 91 (1984): 555; Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM, 1971), 196, and idem *The Lord's Prayer*, Facet Books, Biblical Series 8 (Philadelphia: Fortress,

Christians and in current use then, such as the Lord's Prayer, is impossible to determine (Luke 1:1-4; John 20:30-31).

Views on the Origin and Forms of the Lord's Prayer

What accounts for two different versions of the Lord's Prayer? Bandstra conveniently lists five possibilities:²⁵⁶

1. The Lord's Prayer was composed by others after Jesus.
2. Jesus gave the Lord's Prayer on two different occasions.
3. Matthew preserved the original words, later adapted by Luke.
4. Luke preserved the original words, later expanded in Matthew.
5. Two forms stemmed from different early communities.

1964), 15; Karl Georg Kuhn, Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser and der Reim, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, no. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950), 32-33; Enno Littmann, "Torreys Buch über die vier Evangelien," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 34 (1935): 29-30; Ernst Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer (New York: Harper, 1965), 27-29; Johannes C. de Moor, "The Reconstruction of the Aramaic Original of the Lord's Prayer," in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament supplement series (Sheffield: University Press, 1988), 415-16; 419-21; Günther Schwarz, "Matthäus VI.9-13/Lukas XI.2-4. Emendation und Rückübersetzung," New Testament Studies 15 (1969): 246; James W. Thirtle, in Carmignac, "Hebrew Translations," #60, or in James W. Thirtle, The Lord's Prayer: Critical and Expository (London: Morgan and Scott, 1915), 212-13; Charles C. Torrey, "The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels," in Studies in the History of Religions presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends (New York: Macmillan, 1912), 309-17; and revised in "A Possible Metrical Original of the Lord's Prayer," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 28 (1914): 314.

Most of these are in Aramaic. Special note should be taken of G. Schwarz whose radical emendation was made to provide "perfect" symmetry; his result: "Father, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done; give us our bread, and forgive us our debts, and deliver us from our temptation" (the sixth and seventh petitions are combined!).

²⁵⁶ Bandstra, "Original Form," 31-35.

One of the most brilliant analyses of the Lord's Prayer representing no. 1 above is that of M. D. Goulder.²⁵⁷

According to him, Matthew composed the Lord's Prayer by using Markan materials relating to prayer, especially from the Garden of Gethsemane (Mark 11:25; 14:36, 38). Luke then borrowed Matthew's Prayer.

Goulder assumed the existence of Mark's Gospel prior to Matthew's and that Luke utilized both predecessors when he wrote his Gospel. He also assumed that Matthew's version displays strong traces of typical Matthean style while Luke's Prayer mirrors Lukan style. Notably, Goulder rejected a *priori* notions of dependence of either Prayer on typical hypothetical "Synoptic sources" such as Q, M, or L.²⁵⁸

According to Goulder, the force of these contradictory proposals is cumulative, and must be fatal to the theory that Jesus composed the prayer."²⁵⁹ Goulder, who accepted the priority of Mark, believed that the nucleus of the Lord's Prayer was given by Jesus in this prayer instruction in Mark 11:25: "And whenever you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against any one; so that your Father also who is in

²⁵⁷ M. D. Goulder, "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer," The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 14 (1963): 32-45.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 33-34. Goulder observed and documented the uncertainty and disagreement relating to the "source theory" despite his claim of Markan priority. He demonstrated that such authorities dominant in that field (Streeter, Creed, Kilpatrick, T. W. Manson) were deficient in explaining the origin of the Lord's Prayer.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 34. While Goulder dismissed the "source theory" he unfortunately also denied that Jesus himself taught the Prayer.

heaven, may forgive you your trespasses (ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῆ ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν).²⁶⁰ Matthew

ingeniously turned the command of Jesus in Mark 11:25 into the Prayer in the Sermon on the Mount.²⁶¹ So far, the first level of the formation of the Lord's Prayer took place this way according to Goulder: "Pray then like this: Our Father who art in heaven (v. 9) . . . and forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors (v. 12)," followed by the summary statement (vv. 14-15). The latter included the notion of reciprocal forgiveness.²⁶² Matthew substituted the familiar word "debts" for sin, which was commonly employed in an Aramaic milieu (cf. Matt. 18:24). Matthew "could not write '. . . as we have forgiven our trespassers' because that word would make no more sense in Greek than in English."²⁶³ He added that the words ἁμαρτία, ὀφείλημα, and

²⁶⁰ The textual attestation of the next verse is divided (11:26, "But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father who is in heaven forgive your trespasses"); incidentally, Goulder, 35, 36, fn. 2, challenged H. F. D. Sparks, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," in Studies in the Gospels: Essays in memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1935), 245, who claimed that both verses, 11:25 and 26, were spurious.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 35. Goulder explained the method by which he held that the Lord's Prayer originated: "Jesus gave certain teaching on prayer by precept and example, which was recorded for the most part by St. Mark. This was written up into a formal Prayer by St. Matthew, including certain explanations and additions in Matthaean language and manner. St. Matthew's Prayer was then abbreviated and amended by St. Luke."

²⁶² Ibid., 37.

²⁶³ Ibid.

παραπτῶμα are interchangeable. Luke preferred the straightforward "sins" in the first clause, although he had to retain a wording similar to what appears at Luke 11:4 ("to all who are indebted to us"). Matthew changed Mark's wording (Mark 14:36) in the address (αββα ὁ πατήρ [sic]) to the more correct vocative, conforming to the way Jesus prayed. Early Christians must have been fond of the *abba* phrase, since it appears in Mark 14:36; Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:15. As it gradually fell into disuse, translations were substituted, but in the correct Greek vocative case as in the Gethsemane parallels at Matt. 26:39, 42; Luke 22:42. For the next step in creating the Lord's Prayer, Matthew re-phrased Mark 14:36 into a more epigrammatic form, "Thy will be done."²⁶⁴ The setting at Gethsemane also provided material for Matthew's composition of the Lord's Prayer. A comparison will illustrate similarities and differences:

Mark 14:36 - ἀλλ' οὐ τι ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ

Matt. 26:39 - πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σύ

26:42 - γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου = Matt. 6:10b

Luke 22:42 - πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω

At Gethsemane Jesus spoke these words to the sleepy disciples

(Mark 14:38): γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐλθῆτε εἰς πειρασμόν

(cf. Matt. 6:13a, καὶ μὴ εἰσεγενέκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν). One can see

the similarities. Goulder maintained that the seventh petition was added as a gloss to soften the theological

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 39.

problem of God leading men into temptation.²⁶⁵

The remainder of Matthew's composition, according to Goulder, came from other sources. The second petition evolved from the Aramaic prayer, "Mar ana tha" [sic], put into prayer form, "Let Thy kingdom come."²⁶⁶ The fourth petition derived from known oral tradition found in Matt. 7:7-11.²⁶⁷ The Lord's Prayer properly asks God's care and provision for now; hence, the prayer asks for tomorrow's bread today.²⁶⁸ The first petition established the hallowing of God's name from the third commandment (Reformed = fourth commandment). "In this way the Prayer begins, like so much else in the Sermon, from the Decalogue, which is to govern its general structure besides [i.e., Divine concerns first, and then man's concern's]."²⁶⁹

Luke improved Matthew's version by adding τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν to explain ἐπιούσιον, along with the change to the present verb tenses that an idea of "day by day" would require. Luke's fifth petition is likewise an improvement in wording. The omission of the third petition and second clause of the sixth

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 42. See Chap. IV, fn. 350, *infra*.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 43.

²⁶⁷ Ibid. Note that the bread was not future, for Goulder. Like the daily manna feeding so God will take care of his own today. Luke glossed *epiousios* with "day by day."

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 44.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 45.

petition (the "seventh petition") were considered as redundant; conforming to Luke's pithy style they were omitted.²⁷⁰

Goulder rendered the service of proving, firmly and clearly, that the Gospel "source theory" was deficient in explaining the origin of the Lord's Prayer. He demonstrated that Luke was probably dependent on Matthew's Prayer which their close resemblances indicate, especially as seen by the use of the *hapax legomenon* ἐπιούσιος. Further, Luke's differences are shown by Goulder to have originated from stylistic improvements over Matthew. Luke trimmed what was inessential.²⁷¹ Goulder also drew attention to the noneschatological interpretation of the Prayer. In general, Goulder has raised some of the main issues often discussed by the literature on the Lord's Prayer.²⁷²

However, Matthew surely did not compose the Lord's Prayer as Goulder maintained. The Biblical texts state that Jesus himself taught the Prayer (Matt. 5:2; 6:9; Luke 11:2).

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 40, "If we are to be pithy, pithy let us be."

²⁷¹ This in itself would not jeopardize the doctrine of inspiration, a concept held by many Christians. That doctrine usually allows the expression of individual personality in the process of writing.

²⁷² Goulder was followed by Sjef van Tilborg, "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer," *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 94-105, in which he attempted to supplement Goulder's form-critical study along redactional lines. His study did not contribute anything significantly new or different. He did emphasize as much, if not more than Goulder, "the failure of the eschatological exegesis of the Lord's Prayer, as proposed by E. Lohmeyer, J. Jeremias, and R. E. Brown" (p. 94).

Therefore it cannot be said that Matthew or Luke themselves, individually, composed their own prayers and pawned them off to early Christian congregations as being from Jesus. Why would early Christians have accorded respect for that kind of Prayer? Surely some of those who heard Jesus' teaching lived long enough to be capable of verifying that Jesus himself had taught the Prayer. Secondly, Goulder assumed the priority of Mark and the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark. But the claim of Markan priority is fragile.²⁷³ Even if Matthew did borrow extensively from Mark, Goulder must resort to other sources to complete all of Matthew's petitions. For example, the source of the second petition in the cry *Maranatha* is specious. Further, Goulder does not sufficiently allow for possible parallels or influence from the synagogue to have influenced the composition of the Lord's Prayer.²⁷⁴

Goulder's remains an unproved theory that ignores the claim of the text regarding the divine authorship of the Lord's Prayer.

It is likely that the Lord's Prayer, as taught by Jesus, was informed by his own life experience. This Prayer foreshadowed his own forgiving (Luke 23:34), it pointed to

²⁷³ Goulder, 32, fn. 1, Goulder himself noted the uncertain and improbable nature of Markan priority in recent scholarship. See comments in this regard, rejecting the popular Gospel "source theory," in fn. 176, *supra*; see also B. C. Butler, The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis (Cambridge: University Press, 1951); and William R. Farmer, The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis (Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976).

²⁷⁴ For example, the possibility exists of a connection between themes in the *Kaddish* and the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer.

his own temptation and deliverance (at "The Temptation" and later in Gethsemane), and it reflected his and his disciples' need of daily bread. The Prayer which Jesus taught has a proleptic value; it anticipated the reality of the everyday life of God's people. Jesus' perfect substitution for sinful man included the life he lived in dependence on God. The petitions of the Lord's Prayer reflect, then, his life and the lives of all who follow him (Heb. 4:15).

A second possibility exists for explaining the existence of the Lord's Prayer twice in the Gospels (see no. 2 above). The traditional explanation is that the Gospels transmit the Prayer twice because Jesus gave it twice, at two different times in his ministry and at different locations. There are no important objections against this view. Richard Lenski's explanation is succinct:

If this had been one of the Twelve [who requested prayer instruction], Luke would have given his name; it must have been one of the Seventy (10:1, 17) or some other one of the wide circle of disciples. This explains how Jesus came to give the Lord's Prayer a second time and explains the briefer form that was used on this occasion. This man and many others had not been present when the Sermon on the Mount was delivered, in which Jesus taught the Lord's Prayer, and it is thus that he repeats it briefly. He did not repeat it verbatim from the sermon, for he intended to give no fixed formula; he abbreviated because he had already given the prayer in full once before.²⁷⁵

A third explanation for the versions of the Prayer holds that Matthew preserved the more original form of the Prayer and that Luke trimmed it down (no. 3 above). Luke

²⁷⁵ Lenski, Luke, 620. Many others follow this theory for the origin of the Lord's Prayer: Smukal, 150-51; Thirtle, 15; William F. Arndt, St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956), 294. Carmignac, Recherches, 19, lists a number who take this view.

tended to abbreviate. For example, Matthew's eight or nine Beatitudes (5:3-11) are trimmed down to four in Luke 6:20-22; Matthew's hundred, sixty, and thirtyfold (13:8; cf. Mark 4:8) is reduced to simply a hundredfold in Luke 8:8; Matthew and Mark record the feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand, whereas Luke omits the latter. Carmignac pointed out that the superior rhythmic and structural qualities of Matthew's Prayer, in keeping with good Semitic practices, is lost in Luke's version.²⁷⁶ For this reason, he defended the originality of the Matthean version; Luke's version represents an abridgment.²⁷⁷

Another suggestion often made is that Luke's is the original Prayer and Matthew's Prayer represents an expanded form of Luke's or of Jesus' original Prayer. This argument (no. 4 above) is partly based on the observation that Luke preserved details of the circumstances when the Prayer was taught. Therefore one could rightly conclude that Luke preserved the original form of the Prayer. This solution probably has gained the plurality of modern supporters. The usual principle governing this line of thinking is that

²⁷⁶ See K. G. Kuhn, Achtzehngebet. E. F. Scott, The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Scribner's, 1952), 7-30, takes issue with the idea that Jesus' teaching was molded into its form by the later church. Jesus gave a well-planned Prayer, which Matthew transmitted.

²⁷⁷ Carmignac, Recherches, 25; on p. 24 he listed representatives of this view. August Tholuck, Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount (Edinburgh: Clark, 1874), 318-19, thought of Matthew's version as being more authentic because (1) Jesus expressly forbade verbosity, which the Prayer would have been liable of doing if it were an amplification of some original form, and (2) because Luke was prone to "perfecting" previously given material.

liturgical forms have a tendency towards amplification.²⁷⁸ Therefore, Luke's Prayer, being the shortest, more nearly reflects the Prayer of Jesus before additions were made to it. Jeremias is probably the most articulate spokesman for this view.²⁷⁹

Finally, in reference to no. 5 above, certain scholars think that Matthew and Luke faithfully present the Prayer that stemmed from certain "communities." The Evangelists would never have altered so venerable a Prayer as that taught by Jesus. Therefore, the forms in Matthew and Luke were copies of prayers with which they were familiar.²⁸⁰

Conclusion

The critical assumption often made is that the Gospels are the final redactional deposit of material shaped by oral and written traditions active in the early church, especially in the years between Christ's life and the final literary productions of the Evangelists. But it is difficult to imagine early Christians taking liberties with and modifying such a revered dominical Prayer, or of composing one

²⁷⁸ Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, 11-12, cited such expansions; *contra*, Carmignac, Recherches, 21, who maintained that this is not true, since liturgical forms tend to have stability and resist change.

²⁷⁹ Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, 12; New Testament Theology, 195; see Carmignac, 20-21, for a list of those who have followed this line.

²⁸⁰ Lohmeyer, 30; Matthew's Prayer arose from a Galilean community, Luke's Prayer from the Judean church. Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, 9, while preferring the Lukan Prayer as more authentic, believed that the Matthean Prayer was primarily in use among Jewish-Christians, and the Lukan Prayer was used among Gentile Christians.

pseudepigraphically under his name!²⁸¹ Common to most theories (except no. 2) is that the two versions of the Lord's Prayer stem from different sources of material and/or that the original Prayer taught by Jesus has been altered.

Actually, the view that Jesus taught the Prayer at least twice and which is transmitted twice in the Gospels (Matthew and Luke) is the most satisfactory solution to the Synoptic evidence and this is the most credible course to

²⁸¹ Many authorities cite the history of the ROTAS-SATOR square as evidence of the early existence of the Lord's Prayer. If this enigmatic cryptogram indeed attests to the Lord's Prayer, then use of the Lord's Prayer conceivably predates alleged reshaping in the oral tradition and more likely would point to Jesus himself as its originator. This square or palindrome consists of five words read in either direction: rotas, opera, tenet, arepo, sator, meaning "the sower arepo holds with care the wheels" or "the wheels with care hold arepo the sower." This "magic square" has been found in various locations, the earliest which is from Pompeii, and therefore must be dated before the volcanic eruption in A.D. 79. It has been claimed as a Christian symbol which can be arranged to form a cross, reading "Pater Noster" with the extra A and O (from Arepo) possibly standing for Jesus the Alpha and Omega. Many scholars are unconvinced of its Christian origin and think of it as derived from mystical Judaism or Mithraic sources. However, there is no intrinsic reason to think that Christians did not live in Pompeii before A.D. 79 if they were in Rome and Puteoli. If indeed the square does depict the Lord's Prayer, then it was being circulated and used very early. For more on this subject see Donald Atkinson, "The Origin and Date of the 'Sator' Word-Square," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 2 (1951): 1-18; idem, "The Sator-Formula and the Beginnings of Christianity," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 22 (1938): 419-34; William Baines, "The Rotas-Sator Square: A New Investigation," New Testament Studies 33 (1987): 469-76; Carmignac, Recherches, 446-68; David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Athlone, 1956), 403-405; Floyd Filson, "Were there Christians in Pompeii?" The Biblical Archaeologist 2 (1939): 14-16; Hugh Last, "The Rotas-sator Square: Present Position and Future Prospects," The Journal of Theological Studies, n. s. 3 (1952): 92-97; John Lowe, The Lord's Prayer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 59-63; Walter O. Moeller, The Mithraic Origin and Meanings of the Rotas-Sator Square (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973). See also in Bibliography: S. Eitrem, D. Fishwick, F. Haverfield, F. Henke, H. Lietzmann.

take.²⁸² It is probable that the more complete Matthean version was more appropriate within the structured context of the Sermon on the Mount and conducive for congregational use, while Luke's version was more suitable to an impromptu and somewhat informal request for a personal Prayer from Jesus.

As far as establishing the text is concerned, an eclectic approach is taken by most commentators. That is, they usually follow the "edited" Greek texts, but consider all possible variants. The familiar vernacular and liturgical versions of the Lord's Prayer generally adhere more closely to the Majority Text version from Matthew. Without hesitation or apology, then, an eclectic approach based on "edited" texts²⁸³ and the Majority Text²⁸⁴ should be the method followed in interpreting the Lord's Prayer.

Hopefully, the previous theological and literary studies will have provided proper background for interpreting the Lord's Prayer. It appears conclusive that a purely eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer could stand or fall depending on the way the kingdom and temporal blessings are viewed. To see in the second and fourth

²⁸² "Repetitio est mater studiorum."

²⁸³ Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, eds. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, 26th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979); and, The Greek New Testament, eds. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, third corrected edition (London: United Bible Societies, 1983).

²⁸⁴ The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text, eds. Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad, second edition. (New York: Nelson, 1985).

petitions, particularly, present soteriological and incarnational values naturally leads to a primarily noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. In addition, the paternal/filial claims of relationship and grace as well as the gift of the privilege of prayer bolsters an orientation to the present in understanding the Lord's Prayer. The preceding literary studies of the texts and of the settings of the Lord's Prayer with the centrality of the focus on God's daily blessing in Matthew and the palpable "everydayness" seen in Luke's wording serve to confirm this present application. These accents will be vital for proper interpretation of the Lord's Prayer in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV
EXEGESIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction: The Address

Father

The address of the Lord's Prayer begins with the Greek vocative Πάτερ.¹ Addressing God as "Father" is common to all the prayers of Jesus, except the cry of desolation from the cross which is a quotation from Ps. 22:1. The prayers of Jesus which are recorded in the Gospels are as follows.

1. Matt. 11:25-26 (Luke 10:21 is identical):

I thank thee, Father (πάτερ), Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes; yea, Father (ὁ πατήρ), for such is thy gracious will.²

2. Matt. 26:39, 42:

My Father (πάτερ μου), if it be possible, let this cup pass (παρελθάτω) from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt. . . . My Father (πάτερ μου), if this cannot pass unless I drink it, thy will be done.

¹ Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, tr. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1971), assumed that the various ways that God is addressed as "Father" proves an underlying Aramaic Abba (i.e., with or without pronouns, and without respect to the distinction between nominative and vocative forms).

² The *Shema*, benediction no. 1, refers to heaven and earth; the *Eighteen*, nos. 5 and 6, addresses God as "Father."

Mark 14:36: "Abba, Father, (αββα [sic, viz. Ἀββᾶ] ὁ πατήρ), all things are possible to thee; remove (παρένεγκε) this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what thou wilt."

Luke 22:42: "Father (πάτερ), if thou art willing, remove (παρένεγκε) this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done."

3. Luke 23:34: "Father (πάτερ), forgive (ἄφες) them; for they know not what they do."³

4. Matt. 27:46: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken (ἐγκατέλιπες) me?"⁴

5. Luke 23:46: "Father (πάτερ), into thy hands I commit my spirit."

6. John 11:41-42:

Father (πάτερ), I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always, but I have said this on account of the people standing by, that they may believe that thou sendest me.

7. John 12:27-28: ". . . 'Father (πάτερ), save me from this hour'? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour.

³ Bruce Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1975), 180, explained that this "logion, though probably not a part of the original Gospel of Luke, bears self-evident tokens of its dominical origin" and thereby advocated retention of the reading, despite its absence in a variety of MSS.

⁴ According to *ibid.*, 70, 119-20, a partly Hebrew and partly Aramaic prayer stood behind the Greek quotation at Matt. 27:46; the parallel at Mark 15:34 was fully Aramaic. Since this is a Psalm quotation, this prayer will be excluded from further consideration here.

Father (πάτερ), glorify thy name."

8. John 17:⁵

Father (πάτερ), the hour has come. . . (v. 1); Father (πάτερ), glorify thou me . . . (v. 5); Holy Father (πάτερ ἅγιε), keep them in thy name . . . (v. 11); . . . that they may all be one; even as thou, Father (πάτερ), art in me . . . (v. 21); Father (Πάτερ), I desire . . . (v. 24); O righteous Father (πάτερ δίκαιε), the world has not known . . . (v. 25).

Generally, Jesus is reported to have invoked God by a simple and terse address "Father" or "Abba" except in the Gospel of Matthew. There, the tendency is to adorn the word "Father" with an adjective or other phrase, which is often the pattern in the first Gospel with regard to God (e.g., heavenly Father, your Father in heaven, et al.). The Greek vocative is generally used for Jesus' invariable address for God, including those of the "High-Priestly Prayer" in John 17. However, in the first prayer (Matt. 11:25-26 and Luke 10:21) the second "Father" is given as a regular nominative case, probably because it appears in the middle of a sentence, begun with a proper vocative form. The most unexpected reading is in Mark 14:36. Instead of the Greek vernacular "Father," the translated Aramaic *Abba* is used, followed by an attributive clause in the nominative case (ὁ πατήρ), which is

⁵ The entire chapter of John 17 is not reproduced here, but only the relevant sections which address God six times as "Father."

not in the expected vocative case.⁶ Here Mark evidently reported the actual word of Jesus in Aramaic, *Abba*, with a Greek translation added, confirmed by comparison with the parallel at Luke 22:42.⁷ The Greek word ὁ πατήρ is not an inflected form, such as the vocative, but the nominative "dictionary" equivalent, *Father*. In all the other above prayers of Jesus the Greek vocative πάτερ is used rather than *Abba*. Evidently, then, *Abba* probably should be understood as a vocative. It should be noted that Mark used more Aramaic words than the other Evangelists. It very well may be that this is in keeping with his propensity for realism, capturing the very language spoken by Jesus at that time in Palestine. In most cases, Mark supplied a translation, as seen above at Mark 14:36. The inevitable conclusion to draw, then, is that Jesus employed the simple word *Abba* in his own prayers and that *Abba* stood behind the Greek words for "Father."

The propensity or fondness of Jesus for using the word "Father" with which to address God or to refer to him is

⁶ Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr.), 265, explained: "in the Greek appositions to vocatives are in the nominative." Jeremias, 64, claimed that a nominative form with an article could be a vocative. According to this view, Jesus prayed "Abba, Father" or "Father, Father" which is unlikely. It seems more probable in view of the above parallels that he prayed simply, "Father" (which is what the Aramaic means).

⁷ S. Vernon McCasland, "Abba, Father," Journal of Biblical Literature 72 (1953): 86, in his detailed study, concluded that the ὁ πατήρ in Mark 14:36 is the same form as the other vocatives in his prayers, and is another appellation for "my Father." "The definite article in Greek often has the significance of the possessive pronoun" (p. 87). However, this may be more strained than to take it simply as a translation appended to the original Aramaic word.

confirmed and supported by the way he so frequently used that term for God throughout the Gospels. The word "Father" is used of God alone, or with a variety of modifying adjectives (my, our, his, your, heavenly, and so forth). Matthew reports the use of "Father" 45 times; Mark 3 times; Luke 17 times; John 118 times. Of Matthew's 45 examples, 18 are "your Father," 18 are "my Father," and 9 represent other uses of Father. In Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, Jesus used "your Father" 15 times, "my Father" one time (in its conclusion at 7:21), and "our Father" one time (in the Lord's Prayer).⁸ In Matthew, "Father" is connected with "heaven" by a relative clause ("Father who is in heaven") 14 times; in Mark heaven is used with the Father twice (Mark 11:25, 26 [v. 26 lacks proper manuscript witness]); in Luke once (at 10:21 "Father, Lord of heaven . . .") or, twice if the full address of 11:2 in Lord's Prayer is counted); the combination is lacking in John. The result of this information suggests that Matthew particularly among the Evangelists connects Father and heaven. Matthew also employs the variant "heavenly" 5 times (6:14, 26, 32; 15:13; and 18:35 [var., ²επουράνιος]). John characteristically allows the word Father to stand alone, yet most often the context shows invariably that the Son is pictured in a relationship with the Father, whereby the Son is the agent representing the Father. There are 46 examples among the four Evangelists of the adjective

⁸ It should be noted that these tabular results reported are approximations unavoidably resulting from textual or interpretive variations. Statistics are from F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan, 1942), 402.

"my" being used by Jesus with which to identify the Father.

There is no doubt that Jesus innovatively used the word Father in reference to his relationship with God.⁹ Mark 14:36 provides the insight, as mentioned, that the very word that Jesus used was the Aramaic *Abba*.¹⁰ The use of that word *Abba* persisted among Christians as a word fondly used in remembrance of Jesus' own use, as is evidenced by the other two places it is mentioned in the New Testament: Gal. 4:6 and Rom. 8:15.¹¹ The word *Abba* was a word with which the congregations of Galatia and the Roman church, both evidently with many Gentile members, were familiar. The Roman church, by the way, was not founded by Paul, hence the use of *Abba* should not be construed as a Paulinism.

Joachim Jeremias maintained that Jesus' use of the

⁹ Heinz Schürmann, Praying with Christ: The Our Father for Today, tr. William Ducey and Alphonse Simon (New York: Herder, 1964), 140, fn. 484. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), 89-115, after a careful study along source-critical lines arrived at the conclusion that most occurrences of "Father" were used after Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, and therefore, the word was intended only for disciples (98, 102). That means that "by adoption" believers even today become partakers of the supreme reality of the Father in heaven (105). The Lord's Prayer "is the sum of the teaching of Jesus on the Fatherhood of God. . . . It reveals God as concerned with things infinitely great and infinitely little" (115). Manson provided valuable information despite his critical methodology.

¹⁰ Joseph Fitzmeyer, "Abba and Jesus' Relation to God," in À Cause de L'Évangile, P. Jacques Dupont FS (Saint-André: Cerf, 1985), 19, maintained that the Aramaic *Abba* here is emphatic.

¹¹ For a detailed exegesis of this theme in Paul and an excursus on *Abba*, see Ernest De Witt Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1920, 1988), 223-24; also for *Abba* in oral tradition, see Benoit Standaert, "Crying 'Abba' and saying 'Our Father,'" in Intertextuality in Biblical Writings, Bas van Iersel FS (Kampen: KOK, 1989), 141-58.

Aramaic word *Abba* (ܐܒܐ) was a unique address.¹² He stated that of all the familiar ascriptions to God prior to Jesus, Father was rarely used of God and *Abba* was never used in Old Testament prayer language.¹³ Perhaps closest to this address of God are the "Thou art" forms ([ܐܢܝ] ܐܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܐ), such as in Is. 63:16 (*bis*); 64:8; Jer. 3:4, 19; Ps. 89:26.¹⁴ Yet these are not prayer addresses to God *per se*. Only at Is. 63:16 and 64:8 is "Father" directly applied to God in a form of prayer.¹⁵ The only two clear examples stemming from early Judaica addressing God as Father are *Ahaba Rabba* ("Great love"), part of the morning *Shema* stemming from the ancient priestly liturgy of temple worship and a part of the New Year Liturgy, *Abinu Malkenu* ("Our Father [ܐܒܐ] ܐܘܢܐ, our King"), attested as early as A.D. 135.¹⁶ Only one instance occurs of

¹² However, Isabel Ann Massey, Interpreting the Sermon on the Mount in the Light of Jewish Tradition as Evidenced in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch (Lewiston: Mellen, 1991), 23, claimed that by the time of late Judaism the word "father" was emerging in the Targums, Philo, and proto-rabbinic literature for אב/אב/אב. In agreement with Jeremias and Massey is Georg Schelbert, "Sprachgeschichtliches zu 'abba,'" in Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy, ed. Pierre Cassetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 395-447. See also Franz Mussner, Tractate on the Jews, tr. Leonard Swidler (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 123-30.

¹³ For that reason, Ernst Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer, tr. John Bowden (New York: Harper, 1965), 35, believed that *Abunan* (Our Father) was the original expression behind Matthew's address, although *Abba* stood behind the simple "Father" of Luke's address.

¹⁴ Jeremias, Theology, 65; The Prayers of Jesus, Studies in Biblical Theology, second series 6, tr. John Bowden, John Reumann, and Christoph Burchard (London: SCM, 1967), 22-24.

¹⁵ Jeremias, Theology, 65; indirect: Ps. 68:5; 103:13; Jer. 31:9.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 63-63.

the use of *Abba* in Rabbinic literature, which even there was not a prayer address. Jeremias cited it as follows:

Hanin ha-Nehba was the son of the daughter of Onias the Circle-drawer. When the world needed rain, our teachers used to send school-children to him, who seized the hem of his coat and said to him, *abba, abba, hab lan mitra* ('Daddy, daddy, give us rain!'). He said to Him (God): 'Master of the world, grant it for the sake of these who are not yet able to distinguish between an 'Abba who has the power to give rain and an 'abba who has not.¹⁷

In sum, only in late Judaism did nomenclature emerge using "fatherhood" terms of God. Even then, its occurrence was infrequent and virtually never in the form "Abba" itself, whereas in the New Testament Jesus introduced such common vocables for God (viz., Father, my Father, our Father, *Abba*).

Jesus' use of the simple *Abba*, as maintained earlier, has been explained grammatically as a Greek neologism arising from the Aramaic emphatic state ("The Father") or from a substitution for the first person possessive form ("my, our Father").¹⁸ Other explanations have been offered for this

¹⁷ Ibid., 65-66 (b. Tann. 23b); "Onias" and "Honi" are equivalent.

¹⁸ Jeremias, *Prayers*, 21, assumed that *Abba* stood behind Jesus' frequent use of "Father" in Greek translation. According to him, *Abba* was rarely used of God in prayer and only somewhat more frequent in speech and acclamations. For Jews, the word "Father" was not expressive of a personal relationship with God, but "the relationship is always between God and Israel." Generally, Judaism was reluctant to call God "Father." Often the phrase אבא אבא אבא אבא was used, but not with the personal feeling that "our heavenly Father" has in the New Testament (p. 22). In colloquial language *abi* had entirely given way to *Abba* both in Aramaic and in Hebrew (p. 23). This is proved by examples from the *Mishnah*. Jesus adapted this usage to personal prayer (p. 23). Jeremias said (p. 22): "This personal reference to God as the heavenly Father represented an essential deepening of the relationship with God" and was a feature of the newness of the preaching of Jesus. Jeremias contended (p. 29) that outside of rare exceptions "there is as yet no evidence in the literature of ancient Palestinian Judaism that 'my Father' was used as a personal address to God." He maintained that no example exists

form.¹⁹ One is that the form represents the emphatic state which secondarily took over the forms of the first person.²⁰ Gustaf Dalmann viewed it as a diminutive form whereby the inflected *abi* became *abba*.²¹ Jeremias further claimed that the origin of the word arose from an uninflected exclamatory form mimicking the babbling sound of children.²² They learned to speak by saying *abba* and *imma*, or father and mother. Later the term *abba* came to be applied affectionately and respectfully to venerated elders.²³ Jeremias, in his *New Testament Theology*, retracted earlier extreme

demonstrating that God was ever called *Abba* (p. 60). The address of God as Father was evidence for Jeremias that Jesus taught a whole new manner of personal prayer and the word *Abba* was Jesus' *ipsissima vox* (pp. 108-115). See further on philologic forms of *abba*, Schelbert, 408-13.

¹⁹ E.g., F. Blass, and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [hereafter BDF], tr. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University Press, 1961), 81, sec. 147.3, explained that the Aramaic arthrous *abba* must have been a vocative form and that the Greek "Father" was a vulgarity arising from the suppression of the vocative of the third declension, i.e., both πάτερ and πατήρ were equivalent to *Abba*.

²⁰ Reported by Jeremias, *Prayers*, 58. The form could be translated either "the Father" or "my Father."

²¹ Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, tr. D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: Clark, 1902), 190-93. The first singular *abi* only is used in Dan. 5:13; it became obsolete, replaced by *abba*. Dalman, 192, implied that the Matthean wording "Our Father" and Luke's "Father" could both easily have pointed to either a simple ܐܒܝ , or more formal Aramaic address ܐܒܝܢܝ , (Galil. ܐܒܝܢܝ), i.e. *Abba* could be translated either as "Father" or "our Father."

²² Jeremias, *Theology*, 66; *Prayers*, 58. The doubling of the radial is a feature of *Lallwörter* (nursery words). For Jeremias, the word was a static form taking neither suffix nor inflection.

²³ *Ibid.*, *Theology* 67.

expressions which he had assigned to the word *abba* ("Daddy") as being too familiar.²⁴ His earlier position, which many scholars have latched onto, is carried by this statement:

In origin, *abba* is a purely exclamatory form, which is not inflected and which takes no possessive suffixes; the gemination is modelled on the way in which a child says *imma* to its mother [or Daddy]. . . . This form *abba*, deriving from children's speech had made considerable headway in Palestinian Aramaic in the period before the New Testament. . . . Syrian nurses often used *abba* and *imma* to teach nurslings to begin talking.²⁵

Jeremias further contended that the word *abba* took over forms with suffixes and also replaced the emphatic form *abha* (אָבָה); therefore *abba* could stand for "his father," "our father," and so on.²⁶ Jeremias attempted proving this assertion by comparing the prayer of Jesus in Mark 14:36 which used the

²⁴ Ibid. See additional comments and disclaimers at fn. 25, next.

²⁵ Ibid., Prayers, 58-59. Later Jeremias softened his tone, not insisting on this extreme familiarity, Theology, 67. James Barr, "'Abba' Isn't 'Daddy,'" New Testament Studies, n.s. 39 (1988): 28-47, took issue with Jeremias. Barr said on lexical grounds, and hinting that the word was also a good Hebrew form, that it was an "adult word" and not an endearment (p. 38). Barr felt that Jeremias wrongly allowed diachronic arguments about word origins to interfere with the synchronic state of the language in the given period. Adults were not using children's language, but even children were using adults' language. Barr questions whether *Abba* was as pervasive as Jeremias makes it out to be; Barr tended to think that inflected forms stood behind this word as represented by Greek equivalents with the pronominal adjectives such as "my" or "your" in the New Testament period. For further negative reassessment of Jeremias' claims, see James A. Rimbach, "God-Talk or Baby-Talk: More on 'Abba'," Currents in Theology and Mission 13 (1986): 232-35; Geza Vermes, Jesus and the World of Judaism (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 42; Fitzmeyer, *ibid.*, 15-38; and James H. Charlesworth, "A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of *Abba*: A Study of the Lord's Prayer," in The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era, ed. James H. Charlesworth with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity, 1994), 1-14 (especially pp. 7-10).

²⁶ Prayers, 59.

Aramaic *Abba* with its parallel in Matt. 26:39 which used "my Father" in Greek; Luke 22:42 used the simple Greek vocative without a pronoun.²⁷

Jeremias asserted that for Jesus to have thus employed *Abba* as a vocative with which to address God suggested three themes.²⁸ First, it expressed familiarity with God. Second, it expressed the son's obedience to the Father (Matt. 11:25; Mark 14:36). Thirdly, it was a word of authority. Jesus authorized the address "Father" of God for Christian prayer. Jeremias believed that the shorter Lukan address of the Lord's Prayer, simply "Father," or *Abba*, implies Jesus' simple and frequent preference for addressing God.²⁹

Jeremias' insistence on the importance of the word *Abba* would not have direct bearing on interpreting the Lord's Prayer if Gal. 4:6 and Rom. 8:15 had not cited this very vocable as an expression of faith.³⁰

Regardless of the various explanations that have been suggested for the word *Abba*, its essential meaning is clear. Thus, *Abba* is a mark of sonship and possession of God's

²⁷ Ibid. See fn. 7, *supra*.

²⁸ Ibid., 62-63. Therefore, the form *abba* could be (1) an emphatic form ("the Father") used vocatively (final determinative -a), or (2) the same form replaced a form inflected with a possessive pronoun, or (3) it was a child's word with natural gemination. While Jeremias entertained all possibilities, he preferred the third.

²⁹ Ibid., 63; *Theology*, 64.

³⁰ Ibid., *Prayers*, 55: "This [use of *Abba* in the Gentile churches] presupposes that Jesus frequently used 'Abba' as a form of address to God." Cf. also section on "Divine Paternity" in Chapter III, *supra*, for the emergence of the unique address "Father" for the new age.

Spirit. The theological principles enunciated by the above Pauline verses are corollary to Jesus' gift of the Lord's Prayer.³¹ Both verses show that the sincere cry of *Abba* "is only possible within the new relationship with God given by the Son."³² *Abba*, then, anticipates the fulfilment of promise of sonship: "'I will be your father, and you will be my sons and daughters' (II Cor. 6.18 = II Sam. 7.14, free quotation) [*sic*]."³³ A form of Jesus' original Semitic *Abba* undoubtedly stood behind the Greek Πατήρ.

In Heaven

The Greek ὅ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς of Matthew's address probably also had a Semitic background.³⁴ This is especially evident by the mechanical use of the plural in Greek, since generally heaven was plural in Hebrew (see Ex. 20:4; Deut. 5:8).³⁵

³¹ It has been claimed that Paul may have had the Lord's Prayer in mind with these two verses, to which Ernst Dobschütz ("The Lord's Prayer," Harvard Theological Review 7 [1914]): 305, replied: "It was through Jesus that the Christians learned to address God as their father; it is probably by the Lord's Prayer that they became accustomed to do so. This seems a reasonable explanation, whereas the suggestion that Paul, in the two passages adduced, had the Lord's Prayer in mind, quoting it by its first word, can hardly be accepted."

³² Jeremias, Prayers, 65.

³³ Ibid. Sonship is assumed also by the important prophecy of the time of the New Testament in Jer. 31:1, 33.

³⁴ Lohmeyer, 35; see also David J. Clark, "Our Father in Heaven," The Bible Translator 30 (1979): 213, who suggested a translation "Father God" instead of "Our Father in heaven" for Matt. 6:9; this "dynamic equivalent" is hardly tenable.

³⁵ Lohmeyer, 34.

Biblical Hebrew would probably write *abinu asher bashshamayim* and Mishnaic Hebrew would prefer *abinu shebbashshamayim*.³⁶ Literally, the address would say, "Our Father, who art in the heavens." Jean Carmignac astutely showed that a literal translation of the Greek was awkward and unclear, such as "our Father of heaven(s)" or "Father of us of the heaven(s)."³⁷ Semitic languages cannot say "Father of heaven," or "heavenly Father," but must use a preposition, rendering "in heaven." In fact, that is what Matt. 6:9 has done in Greek. The idea is not that of situating God's residence in heaven qua place, but to contrast terrestrial fathers and the celestial Father. "My or your heavenly Father" (e.g., Matt. 5:48; 6:14, 26, 32) is simply a variation of "Father in heaven."³⁸ The supramundane expression does not intend to localize and restrict God, but to identify him.

Certain passages do speak of heaven as the abode of God. Ps. 2:4 says, "He who sits in the heavens laughs." Ps. 11:4 reveals, "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven." Ps. 115:16 claims, "The heavens are the Lord's heavens, but the earth he has given to the sons of men." Other similar passages include 1 Kings 8:30, 32, 34,

³⁶ Jean Carmignac, Recherches sur le "Notre Père" (Paris: Letouzey, 1969), 70.

³⁷ Ibid., 72.

³⁸ Ibid., 73; Carmignac preferred "heavenly Father" to "Father in heaven" so as to avoid a location for God and yet to sufficiently maintain the idea of transcendence; his suggestion merits consideration.

36, 39, 43, 45, 49; 2 Chron. 6:21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 39; Neh. 9:27, 28; Ps. 33:13; 53:2; 103:19; Eccl. 5:2; Is. 66:1 (cf. Acts 7:49). The contrast between heaven and earth or between God and man is clearly portrayed in such passages as Matt. 7:11; 21:25 (cf. Mark 11:30; Luke 20:4); 23:9; John 1:13; Heb. 12:9. Heaven is therefore not so much a *locus* as a reference pointing to God and the things pertaining to God, in contradistinction from creation. Hence, the difference between God the heavenly Father and terrestrial fathers is implied in the address of the Lord's Prayer. Unlike earthly fathers, God is associated with the majesty of heaven. The typical Jewish contemporary of Jesus may have also tended to think of their patriarch Abraham in terms of "father."

Carmignac reported this typical tendency of designating Abraham by "our father"; he concluded that Jesus added "in heaven" to the address in order to avoid misunderstanding among the Jews.³⁹ Several passages illustrate this tendency of equating fatherhood with Abraham: Matt. 3:9 and Luke 3:8 (we have Abraham as our father); Luke 16:24, 27, 30 (father Abraham); John 8:56; see also verses 53, 56 (your father Abraham); Acts 7:3; Rom. 4:1, 12; James 2:21. Actually, the distinction between the celestial Father and terrestrial fathers, especially of the patriarchs, was made already in Is. 63:16, which claims, "For thou art our Father, though

³⁹ Ibid., 73. Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 2:220, portrayed God's benevolent judgment as based on the "merits of the fathers," especially of Abraham.

Abraham does not know us . . . thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer from of old is thy name."

Most Lukan texts omit the reference to heaven. Scholars accept this phenomenon as either representing a more concise version, or oppositely, that the phrase is a typical Matthean addition.⁴⁰ Luke generally tends to report that Jesus invoked God in prayer by the simple "Father" (Luke 10:21 [*bis*]; 22:42; 23:34, 46), possibly under Pauline influence, since the simple *Abba* is employed in Paul's epistles at Gal. 4:6 and Rom. 8:15.⁴¹ Carmignac has shown that the phrase "in heaven" is not strictly Matthean; see Mark 11:25-26; Luke 11:13. In the last case the literal ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ following immediately after the Lukan Lord's Prayer may have presupposed in Hebrew *asher mishshamayim*, since *beth* and *mem* at Qumran are similar.⁴² Carmignac was inclined to think that Luke abbreviated his address in the Lord's Prayer since it was too "Semitic" with the reference to heaven(s).⁴³ The longer Matthean form is demanded by several poetic schemes of the Lord's Prayer. According to Carmignac, Luke's leaner version also may betray Paulinisms which hearkened back to Jesus himself, reflected

⁴⁰ Carmignac, 74.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 76. However, the expression itself may not be a Paulinism; see above at fn. 11 and following.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 75.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 76. However, unlike Luke 11:2b, there is no "abbreviation" or omission of the phrase "in heaven" at Luke 11:13.

for example by the simple and frequent *Abba* as an address to God. Matthew's more full composition requires the complete address for the sake of balance and form.⁴⁴ It is possible to conclude that Matthew's address is consistent with his total structure and approach; Luke's terse address conforms to a prayer that in many manuscripts also omits the third and seventh petitions.

Ultimately, in spite of various proposals, there is no intrinsic reason not to suppose that Jesus may have taught the Prayer in two different ways on separate occasions, one simpler (Luke) and another more complex (Matthew).

It is obvious that the Matthean address sets the stage for the following celestial and terrestrial contrasts relative to the fourth petition:

Father of ours in heaven -- bread of ours on earth;
and, likewise, to the second part of the third petition, which doubles as a transition to the second strophe:

Father in heaven -- as in heaven also on earth.

It should be noticed that a general direction tends from heaven to earth. The bread is "earthly" by virtue of the possessive adjective "our." To translate the address one must make good sense, either by supplying a verb ("Our Father who art [are] in heaven"), by omitting the relative pronoun ("Our Father in heaven"), or by making the original prepositional phrase an adjective ("heavenly"). The Latin and most versions have added the verb ("Pater noster qui es . . .").

⁴⁴ Ibid.

Interpretation

In the Old Testament the people of Israel were aware of God's Fatherhood and their sonship. This is attested when God spoke to Pharoah before the Exodus, "And you shall say to Pharoah, 'Thus says the Lord, Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, "Let my son go that he may serve me"; if you refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay your first-born son'" (Ex. 4:22-23). Carmignac divided the Old Testament passages which speak of God's Fatherhood into the following three categories: (1) God is Creator (Deut. 32:6; Is. 64:7; Mal. 1:6; 2:10), (2) Preserver (2 Sam 7:14; Is. 1:2; Ps. 27:10; 68:6; Is. 63:16; Jer. 3:19), and (3) One who loves (Ps. 103:13; Prov. 3:12; Hos. 11:1-3; Jer. 31:20; Mal. 3:17).⁴⁵ Hos. 11:1-3 especially attests to the tenderness of God's love: "When Israel was a child, I loved him."

Some of these same themes are also taught in the New Testament (e.g., Matt. 5:45; 6:26-30; 7:9-11; 10:29; 18:10, 14; cf. Luke 11:11-13; Matt. 10:29). Jesus taught about God's Fatherhood in relation to believers in Matt. 23:9, "And call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven." Ernst Lohmeyer suggested that the designation of God as Father by Jesus signified a New Testament extension of the holy name of Yahweh (*Adonai*).⁴⁶ That name, like Father, taught the presence of God: "Therefore my people shall know my name; therefore in that

⁴⁵ Ibid., 56.

⁴⁶ Lohmeyer, 44.

day they shall know that it is I who speak; here am I" (Is. 52:6).

A special relationship exists between the Father and the Son. Jesus is the "Son of God" as prophesied in Pss. 2:7 and 89:26-27. Several verses in John's Gospel make this clear. For example, Jesus is able to make God known in 1:18, "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." This relationship is taught in 5:18: "This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he . . . also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God." Jesus said to the Jews, "You know neither me nor my Father." Jesus made it clear that God the Father should be more significant in the lives of people than was their Father Abraham, of whom the Jews were so proud (8:53-58). Other Johannine references include 8:19, 42; 3:30; 14:9-11, 20-21; 17:21; 20:17. In fact, John stressed throughout his Gospel account that Jesus is the divine Son and certified agent of the Father.⁴⁷

Two other passages that similarly teach the relationship between the Father and the Son are the parallels at Matt. 11:27 and Luke 10:22; each one immediately follows after Jesus' prayer no. 1, listed above. Matthew reads: "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to

⁴⁷ This theme has been developed by A. E. Harvey, Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel (London: SPCK, 1976), 88-92, 115-17.

reveal him." Because of its similarity to theological accents observed in John's Gospel, it has been dubbed the "Johannine thunderbolt" (attributed to Karl von Hase of Jena). This verse speaks of the soteriological blessing that the Son gives to the world by transmitting the knowledge of the Father (cf. John 10:15). The promise of sonship is mediated to believers by Jesus, God's divine Son and certified agent.

Yes, through the Son, the Father grants soteriological blessings. John 1:18 teaches, "No one has ever seen God; the only Son (var.: God), who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." The result of Jesus' coming is that sinners on earth can be placed into a relationship with God by faith as his "sons," as John 1:12 promises: "But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God."⁴⁸ This soteriological blessing pertaining to God's new children on earth is reiterated in 1 John 3:1 which says, "See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and so we are." Sinners become children of God the Father through the process of rebirth through water and the Spirit (John 3: 3-8), as Jesus marvelously explained to Nicodemus. This same soteriological blessing is assumed in the Pauline passages at

⁴⁸ Carmignac, 61, believed that the soteriological approach, exemplified by this verse, is the best interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. God saves by making sons by adoption, through faith. So also, H. F. D. Sparks, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," in Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1935), 260, who spoke of sonship, not by birth, but by grace!

Gal. 4:5-7 and Rom. 8:14-16. Likewise, 1 Pet. 1:17 attests to the importance attached to the use of the word "Father" in prayer by the "sons" in faith. The word "Father" expresses the filiation of sinners with God their Father, and the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ.

God's gracious Fatherhood is especially the subject of the Parable of the Lost Sons in Luke 15:11-32. The sinful prodigal son finally "came to himself" (v. 17) and in repentance acknowledged, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son; treat me as one of your hired servants" (vv. 18, 19). His profligacy severed his filial relationship. Notice that "heaven" is a circumlocution or hypostasis for "God." The context of this parable of sin, repentance, and forgiveness suggests that God is the Father of all believers. Before conversion from sin, men are nothing more than "hired servants." After conversion, they are placed in the position of sonship simply on the basis of the Father's grace. The father establishes this relationship monergistically, as the parable implies, ". . . for this my was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found" (v. 24). God is the one who "finds" and "makes alive."

In Judaism, God was rather infrequently invoked as Father for fear that such an appellation might seem too familiar. Judaism generally associated the paternity of God with his royalty.⁴⁹ On the other hand, the Lord's Prayer

⁴⁹ Carmignac, 63.

centers specifically on God's Fatherhood.⁵⁰ Ernst Dobschütz made this point when he summarized: "With Jesus what was in former times exceptional becomes the rule."⁵¹

However, the relationship of believers with the Father is separate from that of Jesus with his Father. The Lord's Prayer makes this distinction. The "our" of the "Our Father" does not include Jesus. John 20:17 keeps that difference in mind by reporting Jesus' statement to Mary Magdalene on Easter morning, ". . . I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." The Lord's Prayer was given for Jesus' disciples (Luke 11:2). In Matt. 6:7-9, Jesus spoke about the improper manner of the praying of the Gentiles. Therefore, it is probable that his audience for the Sermon on the Mount was primarily Jewish.

The sonship of believers is a gift of the Savior. Jesus makes them all "brethren" by virtue of their common sonship. This is not anything they could accomplish by their own power or merit. As such, Jesus is the "elder Brother" of all those enjoying the sonship by adoption into the family of God the Father (Heb. 2:10-11). This spiritual relationship between believers, or sons of the Father, is referred to by Jesus in Matt. 12:48 (see also Mark 3:33-41; Luke 8:21), "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?" Jesus' community (the invisible church) consists of all those whom he declares to be his own, by virtue of his love and by means of his

⁵⁰ See A. Lukyn William, "'My Father' in Jewish Thought of the First Century," The Journal of Theological Studies 31 (1929): 42-47.

⁵¹ Dobschütz, 304.

Gospel call. Those "who do the will of my Father in heaven" are the Father's real family (Matt. 12:50). Matt. 23:8 teaches that believers are not to be known as rabbi or teacher, for their position is one of being brethren under the one teacher, Jesus. In the next verse, 23:9 (cited earlier) a contrast is drawn in which Jesus forbade Christians to call a mortal on earth (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) "father" "for you have one Father, who is in heaven" (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, et al.: οὐράνιος Father). This phraseology tacitly suggests the language of the Lord's Prayer. The community of believers are the ones who are to pray the Prayer Jesus taught.⁵² They pray the Lord's Prayer precisely because they have a Father in heaven. Only those who know the Father, through Jesus' revelation, can dare pray the Prayer Jesus taught.⁵³ The Lord's Prayer is a gift given to them to use during this time of living on earth. It summarizes their needs which can be taken to the Lord in prayer. Their right of being heard is through Jesus, the Son of the Father and the High Priest of believers (2 Pet. 2:9;

⁵² Joachim Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, Facet Books, Biblical series 8, tr. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964), 20. The honor of the unique name "Father" is to be reserved only for God. The Jewish doctrine of the "merits of the Fathers" (cited above, fn. 39) may provide the background for the warning of Matt. 23:9.

⁵³ W. Marchel, Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens, Analecta Biblica 19 (Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1963), 170-89, believed that Jesus did not necessarily directly authorize his followers to use *Abba* in their prayers; *Abba* was part of his own prayer habit and later, Christians more aware of their relationship with the risen Lord, began to adopt its use.

Heb. 7:25). Therefore, they pray "Our Father who art in heaven." Richard C. H. Lenski explained that the "'Our' presupposed the possession of faith" and draws God down to earth, while "'who art in the heavens' . . . reveals the greatness of him who is thus drawn down."⁵⁴ Their sonship is by the Father's adoption; Jesus' sonship is by a spiritual and eternal relationship to the Father. Their privilege of addressing God as Father signifies that the Lord's Prayer is intended for the here and now. Now he is "Father"; at the eschaton he will be judge and king.⁵⁵

The theme of Christian community certainly is oriented to the present. The Christian brother is the subject of the warning in Matt. 5:22-24 (be reconciled to the brother); 7:3-5 (cf. Luke 6:41-42, do not try to take the speck out of your brother's eye before your own); 18:15 (disciplinary steps to be taken toward restoring and saving the brother), 21 (forgive a brother seventy times seven), 35 (unlike the unmerciful debtor, forgive your brother). John taught that "he who hates his brother is in the darkness" (1 John 2:10-11; see also 3:14-15; 4:20-21). The practical consequence of faith is to show love toward the very same brethren who call God their Father too. The theme of Christian community assumed under divine Fatherhood and sonship by faith does not pertain to the "universal brotherhood" of natural philosophy.

⁵⁴ Lenski, Matthew, 264-65; "Thus love is joined to faith in "our Father" (264).

⁵⁵ Robert Hamerton-Kelly, God the Father (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 99.

Sinners are not "sons of God by nature, but by grace."⁵⁶

The soteriological blessing of the Savior which enables a filial relationship of the believer with the Father pertains to the present Gospel age and continues into eternity where the fellowship will be complete and unbroken. The Lord's Prayer is not only a prayer, but also instruction in the theological message of God's grace (cf. Matt. 11:27). The *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* reciprocate. The Gospel message announces that all sinners can be children of the heavenly Father. Jesus made such a blessed fellowship possible. Even private and individual prayer is never spoken in a vacuum; it always assumes Christian fellowship with others. Therefore believers pray "Our Father who art in heaven."

It is God who is addressed in the Lord's Prayer as Father.⁵⁷ Matt. 6:9 makes it distinctly clear that it is the celestial Father, not man, who is addressed. The address of the Lord's Prayer suggests both God's transcendence and immanence. God is far removed from and superior to finite man, yet, on the other hand, Jesus both taught and made possible the nearness of God to man. God would remain hidden, *absconditus*, if it were not for Jesus. The Christian comes to know *Deus revelatus* only by virtue of Jesus. This tension between the transcendency and immanency of God is

⁵⁶ I.e., by adoption; Carmignac, 67. See Chap. III, fn. 15.

⁵⁷ Representatives of feminist ideology sadly reject masculine nomenclature in order to make God more "incarnate" (more in touch?); see William Oddie, What Will Happen to God? (London: SPCK, 1984), 115, for a reply to their lack of sense of the *mysterium tremendum*.

weighed in Rom. 10:6-9 (based on Deut. 30:11-14; cf. John 3:13; Eph. 4:10; Baruch 3:29-30):

But the righteousness based on faith says, Do not say in your heart, "Who will ascend into heaven?" (that is, to bring Christ down) or "Who will descend into the abyss?" (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does it say? The word is near you, on your lips and in your heart.

The Christian does not believe that God is ontologically remote and unreachable (see 2 Cor. 12:2 for a view of ancient cosmology). Because of Jesus' incarnation, the full revelation of God the Father touches man living on earth. The Father sent the Son on the divine mission of salvation into this world. This wonderful message is implicit in Jesus' discourse with the Samaritan woman at the well. In John 4:10 and 14 Jesus offered life with God, eternal life. He proceeded to destroy her notion that salvation depended upon traditions and the observance of physical locations of worship (v. 21). True worship is possible only through Jesus (v. 26). Jesus made it possible to worship God by bridging heaven and earth, as he pointed out: "But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for such the Father seeks to worship him" (v. 23).

The Lord's Prayer does not pray in Jesus' name directly, but the words are spoken only by those who know him by faith. For them, the door of heaven is open to the Father. The right of the children of God to pray to their heavenly Father has been established by Jesus (Matt. 19:13-15; Mark 10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17; Rom. 8:21; Gal. 4:31 [believers are

not slaves under the law but free under the Gospel]; Eph. 3:12; 5:1, 8; 1 Pet. 1:14; 1 John 3:10; 5:2; 2 John 1:4, 13).⁵⁸ The believer who prays the Lord's Prayer is now confident of being heard by God. The gap between man and God by reason of sin is bridged. The address "Father" reflects that closeness, love, and tenderness which Jesus has brought about between God and man. The address of the Lord's Prayer is prayed boldly precisely because of the new relationship the Christian enjoys by God's grace made possible by Jesus.

Because of the aforesaid "incarnational" values connected with praying the Lord's Prayer, the address becomes the key to understanding the whole Prayer. God invites his children to turn to him for their every earthly need, both of a spiritual and temporal kind. Jesus explained that prayer is for the here and now of daily life (command and promise):

Ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask him! (Matt. 7:7, 11b)

The Petitions

The pattern for the construction of the Decalogue provides a glimpse into the composition of the Lord's Prayer.⁵⁹ The Decalogue is divided into two tables or parts, love to God and love to man, or man's responsibilities toward

⁵⁸ Lohmeyer, 36. Consequently, the privilege of praying to the heavenly Father belongs to the present Gospel age. Prayer to the Father by his children by faith is not confined in its petitions only to the *eschaton*.

⁵⁹ Albert Kleber, "The Lord's Prayer and the Decalog," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 3 (1941): 302-20.

God and his responsibilities toward his neighbor. The Lord's Prayer is divided into two strophes. The verbs in the first are in the third person; in the second strophe they are in the second person. The one who prays puts his own concerns after those of God. God is foremost and primary. Although every word in the Lord's Prayer is significant in such a concisely compressed Prayer as Jesus taught, it will be observed that the verbs occupy a position of prominence. In the first strophe they are *hallowed, come, be done*; in the second strophe they are *give, forgive, lead (away), deliver (from)*. It has already been shown that in the fourth petition, ulterior motives (parallelism with the address) caused the displacement of that verb from its emphatic position. Therefore, that verb "give" also is intended to be emphasized as in all the other petitions. After the triadic first strophe, the second strophe follows in an anthropological direction, thus lending support to a noneschatological interpretation.

1. God's Name

In the Decalogue, God revealed himself as the only true God by the election and deliverance of Israel (Ex. 20:2) and therefore he required the loyalty of his beloved people by giving the First Commandment ("You shall have no other gods before me," Ex. 20:3; Deut. 5:7). This loyalty was to be undivided, as indicated by the prohibition against idolatry (Ex. 20:4; Deut. 5:8). Then God commanded the following: "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain" (Ex. 20:7; Deut. 5:11).

Name

The first petition of the Lord's Prayer asks God to hallow his own name. The word ὄνομα is the standard translation for the Old Testament Hebrew word שֵׁם . Biblical scholarship generally accepts the fact that the *name* bears a relationship with the one named. For example, the Old Testament records the *giving* of a name on several occasions. Hans Bietenhard explained, "By giving someone a name, one establishes a relation of dominion and possession."⁶⁰ Examples of the privilege of naming and also of acquiring dominion include Adam's naming of the animals (Gen. 2:19), naming of cities (2 Sam. 12:28), or the naming of lands (Ps. 49:11). As Creator, God named the stars (Ps. 147:4). He established his claim over Israel (Is. 43:1) so that the Israelites became God's people (Is. 63:19; 2 Chron. 7:14). God often revealed himself by disclosing his name (e.g. יְהוָה , Gen. 17:1) and by the *Tetragrammaton* (Ex. 3:14). Ex. 20:24 taught that God will bless his people wherever they remember his name.⁶¹ Although God (*Yahweh*) dwells in heaven (Deut. 4:36; 26:15), he chooses a place (דִּירָא) to cause his

⁶⁰ Hans Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament [hereafter TDNT], ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-74), 5:253. Such "naming" could be understood in relation to the modern linguistic concept of "performative language."

⁶¹ The "Aaronic benediction" is recorded in Num 6:24-26. After these words, God said to Moses (v. 27): "So shall they put my name upon the people of Israel, and I will bless them." God's covenant blessing was assured with the divine name being given. As such, the concept underlying the divine name was not static, but active, and directed toward God's people in grace.

shem to dwell there (Deut. 26:2). In fact, the terms "the name" or "the place" became familiar circumlocutions for God. The *name* was used for the glory of God (Ps. 48:10; Is. 26:8; 55:13 (MT, "name"; RSV, "memorial")). Believers should expect that God will bless his children on earth who know his name, according to Ps. 91:14-16: "Because he cleaves to me in love, I will deliver him; I will protect him, because he knows my name. When he calls to me, I will answer him." Along with the שְׁמִי , God's שְׁמִי (Is. 59:19; Ps. 102:15) or שְׁמִי (Ps. 106:47; 145:21) can be associated.

Several passages particularly focus attention on God's concern that his name would not be profaned among people. For example, God said in Ezek. 20:9 (cf. 36:23), "But I acted for the sake of my name, that it should not be profaned in the sight of the nations . . . in whose sight I made myself known to them in bringing them out of the land of Egypt." Chapter twenty of Ezekiel is important for understanding the significance of this concept. Verses in Ezekiel review the rebellion against God after the Exodus (20:13, 15, 24), but God is shown also to have exercised his restraint: "But I acted for the sake of my name, that it should not be profaned in the sight of the nations" (Ezek. 20:14; cf. 20:22, 44). Further, God, desiring to bring the Israelites into the Promised Land, added, "I will manifest my holiness among you in the sight of the nations" (Ezek. 10:41).

God's holiness cannot be separated from his name. God revealed his holiness at Meribah when the Israelites rebelled (Num. 20:13). He revealed his holiness in the *Trisagion* of

Is. 6:3. His name is claimed as holy in Ezek. 36:21, 22; 39:7, 25; 43:7, 8. God's holy name is profaned by unholy living (Lev. 19:2) and by unholy words (cf. Ex. 20:7; Deut. 5:11; Matt. 5:34). Because of the association of God's holiness and his name, the *Tetragrammaton*, for example, came to be viewed as nearly a magical formula. Bietenhard stated, "Already in the Talmud, however, not merely the names of God but the individual letters of the names and indeed of the whole Heb. alphabet are regarded as magically potent."⁶²

New Testament usage is similar to the Old Testament. The word "name" frequently refers to the holy God himself. Some of the numerous examples are listed. Matt. 21:9 reports, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." Matt. 18:20 says, "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Luke 10:17 reported the results of the mission of the seventy: "Lord, even the demons are subject to us in your name!" (cf. v. 20). The apostles left the counsel of Gamaliel in Acts 5:41 "rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name." See also Matt. 7:22; 12:21; 18:5; Luke 21:8; James 2:7.

As in the Old Testament, the glorifying of the name of God is noted as of significant importance in the ministry of Jesus. Bietenhard made this observation regarding the close relationship between the name and the glory of God: "The name of God belongs to His manward side, the side of

⁶² Ibid., 270.

revelation."⁶³ On the basis of John 12:28 ("Father, glorify thy name," and "I have glorified it, and will glorify it again"), God revealed himself as the loving Father by glorifying his own name in the life and work of Jesus. Jesus came to do the work of the Father, as the Father's appointed agent or representative. God's salvific disposition toward man was completed and perfected, yes, became possible, by means of Jesus. Jesus did what man is unable to do satisfactorily, to glorify God's name.

Jesus glorified the Father by his soteriological activity on behalf of man. For example, baptism applies the fruits of redemption to the one baptized by reference to and use of the word "name" (Matt. 28:19; Rom 6:1-11; James 2:7). Remission of sins is preached in the name of Jesus (Acts 10:43; 2:38-39) and believers have life in this name (1 John 5:13). Prayer is a privilege given to the Christian: "Whatever you ask in my name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son; if you ask anything in my name, I will do it (John 14:13)."

The assertion that God and his name are synonymous is widely accepted. Ernst Lohmeyer made the point that God's name is the way that God reveals himself to the world; the hidden God seeks to reveal himself by manifesting his name.⁶⁴ This distinction has great significance for understanding the first petition of the Lord's Prayer. God's name connects God

⁶³ Ibid., 272.

⁶⁴ Lohmeyer, 75.

with the world. Jesus, who revealed the special term "Father" and reserved it for New Testament Christians, taught in the second petition that God's holy name "Father" is to be sanctified.⁶⁵ According to Lohmeyer, "the name of God takes its place among those concepts or forms which . . . accomplish his work. The name manifests God's hidden holiness."⁶⁶ God's holiness is unseen, but his glory can reveal that holiness: "To 'hallow' means to change God's hidden holiness into manifest glory."⁶⁷ In sum, God the Father chooses to reveal himself by his name. Congruent with the incarnation of Jesus, God manifested his love and mercy to the world in a special way through Jesus, that "name which is above every name" (Phil. 2:9).

To Hallow

To "hallow" the name is the request of the first petition of the Lord's Prayer. The New Testament Greek word ἁγιασθήτω is a third person singular, first aorist passive imperative like the initial verbs of all three *cola* or lines of the first strophe (the verbs in the first and third lines are passive, that in the second line is active). The first petition asks God to make his name holy. The passive verb form used here avoids the naming of God. God is the agent of

⁶⁵ Ibid., 76; Robert H. Gundry, Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 106.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 77.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 72.

the passive form. The verb ἁγιάζειν is obviously built on the word ἅγιος with an added factitive -άζειν.⁶⁸

This Greek word is the usual Septuagint translation for the root $\text{ו}^{\prime} \text{ק}^{\prime}$. The usual translations of $\text{ו}^{\prime} \text{ק}^{\prime}$ are: to be holy (*qal*); to show, prove oneself to be holy, to be treated as holy (*niphal*); to pronounce holy, to dedicate, to establish a holy time, to consecrate, to convey holiness, to treat as holy (*piel*); to make holy, consecrate (the *hiphil* carries typical causative force); to behave as holy (*hithpael*).⁶⁹ The passive of ἁγιάζειν is similar to the passive Hebrew forms, meaning to reveal something as holy.⁷⁰ Lohmeyer believed that the original Aramaic was a *hithpael* form; he asserted: "so it is probable that the prayer here is for what God's name may do in itself and for itself, namely that it shall reveal itself to be holy."⁷¹

Synonyms for ἁγιάζειν are μεγαλύνειν, δοξάζειν, and marginally, τιμάω. A special relationship prevails in the Bible between the concepts underlying "to sanctify" or hallow and "glorify" (John 12:28). The New Testament word δόξα,

⁶⁸ James Hope Moulton, and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), 4.

⁶⁹ William L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 313-14.

⁷⁰ Lohmeyer, 67.

⁷¹ Ibid.

δοξάζω is not related to its classical Greek meaning ("to consider") so much as to the particular meaning given it in the Septuagint, having to do with "divine honor" "splendor," "power" and "radiance."⁷² Outside of the Lord's Prayer, ἀγιάζειν is used by Matthew only at Matt. 23:17 and 19. There it refers to the sacralization of objects used in the temple cultus. Mark does not use the word, nor Luke except in the Lord's Prayer (Luke 11:2c). In John, the glory of Jesus is especially remarkable (John 1:14), although the word ἀγιάζειν is employed thrice (John 10:36; 17:17, 19). Jesus expressed the fact that he was an agent or representative of God who sent him on the mission to save: "My teaching is not mine, but his who sent me" (John 7:16); and, "But he who seeks the glory of him who sent him is true" (John 5:18); and again, "Yet I do not seek my own glory" (John 8:50). In his High Priestly prayer, Jesus prayed that believers would be drawn into the unity of fellowship with God and Jesus (John 17:24). Jesus would be able to glorify the Father by virtue of accomplishing the work given him to do (John 17:4). Ultimately, Jesus would glorify the Father (John 17:1; cf. also 12:28; 13:31-32; 14:13; 15:8). God's glory is completed by the Son's work of redemption ("to give eternal life to all," 17:2). In John 5:44 the "glory" that can come from the only God clearly refers to mortals receiving the blessing of

⁷² Gerhard Kittel, "δοκέω, δόξα, κτλ," in TDNT 2:247. The word "glory" is also used in the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer. There it is used particularly in antithesis to diabolical splendor and power.

life and salvation.⁷³ In John 17:17 Jesus *prayed* for the sanctification of believers through the word. In John 17:19 Jesus directed his *mission* toward the sanctification of believers. God clearly sanctifies, in the broader sense of the term, by means of his representative, Jesus. God acts, man benefits, and God is glorified (John 17:1).

Several other passages also teach that the believer receives his sanctified status through divine activity. 1 Cor. 6:11 says, "But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." See also Eph. 5:26; Heb. 2:11; 10:10, 14, 29; 13:12; Rev. 22:11 (καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι, with that verb being identical in form to the verb of the first petition). 1 Pet. 3:15 urges the Christian to be active in sanctifying Christ: "But in your hearts reverence (ἁγιάσατε) Christ the Lord. Always be prepared to make a defense to any one who calls you to account for the hope that is in you." *Sanctifying* Christ is done, then, by proclaiming him. His name is hallowed among believers who are the justified and sanctified ones. Lohmeyer explained the sanctifying of God's people this way: "The hallowing of God's name 'Father' also means the hallowing of all those to whom he is Father."⁷⁴ The whole semantic field of "holiness" avows that God is

⁷³ L. H. Brockington, "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament use of DOXA," in Studies in the Gospels, Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 1-8.

⁷⁴ Lohmeyer, 82.

holy. His holiness is not only an attribute; it is his very essence.⁷⁵ Hos. 11:9 says, "I am God and not man, the Holy One is in your midst." Jesus is ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 1:24; Luke 4:34; John 6:69). The Holy One of God, Jesus, penetrates and permeates the whole Gospel message; he is its content and *raison d'être*.

Rabbinic Judaism of course represented the later application of principles already taught in the Old Testament. Jewish theology after the Exile tended to emphasize certain themes. One of these was the holiness of God. In fact, in later Judaism the *Tetragrammaton* was replaced by its pronunciation with *Adonai* and God was referred to by circumlocutions such as *the Shamayim*. The *Kaddish* of the synagogue began, "Magnified and hallowed be the name . . ." Notice that this prayer asks God to perform the action of hallowing his own name. *Siphre Deuteronomium* explained that the ten plagues, the crossing of the river Jordan, the saving of Daniel, the saving of the three youths in the fiery furnace were all for the purpose of hallowing God's name.⁷⁶

However, another trend developed that emphasized what men, not God, should do. The Israelites especially, as God's chosen people, must live in a manner so that men could see

⁷⁵ Ibid., 71.

⁷⁶ George Foote Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Harvard, 1927), 102-103.

that the God of Israel is the true God.⁷⁷ They were to obey God's will and keep the commands of the *Torah* so as to achieve a blameless walk before the eyes of the world.⁷⁸ The hallowing of the name ($\square \psi' \square \dot{\mu}' \dot{\iota}' \tau \dot{7} \rho$) became the chief ethic and ideal in Judaism.⁷⁹ The negative side of this picture emphasized separation from others, especially Gentiles, and from idolatry.⁸⁰ Of course, this naturally led to a self-righteous attitude, whereby the Jew concluded that he could contribute to the holiness of God by his own endeavors.

God's holiness requires sanctification on the part of his creation. God demands holiness in Lev. 11:45: "You shall therefore be holy, for I am holy." More statements follow: "And you shall not profane my holy name, but I will be hallowed among the people of Israel; I am the Lord who sanctify you" (Lev. 22:32). Is. 29:23 prophesies of God's people, "For when he sees . . . the work of my hands, in his midst, they will sanctify my name." Moses failed to enter the promised land, as God objected, "because you did not revere me as holy in the midst of the people of Israel" (Deut. 32:51). Responsive obedience is expected also in such New Testament passages as 1 Cor. 6:20; 1 Tim. 6:1; 1 Pet.

⁷⁷ Karl Georg Kuhn, "ἅγιος, ἀγιάζω, κτλ," TDNT 1:99.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* See the *Kaddish*: $\delta \tau \tau \quad \tau \dot{\mu}' \dot{\iota}' \tau \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho \dot{7} \rho$.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 100.

3:15. Jesus said in Matt. 5:16, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven." Sadly, sinful human beings disappoint God and profane his name and holiness. Virtually all people by nature fail to live lives congruous with God's holiness (Gen. 8:21; Rom. 5:12; 1 John 1:8).

Since man himself cannot completely and properly hallow God's name, God himself accomplishes it. In such passages as Lev. 10:3; Ex. 29:43; Is. 4:16; 42:8, 12; Ezek. 20:41; Zech. 14:20-21, it is God who acts to vindicate his holiness. God preserved Pharaoh in order for his name to be declared (Ex. 9:16). He acts to show mercy to those who have transgressed against him (Ex. 32:12-14; Deut. 9:25-29). The classic statement of this theme is recorded in Ezek. 36:22-23:

It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name, which you have profaned among the nations to which you came. And I will vindicate the holiness of my great name, which has been profaned among the nations, and which you have profaned among them; and the nations will know that I am the Lord, says the Lord God, when through you I vindicate my holiness before their eyes.

When God hallows, he gives a new heart (life) and a new spirit, his Spirit (Ezek. 36:26, 27). Then when God acts, He is glorified. Lev. 10:3 says, "I will show myself holy ($\psi \tau \rho \alpha$) among those who are near me, and before all the people I will be glorified" ($\tau \rho \alpha \rho \alpha$). When God hallows, it is for the redemption of his people who then, in turn, glorify him. For God to be sanctified, he must also sanctify. Leonardo Boff put it this way, "God who is ontologically remote (holy), becomes ethically near (holy)"

and "bridges over the gulf interposed between his holy reality and our profane reality."⁸¹

The first petition touches on themes relating to both the justification and sanctification of the believer. The doctrine of "justification by grace" teaches that man is powerless and his redemption therefore is entirely in the hands of God. God acts by having sent Jesus into the world as the Redeemer and Savior from sin. Jesus is the one who glorifies God. His work is attributed to the believer by faith. Man's acceptance of the promise of forgiveness of sin comes from God's activity. In terms of sanctification, man is spiritually helpless and powerless to satisfy the demands of God's holiness (expressed in the "law" of God). But once man participates in the new life of the Spirit and is a justified believer, then he is able to lead a "sanctified" life. That is, God so consecrates the Christian that his life becomes a living sacrifice to God (Rom. 12:1). Paul exhorted: "So whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:13). Man himself does not have that capability to serve and glorify God properly, but God empowers him to do so. Therefore, God who demands holiness sanctifies and thereby is sanctified.

God's initiative in sanctification works in a hidden but revealing way through the means of grace. In short, through the means of grace Jesus is revealed. By means of

⁸¹ Leonardo Boff, The Lord's Prayer: The Prayer of Integral Liberation, tr. Theodore Morrow (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1983), 45-46.

Jesus God does everything that the hallowing of his name entails.

Interpretation

The first petition, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, is set against the Old Testament and rabbinical conceptions of the "name" and the "hallowing" or "sanctifying" of it. The verb of the first petition is an aorist imperative, a tense generally used for prayer. Use of the passive not only avoids the divine name, but significantly recognizes God as being the agent for completing the action prayed for.⁸² Much of what is said here about the first petition will also apply to the next two petitions also. These petitions are addressed to God. He alone can act to provide responses and answers.

Two interpretations of this petition are possible: a future eschatological and a present noneschatological interpretation. Commentators representative of the latter view may emphasize either divine or human activity in hallowing God's name. The eschatological interpretation reserves the fulfilment of this petition by a single divine act at the end of history.

As already seen, on the one hand, believers are to hallow God and his name (Is. 29:23). On the other hand, the work of hallowing is completely left to God (Ezek. 36:22-23).

⁸² See Jeremias, New Testament Theology, 9-14, for a complete analysis of the divine passive. Also, see E. Pax, "Beobachtungen zum biblischen Sprachtabu," Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus, 12 (1961-62), Excursus: "Das sog. Passivum theologicum," 92-110.

These two views need to be reconciled. The obvious solution appeals to God's monergism which yet allows room for man's synergistic efforts (in the good sense of the term!); that is, God is active in and through the believer. The first petition asks God to answer the prayer petition. It asks *him* to act. When God does so act, he causes himself to be glorified in and among his children. His hallowing is not in a vacuum, in isolation from his people.⁸³

An eschatological interpretation of the first petition is based on the simple force of the aorist. This view expects God to act once in history. It asks him to act so as to hallow his name. It assumes a certain determinate hallowing, not a gradual one. If God alone is the subject of the verb, he is the one who should manifest his honor and glory by a simple, decisive, glorious, eschatological act. Raymond Brown explained how he would understand this request for hastening the final end:

The passive is a surrogate for the divine name, and the *Einmaligkeit* of the aorist is to be given its full force. It is a prayer that God accomplish the ultimate sanctification of His name, the complete manifestation of His holiness, the last of His salvific acts Only the last days will see that vindication of the holiness of

⁸³ Dobschütz, 306, described this approach, although he did not agree with this position: "We would hallow thy name--do thou help us to do so; we would bring in, or spread, thy kingdom--do thou work with us; we promise to do thy will as it is done by the angels--enable us to fulfil this promise." He wrongly made the preceding a "promise" or "vow" which the Lord's Prayer is not. He also failed to recognize that the position he parodied does not expect human strength to accomplish these things, but duly allows God to take the initiative in acting; only God can accomplish these three petitions. Dobschütz, like so many who disparage a noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, failed to appreciate the soteriological dimension connected with the petitions in the first strophe. They bespeak of divine grace to men!

God's name.⁸⁴

The second, noneschatological view sees God completing the hallowing of his name among believers while they live in the here and now. On the basis of Is. 29:23, God's people should be extensions of the incarnation so that their work glorifies God. This is basically Luther's interpretation.

Those who object to the present orientation and application of this petition overlook the force of the aorist used as a verbal form in prayer. Instead, they look for a simple, punctiliar action, of which the aorist is capable and which probably represents its most common use. It is claimed, therefore, that the noneschatological interpretation of this petition tolerates an orientation toward the present that wrongly assumes a gradual and ongoing hallowing in this world by men. The eschatological viewpoint understands the hallowing as a sovereign fiat asked to be realized only at the consummation. Dobschütz, for example, queried, "How can the name of God be hallowed in a single act? It cannot, if it is to be hallowed by men. But Jesus is not thinking here of men; nor will the Christian think of their agency."⁸⁵

In reply, it should be pointed out that the second interpretation indeed does assume that God is the only one truly capable of answering the petition. Yet, he acts in

⁸⁴ Raymond E. Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," in New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965), 231.

⁸⁵ Dobschütz, 307; he added, 309, "God is asked to sanctify his name by some wonderful mighty deed, in a word by nothing less than the establishment of his kingdom."

such a way that his people are included (Heb. 2:11).⁸⁶

This view takes the passive form that is addressed to God seriously (aorist imperative). God, not man, is indeed the agent in this passive construction (Num. 14:20-22). This petition asks God to hallow his name and it asks that God cause man to be moved to glorify it also. This view takes into account the imperfect hallowing of God's name in the present Gospel age, as well as the perfect and final hallowing that is still to come. If the aorist has the aspect of serving in the capacity of a prayer petition, then one does not need to insist on its punctiliar aspect. Essentially, the "here and now" interpretation understands God's activity in the world as "incarnational." That is, God chooses not to work immediately, but mediately, through means, on this side of eternity.

The interpretation proposed here for the first petition does not violate God's sovereign position. This petition asks him to act and work as he wills. The prayer is indeed addressed solely to God. The Christian leaves all the details to God. Carmignac wisely accepted this interpretation:

Since the two aspects [of God working alone and of his involving his people] are part of both the Old and the New Testament, we do not have the right to exclude either the one or the other thought of Christ, which is formulated precisely in a way to include both. In short, we ask God to effectively complete his glory and we ask him for the grace ourselves of contributing as much as

⁸⁶ Carmignac, 88, believed that if the aorist is a faithful translation of the Hebrew iussive, the Prayer asks, "May your name be hallowed." This would allow for the sanctified action of man to effect God's glorification.

possible to assure it.⁸⁷

Prayer is meant to serve the needs of God's beloved children who are living now as strangers in this world. As such, they pray that God would hallow them by granting the blessings of redemption, made possible by Jesus. This petition is appropriate for Jesus' disciples. They have already become believers, but they acknowledge God's initiative and their own spiritual weaknesses and inability. This petition leaves no room for synergism (in the bad sense!). God's salvific activity in Jesus and through the Spirit is entirely monergistic. The aorist passive verb recognizes God as the sole agent in justification and sanctification. Man only has it in his power to profane the name of God both by disobedience and by rejection of God. This petition asks God to hallow his name among his people in spite of man's profanation of that name (Is. 43:7, 21). What is only partially realized will at the Last Day be fully realized, of course. The first petition asks for that full hallowing of God's name also.

However, the first petition is *primarily* oriented to the present existential circumstances of Christians who are taught to pray this petition while living now. Hence,

⁸⁷ Ibid., 85: "Puisque ces deux aspects font partie l'un et l'autre de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, nous n'avons pas le droit d'exclure soit l'un soit l'autre de la pensée du Christ, qui est formulée précisément de façon à les inclure tous les deux. En somme, nous demandons à Dieu d'assurer efficacement sa gloire et nous lui demandons la grâce de contribuer nous-mêmes à l'assurer le plus possible." See also Philip Harner, "Matthew 6:5-15," Interpretation 41 (1987): 173-78, who identified *man's responsiveness* to God's promises with regard to all seven petitions.

Cocceius explained that this petition includes man's human activity and is related to God's soteriological will.⁸⁸ Essentially the prayer asks God to live up to the reputation of his holiness by giving his people redemption. God is glorified by the holy name of Jesus (Is. 49:3). God's glory has a salvific dimension, as Simeon of old confessed upon seeing the "Lord's Christ": "For mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou has prepared in the presence of all peoples . . . for glory to thy people" (Luke 2:30-32). Jesus is active in the lives of Christians through the Spirit, working justification by grace and causing sanctification in them to gradually unfold in time before eternity. The first petition is subject to a soteriological orientation. The concern of hallowing God's name is applicable to God's people today. When God hallows, God is glorified and man is blessed with the gifts of God intended for salvation and holy living.

2. God's Kingdom

The concept of the kingdom of God is a prominent theme in the New Testament. It has Old Testament antecedents although the phrase itself is not used there. When the Old Testament describes God's role as King, it emphasizes his activity more than his nature. This has implications for understanding the first two petitions of the Lord's Prayer.

⁸⁸ Quoted in August Tholuck, Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount (Edinburgh: Clark, 1874), 334: "Dei nomen sanctificatur (1) per obedientem servatoris, (2) per verbum evangelii, quo Christi justitia et Dei sanctitas manifestatur" (The name of God is hallowed [1] by obedience of service, and [2] by the word of the Gospel, whereby the righteousness of Christ and the holiness of God is manifested).

The first petition emphasizes the holiness of his nature; the second petition underlines his activity among men.

Kingdom

God was honored as King in connection with the Exodus and the covenant event at Sinai. Balaam's second blessing shows this: "The Lord their God is with them, and the shout of a king is among them. God brings them out of Egypt" (Num. 23:21-22; cf. Deut. 33:5). In fact, since God was their King, the Israelites had no need for a monarch. This is reflected in Gideon's reply after being asked to serve as King, "I will not rule over you, and my son will not rule over you; the Lord will rule over you" (Judges 8:23). Even after the monarchy, God was still regarded as King: "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endures throughout all generations" (Ps. 145:13).

Late Judaism saw two streams of thought in regard to the kingdom. One was an eschatological conception whereby Jews "looked forward to the time when God would manifest his rule over the entire earth, so that all peoples would acknowledge him as the one true God."⁸⁹ This was one of the directions of apocalyptic imagination (see no. 11 of the *Eighteen Benedictions*). The other notion suggested that people could hasten the advent of the kingdom on earth. One of the favored ways of doing this was by taking the yoke of

⁸⁹ Philip Harner, Understanding the Lord's Prayer (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 70.

the kingdom upon themselves by the recitation of the *Shema*.⁹⁰ Taking the yoke easily led to self-righteous conclusions. The hope of restoring God's kingdom on earth in later Judaism was freighted with nationalistic overtones. The political aspect of this eschatological hope can be seen in the *Eighteen Benedictions*, no. 14. This hope generally included the restoration of the Davidic throne, as seen in the Apocalyptic Psalms of Solomon (17:3-4, 23):

But we hope in God, our deliverer; For the might of our God is for ever with mercy, And the kingdom of our God is for ever over the nations in judgement Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David, At the time in which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant.

Teachings about God's kingdom based on Dan. 2:44 and 7:27 fed nationalistic aspirations. In short, Jews hoped for the restoration of their theocracy, wrested from foreign powers. If God were to rule again, Israel must be set free from Gentiles and subject to God alone.⁹¹ It should be mentioned that the term itself, מְלִכְוֹתָא דְּיְהוָה (Ar., מְלִכְוֹתָא דְּיְהוָה) was rather infrequent in Judaism, and practically nonexistent in the Old Testament, in comparison with Jesus' use of the term "kingdom of God" (see Ps. 22:29; 45:7; 103:19; 145:11-13; 1 Chron. 29:11; Dan. 2:44; 4:28; 7:28).⁹² On the other

⁹⁰ Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1942), 1:269; Dalman, Words, 97. See also the extended comments, *supra*, Chapter III, fn. 133.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 98.

⁹² Karl Georg Kuhn, "βασιλεύς, κτλ," in TDNT 1:572. See Chapter III, fn. 4.

hand, it occurred frequently in connection with the phrase "to accept the yoke of the kingdom of God" (meaning to recite the *Shema*).⁹³

Jesus stressed the kingdom of God in his teaching.⁹⁴ He was familiar with its use in late Judaism, but did not employ the same range of meanings attached to it. His message was different and distinct. He regarded the kingdom of God as a concept associated with the fulfilment theme that God was working mightily in the world through himself. It is important to emphasize this doctrine or theme. For Jesus, the "kingdom" designated the new time of salvation that God was bringing. It was God's gift to men: "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12:32). It could not be earned, and the recipients were certainly undeserving ("We are unworthy servants," Luke 17:10). Unlike Jewish precedents, for Jesus the kingdom could not be earned or hastened by men; it was a gift of God. It was made available for all, regardless of station in life (Mark 2:15-17; Luke 14:15-24). Yet, it could be rejected by willful disobedience and disrespect (Matt. 7:21-23; 21:43; Luke 6:46; 13:26-27). It was not associated with nationalistic emphases; rather, it was the announcement of God's grace to sinful mankind. It brought hope and God's love to bear upon those in desperate spiritual need (Luke

⁹³ Ibid.: מִן הַיְּמֵינוּ הַיּוֹמִים הַזֵּהִם שֶׁנֶּחְמָד [sic].

⁹⁴ For a helpful succinct study of the Biblical concept of the kingdom of God, see William Frederick Arndt, St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956), Excursus, 150-153. Note that the "kingdom macarisms" spoken in the Beatitudes are present tenses (Matt. 5:3, 10; Luke 6:20).

4:18). The kingdom of God is present as the *supremum bonum donatum Dei* where and when the kingdom of the adversary is being defeated (Matt. 12:28-30; Luke 11:20-22; 1 John 3:8b).

The kingdom teaching of Jesus assumed that all people could belong to God's kingdom, rather than to think that it was designated for only the Jews. Without God's grace in Jesus, there is really no kingdom. Until receiving God's gift of grace, no group can really be called God's people, as 1 Pet. 2:10 explains: "Once you were no people but now you are God's people; once you had not received mercy but now you have received mercy." That teaching is derived from Hos. 1:9-10 where the familiar term describing the impenitent, "not my people [*Lo-ammi*]," is used. In 1 Pet. 2:9 all the believers comprise a "kingdom of priests": But you are a chosen race, a royal (*βασιλείον*) priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people." This doctrine stems from the promise God gave to his covenant people in Ex. 19:6: "And you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (cf. Num. 11:29; Is. 61:6; 66:21; Rev. 1:6). The kingdom of grace comes through Jesus the King of grace. In the New Testament the kingdom is always identified with Jesus (Matt. 16:28; 19:29; Mark 10:29; Luke 18:29; 22:29; Acts 8:12; 28:31; Rev. 12:10). Marcion, an early church leader known for his lack of orthodoxy, nevertheless could say, "In evangelio est dei regnum Christus ipse."⁹⁵

⁹⁵ Quoted by Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "*βασιλεία*," in *TDNT* 1:589; "In the Gospel, Christ himself is the kingdom (reign) of God." Note how similar this definition is to that of Cyprian writing much later (ca. A.D. 252) in the quotation at Chapter II, fn. 145, *supra*.

God invites men to his kingdom so that they, the true Israel, may enjoy the soteriological blessings connected with that kingdom (Rom. 11:26; Gal. 6:16). The kingdom is not the same as the organized Christian church on earth *qua* institution, although it must be understood that those who have received the kingdom become identified with the visible Christian assembly (Matt. 16:18; Col. 4:11) to which the very "keys of the kingdom" are given (Matt. 16:19). As such, the blessings of the kingdom are spiritual, not temporal. They are located where the word of Christ is. The kingdom is spiritual, not ethical or in any way associated with temporal power (John 18:36; Acts 1:6). Karl Schmidt had this to say about the New Testament kingdom in respect to its spiritual and yet "incarnational" nature:

We should compare the Jewish Shemone Esre and its fervent nationalism with the Lord's Prayer and its complete absence of any such particularism. Similarly, immanence is never preached at the expense of transcendence in the proclamation of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God is beyond ethics. To orientate oneself by ethics is to think of the individual. In Jesus and the apostles, however, the individual does not stand under the promise as an individual. It is the community which stands under the promise; the individual attains to salvation as its member.⁹⁶

As already proposed, the terms "kingdom of grace" and "kingdom of glory" are useful categories delineating the present and the future dimensions associated with Jesus' many teachings about the kingdom. In a sense, both of them

⁹⁶ Ibid., 586. For A. N. Janaris, "The English Version of the Lord's Prayer," The Contemporary Review 346 (Oct. 1894): 580-91, *Lord*, and *Lordship* were preferable to *King*, and *kingdom* in translation (p. 582).

underscore the grace of God and point to Jesus the King of the kingdom.⁹⁷ The grace of God associated with the kingdom teachings of Jesus is primarily oriented toward the "time of grace" of the present existence in which men now live and to whom Jesus came.

To Come

The word used for "coming" in the second petition is ²¹ερχομαι, ²¹ερχεσθαι, the usual translation of κ̅ι̅. Its meaning is predominantly local.⁹⁸ This Greek word is frequently introduced with various prepositions to create a compound verb subject to particularized meanings. Lohmeyer explained this concept ontologically in terms of the here and now: "Often, of course, the word 'come' seems to be simply a synonym for 'happen, take place' . . . but the expression reaches still deeper . . . and whatever exists and takes place . . . is a 'coming into time or through time.'"⁹⁹ The word is used in connection with the Messiah in several instances (cf. Is. 5:19, "Let the purpose of the Holy One of Israel draw near, and let it come" [ἐλθάτω]). This famous

⁹⁷ Lohmeyer, 127, claimed that Tertullian reversed the second and third petitions because the kingdom of glory should precede the kingdom of grace. See Chap. II, fn. 121.

⁹⁸ Johannes Schneider, "ερχομαι, κτλ," in TDNT 2:667; and Lohmeyer, 89-90; Dobschütz, 310, said that it was not local, but temporal, though by his explanation it is clear that he meant the same thing, namely, that the kingdom as a realm is not intended by this word group, but rather, reference is made to God's incarnate (reigning) activity.

⁹⁹ Lohmeyer, 92.

statement from Daniel 7:13 declares, "And behold, with the clouds of heaven there came (ἦρχετο; Theod., ἐρχόμενος) one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him." Ps. 118:26 uses "ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου." This verse is quoted in connection with Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem on the first Palm Sunday; he was the "coming one" (Matt. 21:9; Mark 11:9; Luke 13:35; 19:38; John 12:13).¹⁰⁰ Luke went beyond quoting the Old Testament verbatim when he added a reference to Jesus being the King of Messianic peace (that is, salvation!): "Blessed is the King who comes in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!" (Luke 19:38). The Evangelists allowed the crowds to define the office and person of Jesus. This "Palm Sunday" Christological affirmation states that Jesus must be understood in terms of the "coming" King of salvation.

The New Testament explains the work of Jesus in several places in terms of his coming. For example, the Bible tells that Jesus came to call sinners to repentance (Mark 2:17, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (cf. Matt. 9:13; Luke 5:32). Jesus claimed that his purpose was to "fulfill" the Old Testament. This claim is put in terms of "coming": "I have come not to abolish them [the Law and the Prophets] but to fulfil them" (Matt. 5:17). Of course, his message and purpose would meet misunderstanding and rejection from some

¹⁰⁰ See Werner Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus, tr. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM, 1956), 115-117, for exegesis of the entry in Jerusalem understood as the coming of salvation to the here and now.

quarters, "Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to set a man against his father" (Matt. 10:34-35; cf. Luke 12:49-53). Jesus' coming would bring even more than division. It would bring a time of judgment for those who would reject him, for by rejecting God's son, God was being rejected, "For judgment I came into this world" (John 9:39). On the other hand, those who respond to Jesus' invitation and gift receive eternal life, "For this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:40). Note that the power to respond to the blessing of the coming of Christ depends on the initiative of God (divine monergism) as John 6:65 instructs, "No one can come to me unless it is granted him by the Father."

It must be remembered that before the New Testament and the coming of Jesus, popular Jewish belief held that Elijah must return before the Messiah's coming. Jesus explained that this expectation was satisfied and fulfilled by the ministry of John the Baptizer. If, indeed, the premise is granted that John was the promised forerunner of the Messiah, then clearly the Messiah and Savior has "come" to this earth in the person of Jesus (Matt. 11:14; 12:41 [ὡδὲ]; 17:10-13; 27:47-49; Mark 9:12; 15:35; Luke 7:20 ["Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?"]; 9:33; 11:31). It should be noted that the Old Testament never speaks of the "coming" of the kingdom (in grace!), only of its being made manifest (by a future "appearing"), or, in Judaism, of the

taking the yoke of the kingdom upon oneself.¹⁰¹

The Gospel of John is especially replete with illustrations combining the idea of "coming" with Jesus. The end result of these citations is to see that Jesus came to bring God's message of salvation. His coming was a coming in grace. God's love and favor became manifest through Jesus' coming. To the Samaritan woman at the well, Jesus announced the New Testament way of worship as being "in Spirit and in truth" (John 4:23). This "hour" or moment of grace was now upon God's people precisely because Jesus had come (ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἔστιν). This description of worship pertains to the present Gospel age. In John 5:43 Jesus explained that he came specifically to bring the blessings of salvation or of "life" (see John 5:40): "I have come in my Father's name." He was sent to this world as the agent or ambassador of the Father, "For I know whence I have come and whither I am going" (John 8:14), and again, "I am from above" (John 8:23). The Father sent Jesus, who said, "I came not of my own accord, but he sent me" (John 8:42). Once again, the salvific purpose of Jesus is underscored in John 10:10, "I came that they may have life." Jesus said in John 12:27, "For this purpose have I come to this hour." Jesus came as a light to save the world (John 12:46-57). In sum, Jesus' coming was accompanied by proclaiming and making possible the blessed reign of grace on earth among men (Luke 2:14).

¹⁰¹ Lohmeyer, 90. Georg Strecker, The Sermon on the Mount: An Exegetical Commentary, tr. O. C. Dean (Nashville: Abingdon, 1988), 114, observed that the term "come" therefore is not restricted to the future.

The Bible also looks toward the future eschatological day of Jesus' coming in glory. In Matt. 16:27-28 reference is made to the final coming or visible return of Jesus to earth: "For the Son of man is to come with his angels in the glory of the Father . . . there are some standing here who will not taste of death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."¹⁰² A cluster of references to the second coming can be found in Jesus' "Olivet Discourse" of Matthew 24 and 25. It is said at Matt. 24:30, "Then will appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven . . . and they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds" (cf. 26:64). His coming will be at an unexpected hour (24:44, 46). In the Parable of the Talents the master "came" to settle accounts (25:19). Jesus' coming will be in glory (25:31). John, too, speaks of Jesus and his second coming. John 5:25 reports Jesus' teaching: "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live." On the Last Day, at the general resurrection, those receiving the blessing of eternal life will be the same ones who received the blessing of life through faith in Jesus while living in this world. "The

¹⁰² There are several synoptic passages reporting similar references to Jesus' coming perceived as happening soon; cf. Matt. 10:23; Mark 13:9-13; Luke 21:12-19; Matt. 16:28; Mark 9:6; Luke 9:27. Interpretations vary. Such words of Jesus may be proleptic of the future *parousia*; other interpreters look at them as "experienced now, but not exhausted," or as referring to Jesus' own resurrection, or as indicative that Jesus expected the end within a generation (A. Schweizer). The first two appear to satisfy the data best. The expectation of the *parousia* has been expected by believers throughout the generations to happen at any moment, therefore, Christians should be ready and prepared. See further discussion in Arndt, 261, 416-17, 420, 422-23.

resurrection is already present when men in faith have passed from death to life."¹⁰³ Jesus promised to come again at the Last Day in John 14:3: "I will come again." He referred to his parousia as a "coming" in John 21:22: "If it is my will that he [John] remain until I come (ἕως ἔρχομαι), what is that to you?" (cf. v. 23).

From all these passages, it is abundantly clear that Jesus is the divinely appointed "coming one" to bring life, grace, and salvation to sinners. His coming is twofold, now in grace, and hereafter, in glory. He came once to teach God's love to sinners. He also paid the ultimate price by the sacrifice of his own life on the cross to earn man's salvation. His first coming was a coming in grace for mankind. At the end of history, Jesus will return. This "coming" will be glorious. He will come to raise the dead and to judge (John 5:21-22). It will be a day of acquittal and bliss for those who are his children by faith and adoption.

Interpretation

God's kingdom brings grace and salvation to his people. This holds true for the expression "coming" which often, when used in other contexts, is used locally or spatially but which, when joined with other key salvation concepts, suggests the coming of grace and salvation. The coming of the King of the kingdom was in the person of Jesus. His coming continues through the ministry of the word in the

¹⁰³ Schneider, 673.

present Gospel age (Luke 4:21). After his second coming, he will be seen in his full glory and believers will be brought to the kingdom of glory. Both the present and future aspects of the second petition of the Lord's Prayer come into view. The kingdom petition significantly occupies the center of the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer. Its *primary* orientation is for the present time of grace.

The second petition employs the aorist active imperative verb ἐλθάτω (first aorist) or ἐλθέτω (second aorist), depending on the manuscript, of ἔρχομαι. These possibilities are inconsequential and probably reflect scribal variations in the manuscript tradition. Lohmeyer properly stated about this variation of forms: "It points to the increasing confusion of the two forms in the koine, which has led to the complete abolition of the difference in modern Greek."¹⁰⁴ Some Old Latin manuscripts translate the phrase *veniat regnum tuum*, while others, including the Vulgate, offer *adveniat regnum tuum*. The first ("come") is more literal and is therefore preferable to the second, which is interpretative and suggests "coming to." The traditional English rendition is probably the best translation: "Thy kingdom come." This hallowed phraseology captures the third person active imperative, which otherwise is difficult to render into English translation. This very verb, by the way, is given in Goodwin's *Greek Grammar* with a suggested

¹⁰⁴ Lohmeyer, 88. The edited Greek texts and Majority text prefer the more classical second aorist form. See BDF 43, sec. 81.3.

translation for the third person imperative: "Let him [or, it] come."¹⁰⁵ English "sense" prefers a iussive form to provide a smooth translation: "Let your kingdom come." But the traditional English translation, "Thy kingdom come," does indeed successfully allow for the strength of the third person and does not artificially introduce the permissive or iussive. Because the aorist imperative possesses an aspect suitable for prayer petitions, it does not need to reflect the ordinary force of a single event or answer to the prayer. It simply asks God to cause his kingdom to come. Two possibilities exist for interpreting the second petition.

One type of interpretation that has been suggested relates to future eschatology. This interpretation emphasizes the final inbreaking of God's kingdom on the Last Day. Johann Bengel summarized this interpretation: "Adventum regni dei ad seculi finem refert."¹⁰⁶ In this view, the kingdom has not yet appeared on earth, but it will come one day in manifest glory.¹⁰⁷ This interpretation depends heavily on the force of the aorist imperative. God is asked to act once in a mighty and final way. He will

¹⁰⁵ William W. Goodwin, A Greek Grammar (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 287.

¹⁰⁶ Johann Albrecht Bengel, Gnomon (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1915), 49 *ad loc*; "the advent (coming) of the kingdom of God refers to the end of the world."

¹⁰⁷ Some interpret the coming of the kingdom in an earthly dispensational way of a reign of Christ where injustice, evil, and godless powers will be replaced with the peace and holiness of God's earthly reign; this line is rejected in this study as falling outside of the "analogy of faith" and clear Scriptural teaching.

provide an answer when, at the end of history, he will usher in his kingdom promised by Jesus. Raymond Brown cited passages which speak of the universal kingdom of God such as Jer. 10:7, 10; Mal. 1:14 in favor of the final reign of God.¹⁰⁸ He solicited the signs of the last times, for example in Is. 24:23, as evidence for a final breaking of God into history.¹⁰⁹ He showed that God's dominion will be incomplete now in this world until Jesus returns. Satan still has power (Luke 4:6; 1 John 5:19). Brown summarized how he understood the second petition: "The Christians are not primarily asking that God's dominion come into their own hearts, but that God's universal reign be established--that destiny toward which the whole of time is directed."¹¹⁰ Brown lamented "the gradual loss of eschatological import" by a noneschatological interpretation of the second petition.¹¹¹ For him, this petition does not deal "with the everyday growth of the kingdom," but with the "definitive reign of God at the end of the world."¹¹² Such a futuristic interpretation is solely oriented to what has been called the

¹⁰⁸ Brown, 233.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 234.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid., 232; at his fn. 59, he suggested that *Didache* 10.5 "gives the eschatological aspect" when it asks that the church be gathered from the four corners into the kingdom. Must this be understood eschatologically? It could simply refer to the harvesting of souls in this age, before the end comes, and therefore pictorially serve to emphasize a mission theme.

"kingdom of glory."

A second way of interpreting the kingdom petition emphasizes the kingdom of grace as being intended primarily for present existence. This idea may be described in the following way: "One envisages a gradual coming of the kingdom as an increasingly deep and extensive penetration of it into the hearts of men."¹¹³ Biblical support is gleaned from images of the church, such as the steady growth of a grain of mustard seed (Matt. 13:31; Mark 4:31; Luke 13:19). Men are co-workers of God in the task of kingdom work on earth. The theme of missions is a significant corollary of this view.¹¹⁴ Lohmeyer summarized this emphasis: "God brings it about among men, and through a constantly repeated *ora et labora* men are his instruments, until it is fulfilled in very truth through the action of God at the end of the world and of history."¹¹⁵ As much as Lohmeyer would prefer the eschatological interpretation of the second petition, he conceded that this petition is more compatible with a present interpretation:

A petition which is so exclusively directed at the coming of the kingdom [in the future] seems, however, to expose itself to one grave suspicion: should it not know that this kingdom is already 'at hand' in the very work and preaching of Jesus? Here the old explanation, which

¹¹³ Lohmeyer, 101.

¹¹⁴ Georg F. Vicedom, A Prayer for the World: The Lord's Prayer--A Prayer for Mission, tr. Edward and Marie Schroeder (St. Louis: Concordia, 1967).

¹¹⁵ Lohmeyer, 101; Lohmeyer who otherwise took an eschatological posture towards interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, surprisingly mediates his position here.

in various ways talks about a twofold coming, seems to be justified, and it is not easy to refute it Many parables of Jesus about the kingdom of God would be incomprehensible if we tried to exclude this idea of the nearness and presence of the kingdom.¹¹⁶

In fact, Lohmeyer finds it difficult to sustain his argument and ultimately does not refute the "suspicion" to which he referred except to say that both emphases, the present reality and the future promise, come from God.¹¹⁷ Lohmeyer did correctly point out that this petition acknowledges God alone as the one to bring this petition to fulfilment, on the basis of the active imperative.¹¹⁸ Likewise, John Broadus saw the primacy of the present dimension within the compass of the second petition:

The prayer that it might *come* would in the minds of our Lord's hearers refer especially to the beginning of the reign, the introduction of the kingdom . . . so in the full sense the coming of that reign or kingdom includes the idea of its complete establishment."¹¹⁹

Obviously, the noneschatological interpretation of this petition has the advantage over the eschatological interpretation since the believer is still in the world, as Jesus implied in John 17:11: "they are in the world." While

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 106.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 107. Lohmeyer operated with two levels whereby the Platonic conception of the kingdom seems to take on visible form. This is an example demonstrating his tendency at times toward a philosophical interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, which is less than satisfactory.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ John A. Broadus, Commentary on Matthew (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886; repr. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1990), 134.

in the world the believer comes under the influence of God's love and grace, while at the same time he abides in hope of the future consummation (cf. John 17:14: "they are not of the world"). By the second petition, he asks to be included in the host of those to be gathered before the Lamb (Rev. 7:9). Future hope cannot become a reality without present salvation. The aorist imperative designates God alone as the one who acts in a monergistic, sovereign way for the salvation of his people. There is no room for man's efforts. Man's works are frail and incapable of earning him a place in God's kingdom. In the second petition, the believer asks God to act now in time when and where the need is the greatest. Lohmeyer correctly drew attention to the wording of this petition, by saying,

One can understand . . . why the petition does not speak of 'being near' or 'being in the midst of you', but simply of 'coming'. The very colourlessness of this word conceals the depth of the surrender in which the suppliants look for the kingdom, and the magnitude and grace of the divine will, which its coming implies Jewish hope painted some pictures of how all salvation . . . would be found in the future kingdom There is nothing of all this in this petition.¹²⁰

The interpretation of the second petition that is primarily oriented to this present Gospel age has the advantage of applying the blessings of the Gospel centered in the theme of God's kingdom to the spiritual needs of people. Dietrich Bonhoeffer explained this emphasis by saying:

It is not a matter of what God could do and what we could do, but rather of what God has done for us, and wants to do again and again, that provides the basis for

¹²⁰ Lohmeyer, 108. An eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer potentially suffers Judaizing tendencies.

our prayer for the coming of the kingdom. The kingdom of God is meant for the earth; it comes to this earth that stands under the curse.¹²¹

The word "kingdom" in the second petition must be understood within the whole context of teachings about the soteriological blessings which have come about because of and for the sake of God's Son, Jesus. A strictly future eschatological interpretation tends to over-spiritualize the Gospel message, making it only a glorious hope, unrelated to the needs of everyday living.¹²² When Jesus promised the dying thief, "Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43), he applied the Gospel of the kingdom concretely to a poor sinner who needed to be reassured of God's love and grace then. This was not a vague future promise, but a loving word spoken to a man with a spiritual need (Luke 23:42). This is not to deny the future dimension related to teachings about the kingdom. Indeed, the thief was dying, but he was promised future life!

The themes of the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory both belong to the second petition. The danger of taking a strictly eschatological view of the second petition is that it tends to minimize God's activity through the means of grace now. Jesus caused the distant and hidden

¹²¹ John Godsey, Preface to Bonhoeffer: The Man and Two of His Shorter Writings (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965), 37-38.

¹²² A unilateral eschatological emphasis tends to accent the kingdom of glory rather than the kingdom of grace. A related problem concerns the relationship of a "theology of the cross" with a "theology of glory." Could it be that the eschatological approach cannot accept the cross, but wants only glory? The docetic tendency denigrates the mundane.

transcendence of God to meet man in his present existence. That was Jesus' message and purpose. The way that God works among his people through the Gospel even today is at once soteriological and incarnational. E. F. Scott, one of many authorities who have interpreted the Lord's Prayer noneschatologically, said:

The hope of the future is to fill the present with new significance. We are to feel that through all that is happening now God is working to bring in his kingdom, and that we must work along with him. The prayer that the Kingdom should come is at the same time a prayer that God will help us to live for it now.¹²³

In a prayer so concise as the Lord's Prayer, one must not assume repetition. Each petition has its own meaning. Yet a relationship does exist between the first two petitions. The first petition speaks of God's nature; the second of his actions. It should be noted that in the *Kaddish* the name and the kingdom go together, befitting the Rabbinic rule for prayer: "Any benediction in which (God's) kingship is not mentioned is no benediction (*Berak. 40b*).¹²⁴ In the first petition, God is the Holy One and in the second petition he is the King. The "Father" of the address is positioned over both. Therefore the name Father "draws those who pray like children to their father . . . in holiness and glory, before which they bow the knee and worship."¹²⁵ The

¹²³ E. F. Scott, The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Scribner's, 1952), 93.

¹²⁴ Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Munich: Beck, 1926-28; 1956), 1:419.

¹²⁵ Lohmeyer, 110.

first petition asks God to reveal his holiness by living up to his name (1) by vindicating his people with redemption and (2) to cause his faithful ones to avoid profaning his holiness. The second petition, with its active aorist imperative, prays for God himself to act. He does so by means of Jesus, the "coming one." Jesus, the "Galilean King," acquired his royal status from the "King of the Ages (1 Tim. 1:17), the Ancient of Days" (Dan. 7:13). He invites all to his kingdom of grace now and to enter his realm of glory hereafter. Further, he clothes his faithful with royalty. He gives them the distinction of being "a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign on earth" (Rev. 5:9). "Where his name is praised, there is his kingdom."¹²⁶ In the first petition, Jesus is the means toward fulfilment. He does what sinners can never do. He glorified God on behalf of sinners (John 17:1). In the second petition, Jesus is the fulfilment of the Old Covenant. He is the "coming One" and the King of the kingdom. To pray for God's kingdom to come is to ask for Jesus, along with the blessings of faith that accompany his coming. Through Jesus, "God is with us" (Matt. 1:23; cf. 28:20). For God to manifest his holiness and to send his kingdom means that he is a revealing God, opening up his hiddenness in Jesus.

The first two petitions have a proper place in Christian prayer life. These two petitions acknowledge God's magnanimous work and man's spiritual poverty.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 100.

40:8 (men); 103:21 (angels); 143:10 (men). When Judas Maccabaeus was ready for battle, he said: "But as his will in heaven may be, so he will do" (1 Macc. 3:60). This is in line with Samuel's prayer, "Let the Lord do what seems good to him" (1 Sam. 3:18; cf. 1 Chron. 19:13). Such examples refer to moral performance or divine direction in everyday life, so that holy living brings God pleasure. The semantic range of the word can include the king's will, man's desires and self-will, and even a capricious will.¹³⁰ Reference to the will of God plays a minor role in rabbinic doctrine. It does appear, however, in the opening of the *Kaddish*.

The two most important categories of "will" for the purposes of this study are the salvific will, and the ethical will (justification and sanctification); or, spiritual and temporal usages of the word.¹³¹

In the epistles, the will of God often refers to man's spiritual good and salvation. Eph 1:5 speaks of man's election, "He destined us in love to be his sons through Jesus Christ, according to the purpose of his will." Other passages which more or less clearly address the salvific character of God's will are Acts 22:14 (Paul's conversion was God's will); Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:9, 11; Col. 1:9; 1 Thess. 4:3; 5:18; Heb. 10:7, 9 (cf. Ps. 40:7-10), 10 (believers are "sanctified" by the will of God done by Jesus); 2 Pet. 1:21

¹³⁰ Schrenk, 53.

¹³¹ See *Ibid.*, 44-62, for other minor categories of the divine will, such as, e.g., the usage of the words to refer to God's creative will: "For thou didst create all things, and by thy will they existed and were created" (Rev. 4:11).

(inspiration of Scripture). 1 Tim. 2:4 especially clearly explains that God "desires (θέλει) all men to be saved" (cf. 2 Pet. 3:9). In the Gospels, Matt. 18:14 reports, "So it is not the will of my (var., your) Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." Similarly, Jesus prayed in Matt. 11:26 regarding the Gospel being revealed to babes that "such was thy gracious will (εὐδοκία)." In the Parable of the Two Sons, Jesus asked, "Which of the two did (ἐποίησεν) the will of his father?", applying the parable to entering the kingdom of God (Matt. 21:31). In John 1:12-13, God's salvific will is able to create new spiritual birth: "But to all . . . who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God; who were born [videlicet, of the will, ἐκ θελήματος] . . . of God." Jesus said in John 4:34, "My food is to do the will (ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα) of him who sent me . . . to accomplish his work [of salvation]." John 6:38-40 especially enunciates the salvific will of God:

For I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me; and this is the will of him who sent me, that I should lose none of all that he has given me, but raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.¹³²

Ethical obedience to God is also referred to as doing

¹³² Schrenk, 55, stated: "The Christology of Jn. is simply the will, act and obedience of the Son There is . . . exact correspondence between ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα and τελειῶν τὸ ἔργον. The will is done by accomplishing the works." God's determinate will is salvific (Jannaris, 585).

the will of God. While it is difficult to categorize the several usages of the word "will" satisfactorily, most of the following examples describe obedience or submission to another's will. Jesus said in Matt. 7:21, "Not every one who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven." Jesus said in Matt. 12:50, "For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister, and mother."¹³³ The most important examples are those from Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane.¹³⁴ Matt. 26:39 reports, "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup [of suffering] pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will (θέλω), but as thou wilt," and then at verse 42, Jesus continued, "My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, thy will be done" (γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου). Notice that this last clause (Matt. 26:42) is exactly identical to the third petition of the Lord's Prayer. In Mark 14:36, Jesus prayed, "Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I

¹³³ Mark 3:35, "Whoever does the will of God . . ."; Luke 8:21, "My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it."

¹³⁴ Jesus' Gethsemane prayer is usually regarded as an expression of his obedient submission to the will of the Father and reflects his vulnerable yet perfect humanity in its state of humiliation. Lohmeyer, 123, on the other hand, wrongly claimed that Jesus was "not a trembling man," but one who in prayer discovered that the Father willed his suffering and so his attitude was not one of surrender "but [of] a clear decision, 'Arise, let us be going' to achieve the Father's "eschatological will." Lohmeyer appears to have disregarded Jesus' true human suffering, as if obedience to the Father's will were easy. It is as if the suffering must be quickly dismissed so as to get Jesus, and Lohmeyer too, on to the glory of the Final Things.

will (τι ἐγὼ θέλω), but what thou wilt." Luke 22:42 reports, "Father, if thou art willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine be done" (μὴ τὸ θελήμα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σου γινέσθω).¹³⁵ Doing the ethical will of God is mentioned in such passages as the following: Rom. 2:18 (knowing the will through the law); 12:2; Eph. 5:17; 6:6, 7; Phil. 2:13; 1 Thess. 4:3; 2 Tim. 2:26; Heb. 10:36; 13:21; 1 Pet. 2:15; 3:17; 4:2; 4:19; 1 John 2:17 ("who does the will of God abides for ever," could be salvific). Needless to say, God expects his people to praise him by their good works, which are evidence of a living faith. Obedience and holy living are included in the doing of God's will. Ethical behavior is not taught in the New Testament as the way of salvation. But, morality shaped by God's commandments is assumed to be part of Christian life, accomplished by the work of the Holy Spirit.

Other passages pertaining to divine directions in details of life probably should also be considered under the ethical or temporal will of God. Perhaps the best example is Acts 21:14, in which Paul stated in regard to his plans, "The will of God be done." Other verses which speak of obedience to the divine will include John 9:31; Acts 13:22; 18:21; Rom.

¹³⁵ Notice that Luke used the present tense of the verb which is rare in Greek for prayer (perhaps in context stressing urgency; cf. Jesus' final prayer from the cross in Luke 23:46), whereas Matthew used the common prayer aorist. Luke used exactly the same phraseology in Acts 21:14 as in Luke 22:42. In Acts, it was Paul who said, "The will of the Lord be done." In both cases, even in differing circumstances, submission to the divine will is spoken of.

1:10; 15:32; 1 Cor. 1:1; 4:19; 16:7, 12; 2 Cor. 1:1; 8:5; Eph. 1:1; Col. 1:1, 4:12; 2 Tim. 1:1; James 4:15; 1 John 5:14. Christian life is lived under God's direction and control. The justified and sanctified believer expects to follow God's guidance and leadership so that he lives out his life according to God's will (*Deus vult; Deo volente*).

Opposition against God's good and perfect will stems from sin and its source, Satan (2 Tim. 2:26). Hostile forces oppose God's will, often manifest in evil people (Luke 23:25).

The above data show that the word "will" is subject to several different meanings. The context determines what the precise meaning should be. That the word can and often does mean God's salvific will toward man is clear. Man's salvation comes from none other than the Mediator between God and man whose mission on earth was to do the will of the Father. As the salvific will of God in Jesus resulted in man's justification, the justified person responds by obedience to God's will (revealed in the Law) being motivated by the Holy Spirit. Obedience and morality are well-pleasing to God and the natural result of true faith (James 2:17). For men to do God's will is to do his pleasure. The ethical demand is part of Christian life (see Matt. 3:8, "Bear fruit that befits repentance"). The preeminent example of submission to the will of the Father can be seen in the struggle of Jesus at Gethsemane. The will of the Father there was not expressed in the form of law (commandments), but of God's divine plans and details being worked out in the

life of Jesus.¹³⁶ God purposed his Son's death to make atonement for man's sin. Jesus obediently submitted to that implacable will (Matt. 26:24; Mark 14:21; Luke 22:22). Complete surrender was required of Jesus in his State of Humiliation.¹³⁷ Gottlob Schrenk drew the conclusion that the Christian is willing to follow the attitude of submission, since it agrees with that of Jesus at Gethsemane: "This attitude is necessarily demanded of the followers of Jesus because Jesus Himself is wholly rooted and lives in the divine will."¹³⁸ Thus, "will" can be salvific or ethical.

Finally, the above Biblical citations make it clear that the active verb used with θέλημα and cognates is ποιέω. One "does" God's will. The usual passive construction of the verb "doing" employs forms of γίνομαι,¹³⁹ although the passive aorist ἐγενήθην is "relatively rare" in the Gospels.¹⁴⁰ It means that God's will is done, or becomes an accomplished fact. In the third petition, the verb is a first aorist

¹³⁶ Schrenk, 55.

¹³⁷ See fn. 134 above re: Lohmeyer's incorrect interpretation of Jesus in Gethsemane.

¹³⁸ Schrenk, 55.

¹³⁹ Carmignac, 107.

¹⁴⁰ Lohmeyer, 111. The synoptics use the passive aorist in the quotation from Ps. 118:22 (Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17), but nowhere else except in Matthew; there it occurs seven times, five in the imperative form (6:10; 8:13; 9:29; 11:23; 15:28; 26:42; 28:4). Gundry, 106, claimed that Matthew's characteristic predilection for the will of God "being done" was an application of Jesus' emphasis on observing the law of God; as such, it should not be understood eschatologically.

passive imperative, γενηθήτω. The translation, "Thy will be done," understood as an imperative, is the best way to render correctly the third petition. The aorist passive imperative, as noted before, is a familiar verbal form used in prayer and should escape the conception of a single event, which is the more common aspect of the aorist. The passive requires an agent. Carmignac, who saw an original Hebrew version underlying the Greek Lord's Prayer, showed that the Greek γενηθήτω could represent either a Hebrew passive pual or reflexive hithpael form of יְרַחֵם . Carmignac, whose Semitic credentials are unquestionable, argued that there is often a "confounding" of the passive and the reflexive ideas, which he solicited to prove that the agent of the passive can be both man and God: "Consequently we not only pray that the creation does the will of the Creator, but we also ask that that will be done, and that it may be God who renders us teachable and obedient regarding our will to his."¹⁴¹

On Earth

An addition follows the third petition, "on earth as it is in heaven." This is a ὡς - καί construction, best taken as a comparison.¹⁴² The Western Text D and some of the Latin

¹⁴¹ Carmignac, 106: "Par conséquent nous ne demandons pas simplement que les créatures fassent la volonté du créateur, mais nous demandons aussi que cette volonté se fasse, que ce soit Dieu qui nous rende dociles et obéissant en accordant nos volontés sur les siennes."

¹⁴² BDF, 236, sec. 453.1. Wrongly *both/and*, see G. H. P. Thompson, "Thy Will Be Done in earth, as it is in Heaven (Matthew vi. 11): A Suggested Re-interpretation," The Expository Times 70 (1958-59): 379-81.

tradition omit the "as" allowing the apodosis of the third petition to read "on earth and in heaven." There is a difference. The latter prays that God's will should be done everywhere, in the whole universe.¹⁴³ The former, which most texts give, subordinates one member of the phrase to another; the word "earth" receives the stress. As in the realm of the heavenly God's will is done perfectly, this prayer asks that God's will be done on earth also. Similar comparative expressions can be found in the Bible. In Ex. 16:34, the *as-so* is used: "As the Lord commanded Moses, so Aaron placed it [manna] before the testimony . . ." (see also Num. 1:19; Is. 53:7). John 20:21 reports Jesus' words: "As (καθώς) the Father has sent me, even so (καγώ) I send you" (see also Acts 7:51; 2 Cor. 13:2; Gal. 1:9; Phil. 1:20). Other similar variations may be cited as, for example, this verse from Luke 6:31 (the "Golden Rule") which reads: "And as (καθώς) you wish that men would do to you, do so (ὁμοίως) to them." Carmignac pointed out the Semitic habit of naming the object to be stressed first; hence, the Greek literally reflects a Semitic substratum: "As in heaven, also on (the) earth."¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³ Lohmeyer, 126, *et passim*. He spoke of the "unity of everything" in heaven and on earth. Cf. previous fn.

¹⁴⁴ Carmignac, 111; he noted that the question whether or not an article should be attached to the word "earth" is immaterial and does not change the meaning. He tended to think that, since Semitic poetry would tend to omit the article, likewise the Lord's Prayer, being poetic, would prefer omission of the article; if the Prayer were not understood as poetry *per se*, then the article would be preferable.

In translation, however, in comparisons usually the object of comparison is stressed and placed first; therefore it is correct to translate, "on earth as (it is) in heaven." To translate "as in heaven, even on earth" is awkward. As such, the phrase is a subordinate phrase in Greek. A verbal construction such as "it is" or "it is done" is often supplied in translation to complete the sense, similar to the address which also needs a verb in translation to complete the sense ("Our Father who [art] in heaven").

Heaven and earth taken together can mean the whole creation of God. God is called the Lord of heaven and earth in Matt. 11:25. The two words usually however suggest a division between heaven and earth, matching the ancient Biblical outlook, and also modern popular cosmology! In comparison with earth, heaven is often viewed as being nearer the Creator. For example, Jesus taught in Matt. 5:34, "Do not swear at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, or by the earth, for it is his footstool." Certainly there can be a relationship between heaven and earth. For instance, terrestrial activities have an influence on heaven, as when "binding and loosing on earth" has effect in heaven (Matt. 16:19; 18:18-19). The celestial can also have an influence on the world; this is portrayed by the "pattern" in heaven establishing grace on earth (Heb. 8:5). Yet, heaven and earth are two different realms. The prepositions ²ἐν and ²ἐπι mark these two realms.

The word for heaven is singular in the third petition,

whereas the same word in the address is plural. The plural number, of course, represents the Semitic habit of rendering "heaven" and is properly translated with a singular noun. The opening words of the Bible, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," uses the plural in Hebrew for the "heaven(s)"; the Septuagint uses the singular τὸν οὐρανόν.

There is probably no substantial difference between the singular and the plural. Lohmeyer showed that a minor nuance, however, may be implied, when he stated, "In short, the singular is used wherever heaven and earth are combined in the unity of creation, the plural where 'heaven' means God's world away from all the bustle and distraction of earth."¹⁴⁵ The combination of the words "heaven" and "earth" is frequent in the Bible; for example, see Deut. 3:24; 4:39; Josh. 2:11; 1 Kings 8:23; 1 Chron. 29:11; Ps. 113:6; 135:6; Eccl. 5:2 (Heb., 5:1); Joel 2:30 (Heb., 3:3); Dan. 6:28; Matt. 6:10; 11:25; 16:19; 18:18; 23:9; 28:18; Luke 2:14 (ἐν ὑψίστοις); 3:21; 11:2 (C, D, et al.); 19:38; Acts 2:19; 1 Cor. 8:5; Eph. 1:10; 3:15; Phil. 2:10; Col. 1:16, 20; Rev. 5:3, 13. In both Testaments, heaven was thought of as the place

¹⁴⁵ Lohmeyer, 114-15, defended this distinction since it served his eschatological interpretation that the petition asks that God's will be done at the parousia everywhere. However, Helmut Traub, "οὐρανός," in *TDNT* 5:534, fn. 322, denied any such distinction; see also BDF, 77-78, sec. 141.1. Probably the safest conclusion to draw is that heaven is singular in Greek except in those places where it represents Semitic influence or literal translation from a Semitic language; so, Traub, 510, who commented on this Semitic peculiarity that the plural probably was expressive of a cosmology of several heavens (cf. 2 Cor. 12:2), or by plerophony to comprehend the universe.

of God's abode, a metaphor of his presence, or even circumlocution for God himself (cf. the words of the "prodigal son" who confessed, "I have sinned against heaven" [Luke 15:18]). Nevertheless, God was not confined to heaven as a locality. According to 1 Kings 8:27, "the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain" him (cf. 2 Chron. 6:18). Heaven was eternal, devoid of sin, and the sphere of God's power and dominion. Hence it was considered to be the source of all blessings (Gen. 4:25; Deut. 33:13; 1 Kings 8:35). Heaven and earth are God's creation, though earth has been corrupted by man's sin. Earth and heaven are treated differently. Consequently, Jesus spoke of the great reward of heaven (Matt. 5:12) and of storing up treasures in heaven (Matt. 6:20). Jesus looked up toward heaven in prayer (Matt. 14:19). He taught that John the Baptizer's message was from heaven rather than from men (Matt. 21:25). That God resides in heaven means that heaven is the starting point of the divine work of salvation, and signifies more than simply divine transcendence.¹⁴⁶ God's "power is manifested [on earth] at the coming of the Son of Man in the gathering of the elect" from the four corners of the world.¹⁴⁷ The created cosmos conceals Christ's lordship, but heaven reveals his lordship. At Jesus' baptism heaven opened (Matt. 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:2). The opened heaven makes it possible

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 520.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 516. Traub, 525, explained that the term heaven often connotes God's salvific attitude toward creation.

for faith to see the glory of God (2 Cor. 5:7).¹⁴⁸ The word ἑπουράνιος as a variation of οὐράνιος has no special value.¹⁴⁹ However, the joining of "heaven(ly)" to the word Father denotes the loving and caring disposition of God toward his creation.¹⁵⁰

God's desire for man's salvation is portrayed in a way that pictures heaven and earth being drawn together and where God appears as being accessible. Rom. 10:6-8 builds on Deut. 30:11-14 which teaches that God is not inaccessible and his word is not too hard for man. God's love bridges the gap between earth and heaven in Jesus Christ, for the "word of grace" "is near you" (Rom. 10:8; cf. Eph. 4:9; Ps. 68:18; John 1:51). This incarnational truth is assumed in Heb. 8:1 where Christ is seated in heaven as the high priest. It is only through Jesus that man on earth is elevated to God in heaven. The otherwise inaccessible God (Is. 55:9) becomes accessible (Is. 55:10-11). Jesus unlocks heaven's doors (Matt. 16:19). Because Jesus is the connection between heaven and earth, God becomes approachable and can be called "heavenly Father" by the assembly of the faithful (Matt. 18:19). The result of salvation and grace brought by Jesus means peace on earth, in the full sense of that salvific word

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 530.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 539.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 538.

(Luke 2:14, ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη).¹⁵¹

Heaven was thought of as the place of God's reign without opposition by the heavenly counsels.¹⁵² The second clause of the third petition prays that the perfection of heaven may be extended to earth. A paraphrase might be: "Do thy will on earth, as it is already done in heaven."¹⁵³ God is identified with heaven, while the believer is identified with earth, as being on the level or plane (ἐπί) of the earth. Heaven, named first, corresponds to the Matthean address to the Lord's Prayer. The words for heaven in the address and in the last clause of the third petition form an *inclusio* embracing the three petitions of the first strophe, which relate to God. "God in heaven" is juxtaposed with "man on earth." Then with the mention of earth, a shift takes place directing the petitions to earthly matters in the second strophe. As God's will is done perfectly only in heaven (Ps.

¹⁵¹ For Lohmeyer, 126, the third petition asks for the difference between heaven and earth to be abolished by one final event and this world will then become God's world as it is in heaven. It would be preferable to explain that the third petition prays for heaven to be accessible to people on earth by faith and the pattern of heavenly perfection to be done on earth. However, it is true that the differences between heaven and earth will be abolished at the Final End (Eph. 1:10).

¹⁵² Lars Hartman, "Your Will Be Done on Earth As It Is in Heaven," African Theological Journal 11 (1982): 209-218, has made a superb study of the "heavenly counsel," drawing on material from the Old Testament, apocalyptic literature and Philo. He concluded that the forces of created nature and the angels do God's will without resistance. God's will, broadly interpreted, includes salvific, creative, and moral dimensions. God's will was done perfectly by Jesus on earth (p. 216).

¹⁵³ Harner, 79.

103:20-21; Dan. 7:10), the third petition asks that the perfection of heaven might become a reality among those living on the earth presently under the curse of sin.

The earth is the "theatre of sin" and in need of the redemption which Christ offers.¹⁵⁴ Jesus, the Son of man, came to forgive sins "on earth" (Mark 2:10). The redeemed are ransomed "from the earth" (Rom. 14:3), and believers are strangers and pilgrims "on earth" (Heb. 11:13) who must not set their affections on what is "on the earth" (Col. 3:2). In the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer, the believer asks God to raise his concerns to God. This line of thought is continued in the second strophe where earthly concerns, put at God's disposal, ought not sever the Christian's relationship with God. The first strophe begins with "Our Father . . ." and the second strophe begins "Our bread . . ." (Πάτερ ἡμῶν . . . τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν); these two cola begin with nouns and pronouns, not verbs. All the other petitions begin with the verb first. The two strophes relate to these two themes, God's concerns and man's concerns. Jesus brings God the Father to man in the second strophe. Both strophes, of course, relate to believers on earth, who await the Last Day in faith and hope. The second part (apodosis) of the third petition serves as a transition to the second strophe.

One final item remains for discussion. That has to do with the question of whether or not the final clause relates only to the third petition or to all three petitions of the

¹⁵⁴ A phrase used by Hermann Sasse, "γῆ," in TDNT 1:680.

first strophe. It should be remembered that the oldest and most valuable Greek Biblical manuscripts did not provide line breaks and clear punctuation (*scriptio continua*). Hence, it is easy to see that the apodosis in the third petition either could belong only to the third petition itself, or it could belong to the entire first strophe. Some commentators think that the added clause is part of the third petition only:

"Thy will be done on earth as (it is done) in heaven."

Usually this solution would omit any comma in the text in translation.¹⁵⁵ Scholarship is divided. Luther, for example, takes the whole sentence as one unit, comprising the third petition. R. C. H. Lenski collaborated with that view by stating: "'As in heaven,' etc., applies only to the third petition; for in the second we cannot say that the kingdom can 'come in heaven'; it has always been there."¹⁵⁶

Dobschütz added these comments to the discussion:

This last clause, 'as in heaven so also on earth,' cannot be taken as belonging to all three petitions, as is held by Westcott and Hort, for it is connected in tradition exclusively with the third one. The introductory particle 'as' indicates that heaven and earth are not taken as the two parts of the universe on an entire equality (compare Gen. 1:1, Matt. 5:18, etc.), but are contrasted; the heaven, God's residence, being the model of perfection, where the will of God is done always without reluctance, the earth on the contrary being the scene of rebellion against God (compare Is. 55:9, Deut. 30:12, Ps. 2:7). The petition thus asks God to cause his will to be done by men as it is regularly done by the angels.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ See the decision of the English Parliament, fn. 160, *infra*.

¹⁵⁶ Lenski, Matthew, 267.

¹⁵⁷ Dobschütz, 312.

Another possible reason for accepting the fact that the third petition breaks the pattern of the previous two petitions and so is characterized by greater length is based on the fact that *both* petitions surrounding the central fourth petition each contain two $\omega\varsigma$ constructions.¹⁵⁸ The apodosis belonging to the fifth petition ("as we forgive . . .") completes the thought of its protasis ("And forgive us . . .") just as the apodosis of the third petition completes the thought of its protasis. These two longer petitions, the third and fifth, surround the key fourth petition. The second half of the third petition also serves to initiate the transition from the first to the second strophe. As such, it has a vitality of its own and at the same time the similarities between the style and form of the first three petitions is preserved.

Others interpret the additional clause as belonging to the entire first strophe, to all three previous petitions. In this way, all three petitions of the first strophe would also remain intact and be similarly structured: verb, noun, possessive pronoun. Those who apply the phrase "on earth as it is in heaven" to the entire first strophe do so out of deference to stylistic considerations and for theological reasons. They maintain that the symmetry and parallelism between the first three petitions would be lost if the third petition broke the pattern and would be longer than the previous two petitions. The latter interpretation asks that

¹⁵⁸ This reason for defending the integrity of the third petition (greater length of the third petition to correspond with the construction of the fifth petition, these two surrounding the fourth) have not been discovered anywhere in the vast literature on the Lord's Prayer.

God's name be hallowed on earth, that his kingdom come on earth, and that his will be done on earth. Needless to say, this interpretation requires punctuation that puts a "stop" (comma or semicolon) at the end of the protasis of the third petition.

Lohmeyer defended applying "on earth as it is in heaven" to all three petitions by the theological argument that, taking heaven and earth together as a unit, the three petitions of the first strophe ask God to break into all creation (combining heaven and earth) with a final eschatological act.¹⁵⁹ Carmignac offered an even more solid defense for taking all three petitions together with "heaven and earth." He pointed out that on the basis of an analysis of Semitic poetry, a strophe can consist of three parallel lines, knit together with an introductory and concluding line. The concluding line would summarize and complement the three petitions belonging to the first strophe.¹⁶⁰ The end result of this arrangement could be summarized by the

¹⁵⁹ Lohmeyer, 126.

¹⁶⁰ Carmignac, 112-115, pointed out that this idea was original with Origen, but otherwise very little attention was paid to it until this century; the idea is generally accepted today. He showed that this triadic structure of the first strophe, whereby the last clause summarizes each and all three of the previous earlier petitions, became an issue in the British Parliament, and it was officially adopted in 1903 in the House of Commons, that the following punctuation be required in the *Book of Common Prayer*: "Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven." More on this in Bruce Metzger, "The Prayer that Jesus Taught His Disciples," in Sowing the Word, ed. Patrick Rogers (Dublin: Dominican, 1983), 129.

following examples provided by Carmignac:¹⁶¹

Our Father who art in heaven!
 Hallowed be thy name!
 Thy kingdom come!
 Thy will be done!
 On earth as it is in heaven! or,

Our Father who art in heaven!
 On earth as in heaven,
 Hallowed be thy name,
 Thy kingdom come,
 Thy will be done!

No easy decision can be made with regard to the question of whether the "on earth" clause should belong only with the third, or with all three strophes. *Thematically*, "on earth as it is in heaven" explains the dynamic activity of God relative to all three petitions. *Grammatically*, the clause is probably best taken with the third petition only. The verb of the third petition, γενήσῃτω, prays God to cause his will to be done on earth. The first three petitions each stand as separate sentences, without any conjunction joining them (asyndeton arrangement) unlike the paratactic, polysyndetonic arrangement which connects the petitions in the second strophe. Therefore, the third petition is apparently one complete autonomous sentence, consisting of two clauses. The third and fifth petitions with their ὡς coordinates frame the central fourth petition. The first clause of the third petition follows the simple verb, noun, pronominal adjective format of the other two previous petitions; its last clause specifically defines where the will of God will be

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 116.

accomplished (on earth!).

Interpretation

Like the previous two petitions, the third is subject to two interpretations, the future eschatological and the temporal noneschatological. The eschatological orientation holds that God is requested to act in one great final way at the end of the ages, when *his will* will be completely revealed and done. Again, the punctiliar aspect of the aorist imperative of the verb is solicited to support this view. Appeal is made to the passive form to show that it is God alone who is able so to act at the consummation to do his will. The Christian prays as one whose citizenship is in heaven and yet who is bound to earth, where God's will is not being done. The final enemy of God and man will be overthrown. Spiritual opposition against God and his people will be broken. God will be victorious (Rev. 11:5, 17; 12:10). The prayer will be answered in the future because this single event is yet to come. Brown provided a typical summary of this view: "Again the *Einmaligkeit* of the aorist favors one supreme moment rather than a gradual process."¹⁶² Lohmeyer expressed his future interpretation of the third petition as follows: "It asks for this difference [between heaven and earth] to be abolished at the end of time. It asks for a single will to be made powerful and effective against all divergent ones so that the world's original

¹⁶² Brown, 235.

destiny may be fulfilled in one event."¹⁶³

This extreme eschatological interpretation runs the danger of discounting the present activity of God for his people, as he works in them by way of sanctification and as he continually protects and releases them from satanic thralldom. In many places, the Bible teaches that God's will is being done among people, in the church, and during the present Gospel age. Jesus announced that "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me (Matt. 28:18). Every knee should bow to Jesus in heaven and earth now that God has exalted him (Phil. 2:10). Jesus is worthy of praise for all that he did for the present needs of his people (1 Tim. 3:16). God's people are his justified and sanctified ones; as such God calls upon them to do angels' work on earth (Dan. 12:3; 1 Cor. 6:3; Gal. 1:8; 4:14; Heb. 2:11, 13b; Rev. 14:6, 13; 22:16). The reality of the present-day need of God's people to be delivered from the assaults of the one who opposes God's will (2 Thess. 2:4) ought not be dismissed lightly. Satan is especially active now among the true believers in reaction against God precisely because God's kingdom is being preached in this present age and his will is being accomplished among his justified and sanctified ones.

Those who prefer an application of the third petition to the future nevertheless must reckon with the present day accomplishing of God's will. Lohmeyer addressed this concern by explaining that the present activity of the *ecclesia*

¹⁶³ Lohmeyer, 126.

militans is only preparation for the final eschatological kingdom.¹⁶⁴ According to him, the will of God is being done now in the world "in secrecy"; the third petition asks that it be done fully and openly.¹⁶⁵ Lohmeyer reasoned, "if the third petition refers to God's will to achieve the work of eschatological consummation and prays for it to be realized, this seems to imply that this will has not hitherto been perceptible and effective in the history of the world."¹⁶⁶ For Lohmeyer, the doing of God's will now is hardly perceptible and has only a temporary character.¹⁶⁷

During their present time on earth God's will is being done for Christians, and by and among them. When Paul stated in Acts 21:14, "The will of the Lord be done," he was confessing that he was living in a time when God is in control, prior to and in preparation of, the Last Day, when God's will will be fully known and when his will will be

¹⁶⁴ Lohmeyer, 128.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 129.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Lohmeyer, of course, is correct in his analysis to this extent, that God's will is hidden and is revealed only on account of the activity of Jesus. Jesus is God's will being revealed. However, Lohmeyer emphasized the failure of the *Deus revelatus* in this world, rather preferring to postpone doing God's will completely for the future. True, God's full revelation will be made after this age, but already in the present Gospel age, God, who was hidden under the (OT) Law and because of darkness and sin, is now being revealed as never before through his incarnate Son. Generally preferring an eschatological interpretation, Lohmeyer made only slight concession to a present fulfilling of the divine will.

done.¹⁶⁸ Such statements illustrate that even among those who hold to a future eschatological interpretation, a present application is often conceded to exist for the third petition. Lohmeyer minimalized the present reality of God's will being done, although he was forced to acknowledge its existence and activity.

An interpretation of the third petition that is oriented to the present is most compatible with the facts at hand. It is clear that the will of God has both spiritual and temporal dimensions. One theme emphasized in the New Testament especially is that God wills man's salvation through Jesus (Eph. 1:9; 1 Tim. 2:4). As such, God's will results in man's "justification." Another theme connected with God's will is related to obedience. God intends all creation to be obedient to his will. The law of God imposes ethical demands upon God's people. Believers especially are submissive to the will of God which controls and orders their lives. This submission relates to "sanctification." God's will is done among his people and by their Spirit-impelled lives. Obedience naturally flows from faith (James 2:17).

The third petition rightly asks God to cause his will to be done on earth as it is already being done in heaven. God's servants, the holy angels, do his bidding (Heb. 1:14). In heaven, God's will is kept perfectly:

Bless the Lord, O you his angels, you mighty ones who do his word Bless the Lord, all his hosts, his ministers that do his will! Bless the Lord, all his works, in all places of his dominion (Ps. 103:20-22).

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 128.

The third petition asks that the standard of heaven be done on earth. God's will is not only done by the "heavenly counsel" but that counsel includes Jesus and his gift of salvation. Surrounding Jesus and giving him such praise as is worthy of the Savior of the world are the "living creatures and the elders" and the "many angels" of Rev. 5:11-14. Jesus is praised in heaven for having accomplished man's ransom (Rev. 5:9). The perfect will of God is related to the divine salvation granted to sinners, accomplished by the perfect God-man. Natural man cannot render obedience to God. Even the Christian who does God's will, however imperfectly in this world, does so only insofar as he has been moved by God. The third petition does not ask man on his own power to conform to God's will or on his own ability to patiently endure hardships and suffering.

Rather, the third petition asks God to accomplish his will in and among his people. Perfect obedience to God's will was accomplished by Jesus ("I have come to do thy will," Heb. 10:7, 9). Jesus' life and work earned man's salvation. His task included perfect obedience to God's will and law, submission to suffering, and perfect surrender of his own will. Jesus who accomplished man's salvation prayed in Gethsemane "Thy will be done" (Matt. 26:42). His submission yielded to the Father's plans. That same prayer is still prayed in the third petition by believers who are submissive to God's will. This "submission" is not a kind of blind fatalism, but it recognizes the monergism of God who graciously governs his creation by accomplishing his salvific

will among them. Because of God's grace revealed through Jesus and on account of Jesus' perfect submission to the Father's will the believer is declared "justified" before God.

The true believer is enjoined to obedience to God's will and law. He should not flaunt God's righteousness by deliberate unholy living, thus jeopardizing his salvation (Eph. 4:30). The new man in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17) conforms his will to the divine will. The "Old Adam" works against God's will (Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45-49). Living in a state of grace means sanctified living. The Bible does lay moral imperatives on the Christian. Paul paranetically urged Christian sanctification as becoming of God's people. For example, Rom. 12:1-2 says:

I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect.

The Christian is willing to suffer and yield his own will, plans, and life to God (Acts 5:41; 9:16; Rom. 8:17; 2 Cor. 11:19, 20; 12:9; Phil. 1:29; 2 Tim. 2:12; Heb. 11:25; 13:3; 1 Pet. 2:20; 3:14, 17; 4:15, 16; Rev. 2:10). The Christian is urged to pray according to God's will (διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, James 4:3). The Bible teaches that on the Last Day there will be a reckoning of deeds done on earth (2 Cor. 5:9b-10): "we make it our aim to please (εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ) him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that

each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body."

God grants his people the gift of his sanctifying Spirit so that they are enabled to do his will. True sanctification means that Christ is active and alive in the believer. In that sense, a partnership between God and the believer exists. Jesus taught in John 15:5, "I am the vine, you are the branches. He who abides in me, and I in him, he it is that bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing," and in verse 8, he continued, "By this my Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit, and so prove to be my disciples."¹⁶⁹ Jesus' perfect submission to the will of the heavenly Father is applied by faith to individual believers. Obedience to God's will is nothing but responsive faith, as Jesus suggested to the rich young ruler (Matt. 19:17), and as he taught would be sought by God at the Final Judgment (Matt. 25:40).

God performs his activity and does his will among people. Even Lohmeyer could say, "God not only commands what he wills, but he also does what he commands."¹⁷⁰ Heb. 13:21 says that God will "equip you with everything good that you may do his will, working in you that which is pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." Phil. 2:13 teaches that "God is at work in

¹⁶⁹ Carmignac, 108, claimed on the basis of an underlying Hebrew iussive rendered by the Greek aorist that the third petition indicates that the human will, consecrated to God's service, asks that the divine will be done.

¹⁷⁰ Lohmeyer, 120.

you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure." Even Ps. 90:17 speaks of God's leadership and blessing in the lives of his faithful believers: "Let the favor of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us, yea, the work of our hands establish thou it." From the viewpoint of sanctification, the believer can accept God's control over the affairs of his life, whether weal or woe, as Paul said in Acts 21:14, "The will of the Lord be done." Ultimately, all of man's temporal obedience to the will of God, his commandments and his governance, is intended to serve God's salvific will. As such, it is proper in Christian prayer relating to temporal affairs, for the believer humbly to submit to the divine will (Ps. 31:15; 1 Cor. 10:6, 13; 2 Cor. 4:15; 12:9; Phil. 1:21; Col. 1:24; Heb. 12:10; Rev. 3:19). Hence, Christian prayers typically include a reference to God's will being done (Matt. 8:2; James 4:3; 1 John 5:14).

The third petition asks God to do his will by imparting the blessings of salvation earned by the only one who ever fully accomplished and fulfilled God's will, his son Jesus. This petition asks God to be active in the lives of Christians through his Son and by the Holy Spirit so that God's will may continue. It asks God to break and hinder every hostile force that would prevent his salvific will from being accomplished. This interpretation recognizes the importance of the aorist passive imperative. The aorist imperative is used as the standard and preferred verb in prayers. The imperative addresses God and asks him to act.

He alone has the ability and the prerogative. The third petition acknowledges the monergism of God and the weakness and inability of man to purpose and accomplish God's will by himself. It allows God to act the way he will; no conditions are laid upon God. He is not told how or when to act. The passive is used. This allows God to act through believers, who will be obedient and submissive to the divine will, and in whom forces hostile to God will be defeated.

Similarly, in the first petition, God will hallow his name by imparting salvation to his people, who resultantly will no longer profane him and his benevolence. God's name is profaned when his will is not done. His kingdom blessings cannot come if preaching is hindered by personal disbelief and opposition from the devil, the world, and sinful flesh. This prayer asks God to curb and break these powers so that his will alone can prevail. When Jesus indicated that Satan's power was crushed, God and his holy will were vindicated; Jesus was the "stronger man" who assailed and overcame the devil (Matt. 12:28, 29; Mark 3:27; Luke 11:20-22). The public ministry of Jesus was designed for the fall of Satan (Luke 10:18). The crucifixion itself was fulfillment of the *Protoevangelium* (Gen. 3:15) whereby Satan's head would be crushed. The third petition of the Lord's Prayer asks God, who alone has the power, to be the champion of his people. Jesus waged this battle. He is the Christian's strength (Heb. 5:7-9). God's will is always being done, even in the present, where he empowers obedience to his will. Like the previous petitions, this petition also looks to the

future when God's will will be done perfectly. The *ecclesia militans* will become at the Last Day the *ecclesia triumphans* by virtue of God's will. May it be done now as it is and always will be done in eternity!

The direction of heaven to earth suggests the incarnation of God's love. Without Jesus, heaven and earth would be separate. Because of Jesus, the blessings of heaven are announced to those living in the present age. The "opening of heaven" is a soteriological work of Jesus. At Jesus' baptism, heaven was opened (Matt. 3:16, Mark 1:11, plural; Luke 3:21, singular). Jesus claimed to reveal the glory and grace of heaven, "Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man" (John 1:51). Although this world is the "theatre of sin," the third petition asks that it may yet become the arena of justifying grace.

God's soteriological blessings made possible by Jesus are intended for those living in the present day of grace, before the end of time. God's plan is that his justified ones now live out their lives, sanctified by him, for his own purposes and glory: "Every good endowment and every perfect gift is from above (²ἀνωθεν² ἐστὶν καταβαῖνον), coming down from the Father of lights Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures" (James 1:17-18). In short, the third petition asks for the blessings of justification and sanctification; it asks for God's salvific and moral will to be done. There is no doubt about God's will being done in

heaven. Therefore, the third petition asks that it be done by God among those living on earth.

4. Our Bread

The fourth petition occupies the center of the Lord's Prayer when the Prayer's structure is reckoned as containing seven petitions. The word for bread stands emphatically at the beginning of the petition, whereas in all the other petitions the verb, or verb with conjunction, is placed at the initial position. The word order for the fourth petition is similar to that of the Matthean address. The *hapax legomenon*, *epiousios*, occupies the center of the fourth petition. This attributive or exegetical adjective modifies "our bread" which in both Matthew and Luke is placed at the beginning of the line for the sake of emphasis. Three words precede τὸν ἐπιούσιον and three words or phrases follow it:

Matt.-	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν	<u>τὸν ἐπιούσιον</u>	δοῦν ἡμῖν	σήμερον
Luke -	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν	<u>τὸν ἐπιούσιον</u>	δίδου ἡμῖν	τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν

Luke's "day by day" is iterative or distributive.¹⁷¹ The second aorist active imperative verb of Matthew accordingly is adjusted to the present tense in Luke, both being formations of δίδωμι. Matthew's version consistently employs the normal aorist properly used in prayer to ask for divine benevolence one day at a time. The Lukan prayer carries the notion of daily and regular divine benevolence. The central

¹⁷¹ Charles F. D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), 59.

position of τὸν ἐπιούσιον in this petition within the entire prayer suggests its significance. There is little doubt that this unusual word was intended to be understood.

Yet *epiousios* presents the chief problem for understanding this petition. Its meaning is elusive and has been a *crux interpretum* for twenty centuries. The interpretation given *epiousios* probably influences the way the whole prayer should be understood. In short, if *epiousios* refers to qualitative, quantitative, material bread, the entire Lord's Prayer probably should be interpreted for the here and now. On the other hand, if *epiousios* refers in some way to spiritual bread, then the Lord's Prayer is justifiably interpreted in a non-material, future eschatological sense. The literature is so vast that covers the question of the meaning of *epiousios* that it is difficult to assess all of it. A summary of possibilities will be reported and some tentative conclusions drawn.

Bread

The word for bread in the Bible is generally $\bar{\aleph} \bar{\aleph} \bar{\aleph}$, Heb.; $\bar{\aleph} \bar{\aleph} \bar{\aleph}$, Aramaic; ὄψος. The word can refer to bread in general, which nourishes, such as in Gen. 14:18; 31:54; 37:25; Ex. 18:12; 1 Sam. 17:17; Job 42:11. The word can be used of the bread of the cultus (Ex. 25:30, "showbread") or of food in general (Gen. 3:19). It can also refer to manna (Ps. 105:40). The Greek *artos* presents similar usage, referring to actual bread or to eating (Matt. 15:2; Mark 3:20; Luke 14:1; John 13:18; 2 Thess. 3:8, 12). Bread as

physical nourishment is the usual meaning of *artos*, even when a spiritual application is made of such bread, as several examples will show.

Some passages compare bread with the word of God (Deut. 8:3; Amos 8:11; Is. 55:1-11) or to wisdom (Prov. 9:5; Eccl. 15:3). Special reference is made to bread's spiritual nourishment in Matt. 4:4 and Luke 4:4; Matt. 15:26 and Mark 7:27; Luke 14:15; 22:29-30; and John 6:26-65. Matt. 4:4 and Luke 4:4 quote Deut. 8:3. The context for these words is Jesus' temptation. Matt. 4:2 explains that after fasting forty days and nights, Jesus was hungry. His hunger gave occasion for the first temptation of Satan. This tempter said to Jesus, "'If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread.' But he answered, 'It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God''" (Matt. 4:3-4). The devil had appealed to Jesus' human suffering. If Jesus possessed divine sonship along with all its powers and prerogatives, then why not alleviate his hunger? Yet, in order to fulfil the law of God and to suffer in every way for mankind he did not selfishly satisfy his hunger by making bread from the stones which lay about. Real material bread would have satisfied his hunger. But, Jesus pointed out on the basis of Deut. 8:3 that what sustains life is God, or the word of God. Food or bread was not the fundamental need of man. Jesus said, in other words, that God had sustained him thus far, and he would also provide for future needs. Deut. 8:3 refers to the Israelites' forty years of wilderness

sojourning and also to the gift of manna:

And he humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna, which you did not know, nor did your fathers know; that he might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but that man lives by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord.

Jesus did not directly equate bread with the word of God in the temptation account. He used the context of bread to teach a valuable lesson and to point to a spiritual truth. The bread which Jesus could have miraculously manufactured for himself would have satisfied his hunger temporarily. Observe that the first level of meaning for the word "bread" was real bread that nourishes the body. Material bread nourishes because of God's blessing and providence. Spiritual bread is an *application* of bread to a second level of meaning.

In Matt. 15:26 and Mark 7:27 a Canaanite woman, having requested Jesus' divine mercy for her daughter, heard Jesus reply that it would not be proper to feed the bread crumbs from the master's table to the household dogs. The point of Jesus' lesson was that bread crumbs and morsels were often fed to small household pets, for they too had to be looked after and cared for. The bread crumbs in this illustration would have been real bread. Only by implication were the crumbs symbolic of spiritual blessings (Matt. 15:28; Mark 7:29). This episode conveyed a spiritual truth about the Savior's love and God's care of body and soul, but the bread itself in this account was not intended to be equated with the word of God. It pointed to a second level of meaning. The first level of meaning, real bread, did not evaporate!

In Matt. 22:1-14 and Luke 14:15-24 Jesus told the parable of the Great Banquet. The point of this parable is that many should be invited to God's gracious banquet, the offer of salvation (Luke 14:22, "There still is room"; and verse 23, "Go out to the highways . . . and compel people to come in." This parable was introduced by Luke with a reference to earthly bread by one of the guests of the marriage feast: "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God!" (Luke 14:15). This parable makes the point of inviting guests to the feast of the Savior in the time of grace in anticipation of the joys of the eternal banquet in heaven. A similar teaching is presented in Luke 22:29-30. Earlier, it was demonstrated that in John 6:26-65 Jesus later interpreted the bread spiritually on the basis of the real physical bread of John 6:1-15 with which he fed the hungry multitude. These several examples show that *real bread* was spoken of on the first level of the meaning of the word even if on a second level, by application, nourishment was given a *spiritual interpretation* later. In these examples, the first level of meaning, physical bread, is not forsaken.

There has been a tendency throughout the Christian era to abandon the first level of meaning for the second level. This process is illegitimate if no warrants are given for seeking a higher, spiritual interpretation. Already Marcion succumbed to the temptation of interpreting the bread of the fourth petition spiritually. He changed the "our bread" to "your bread" to signify that it was more than physical; for

him it was spiritual and divine bread.¹⁷² Generally speaking, interpretation followed the perceived noble impulse to spiritualize bread, or conversely, it suffered from the negative tendency of despising the material side of life. The bread of the fourth petition, thus spiritualized, could be the sacramental flesh of Christ or Christ himself as being the very Word of life. What could be embraced in part now, would be fully realized eschatologically. Literal exegesis usually interprets the fourth petition materially, while the "allegorists" prefer a spiritual interpretation.

Representatives of the "school of Antioch" tend to prefer a material interpretation of the fourth petition: Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, to name some of the church fathers of that school.¹⁷³ Some fathers of the church combined the two alternative interpretations, the material and the spiritual: Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine, among others.¹⁷⁴

Carmignac listed eleven typical arguments advanced in support of a material interpretation of the bread in the fourth petition.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² Carmignac, 145.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 153-56.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 159-63.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 186-89. Carmignac himself, however, preferred a threefold interpretation of the bread: the material, spiritual, and sacramental, but not eschatological.

1. The spiritual interpretation of the bread is philologically weak. There is little warrant for translating *epiousios* as "supersubstantial" as Jerome did, giving "supersubstantial bread." The translation of the adjective as "daily" bread is more conducive to *material* bread, especially in those lands where daily communion has fallen out of practice. If communion were daily, as was the more prevalent custom in the churches of the West, then the "daily bread" might be more susceptible of an interpretation meaning sacramental bread.

2. The spiritual interpretation is the fruit of the allegorical method championed by Origen and the Alexandrian school, which unfairly influenced much later interpretation, and which improperly introduced needless secondary meanings.

3. The spiritual interpretation may be within the scope of application, but the primary sense must be the literal sense, unless the context clearly points in another direction. John 11:13 furnishes a good example of an obvious figurative meaning where Jesus spoke of the death of Lazarus as a sleep. However, ordinarily literal and figurative language should not be confused.

4. When Jesus taught the Lord's Prayer, the disciples at that time would not have yet understood the bread sacramentally. Jesus' instructions on the Lord's Prayer chronologically preceded the institution of the Last Supper.

5. If Jesus intended the bread to be spiritual, he

would have made his intention more precise.¹⁷⁶

6. In a prayer as compact as the Lord's Prayer, Jesus would not have spoken twice of spiritual things. The second petition especially is patently related to spiritual blessings. If the bread of the fourth petition were spiritual, then it would be redundant *vis-à-vis* the second petition.

7. The patristic expositions of the Lord's Prayer are not unanimous in their interpretations. If the fourth petition were to be interpreted spiritually, this meaning would have been so obvious that virtually all patristic interpretation would be unanimously spiritual.

8. The obvious sense of the simple word bread applies to material bread. Why look beyond the natural meaning of the word for a deeper or hidden sense?¹⁷⁷

9. Earthly realities of everyday life are embraced by the blessing of daily bread. In Jesus' teaching, and in fact, throughout the Bible, man's needs are not neglected by a loving and gracious God.

¹⁷⁶ Heinz Schürmann, Praying with Christ: The Our Father for Today, tr. William Ducey and Alphonse Simon (New York: Herder, 1964), 127, n. 250: "In so brief and terse a prayer, there would be no room for figurative expressions The word *today* would be out of place, for one asking for the bread of the coming world, i.e. for the beginning of the "meal" in heaven. Besides there is the fact that such a request would be then identical with the one asking for the coming of the kingdom of God, of which the "final meal" is only another figure; but the prayer of the Lord contains nothing superfluous or [with] double-meaning."

¹⁷⁷ F.-M. Braun "Le pain dont nous avons besoin (Mt 6,11; Lc 11,3)," Nouvelle Revue Théologique 100 (1978): 568, suggested that a spiritual interpretation is too metaphysical for such a simple prayer.

10. When Jesus warned against anxiety about the future (Matt. 6:25-34), he was teaching the believer dependency on God for the basic needs of life.

11. The presence of the word "our" indicates that the bread is adapted to our nature and is suitable for our bodies, rather than its being of a spiritual kind.

These valid observations compel "bread" to be understood in the normal sense of the word. The bread of the Lord's Prayer refers to ordinary material bread. Nothing in the text or the Matthean and Lukan contexts requires a figurative or spiritual meaning for the word "bread." In the passages where Jesus spoke of bread spiritually, his *first* point of reference was the ordinary bread which is eaten. Whenever bread is given a different meaning, sacramental, or spiritual of Christ as the Word of life, the text or context gives warrant for such metaphorical interpretation. That God promises to hear the prayer spoken about the everyday needs of his people reveals God's comprehensive love for his creation. God reveals himself as being accessible to man's needs. Once again, the fourth petition is best understood incarnationally. God is not too busy or unconcerned for his people. He steps down to them with his helping hand. Precisely because God addresses their daily needs, Jesus can warn against anxiety about daily life. All temporal cares are placed with God who gives the command to pray and promises to hear and answer prayer (1 Pet. 5:7). The Lord's Prayer is a "perfect prayer" because it embraces all the needs of his people, even the temporal concerns of everyday

living (Matt. 6:30-32, 34; 7:11; Luke 11:18).

Epiousios

The word *epiousios* has exercised the minds of philologists and exegetes for the last twenty centuries. Regardless of the lack of a clear solution to its meaning, the word has enjoyed a secure place in the manuscript traditions, obviously originating with the original "autographs" of Matthew and Luke themselves. Whether Jesus coined this Greek term or whether he used a Semitic word which Matthew and Luke both report by the same translated word in their Greek Gospels is beside the point. This word is employed in the canonical Scriptures and many suggestions have been made for its meaning. Philologic investigations may help, since no semantic field for this *hapax* is possible, yet assured results are inconclusive. Synchronic linguistic research into the meaning of the word is also limited owing to the paucity of data.

Inscriptional and Papyrological Investigations

Since the word does not appear anywhere in all of Greek literature except in that influenced by the Lord's Prayer (*viz.* Patristic literature), endeavors have been made to investigate the word by means of ancient inscriptions and papyral discoveries. The only possible attestation for the word in secular use is an Egyptian Fayyum papyrus fragment of an itemized account book dating from the end of the fifth century A.D. This was published in 1889 by A. H. Sayce in

Flinders Petrie's *Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsinoe*. This same information was reprinted in 1915 in a more accessible volume.¹⁷⁸ A typical entry reads:

On the 6th of Mechir (i.e., 6th Egyptian month):
Fowl, flesh meat, salt, (? vegetable-) head, spices,
mint, bread-rolls, eggs, oil, personal item (emoi), young
animals, wine = 12 obols.

The passage containing the reference reads as follows:

On the 15th of Mechir: epiouisi[] 1/2 obol legumes,
mint, bread-rolls = 1 denarius 6 obols.

The word in question is defective (ἐπιούσι-). Friedrich Preisigke, perhaps over-confidently, assigned the definition: "sufficient for the day's need" ("für den Tagesbedarf hinreichend").¹⁷⁹ This papyrus reading probably indicates in context an appropriate portion or stipulated amount. Then in 1925 three scholars independently of each other converged in calling attention to this discovery (A. Debrunner, H. J. Cadbury, M. Dibelius).¹⁸⁰ In addition, Ferd. Stiebitz and Adolf Deissmann discovered a list of daily commodities from Pompeii in which the Latin word *diaria* played a role and subsequently concluded that since the Greek list was similar, *epiouisi*- probably meant something like daily rations and

¹⁷⁸ Friedrich Preisigke, Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten, vol. 1 (Strassbourg: Trübner, 1915), 5224.20. The following ET is by Sebastian A. Falcone, "The Kind of Bread We Pray for in the Lord's Prayer," in Essays in Honor of Joseph P. Brennan, ed. R. F. McNamara (Rochester, New York: St. Bernard's Seminary, 1976), 45.

¹⁷⁹ Preisigke, col. 567.

¹⁸⁰ Werner Foerster, "ἐπιούσιος," in TDNT 2:591, fn. 1.

artos epiousios in the fourth petition would signify a daily ration of bread.¹⁸¹ This whole conjecture is insecure, as Bruce Metzger pointed out.¹⁸² Sayce's scholarship was inexact and the papyrus under study has been lost from the British Museum!¹⁸³ Further examination has been rendered impossible.

Another archaeological discovery consists of a hieroglyphic symbol from the Egyptian fortress of Beth-shan, discovered by Alan Rowe on over one hundred terra cotta *simulacra* of breadrolls or buns. Rowe explained them as votive offerings as described in Jer. 7:17-18. At any rate, one type of the terra cotta loaves were imprinted with "daily (offering?)" in hieroglyphic. Rowe alluded to the showbread of the temple for a similar usage (1 Sam. 21:6). This phenomenon has not been fully assessed and probably is insufficient to lead to the conclusion that ἐπιούσιος-bread is daily-bread.¹⁸⁴

A third discovery has generated speculation. In 1941,

¹⁸¹ Foerster, 592, fn. 16; Falcone, 46.

¹⁸² Bruce Metzger, "How Many Times does 'Epiousios' Occur Outside the Lord's Prayer?" The Expository Times 69 (1957-58): 53; and, D. Y. Hadidian, "The Meaning of ἐπιούσιος and the Codices Sergii," New Testament Studies 5 (1958): 76-77.

¹⁸³ Metzger, 53; R. F. Wright, "Our Daily Bread," Church Quarterly Review 157 (July-September 1956): 340-45.

¹⁸⁴ Alan Rowe, The Topography and History of Beth-Shan (Philadelphia: University Press, 1930); Sigmund Mowinckel, "Artos epiousios," Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift 40 (1939): 247-55.

C. Blinkenberg published a mutilated inscription from Lindos of Rhodes, now preserved in the museum of Copenhagen, which reads EN[IA]YCIW. G. Klaffenbach, a Berlin paleographer, conjectured that the reconstructed word should read not *en(ia)usio*, but *ep(io)usio*, meaning "to the coming, the next priest of Athene" (i.e., chosen for the next year).¹⁸⁵ Metzger demonstrated that, in context, the word should be read differently, namely, as "annually."¹⁸⁶

Fourthly, it has been reported in three Armenian *Codices Sergii*, as noted in the Septuagint (1798-1827) edited by Holmes-Parson, that 2 Macc. 1:8 adds to the showbread (τοὺς ἄρτους) the word ἐπιούσιους. The retroversion from Armenian into Greek is a translation of an original Armenian word which does not mean daily. D. Y. Hadidian showed that this citation therefore is worthless.¹⁸⁷ Previously, scholars maintained that Sergius Malea had introduced the reading. The result of Hadidian's research in the Mechitarist Library in Vienna revealed that the original Armenian adjective modifying the bread at 2 Macc. 1:8 was *yagaesatz*, "continual" whereas the adjective in the Lord's Prayer was *hanapazord* "constant." Hadidian concluded that Parsons and not Malea

¹⁸⁵ First announced by E[rnst] V[ogt], "ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐπιούσιος = ὁ ἄρτος ὁ τῆς ἐπιούσης," *Biblica* 35 (1954): 136-37, though in the next number (p. 274) expressing reservations.

¹⁸⁶ Metzger, 53. These paleographical attempts are inconclusive.

¹⁸⁷ Hadidian, *passim*; Metzger, 53; Foerster, 591, fn. 4; Falcone, 47.

translated or conflated the text with *epiousios* for *yagaesatz* under the influence of the word "continual" of the Syriac (Curetonian and Sinaitic) and Syrian Acts of Thomas. Thus *epiousios* was not original and too late to be significant.

In conclusion, any hope of finding a secular literary or inscriptional example of *epiousios* is exhausted. Its meaning remains elusive on the basis of meager and questionable archaeological possibilities.

Versional Witnesses

The early versions of the New Testament provide more possibilities for understanding the word. Among the plethora of efforts, it is difficult, yes impossible, to settle on one as being absolutely correct. The variety of attempts to render the word among the versions demonstrates that from early on the meaning of *epiousios* was elusive. The testimony of the versions does illustrate the range of possibilities which exist and how the traditional word "daily" became the standard translation in the fourth petition (pre-Vulgate Latin, Luther 1522, Tyndale 1525).¹⁸⁸

The translated word "daily" clearly stems from the Latin tradition (*Itala*, Jerome in Luke) which offers *panis quotidianus*, or the Old Latin, *panis cot(t)idianus*.¹⁸⁹ The

¹⁸⁸ Arland J. Hultgren, "The Bread Petition of the Lord's Prayer," in Christ and His communities, Essays in Honor of Reginald H. Fuller, ed. Arland J. Hultgren and Barbara Hall (Anglican Theological Review Supplementary Series 11, 1990), 53.

¹⁸⁹ John Hennig, "Our Daily Bread," Theological Studies 4 (1943): 445-454.

Latin tradition takes the expression in a "daily-temporal" sense. Other versions follow such categories of sense as the "future-temporal", the "durative-temporal," or the "physical and/or spiritual qualitative." Jerome (ca. 345-420) inexplicably gave "supersubstantial bread" in Matthew. Jerome's comments do introduce the scope and dimension of the problem:

What we have translated super-substantial is in Greek *epiousios*, which word the Seventy translators most frequently give as *periousios*. We have therefore examined the Hebrew, and wherever they used *periousios* we have found SGOLIA (=segullah), which Symmachus has translated *exaireton*, that is pre-eminent or distinguished, although in a certain passage he has expressed it by *peculiare* (private treasure). When, therefore, we ask of God to bestow upon us that bread which is a peculiar treasure, or pre-eminent, we ask for Him who says, 'I am the living bread, which came down from heaven.' In the Gospel which is called 'according to the Hebrews,' instead of super-substantial bread I have found *mahar*, which means 'for tomorrow'; so that the sense is: Our bread for tomorrow, that is, for the future give us today. We can understand supersubstantial bread, also, in another way, as that which is above all substances and surpasses the whole world of creatures. Others suppose simply that the saints have care for present food only, according to the language of the apostle who says, 'Having food and raiment, let us with these be content.' Accordingly, among the subsequent precepts is this one, 'Do not take thought for the morrow.'¹⁹⁰

In this passage Jerome raised four possibilities: pre-eminent, for tomorrow, above all substances, suitable for present needs. His preference is for number three which

¹⁹⁰ PL 26:44, "In Evangel. Matt." 1.6.; ET in Falcone, 37-38.

reflects a spiritualization of the bread.¹⁹¹

Other versions provide other attempts at understanding the word under consideration. Sebastian A. Falcone has assembled a mass of information which follows in summary fashion.¹⁹²

1. Coptic dialects. The Sahidic version (ca. 3rd century) gives: "Our bread that cometh give thou it to us today" (Matthew; Luke is fragmentary). The Bohairic version from the delta near Alexandria (ca. 4th cent.) renders *epiousios* as a temporal adjective: "Our bread of tomorrow give us today" (Matthew), and "Our bread that cometh give it to us today" (Luke). The *Gospel according to the Hebrews* also gives "tomorrow," if Jerome's testimony is reliable.¹⁹³

2. Georgian version (ca. 5th cent.). The reading *puri arsobisaj* means "bread necessary for existence." In 1904 a new manuscript from A.D. 897 was discovered which gave *puri samardisoj* meaning "never ending bread." In 1922,

¹⁹¹ "In Evangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, pro 'supersubstantiali pane', reperi 'mahar', quod dicitur 'crastinum'; ut sit sensus: 'Panem nostrum crastinum, i.e. futurum da nobis hodie'." This text is conveniently given in Kurt Aland, Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964), 87 [3rd ed., 1979, p. 57], along with other early scattered patristic references to the Lord's Prayer. In much current literature, Jerome's citation of the nonextant *Gospel According to the Hebrews* may be the most popular suggestion, meaning tomorrow, and which readily lends itself to a future eschatological interpretation of the bread. Jerome's etymology for "pre-eminent" reflects the spiritualizing influence of Origen. See also fn. 202, below.

¹⁹² Falcone, 40-44.

¹⁹³ Only about 25 words are extant; see Falcone, 57, n. 13.; and, Chapter III, *supra*.

S. Kauchtschischwili discovered a 6th century palimpsest reading *samaradghisoj*. The element *mara* presented a dilemma of whether it was related to the neo-Georgian *mara* meaning everlasting, or to the Semitic *mahar* meaning tomorrow. Kauchtschischwili selected the latter, yielding "bread for the coming day."¹⁹⁴

3. The Persian version (ca. 7th cent.) gives "bread necessary for this day." This version is probably dependent on the Peshitta.

4. Syriac versions. The Curetonian (ca. 4th cent.) gives "And our bread, the continual one, of the day give to us," (Matthew) and "And give to us the bread, the continual one, of everyday" (Luke). The Sinaitic gives only Luke, "constant." The Syriac Acts of Thomas (ca. 2nd or 3rd cent.) gives "continual bead" (no. 144). The Palestinian Syriac (ca. 6th cent.) gives "our bread of abundance," although this reading is susceptible of a scribal error.¹⁹⁵ The Peshitta (5th cent.) reads, "Give to us the bread of our necessity this day," (Matthew) and "Give to us the bread of our necessity every day" (Luke). This may reflect dependency on Prov. 30:8, "Feed me with the food that is needful for me." The Philoxenian and Harclean revisions also give "necessary." The Syriac *Diatesseron* (post 5th cent.) gives a paraphrase which corrupts the sense, and may be discounted: "Give us

¹⁹⁴ S. Kauchtschischwili, "Ein Beitrag zur ετιμωσις-Frage," Philologische Wochenschrift 50 (September 20, 1930): col. 1166-68.

¹⁹⁵ Explained by Falcone, 42.

the strength of today."¹⁹⁶

5. Several other versions. The Armenian (ca. 5th cent., already cited) gives "constant." The Gothic version (before A.D. 383) gives "continual"; only Matthew is extant. The Old Slavic (9th cent.) reads "necessary." The Arabic version (8th cent.) gives (only Matthew), "The bread necessary for subsistence." Falcone noted that the Arabic work carries the connotation of "the hand stretched forth in the manner of a beggar."¹⁹⁷ The Ethiopic version (ca. 600) gives, "The bread of each day give us today," (Matthew) and "The bread from one day to the next give us" (Luke).

6. Summary of the Latin tradition. Falcone explained what is meant by the Latin tradition:

There is a strong consensus that at least two Old-Latin versions exist: The African (being the earliest) and the European (being a later revision or translation). Some scholars would argue for a third; the Italian, which is revision of the European. In any event, the African version dates around 200 A.D.¹⁹⁸

As cited earlier, the Old Latin versions give *Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie* in Matthew; *hodie* is changed to *cotidie* in Luke. Falcone believed that this translation was influenced by James 2:15-16: "If a brother or sister is ill-clad and in lack of daily food ($\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\varsigma$, *victu cotidiano*) . . . without [you] giving them the things needed

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 42.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 43.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 58, n. 25.

(τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, *necessaria*) for the body."¹⁹⁹ He also believed that the word "daily" "surrendered to the gravitational pull of the adverb in this petition."²⁰⁰ The familiar wording "daily" obviously stems from the Latin tradition.

From the versions it is evident that a broad usage of possibilities have been followed by early translations of the Bible. In some cases, it is clear that the word used to translate *epiousios* succumbed to theological presuppositions. It also may be true that some divergences resulted from the inability to adequately render *epiousios* with an adept one word equivalent in another language and that all translational efforts are in a sense interpretive.

The versions then shed light on the meaning, but do not directly provide an unambiguous definition of the word *epiousios*. The early Latin versions give a daily-temporal meaning. The Sahidic and Bohairic of Luke ("coming") may be present or future. The Bohairic of Matthew, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and Tiflis Georgian are definitely future-temporal. A number of versions represent the durative-temporal sense ("continual"): Adyson Georgian, Syriac (Cur. and Sin.), Armenian, Syriac *Acts of Thomas*, Gothic. All the representatives of the qualitative sense are rather late: Persian, Peshitta, Harclean/Philoxenian, Georgian, Vulgate, Old Slavic, Arabic, Palestinian Syrian,

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 43.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

and Syriac *Diatesseron*. Jerome's *supersubstantialem* gives a spiritual-qualitative sense. It would be fair to say that his choice is eccentric and individualistic. Jerome's idiosyncratic rendition was not received everywhere, as the common liturgical wording of the Latin Lord's Prayer illustrates.

Philologic Proposals

Philologically, four different proposals have been made to explain the word.²⁰¹

1. The first proposal is based on a suggestion made by Origen that the word was coined from ἐπί + οὐσία meaning "necessary for existence." The preposition and substantive can, of course, each receive particular colorations leading to diverse translations.

Jerome proposed "super-substantial" on the basis of this etymology. He undoubtedly took the *epi* in a locative sense: over, above substance or essence, as he explained, "That which is above all substance and surpasses the whole world of creatures."²⁰² One objection to this explanation is that οὐσία seems out of place as a philosophical abstraction in a prayer so terse and down to earth as the fourth petition

²⁰¹ Categories are from Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, tr. and adapted William F. Arndt and Wilbur G. Gingrich (Chicago: The University Press, 1957), 296-97 [hereafter BAG].

²⁰² See fn. 191 above. Jerome simply and literalistically translated ἐπί with "super" (over, upon) and οὐσία with "substantial" (substance, being).

is.²⁰³ Further, ἡ οὐσία generally means "property" in the New Testament (Luke 15:12-13) and secular papyri.²⁰⁴ That seems to be the way the word οὐσία is understood in Luke 15:12-13: "'Father, give me the share of property that falls to me (δοῦ μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας) . . . and there he squandered all his property (τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ) in loose living.'" Obviously, Jerome's proposal conforms to a spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition.²⁰⁵

Another explanation within this first philologic category emphasizes the preposition as "purpose" and the substantive as existence, yielding "bread for existence" or "bread necessary for existence or sustenance." Origen, as well as the Peshitta, championed this interpretation.²⁰⁶ The special merit of this explanation is that ἐπί can often be used in the sense of purpose or motive: ἐπιδόριος from δόριον signifies "that which concerns the supper, dinner, meal, or

²⁰³ Carmignac, 129.

²⁰⁴ BAG, 600.

²⁰⁵ Following this line is William K. Prentice, "Our 'Daily' Bread: Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον," The Review of Religion 11 (January 1947): 126-31.

²⁰⁶ Represented by F. Tilney Bassett, "Give us this Day our Daily Bread," The Expository Times 3 (1891-92): 27-31; Hermann Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek, tr. William Urwick (Edinburgh: Clark, 1878), 239-42; Friedrich Hauck, "ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 33 (1934): 199-202; Christian Rogge, "'Ἐπιούσιος und kein Ende,'" Philologische Wochenschrift 47 (September 10, 1927): col. 1129-35.

ἑπικεφαλαίος from κεφαλή signifying "that which concerns the head."²⁰⁷

Objections have been raised against this formation of *epiousios*. Philologically, the original form should be ἑπουσία since Greek ordinarily avoids a hiatus between two vowels and would naturally elide the *iota*, only retaining it when an original *digamma* preceded the vowel like in ἑπιανδάνω. For example οὐράνιος (Matt. 6:14, 26, 32; 15:13) is properly ἑπουράνιος in Matt. 18:34, not ἑπιουράνιος. On the other hand, some authorities show that after the classical period, examples can be marshalled to illustrate that ἐπί could have been fully retained in this formation, as examples illustrate: ἐπιείκελος, ἐπιέλπομαι, ἐπιετής, ἐπίουρος. Carmignac cited twenty-six such examples where the *iota* is retained.²⁰⁸ Another objection relates to the formation in -ιος, since an adjective formed from -ια generally ought to terminate in -ωδης or -αιος. Carmignac answered this objection by several examples, such as: ἐπιθύμιος from ἐπιθυμία, ἐπικάρπιος from ἐπικαρπία, and ἐξούσιος, ὁμοούσιος, ὁμοιούσιος, περιούσιος which all

²⁰⁷ Carmignac, 130.

²⁰⁸ Carmignac, 129; Albert Debrunner, "Ἐπιούσιος," Theologische Literaturzeitung 50 (Mar 1925): col. 119, has ardently defended this view. See Foerster, 593, fn. 21. See also fn. 215, below.

derive from οὐσία.²⁰⁹ It may also be wondered why available words such as ἐπιτήδειος (suitable) or ἀναγκαῖος (necessary) were not used.

A further twist was offered by A. N. Jannaris who thought that ἐπιούσιος had been coined in antithesis to περιούσιος, meaning distinguished, peculiar, special, so that in contrast, *epiousios* bread would be simple or common bread.²¹⁰ According to this idea, *periousios* bread would be for abundant bread, *epiousios* bread would refer only to basic needs. *Periousios* would be for a superfluous supply of bread; *epiousios* would be for a basic quantity of bread necessary to sustain life. Similarly, James W. Thirtle suggested "the bread on which we exist" or "our sustaining bread" based on *epi* and *ousia*.²¹¹ Each of the above ideas underscores the uniqueness of the word *epiousios* and, like the following proposals, leaves open the possibility that *epiousios* was coined in the New Testament to express an idea that could not be expressed by another clear word. Most of the possibilities expressed above fall under the temporal or

²⁰⁹ Carmignac, 129.

²¹⁰ A. N. Jannaris, "The English Version of the Lord's Prayer," The Contemporary Review 346 (October 1894): 586-88. Jannaris emphasized the *epi*. As such, the *iota* would not be elided as normally expected. See Henri Bourgoïn, "Ἐπιούσιος expliqué par la notion de préfixe vide," Biblica 60 (1979): 91-96, who in contrast, devalued the use of the prefix, that is, claimed that it did not significantly contribute to the essential meaning of the root.

²¹¹ James W. Thirtle, The Lord's Prayer: An Interpretation Critical and Expository (London: Morgan and Scott, 1915), 128-31.

spiritual-qualitative category previously mentioned. None of the above suggestions have totally escaped criticism.

2. The second hypothesis proposed for explaining *epiousios* stems from a combination of *ἐπί* and the verb *εἶμι, εἶναι* (*sum, esse*). The nominative and genitive, masculine, feminine, and neuter participles are ὦν, ὄντος; οὔσα, οὔσης; ὄν, ὄντος. The adjective *epiousios* would be built upon the feminine stem in the same way that several other adjectives are formed from participial inflections of a verb; for example: *ἐκούσιος* from *ἐκών*, *ἐθελούσιος* from *ἐθέλων*, *γερούσιος* from *γέρων*.²¹² When the word "day" is omitted, then the phrase *ἐπὶ [τὴν] οὔσαν* [sc. *ἡμέραν*] is substantivized and can mean "for the current day, for today."²¹³ According to this explanation, the hiatus, or non-elided iota, remains a problem, against which objection can be made as in the first hypothesis above.²¹⁴ Attempting to overcome this objection, Albert Debrunner strenuously defended this hypothesis in a series of articles early this century. He pointed out that Sophocles (*Oedipus Rex* 781) employed *ἡ οὔσα ἡμέρα* in the sense of the "present day," just as *ἐπέτειος*, *ἐπιμήνιος*, and *ἐφημέριος* would signify "of the year," "of the month," and "of the

²¹² Carmignac, 131.

²¹³ BAG, 297. See Acts 13:1.

²¹⁴ BDF, 67, sec. 124. In fact, by way of objection, why not have simply used the familiar *ἐφήμερος* (James 2:15)?

day."²¹⁵ This line of thinking is also defended by other authorities.²¹⁶ Carmignac objected that ἡ οὐσα ἡμέρα "for the present day" does not justify creating the adjective ἐπιούσιος without the ἡμέρα.²¹⁷ It appears that this proposal does not have many adherents yet its advocates defend it vigorously.²¹⁸

3. This and the next proposal are built on formations deriving from "to go, come" (εἶμι, ἔναι; *ibo, ire; iter*). The nominative and genitive masculine, feminine, and neuter participial forms are: ἰών, ἰόντος; ἰούσα, ἰούσης; ἰόν, ἰόντος. Linguistically, these proposals are free of objections raised earlier, since the *iota* is part of the stem of the root word and must not be elided (not ἐπί-ἔναι, but ἐπ-ἔναι; not ἐπ-εἶναι, nor ἐπί-εἶναι). Secondly, many examples of formations

²¹⁵ Examples by Carmignac, 131. See BDF, 66, sec. 123.1: ". . . conceptually and grammatically the most plausible explanation is the assumption of a substantivization of ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσαν (scil. ἡμέραν) '(determined) for the day in question' ('this day' Mt, 'any day' Lk)." See Debrunner in Glotta 4 (1913): 249-53; 13 (1924): 167-71; Philologische Wochenschrift 51 (1931): 1277f; see also BAG, 297, sec. 2, for further bibliographic references to Debrunner's prolific literature produced on the subject; but *contra*, C. G. Sheward, The Expository Times 52 (1940-41): 120, fn. 2, who objected that ἡμέρα was never assumed with οὐσα, and that against Debrunner, the *iota* should be elided (BDF, 67, sec. 124, claiming that *koine* does not avoid hiatus).

²¹⁶ Gustaf Dalman, Die Worte Jesu (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930), Anhang, 334.

²¹⁷ Carmignac, 132.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, i.e., following upon Debrunner's immense literature and stature. Carmignac noted that a few authorities take this possibility, not in a local or temporal sense, but in a final sense, similar to the first proposal above, thus, "that which is suitable, convenient."

constructed on ἔναι occur in classical and *koine* literature. Thirdly, apropos of the earlier proposals, Greek words were already available to express notions of daily (καθημερινός, Acts 6:1; ἐφήμερος, James 2:15), necessary (ἐπιτήδειος, James 2:16; ἀναγκαῖος, Tit. 3:14), or sufficient (ἰκανός, Matt. 28:12). A nuance was required which only *epiousios* could furnish. Therefore this word was employed instead of any other more available word according to some authorities.

This third proposal, then, takes the *epiousios* in the sense of "following" as in ἡ ἐπιούσα sc. ἡμέρα (cf. ἑκὼν, ἑκουῖσα). The word "day" may or may not be part of the phrase, but certainly the phrase means the day which follows, the next, or "nexty."²¹⁹ Luke is apt to use such expressions in Acts; see for example 7:26, "on the following day" (τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ); 16:11, "on the following day" (τῇ δε ἐπιούσῃ); 18:19 (the Western text), "on the following sabbath" (τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ); 20:15, "the next day" (τῇ ἐπιούσῃ); 21:18, "on the following day" (τῇ δε ἐπιούσῃ); 23:11, "the following night"

²¹⁹ Lemuel S. Potwin, "The Old Syriac Version of the Lord's Prayer: Its Rendering of 'ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ,'" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 51 (1894): 165-68, used "nexty." Lohmeyer, 142, explained that this "future" bread is related both to *crastinum* and *venientem*.

(Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτί).²²⁰ With this explanation, the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer requests bread for the next or following day, especially if used as an evening prayer, or for the day just beginning, if prayed in the morning.²²¹

A philological objection raised against this hypothesis is that *epiousios* ought not be formed from a quasi-substantive ἡ ἐπιούσα, that is, since "day" is only understood and must be supplied to complete the sense.²²² Yet even Origen, who was more acquainted with his native Greek than moderns are, at least entertained the possibility of this construction, without personally adopting it. In fact,

²²⁰ Adherents include G. Adolf Deissmann, "Ἐπιούσιος," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Georg Heinrici (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914), 115-119; Anton Fridrichsen, "ARTOS EPIOUSIOS," Symbolae Osloenses 2 (1924): 31-41; S. Kauchtschischwili, 1166-68; Joseph Barber Lightfoot, On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament (London: Macmillan, 1872, 1891), 195-242; J. B. McClellan, "On the Rendering 'Daily Bread' in the Lord's Prayer," The Expository Times 2 (1890-91): 184-88; Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, "Die Vierte Bitte im Vaterunser," Protestantische Monatshefte 18 (1914): 358-64.

²²¹ Frederic Henry Chase, The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church, Texts and Studies, vol. 1, no. 3, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: University Press, 1892), 46-47: "Bread of the day"; the Lord's Prayer could be recited in the evening or in the morning considering the bread as either the bread of today or bread of the morrow. In the morning the Lord's Prayer would be prayed "Give us this day our bread" and in the evening "Give us our bread for the coming day." This appears a contrivance to accommodate both *epiousios* and "today" in the Matthean version. According to this suggestion Luke simply repeated the adjective and his own adverbial expression.

Incidentally, Sheward, 120, fn. 3, demonstrated that this formation in context could be taken as "today." He cited Plato, *Crito* 44a: Οὐ τοίνυν τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας οἶμαι αὐτὸ ἕξειν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἑτέρας (Well, I think it [the ship] will not come in today, but tomorrow).

²²² Karl Holzinger, "Zur Lösung der ἐπιούσιος-Frage," Philologische Wochenschrift 51 (July 4, 1931): col. 325-830; (July 11, 1931): col. 857-863.

adjectives can be formed without expressing the word "day" itself, but which nevertheless clearly signify the unsupplied word: John 11:39, "for four days" (τεταρταίος); Acts 28:3, "on the second day" (δευτεραίος).

This third interpretation sees a continual, regular movement so that God's help is expected for each tomorrow.²²³ As such, it fits the category of the future-temporal sense. However, such a future orientation may run counter to Jesus' teaching in Matt. 6:25-34. For example, at verse 34 the believer is specifically exhorted not to worry about the future or tomorrow (εἰς τὴν αὐριον). In fact, the believer is urged to take one day at a time (ἄρκετὸν τῆ ἡμέρα). Further, other suitable words for tomorrow were available if that should have been the meaning of *epiousios*, such as αὐριον and ἐπαύριον. Moreover, this proposal contradicts the present orientation of the "today" and "our" of the fourth petition. Therefore, this proposal is subject to objections also.

4. The fourth and last proposal is that which takes into account the idea of movement or motion. Several variations on the theme will be reported.

First, there is the temporal-durative or future, depending on the emphasis given it by personal preference. This explanation takes *epiousios* to be an expression similar

²²³ T. W. Manson, "The Lord's Prayer," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 38 (1956): 442; it could apply equally to today's bread or to tomorrow's bread.

to τὸ ἐπιόν. It is based on ἐπί + ἔναι, "for the coming (sc. day)." This is the bread for the future, for it is that which comes sequentially and regularly. This construction suffers no philological objections. Its emphasis on sequential regularity does not counter the prohibition to worry in Matt. 6:25-34, according to its advocates.²²⁴

Another suggestion, constructed as above, applies the adjective to the bread, not to a supplied "day". It would ask, "give us this day the bread that comes to it." It is similar to the second hypothesis named above, except that it is constructed on a different verbal foundation (ἔναι rather than εἶναι). Its perspective is slightly different also. This suggestion under consideration prays more for the bread "coming to this day" while in the second hypothesis the nuance is more "for this present day." Karl Holzinger described it as, "Das zu diesem Tage hinzukommen geeignete oder zugehörige Brot."²²⁵ This should be classified as representing a temporal daily (durative) sense. This suggestion satisfies all the grammatical criteria. The only drawback is that it tends to create a tautology, to which criticism, the translation "daily" is also clearly and admittedly subject! It has been felt awkward to employ in so

²²⁴ See Johannes Haußleiter, "Vaterunser," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, ed. Albert Hauck (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 20:431-455; and Alfred Seeberg, "Vaterunser und Abendmahl," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Georg Heinrici (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914), 109, for this view.

²²⁵ Holzinger, 828. See also next fn.

concise a prayer as the fourth petition two similar words "Give us this day our daily bread" although the word "daily" is probably the best single expression for the hypothesis under study. Unfortunately, Holzinger's paraphrase is too long and awkward in any modern language or brief prayer to be suitable.²²⁶

Another suggestion has been made, based on the present participle of ἐπιέναι, used attributively, with the sense of following or next.²²⁷ This formation is constructed on the combination of ἐπί + ἔναι, and is similar to number three above. Unlike the "future bread" of that hypothesis, which emphasizes "time when," this formation prefers to emphasize the bread of which man has need. This attributive adjective is ἐπιών, suggesting the (needful) bread which is coming. It refers to the Christian's next meal. This proposal represents a qualitative physical category. However, by way of objection, why must food be measured out beforehand for the following day?

Finally, a purely eschatological hypothesis is based on

²²⁶ Of all the hypotheses reported in this section, Holzinger's neglected suggestion may be one which is the most compatible with the philologic requirements, the theological context of Jesus' teaching, and to the entire Biblical milieu. His "das hinzukommen" bread was translated as the bread "'calculated to come,' i.e., this day" according to Foerster, reporting this possibility; "ἐπιούσιος," in TDNT 2:592, fn. 11.

²²⁷ See Hennig, 445-54; Thomas G. Shearman, "Our Daily Bread," Journal of Biblical Literature 53 (1934): 110-117.

ἐπί + ἔναι. This is the bread to come. This is probably the most commonly accepted etymological possibility today.²²⁸ This view may be described as a qualitative spiritual sense. It is philologically sound, it is compatible with eschatological and spiritual interpretations of the fourth petition, and it agrees with the statement quoted by Jerome from the *Gospel According to the Hebrews*.

However, no reason exists to necessitate turning to the nonextant *Gospel According to the Hebrews* to support a particular reading. That document was probably a translation of the original Greek Matthew into a Semitic language (most likely Aramaic). Further, Jerome may have misquoted the passage.²²⁹ Jerome himself did not take the suggestion to which he made reference, offering instead "Give us this day

²²⁸ For example, adherents include: Matthew Black, "The Aramaic of τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον (Matth. 6,11 = Luke 11,3)," The Journal of Theological Studies 42 (1941): 186-189; Raymond Brown, 241; Johannes Herrmann, "Der alttestamentliche Urgrund des Vaterunsers," in Festschrift Otto Procksch (Leipzig: Deichert and Hinrichs, 1934), 71-98; Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, 200; Lohmeyer, 142; James Hope Moulton, and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), 243; Georg Walther, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Griechischen Vaterunser-Exegese, Texte und Untersuchungen, 40, no. 3 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914).

²²⁹ While Jerome may have initiated this movement, his data provides limited value. The unknown Gospel may be a later translation of which *mahar* "tomorrow" was not original but only a poor translation word from the Greek (Carmignac, 137). The sense of "tomorrow" is out of place in a prayer which definitely centers on "today"; nevertheless, Jerome's citation has had its supporters, and in fact, nearly all who prefer a "futuristic" reading for *epiousios* solicit Jerome's allusion for support. It is also possible that Jerome misread an original MH'R (with a yod, *mechir*, meaning salary or bread offered as salary; see Deut. 24:14-15; Matt. 20:1-16) and simply assumed MHR, "tomorrow"

our supersubstantial bread." To deliberately seek a meaning of *epiousios* that fits the spiritual and eschatological interpretations as Jerome did would be tantamount to introducing a presupposition that is foreign to the Biblical conception of ordinary bread. Although the suggestion is etymologically sound, other factors have to be considered. As Falcone noted: "Etymological hypotheses cannot resolve the issue."²³⁰

Before leaving this subject, the brilliant conjecture of Christian Rogge should be reported.²³¹ He stated that the meaning of a word does not always and completely conform to etymology, but it also depends on usage. He interpreted *epiousios* as that which concerns the following day (temporal-future). But he asserted that the word in the course of history had often been misunderstood and was wrongly taken as Origen did; that is, that *epiousios* was truly a formation of ἐπ' + ἰούσα, but often taken as ἐπί + οὐσία. In imitation of καθημερεύσιος it acquired the sense of that which concerns daily needs, hence, practically *quotidie*.

Needless to say, abundant historical and philologic research has not produced a clear meaning for *epiousios*.

without the *yod*; or since *epiousios* was so closely related to *periousios*, that the Hebrew petition may have read *lehem segullatenu*: "our precious bread," thus, Hermann Rönsch, "Wie und aus welchem Grundgedanke ist die griechische Fassung der Vierten Bitte im Vaterunser zu erklären?" Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie 27 (1883): 385-93.

²³⁰ Falcone, 54.

²³¹ Rogge, "Kein Ende," 1129-35.

Some proposals are brilliant, while others evaporate against objections. Probably it is a fair evaluation to conclude that formations constructed on ἵνα withstand philological scrutiny better. Yet it may rightly be questioned whether any future-temporal interpretation is compatible with Jesus' warning against anxiety: μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον (Matt. 6:34). In fact, it appears presumptuous and contradictory to faith to ask for the bread of tomorrow. The disciples, for example, were sent out on the missionary campaign without advance provisions: "He charged them to take nothing for their journey except a staff; no bread" (Mark 6:8; cf. Matt. 10:9-10; Luke 9:3). The disciples were to accept bread at such time that it was needed. The eschatological bread of the future transcends the everyday needs of God's people. The time of Christian disciples' needs is now. The other petitions in the second strophe rather clearly apply to the present needs and conditions of God's people (that is, forgiveness now, deliverance now). Should not the fourth petition also be concerned with the ordinary physical needs which God's children have now, enabling them to serve as Jesus' disciples?

Besides the hypotheses which suggest explanations of the word *epiousios* on the basis of Greek etymology and/or which elucidate the attempts of the versions to understand that word, several suggestions should be reported which are based on Old Testament conjectures. Many of these explanations are perceived to belong analogously to *epiousios* bread.

upon Prov. 27:1, "Do not boast about tomorrow (τὰ εἰς αὐριον), for you do not know what a day (ἡ ἐπιούσα, that is, the following day) may bring forth." Literally, the phrase should read, "in the day of tomorrow" ($\overline{\gamma} \overline{\pi} \overline{\alpha} \overline{\delta} \overline{\beta} \overline{\iota} \overline{\nu}$). This suggestion is obviously elicited in support of the third Greek etymological hypothesis above and lends itself to the view that *epiousios* means tomorrow or future. Werner Foerster, realizing that ἐπιούσα per se does not mean tomorrow('s bread) made the suggestion that *epiousios* referred to the "dawning" day.²³⁴

Picking up on the theme of things needed (see Greek etymological hypothesis no. 1 supra), Prov. 30:8 is cited for collaborative support.²³⁵ The full text of Prov. 30:8-9 reads: "Remove far from me falsehood and lying; give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with the food that is needful for me, lest I be full, and deny thee, and say, 'Who is the Lord?' or lest I be poor, and steal, and profane the name of my God" (cf. Sir. 40:29). The "food needful for me" is $\cdot \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\beta} \overline{\pi} \overline{\pi} \overline{\zeta}$ in the Massoretic text. The Targum prays, "Give me the life sufficient for me."²³⁶ The Septuagint offers τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ αὐταρκῆ. The Vulgate gives, "Tribue

²³⁴ Foerster, 598.

²³⁵ Joseph Hensler, Das Vaterunser. Text- und Literarkritische Untersuchungen, in Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, vol. 4, no. 5 (Münster-im-Westphalia: Aschendorff, 1914); Herrmann FS, 71-98.

²³⁶ Black, Aramaic Approach, 150.

tantum victui meo necessaria." This expression, (*lehem*) *chuggi*, is used at Gen. 47:22; Ezek. 16:27. The idea of God supplying man's basic needs and requirements as a daily portion is compatible with instruction from 1 Tim. 6:8; Tit. 3:14; James 2:15, 16. This solution does allow for a possessive pronominal adjective (*our* or *my*). It also conforms to the Rabbinical view that excesses in either direction, poverty or wealth, are not wholesome. This is the "bread of our sufficient quantity" (*dayyenu*).²³⁷ The notion of bread or provision for one's journey through life, based on Gen. 45:23, is a variation solicited to support the translation "daily." However, there is no intrinsic reason to think that *epiousios* should mean necessary or needful.

Some scholars have tried to extrapolate a meaning of *epiousios* from Ex. 16:4 which tells about gathering the manna every day: "And the people shall go out and gather a day's portion every day" (יָצְאוּ וַיִּקְרְבוּ וַיִּקְרְבוּ וַיִּקְרְבוּ, τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν). Carmignac is doubtful that these three Hebrew words are represented by one Greek word.²³⁸ If the expression is shortened to "bread of the day," then a tautology exists, asking for bread of the day this day.²³⁹

J. K. Edwards called attention to the root S'D, "to

²³⁷ Strack-Billerbeck, 420; Thirtle, 242.

²³⁸ Carmignac, 140.

²³⁹ Ibid.

sustain" which is often employed in Aramaic for sustenance.²⁴⁰ He cited the Targums of Lev. 26:26; Is. 3:1; Ezek. 4:16; 5:16; 14:13; Ps. 72:16 and 105:16). The original Aramaic would be *se'id lahmana* "bread of our sustenance." By way of objection, Carmignac asked why the Greek order is reversed, if the Greek had accomodated the Hebrew.²⁴¹

G. Kuhn suggested that *epiousios* derived from ἐπιών which rendered the Hebrew participle *holek* or Aramaic *haleka* meaning going, coming.²⁴² This participle signified "our current bread" or "the bread of which we have current need" (*lahma dehaleka* or *lahma dikhaleka*).

Matthew Black made the interesting conjecture that the idea of "day by day" could be rendered by *yoma den weyomahr* but then the Greek translator of the primitive text made an error by attaching the word "tomorrow" to the word following *yoma*, resulting in: "give us today our bread of tomorrow."²⁴³ Said Black, "Matthew's text preserves the mistranslation: compared with the above Aramaic, its difficulties are explicable; σήμερον is *yoma (den)*, τὸν ἐπιούσιον corresponds to

²⁴⁰ J. K. Edwards, "The Word ἘΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ in the Fourth Petition of the Lord's Prayer, Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie 29 (1886): 371-78.

²⁴¹ Carmignac, 140.

²⁴² Reported by Carmignac, 142.

²⁴³ Black, Aramaic Approach, 1st & 2nd ed., 153; 3rd ed., 207.

(den) *weyomahra*."²⁴⁴ Luke retained the τὸν ἐπιούσιον, but added the correct translation τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. Objectively speaking, this seems to be an adequate solution to the different adverbs used by Matthew and Luke (today and day by day) rather than a credible explanation of *epiousios*. It should be noted that the notion of "daily," which may cast light on the meaning of *epiousios*, can be based on the manna account at Ex. 16:4 which used the phrase "a day's portion every day."²⁴⁵

A notable suggestion was made by Franz Dornseiff who asserted that the background for the fourth petition was the giving of the manna in Exodus 16. However, Jesus was not thinking of the daily manna but he had in mind the manna given on the eve of the sabbath. God provided for a perfect sabbath rest whereby his people did not have to worry about what to eat the next day. The instructions to gather a double amount for the sabbath (Ex. 16:23, 26), intended to remove worry and increase trust in God, is paralleled by the explanation of the fourth petition from a later part of the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus taught in Matt. 6:34 not to worry about "tomorrow." The bread of the fourth petition in the

²⁴⁴ Ibid. Carmignac, 142, was hesitant to accept this solution because the Greek translator who otherwise was so careful to preserve the original Semitic word order did not do that here.

²⁴⁵ Jean Starcky, "La Quatrième Demande du Pater," Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971): 401-409, developed this very credible idea from the Hebrew through the LXX; Pierre Grelot, "La Quatrième Demande du 'Pater' et Son Arrière-Plan Sémitique," New Testament Studies 25 (1979): 299-314, confirmed this notion, except via Aramaic.

Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer was likened to the portion for the sabbath.²⁴⁶ The word *epiousios* meant "for tomorrow" (Ex. 16:23, ἄρτοι κριθῶν ἑπταήμερον, ἐπὶ- "for" + ἰούσα "this coming day"; LXX, εἰς τὸ πρῶτον). Luke's version, instead, had the daily manna in the background which gave rise to the familiar "daily bread" prevalent in the Latin tradition. Dornseiff applauded Luke's version which facilitated the fourth petition for Gentile use and which had the effect of adapting the Lord's Prayer for popular use for twenty Christian centuries. Much of what Dornseiff said is sane and can be appreciated. He successfully demonstrated the propriety of associating the theme of manna with the fourth petition. Unfortunately, his explanation of ἐπὶ-ἰούσα (etymology no. 3 above) would read "for tomorrow," not "for the morning." It seems preferable to accept his explanation with the proviso that *epiousios* bread is bread "coming upon," like the manna covering the ground, sent from heaven "today" or "daily."

Carmignac's own proposal must be considered. He accepted the hypothesis that *epiousios* is derived from ἡ ἐπιούσα (ἡμέρα), "the following day."²⁴⁷ He also accepted

²⁴⁶ Franz Dornseiff, "ἐπιούσιος im Vaterunser," Glotta: Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache 35 (1956): 148, "Im Reminiszenz an diese Pentateuchstelle ist die Vaterunserbitte also zu interpretieren: Gib auch uns überschüssiges Vorratsbrot wie das am Rüsttag für den Sabbat in jenen gesegneten 40 Wüstenjahren gesammelte Manna. Laß uns leben frei von Not und Schuld wie unsere Väter in ihrer gottnahesten Zeit. Die galiläischen Bibelleser und Jesushörer verstanden solche Zitate."

²⁴⁷ Carmignac, 214, under the influence of F. Dornseiff; see fn. 246.

Jerome's testimony of an original *mahar* in the Hebrew Lord's Prayer, but thought that Jerome failed to report a *lamed*, which would allow Jerome's source to say "for tomorrow." He saw a definite relationship between Exodus 16 and the fourth petition, especially since *mahar* was employed at 16:23. Further he saw a play on the words between *lahmenu* (our bread) and *lemahar* (for tomorrow).²⁴⁸ To the objection that to pray "give us this day our bread for tomorrow" is nonsensical or counter to Matt. 6:25-34, he replied that *mahar* is subject to a broader interpretation, so that the pilgrim asks God to provide provisions on a regular basis (material bread) and that it would be renewed regularly (spiritual bread).²⁴⁹ The fact that extra manna had to be gathered on the eve of the sabbath suggests the spiritual nature of the bread; namely, that God was concerned to give his people the sabbath blessing of rest and nourishment for the soul.²⁵⁰ Carmignac's proposal then is: "Give us our bread which will nourish us for tomorrow" or "the bread which will permit us to go to tomorrow."²⁵¹ He explained that the bread is not necessary for eating tomorrow, but for having

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 215.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., 216.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 218.

it ready for tomorrow.²⁵² The formation *lemahar* is used five times in the Old Testament with three or four of the examples signifying "before tomorrow" (e.g., Num. 11:18; Josh. 7:13; Ex. 8:6?).²⁵³ Carmignac claimed to have resolved the problem of *epiousios* whose exact equivalent is *lemahar*. He explained that the common and usual word $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ would denote only "morning." The connotation preferred in the Lord's Prayer, however, is "until morning." Phrases such as $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\grave{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \tau\grave{\eta}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ would work, but a simple, single adjective would serve best; therefore *epiousios* was formulated.²⁵⁴ This word would be clearly understood in Greek and by those familiar with a Semitic background. For Carmignac, the bread was at once the material bread of nourishment, the nourishment of the word of God, and sacramental nourishment, but not eschatological bread.²⁵⁵

Carmignac's resolution of the problem of the meaning of *epiousios* is original and creative. But, it also appears contrived. For example, on the basis of Num. 11:18, he blended today and tomorrow together and blurred the distinction of actions done today, tomorrow, and "for

²⁵² Ibid., 217: "'pour (manger) demain', car elle peut aussi signifier 'notre pain pour (aller à) demain' et donc aboutir à un sens voisin de 'jusqu'à.'"

²⁵³ Ibid., 218.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 219.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 221.

tomorrow" claiming that "for tomorrow" means before tomorrow. He appealed to Num. 11:32 which speaks of "all day, all night, and the next day" for the gathering of quails. If then, in the final analysis, "today" is really meant, what is the point of praying "for tomorrow"? And if the prayer indeed is for tomorrow, then why not allow *mahar* or *αύριον* stand on their own strength? There seems to be no clear reason why anticipation of the next day should be part of the Lord's Prayer, especially if it also should have a sacramental sense as Carmignac believed it has. Further, philologically, *epiousios* suggests a movement, with which Carmignac agrees; but, does it carry the intrinsic meaning of "for today, until or up to tomorrow"? Ultimately, Carmignac's mediating hypothesis is an accommodation to two tendencies of interpretation; it tried to satisfy the both/and of today and tomorrow, allowing room for temporal, spiritual, and sacramental interpretations.

Primacy of Material Interpretation

Profuse studies of the word *epiousios* do not lead to a secure explanation of the word. In his significant article (TDNT), Werner Foerster synthesized the many viewpoints of scholarship and arrived at the conclusion that *epiousios* must be physical-qualitative rather than temporal. His article is valuable for the way in which prior scholarship is assessed. He concluded that either a daily-temporal (*ἐπι τὴν οὔσαν*) or durative temporal (*ἡ ἐπιούσα*) understanding of the word is

philologically possible, but he argued that the "addition of τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (Π Ι Γ Γ ς > Γ) or σήμερον (Ι Γ Τ ρ Δ Ι Γ)

... serving the same purpose surely seems tautological."²⁵⁶

Therefore Foerster abandoned all temporal understanding of the word *epiousios*. His conclusion was reinforced by the Preisigke papyrus which implied a daily ration of half an obol. This amount, even in ancient times, would be too miniscule for a daily ration. Foerster therefore avoided any temporal meaning for *epiousios*. He preferred the physical-qualitative sense (necessary). He drew attention to the account of the giving of manna, especially to Ex. 16:18, where "those who gathered too much had no superfluity, and those who gathered too little had no lack."²⁵⁷ He adduced Prov. 30:8 to illustrate. Foerster concluded: "What the Lord has in view is not the space of a day but what is needed by Him and the host of disciples associated with Him."²⁵⁸ Unfortunately, Foerster was too cavalier in the way he discounted the temporal durative sense, even after he admitted its possibility.²⁵⁹ Further, he wrongly assumed

²⁵⁶ Foerster, 598. Incidentally, J. A. T. Robinson, "The Lord's Prayer," in Twelve More New Testament Studies (London: SCM, 1984), 58, suggested that the article with the adverbial phrase (τὸ + καθ' ἡμέραν) in Luke 11:3 required the phrase to be understood epexegetically, "i.e., the bread that belongs to each day." See also the discussion at fns. 243 and 244, *supra*.

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 599.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 597.

that a temporal sense creates a needless tautology.

But do all possible meanings of ἐπ-ῖέναι clash with today or day by day? Other meanings could be sought which do not clash, such as "continual" (Curetonian and Sinaitic Syrian, Gothic, *Acts of Thomas*), "recurring" (Armenian), "never failing" (Adyson Georgian), "forthcoming" (Bohairic, Sahidic), or even "daily" (Old Latin, *Itala*)! Owing to deficiencies, objections, and the ultimate failure to arrive at a definite meaning for the word *epiousios* in the literature, a different approach may well be entertained.

In the Matthean Lord's Prayer, the apodosis after the third petition (ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς) serves as a summary for the first strophe, but also as a transition to the second strophe. The "Thy petitions" refer to the concerns of God "in heaven." The "us petitions" refer to the believer's needs "on earth." This contrast is also supported by the prepositional phrase in the address "in heaven" and by the final prepositional phrase "on earth" The Western text, Received Text, and others, make the contrast even more symmetrical by the addition of τῆς: ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς - ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. The fourth petition breaks the pattern of the second strophe where the verbs appear first; here, the noun (direct object) is placed first for emphasis. Why emphasize bread, unless a contrast were intended between Πάτερ ἡμῶν (*Our Father* in heaven) and ἄρτον ἡμῶν (*our bread* on earth)? Notice that the emphasis on earthly is signified by ἐπί, in contrast to the

heavenly, indicated by ἐν. To describe "our bread" an adjective follows that is formed by the prefix ἐπί. Therefore, it becomes abundantly clear that the bread of the fourth petition is "earthly" in some way. A term was available for earthly (ἐπιγῆιος). It is used in John 3:12, where earthly and heavenly are contrasted (see also 1 Cor. 15:40; 2 Cor. 5:1; Phil. 2:10; 3:19; James 3:15). Since this word was available and not used, there must be something deficient about it, making it objectionable or unsuitable. In the above examples, the conception of "earthly" is static, flat, and neutral; that is, it carries no further meaning besides *earthly* as being the opposite of heavenly. If Jesus had wanted to give this word the nuance of the *movement* of divine blessings and providential grace from heaven to earth, ἐπιγῆιος would not be suitable. The idea of the *action* of God's grace is certainly implied by the verb "give us."

A Greek adjective could very well have been coined, conveying the idea of *earthly* nourishment *coming down from above* (ἐπί), with ἰούσ- supplying the sense of movement or direction. The coined word *epiousios* suited the requirement of the fourth petition to acknowledge a *divine source* of *earthly* blessings. This idea carries special weight since it is generally conceded that a construction based on ἵέναι satisfies the grammatical requirements best. The *iota* would naturally be present and need not be elided.

Most proposals built on the formation of ἔναι, in the sense of "coming" tend to view the "coming" as a "going away," futuristic. None, except perhaps Holzinger's, imply a "coming to" or "down."²⁶⁰ In the manna tradition, God's bread "comes down" (Ex. 16:4, 15; John 6:32, 58). The manna was like a layer of hoarfrost as it covered the earth each morning (ἐπιτῆς γῆς , Ex. 16:14). Notice the sense of movement: from heaven to earth. The *epi* was used in this account from Exodus 16; this is the same prefix appearing in the word *epiousios*! The manna came regularly, six days per week, with a double amount for the sabbath (Ex. 16:5, 29). An action occurred that for all practical purposes could be called "daily." This daily blessing reminded the believing Israelite of the grace and love of God. The manna taught the believer his dependency on God and that he should receive his blessings with thanksgiving (Ex. 16:6, 12). That God's blessing came down for the day's needs is signified by the *σήμερον* of Matthew; that it comes regularly and daily is noted by Luke as τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν.

That Jesus fed the multitudes (John 6:1-14) proved his divinity as well as his capacity to nourish his disciples. The feeding of the five thousand was meant to be a sign to the multitude of this fact (John 6:25). Some wrongly wanted

²⁶⁰ Holzinger, 828, "Das zu diesem Tage hinzukommen geeignete oder zugehörige Brot." It was not future = "das Hinzukommende."

to make Jesus a bread-king (John 6:26). Later, Jesus used the feeding of the multitude to enlarge on the theme that he was the bread of life (John 6:33, 35, 41, 48, 49, 50, 53, 58) and the manna from heaven. Such a spiritual interpretation does not distract from the fact of the physical nourishment that occurred in the feeding of John 6:1-14. The actual feeding and spiritual application are two different things. Likewise, the bread in the Lord's Prayer is a physical nourishment. The words should be taken in their intended sense.

It is obvious from all the data presented thus far that material bread is the most likely sense of *epiousios* bread and that the idea of God's blessing of nourishment for his children on earth is intended. Reflecting these insights, and rearranging the word order to conform to the other petitions in the second strophe, the fourth petition could be paraphrased: "Give us today/day by day our bread *which comes to us* (on earth) from God (in heaven)." Note the similarity of this conception with James 1:17: "Every good endowment (δόσις) and every perfect gift (δώρημα) is from above, coming down (ἄνωθεν ἔστιν, καταβαίνον) from the Father of lights."

A Tentative Solution

A most perceptive and useful journal article by Arland J. Hultgren developed this very theme.²⁶¹ He introduced his study of the bread petition in the following way:

²⁶¹ Cited earlier; see especially Hultgren, pp. 48-54.

There is another possibility that seems not to have been considered but which merits a hearing. That is a proposal that builds upon the substantial and widely held view that ἐπιούσιος is derived etymologically from a participial form of ἐπιέναι ("to come upon") but which does not propose and introduce ἡμέρα as the implied word that the adjective modifies. The phrase τὸν ἄρτον . . . τὸν ἐπιούσιον is grammatically equivalent to τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, i.e., the adjective modifies ἄρτον.²⁶²

Hultgren pointed out that some of the ancient versions correctly understood the petition as "coming bread" including the Palestinian Syriac and Sahidic texts of Matthew 6:11 and the Sahidic and Bohairic texts at Luke 11:3.²⁶³ Several modern scholars are also in accord with this interpretation, although none have articulated this view as thoroughly as Hultgren.²⁶⁴ Ambrose attested to this possibility when he pointed out that the Latin-speaking Christians use *quotidianum* in the fourth petition, while Greek-speaking Christians say ἐπιούσιος, by which they mean "coming" (*advenientem*) bread.²⁶⁵ Hultgren asserted that the readings "constant" or "continual" (*perpetuum*) may also reflect the understanding that the bread prayed for comes from the hand

²⁶² Ibid., 48.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 459; and especially Bernard Orchard, "The Meaning of Ton Epiouision. (Mt 6:11 = Lk:11:3)," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 3 (1973): 279.

²⁶⁵ Hultgren, 49.

of God (Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac, Armenian).²⁶⁶

Further, the image of bread as *coming from* God recalls the manna tradition, whereby God gives his people bread from heaven. At Ex. 16:4, God said to Moses, "I will rain bread from heaven (ἀρτούς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) for you," and at 16:15 the manna is called "the bread which the Lord has given (ἔδωκεν) you to eat." Therefore, Hultgren concluded that the petitioner who prays the Lord's Prayer "would not simply ask for bread but would also in the same breath make a confessional statement, reflecting the centuries' old conviction that everything needful for life has been given 'from heaven.'"²⁶⁷ The manna also came daily (Ex. 16:4). The Latin tradition using "daily" completes the manna tradition in the fourth petition.

Hultgren's proposal coheres well with the fourth petition as it is reported in either Evangelist's Gospel.²⁶⁸ In Luke's version especially, the present tense asks God to

²⁶⁶ Ibid. See the suggestion above from Potwin, "The Old Syriac Version," who demonstrated the evidence of *tamid*, "continual" being used in that very early translation. He had proposed in the previous year (*JBL* 12 [1893], 18), on the same basis, that ἐπ' ἰών meant "on-coming" with the denotation of "constant succession," "our constant supply of bread," "our bread right along." See also Hadidian, 81, who concluded that the "oldest tradition" represented by the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syrian and Acts of Thomas (no. 144) has the right meaning: "Give us this day our bread of continuity" (i.e. continual).

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 50.

²⁶⁸ This study is indebted to Hultgren who articulated similar conclusions independently reached by the present writer in the course of study and reflection on this topic.

keep on giving his blessing on a regular basis. Hultgren assessed this truth:

It seems fitting that the bread in question be understood by Luke and his readers as the ordinary bread of everyday existence "which comes" from God. An eschatological interpretation ("Keep giving to us the bread of the future kingdom day by day"), while by no means impossible, seems strained. What kind of bread would this be? Presumably the word "bread" would have to be a metaphor for spiritual gifts. But elsewhere Luke's concern for the feeding of the body is so eloquent (6:21; 4:13-14; 16:19-31) that one hears "bread" in his version of the Lord's Prayer to signify food, drink, and other things needful for life.²⁶⁹

Even in Matthew, the everyday needs of man are under the governance of God (5:45; 6:30, 32); this easily lends itself to the conclusion that the Matthean fourth petition likewise makes reference to God's providential care. A noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer easily conforms to the prayer of Ps. 145:15 (Ps. 144 LXX): "σὺ δίδως τὴν τροφήν αὐτῶν in due season." The shift in emphasis in the second strophe of the Lord's Prayer should signal that the present needs of the disciple are put under consideration. Those who advance an eschatological interpretation fail to do full justice to this very existential orientation in the second strophe.²⁷⁰ Those who have been predisposed to a futuristic interpretation of *epiousios* have naturally not sought a

²⁶⁹ Hultgren, 51.

²⁷⁰ Many have observed the shift of emphasis to man's needs at the fourth petition, such as Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth (New York: Harper, 1960), 137; Foerster, 597; Eduard Schweizer, The Good News according to Matthew, tr. David Green (Atlanta: Knox, 1975), 154; Joseph Fitzmeyer, The Gospel according to Luke (X-XXIV), The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 899-900, 904.

solution so rooted in a notion of temporal bread.

As confirmation of his proposal that the word *epiousios* originally signified "coming bread" Hultgren pointed out that this interpretation was easily "capable of giving rise to the other [similar] interpretations."²⁷¹ That is, it was only a short step to pray for "continual" bread, "daily" bread, or "necessary" bread. He reasoned that it was then naturally easy to provide a "future" meaning, as he explained:

The word ἐπιούσιος, as we have maintained, modifies the noun "bread." But given the similarity of the unusual ἐπιούσιος to the familiar ἐπιούσα [ἡμέρα], it would have been easy in time for interpreters to take the adjective as referring to "the coming day." We see this in the passage quoted from Ambrose earlier Once the shift to "coming day" was made, the latter term could also take on an eschatological reference so that the petition could be understood to refer to the bread of the coming age.²⁷²

To reiterate, Ambrose reported that *epiousios* bread was coming bread (*advenientem*), and then he spoke of the Latin translation as being "daily" bread (*quotidianum*). Ambrose proceeded to explain this translation wrongly on the basis of influence from the familiar expression τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν, "the coming day" (that is, based on *advenientem diem*, not on *panem advenientem*).

Hultgen offered his proposal cautiously, and observed that the word "daily" is "so imbedded in the English tradition that no matter how strongly one might propose an

²⁷¹ Ibid., 52.

²⁷² Ibid., 53.

alternative to it as linguistically or exegetically superior, it is likely to stay."²⁷³ The *International Consultation on English Texts* concurs, although for them, "daily" may reflect other presuppositions supportive of spiritual and eschatological interpretations:

The translation "daily bread" is notoriously uncertain. It may mean "bread for tomorrow," referring not only to the next day but also the "great tomorrow," or the final consummation. The petition would then be for the food of the heavenly banquet, and this would fit well with the eschatological perspective which seems to control the whole prayer. On the other hand it could mean simply "the bread which is necessary," without any particular temporal reference. There would seem to be no sufficient reason for substantially varying the familiar translation. In a world where so many are hungry, there may seem especial reason to maintain it.²⁷⁴

In fact, the word "daily" is a useful and appropriate breviloquence for a longer awkward statement describing the kind of bread for which the fourth petition asks.²⁷⁵ This bread is God's regular gift of nourishment from heaven to man on earth. Understood this way, the use of "daily" as a suitable translation would not be tautologous to "today" but it would indicate the nature of the bread, its provision and distribution, the kind that continually and regularly comes from God to sustain the believer. It would not be temporal

²⁷³ Ibid.

²⁷⁴ Prayers We Have in Common: Agreed Liturgical Texts Proposed by the International Consultation on English Texts (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970; 2nd ed., 1975), 2-3.

²⁷⁵ Colin J. Hemer, "ἐπιούσιος," Journal for the Study of the New Testament 22 (1984), 91, while he preferred a different interpretation (for our coming day's need) concluded: "The traditional rendering 'daily' is less sharp, but conveys the essential sense, and may serve in default of a more exact adjectival equivalent."

except insofar that it is received daily. Over one hundred years ago, a certain H. W. Horwill put these thoughts into perspective:

What we ask in this day's portion of the bread which has been and which, trust in our Father's gracious provision assures us, will be SUCCESSIVELY given from day to day while life lasts Of this bread we must not ask such a supply as while it lasted would, so to speak, make us independent of God. What we are bid ask is τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον, the SUCCESSIVE SUPPLY OF SUCCESSIVE NEED [*sic*].²⁷⁶

He added:

The English rendering "daily," though no translation, is not far astray from the essential meaning of the word. While apparently less allied in form, it is essentially far nearer to the original than our "morrow's" bread, or our "future" bread, either of which presents an instance of a literalness which misinterprets.²⁷⁷

This proposal for "coming (to us) bread" is the most linguistically and theologically satisfying interpretation discovered so far in the vast literature on the subject.²⁷⁸ No objections can be raised against it, unless they stem from a theological preconception or predisposition for a spiritual or eschatological reading of the fourth petition. Hultgren

²⁷⁶ H. W. Horwill, "Our 'Daily' Bread," The Expository Times 2 (1891): 256.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ G. H. Smukal, "The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer," Concordia Theological Monthly 16 (1945): 506, broached this idea: "In Luke we are taught to ask for repeated action (present tense), and in Matthew we pray that the Father may provide us with the bread we need at that particular time (aorist). Inasmuch as both tenses are applicable to bread modified by ἐπιούσιος, I hold that ἐπιούσιος qualifies bread as ordinary bread, which the Father gives in portions as well as without ceasing."

astutely asked why this particular word was used, apparently coined for the unique requirements demanded by the kind of bread included within the scope of the fourth petition, when other expressions were available. For example, he cited examples of comprehensible, but less facile, participles that could have served as adequate renderings: τὸν ἐπερχόμενον or τὸν ἐπιόντα.²⁷⁹ Hultgren maintained that ultimately *epiousios* is the word that was given in the canonical Scriptures. To prefer that a different word had been used begs the question; any author may employ a given word or expression from several different options available.

The following thoughts should be added to Hultgren's fine study. First, the word *epiousios* may have been very available for the Greek composition of the Lord's Prayer. Although it is a *hapax legomenon* in recorded literature, that does not mean that it never existed. When it is treated as "coined," this is merely a convenient way of referring to its inception and origin from a later point of view. It may or may not have been coined. Since the word is not extant in any other known literature, its origin, practically speaking, has always been identified with the Lord's Prayer. Under the familiar rule of *difficilior lectio potior*, the word *epiousios* has been preserved in all manuscript traditions. Since its only known occurrence is in the Lord's Prayer, the

²⁷⁹ Hultgren, 53. Although Hultgren did not cite Heb. 6:7, the idea contained there is similar: "For land which has drunk the rain that often falls upon it (γῆ... τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον), and brings forth vegetation useful to those for whose sake it is cultivated, receives a blessing from God."

word naturally resists confident analysis. Its meaning, therefore, must be explained, by default, on the basis of etymological considerations, and its meaning must be sought within the whole context of the Bible, particularly as it may be elucidated from the total direction of Jesus' teaching. Jesus' teachings regarding prayer and of man's ordering of his priorities, and the pattern of divine blessings which come down to man on earth like the manna did for the Israelites, help fill out the meaning of *epiousios*, entirely independently of any historical circumstances and diachronic development of that vocable.

Secondly, it may have been the best, if not the most "catchy," expression for an $\text{-}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ word. This category of Greek words is used adjectivally to describe something, much as the English endings *-y* or *-like*. *Epiousios* then is the "coming-like bread." The Latin tradition which bequeathed to the world the succinct translation "daily" has done Christendom a great service by providing the most felicitous rendition of *epiousios* that can be imagined. In fact, it is possible that the Latin and Old Syriac traditions did correctly understand the word *epiousios*, but they, as today, found it difficult of succinct expression. The emphasis on "today" and/or "coming to us regularly" in the fourth petition governs the entire Lord's Prayer and lends credibility to the interpretation and application of the fourth petition for the present time of the Gospel. This tentative conclusion deserves serious consideration.

Interpretation

Several preliminary comments are in order. The fourth petition introduces the second strophe of the Lord's Prayer. In contrast to the first strophe, an obvious anthropological dimension is inherent in the second strophe. Each petition in the second strophe is conjoined by a conjunction. The second strophe contains the "us petitions" in contradistinction to the "Thy petitions" of the first strophe. It is necessary to bear in mind that all the petitions of the Lord's Prayer assume that the one praying is a child of God by faith, a true disciple. The topics covered by the petitions of the second strophe relate to the needs of the true believer living now and praying now. They do not primarily have the consummation in view. That is readily evident from the fifth petition, whose concern is neighborly forgiveness. In the second strophe, the believer's present need of nourishment, forgiveness, strength and deliverance is primarily in view.

Of course, the present orientation does not exclude the future. God's people are fed, forgiven, strengthened, and rescued now, so as to be ready for the Last Day. God hears and answers their prayers for these things just mentioned so that they are enabled to be the kind of people Christians should be. Christians are to be active in serving God in this world. God's blessings free them from earthly cares, from selfish concerns, from needless worry and anxiety caused by the devil, the world, and the sinful flesh. From the many remarks already reported in this section on the fourth

petition, very little more needs to be contributed by way of interpretation.

It should be remembered that there are two general approaches to the Lord's Prayer, the future eschatological and the present noneschatological interpretations. The fourth petition is also subject to several adjunct emphases. The bread can be interpreted as physical, material bread. This is compatible with the noneschatological interpretation. The bread can also be interpreted spiritually, either as the word of God or of Christ himself, and even sacramentally. Often, although not always, a spiritual interpretation goes hand in hand with an eschatological interpretation.

Raymond Brown, who strongly advocated an eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, favored the derivation of the word *epiousios* from ἐπί + ἕναι, with a future reference. For him, *epiousios* is the bread for the coming day, and of course, he placed credence in the remark of Jerome concerning *mahar* meaning "tomorrow".²⁸⁰ Brown described the eschatological interpretation of the fourth petition this way:

Those who favor the eschatological interpretation of this petition prefer the . . . derivation of *epiousios*, which makes the petition a request for the bread of tomorrow, the bread of the future. We may agree that the Christian community was marked with poverty; but we believe that in this need the Christians yearned, not for the bread of this world, but for God's final intervention and for that bread which would be given at that heavenly table. In the Gospels, God's supplying men with food is

²⁸⁰ Brown, 240.

frequently in terms of an eschatological banquet.²⁸¹

Brown also assigned a spiritual and a sacramental interpretation to the fourth petition, as he explained:

We see clearly that Jesus is speaking of no material bread, for He Himself is the bread: "I am the bread of life; he who comes to me shall not hunger" (Jn 6:35). As the discourse that follows shows, He is the bread in a twofold sense: as the incarnate teaching (Word) of the Father and as the Eucharist. In the latter sense, as the Eucharistic bread from heaven, He promises that whoever eats of His flesh will be raised up on *the last day* (6:54; Vulgate, 55). Thus Jn joins with Paul (1 Cor 11:26) in seeing the Eucharistic bread as an eschatological pledge.²⁸²

Brown believed that the reason the Lord's Prayer is prayed at communion services is because the fourth petition is, above all, a request for the sacramental bread that was the subject of John 6, according to his interpretation of that Johannine discourse.²⁸³

The active aorist imperative is taken as evidence for

²⁸¹ Ibid., 241.

²⁸² Ibid., 242.

²⁸³ Ibid., 243. However, the more likely reason for its customary use in the communion service is undoubtedly on account of the fifth petition. Before the gift can be "offered at the altar," reconciliation must be made with one's fellowman (Matt. 5:23); once that is done, all pray the "family prayer" of God's children (the Lord's Prayer), and then the sacrament is received. Favoring this probability is Willy Rordorf, "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of its Liturgical Use in the Early Church," *Studia Liturgica* 14 (1980-81): 11-12; so also Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, tr. Francis A. Brunner (New York: Benziger, 1955), 2:283. Enthusiasm for sacramental interpretation of the fourth petition may have dimmed the original purpose for employing the Lord's Prayer in connection with celebrating the Lord's Supper.

an eschatological interpretation.²⁸⁴ Typically, Brown took the aorist as a request for the "bread of life" to be offered to God's people once, at the *eschaton*. He did not say what bearing that verb form has on the sacramental and spiritual interpretations.

Brown admitted that his comments apply to the Matthean fourth petition. He acknowledged (and decried?) that the version in Luke is definitely "continuative and noneschatological."²⁸⁵ He correctly pointed out that Luke's "daily" (τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν) is "distributive and noneschatological."²⁸⁶ Brown explained that the present orientation of the Lukan petition reflects "the passing of the tension about the Second Coming" so that the eschatological interpretation of the prayer "yielded to the more pressing daily outlook."²⁸⁷

Over against an eschatological interpretation of the fourth petition, it is manifestly clear that the primary orientation of the prayer is for the present needs of God's people. They are invited to pray to God about their daily needs. Helmut Thielicke said about God's providential care:

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 238.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 239.

²⁸⁶ Brown noted Luke's predilection for the expression "day by day" (Luke 19:47; Acts 17:11) over against the other Synoptists. A comparison of the saying about taking up one's cross (Matt. 16:24; Mark 8:34; Luke 9:23), reveals that among the Evangelists only Luke added "daily."

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 239.

"He occupies himself with the trivialities of humankind."²⁸⁸ The Lukan version of the prayer makes that most clear. One cannot disregard the Lukan version as Brown has done. Both Prayers must be accepted and treated equally. One will assume that since they were both taught by Jesus, that they should contain the same teachings and emphases. Although the Evangelists' reports about Jesus and his teachings may vary, these variations are not contradictory. They are susceptible of explanation and harmonization. The Lukan version of the fourth petition clearly emphasizes the present orientation and suitability of that Prayer for today. That does not mean that this is not true with the Matthean version. In fact, Luke's Prayer clarifies what may not have been so clear in Matthew's version. Matthew's present orientation, however, is supported by the context in which it is placed. In the Sermon on the Mount, several teachings invite believers to not worry and to commit their physical needs to God (Matt. 6:25-34; 7:7-11). The Matthean aorists in the second strophe show, by the way, the present applicability of all the aorists in the Lord's Prayer.²⁸⁹

There is strong support, then, for a present

²⁸⁸ Helmut Thielicke, Our Heavenly Father, tr. John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper, 1960), 81.

²⁸⁹ Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr.), 623: "The tenses are misunderstood when the . . . aorists in the first petitions are referred to the end of time, that the Father shall then bring to completion (aorist) the hallowing of his name [etc.] This peculiar idea regarding the aorist is refuted by . . . [the] last . . . aorists . . . which certainly do not refer to the end of time."

noneschatological interpretation of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer. A continuous theme, like a stream, emphasizing God's gracious benevolence toward his people runs throughout the Bible. The fourth petition reflects these teachings. The bread is real, physical bread.

It is proper to understand the fourth petition in a broader way and more generally, inclusive of food, raiment, and so forth (*pars pro toto*, or *species pro genere*, Matt. 7:11; Luke 11:13; 1 Tim. 6:8; James 2:15). God's blessings come to his people regularly and daily.

The central thought of the fourth petition both in Matthew and Luke contained in the adverbs "daily" or "today" defines the imperative verb more precisely. The emphasis on "today" makes the fourth petition more patient of a noneschatological interpretation. It implores God's providential care for today so that the child of God does not need to worry. As such, the whole tenor of the second strophe, indeed of the entire Lord's Prayer, is established. God's soteriological and temporal blessings are given today. Today, the believer is graciously offered help along his journey through life. For all needs the believer yields himself to God's beneficence. God acts *now* on the believer's behalf. God also employs means to accomplish his ends:

His manner of distribution is by way of our labor. It is His will that we pray for bread with our hand on the plow. "Thou shalt eat the labor of thine hands." Only to the sluggard, who will not work, does the Lord say that he should not eat. The possession of daily bread does not depend on one's labor. God provides also for infants, for the honest poor, for the sick. The petition implies the prayer: Withdraw not Thy feeding

hand.²⁹⁰

"Our daily bread" reveals the love of the "Father in heaven." God's people will be dependent on his divine help until the Last Day when the eschatological heavenly feast is prepared.²⁹¹ Until then, earthly bread is in view.²⁹² God's present blessings can indeed serve as a foretaste of the feast to come, just as earthly blessings prompt willing gratitude and faithful service to God. "Daily bread" may point to the *eschaton* by way of *application*, but the stark words of the fourth petition themselves only point directly to man's needs under the loving providence of God the heavenly Father. The temporal, not the spiritual, is the primary or first level of meaning. It should be acknowledged that Jesus made the Christological claim about himself as being the "bread of life." Certainly this is a *bona fide* spiritual interpretation based on bread in general. However, no warrant exists to think that the bread *in the fourth*

²⁹⁰ Smukal, 507.

²⁹¹ Schürmann, 58: "Jesus may have been thinking of the beggars or poor labourers of Palestine, who are dependent upon what a lucky moment may bring, someone like Lazarus or more likely, the poor widow who gave away her last penny and was thus forced to rely on alms to buy her daily bread." Luke's version, likewise, is prayed in the "uncertainty of existence" and "implies continual [divine] giving" (62).

²⁹² D. R. Catchpole, "Q and 'The Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi. 5-8/9)," Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 34 (1983): 407-24, by means of source and form-critical methods, nevertheless arrived at a justification for a noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer and the fourth petition specifically. The parable about the good things needed in Luke 11:5-8, 13, is a "statement about God as the giver who responds to petitions for basic human necessities" (423).

petition of the Lord's Prayer should be subject to a spiritual interpretation. If the Bible somewhere had given a reason to do so, then it would be a different matter. Then a spiritual interpretation would be justified.²⁹³ Nor is there internal warrant for justifying a sacramental interpretation of the fourth petition.²⁹⁴ The plain, clear, and literal meaning of the Bible's words are accepted unless the context or some other reason compels a different interpretation.²⁹⁵

It should be added that the petition for temporal blessings is not spoken out of selfishness. Christians are not thankless. While this petition may be for material bread, it is not a materialistic petition. Heinz Schürmann

²⁹³ See Leonardo Boff, 74, who does not follow the traditional Roman Catholic predilection of giving the bread a spiritual interpretation: "In the second part [strophe], we see no mysticizing or spiritualizing The unmistakable union of material and spiritual, of human and divine, constitutes the force emanating from the mystery of the incarnation. In the kingdom of God there is an interlocking of material and spiritual, of human nature and cosmos, of creation and Creator. We should not be surprised, then, if in the Lord's Prayer the two are brought together; here the most sublime encounters that which is most down-to-earth."

²⁹⁴ One may wonder what normative influence a sacramental interpretation of the bread of the fourth petition played in the custom of communion in one kind (i.e., the priority of the bread); thus, Ulrich Luz, Matthew 1-7: A Commentary, tr. Wilhelm C. Linss (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 381. Surprisingly, then, some Roman Catholics diverge from the typical sacramental emphasis; see next fn.

²⁹⁵ Henri van den Bussche, Understanding the Lord's Prayer, tr. Charles Schaldenbrand, (New York: Sheed and Ward), 117, "Such an interpretation [eschatological or sacramental], however, need not detain us. The disciple prays for the ordinary bread of each day; his need for bread is the most tangible sign of his situation of need and his best opportunity to show his confidence in God. The kingdom is truly the center of his interest, but it cannot be reduced to a Platonic dream; it must take on reality in the daily course of his work-a-day life."

put this thought into perspective: "Indeed, far from being a request for some mere temporal good, it is really a plea . . . that we may truly live and work for his Church."²⁹⁶ He continued by explaining that this had particular reference to the disciples of Jesus who needed to be sustained either as a group, or, individually on missionary journeys which even then "shows the importance of praying for others."²⁹⁷

Schürmann went on to apply this petition to the Christian today who also, despite various circumstances and not working exclusively for the kingdom as the Apostles, still must seek divine help in the midst of secular occupations as he lives for a higher purpose and works for, sacrifices for, and serves in the kingdom of God. The Christian often experiences temporal insecurity on account of his commitment to the Gospel. The fourth petition exposes man's dependency and reveals God's goodness without superfluity.²⁹⁸

5. Our Forgiveness

The fifth petition is undoubtedly the easiest petition in the Lord's Prayer to understand. It also may be the most significant. The Lord's Prayer in Matthew is followed by an important commentary on this petition (Matt. 6:14-15). The fact that only the fifth petition is especially singled out for comment would suggest its importance for Christians who

²⁹⁶ Schürmann, 60.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 61.

²⁹⁸ The fourth petition has no reference to a theology of "health and wealth" so popularly advocated in some contemporary theology.

live in community with one another in a sinful world. Even if it is the easiest petition to understand, it is at once the most necessary and difficult to apply to everyday living.²⁹⁹

Sin

The ugly reality of sin affects every human being. The Hebrew of the Old Testament has many words for sin such as: $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$, $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$, $\aleph \aleph$, $\aleph \aleph \aleph$, $\aleph \aleph \aleph$, $\aleph \aleph \aleph$. Each one of them has a background illustrative of their individual shades of meaning. But the fact that there is no consistent way of translating any one of them by one particular word suggests that their true meanings must be discovered from their context and usage, not on the basis of etymology. Generally, the word "sin" serves as a suitable translation. Kenneth Grayston made this comment:

No difference of any importance is discoverable in the OT use of the three commonest roots, *h t'*, *'awon*, *pesha'*, i.e. behind the diversity there is a fundamental, unified conception of sin characterized in part as failure, in part as irregularity or crookedness, in part as infringement of the psychic totality of the soul.³⁰⁰

Grayston pointed out that in the Old Testament, particularly, sin should be considered in the context of the covenant:

All life is upheld by covenant; and the essence of sin is breach of covenant, e.g. injuring one's brother: 'forgive . . . the transgression of thy brethren, and their sin, for that they did unto thee evil' (Gen. 50.17;

²⁹⁹ Manson, 443.

³⁰⁰ Kenneth Grayston, "Sin," in A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. Alan Richardson (New York: Macmillan, 1950), 227.

note how widely this extends in Amos 1.6, 9, 11).³⁰¹

Sin against God and one's fellow man could be forgiven. That God could forgive sin(s) was the assumption made by Moses when he prayed for Israel in Ex. 32:32. The notion of individual responsibility for sin was stressed in Ezek. 18:1-4, 25-32. The supplicant prays for divine forgiveness, for example, in Ps. 25:12; 51:2. At Ps. 130:4 it is said of God, "But there is forgiveness with thee." Asking for divine forgiveness is the import of the *Eighteen Benedictions*, no. 6, as well as the content of the Jewish New Year's prayer.

The New Testament *kerygma* is the proclamation that a Savior came to make atonement for man's sins (Matt. 1:21; John 1:29). Otherwise, man's sins would bring the curse and punishment of God (Gen. 3:15-17; Ezek. 18:4, 20; Rom. 5:12; 6:16). The New Testament age, or the Gospel age, is marked by the forgiveness of sins (Mark 1:4). Jesus mingled with sinners (Matt. 9:13; Mark 2:17; Luke 5:32) and was called their friend (Matt. 9:10; 11:19). But, Jesus did not relax the Law of God to work freedom from sin (John 8:31-32, 36). According to his interpretation of the Law, he required higher standards, and in fact, he provided the fulfillment of the Law's requirements by his own coming and perfection of life (Matt. 5:17-20). He censured many of his Jewish contemporaries as being a "sinful and adulterous generation" and denounced their sin which separated them from God (Mark 8:38). Jesus' death and resurrection was intended for the

³⁰¹ Ibid.

forgiveness of sins (Matt. 26:28; Luke 24:47). Repentance and forgiveness was a feature of early apostolic preaching (Acts 2:38; 3:19, 5:31; 10:43; 13:38). An important verse defining sin is Rom. 3:23: "All have sinned (ἥμαρτον) and fall short of the glory of God." This verse alludes to the actual sins that sinners commit as well as pointing to the general truth that all people are depraved by nature and therefore fall short of God's perfect image (John 3:5; 1 Cor. 15:49).

The message of God's forgiveness of sin on account of Jesus was of prime importance in the New Testament, as Paul said, "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins" (1 Cor. 15:3; see also Rom. 4:25; Gal. 1:4; 2 Cor. 5:19). Again, Paul said, "But God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). Certainly, the work of Jesus the Savior and man's sin belong together (sin and grace), as Grayston asserted, "To deny that Christians have sins is to deny the gospel (cf. I John 2.12, 4.10, Rev. 1.5) and to make Jesus, advocate and expiation for us and the whole world, of none account."³⁰²

In the context of the Lord's Prayer, three different root words are employed for sin, ὀφείλημα, παράπτωμα, and ἁμαρτία. Luke 11:4 uses the most common generic word in the New Testament for sin in the first clause of the fifth

³⁰² Grayston, 229.

petition (ἁμαρτίας). In the second clause Luke's version uses the participial phrase "everyone who is indebted (παντὶ ὀφείλοντι) to us." The addendum at Matt. 6:14-15 employs the word "trespasses" (παραπτώματα). But within the Matthean Lord's Prayer itself (Matt. 6:12), "debts" (ὀφειλήματα) and "debtors" (ὀφειλέταις) occur, words easily understood in the Jewish Christian circles for whom Matthew's Gospel is generally understood to have been written. It is generally conceded that the Lukan fifth petition *in toto* is easier to understand than Matthew's. Luke's version uses the common Greek word for sin with which to ask God's forgiveness of sin. Perhaps the common word for sin was more fitting in a Gentile milieu, for which Luke's Gospel is usually considered to have been intended.

Sin As Debt

Matthew's employment of "debt" words undoubtedly reflects a milieu in which the Aramaic word *hob* had become a common word for sin.³⁰³ Friedrich Hauck described the emergence of that word current in later Judaism as follows:

It is typical of later Judaism that it should add this term from the world of law and business to the many others, already present. Man's relation to God is that of a debtor to his creditor. Each transgression means indebtedness to the God who has given the Law. In heaven men's acts are entered into an account book (כּוּבְנֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם), and the final reckoning decides whether the fulfilments

³⁰³ Black, 2nd ed., 102.

of the Law or the transgressions are in the ascendancy.³⁰⁴

While the English word "debt" is the most literal translation of the Matthean petition, one must remember that "debt" refers to sin metaphorically. Carmignac asserted that since other Greek words for sin were available, probably the choice of the "debt" words for sin reflected the original Aramaic background of the fifth Matthean petition.³⁰⁵ The word *hob*, "debt," became the word of choice in the first century A.D. for sin in Aramaic. This expression was free from the shades of meaning attached to other Hebrew words, as explained by Hauck:

As חוב sin is no longer rebellion against God (חַיִּיב), or missing the mark (חָטָא), or guilty deviation from the way (חָטָא), or disobedience to God's commandments. It is a negative thing, arrears in payment, which can be made up by a corresponding payment.³⁰⁶

It possessed its own emphasis.³⁰⁷ That emphasis was able to embrace both the positive and negative elements of sin, easily identified by the useful modern distinctions "sins of

³⁰⁴ Friedrich Hauck, "ὀφείλω, κτλ," in TDNT 5:562.

³⁰⁵ Carmignac, 224. Lohmeyer, 162, said that "Aramaic, as against Hebrew, which is already over-rich in words for 'sin', has produced a new, perhaps comprehensive, perhaps alternative expression, which is, moreover, taken from commercial life," although he added that it may have a strictly "Galilean provenance" (163).

³⁰⁶ Hauck, 562.

³⁰⁷ F. Charles Fensham, "The Legal Background of MT. vi 12," Novum Testamentum 4 (1960): 1; against the background of the ancient Near East, Biblical and secular, "the law prevailed that a creditor had the right to take his debtor or his family into slavery." In regard to the fifth petition, Fensham explained: "God as our creditor can take us into slavery, but Jesus paid our debts."

commission" as well as "sins of omission."³⁰⁸ The semantic field of "debt" words embraces not only the usual active concepts associated with sin such as rebellion and disobedience against God, but also the negative concepts of failure, unwillingness, and inability to serve God's glory as the Christian is obligated. For reference to the idea of obligation in relation to sin, see Matt. 12:36 ("I tell you, on the day of judgment men will render account [ἂποδώσουσιν] for every careless word they utter") and Luke 17:10 (" . . . when you have done all that is commanded you, say, ' . . . we have only done what was our duty'" [ὁ ὀφείλομεν]).³⁰⁹

Use of the word "debt" underscores man's shortcomings and points to sinful man's negative status, failure, and shortcomings before God's standards. The word for "debt" (ὀφείλημα) only occurs twice in the New Testament (Matt. 6:12a, Lord's Prayer; Rom. 4:4); the related word (ὀφειλή) occurs only thrice (Matt. 18:32; Rom. 13:7; 1 Cor. 7:3). Only in the Matthean fifth petition does the word ὀφειλήματα convey the idea of "sins"; elsewhere, it represents more the idea of something owed, or the sense of obligation (cf. Rom. 4:4; also Rom. 13:7; 1 Cor. 7:3; Matt. 18:32). This same emphasis on obligation pertains to the word "debtor" (ὀφειλέτης) in the New Testament (Matt. 6:12b; 18:24; Luke

³⁰⁸ Carmignac, 224.

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

13:4; Rom. 1:14; 8:12; 15:27; Gal. 5:3), except in Luke 13:4 where it means "sinners" or "offenders" (cf. ἁμαρτωλοί in Luke 13:2 with ὀφειλέται in 13:4). In the Lord's Prayer at Matt. 6:12b the word for "debtors" (ὀφειλέταις) means "those who have sinned or offended against us." The same word is also used in the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Debtor) at Matt. 18:24 of one standing in financial obligation, although by application as will be seen, it refers to one who has incurred a spiritual debt by reason of sin. In the Lord's Prayer at Luke 11:4b, the present active participle of the verb ὀφείλειν is used (ὀφείλοντι), instead of the Matthean substantive, meaning "everyone indebted to us." The incidence of the verb ὀφείλειν is not infrequent in the New Testament. The singular number at 11:4b assumes forgiveness for everyone, for "each one," παντί (viz., not the plural "for all"), who may have incurred some debt of sin against the one who prays, thus individualizing the Matthean plural "our debtors." The Lukan iterative or durative present tense (ἀφίμεν or ἀφίομεν) indicates repetition in the sense of offering forgiveness at *each instance* to an offending neighbor.³¹⁰ This addition of

³¹⁰ Lenski, Luke, 624. Lenski, *ibid.*, notes that the willingness of the Christian to forgive is denoted by the γάρ: "But γάρ does not state the reason . . . we ask remission of God; the Jews already knew that the source of remission was the grace of God (Ps. 51:1; Dan. 9:18) but [it points to] the *requisitum subjecti* (Calov), without which no believer would venture to appear before God to ask remission for himself."

"everyone" is typical of Lukan style.³¹¹ Since the Lukan Prayer uses the word "sins" at 11:4a,³¹² the following justifiable paraphrase of the Lukan Lord's Prayer unfolds its meaning: "And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone *who sins (against) us,*" or, " . . . *who offends us.*" The latter is more literal in the sense of providing one equivalent English word for each Greek word. Probably the Lukan fifth petition preferred to avoid the word group debt/debtor as used in the Matthean petition as much as possible "whose figurative religious sense was alien to the Gk. world."³¹³ The use of the "debt" word group, prominent in the Matthean petition, enlarges the notion of man's lack toward God. On the "balance sheet" of God sinners are under obligation. Compensation and recompense must be made to God when it is owed.

Sin As Trespass

The fifth petition speaks of forgiveness in both its clauses. The first clause asks for God's forgiveness; the second speaks of the Christian's willingness to forgive others. Special reference to forgiveness for one's neighbor

³¹¹ Carmignac, 222. Cf. Mark 3:5, "he looked around at them" with Luke 6:10, "and he looked around at them all"; Mark 3:7, "from Judea" with Luke 6:17, "from all Judea"; Matt. 5:42, "Give to him" with Luke 6:30, "Give to every one."

³¹² Gustav Stählin, "ἁμαρτάνω, κτλ," in TDNT 1:295. ἁμαρτία is the predominate word for an "offence in relation to God with emphasis on guilt." The word is used to refer to an individual act and to denote the defective nature of man.

³¹³ Hauck, 565.

is made in the addendum to the Matthean Lord's Prayer. The significance and importance of the sixth petition is capsulized by these words of Matt. 6:14-15:

For if you forgive (ἀφῆτε) men their trespasses (παραπτώματα), your heavenly Father also will forgive you; but if you do not forgive men (var., their trespasses), neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

Mark 11:25-26 reports these similar words of Jesus:³¹⁴

And whenever you stand praying, forgive (ἀφίετε), if you have anything against any one; so that your Father also who is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses (παραπτώματα). (var., But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father who is in heaven forgive your trespasses.)

Observe that the usual word for "forgive" is used (ἀφίημι) and that the word for "sins" is "trespasses" in both the above two passages. The word "trespasses" in the Gospels is limited to these two passages; but in the Pauline epistles the word does occur (Rom. 4:25; 5:15, 16, 17, 18, 20; 11:11, 12; 2 Cor. 5:19; Gal 6:1; Eph. 1:7; 2:1; Col. 2:13). Eph. 1:7 significantly employs this expression: τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων. Lenski offered this explanation of the word "trespasses" for sin, apropos to Matt. 6:14-15:

The παραπτῶμα is any act by which one falls to the side (παρά), off the right path, thus "a misstep," "a blunder." This word is used extensively as a designation of sin. We cannot call it a mild term, as some do; for it indicates only one side of sin, a fatal misstep,

³¹⁴ Metzger, Textual Commentary, 110, explained the textual uncertainty of Mark 11:25; see Metzger, 17, for further remarks on this verse and Matt. 6:15.

just as ἁμαρτία denotes another, a missing of the mark. Jesus uses παραπτώματα for the same reason that he used ὀφειλήματα in v. 12: he selects a term which fits both men's offenses against us and our offenses against God.³¹⁵

Significantly, the word "trespasses" is used in the Matthean addendum. Since Matt. 6:14-15 is obviously a commentary on the fifth petition using the word "trespasses," it is likely that the two words "debts" and "trespasses" carry similar meanings: offenses, faults, injuries, against another. The two passages say nothing about suffering personal offense from others nor of individual "rights"; Jesus simply encourages the Christian to be forgiving of others. Yet the wording of the Markan passage is open to the notion that the reason that one would "have something against someone (κατά τινος)" is that the one praying had been sinned against by someone. Therefore, these words have a force that the general word *amartia* does not have. In general, ἁμαρτία refers to "sin against God" as used in the other occurrences elsewhere in the New Testament (Rom. 4:25; 5:15, 17, 18, 29; 11:11, 12; 2 Cor. 5:19, Gal. 6:1; Eph. 1:7; 2:1, 5; Col. 2:13). Both passages printed above (Matt. 6:14-15 and Mark 11:25-16) explain forgiveness from God in terms of a Christian's ability to forgive others. One's neighbor is in mind.

The Common Word For Sin

The "debt" group has the advantage of succinct

³¹⁵ Lenski, Matthew, 272-73.

linguistic expression which is preferable in the concise wording of the Lord's Prayer. "Debt" also faithfully translates the contemporary Aramaic expression for sin. However, Jesus and the inspired Evangelists may have generally preferred to employ a different term in Greek whenever possible that would be free of commercial or fiscal associations. That is apparent in the Lukan fifth petition: "And forgive us our *sins*, as we also forgive all who are indebted to us." It is difficult to express succinctly the apodosis with the single word "sin" in Greek or English. Incidentally, the same difficulty also pertains to the word "trespasses."³¹⁶ The word "debts" has the advantage of concise one-word formulation in Greek (as well as in translation): "And forgive us our *debts*, as we forgive our *debtors*." It may be that the word "trespass" was actually superior for use in a context that spoke of sins against God and one another (Matt. 6:14-15; Mark 11:25-26), but the Bible suffered another word selection in the interest of literary style (Matt. 6:12; Luke 11:4a and b).³¹⁷ In summation, valid reasons exist for the words "debts" and "debtors" in the Matthean fifth petition, for "sins" and "everyone who is

³¹⁶ This is indeed the case with the traditional English wording: "And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive *those who trespass against us*"! Luke 11:4b could be translated, as mentioned earlier, "for we also forgive everyone *who offends us*" but this vernacular wording is as poor and wooden as Matt. 6:12b would be with "as we forgive our trespassers"!

³¹⁷ Wilhelm Michaelis, "παράπτω, παράπτωμα," in *TDNT* 6:171, asserted, "There are no *παράπτώματα* against one's neighbour which do not affect one's relation to God, and vice versa." But, Michaelis, 172, showed that *ἁμαρτία* and *παράπτωμα* are essentially synonymous.

indebted to us" in Luke's Prayer, and for "trespasses" in the commentaries on forgiveness at Matt. 6:14-15 and Mark 11:25-26.

The English Prayer

One should not object to literal vernacular translations that reflect these peculiar wordings. The familiar German version, for example, employs "debt" words: *Schuld, Schuldigern*; the Latin uses *debita, debitoribus*. In some quarters, preferential treatment is accorded the wording of the English Lord's Prayer that literally conforms to the Matthean Prayer in the King James Version. However, the familiar "liturgical" or traditional wording should not be disparaged either. To pray, "And forgive us our *trespasses* as we forgive those who *trespass against us*" may actually more adequately convey the desired nuance; that is, to quote some of the conclusions of Wilhelm Michaelis, the Christian prays by the word "trespasses" that God would forgive him the sins which have disrupted his "relation to God through his fault" and have put him on the negative balance of God's judgment.³¹⁸ Further, "the severity of offences against men is emphasised" by the same word used to describe man's offenses against God.³¹⁹ The variant reading at James 5:16 suggests the equivalency of the words "trespasses" and "sins," as does a comparison between Eph. 1:7 (τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν

³¹⁸ Ibid., 172.

³¹⁹ Ibid., 171.

παραπτώματων) and Col. 1:14 (ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν . . . τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν).

"Trespases" and "debts" also are nearly equivalent. They both imply the immensity of man's sins, such that man is guilty for even his failures to do what he was obligated to do. But the word "trespases" is free of the kind of fiscal background that could be liable to misunderstanding. It may also have a slightly broader range of meaning, including, as aforesaid, the negative judgment resulting from failure to do what is expected of God's people and the inclusion of one's relationship to others. The words "trespases" and "sins" may have been preferable for Greek-speaking gentiles, while "debts" would have been preferable in a Semitic context. Fidelity to Tyndale's Bible which translated "debts" as "trespases" has been perpetuated in traditional English versions of the Lord's Prayer. As seen from the above discussion, this is not unobjectionable; in fact it may be preferable. Yet using the word "trespases" has been perceived in some quarters, alluded to earlier, as taking liberties with the original Greek text of Matthew. Probably the word "sin" would overcome most objections; if it would be a universally acceptable translation of the "debt" words, it would be free of the undesirable associations connected with the "debt" words, it would probably be better understood in modern English than "debts" or "trespases," and it would allow perfect compatibility between the Matthean and Lukan versions of the Lord's Prayer in translation. However, the

purpose of this study is not to propose changes in wording of the vernacular Lord's Prayer. "Trespases" has a secure position in the familiar traditional version and it is at least free of the undesirable commercial overtones that would require further clarification. The freedom which Christians have in using a variety of possible wordings of the Lord's Prayer is in keeping with the spirit of this Dominical Prayer (Matt. 6:9). Such variety began with Jesus himself who selected different words and expressions relative to the fifth petition in these two Prayers undoubtedly taught on two different occasions.

Forgiveness

Sinful man is so spiritually incapable of making restitution for his sins and misdeeds against God and his neighbor to whom he is obligated that he must depend on forgiving grace. His own efforts are qualitatively and quantitatively short. He is unable to rely on his own achievements. Only forgiveness can reverse his plight. Just as divine forgiveness can restore the relationship between God and man destroyed by sin, so also one's forgiveness of others restores broken human relationships. Jesus taught the necessity of his people to be as generous in extending forgiveness to others as God himself is generous and gracious to forgive.

The common New Testament word for "forgiving" (ἀφίημι) presents no difficulties. This word became a standard term

in the Scriptures for remission of sins, or of redemption.³²⁰ It literally means "to send away" sins. For example, in Deut. 15:2, the release of the sabbath year was expressed by this word for forgiveness (ἄφεσις). Likewise, the Year of Jubilee was intended to be a time of release, as Lev. 25:10 instituted it: "And you shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty (ἄφεσον) throughout the land." These institutions were arranged for the general forgiveness of debts, for the freeing of slaves and property, and for the land to lie fallow.

The Septuagint employed this word group to express divine release or remission of sin. Is. 55:6-7, for example, says: "Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near . . . let him return to the Lord, that he may have mercy on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon (πολὺ ἀφήσει τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν)." Sirach 28:2 of the Apocrypha added the dimension of forgiving others using the same word for forgiving: "Forgive (ἄφες) your neighbor the wrong he has done, and then your sins will be pardoned (λυθήσονται, or "loosed") when you pray."

Christians are also urged to be forgiving. For example, Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:7), "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." At Matt. 5:44 he taught, "Love your enemies and pray for those

³²⁰ Thus, Samuel Tobias Lachs, "On Matthew VI.12," Novum Testamentum 17 (1967): 6-8. Related words include ἐλεημων (Matt. 5:7), οἰκτίρων (James 5:11), χαρίζομαι (freq.), ἀπολύω (Luke 6:37).

who persecute you." At Matt. 7:1, Jesus enjoined Christians not to judge their brethren, "Judge not, that you not be judged" (Matt. 7:1; cf. Luke 6:35-37). Such a forgiving attitude among Christians results from the forgiveness that has come from God first. Paul instructed, "As the Lord has forgiven you, so you also must forgive" (Col. 3:13). 1 John 1:9 teaches, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, and will forgive ($\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta$) our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Friedrich Hauck summarized the New Testament teaching about sin and forgiveness this way:

Jesus, who teaches His disciples to pray for remission, perceives how impossible is the way of compensating for bad deeds by good deeds after the manner of Pharisaic thinking. In the formally similar use of the same metaphor Jesus rises above Jewish thought materially by grounding the divine remission in the divine mercy. He does not speak of any underlying human achievements in the form of works, merits, sacrifices, fasts etc. Whereas in the OT remission of debt is as it were bought from God by the guilt offering etc., Jesus lifts the process right out of the cultic and legal sphere. $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$, "to remit," becomes "to forgive." Forgiveness is a matter of grace.³²¹

Several New Testament passages vividly depict the matter of forgiveness, especially in relation to one's neighbor.

First, the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Debtor) in Matt. 18:21-35 provides a parallel to the actions expected in the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer. This teaching of Jesus on the principle of forgiveness is preceded by the teaching on church discipline in verses 15-19. The goal of

³²¹ Hauck, 5:562-63.

this doctrine is to gain an erring brother.³²² Hopefully, the errant person will be penitent and restored to the fellowship of the church (v. 17). Verse 18 declares of Christians (note the plural), "Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Christians are duty-bound to "loose" or forgive the penitent and erring brother. Such temporal action is honored in heaven (v. 18: ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and ἐν οὐρανῶ). At verse 19, unity in prayer (αἰτήσονται) is mentioned. This is part of the fruit of restored and harmonious fellowship, whereby the offender and the offended live under forgiveness. As a result of forgiveness the two can pray together, as one harmonious voice (συμφωνήσωσιν). Peter asked Jesus how often such fraternal absolution should be given (v. 21), "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive (ἀφήσω) him? As many as seven times?" Gaining the brother requires forgiving frequently. The Christian also must be in constant readiness to forgive. Peter had thought his suggestion was generous, only to have heard that Jesus multiplied Peter's answer to seventyfold

³²² Since the general disposition of man is toward an unwillingness to forgive others the Lord's Prayer, and Christian instruction in general, urges to freely forgive others. However, this is not necessarily a matter of "cheap grace." Forgiveness from God is not conditional nor in being given to others should it be conditional; nevertheless repentance on the part of the recipient is a *sine qua non*; see Charles F. D. Moule, "' . . . As we forgive . . .': A Note on the Distinction between Deserts and Capacity in the Understanding of Forgiveness," in Donum Gentilicium, David Daube FS, ed. E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, W. D. Davies (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 68-77.

(v. 22).³²³

In order to make his point, Jesus then told the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant (18:23-34). This parable is designed to show that only he can expect to receive forgiveness who also generously forgives. This is a central truth pertaining to the kingdom of heaven (v. 23). The king made a reckoning of his accounts. He found that someone, a debtor (ὀφειλέτης), owed him an extravagant amount of money (v. 24). The exaggerated amount would indicate the impossibility of repaying the debt, just as no one could dare repay God for omission of deeds (debts) previously committed. In keeping with contemporary customs, this debtor and his family were ready to be sold (Lev. 25:39; Ex. 22:3; 2 Kings 4:1). However, he begged for mercy. Forgiveness and cancellation of the debt was graciously granted (v. 27). Inordinately ungrateful, that unmerciful debtor in turn irreprehensibly demanded repayment of a rather small debt from a fellow servant (v. 28) even after that poor debtor had begged for mercy and promised repayment! The application of this part of the parable is obvious. God's forgiveness for the sinner is as great as the debt of his sin. The sins and injuries the Christian suffers from others is minor in comparison. The Christian should be willing to forgive, without conditions and without cruelty. The servant's penurious behavior was reported to the king by fellow servants. The king addressed the debtor, "You wicked servant! I forgave

³²³ The textual variant is immaterial. Multiples of seven indicate a perfect number.

(ἀφῆκα) you all that debt (ὀφειλήν) because you besought me; and should not you have had mercy on your fellow servant, as I had mercy on you?' (vv. 32-33).

Notice that the Greek roots of the verb and noun object at verse 32 are identical to those of the Matthean fifth petition (τὴν ὀφειλήν ἐκείνην ἀφῆκά σοι). Again, the final statement with which Jesus concluded the parable (verse 35) is reminiscent both of the fifth petition and of the addendum at Matt. 6:14-15: "So also my heavenly Father will do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother (var., their trespasses) from your heart" (v. 35). Thus, this parable clearly enlarges on the theme of the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer.

Second, a similar commentary occurs in Luke 7:36-50. This parable of Two Debtors was told by Jesus in a Pharisee's house (v. 36; Simon by name, v. 40), after Jesus was anointed by a sinful woman (vv. 37-38). At verse 41, Jesus explained that a certain creditor had two debtors, one owing a large and the other a smaller sum of money. "When they could not pay, he forgave them both" (v. 42). Jesus proceeded to explain that the loving response of the one who had the greatest debt was naturally greater than the one with a small debt that had been forgiven (v. 47). Jesus then forgave the sins of the woman whose sins were so great (v. 48, ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι). This wonderful gift of divine forgiveness was likewise uttered from the Savior's mouth at the healing of

the paralytic, "Your sins are forgiven" (Matt. 9:2; Mark 2:5; Luke 5:20). The Parable of the Two Debtors serves as a commentary on the fifth petition. The same verb is used; two different nouns ("debts" and "sins") are prominent in this text, both of which appear in the Lukan Prayer. This woman's forgiveness stemmed from faith; it was not based on the work-righteousness of her love to God (see v. 50). Her "greater love" was indicative of her greater sin. The *tertium comparationis* is obvious from v. 47. The application is clear. Jesus taught that there should be a response to grace. God's magnanimous grace precedes effusive response.

Thirdly, a powerful teaching on forgiving grace to the sinner was the point of the Parable of the Lost Sons in Luke 15:11-32. It should be sufficient to draw attention to several details of this familiar parable which was taught by Jesus.³²⁴ Observe that the first part of the parable centers around the love of the father and the disobedient profligacy of the son. This is a parable depicting the forgiving grace of the heavenly Father and the sinful activity of his children. God is a "Father" with whom the "sons" find a loving relationship. After the prodigal son squandered his inheritance in wild, debauched living he returned to his father. He was at the end of the road with no other recourse. He prayed (v. 21): "Father, I have sinned against

³²⁴ For an especially helpful exposition of this parable, see Kenneth Ewing Bailey, Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 158-206. This parable teaches the lesson of free divine and human forgiveness, but it is not concerned about the grounds of forgiveness (the cross) nor how it is appropriated (mediated by faith).

heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son." He confessed that he should no longer expect to be part of the family. Yet, he repented and was filled with faith at the same time, trusting that his father would render compassion (Is. 65:24). The point of the parable is drawn at verse 32, ". . . for this your brother was dead, and is alive; he was lost, and is found." In the end, the prodigal's restoration to the family was complete, as the Father's warm welcome and merry-making showed to the community. Christians are forgiven by the grace of the heavenly Father on the basis of the atonement for sin made by his Son, Jesus the Christ. Forgiveness is a gift. In the Lord's Prayer, they ask for such forgiveness from their "Father in heaven."

The second section of the parable, verses 25-31, describes the resentment (v. 28) of the older "obedient" brother who stayed at home. Contrary to his unforgiving behavior, the Christian should be forgiving of others. There is no room for the Christian to complain about his treatment as a Christian, or to begrudge extending the hand of love to a neighbor. Within the Christian fellowship, there is no place for self-righteousness. All receive forgiveness from God equally. All have a need of God's forgiveness, whether the need is great or small. The elder brother did not "earn" forgiveness, but it was likewise given to him on the basis of sonship (v. 31). This parable serves as an important commentary on the two themes contained in the fifth petition, receiving divine forgiveness and the need of forgiving others.

Fourth, several other passages will be cited which also relate to Jesus' important teaching about extending forgiveness to others. Passing reference could be made to the discourse on the Last Judgment in Matt. 25:31-46, which speaks of the Christian's loving response to God's prior grace. In Matt. 5:23-24, Jesus taught,

So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift.³²⁵

Luke 17:3 reports this statement of Jesus: "If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him; and if he sins against you seven times in the day, and turns to you seven times, and says, 'I repent,' you must forgive him." The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican in Luke 18:9-14 is reported to show that forgiveness comes from God alone and there is simply no room for self-centered disregard for others in the kingdom. In Jesus' conversation with the rich young ruler (Luke 18:18-30) eternal life is not considered without a response that serves one's poor neighbor (v. 22). In these, and other possible examples, it becomes clear that Jesus' teaching about receiving forgiveness and giving

³²⁵ Passing reference was made in regard to the bread petition that the probable reason the custom developed for using the Lord's Prayer in the communion liturgy right before the distribution is not because of the reference to bread, but because of the fifth petition, with its reference to forgiving others. That is the point made by Rordorf who claimed that the aorist in the Matthean fifth petition reflected the action that once forgiveness has been given, then and only is the communicant ready to receive the sacrament. For him, the aorist was well chosen. See Willy Rordorf, "'Wie auch wir vergeben haben unsern Schuldner' (Matth. VI, 12b)," in Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 107 (Berlin: Akademie, 1970), 236-41.

forgiveness to others is a central doctrine of the New Testament.

Forgiveness is always prior to response; faith precedes the fruits of faith. Grace comes now in time and is active in the lives of God's people. For example, Jesus told the sinful woman that her sins would immediately, right there and then, be forgiven, "Your sins are forgiven" (Luke 7:48). He also absolved the paralytic at the moment of his healing (cited above). It is in this present age that Christians both receive God's forgiveness and forgive one another, as Matthew 18 teaches. If one seeks to be reconciled with a brother who has created offense, and forgiveness takes place, "you have gained your brother" now (Matt. 15:15b). The "binding and loosing" of Matt. 18:18 pertains to the time of the Christian's present experience; the context indicates that the Christian congregation is the *locus* where forgiveness is practiced. Of course, forgiving and being forgiven, forgiveness exercised and experienced now in time, has eternal consequences (Matt. 16:19; 18:18; John 20:23). The time of salvation was inaugurated with Jesus. Jesus told sinners here and now that their sins were forgiven. There is no doubt that the import of the fifth petition applies to the here and now of the present Gospel age.

In summary, the New Testament teaching about forgiveness, as elucidated by the above citations among others, can be described as follows. God's forgiveness is completely unearned. It is rooted in God's love for sinful man, his creation. Forgiveness is a forensic act of the

unmerited grace of God. According to Matt. 26:28, divine forgiveness of the sinner is directly connected with the death of Jesus. Accepting forgiveness puts the Christian in a debt of gratitude to God (Rom. 6:16-19). This forgiveness provides the motive for forgiving others. The fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer assumes faith which appropriates the offer of divine forgiveness and which becomes active in love (Gal. 5:6) towards one's neighbor and thereby also toward God.

Interpretation

The Matthean Lord's Prayer consistently employs aorist verbs throughout. This is no less true in the case of the fifth petition. The second aorist imperative ἄφεσ is used to ask for divine pardon in the protasis; a first aorist active indicative is used in the apodosis (ἀφῆκαμεν) to refer to human pardon. The ὡς clause is comparative or correlative.³²⁶

The verb in the apodosis is best rendered in translation by a present tense rather than by a historic tense. Using the present tense in translation is supported by the fact that the aorist in "prayer language" loses its feature of a single, punctiliar event. This aspect of the aorist serves in prayer to petition God to act. Although the ἀφῆκαμεν in the apodosis may not be a typical "prayer aorist" since it speaks of man's response to the prior divine action of giving forgiveness, it does stand in a grammatical

³²⁶ BDF, 236; sec. 453.2; it is not causal (*quid pro quo*).

relationship with its protasis. The "prayer aorist" of the protasis then governs the verb in the apodosis. Thus the aorist is used to voice the Christian's promise in prayer to God that he is willing to forgive others precisely because he has been first forgiven by God. A literal translation "as we have forgiven" is only a slavish, pedantic rendition of this aorist. Further support for this conclusion can be gained by comparing the Lukan Prayer. Most manuscripts of the Lukan forgiveness petition give a present form of the verb in the second clause. Luke's version prays, "And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone who is indebted to us." This version properly captured the desired nuance more clearly by using the present tense of the verb:

ἀφίόμεν.³²⁷ Luke's version prioritizes God's forgiveness and avoids the suggestion of making the Christian's forgiveness conditional on his own ability to forgive (which would be a form of work-righteousness). That is the very difficulty that is often detected in Matthew's version. If the second clause were understood to be a historic tense, it would imply that divine forgiveness is granted only on the condition that the Christian forgives others first.

Several commentators have rightly discovered the desirability of translating the Matthean fifth petition with a present tense, even if they cite other reasons for support of their conclusions. Lohmeyer explained the Matthean aorist

³²⁷ Lohmeyer, 167, explained that this word is a popular neologism. Carmignac, 230, explained that ἀφίεμεν in some MSS such as the Majority Text tradition is simply a more classical variation of the present tense ἀφίόμεν.

by saying, "the earliest community regarded the forgiveness as a single event, and not something extending over a long period."³²⁸ He explained that the aorist here should be expected since it was used throughout the Matthean Prayer, but "we should beware of drawing theological conclusions from the past tense."³²⁹ He also added that the Matthean aorist and the Lucan present point to an underlying Aramaic *peal* (Heb., *gal*) leaving impermissible any conclusion that required a historic tense in translation ("as we have first forgiven").³³⁰ Jeremias said, "There lies behind Matthew's past tense form what is called in Semitic grammar a *perfectum praesens*, a "present perfect," which refers to an action occurring here and now."³³¹ In contrast with his general approach, Brown explained the Matthean aorists in a way compatible with a present interpretation of the apodosis: "The correlativity of the two actions is nicely expressed by Mt's aorist tense in both clauses. In part, the correlativity is based on the fact that a sin against the brother is a sin against the Father."³³² Perhaps surprisingly, Brown's explanation is the most supportive of the view that a strong

³²⁸ Lohmeyer, 161.

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ Ibid., 181.

³³¹ Jeremias, *The Lord's Prayer*, 14. In his *Theology*, 201, Jeremias called it a "perfectum coincidentiae" and translated "as herewith we forgive . . ."

³³² Brown, 284, fn. 115.

grammatical case can be made that the concept in both versions of the Prayer is identical; namely, that God forgives first and as a result of receiving divine pardon the Christian is stirred to be forgiving of others. In fact, the Christian can jeopardize his own forgiveness by withholding forgiveness from others (Matt. 5:23-24; 6:14-15; 18:21-35).

Only on the surface does Matthew's version imply that forgiveness is conditional on the ability and willingness of the Christian to first forgive others. Actually, Matthew's wording is "rigorist," as the addendum illustrates: "For if you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father also will forgive you" (Matt. 6:14). This does not contradict Matthew's Parable of the Unmerciful Debtor, in which parable forgiveness from the king was given first. Carmignac explained Matthew's rigorist tone of the second clause of the first petition this way:

It is not the forgiveness of God which is conditioned by ours, it is the value of our prayer which is conditioned by our previous pardon. God does not depend on man, but our prayer depends on our sincerity: the [Lord's] prayer would be hypocritical (as is the case in Matthew 18, 23-35) if it had not been preceded by the granting of sincere forgiveness.³³³

To be forgiving, in its broadest sense, is a necessary dimension of Christian life. To show love, mercy, and compassion is expected of the Christian. James 2:13a sternly warns of this Christian obligation: "For judgment is without mercy to one who has shown no mercy" (ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος). The fifth petition is the only place in the

³³³ Carmignac, 231.

entire Lord's Prayer which speaks specifically of what the Christian does or promises to do.

To be forgiving and to be forgiven are related as sanctification is to justification. Works reveal faith (James 2:14, 17). James speaks to this issue in several places. For example, James 2:8 declares, "If you really fulfil the royal law, according to the scripture, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself,' you do well." Reference has already been made to James 2:13 (judgment is without mercy if mercy is not given). See also Eph. 4:32; 5:2; Col. 3:13.

The apodosis in Matthew's fifth petition begins with ὡς καί and Luke's with καὶ γάρ.³³⁴ Carmignac minimalized the differences of these two expressions on the basis of a supposed Hebrew original. He surmized that their differences were more apparent than real, since both are Greek renditions of the same original Hebrew *af anu* or *gam anu*; Matthew is more literal while Luke is more literary.³³⁵

Carmignac also pointed out that the καὶ in Matthew's second clause belongs with the ἡμεῖς, not with the ὡς. His most compelling reasons are listed.³³⁶ First, in the addendum at Matt. 6:14, the two words καὶ ὑμῶν belong together.

³³⁴ See J. J. Cadbury, "Superfluous KAI' in the Lord's Prayer and Elsewhere," in *Munera Studiosa*, William H. P. Hatch FS (Cambridge, Mass.: Episcopal Theological School, 1946), 41-47. For the construction meaning "yes, even" see BDF, 236, sec. 452.3.

³³⁵ Carmignac, 228.

³³⁶ Ibid.

Second, in the Lukan version, the comparative conjunction ὡς has disappeared and the intensive pronoun αὐτοί has been added leaving "for even we ourselves forgive." Third, there are many examples where καί is joined with the pronoun, giving καγώ. This is a frequent construction connecting two words frequently taken together. The emphasis, then, is on what the Christian also promises to do. If the Christian asks the Lord for forgiveness, he also needs to forgive. The Matthean ὡς clause does not imply causality, but similitude. To understand it as a cause or condition would be tantamount to work-righteousness (Pelagianism).³³⁷ This misunderstanding must be avoided. The potential for misunderstanding is strengthened if one would take the γάρ in Luke 11:4 and the ἵνα of Mark 11:25 causally. Forgiveness does not rest on man's merit but on God's grace. In the Matthean and Lukan fifth petition, the two clauses are related to each other by simple comparison. In Mark 11:25, the *hina* clause seems to imply that one's forgiveness from God can be destroyed by the refusal to forgive others. Lohmeyer emphasized the connection between the two clauses when he said that "'our forgiving' is not contrasted with God's as though it were something separate, but that this very forgiveness for which

³³⁷ Ibid., 232. A heresy arose in which Augustine and others complained of an excessive Pelagianism that taught that Christians could attain such perfection so as to dispense with the fifth petition. A decision against this self-righteous aberration was reached in the sixteenth council of Carthage in A.D. 418 (see Carmignac, 233).

we ask and which we grant to our debtors comes from God himself."³³⁸ Both clauses are related logically by the $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ and are to be taken simultaneously, with the "and" or "also" being hardly necessary in translation.³³⁹

It is important to remember that all the pronouns in the Lord's Prayer are plural. In the fifth petition, the plural especially presupposes Christian community. Although individuals pray for divine forgiveness, they are not isolated from the whole family of God that also prays. The children of the Father are especially mindful of others. Lohmeyer called attention to this idea:

Anyone, then, who has separated himself from the community of brotherly love may be called a debtor, just as anyone who through his action separates himself from the love of the 'Father' must be called 'God's debtor'. Now there is this mutual love of the 'brethren' only because it is grounded in the love of the Father for his children; as a result, the one who separates himself from the love of the brethren is cut off from the love of God.³⁴⁰

God wants his people to recognize the existence of the brethren and to show them forgiving love. The familial or communal aspect of the Christian faith is assumed in 1 John 3:1, for example: "See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and so we are." A loving disposition toward others is commanded by Jesus, "I have given you an example, that you also should do as I have

³³⁸ Lohmeyer, 183.

³³⁹ Ibid., 180. Also, see fn. 334.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 183.

done to you" (John 13:15). See also Gal. 6:1-2; Eph. 4:2-3; 2 Cor. 2:7-8. The community of believers praying the fifth petition, the "us" and the "our," prays precisely because they are all the family members of the heavenly Father. The Father who forgives sins, for the sake of his Son, thereby creates sons and heirs of the household. The fifth petition is "to be understood primarily as a petition in which a community of suppliants turns to its Father."³⁴¹ Lohmeyer pointed out that when debtors owe a debt to a fellow individual believer, they really owe the debt to the community. As such it is not an individual granting forgiveness, but "brothers forgiving those who are separating or have separated themselves from the community of brothers."³⁴² It is significant that the passage about church discipline begins with the word "brother" by saying, "If your brother sins against you If he listens to you, you have gained your brother" (Matt. 18:15). The fifth petition values the Christian fellowship and seeks to preserve it. By the power of forgiveness it can remain intact and unbroken. What values this petition holds for the Christian congregation!

Two interpretations of the fifth petition are possible, the eschatological and the noneschatological. Most of those who prefer the former still apply this petition, at least in part, to the present reality of Christian life. The typical

³⁴¹ Ibid., 186.

³⁴² Ibid.

eschatological interpretation appeals again to the aorists bearing the note of *Einmaligkeit*. The Matthean fifth petition, in preference to the Lukan, is more applicable to an eschatological interpretation since it is viewed as praying for final forgiveness at the consummation, conditional on the fact that the Christian has forgiven others (historic tense), in preparation for the Final Judgment. Brown presented this explanation of the fifth petition:

It covers the summation of a lifetime, treated as one action before God's judgment seat. Both Lk and the *Didache* use a present tense. This is probably the same tendency away from eschatology which we encountered in the Lukan version of the fourth petition.³⁴³

The eschatological interpretation believes that Christians live in expectancy of the imminent judgment of Christ. The forgiveness of sins is often put in terms of judgment (Matt. 5:23-25, urging reconciliation lest the accuser hand one to the judge; Luke 6:37, judge not . . . forgive, and you will be forgiven; Matt. 18:23-35; 25:31-46, where one's dealings with others becomes the criterion of judgment).³⁴⁴ The full and perfect status of sonship will not be realized until the kingdom comes at the Last Day, according to this interpretation. At the Last Day, all sins will be manifest, and the individual may stand before the judgment without the means to pay (Matt. 18:34). This petition solicits the ultimate pardon, according to the future eschatological

³⁴³ Brown, 244.

³⁴⁴ These examples are from Brown, 245-46.

interpretation.³⁴⁵

Probably the strongest argument for the noneschatological interpretation lies in the second clause of the fifth petition. It refers to the promise of believers who pray the Lord's Prayer to be forgiving. Brown even tended to interpret that clause eschatologically. He asserted that this second clause assumes a disposition of extending "the complete and final act of brotherly forgiveness."³⁴⁶

However, Brown conceded that while this promise undoubtedly "removes all obstacles to the perfect community of the heavenly banquet table" its present orientation is obviously patent.³⁴⁷ Further, Luke's version of the fifth petition is definitely oriented to the present existence of the believer within the Christian fellowship, when it prays, "And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive all our debtors" (Luke 11:4). Matthew's version is also oriented to the here and now of the Gospel age if the two aorist verbs in the fifth petition are simultaneously taken with a present sense when it prays, "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors" (Matt. 6:12).

The need for divine forgiveness and human pardon is

³⁴⁵ Brown, 247; Lohmeyer, 179, "Although the petition refers to a forgiveness of sins now, on earth, it also refers to a final forgiveness on the one day of God, which makes the person who prays free for God's kingdom and his glory."

³⁴⁶ Brown, 248.

³⁴⁷ Ibid. Schürmann, 132, fn. 353, explained that this aorist did not refer to eschatological pardon, but it simply served to emphasize the urgency of the petition.

ever-present. It always exists because of the fallen condition of creation (Rom 5:12). This present dimension of daily renewal is highlighted in Eph. 4:22 ("Put off your old nature which belongs to your former manner of life"), and 4:24 ("put on the new nature"). The need for daily growth in sanctification is assumed in the following verses (4:25-32) where the already-justified Christian is urged to avoid falsehood, anger, thievery, evil talk, grieving the Holy Spirit, bitterness, and so on. Significantly, the present life of the believer within the setting of the Christian assembly is assumed at 4:25 ("for we are members one of another") and at 4:32 ("forgiving one another, as God in Christ forgave you").

The need for daily renewal in sanctification is continuous. To forgive others is an everyday need. To be forgiven by others is also an everyday need. It is also necessary to regularly be forgiven by God, against whom even the Christian daily and often sins. Receiving *divine* forgiveness relates to justification. Giving *human* forgiveness relates to sanctification. Both are necessary for Christian life in the present Gospel age. Forgiveness is not reserved only or exclusively for the Last Day, but it is received, applied, given, and enjoyed now. Jesus gave the promise of forgiveness to his people for their earthly pilgrimage, before the Last Day would come, when he declared to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained" (John 20:22b-23). The proclamation of this message

has been commissioned to God's people (the church):

"Repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations" (Luke 24:47). The Messianic age, the time of the Gospel, is marked by faith in Jesus for the forgiveness of sins, as Acts 10:43 indicates, "To him all the prophets bear witness that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name."

Forgiveness is a gift of God. The Gospel age is a time of salvation when believers are assured that their sins are forgiven by God on account of and for the sake of his Son Jesus. The fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer is appropriately applied to the Christian life now.

6. Our Temptation

All the Matthean verbs in the Lord's Prayer are aorists, including the verb of the sixth petition, "And lead us not into temptation." However, since this verb is a negative formation, the regular imperative cannot be used. A subjunctive is required in an aorist negative construction.³⁴⁸ Except for that grammatical nuance, it is essentially true, then, that in Matthew, all the petitions are aorist imperatives. The sixth petition in Luke is identical to Matthew's. A conjunction connects this petition with the previous one. If the fifth petition speaks of past sin and the seventh of protection from sin's power, the orientation

³⁴⁸ BDF, 173; sec. 337.4; A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 173. Few commentators have reckoned with the verb in this petition; most confine themselves to a discussion of temptation itself.

of the sixth petition speaks of the cause of present sin, namely, temptation.³⁴⁹ Therefore, this petition asks God to keep the believer from slipping back into sin again once it has been forgiven.

The greatest problem connected with this petition concerns the dilemma of whether or not a good God actually leads his people into temptation and sin. If God directly contributes to sin or temptation, he cannot be an infinitely good God. Indeed, God does not act with nefarious intent. In order to tackle this problem, it is best to begin with a study of temptation itself.³⁵⁰

Temptation

In the Old Testament, several outstanding examples of various temptations occur. The first record of a temptation is the Fall of Man into Sin (Gen. 3:8-24). In this account,

³⁴⁹ Carmignac, 267.

³⁵⁰ Various gratuitous mollifications have been introduced to soften divine responsibility for leading people into sin; see Carmignac's report, 238-55, where they are classified severally by the addition of a gloss ("do not lead us into more temptation than we can bear"), by equivocation of the word temptation ("lead us not into testing" [especially the 'final test']"), by substitution of the active with a passive ("we are introduced into temptation by God"), by attenuation of the sense of the verb ("let us not enter"), by accepting abandonment into temptation by God ("since he is sovereign"), or by various combinations of these. The notion of abandonment seems to be the attitude of Edmund Schlink, "Die Gemeinde Jesu Christi und die Anfechtung," in Theologische Existenz Heute, vol. 59 (Munich: Kaiser, 1938) who placed the sixth petition in a law and Gospel context and said that since the new obedience of the regenerate man in this age remains imperfect, he is yet under the law ("third use") from which "temptations" come for chastening and refining. However, it is apparent that the sixth petition does not refer to divine *anfechtungen* for good but to deliverance from sinful temptations to evil. The former should be received with joy (James 1:2), while the latter should be avoided

Satan in the form of a serpent beguiled Adam and Eve. Adam fell into a state of sin because of disobedience against God's prohibition not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He yielded to temptation of his own free will. Therefore the guilt was his, even though Satan had tempted him (through Eve). God subsequently imposed punishment on the first couple and the whole human race for this disobedience (Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:49).

This historical account does not speak in terms of temptation *per se*, but of man's beguilement, disobedience, punishment, and the Messianic promise. Of course, the ultimate source of temptation was Satan (Gen. 3:1-5, 13-15)

(James 1:13-15). The former pertains to "Gospel"; the latter to "law." Although God works through the law, the sixth petition asks to be spared of the ultimate consequence of the law--death and eternal ruin. The law of God works to judge and drive to mercy; see Schlink, 18-24. So also Stanley E. Porter, "Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4: 'Lead us not into temptation,'" The Expository Times 101 (1990): 359-62. Porter said that the sixth petition acknowledges that ultimately everything is under God's control and he is finally responsible for man's temptation, although his people nevertheless pray to be spared. Porter, 361, acknowledged that this explanation is no "joyous solution" even though true! Carmignac objected strenuously especially against this kind of explanation; indeed, it runs counter to James 1:13 which teaches that God does not tempt anyone to evil. Geoffrey G. Willis, "Lead Us Not into Temptation," The Downside Review 93 (1975): 281-88, has collected a large number of glosses, especially from the Latin tradition, to illustrate different ways that have been taken to remove responsibility from God of causing evil.

The Augsburg Confession of 1530 teaches that God is not the cause of sin; thus, Article 19: "Our churches teach that although God creates and preserves nature, the cause of sin is the will of the wicked, that is, of the devil and ungodly men," in Theodore Tappert, Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, and Arthur C. Piepkorn, eds., The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 40-41; Hans Lietzmann, Heinrich Bornkamm, Hans Volz, and Ernst Wolf, eds., Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 75.

to whom part of the curse was afterwards addressed. In the so-called *Protoevangelium* of Gen. 3:15 it was prophesied that Satan would some day "bruise the heel" of the promised future Messiah and "seed of the woman." In fulfilment of this prediction, the temptation of Jesus and his maltreatment and death (both the active and passive obedience of Jesus) were directly wrought by Satan, in accord with the permissive will of God the Father. With regard to Adam and Eve, they were held responsible for their own disobedience in succumbing to temptation. This is proved by their respective curses in Gen. 3:16 and 17-19. The account of the "Fall of Man" into sin leads to the conclusion that man must contend ever since with the reality of Satan as a force hostile to God and of his own predilection to yield to temptation (Gen. 6:5). A good God does not cause temptation or sin, but he can and does test the obedience of his own (cf. Gen. 3:3, "but God said, 'You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden . . . lest you die'"). God can also use the existence of evil in the world for the wholesome chastening of his people (Gen. 3:1, 22; Jude 6).³⁵¹ In short, in the Garden of Eden, God was *testing* and Satan was *tempting* man.

Gen. 22:1-19 probably contains the most pointed example of testing in the Bible: "God tested Abraham" (22:1).

³⁵¹ After the curse, God's gift of life became necessary, as reference to the "tree of life" (Gen. 3:22; Rev. 22:2) shows. Note also that God is sovereign. Genesis 3 does not teach a false dualism of good and evil, or God and Satan, as being two equals. This fallen condition has bearing on Luther's description of present life lived under acceptance of *Anfechtungen*; see Chap. II, supra, fns. 271, 285, 293, 308.

Abraham was ordered to sacrifice his son Isaac as a test of his obedience to God. He passed the test by doing what God asked (v. 18), although God did provide a "way of escape" at the last minute (v. 12; 1 Cor. 10:13; Heb. 11:17-19). The usual words meaning to "test" or "tempt" were used (ἰσθῆναι, ἐπειράσασθαι). In this example, God was *testing* Abraham's faith, as Heb. 11:17 asserts.

Job, too, was tested. God gave Satan permission to test Job (Job 1:12). After his sufferings sent by Satan, Job passed the test (42:2). God allowed Satan a limited jurisdiction over Job (see Rev. 20:3, 7). Here, Satan *tempted* Job. God's permissive will was done.

Probably the events triggering the most comment in the Old Testament pertains to the rebellion and fault-finding of the Israelites after the Exodus deliverance. The essence of this rebellion is described in the chapter following the giving of the manna. In Exodus 17 these statements are made: "And Moses said to them, 'Why do you put the Lord to the proof?' (ἵνα ἰσθῆναι ἡμεῖς, πειράζετε, v. 2)," and "And he [Moses] called the name of the place Massah ("proof," ἰσθῆναι, Πειρασμός) and Meribah ("contention," ἰσθῆναι, Λοιδόρησις), because of the fault-finding of the children of Israel, and because they put the Lord to the proof (ἵνα ἰσθῆναι, πειράζειν)." The accounts of the murmuring against the Lord are reported, for example, in Ex. 15:23; 17:87; Num. 14:2, 21-23, 36; 16:41, 49; 17:5, 10; 21:5-6; 25:1, 9; 26:62; Deut. 6:16;

9:22-24; Ps. 78:17-20, 40-41; 95:8-11; 106:14. Reference is made to the Israelites' attitude of rebellion in Heb. 3:7-11, 15-19; 4:7 and in Stephen's sermon in Acts 7:39. The words frequently used of temptation are *piel* פִּיִּל (cf. the substantive "Massah"), or sometimes פִּיִּל ; ὁ πειρασμός, πειράζω; δοκιμάζειν. When man tempts God as in the case of grumbling against God, he is ultimately reflecting his own sinful doubt and rebellion. The Israelites suffered forty years of desert wanderings as punishment for their rebellion against God; they were testing God.³⁵²

It should be observed that the terminological differences between testing and temptation are fluid. In Ps. 26:2 (Ps. 25 LXX) these two words are nearly synonymous: פִּיִּל פִּיִּל . . . פִּיִּל פִּיִּל ! That verse says, "Prove me, O Lord, and try me" (δοκίμασόν με, κύριε, καὶ πείρασόν με). This prayer of David was spoken asking the Lord to refine or test his faith (2b). This sentiment also comes out in Ps. 11:5: "The Lord tests the righteous and the wicked." At Ps. 11:6 the wicked receive retribution and at verse 7 the righteous are vindicated. The Hebrew word *nissah* meaning "test" is frequent. Ex. 16:4 says, ". . . that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or not." Ex. 20:20 says, "Do not fear, for God has come to prove you . . . that you may not sin." Deut. 8:2 (cf. 8:16) states, ". . . that he

³⁵² Of course, for man to test God is a temptation, as shown in such texts cited above like Ex. 17:2, for instance.

might humble you, testing you . . . and fed you with manna." Deut. 13:3 also states, "For the Lord your God is testing you." Likewise, Ps. 66:10, 12 (Ps. 65 LXX) alludes to divine testing and ultimate rescue: "For thou, O God, hast tested (ἐδοκίμασας) us; thou hast tried us as silver is tried. Thou didst bring us into the net (Ἐισήγαγες) . . . yet thou hast brought us forth [or, out] (ἐξήγαγες)." Throughout the Bible it is assumed that God who is sovereign can impose his will and control his creation, as he rightfully claimed to Moses in Ex. 4:11, "Who has made man's mouth? Who makes him dumb, or deaf, or seeing, or blind? Is it not I, the Lord?"

In many such passages, the translation "test" rather than "tempt" would represent the proper intention, since often the notion is of an action whose end is to turn from sin and to lead to good.³⁵³ It appears that *nissah* and *πειράζειν* express the concepts of either "temptation" or of "testing" depending on the context. The word "temptation" carries the negative connotation of leading into sin, unbelief, and apostasy. The word "testing" implies that which is divinely initiated for the good, for the purging of sin, for chastening and strengthening. Throughout the Bible confusion can arise because *peirasmos* may refer either to "testing" or to "tempting" depending on the context.

In later rabbinical writings, the *evil impulse* (*yozer*) in man became seen as the chief source of man's sin and which

³⁵³ Carmignac, 258.

causes him to be led into temptation. The following prayer from b. Ber. 60b illustrates this concept: "Let me not come to destruction nor to temptation nor to shame, and bend my evil impulse to submit itself to thee."³⁵⁴

In the New Testament similar teachings are present as in the Old Testament in terms of testing for good and temptation to evil. It is fair to say that the "unholy three," the devil, the world, and the flesh, are more actively described in the New Testament than in the Old Testament as being the source of temptation. To "test" can mean occasionally to examine or to decide (Acts 16:7; 2 Cor. 13:5; John 6:6). Usually, however, to test or tempt are the senses of *πειράζειν*. Sometimes the word "trial" is used to express either to test or to tempt. Ultimately, the context is required to determine the meaning. To that end, the following examples from the New Testament will be fruitful for study.

The account of Jesus' temptation is recorded in Matt. 4:11; Mark 1:12-13; and Luke 4:1-13. In Matthew and Luke Jesus was tempted by the devil; in Mark he is described as being tempted by Satan. Matt. 4:1 reports, "Then Jesus was led up (*ἀνήχθη*) by the Spirit into the wilderness to be

³⁵⁴ Quoted from Heinrich Seesemann, "πειρα, κτλ," in *TDNT* 6:27; see also Jeremias, *Lord's Prayer*, 29; Harner, 108, conveniently produces this prayer in ET; cf. also similar wording in the Evening Prayer in Chap. III, *supra*, "Prayers in Judaism"; and see *sub loc.* at fn. 377 below.

tempted (πειρασθῆναι) by the devil."³⁵⁵ At 4:3, the devil is called the tempter (ὁ πειράζων) while at verses 1 and 11 he is called διάβολος. Incidentally, at 1 Thess. 3:5 the devil is called the tempter. The temptation is introduced by Luke at 4:1-2, which states that Jesus "was led by the Spirit for forty days in the wilderness, tempted (πειραζόμενος) by the devil." At 4:13, Luke reports "And when the devil had ended every temptation (πάντα πειρασμόν), he departed." Mark 1:13 relates that Jesus was "tempted by Satan" (πειραζόμενος). At Jesus' baptism he was declared to be the Messiah. Then immediately afterwards the Spirit led him, at his "temptation," to declare his Messiahship to the devil. Since Jesus was without sin (*non potuit peccare*), unlike sinners, he resisted the devil's temptations (*potuit non peccare*). Throughout these events, by his inauguration into public ministry by baptism and in his temptation, the Spirit's role

³⁵⁵ Carmignac, 282, maintained that the infinitive is not necessarily one of purpose (final) since generally that construction requires an articular infinitive. Here the inarticular syntax leaves open the possibility of an explanation like this: "Jesus was led into the wilderness by the Spirit and while there was tempted by the devil." Mark 1:12 and Luke 4:2 avoid the implication that God was acting with ill intent. However, cf. BDF, 197, sec. 390, and especially, 202, sec. 395; and, Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek (Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1990), sec. 381, who explained that the infinitive following a verb of motion with an end in view is similar to the usage of the classical future participle of purpose.

For the role of the Holy Spirit at the time of Jesus' temptation, see Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1981), 519, who claimed that the Spirit was the organizer of Jesus' Messianic mission. W. F. Arndt, The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956), 126, viewed Jesus' contest with the devil as one of his main tasks which the Spirit imposed.

was active in guiding Jesus to do the heavenly Father's will. Yet the Spirit was not the direct cause of Jesus' temptation.

The word *πειράζοντες* is subsequently used to refer to the testing of Jesus by various people, at Matt. 16:1 (Pharisees and Saducees), Mark 8:11 (Pharisees), and Luke 11:16 ("others"). Likewise, the same term is used of the Pharisees at Matt. 19:3 and Mark 10:2. The same verb is used of the testing of Jesus by the Pharisees and Herodians in Matt. 22:18, Mark 12:15, by the scribes and chief priests in Luke 20:23, and by a lawyer in Matt. 22:35. The notion conveyed by all these examples is that Jesus was often tempted by the various trials and questionings of his Jewish antagonists. This opposition should be understood as a kind of continuation of Satan's tempting (Luke 4:13; John 13:27). Therefore it is not surprising that Jesus commented in Luke 22:28, "You are those who have continued with me in my trials" (*πειρασμοῖς*). The temptations that Jesus experienced were diabolically motivated. Jesus considered his agony in the Garden of Gethsemane to be a spiritual struggle with temptation.³⁵⁶ It is important to remember that Jesus, the God-man, was speaking. According to his perfect divine sonship he had resolved to carry out the Father's plan for man's redemption. According to his human nature Gethsemane was the arena for a spiritual struggle to conform to the Father's will. The will of God that his people remain strong

³⁵⁶ Recall Lohmeyer, 123, who objected to this view; for him the events at Gethsemane gave rise to Jesus manifesting his resolved willingness to forge ahead into Jerusalem to die ("arise, let us be going").

in temptation is foreshadowed by the encouragement that Jesus gave to Peter, and which Luke records shortly before the Gethsemane account. At Luke 22:31, Jesus told Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren." Clearly, Satan tempts man, but he is countered by the prayer for a strong faith. Strengthening that faith is important in view of the propensity for weak human beings to deny the faith (22:34).

At Gethsemane Jesus urged in Matt. 26:41, "Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation" (ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε [variant, ἔλθητε] εἰς πειρασμόν). Mark 14:38 is identical to Matthew's wording. Both Matthew and Mark add, "the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Luke reports at 22:40, "Pray that you may not enter into temptation" (μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν). Then at Luke 22:44 a similar sentence is added, "Rise and pray that you may not enter into temptation" (ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν).

At least two conclusions can be reached from this data. First, God is not the tempter. In Gethsemane, Jesus was besieged by *satanic* temptation. He warned that his followers should be strong in withstanding this same kind of spiritual assault (cf. 1 Pet. 5:8). Secondly, the wording is nearly identical to that of the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer, except that in the latter the wording is accommodated to a

prayer petition. At Matt. 26:41, Mark 14:38, and Luke 22:46 a negative μη is even used.

In the sixth petition the verb is a common transitive form of ἔρχομαι (εἰσφέρω) used with the phrase "into temptation." An aorist subjunctive is used with μή properly serving for a negative aorist imperative, plus the phrase "into temptation." Those similarities between the Gethsemane account and the sixth petition are displayed from Matt. 26:41 and Luke 22:46, thusly:³⁵⁷

μή εἰσελθῆτε	εἰς πειρασμόν	(Gethsemane)
μή εἰσενέγκῃς	ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν	(Lord's Prayer)

Therefore, the intention of the sixth petition surely is that God's people should not enter into temptation, that is, to not succumb to it in view of human defenselessness. The words of the sixth petition are made words of Jesus' warning in Gethsemane. Through "watching and praying" God grants the strength and victory to overcome temptation. Certainly the parallels between Jesus' struggle in Gethsemane and the sixth petition are most enlightening! *Peirasmos* in the sixth petition does not refer to divine testing. What would be the logic of praying to be spared of testing, if indeed testing is designed to have a blessed outcome? The very fact of prayer *from* temptation indicates its negative quality in the

³⁵⁷ Mark 14:38 is identical except that the verbal preposition εἰς- is either present or absent, depending on the manuscript. The solitary example in the New Testament of φέρω conjugated as an aorist imperative is at John 21:9 (ἐνέγκατε); but see ἐξενέγκατε at Luke 15:22).

context of Jesus' warning at Gethsemane.³⁵⁸ The negative expression "lead us not into temptation" (μὴ...εἰς) could be put positively "lead us out of temptation" (ἐκ), although the latter would not literally reflect Jesus' warning against temptation spoken at Gethsemane, and surely at other times in his ministry.

Significant commentary on temptation occurs at 1 Cor. 10:13, which reads, "No temptation has overtaken you that is not common to man. God is faithful, and he will not let you be tempted beyond your strength, but with the temptation will also provide the way of escape (τὴν ἕκβασιν) that you may be able to endure it." This verse teaches that temptation is the common lot of man (even Jesus was tempted).³⁵⁹ God will give strength for escape from temptation that it may be endured. Because of the weakness of the human flesh, God's strength is necessary. Nor will God abandon his children in the time of need. In fact, when God's children are in danger of "going into" (εἰσέρχομαι) temptation, God will "deliver them from" (ἕκβασις, from ἐκ βαίνω) temptation! In 1 Cor. 10:13, the subject is temptation to evil rather than testing for good.

³⁵⁸ Karl Georg Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (New York: Harper, 1957), 109.

³⁵⁹ Cf. Wis. Sol. 2:24, "But through the devil's envy death entered the world"; Sir. 2:1, "My son, if you come forward to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for temptation."

The first chapter of James also speaks about this important topic. James 1:2-3 advises, "Count it all joy, my brethren, when you meet various trials (πειρασμοῖς), for you know that the testing (τὸ δοκίμιον) of your faith produces steadfastness." James continues at verses 12-14:

Blessed is the man who endures trial (πειρασμόν), for when he has stood the test (δόκιμος) he will receive the crown of life which God has promised to those who love him. Let no one say when he is tempted (πειραζόμενος), "I am tempted by God" (πειράζομαι); for God cannot be tempted with evil (ἄπειραστος ἔστιν κακῶν) and he himself tempts (πειράζει) no one; but each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire (πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος).³⁶⁰

In verses 2 and 12 "trials" or temptations (πειρασμός) are said to confront the Christian. These are considered to be a "testing" of faith which the Christian endures and by means of which he can actually be strengthened. They are testing and trials for the good "so that the person tried is found genuine," since πειρασμος is linked with δόκιμος.³⁶¹ Such probation can be beneficial (v. 3). Incidentally, at verse 12, it is not the testing that is beneficial so much as the

³⁶⁰ The similarity of James 1:12-14 with Sir. 15:11-20 should be noted; the latter reads in part: "Do not say, 'Because of the Lord I left the right way'; for he will not do what he hates (v. 11) He has not commanded any one to be ungodly, and he has not given any one permission to sin" (v. 20).

³⁶¹ Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr), 540 [on James]. Jannaris, 590, asserted that since the δοκιμάζειν word-group was not selected, the sixth petition designated the devil's temptations.

withstanding of temptation that brings the blessings of eternity. These πειρασμοί are to be accepted with joy (v. 2) and the Christian confronted by them is blessed (v. 12). An amplified paraphrase of verses 2 and 12 might read to this effect: "Temptations confront the Christian, but insofar as they are withstood, they are considered to be only trials and therefore they are welcomed with joy."³⁶² God can transform evil brought on externally into discipline and deliverance.

However, at verse 13 a different subject is presented, namely, that of temptations to evil.³⁶³ The ultimate conclusion of verses 13-14 is that God does not tempt anyone to evil. This assertion evidently was raised as a correction against those who excused themselves for yielding to temptations by shifting the blame onto God, or against those who wrongly believed that God intended to lead some into temptation. Evidently there were some who did not want the fault to rest with themselves. James asserted that God is not responsible for temptations to sin; such temptation arises from man's sinful desires and the flesh (vv. 13-14).

³⁶² C. Leslie Mitton, The Epistle of James (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 47, said, "God does allow men to be 'tested' in order that they may be 'proved'. Job was 'proved', and in a similar way Satan asked to have Peter to sift him (Luke 22:31). Our life on earth would not serve God's purpose were there no occasions by which our moral and spiritual muscles could be exercised and thereby strengthened and proved. But though God permits 'testing' He never seeks to induce man to do evil. Of that James is quite certain." This is God's permissive will.

³⁶³ Lenski, James, 540; he also said on the basis of the ὑπό that temptations do not come by nor from God, as if, like Satan, God were the actual tempter (but note the MSS var. ὑπό, at v. 13). Mitton, 46, added that the desire to be free of personal responsibility is modern ("God made me as I am; I am not responsible . . . what I do is God's fault").

God may not be blamed.³⁶⁴ The text actually does not indicate that God *designs* trials for the Christian. It maintains the complete goodness of God by the assertion that "God cannot be tempted with evil" (ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἀπειραστός ἐστὶν κακῶν).³⁶⁵ Verses 13-14 probably assume that temptations will often meet the Christian. He will not be spared of them. Therefore, he should overcome them. He should not resort to blaming God for them. That God may permit temptations is not to admit that he is the cause of them. Lenski applied this section of James to the sixth petition by concluding: "In the Lord's Prayer we ask God so to lead us by his providence as to keep us out of temptation that is too strong for us and to strengthen us in the temptation we do have to face."³⁶⁶ The verses cited from chapter one of James speak variously then both of *temptation to evil* and *testing for good*.

³⁶⁴ Mitton, 47, "It is a sad characteristic of our depraved human nature not only that it does evil, but that it seeks to evade responsibility for its evil doing."

³⁶⁵ Ibid., "God cannot be tempted with evil. Literally this could be translated, 'God is untemptable'. There is nothing in God to which evil can make its appeal. And it is impossible to think of One so wholly free from evil as being in any way directly responsible for it in another." Other possibilities, including "God is inexperienced of evil," are raised by Peter H. Davids, "The Meaning of ΑΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James I. 13," New Testament Studies 24 (1977-78): 386-92, who supports: "God ought not to be tempted" by evil men. However, it is difficult to see how his proposal can follow the passive *πειραζόμενος* (If we are tempted, God ought not be). Davids did correctly conclude that James 1:13 speaks of a personal internalization whereby sinners themselves must carry the blame for temptation rather than faulting God or the devil.

³⁶⁶ Lenski, James, 541.

Some passages speak of "testing for good"; one such passage is 1 Peter 1:6-7:

In this you rejoice, though now for a little while you may have to suffer various trials (πειρασμοῖς), so that the genuineness of your faith, more precious than gold which though perishable is tested (δοκιμαζομένου) by fire, may redound to praise and glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Here πειρασμός receives the emphasis of testing, in association with δοκίμιον. A similar interpretation is voiced at 4:12 which exhorts, "Beloved, do not be surprised at the fiery ordeal which comes upon you to prove you (πρὸς πειρασμόν ὑμῶν), as though something strange were happening to you."

Again, πειρασμός suggests testing for good. But even in this passage, God is not the source of the trials which a Christian must suffer.

Rev. 3:10 is significant insofar that it suggests a slightly different meaning for πειρασμός; that verse tells the church of Philadelphia, "Because you have kept my word of patient endurance, I will keep you from the hour of trial which is coming on the whole world, to try those who dwell upon the earth." Here the words "trial" and "to try" probably refer to coming final persecution rather than to present temptation or testing. Luke 8:13 uses the expression "time of temptation" in a similar vein. Unlike Rev. 3:10, 2:10a probably belongs in the category of intense present rather than final persecution. God does not cause this temptation.

The use of the word "temptation" in the normal sense of "being tempted to sin" occurs at Acts 5:3; 1 Cor. 7:5; Gal. 6:1; 1 Thess. 3:5; Heb. 2:18; 4:15; 2 Pet. 2:9.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the New Testament assumes that believers will be tempted to sin. Sadly, some will succumb to temptation. The sheep would be scattered (Matt. 26:31; Mark 14:27). Satan would demand to have Peter, sifting him like wheat (Luke 22:31). Peter had promised faithfulness to the Lord Jesus (Luke 22:33), although Jesus knew that he would sinfully deny him (22:34). Paul reminded Timothy that to fall into temptation was to enter into a trap (1 Tim. 6:9). Temptation is a reality of Christian life precisely because this is a world fallen into sin. God is good. He does not ordain evil. But given the evil and sin surrounding the Christian, God can utilize these for the good. With God, a potentially destructive temptation becomes merely a test, by which the believer can be purged, chastened, and strengthened (Heb. 12:3-11). God tests for good by using existing evil without himself becoming the source of evil (permissive will). God is sovereign; man is incapable of helping himself. On the basis of passages cited employing words related to temptation, often only the context helps to determine whether "testing for good" or "temptation to sin" is intended in a given passage.

In the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer, the believer asks God to exercise such sovereign power that will lead the believer to strength and victory so as to not succumb to temptation. Divine activity is further explained

at 2 Pet. 2:9: "The Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial (ῥύεσθαι ἐκ πειρασμοῦ)."³⁶⁷ Note the positive expression vis-à-vis the negative expression of the sixth petition. The sixth petition recognizes the weakness of the Christian and acknowledges the believer's total dependence on God. Temptation results from the devil, the world, and the flesh, not from God. While God can transform "temptation to evil" into becoming a "testing for good," *temptation to evil is the main topic of the sixth petition*. This is confirmed by Jesus' warning against succumbing to temptation spoken at Gethsemane (Matt. 26:41; Mark 14:38; Luke 22:40, 46). In the context of Jesus' warning at Gethsemane and in light of the similarity of its wording to the sixth petition, it is apparent that the import of the sixth petition is not temptation for good, but to pray to be led from temptation to evil. Passages such as 1 Cor. 10:13 and James 1:13-14 clearly remove responsibility from God of temptation to evil. These passages clearly reveal God's ultimate will (*opus proprium*) in this matter of avoiding temptation.

The negative prohibition of the sixth petition asks God to cause it that the believer be spared of the effect of temptation. It requests divine help. For that reason "temptation to evil" rather than "testing for good" is the primary import of the word "temptation" as it is used in the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer. Therefore, this petition asks God to lead the believer away from temptation.

³⁶⁷ Sir. 33:1, "No evil will befall the man who fears the Lord, but in trial he will deliver him again and again."

Lead Us Not

In the aorist tense the subjunctive is used following a negative prohibition, μή. For this reason the transitive form εἰσενέγκης is used in the sixth petition, a first aorist active tense of εἰσφέρω. A similar thought is carried by εἰσέλθητε, a second aorist subjunctive of the intransitive verb ἔρχομαι, in the warning against temptation at Gethsemane. Jesus' warning at Gethsemane referred to man's entering temptation, whereas in the sixth petition, divine agency and defense is requested and a "causative sense" is required, satisfied by the word εἰσφέρω.³⁶⁸ This word can be used in an active sense signifying "movement towards"; for example, Gen. 27:33 says, "Then Isaac trembled violently, and said, 'Who was it then that hunted game and brought it to me?' (καὶ εἰσενέγκας μοι)." The word is used several other times always meaning "causing to enter into," "to bring," or "to lead." Gen. 47:14 reads, "And Joseph brought (εἰσήνεγκεν) the money into Pharaoh's home."³⁶⁹ Outside of the Lord's Prayer, the New Testament employs this verb four times. Acts 17:20

³⁶⁸ Carmignac, 268-69; the verb εἰσφέρω is used as a causative of εἰσέρχομαι meaning "to cause to enter."

³⁶⁹ In the LXX εἰσφέρω is almost exclusively the rendering of *hi.* and *ho.:* *Do not cause to come in, or bring;* Konrad Weiss, "εἰσφέρω," in TDNT 9:64. See also Lohmeyer, 195, who asserted that this verb must have a causative, not a permissive force; and cf. comments in Chap. III, fn. 242, *supra*. Behind the Greek was apparently a semitic construction involving the negative with a causative *hiphil* imperative.

reads, "For you bring (εἰσφέρεις εἰς) some strange things to our ears." 1 Tim. 6:7 states, "For we brought nothing into (εἰσηγάκαμεν εἰς) this world, and we cannot take anything out of the world." Heb. 13:11 reports, "For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought (εἰσφέρεται... εἰς) into the sanctuary." Luke 12:11 advises, "And when they bring (εἰσφέρουσιν) you before (Sin., Western: εἰς) the synagogues."

Carmignac suggested that the double use of the εἰς is significant in the sixth petition (μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς εἰς πειρασμόν) since a simpler form was available: μὴ ἐνέγκῃς πειρασμῶ.³⁷⁰ The idea is suggested that the believer can actually "enter into" temptation, more than its being an occasion for discipline. To resist temptation is to escape, to flee, or go out, from it (see 1 Cor. 10:13, καὶ τὴν ἔκβασιν τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπενεγκεῖν). To pray as in Gethsemane to not enter into temptation does not simply mean, "Pray that you are not put to the test," but "Pray that you are not engulfed by it."³⁷¹ "To enter temptation" finds its antithesis in "entering the kingdom" (Matt. 5:20), or "into the joy" (Matt. 25:21), or "into glory" (Luke 24:26). The sixth petition asks for

³⁷⁰ Carmignac, 271, fn. 43. This significance may be attenuated somewhat since the Greek apparently often "feels" the need to supply or repeat the preposition already used in a compound verb. The verb carries the preposition in the preceding four examples: Acts 17:20; 1 Tim. 6:7; Heb. 13:11; and Luke 12:11 *partim*.

³⁷¹ Robinson, Twelve Studies, 62; also Carmignac, 273.

deliverance out of temptation. It is impossible not to be tempted in a sinful world (Matt. 18:7). But the sixth petition asks that the believer would not succumb to temptation. Notice that the word for temptation is inarticular. This refers, then, to temptation in general. This petition asks to be led out of the seductions which confront God's people.

The fact that man can be led spatially *into* (the place of) temptation corresponds to the idea of the trap or snare that temptation really is (1 Tim. 6:9; cf. Ps. 65:12 LXX). The εἰς lends support to the view that in the Lord's Prayer, πειρασμός is not a state or condition in which the believer is tested by God, but the spatial or conceptual place, a diabolical trap, out of which the believer asks God for deliverance, or even better, for preservation from falling victim to it in the first place! In the sixth petition, the believer does not ask God not to test him. Indeed, God can and will test for good. However, this petition is concerned about the diabolical powers surrounding the Christian that threaten him. The weak and defenseless believer must turn to God for protection and preservation. God who gives life and sustenance (fourth petition), and who forgives sin (fifth petition), is now asked to continue what he has begun by leading his children away from temptation.

Unfortunately, as previously mentioned, the wording "And lead us not into temptation" seems to imply at *first glance*, superficially, that God might desire to bring his children into temptation. However, God is not the source of

evil or ill-intent. He, the good God, does not lead his people into evil.

The negative construction of the sixth petition must be appreciated, for it has often been misunderstood.³⁷² Jean Carmignac has successfully shown that the negation syntactically belongs to the result of God's action. The real meaning of this petition would be similar to this thought: "Cause us not to go into temptation," or "cause us to stay away from temptation." The sixth petition, then, should

³⁷² Thomas Ethelbert Page, "Critical Notes on the Lord's Prayer," The Expositor, 3rd series, 7 (1888): 439-40, maintained that the seventh petition must be included with the sixth before the sixth would make any sense. By itself, the sixth petition is subject to misunderstanding (censuring God for evil), whereas the emphasis is on deliverance. Page tried to show that a similar antithetical statement appears at Luke 10:20-21 ("I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes"). Page said that if the first part stood by itself, "I thank thee . . . that thou hast hidden these things from the wise," it would not yield "tolerable sense." The seventh petition is the positive emphatic antithesis to the sixth petition. However, it seems that if this were correct, the negation should belong to the "temptation" and not to the verb. Another explanation that seeks to explain this construction is based on the figure of speech called "litotes" or hyperbole; see Donald A. Carson, The Sermon on the Mount (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978), 70. By *litotes*, the affirmative is emphatically expressed by the negative; e.g. "a citizen of no mean city" (Acts 21:38; cf. the negative "hate" in Luke 14:26 with the positive expression "love" in Matt. 10:37). A similar explanation is based on the figure of speech called "dialectical negation" (see John 12:44, or Rom. 9:13, "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated"; there, Esau is not so much hated as Jacob is preferred for the blessing). The explanations by *litotes* or dialectical negation would essentially pray, "do not bring us into temptation [which you are capable of doing] but to the contrary, take us away from it!". The figure of speech called *meiosis* also is used sometimes to explain this petition. *Meiosis* is a figure of speech leaving the intentional impression that something is less than it really is (understatement; hyperbole is "overstatement"). For the metaphorical use of language, see G. B. Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), 131-43. Ultimately, the grammatical explanation of Carmignac, 266-304, appears most satisfactory, and it does preserve the integrity and autonomy of the sixth petition without depending on the seventh petition to complete the thought.

not imply that God may want to deliver his people into sin or temptation. To the contrary, it assures that God will step in to guard the believer from succumbing to temptation. Of course, the objection can be raised that the sixth petition does not logically infer evil intent on the part of God *ipso facto* by its negative formation ("lead us not into"). It obviously professes God's absolute control. God's complete sway over creation is not doubted. But, surely its negative grammatical form is not employed merely for the purpose of emphasizing the greatness of what one confidently expects in answer to this petition. All other petitions are expressed positively and affirmatively in the Lord's Prayer.

Obviously, the negative formulation of the sixth petition conforms to the usual expressions that Jesus must have typically employed to encourage his followers to avoid temptation, as was seen earlier, for example, in connection with his recorded statements made at Gethsemane. Needless to say, since the Lord's Prayer was taught chronologically prior to Jesus' praying at Gethsemane, such language must reflect Jesus' *typical* way of expressing himself.

Granted that the negative construction of the sixth petition *need* not imply divine nefarious intent, the fact is that this difficult anomaly can best be explained grammatically, as Jean Carmignac has sought to do. Such a solution most satisfactorily explains the negative construction of this petition. Failure to understand this construction has the potential, at least, of leading to a false notion about God. Further, the grammatical difficulty encountered in the

sixth petition is somewhat overcome by the emphatic antithesis of the seventh petition. The latter prays for *deliverance from*. That fact alone should demonstrate that an attempt of overcoming a grammatical difficulty was *originally* made (even though the seventh petition stands on its own integrity as a separate petition), rather than that the sixth petition should be encouched in irony or metaphor. Hence, incidentally, many vernacular translations of the Lord's Prayer punctuate with a comma between the sixth and seventh petitions, whereas a semi-colon precedes the other "and" conjunctions. The seventh petition, separate and distinct from the sixth, is at the same time a positive restatement.

Carmignac provided several examples of the negative belonging to the effect and not to the cause, some of which are reported here.³⁷³ King David's last order to Solomon regarding the crimes of Joab was (1 Kings 2:6): "Act according to your wisdom, but do not let his gray head go down to Sheol in peace." David did not want to say, "Do not make his gray hair descend into peace in Sheol," for that would make Solomon appear caring and solicitous of an old man. David meant to say, "Make his gray hair not descend into peace in Sheol," or paraphrased, "Send him to Sheol violently" (cf. v. 9). The negation pertains to the effect, not the cause.³⁷⁴ Ps. 37:32-33 (Ps. 36 LXX) states, "The wicked watches the righteous, and seeks to slay him. The

³⁷³ Carmignac, 284-91.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 285.

Lord will not abandon him to his power, or let him be condemned when he is brought to trial." God needs to intervene to help the righteous, since he is already under the hand of condemnation. A more suitable paraphrase would be, "The Lord will declare him innocent when he is brought to trial." Ps. 119:133-134a (Ps. 118 LXX) reads, "Keep steady my steps according to thy promise, and let no iniquity get dominion over me" ($\text{לֹא יִשְׁׁרְטָהּ עֲוֹנוֹתַי וְלֹא יִשְׁׁרְטָהּ עֲוֹנוֹתַי}$, καὶ μὴ κατακυριεύσάτω μου πάσα ἄνομία). A paraphrase would bring out the meaning, "Grant that iniquity may not dominate me."

Carmignac asserted that it is a firm syntactical phenomenon in Hebrew (as well as in Aramaic and Greek) that the negative placed before a causative formation can refer to the effect and not the cause. That construction can mean "to cause that not" in place of "to not cause that."³⁷⁵ Whether or not the Lord's Prayer was originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic, the same dynamic applies, namely, that the negation applies to the result, not the cause.³⁷⁶ The form of Greek construction in the sixth petition, admittedly awkward, is a reflection of its Semitic prototype. Ps. 141:4 uses this

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 289, "Quand on examine loyalement ces 50 cas, on ne peut hésiter à conclure que c'est une loi ferme de la syntaxe hébraïque que la négation, placée devant une forme causative ou devant un complexe à sens causatif, peut porter sur l'effet seul et non pas sur la cause: c'est-à-dire signifier: 'faire que ne pas', au lieu de 'ne pas faire que'." Carmignac's ingenious explanation is reviewed in Aelred Baker, "Lead Us Not Into Temptation," New Blackfriars 52 (1971): 64-69.

³⁷⁶ See David Hill, The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible (Sheffield: Oliphants, 1972), 138, who approached this interpretation without comprehending this construction when he said that the original Aramaic was a causative with permissive force ("allow us not to enter").

construction: "Incline not my heart to any evil" (RSV). The English translation conceals a problem to which the Hebrew is open. The words $\text{לֹא תִשָּׂא לִי לֵב אֶל־עֲוֹן}$ could be translated literally: "Do not cause (*hiphil* impf.) my heart to incline to an evil thing." This leaves God open to the possibility of leading into sin. A better translation would be "Cause my heart not to incline toward an evil thing." In this case, the believer asks God's help to avoid sin.

Finally, an example can be taken from the Jewish *Morning Prayer* which asks: "Cause me to go not into the hands of sin, and not into the hands of transgression, and not into the hands of temptation, and not into the hands of dishonor" (b. *Ber.* 60b).³⁷⁷ This prayer clearly asks God for deliverance from the power of sin and temptation. The negative applies to the effect and not the cause. This prayer does not carry the implication that God would lead his people into temptation, which could be the case if the negation were associated with the verb.³⁷⁸ The prayer in

³⁷⁷ See fn. 354, *supra*. In addition to Carmignac's examples, Ex. 12:23 may be cited, "And he will not cause (*gal*) the destroyer to come to your houses to strike" ($\text{וְלֹא יִשָּׂא אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת־יְדֵי הַמְּשִׁיבִים לְפָנֵינוּ לְכַלּוֹתָנוּ}$) means "And he will cause the destroyer not to come to strike."

³⁷⁸ Carmignac's proposal was based on a suggestion made by Johannes Heller, "Sie sechste Bitte des Vaterunser," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 25 (1901): 85-93. Others have broached the idea without articulating it as well as Carmignac; see Jannaris, 588-89, "Have us not brought into temptation"; Alan Hugh McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan, 1915, 1949, 1957), 81, "Cause us not to enter"; Luther, *Small and Large Catechism*, ad loc.; Arndt, 296, "The prayer is not intended to suggest that God might take us into snares and pitfalls, but rather that He has the power to lead us safely past . . ."; Thirtle, 152, "lead us in safety, away from temptation"; acquiescing with Carmignac are Harner, 107; I. H. Marshall, 461; Jan Milic Lochman, The Lord's Prayer (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 145.

Sirach 23:1 attests to a similar construction, "do not abandon me to their [adversaries'] counsel, and let me not fall because of them" (μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης με . . . μὴ ἀφῆς με πεσεῖν). In contrast, with a positive expression Sir. 33:1 (var. 36:1) confirms the Lord's protection and deliverance of the believer from evil: "but in trial he will deliver him again and again" (ἀλλ' ἐν πειρασμῶ καὶ πάλιν ἐξελεῖται).

The sixth petition asks God to be the strength and the cause of the believer's not falling into temptation. This petition is especially necessary in light of man's weakness. E. F. Scott explained this thought: "The idea is rather that we must not presume too much on our own strength."³⁷⁹ Luther recognized this positive divine initiative in his *Large Catechism* (LC.110) when he paraphrased the sixth petition, "Grant that I do not fall because of temptation."

The beauty of this explanation is that one escapes the dilemma posed by positing that a good God causes evil.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁹ Scott, 105. Likewise, Strecker, 123: "The seemingly obvious question whether God himself causes the temptation is not raised. A reflection on the relationship of God's gracious to his wrathful being or on the theodicy problem seems as obvious as the thesis that the evil aspirations of a person from youth on produce that person's temptation and fall (cf. Gen. 8:21) . . . a person faced with the radical eschatological claim must confess his frailty."

³⁸⁰ Vicedom, 107, ably voiced this concern while providing the interpretation expressed by the position of this study: "The petition 'Lead us not into temptation' has caused distress to many a theologian. Literally it would mean that God Himself leads us into temptation, and therefore we pray that God would not do it. On the basis of the total understanding of Holy Scripture, however, the petition must not be understood as if God Himself would seduce us into sin. It is much more the case that God should stand by us in temptation and prevent us from falling prey to an alien will."

Carmignac's suggestion provides a credible solution to the difficulties associated with the sixth petition. His solution appears superior to those approaches which assume nefarious intent from God. While God will sometimes use temptations which originate in man, from the world, and from the devil, for the good of a Christian (discipline, chastening), in the sixth petition the believer clearly prays to be spared of temptation. While it is difficult to understand except from context whether a particular reference means "to test for good" or "to tempt to evil," the sixth petition obviously prays to be spared of the latter. This kind of temptation does not reflect God's permissive will; nor is its origin with God. God's will, reflected in the words of Jesus' Gethsemane admonition, is for the Christian to be on guard *against* temptation. Therefore, obviously, the onus of the sixth petition is that God deliver the believer from the harm of temptation. The grammatical solution that Carmignac proposed with which to understand the sixth petition deserves serious and judicious consideration. It is offered as a tentative explanation of the difficulties associated with the sixth petition.

The alternative to this interpretation would assume that God either acts maliciously, or at best, leads his people into temptation for good (which he does, of course). Interpreted these ways, the sixth petition would ask either to be delivered from divine opprobrium or from divine discipline. The believer would be perceived as resisting God if he would pray to be spared of divine capriciousness or

from divine probation intended for his good. Actually, God clearly exercises a positive role in preventing the Christian from consenting to temptation and in strengthening him against temptation. God's goodness is not compromised, but affirmed. This petition does not imply that God would lead his people into a snare of temptation. When temptation does come to the Christian, God can transform it into testing so that his own grace and victorious power can be manifested.³⁸¹

God will deliver the believer from temptation; in fact, this petition asks God to steer believers away from it in the first place. Since the Christian is weak, spiritual fortitude against temptation must and does come from outside himself. This external power is the *Deus extra nos* who by grace and love also becomes *Deus pro nobis*.

In conclusion, it should be readily admitted that to correctly understand the sixth petition is most difficult. However, it appears that attentuations to explain this petition by appealing to a permissive will, or to a figure of speech that is somehow metaphorically ironic, appear less than satisfactory. Such solutions may not comply with the literal words of this petition. Clearly, the Lord's Prayer does not intimate that God is less than good and perfect. God, being good, is not the direct cause of any temptation; God does not capriciously seduce people into sin. The devil, the sinful world, and the flesh, are the sources of all evil. If the believer falls into temptation, God's goodness transforms such temptations-to-evil into testing-for-good,

³⁸¹ Carmignac, 294.

with the ultimate goal of rescuing and strengthening the believer. However, if temptations occur they happen, at best, with divine permission; they are never executed by God himself. God in his infinite wisdom often deliberately employs harmful and sinful situations to become blessings. Ultimately, the petition "lead us not" implies just that, that God would take the believer away from temptation and the harm it creates. From the human point of view, testing, chastening, and scourging take on a dark appearance as if these things were caused by God; in reality, they are caused by *man's* succumbing to sinful temptation. On the other hand, from the divine point of view, God is sovereign over all things, and all that happens is ordained by him since he is in control of his creation. God occupies an absolute position over creation, sin, and Satan. The true believer is not comfortable with faulting God for trials and temptations. Rather, he sees things as they really are. The eyes of faith see what is otherwise hidden, namely, that the heavenly Father is altogether good. God earnestly desires to *lead* the believer away *from* succumbing to temptation by using any and all means at his disposal. Those who do succumb to temptation should not accuse God, but accept the responsibility themselves.

Interpretation

Unfortunately, the Greek word *πειρασμός* is susceptible of two meanings which can only be determined by context and usage: testing-for-good and temptation-to-sin. However, the

first is not the direct burden of the sixth petition. If various trials come upon the Christian through which he is disciplined, strengthened, and tested for good, then the Christian ought to welcome such difficulties and to receive them with joy. Lohmeyer correctly asserted in regard to the reference to temptation in the sixth petition, "Here, then, temptation is not a testing to strengthen men, for that sort of testing is God's gracious gift to men."³⁸²

Since the sixth petition prays to be spared of temptations, this prayer quite self-evidently prays that the believer would not succumb to all the temptations which threaten from the devil, the world, and the flesh. The believer does not pray to be spared of ordinary temptations to evil, since such temptations are the common lot of man (Matt. 18:7; 1 Cor. 10:13a; James 1:2, 12). He prays for divine strength to avoid *succumbing* to those temptations (1 Cor. 10:13b) and to be preserved from them. The cause of "temptation" in the sixth petition, as Lohmeyer wisely observed, "is not the work of God, but the work of the devil."³⁸³

The nearest parallel to the sixth petition is the word of Jesus in Gethsemane. There he urged, "Pray that you may not enter into temptation" (Luke 22:40; cf. Matt. 18:7). Jesus may have had *everyday* trials and temptations to sin in mind; these also have the potential of leading the believer

³⁸² Lohmeyer, 203.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, 204.

astray. More than likely, though, he intended the kind of temptations that could easily lead to apostasy. He had said earlier to his disciples, "You are those who have continued with me in my trials (πειρασμοῖς); and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom" (Luke 22:28-29a). The temptations of Jesus were the persecutions, dangers, mockings, revilings, rejections, and the events of his passion, which he bore without sin (Heb. 4:15). These same "temptations" would be experienced by the disciples for the sake of the kingdom of God.³⁸⁴ They could either take up their cross suffering similar reproaches and later receive the blessings of the kingdom, or they could apostasize and lose faith. By the words of the sixth petition they ask God for the strength to bear temptation for the sake of his kingdom without apostasy. This petition is a prayer to God asking that faith, and subsequently eternal life, not be lost. In a sense, Lohmeyer's assertion that the second and the sixth petitions are related is true; one may either enter the kingdom or into temptation and thus lose the kingdom.³⁸⁵

A third possibility exists for understanding the kind of temptations to which the sixth petition may refer, besides (1) everyday sins and (2) apostasy. That is (3) a future

³⁸⁴ Robert H. Smith, "History and Eschatology in Luke-Acts," Concordia Theological Monthly 29 (1958): 897, using a synonym for "temptation" (see fn. 387 below), said, "Whereas the eschatological distress (θλίψις) lay in the future from the Judaistic and Old Testament point of view, according to primitive Christianity it was already in progress. The great distress is even now upon the world, having begun with the suffering of the Messiah."

³⁸⁵ Lohmeyer, 205.

eschatological trial, based on Rev. 3:10.³⁸⁶ While the first two possibilities are comprehended within the scope of the sixth petition, the third probably is not.³⁸⁷ Sometimes the "trial" of Rev. 3:10 is cited with reference to the sixth petition. But it should be observed that the temptation of Rev. 3:10 is a particular one (articular), associated with the future eschatological tribulation near the end-time (cf. Rev. 20:7-10; Matt. 24:29; Mark 13:24; 2 Thess 2: 3-4, 9-10; 1 Pet. 4:12; 2 Pet. 2:9). The "temptation" of the sixth petition is inarticular; it refers to general temptations of the nature of everyday sins and apostasy.³⁸⁸ The Christian will always experience persecutions because of loyalty to Jesus. Incidentally, the third category of temptations outlined above are, in a way, already present. The difference between the temptations of the second and third categories (apostasy and future "trials") is only a matter of in-

³⁸⁶ The eschatological interpretation seeks to escape the dilemma posed in the sixth petition by referring it to the future end-time, from which tribulation the believer asks to be spared. This petition becomes a viaticum for that time. However, that explanation and the eschatological one in general are secondary as this study seeks to show.

³⁸⁷ This third sense is often carried by the word θλιψις. This tribulation may refer to the sufferings of the Christian before the parousia; however, it is also the word used to refer to the end-time events (2 Thess. 1:6-10; Rev. 7:14). An interesting study, beyond the scope of this paper, could be based on the semantic field of "afflictions" in the Bible.

³⁸⁸ Davis McCaughey, "Matthew 6.13A. The Sixth Petition in the Lord's Prayer," Australian Biblical Review 33 (1985): 31-40, raised objection against the translation "Save us in the time of trial" and rightly claimed that this reading should be rejected since it assumes an eschatological interpretation, to the exclusion of daily temptations and apostasy during the Gospel age.

tensity and time (cf. the "little season" of Rev. 20:3b, 7).

Two interpretations of the sixth petition are possible, the eschatological and the noneschatological. Those who prefer the former, appeal to Rev. 3:10 to substantiate their claim that the sixth petition does not relate to everyday life so much as to the future.³⁸⁹ Brown argued that "the aorist tenses do not favor the interpretation of this petition in terms of daily deliverance from temptation."³⁹⁰ He continued, ". . . we are not dealing with a question of daily temptation (which, after all, is the lot of the Christian and must be endured: James 1:2, 12) but with the final battle between God and Satan."³⁹¹ Brown defined the "final battle" as the end-time tribulation.³⁹² He asserted that "asking for preservation from the final diabolic onslaught is simply following Christ's directions."³⁹³ Lohmeyer also interpreted this petition primarily eschatologically: "The last temptation, which is to decide and has already decided the battle between God and his adversary in favour of heaven, is imminent."³⁹⁴ For him, the "temptation" of the sixth petition refers to the "final

³⁸⁹ Brown, 250. See comments at fn. 386, above.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 249.

³⁹¹ Ibid., 249-50.

³⁹² Ibid., 250.

³⁹³ Ibid., 251.

³⁹⁴ Lohmeyer, 205.

encounter between God and (the) evil (one) which ushers in God's kingdom."³⁹⁵ Lohmeyer added, "Temptation here is the attempt of the ungodly powers to obtain a final decision in the battle with God over the persons of the praying community who use the word 'we' to describe themselves. The temptation is beyond any possible human strength."³⁹⁶

Although Rev. 3:10 undoubtedly has application to future eschatological events, it is the only place in the New Testament that παρασμός refers specifically to the end-time. Further, even that verse may have application to the present life of believers before the end-time. Lenski asserted:

. . . for not the Christians were on trial but the entire empire, its clash with Christianity showing what its nature really was. 'The hour about to come' is this period which is here foretold before it actually began. The great promise given to the church in Philadelphia is that in this hour it shall be kept untouched and unharmed by the impending dangers.³⁹⁷

Clearly, it is best to avoid interpreting the sixth petition in terms of future eschatology, but to apply it to the present day temptations which Christians face.

The noneschatological interpretation of the sixth petition acknowledges the present day temptations which surround and threaten the believer. The word for temptation is anarthrous; it hardly points to one particular temptation. The inarticulate word temptation signifies temptation(s) in

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 206.

³⁹⁶ Ibid., 207.

³⁹⁷ Richard C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of Revelation (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr.), 146.

general and which are unfortunately experienced in this life. They may be both of an ordinary, every day type of temptation which can result in a loss of faith or they may result from extraordinary satanic measures designed to lead Christians to apostasy. Of course, to yield to any temptation, without repentance, results in a loss of faith. In either case, the arena for temptation is in this present world and in the lives of Christians. Believers experience temptations in the here and now. Many exhortations urge the Christian to be wary of sin; conversely, many exhortations also urge the Christian to be strong against persecution suffered on account of the Christian faith.

Because of the present reality and power of sin and the potential to temptation, the Bible urges the believer to flee sin. In his Sermon on the Mount Jesus taught obedience to the law of God summarized in Matt. 5:48, "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." In this context, Jesus taught that it would be better to pluck one's eye out than to submit to temptation (Matt. 5:29). In Jesus' explanation of the Parable of the Sower he entertained the possibility that worldly temptations may destroy faith (Mark 8:18-19; cf. Matt. 13:22; Luke 8:14): "And others are the ones sown among the thorns; they are those who hear the word, but the cares of the world, and the delight in riches, and the desire for other things, enter in and choke the word, and it proves unfruitful." Romans 6 includes several encouragements to avoid the temptation to sin:

What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? By no means! How can we who died to

sin still live in it? (vv. 1-2). We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. For he who has died is freed from sin (vv. 6-7). Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions. Do not yield yourselves to God as instruments of wickedness (vv. 12-13).

Rom. 12:9 adds, "Let love be genuine; hate what is evil, hold fast to what is good." After the paranetic call to obey the commandments of God (Rom. 13:8-10), Paul said,

Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light; let us conduct ourselves becomingly as in the day, not in reveling and drunkenness, not in debauchery and licentiousness, not in quarreling and jealousy. But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to gratify its desires (Rom. 13:11-14).

In 1 Cor. 3:16 and 6:19 Paul taught that the believer's body is the temple of the Holy Spirit; the implication projected by this image is that God's people should not yield to temptation and sin, thus defiling and destroying God's holy temple. At 1 Cor. 10:21 Paul taught that one cannot accommodate sin and at the same time commune at the Lord's table. Eph. 5:1 urges believers to forsake sin and to "walk as children of light." Phil. 2:14-15 advises, "Do all things without grumbling or questioning, that you may be blameless and innocent, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom you shine as lights in the world." Col. 3:5 urges the believer to mortify his members, "Put to death therefore what is earthly in you: fornication, impurity, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry." Paul urged Timothy to flee youthful lusts in 2 Tim. 2:22, "So shun youthful passions and aim at righteousness." 1 Pet. 4:1-2 compares cessation from

sin with the suffering of Christ, "Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought, for whoever has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin, so as to live for the rest of the time in the flesh no longer by human passions but by the will of God." Among the many passages urging the Christian to flee temptation in this life Heb. 10:26 probably should also be named: "For if we sin deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins" (see also 2 Pet. 2:20).

There are many passages which also associate temptation with suffering on account of the Gospel. Failure in this respect may lead to apostasy. Christians may expect ill treatment from the sinful world because of their faith. The temptation is to apostasize or give up. Heb. 10:32-33 refers to a common Christian experience: "But recall the former days when, after you were enlightened, you endured a hard struggle with sufferings, sometimes being publicly exposed to abuse and affliction, and sometimes being partners with those so treated." Rev. 2:10 encourages faithfulness over against the persecution that Christians will face in this life on account of their profession: "Do not fear what you are about to suffer. Behold, the devil is about to throw some of you into prison, that you may be tested, and for ten days you will have tribulation. Be faithful unto death, and I will give you the crown of life." Paul spoke of times of persecution of Christians in 2 Tim. 3:1-14; for example, in verse 12 Paul said, "Indeed all who desire to live a godly

life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted." Jesus said in the Beatitudes, "Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account" (Matt. 5:10-11). In the Lukan Parable of the Sower, Jesus explained, "And the ones on the rock are those who, when they hear the word, receive it with joy; but these have no root, they believe for a while and in time of temptation (ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ) fall away" (Luke 8:13). In the parallel at Mark 4:17 (cf. Matt. 13:21), these temptations are specifically related to suffering on account of the Gospel, ". . . when tribulation or persecution arises on account of the word, immediately they fall away" (θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται).

Paul said at Phil. 3:18 that many live as enemies of the cross of Christ. The "lawless one" will come to tempt Christians from the faith, especially near the end-time, yet certainly at all times while Christians are still living in this world (2 Thess. 2:1-11; see also the "spirit of antichrist" in 1 John 4:1-3 which is now already in the world). 1 Pet. 4:12-19 exhorts to steadfastness, for Christians will suffer for the name of Christ. Satan will even raise up false teachers to deceive the elect of God (2 Tim. 2:18; 2 Pet. 2:1). Scoffers will also be diabolically raised to tempt believers to apostasize (2 Peter 3:3-4).

Such passages convey the impression that the potential for temptation exists during the present lifetime of the Christian. John Lowe recognized this when he also applied the temptation in the sixth petition to everyday temptations and to the danger of apostasizing rather than exclusively to the "final trial":

It [peirasmos] includes every kind of hard trial and in the circumstances of late Judaism and early Christianity it refers very often to the trials of persecution with the consequent danger of apostasy. In the Lord's Prayer, if one rejects the drastic eschatological solution, it is safe to say that this wider meaning is the predominant one.³⁹⁸

The conclusion that the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer refers to the present circumstances of Christians is irresistible.

The noneschatological interpretation of the sixth petition also seriously takes into consideration sin and grace operative in this present life. Temptation to sin and apostasy have eternal consequences. The unforgiven sin of the impenitent sinner condemns eternally. The Christian is powerless against the diabolical powers which threaten him. Therefore, he turns to God in prayer for strength. God's

³⁹⁸ John Lowe, The Lord's Prayer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 47-48. Hence, the traditional vernacular wording of the sixth petition is superior to ecumenical revisions such as "Do not bring us to the test" or "Save us from the time of trial"; see Prayers We Have in Common (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 2-3, 7. Others, likewise, have favored this interpretation; see Strecker, 122, "Nonetheless, it is hardly an accident that the prayer speaks only of temptation and not the (eschatological) temptation. As with the other petitions of the second table, a purely eschatological understanding is not suggested here. Rather, the one praying has in mind all the dangers that threaten the followers of Jesus on their way and call their faith into question. Even Luke is familiar with a group of community members who only 'believe for a while and in time of temptation fall away' (Luke 8:13)."

monergistic benevolence is assumed in this petition, as with all other ones in the Lord's Prayer. The sixth petition asks God for the strength that the Christian himself does not have in order to withstand spiritual assaults and to gain the victory on the Last Day (1 Cor. 15:57). The Book of Hebrews contains this Christological claim on behalf of the believer: "For because he himself has suffered and been tempted, he is able to help those who are tempted" (Heb. 2:18; cf. 4:15-16; 5:7-9). Therefore, Jesus provides the strength and victory!³⁹⁹ Jesus endured trials and temptations as the vicarious representative of all believers. As such, his endurance imparts a soteriological value (Phil. 3:8-16).

The grace of God that is humbly received in this life will put the believer in good stead at the Last Judgment. Sadly, the grace of God can be rejected by succumbing to temptations in this life. Eternal salvation can be lost. Jesus taught the sixth petition so that Christians would be directed to the source of strength so necessary for them in time of temptation before it becomes too late (Rom. 8:31-39; Eph. 6:10-18). Jesus encouraged his people to ask God for strength against temptation (cf. Luke 11:8, 9, 13; 12:32).

³⁹⁹ Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation," 112, "Since Jesus was exposed to temptation as a man just as are his brethren, he is now able to help them when they are attacked. The difference is that Jesus passed this test of an attacked existence. The *peirasmos* did not seduce into sin. He was 'tempted in every respect just as we,' but 'without sin,' without letting the temptation reach its goal of bringing him to sin." Kuhn added, 113, "[in Gethsemane] Jesus warns the disciples to 'watch and pray'; for by so doing one can escape the *peirasmos*. He himself watched and prayed in Gethsemane." Satan was defeated by the death and resurrection of Jesus. Jesus gives strength to his people today against temptation.

Plainly, the sixth petition is oriented to the here and now of the present Gospel age. The Father's intervention on behalf of the weak and oppressed is the Good News of the Gospel that Jesus taught.

7. Our Deliverance

The seventh and last petition of the Lord's Prayer asks God for deliverance from evil. This petition is a part of the Matthean Prayer and of the version in *Didache* 8.2. It is omitted from most manuscripts of Luke's Prayer. If indeed the manuscripts that omit the seventh Lukan petition are accurate, then it is quite possible that Jesus did not always include this petition in his teaching in respect to its similarity with the sixth petition.⁴⁰⁰ There are formal similarities between the sixth and seventh petitions, as exemplified below:

6.	καὶ	μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς	ἡμᾶς	εἰς	πειρασμόν
7.	ἀλλὰ	ῥύσαι	ἡμᾶς	ἀπὸ τοῦ	πονηροῦ

A conjunction connects the seventh petition with the preceding one (ἀλλά, not καί). The verb is an aorist, as in the other Matthean petitions (first aorist, middle imperative). It should be observed that the word translated

⁴⁰⁰ Many commentators believe that the seventh petition was omitted by Luke himself. Carmignac, 317, added, "Luke's version is not falsified, just impoverished." Contrariwise, recall that Jeremias, *Lord's Prayer*, 12, favored the originality of the Lukan version. For him the seventh petition was a Matthean addition. Whether, then, the seventh petition is claimed to be a *Matthean addition to*, or *Lukan omission from* an "original" Prayer, it cannot be claimed necessarily that the verb in the seventh petition is typically Matthean (see the word study to follow).

as "evil" is articular and the preposition used is ἀπό. The petition is considered to be an apodosis to, and a positive restatement of, the sixth petition in some enumerations (for example, the Reformed tradition). In fact, it does seem to enlarge upon the preceding petition, as if to further define the meaning of the sixth petition in a specific and affirmative way, especially if the referent is to "the evil one" ("deliver us from the temptations that the tempter imposes"). On the other hand, many commentators presume that this final petition is another petition standing on its own integrity. Lohmeyer, for example, treated it as a new, separate petition, characteristic of a "rich Old Testament and Jewish tradition."⁴⁰¹ He considered the seventh petition as being authentic. It expresses positively its negative antithesis in the sixth petition, and concludes the strophe.

Compelling reasons exist for preserving this petition as separate from the previous one. One strong argument supporting the autonomy of the seventh petition rests on the presence of the conjunction. A conjunction is placed between each petition in the second strophe of the Lord's Prayer, although in this case, it is not "and" but rather "but." There are three possible ways of understanding the dialectical force of the conjunction in the seventh petition. It can either be (1) a simple adversative, or (2) a restrictive, or (3) an emphatic conjunction.⁴⁰² A simple

⁴⁰¹ Lohmeyer, 229.

⁴⁰² Carmignac, 316.

adversative conjunction contrasts a negative and positive statement. For example, in Mark 5:39 Jesus said, "The child is not dead but sleeping." A restrictive conjunction usually requires a "nevertheless" or similar expression in translation. In Mark 14:36 Jesus said, "Remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what you will." A third possibility carries the thought forward emphatically.⁴⁰³ Jesus said in John 16:2, "They will put you out of the synagogue; indeed (ἀλλ'), the hour is coming." For other possible examples of this emphatic use, see Luke 6:27; 9:25, 26; John 8:48; 13:18; 2 Cor. 11:1; Eph. 5:24; 1 Pet. 3:16. Those who understand the sixth and seventh petitions together probably favor a simple opposition of two clauses within one sentence or petition, while if these petitions are viewed separately, the latter (third) possibility is most appropriate. The seventh petition then completes the requests of the two preceding petitions as Carmignac explained,

The fifth petition implores pardon for sins already committed, the sixth implores divine assistance for resisting actual temptations, the seventh requests divine help again more strongly so that in the future we can permanently withstand the attacks of Satan secured and protected.⁴⁰⁴

If the seventh petition were really a secondary conjunctive clause belonging to the sixth petition, a simple καί would have been sufficient, or the statement could have followed

⁴⁰³ The emphatic, of course, assumes the adversative. For the emphatic use see BDF, 233, sec. 448.6; see also Moulton, Grammar, 3:330, where other examples are cited.

⁴⁰⁴ Carmignac, 317.

without any conjunction (asyndeton). Another option would have been to have employed a participial form creating a subordinate clause in the second line (seventh petition) like ῥυσόμενος or ῥούόμενος. Carmignac rightly concluded that since this alternate was not used (incidentally, nor are other more intricate participial constructions used elsewhere in the Prayer), the aorist imperative should be simply appreciated as requiring allowing the seventh petition to stand intact as a complete petition.⁴⁰⁵

Therefore the second reason for accepting the seventh petition separately is based on the verb form. Each petition of the Lord's Prayer contains one primary verb (in Matthew, all the verbs of the Lord's Prayer are in the aorist tense). The first aorist imperative ῥῦσαι demands that this petition should be understood as separate from the previous petition, even if it is an emphatic enlargement of the previous petition.⁴⁰⁶

Besides the significant conjunction and the finite verb typical of the other verbs in the Lord's Prayer, a third reason exists for understanding the seventh petition autonomously. The number seven completes the Prayer. The cipher seven is favored as a "complete" number and is used in

⁴⁰⁵ Carmignac, 315.

⁴⁰⁶ As is well known, the Reformed tradition generally combines the sixth and seventh petitions, with the result of counting six petitions in the Lord's Prayer. Calvin related the common themes of the 6th and 7th petitions this way: "proprius Satanae officium tentare" (quoted from Lohmeyer, 224; "to tempt is the proper office of Satan").

Matthew, for example, with respect to his genealogies (three series of fourteen generations); there are "seven spirits" (12:45); seven loaves (15:34, 36; 16:10); seven baskets (15:37); forgiveness should be based on a multiple of seven (18:22); there were "seven brethren" (22:25, 26, 28). The Apocalypse also is replete with septenary numerology. In contrast, numbers based on six are "incomplete" and are related to "this world"; thus, there are six days of creation; see also Rev. 6:12; 9:12, 14; 13:18 (a "human number"); 16:12. It is probable that the Matthean Prayer reflects this Semitic predilection for seven.

Carmignac demonstrated that themes contained in the Lord's Prayer were typical topics of concern from the Judaic literature of Qumran.⁴⁰⁷ This would include the subject of the seventh petition. The following passage from the Dead Sea Scrolls is especially illustrative that the seventh petition is best understood as a separate entity:

Forgive my sin, O Lord, and purify me from my iniquity. Vouchsafe me a spirit of faith and knowledge, and let me not be dishonored in ruin. Let not Satan rule over me, nor an unclean spirit; neither let pain nor the evil inclination take possession of my bones. For thou, O Lord, art my praise, and in thee do I hope all the day. Let my brothers rejoice with me and the house of my father, who are astonished by thy graciousness . . .
[] For e[ver] I will rejoice in thee [sic].⁴⁰⁸

In Jewish prayers Satan can be referred to; however, more

⁴⁰⁷ Carmignac, 315.

⁴⁰⁸ J. A. Sanders, ed., The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll (11 Q Ps^a) (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967), col. XIX, lines 13-18 (*n.b.*, the lacunae in the text quoted). The Jewish morning prayer cited in Chapter III, *supra*, corresponds in structure and theme with the seventh petition: "Deliver me from every evil thing" (b. Ber. 60b).

often the "evil inclination" (*yozer, yotzer ha-ra*) is the point of reference.⁴⁰⁹ At any rate, the seventh petition of the Lord's Prayer should confidently be considered as a separate petition and not just a complement of the preceding petition. The sum of the three "Thy petitions" of the first strophe and the four "us petitions" of the second strophe complete seven petitions within the Lord's perfect Prayer. Three petitions precede, and three follow, the central bread petition.

To Deliver

The main issue raised in connection with the seventh petition, however, is not related to the integrity of this petition but to its meaning. In short, does τοῦ πονηροῦ mean evil or the evil one? In order to investigate the meaning of the seventh petition, the usages of the key words of this petition need to be reviewed.

First, ῥύομαι meaning "deliver" is rather infrequently used in the New Testament. According to Wilhelm Kasch, it is similar to σώζω, yet with a narrower sense than to "save" but with the nuance to "deliver" or "protect."⁴¹⁰ In the Septuagint it can represent רָצַץ "to save" (*niph., hiph., hoph.*); קָדַם "to redeem"; פָּלַט (*piel*) "to bring to safety";

⁴⁰⁹ See Chase, 101-103, for a note on the "evil impulse" in Judaism.

⁴¹⁰ Wilhelm Kasch, "ῥύομαι," in TDNT 6:999.

rarely for שׁוּׁלַח "to deliver, free" (שׁוּׁלַח); לָׁצַד (*piel* "to deliver" and *niph'al* "to escape"); and several other less common Hebrew words meaning to save, guard, deliver, free.⁴¹¹

It is only employed in the New Testament seventeen times, twelve times in connection with the prepositions ἐκ or ἀπό . According to Kasch, in some of these citations the wording is dependent on the Septuagint (Matt. 27:43; Luke 1:74; Rom. 11:26; 2 Cor. 1:10; 2 Thess. 3:2; 2 Tim. 3:11; 4:17). In fact, outside the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13b) this verb only appears in any of the four Gospels twice. The one instance is in Matt. 27:43, which is a quotation from Jesus' mockers; the other is in Luke 1:74, which is a quotation from Zechariah's canticle, the "Benedictus."

Kasch saw the verb as a witness to the central teaching of Scripture, namely, that God grants salvation as deliverance from sin.⁴¹² The concept of deliverance pertaining to this word assumes not only man's sinfulness but also deliverance from the power of evil which reigns in this aeon and which assaults the believer. That is the point of Rom. 7:24 which reports, "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver (ῥύσεται) me *from* this body of death?" The answer is given in Col. 1:13-14, "He [the Father] has delivered (ἔρρύσατο) us *from* the dominion of darkness and transferred us

⁴¹¹ Ibid.

⁴¹² Ibid., 1003.

to the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν), the forgiveness of sins (τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν).” Kasch added that ῥύομαι “denotes final preservation from being snatched out of the eternal salvation which God has provided. Moreover the bearing is not just future, for eternal preservation necessarily has consequences in the present.”⁴¹³ The combination ῥύεσθαι ἀπό or ἐκ can refer to men (Rom. 15:31; 2 Thess. 3:2), powers (2 Cor. 1:10; 2 Tim. 3:11; 4:17, 18; 2 Pet. 2:9), or to Messianic deliverance (Col. 1:13; Luke 1:74; Rom. 7:24; 1 Thess. 1:10).

To arrange the verses differently the following results are obtained. In the following eight verses “deliver” is used in association with the preposition ἐκ: Luke 1:74, from the hand of enemies; Rom. 7:24, from the body of death; 2 Cor. 1:10, from so great a death; Col. 1:13, from the dominion of darkness; 1 Thess. 1:10, from wrath to come (variant: ἀπό); 2 Tim. 3:11, from persecutions and sufferings; 4:17, from the mouth of lions; 2 Pet. 2:9, from temptations (πειρασμοῦ; var. pl.). “Deliver” is used with ἀπό in the next four examples: Rom. 15:31, from unbelievers; 2 Thess. 3:2, from wicked and evil men; 2 Tim. 4:18, from every evil work (ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ); Matt. 6:13 (ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, the phrase under investigation). This information demonstrates that ἐκ is used predominantly with inanimate objects, while

⁴¹³ Ibid.

ἀπό in two of the four cases clearly refers to animate objects (Rom. 5:31, unbelievers, and 2 Thess. 3:2, evil men). However, in one case the pattern is broken, so that ἀπό clearly refers to inanimate evil (2 Tim. 4:18). Among the examples sharing the usage of ἐκ, the consistent pattern is disturbed by allowance of a variant reading at 1 Thess. 1:10; there, the deliverance from "wrath" could be associated with either ἀπό or ἐκ. Obviously, correct Greek grammar could accept either preposition. While the preponderance of current scholarship often asserts that ἀπό favors usage with a personal object, enough exceptions exist forbidding a general rule. In James 1:27, ἀπό is used with an inanimate object (the world; cf. 2 Tim. 4:18 above), and in 2 Peter 2:9, ἐκ is used with an animate object (the godly). It appears that these two prepositions under consideration are rather equal in meaning and are interchangeable. Significantly, none of the above twelve or eleven examples using ἐκ or ἀπό specifically denotes rescue from Satan, only deliverance from some other evil.

Attempts have been made to distinguish between ἐκ and ἀπό. Chase tried to show that ἐκ implied the idea of fleeing danger, while ἀπό supposed that it should be kept distant.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹⁴ Chase, 71-85. Chase advocated the meaning "evil one."

In the Lord's Prayer, according to this view, ἀπό is justified in order that a distance can be maintained between Satan and the believer. Lohmeyer contributed the thought that ἀπό more than ἐκ stresses the one who effects the deliverance (God).⁴¹⁵ It should also be shown that ἀπό in other contexts, and as used with other verbs, never intrinsically requires a personal or animate object. Simply scanning a concordance will show this. For example, see 1 Cor. 10:14 (φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας), 2 Cor. 3:18 (glory), Gal 1:1 (man), Col. 2:20 (elements), 2 Thess. 1:7 (heaven), 1 Tim. 6:10 (the faith), and so on. Likewise, ἐκ is used in John 17:15 of the devil (if πονηροῦ refers to the devil!).

In summation, the evidence is inconclusive in support of the assertion that ἀπό must require a personal animate object (the wicked one instead of wickedness), while ἐκ takes an inanimate object. Secondly, the combination "deliver from" is never used of Satan anywhere else in the Bible. Thirdly, ἀπό is used elsewhere of various inanimate objects.

⁴¹⁵ Lohmeyer, 212. Robertson, Grammar, 577-78, made the distinction that ἀπό indicates merely the general starting-point and ἐκ means "from within"; Moule, Idiom Book, 72, said this rule is generally, but not always, true. BDF leans in the direction that very little difference exists between the two prepositions in *koine*; see, 97, sec. 180; also, 87, sec. 149; 113, sec. 209; 114, sec. 211. Zerwick, sec. 89, maintained that ἀπό is used of persons, while ἐκ is used of things. If that were true, the evil in the seventh petition would be personal (the evil one); but, he concedes that the data is not entirely unambiguous.

Fourthly, while the Greek would tolerate interpreting the word *poneros* as the devil, the Semitic background would not; the latter would prefer to think only of evil in general.

The seventh petition asks God for deliverance from that which has the potential of destroying body and soul. Divine deliverance is a gracious teaching of the Bible. Ps. 22:4-8 speaks of such deliverance: "In thee our fathers trusted; they trusted, and thou didst deliver (ἐρρύσω) them. To thee they cried, and were saved 'He committed his cause to the Lord; let him deliver (ῥυσάσθω) him.'" These verses were quoted at the crucifixion of Jesus (referred to above): "'He saved others; he cannot save himself He trusts in God; let God deliver (ῥυσάσθω) him'" (Matt. 27:42-43). T. W. Manson said that God's deliverance comes as victory over, not escape from, evil.⁴¹⁶ The referent to the "evil" from which the believer asks to be delivered remains ambiguous, however.

Evil

Πονηρός, -ά, -όν may be used as an adjective meaning evil. It may also be used substantively with or without the article; the masculine case would mean an evil person or the devil (the evil one) and the neuter case would indicate an evil thing (that which is evil). The presence of the article in the seventh petition of the Lord's Prayer does not

⁴¹⁶ Manson, 446.

necessarily require that the devil is to be understood by that expression. The genitive formation in the seventh petition (τοῦ πονηροῦ) is ambiguous since the inflection of both the article and of the object of the preposition are the same in the masculine and neuter cases in Greek.

In many passages its meaning is obvious from the context. For example, Luke 6:35 obviously refers to evil people ("the selfish") when it says, "For he is kind to τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς." Whether Satan might be the referent in other cases is not clear. For example at Matt. 5:37 Jesus taught, "Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'; anything more than this comes ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ." Is this "that which is evil" or "the evil one"?⁴¹⁷ At Matt. 5:39, Jesus warned, "do not resist one who is evil" (μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ). Here a person is meant, for it would probably be an enemy, not the devil himself, who would strike one on the right cheek (v. 40). Further, the Christian should resist only the devil, not other people (James 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:8-9; Matt. 5:39). In the Parable of the Sower (Matt. 13:1-9, 18-23; Mark 4:1-9; Luke 8:4-15) Matthew 13:19 explains that it is the evil one (ὁ πονηρός) who comes to snatch away what has been sown. In Matt. 13:39 the enemy who sowed the tares among the wheat is

⁴¹⁷ Here, Lenski, *Matthew*, 239, preferred "the devil" while Günther Harder, "πονηρός, κτλ," in *TDNT* 6:561, preferred "evil" in general.

called the devil (ὁ διάβολος); in the previous verse (v. 38) the weeds (tares) are the "sons of the evil one" (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ). This strengthens the notion that in Matt. 13:19, the evil one is the devil. The parallel readings particularly confirm the idea that the evil one of Matt. 13:19 is the devil. Mark 4:15 states that the enemy is Satan and Luke 8:12 claims that it is the devil (ὁ διάβολος) that takes away the word of God. The Parable of the Sower, then, may represent the most indisputable evidence in the Bible for the expression ὁ πονηρός to mean the devil. In the same chapter, in the Parable of the Dragnet, the τοὺς πονηροὺς are evil people (Matt. 13:49).

In John 17:15 Jesus prayed that God's people might not be taken from the world but kept ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. This is the only place in John's Gospel that πονηρ- might mean the devil; elsewhere John's Gospel prefers to use other terms for this evil foe: devil, 6:70; 8:44; 13:2; ruler of this world, 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; Satan, 13:27; son of perdition (Judas), 17:12.

Rom. 12:9 employs a substantivized neuter noun with the definite article, "Hate what is evil" (τὸν πονηρόν). The word in 1 Cor. 5:13 in context probably refers to a wicked person, employing a substantivized masculine noun with the definite article (τὸν πονηρόν). In Eph. 6:16, the believer is warned of

the "fiery darts of the evil one" (τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ). Since the devil is mentioned earlier (vv. 11-12), this reference is probably to the devil as the "evil one." In 2 Thess. 3:2, Paul prays that his company be delivered from wicked and evil men (ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ . . . πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων), while in the next verse (v. 3) Paul promises that God will guard them from evil (φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ). This "evil" is the result of the actions of evil men. While it may be conceded that the devil may be intended by verse 3, from the context "evil," or "evil men," is probably intended.⁴¹⁸ On the other hand it is possible, of course, to conclude that the devil or evil one was actually intended by verse 3. In 2 Thessalonians 2, the devil is certainly involved in a final rebellion. He will support the "lawless one" (v. 3), the son of perdition (v. 3), and at verse 9 Satan will be the foe of God. For Paul to promise in 2 Thess. 3:3 that God would guard the Thessalonians from the "evil one" would make sense. However, in view of its more immediate context, the reference made in 2 Thess. 3:3 is probably best taken as "evil" since at the previous verse, Paul had reported suffering the evil of opposing men and shameful treatment at Philippi.

⁴¹⁸ It should be observed that this phrase in 2 Thess. 3:3, ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, is the only prepositional phrase in the New Testament identical to the seventh petition. Harder, *ibid.*, stated that Paul may have actually preferred ῥύσεται there, but worded it differently for the sake of variety, since ῥύομαι was already used in the previous verse. A similar verse, even employing the same verb root, is 2 Tim. 4:18, which however is amplified by the words "every work." If this were so, the similarity of this verse to the seventh petition would even be greater. 2 Tim. 4:18 defines the evil as neuter by the adjective "every." See below for more on 2 Tim. 4:18.

2 Tim. 4:18 also is similar to the seventh petition. In fact, because this verse concludes with a doxology similar to that of the conclusion in the "Majority Text" of the Matthean Lord's Prayer, many commentators have maintained that Paul had the Lord's Prayer in mind as he concluded this second epistle to Timothy.⁴¹⁹ Here Paul confessed that "The Lord will rescue me from every evil [work] (ρύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ) and save me for his heavenly kingdom. To him be the glory for ever and ever. Amen." Obviously "evil" in general is meant since the "evil" is associated with "every work" and the context shows that Paul had been speaking of deliverance from such evils as even that of lions (v. 17). Owing to the similarity of 2 Tim. 4:18 with the seventh petition and conclusion of the Lord's Prayer, it would be legitimate to conclude that this verse serves as a commentary on the Lord's Prayer. The adjective in 2 Tim. 4:18 authorizes one to understand the object of the preposition in the seventh petition as a neuter. Note that the *Didache* understood the seventh petition in the same way.⁴²⁰

In 1 John 2:13-14 τὸν πονηρόν occurs twice. The context speaks of overcoming evil (1:7; 2:1, 7, 12, 29). On the other hand, warnings against the antichrist are made in 2:18, 22, 26. The intimate connection between evil and the evil

⁴¹⁹ Chase, 114; this observation is strengthened if the verse were to begin with a conjunction (καί), as many MSS attest!

⁴²⁰ *Didache* 10.5, τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτήν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ.

one is described in 3:8, 10. Verse 8 says, "He who commits sin is of the devil; for the devil has sinned from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil." Probably 1 John 2:13-14 should be understood as the evil one, the cause and source of all evil. 1 John 3:12 describes Cain "who was of of the evil one (ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ) and murdered his brother."⁴²¹ Here again, it may be best to translate "evil one." Less clear is 1 John 5:19 which describes the whole world as lying ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ.

These examples illustrate how difficult it is to decide clearly for "evil" or "evil one" in a given passage. Usage and context are important for determining meaning. It is a New Testament peculiarity that ὁ πονηρός can be used to denote the devil.⁴²² Carmignac proposed *harasha* as the underlying Hebrew equivalent, where the article distinguishes *rasha* from *resha*, evil in general.⁴²³

The nearest equivalents to the seventh petition taken from the Old Testament make reference to evil in general, not

⁴²¹ For this partitive use of ἐκ, see BAG, sec. 234.3.a, to denote origin through begetting. The prepositional phrase in 1 John 3:12 is identical to that of John 17:15, "I do not pray that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that you shouldst keep them *from the evil one.*"

⁴²² In contrast, Harder, 550, claimed that in Hebrew *hara* (the evil) is not used of Satan but only of *men* who are the wicked, or of evil in general.

⁴²³ Carmignac, 310. For him, the seventh petition refers to the devil (qu'il s'agissait de l'être pervers par excellence, le démon).

to the evil one.⁴²⁴ David Hill summarized this tendency and drew a worthwhile conclusion: "Since neither Hebrew nor Aramaic uses 'the evil (one)' to denote Satan, it is probably better to regard the word as neuter and the 'evil' as being that evil, either spiritual or moral, which may befall men in this present time."⁴²⁵ Some examples are provided. In Gen. 48:6 God's angel is called "He who has redeemed me from all evil" (ὁ ρυόμενός με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν). Prov. 2:11-12 avers, "Discretion will watch over you; understanding will guard you; delivering you from the way of evil" (ρύσηταί σε ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ κακῆς). Ps. 121:7 (Ps. 120 LXX) refers to generic evil (יְהִי־לִי־מִן־כָּל־עֲוֹן, ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ). Lohmeyer pointed out that in the Old Testament, evil always means the sum of evil deeds, but in the New Testament, the abstract concept "the evil" is stressed.⁴²⁶ David Flusser concluded that Judaism usually made less reference to the devil as a personal being, but thought more of sin and evil in general which had the potential of tempting the believer and of leading to perdition. For him, temptation was part of the present experience of the believer living in a world under the sway

⁴²⁴ Matthew Black, "The Doxology to the *Pater Noster* with a Note on Matthew 6.13B," in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes*, FS, ed. Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 100), 333-36, was only cautiously willing to accept the possibility that the devil might be the "evil one" on the basis of Dead Sea Scroll discoveries; similarly, Schürer, 2:525-54.

⁴²⁵ Hill, 139.

⁴²⁶ Lohmeyer, 210-211.

of evil (of course, all evil is ultimately derived from Satan). Therefore, he wrote: "In the light of this evidence for ideas and connotations in prayers as quoted in our discourse we have to reject any attempt to read into the last phrase of the Lord's Prayer any eschatological meaning."⁴²⁷

Several observations may be made from the data presented above. First, the combination of ῥύομαι with a preposition always refers elsewhere in the New Testament to rescue from evil or evil men, not from the devil. Second, the two passages in which the combination απο του πονηρου occurs refer to evil in general (2 Thess. 3:3; 2 Tim. 4:18).⁴²⁸ The general meaning of evil is less secure in the case of the two εκ του πονηρου combinations in Matt. 5:37 and John 17:15. Third, masculine articular forms of πονηρ- do not necessarily require the translation "the evil one." Either the devil or evil men could be meant. Context and usage must be factored in. At Matt. 5:39 and 1 Cor. 5:13, for example, where the inflections are identical in masculine

⁴²⁷ David Flusser, "Qumrân and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," Israel Exploration Journal 16 (1966): 203.

⁴²⁸ An expression similar to 2 Tim. 4:18 is used at 1 Thess. 5:22, απο παντος ειδους πονηρου ἀπέχεσθε. Here, evil is clearly meant, both because of the adjective which would not be used of Satan, and in contrast to the previous verse which says, "Hold fast what is good." The "good" is a substantive, τὸ καλόν. Therefore πονηροῦ here undoubtedly should be taken as having an anarthrous quality, "what is wicked." Paul urged his hearers to flee the appearance of evil in connection with the *Parousia*. Lenski stated [First Thessalonians] that this condition applies to the believer in this lifetime prior to the End, in idem, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and to Philemon (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 repr.), 365.

and neuter forms, both articular masculine nouns clearly refer to persons. It should be granted that in the seventh petition one would not pray to be rescued from the evil man; that would be nonsensical. But, the presence of the article does not necessarily demand translating τὸν πονηρόν as the "evil one." On purely linguistic grounds the expression could mean that which is evil, the evil man, or the evil one. "That which is evil" is the least ambiguous. Fourth, there are at least four examples in the New Testament which employ the neuter to refer to that which is evil. Their neuter definite articles permit no doubt about the form. Rom. 12:9 says, "Hate what is evil" (τὸ πονηρόν). Luke 6:45 reports, ". . . and the evil man out of his evil treasure produces evil" (τὸ πονηρόν). Matt. 12:35 is similar, ". . . and the evil man out of his evil treasure brings forth evil" ([τὰ] πονηρά).⁴²⁹ Mark 7:23 says, "All these evil things (τὰ πονηρά) come from within, and they defile a man." Therefore, it is possible and even very likely that the form τοῦ πονηροῦ is a neuter, broadly describing all that which is evil.

Latin Christianity, except Tertullian, usually preferred the neuter, evil in general.⁴³⁰ Eastern

⁴²⁹ The article felt to be necessary is supplied in some MSS; see the same form in Mark 7:23 as cited.

⁴³⁰ The fact that Latin lacks a definite article may have contributed to this view; viz., "libera nos a malo." Lochman, 152-53, pointed out that this predilection conforms to the Western Anselmian view of redemption as *satisfactio*, contra the classic "Christus victor" theme.

Christianity usually preferred the masculine "evil one."⁴³¹

The outlook of the New Testament in regard to deliverance from evil is one whereby the believer's enemies are moral and spiritual (whether evil or the evil one). The New Testament is not so concerned about deliverance from political or bodily evil (Acts 1:6).⁴³²

A comparison of πονηρ- with a common synonym κακ- may illustrate the particular force of the word. According to E. Achilles there is no difference in meanings between these two roots: "It is impossible to show any difference between these two terms. Both are used even for the personification of evil in the devil or men."⁴³³ But is this really true? A fine shade of meaning does appear to belong inherently to these two separate words. Κακ- is often the evil that is opposite of good, usually having neutral, amoral, behavioral, or even forensic connotations. Πονηρ- is oriented toward an antithesis to God, tending to be a more theological and ontological expression possessing moral and personal overtones.

Κακ- denotes that which is devoid of good. Pilate asked

⁴³¹ Lohmeyer, 217. See previous fn., and Chap. II, fn. 244.

⁴³² Carmignac, 306.

⁴³³ E. Achilles, "Evil, Bad, Wickedness," in The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 2:561. On the other hand, Lemuel S. Potwin, "Further on τοῦ πονηροῦ in the Lord's Prayer," Bibliotheca Sacra 48 (1891): 686-91, regarded the meaning in the seventh petition as being "evil." He pointed out that a word like κακός was available, but since it was not used, the nuance "diabolical" must have been required. Only πονηρόν could provide the sense of diabolical evilness.

the crowd about Jesus, "Why, what *evil* has he done?" (Matt. 27:23; Mark 15:14; Luke 23:22; cf. Acts 23:9). Pilate was inquiring whether Jesus' behavior warranted crucifixion as a criminal. Paul asked a rhetorical question in Rom. 3:8, "And why not do *evil* that good may come?" Here he was hypothetically speaking of acting wrongly. In Rom. 7:19 Paul juxtaposed evil and good, "For I do not do the good I want, but the *evil* I do not want is what I do." In Rom. 9:11 Jacob and Esau had not yet been born and had done no good or *bad* (κακόν in the Western text, Byzantine, et al.). Rom. 13:3 says, "Rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to *bad*." Generic evil is spoken of in 1 Tim. 6:10, "The love of money is the root of all *evil*" (τῶν κακῶν). In James 1:3, "God cannot be tempted with *evil*," or better, "God is unacquainted with κακῶν," for this quality does not belong to him! Evil as a quality antithetical to general goodness is mentioned at 1 Pet. 3:11.

On the other hand, πονηρ- often carries the notion of evil which stems from the fallen world and its leader, the devil, in antithesis to God and his will. In Matthew's Gospel this is patent. At 5:37 (" . . . anything more than this comes from evil"), whether ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ means evil or the evil one, the idea suggested is one of unfaith and even challenge against God. The Christian is to not resist "one who is evil" (5:39) for this evil is the Christian's enemy which attacks him precisely on account of his Christian

faith. This is not just the lack of good. In 5:45 God makes his sun to shine on the evil and the good; here again, the context shows that the good are sons of the Father in heaven and the evil are the enemies who persecute Christians (5:44), but whom nevertheless should be loved in the same way that God also blesses them. In 6:23 (cf. Luke 11:34), one can have an evil eye, that is, one can have an evil nature, not just a bad eye.⁴³⁴ Jesus spoke of this generation as being evil, that is, as having a disposition of rebellion against God (12:39). Evil proceeds from a sinful heart (15:19) and therefore is more than just "badness," but being base to the core. This quality of corruption and rebellion against God, deeper than simply a moral defect, is mentioned or alluded to elsewhere: Luke 7:21 (evil spirits); 11:13, 29; John 3:19 (the deeds of the natural man are evil); Gal. 1:4 (the present world is evil); Eph. 5:16 (the days are evil); 2 Tim. 3:13 (evil men will increase near the end); 1 John 3:12 (works of the natural man are evil). It should fair to conclude that the evil associated with *πονηρ*- is antithetical to God and his people. It is the evil that condemns the sinner and, particularly, threatens the believer and imperils faith. It is the activity of the adversary of God lashing against God's will. It is *temptation* seeking the downfall of the believer. Christians will pray to be kept from the destructive power and influence of Satan. *Πονηρ*- then is

⁴³⁴ For the expression "an evil eye" for an "evil nature" in Judaism, see Harder, 555.

diabolical evil.

Interpretation

It is impossible to decide definitely whether πονηροῦ in the seventh petition should be an impersonal neuter gender ("evil"), or a personal masculine ("evil one").

Indeed, Satan is treated as a personal being in the New Testament. This is evident in the temptation accounts of Jesus in the wilderness. There the devil (Matt. 4:1), also called the tempter (4:2), personally confronted Jesus (Matt. 4:1-11; Mark 1:12-13; Luke 4:1-13).⁴³⁵ While engaged in his great Galilean ministry Jesus drove out demons, who at times spoke to Jesus and to whom Jesus replied (Matt. 8:28-34; 17:18; Mark 1:23-34, 39; 3:7-12; 5:1-20; 9:14-29; Luke 8:26-39; 9:37-43). Jesus defined his ministry in terms of conflict with and victory over Satan (Matt. 12:22-37; Mark 3:20-30; Luke 10:17-20; 11:14-23). After the great Petrine confession at Caesarea Philippi Jesus confronted Satan and the personal temptation not to commence entering the passion (Matt. 16:23; Mark 8:33; Luke 9:22-27). In fact, the plot to kill Jesus, his passion, and crucifixion were all a result of the direct intervention of Satan (Luke 22:3, 53; John 12:31). In the life and ministry of Jesus, Satan was considered a personal being, whom Jesus rebuked and renounced. This was for the sake of believers, that they might share in his

⁴³⁵ Chase, 104-105, who devoted the major part of his study of the Lord's Prayer to this petition (pages 71-167) believed the evil one was intended in the seventh petition since the Lord's Prayer reflects Jesus' temptation and entire lifetime of conflict with Satan.

victory against that old adversary, the enemy of God and man (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24-26).

Several considerations point in the direction that evil in general is the preferred interpretation belonging to the seventh petition in spite of the truth and reality of the devil's existence. First, several common terms for the devil were available and used by Jesus, but which were not employed in the Matthean Lord's Prayer. For example, Jesus used the word "devil" at Matt. 13:39; 25:41; Luke 8:12. The devil is named Satan in Matt. 4:10; 12:26; 16:23; Mark 3:23, 26; 4:15; 8:33; Luke 10:18; 11:18; 13:16; 22:31. In fact the only places in the synoptic Gospels that *πονηρός* unequivocally refers to the devil is Matt. 13:19 and 38. Undoubtedly Jesus did accept the Jewish view that Satan was a personal being. The wording of the seventh petition, however, does not seem to encourage a personal interpretation of that word there.

Second, usage supports the more general interpretation as evil. This is particularly true with Judaism, as reported earlier. Jewish thought applied the idea of evil to a variety of situations that could bring harm or sin. But there are no examples which use such an expression as the "evil one." Conformity to Jewish usage and background would suggest that Jesus probably meant "evil" in the seventh petition. In a more general way, the prevalent use of the root *πονηρ*- in the New Testament requires understanding it as "evil" rather than "evil one." In several examples assertions are tenuous that accept a translation of "evil

one." "Evil" is a broader term, easily expressing the things from which the seventh petition asks deliverance. Of course, all evil ultimately stems from the devil.

Third, on account of the parallelism between the sixth and seventh petitions, their objects would be expected to correspond. In the sixth petition temptation is a "thing." The corresponding object in the seventh petition therefore should also be a substantive instead of a personal being.⁴³⁶

Fourth, early evidence supports this broader view. The *Didache* understood the seventh petition this way. Sometimes a nonliterary document is cited to lend support to the interpretation "evil." An Egyptian amulet changed the τοῦ πονηροῦ of the seventh petition to τῆς πονηρίας in order to resolve the ambivalence.⁴³⁷ Πονηρία means "evilness" (not "that which is evil"). Admittedly, this archaeological discovery is not early (dated the sixth century A.D.). But it does corroborate early Christian interpretation like the *Didache*. Further, the whole Latin tradition should not be

⁴³⁶ Scott, 108, used this argument. He pointed out that the sixth petition did not pray for deliverance from "the Tempter" but from temptation, and therefore the seventh prays for rescue from evil, not "the evil one." Jannaris, 589, agreed to this principle which he extensively developed. He demonstrated that the two objects of the two petitions should be similar, not mixed. For example, one could say "Lead us not to the Yankee, but deliver us from the American." It would be foolish to say, "Lead us not into the Turk, but deliver us from the French." However, it should be noted that Jannaris himself viewed the object of the sixth petition to be "the Tempter" and consequently that of the seventh to be "the evil one." Jannaris was at least loyal to the principle he defended!

⁴³⁷ See Lohmeyer, 209.

ignored which has rather consistently taken the word as a neuter.

Fifth, linguistic usage favors the general interpretation. As aforesaid, the combination of ῥύομαι with a preposition always refers to *deliverance from* evil things or evil men, but not from the evil one. That would then be the case with the combination ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ also.

In addition to these "exegetical" and literary reasons favoring the term as having a general meaning of evil, John Burgon added these reasons: (1) Unless clearly compelled otherwise, the broader meaning should stand; (2) the historic baptismal liturgy renounces the devil's works ("pomps"); (3) Jesus would surely not have given prominence to the adversary by naming him in so holy and brief a prayer.⁴³⁸

Whether πονηρ- is masculine or neuter does not make a material difference in the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer.⁴³⁹ In fact, the phrase is capable of a double meaning, namely, that in the Lord's Prayer the seventh petition asks God for deliverance from (1) diabolical evil, whose origin is (2) the "evil one." Satan's activity is manifested by all kinds of evil. The neuter πονηρόν can certainly represent the embodiment of all kinds of evil, yet

⁴³⁸ John William Burgon, The Revision Revised (London: Murray, 1883), 214-16.

⁴³⁹ Lohmeyer, 217, would disagree, preferring the masculine. Chief support for the masculine includes (1) the presence of the definite article, and (2) the fact that the final word of the Lord's Prayer may contrast with its first word (πατήρ and πονηρός [?]).

it does not carry the harshness and partake of the impropriety of calling the adversary by name in so holy a prayer as that taught by Jesus. Believers will always be under the assault of Satan precisely because they follow Jesus as Lord and Savior. As he was persecuted, so also will his followers be persecuted (Matt. 10:16-26, 34-42; 12:41; Mark 13:9-13; Luke 11:32; 12:4-12; 21:12-19). This term used in the seventh petition then inherently reflects both cause and result. To retain the translation "evil" is preferable and correctly embraces all forms of diabolical evil. Since the Lord's Prayer addresses daily needs of the Christian, and the variety of evils experienced each day are frequent, regular, and always intended to wage assault on the believer's relationship with God, "evil" would be the more comprehensive term.

However, "evil" must not be understood as evil "in general" (κακ-) but as *diabolical evil* capable of causing the believer to fail to enter God's kingdom. It is "evil with a purpose"; it is evil personified. It is a real enemy. The "evil" of the seventh petition is a hostile and diabolical force bent on the Christian's eternal ruin. The seventh petition does not ask God to vanquish Satan; it prays that the believer be delivered from the devil's evil.

Two interpretations are possible for the seventh petition. They are the eschatological and the noneschatological views. The eschatological approach of the seventh petition is usually connected with the eschatology of the sixth petition. Such an interpretation asks for deliverance

from the final Satanic assault on Christians near the consummation (at the time of "trial"). Lohmeyer explained the seventh petition this way: "Now if the sixth petition refers to eschatological temptation, the last onslaught and the final defeat of the devil, there is little doubt that the seventh petition similarly speaks personally of this 'evil one'."⁴⁴⁰ He also expressed the typical future eschatological interpretation: "But here, as in all the other petitions, the imperative is in the aorist; it does not mean a constantly renewed testing through life, but a final deliverance, once and for all."⁴⁴¹

It is characteristic of the eschatological interpretation to understand the τοῦ πονηροῦ personally of Satan. Brown explained this connection: "Yet, once we realize that *peirasmos* means the final trial brought on by Satan's attack, a personal interpretation of *poneros* is most fitting."⁴⁴² Brown cited several instances from the New Testament which in his estimation demand a personal interpretation resulting in the "evil one." He admitted, however, that some of his conclusions could be challenged.⁴⁴³

It is true that believers must be ready for the final eschatological assault and unleashing of Satan (Rev. 20:3,

⁴⁴⁰ Lohmeyer, 216.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., 226.

⁴⁴² Brown, 252.

⁴⁴³ Ibid.

7-10). The eschatological interpretation implores the use of the aorist. It views the seventh petition as a request for a single, final vindication of God's people on the Last Day. The deliverance, then, would not be regular and daily, but final and complete. The opponent of God, Satan or the "evil one," would finally lose the battle against God. This prayer would seek God's protection for believers in the final struggles connected with the end-times. Part of the final struggle includes the coming of the Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:2-10). Believers will most assuredly be tested during those dark final days (Matt. 24:42-44; Luke 12:39-40; 1 Thess. 5:3-5). Jesus commended his followers to watchfulness for those days (Matt. 24:15-2). Some of those teachings were proleptic, to be sure. They referred to the final eschatological account in a way that also could be prophetically applied to the imminent destruction of Jerusalem and also to persecutions ensuing after Pentecost (for example, Matt. 24:20, "Pray that your flight may not be in winter or on a sabbath!"). Certainly, the reality of future eschatological evil confronting true believers can be embraced by the seventh petition.

However, that is not its only interpretation. The characteristic of the aorist with its sense of *Einmaligkeit* is not decisive for interpreting the seventh petition. The aorist imperative is also a prayer tense. The Christian living in the present age knows that diabolical assaults confront him every day. The interpretation of the seventh petition for the here and now addresses his real needs. The

Lord's Prayer is prayed by the true believer who recognizes the true diabolical nature of evil surrounding him. He will certainly be threatened now, in time, in his life experience. In Jesus' Olivet discourse, believers were urged to remain faithful, "Take heed that no one leads you astray" (Matt. 24:4). Jesus mentioned various forms of evil with which Christians would be acquainted: false prophets, rumors of war, national unrest, famines, earthquakes, tribulation, martyrdom, hatred from the world, apostasy, growth of wickedness (Matt. 24:5-12). Then in that same discourse, Jesus added words of encouragement for those who would be living their lives during these difficult times, "But he who endures to the end will be saved (24:13; cf. Rev. 2:10).

Paul attested to having experienced suffering on account of the Gospel and divine deliverance. In 2 Tim. 3:11, Paul spoke of his persecution and sufferings and added, "yet from them all the Lord rescued me" (ἐκ πάντων με ἔρρυσάτο). Jesus urged that his people should always be prepared (24:42). Jesus also taught that believers must abide in this world, doing God's service, until the end should come. The Parable of the Talents is presented in the context of these teachings about the Last Days (Matt. 25:14-30). Doing God's will and engaging in his service before the end comes includes feeding the hungry and visiting the needy, for this kind of service is defined as being true service (worship/liturgy) rendered to God himself (Matt. 25:40; Rom. 12:1-2). The time of the Gospel is the day of salvation (2 Cor. 6:2). Now is when the Gospel is preached and God's

salvation is being established through his word (Mark 13:10). The Lesson of the Fig Tree points to present conditions as much as to the future (Mark 13:28-30).

Some of the evil experienced by Christians will come through rejection of close family members (Matt. 13:12; Luke 21:16). Jesus knew that Jerusalem would be destroyed as one of the first evils to be experienced shortly after his days (Matt. 21:20-24; 24:15-28; Mark 13:14-23; Luke 21:20-24). Indeed, Jerusalem's destruction is an undeniable historical fact, having occurred in A.D. 70 and again with utter finality in the year 135. This, as all other events of which Jesus prophesied, happened or will take place during the "times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24).

This so-called time of the Gentiles, also variously called the Gospel age, the Messianic age, the New Testament era, began with events associated with Christ's first advent and the subsequent establishment of his church. This present age will continue until the Second Advent of Jesus. Between these two events, God's people live, experiencing the harsh realities of every day living "under the cross" (Matt. 10:38; 16:24; Mark 8:34; 10:21; Luke 9:23; 14:27).⁴⁴⁴ The devil aims at seducing the Christian to apostasy.

The Christian's greatest resource for strength is prayer. By the seventh petition, he prays now "But deliver us from evil." Then the assurance is realized: "He has

⁴⁴⁴ It is possible to develop the theme that the noneschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer relates to Luther's "theology of the cross" while the eschatological relates to a "theology of glory."

delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Col. 1:13). Jesus has delivered "us from the present evil age" (Gal. 1:4). 2 Pet. 2:9 asserts, "Then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial/temptation" (ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι). The seventh petition asks for deliverance from such temptation and evil that ultimately could threaten salvation. The final deliverance will be from death. This deliverance is viewed as a blessing insofar that the believer will be removed from all the evils experienced in the present world. Paul said at 1 Cor. 15:24-26:

Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death.

As with the other petitions, the pronominal direct object "us" (accusative plural) encompasses all believers. The individual praying does not pray alone, nor selfishly, but for his immediate needs as well as for those of the whole Christian assembly. His prayers are intercessory; they include fellow believers, for all have one Father in heaven.

A certain formal balance or direction of thought can be detected with regard to the first and last petitions of the Lord's Prayer. The first petition speaks of God's supreme glory and the last concludes with the effect of his supreme adversary.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁵ Lohmeyer, 229.

The interpretation that emphasizes the here and now takes seriously the reality of a sinful world in which Christians live and does justice to the teachings of the New Testament, urging faithfulness and endurance until the end. The Christian's need for divine deliverance is incumbent for the here and now of his earthly pilgrimage.

The Conclusion

Some Biblical manuscripts attest to a conclusion of the Matthean Lord's Prayer. No legitimate manuscript evidence exists for a final conclusion in the Lukan Lord's Prayer. Generally the addition of the conclusion is explained as a liturgical amplification based on the fact that in the Greek church, after the choir said the words "But deliver us from evil" the priest would respond with the "doxology." Copyists then began adding the words to their manuscripts because they believed the additional words spoken in the liturgy belonged to the original text.⁴⁴⁶ The Eastern Church generally preserved this doxology. On the other hand, Western Christianity before the Reformation generally seldom used the conclusion, since their Biblical texts such as the various Old Latin, *Itala*, and later Vulgate did not include it. The Reformers and the humanists such as Erasmus who introduced a popular edited Greek text by 1516, professing fidelity to Scripture, attached importance to the Greek text. The Greek texts that were accessible then usually included the

⁴⁴⁶ Carmignac, 322.

conclusion.⁴⁴⁷ Most printed editions were of the Byzantine or Majority Text type at that time.

The Reformers were anxious to return to the use of the original languages. Retention of the doxological termination of the Lord's Prayer was viewed as loyalty to Scripture.⁴⁴⁸ Eventually the difference between including and using the conclusion became a confessional matter. Protestants used the doxology and Roman Catholics did not.⁴⁴⁹

The Question of Authenticity

After the introduction of modern methods of textual study, it was observed that the conclusion was rather poorly attested in extant manuscripts. Generally speaking, scholarship has adjudged the conclusion to be inauthentic.

It would be appropriate and helpful to list some of the arguments favorable for the authenticity of the conclusion which Carmignac has prepared.⁴⁵⁰

1. *Didache* 8.2 provides a two member-doxology, nearly identical with the Matthean Lord's Prayer. The first member, "kingdom," is omitted, although reference is made to the kingdom in the explication at 10.5. This witness is important owing to its antiquity. It may be dated as early

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 323.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁹ Carmignac, 236-27; Lochman, 162.

⁴⁵⁰ Carmignac, 327-28.

as A.D. 100.⁴⁵¹

2. The witness of the early versions, especially the Syrian tradition.⁴⁵²

3. The testimony of Chrysostom and other Greek fathers.

4. The attestation of a number of manuscripts dated from the fourth and fifth centuries.

5. The Biblical nature of the doxology which is probably based on 1 Chron. 29:10-11 from David's prayer near his death, in which similar terms are explicitly used:⁴⁵³

Blessed art thou, O Lord, the God of Israel our father, for ever and ever ($\overline{\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \overline{\kappa}\alpha\iota\ \overline{\alpha}\iota\omega\upsilon\varsigma}$, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος). Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power ($\overline{\delta}\overline{\upsilon}\overline{\nu}\overline{\alpha}\overline{\mu}\overline{\iota}\overline{\varsigma}$, δύναμις), and the glory ($\overline{\kappa}\overline{\alpha}\overline{\upsilon}\overline{\chi}\overline{\eta}\overline{\mu}\overline{\alpha}$, καύχημα), and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heavens and in the earth (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) is thine; thine is the kingdom ($\overline{\beta}\overline{\alpha}\overline{\sigma}\overline{\iota}\overline{\lambda}\overline{\epsilon}\overline{\iota}\overline{\alpha}$), O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all.

6. The example of 2 Tim. 4:18, which is similar to the

⁴⁵¹ It should be noted that the pronoun in the conclusion of the *Didache* is a genitive, which may attest to its authenticity. If the conclusion at 8.2 were a later interpolation, the one at 10.5 was made to agree, for there the genitive is used again. The evidence suggests that the conclusion at 8.2 was not an interpolation, but original. J. A. T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament (London: SCM, 1976), 327, cited reasons for a date as early as A.D. 60 on the presumption of the completion of the New Testament canon prior to A.D. 70, and its early collaborative support for the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer. Bo Reicke, The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 153, also assumed the pre-canonical existence of the *Didache*.

⁴⁵² Lohmeyer, 231, maintained that the conclusion originated with the Syrian church.

⁴⁵³ Black, "The Doxology," 331, asserted that the wording of the conclusion was not directly dependent on the Hebrew of 1 Chron. 29, but it originated via an Aramaic Targum of the same.

seventh petition followed by a doxological conclusion.

7. Jewish custom required a doxology at the end of every prayer (*Berak.* 1.4; 9.5; *Yoma* 6.2).⁴⁵⁴ This custom was probably in vogue at the time of Christ. The *Alenu* contains a similar doxological conclusion.

8. Similarly, Jewish custom required concluding a prayer on a favorable note. Consequently, since the seventh petition ends with "evil" Jesus could well have added a final positive termination.⁴⁵⁵

On the other hand, several considerations inveigh against the conclusion, some of which are listed below provided by Carmignac.⁴⁵⁶

1. The manuscripts which omit the doxology represent various traditions, the older Alexandrian, the Western, and even part of the Palestinian (Lake group), rather than just one or two manuscript traditions. Carmignac made the conjecture that the conclusion was inserted into the Matthean text under the influence of Lucian of Antioch about A.D. 300 and that its position spread to Egypt and elsewhere after that.⁴⁵⁷ The ancient versions that include the conclusion

⁴⁵⁴ Citations from Carmignac, 327.

⁴⁵⁵ Karl Georg Kuhn, *Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, no. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950), 39-40; G. Klein, "Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 7 (1906): 29-40; Harner, 143.

⁴⁵⁶ Carmignac, 328-33.

⁴⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 328.

have ties with Antioch (Syrian, Armenian, Georgian).

2. The Greek fathers who attest to the conclusion were all from only one locale, Antioch: Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. The Western fathers (Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, *et alii*), and those of Egypt (Origen), of Palestine (Cyril of Jerusalem), and even of Cappadocia (Gregory of Nyssa) do not comment on the doxology.

3. The *Didache* attests to an abridged doxology; further, it tends to multiply doxologies aimlessly.

4. The conclusion did not originally exist in Matthew since, when copyists amplified Luke by adding Matthew's third and seventh petition, the doxology was not added as would have been expected. There it never existed, as other assimilation from the Matthean Prayer to Luke proves.

5. The tenor of the conclusion does not conform to the brevity of the rest of the Prayer. The "kingdom" in the second petition refers to God's grace among men, whereas in the conclusion, that word is practically an attribute of God (God is the royal king) and refers more to his power, especially in distinction from present world rule, and against the "evil" in the seventh petition. Likewise, the ample style corresponds to typical liturgical expansion. In fact, historically, the Lord's Prayer came to be used more and more in corporate liturgies.

6. Jewish custom requiring a doxological conclusion at the end of prayer could have been handily observed by Christians adding a conclusion later on. Some Qumran texts

illustrate this custom.⁴⁵⁸

It is difficult to assess the arguments for and against the authenticity of the doxology. Probably the safest course is to cautiously accept its position in a part of the manuscript tradition of Holy Scripture. Indeed, the doxological conclusion of the Lord's Prayer is contained in the majority of manuscripts of Matthew's Gospel, even if this majority represents in the main the Byzantine text tradition which is often uncritically deemed inferior in status.⁴⁵⁹

Who knows whether several other "floating" passages might be divinely inspired and have become attached to a particular reading, rightly or wrongly? They enrich faith and should not be discarded (for example, the *pericope adulterae* of John 7:53-8:11, or the additional material after Mark 16:8).

Nothing in the conclusion runs counter to the teachings of the rest of the canonical Scriptures, and its words are employed by countless Christians praying the Lord's Prayer. It may well be that the conclusion should be accepted as divinely inspired words, but not as taught by Jesus himself in the same way as the petitions of the Lord's Prayer were taught by him.⁴⁶⁰ The similarity of 2 Tim. 4:18 and the

⁴⁵⁸ Carmignac, 332.

⁴⁵⁹ However, many authorities no longer relegate the Majority Text tradition to an inferior status. See comments in Chapter III, *supra*.

⁴⁶⁰ Hill, 139, pointed out that "in the time of Jesus it would have been very unusual for a Jewish prayer to have ended without a doxology, expressed or assumed, but the form of words may have remained the choice of the person praying until this prayer became increasingly used as a common prayer in worship when a fixed form of doxology was established."

presence of the conclusion in the *Didache* appear to be particularly weighty arguments in support of the position of retaining the traditional conclusion of the Lord's Prayer. Its deletion from many early manuscripts is as explicable as its intrusion.⁴⁶¹ Therefore, the most appropriate position is one of cautious acceptance of the conclusion rather than to follow wholesale the tendency of rejecting it.⁴⁶²

Although Carmignac himself concluded that the Matthean conclusion was not original, he could appreciate its spiritual richness. What he said might well describe also the view of "cautious acceptance":

For the "Our Father" as a prayer, liturgical or personal, could have very well been concluded by a doxology. In favor of such an addition, its Scriptural origin (1 Chron. 29:11), its extreme age (since the *Didache*), its remarkable beauty, its noble theocentricity, would come into play. On the other hand, one

⁴⁶¹ Therefore, various authorities do entertain its authenticity. See Davies, *Setting*, 452, who suggested that since the doxology was assumed in the manuscript tradition it may have been "sometimes included and sometimes omitted"; Charles F. D. Moule, "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Christological Terms," *The Journal for New Testament Studies*, n.s. 10 (1959): 254, who suggested that "reverence for the tradition of his [Jesus'] words prevented the Christian Church from altering it in its essential contents"; Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, *Criticism of the New Testament*, vol. 2 (London: Bell, 1894), 324, who claimed that the conclusion could have as easily been omitted from Matthew's version by assimilation to Luke, as other manuscripts have incorporated a conclusion to Luke's Prayer by assimilation from Matthew.

⁴⁶² To say that the conclusion is not genuine is saying too much. Calling it a liturgical embellishment is only a guess. The question remains as to its origin. If it originated in Syria (Lohmeyer, 231) some decades, if not centuries, after Christ, why was it attached only to the Matthean Prayer but not to the Lukan? One may have expected such an interpolation at both locations. At any rate, its Syrian provenance *per se* does not preclude its firm position in a major manuscript tradition (the Byzantine).

could also prefer to preserve the original form of the prayer of the Lord and its poetic rhythm.⁴⁶³

The Form of Doxology

Old Testament and Jewish precedents exist for using doxological forms.⁴⁶⁴ Lohmeyer helpfully distinguished several types of benedictions.⁴⁶⁵

One form uses a stereotyped passive phrase with the third person: "Blessed be he . . ." The New Testament inherited this form seen in the use of εὐλογητός, for example, at Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 2 Cor. 1:3; 11:31; Eph. 1:3; 1 Pet. 1:3. In later Judaism, a second person variation developed, with only two examples in the Old Testament (1 Chron. 29:10; Ps. 119:12) according to Lohmeyer: "Blessed art thou . . ." An "Amen" often was added to benedictions as in Ps. 106:48, "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting! And let all the people say, 'Amen!' Praise the Lord!"

An active doxology was used also; for example, "Praise the Lord, Hallelujah." This form was carried into the New Testament (Rev. 19:1-6). Lohmeyer cited a modification of this in the well-known Ps. 118:29 (Ps. 117 LXX): "O give thanks to the Lord, for he is good; For his steadfast love

⁴⁶³ Carmignac, 333.

⁴⁶⁴ See especially Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns (New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1977), 77-108; and Eric Werner, "The Doxology in Synagogue and Church," in The Sacred Bridge (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 273-312.

⁴⁶⁵ Lohmeyer, 232-35.

endures for ever!" This form is important because of the use of the ὅτι clauses in doxologies: Ἐξομολογείσθε τῷ Κυριῷ, ὅτι ἄγαθός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.⁴⁶⁶

Lohmeyer also drew attention to a form akin to 1 Chron. 29:10-11. This form begins with a dative reference to God, then the praise is mentioned in one or several words, often without the copula, followed by a note of time and a final "Amen."⁴⁶⁷ This pattern appears occasionally in the Targums, at the end of the *Alenu* prayer ("Thine is the kingdom, and from eternity to eternity thou art in glory"), and in the Pauline corpus.⁴⁶⁸ From the New Testament he cited Rom. 11:36; Gal. 1:5; 2 Tim. 4:18; Heb. 13:21, as well as post-apostolic literature. These doxologies are addressed to God, but Christ could also be praised by them (Rom. 16:27; 2 Pet. 3:18; Jude 25). Rev. 5:13 and 7:12 are further elaborations. Other doxologies using the dative of reference in the New Testament, not cited by Lohmeyer, are: Phil. 4:20; 1 Tim. 1:17 (Τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων . . . τιμὴ καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.); 1 Pet. 4:11; 5:11. In every example given above, the ascription of praise is addressed to God using the dative case.

But in the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer, the

⁴⁶⁶ Lohmeyer, 233; BDF, 238, sec. 456.2; Zerwick, sec. 420, 421. "For" indicates loose subordination to follow.

⁴⁶⁷ Lohmeyer, 233.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., 234.

genitive is used: Ὅτι σου ἔστιν . . .⁴⁶⁹ Because of the genitive possessive pronoun, the last line of the Matthean Lord's Prayer consists of a true prayer of affirmation rather than doxology. Literally, it does not praise God by the words "To you be the kingdom . . ." but prays the affirmation: "For your kingdom and power and glory are forever. Amen." As such, these words are an asseveration; they are an elaborate "Amen." Lohmeyer aptly identified the conclusion, which is popularly dubbed the "doxology," as being prayer rather than praise.⁴⁷⁰ Lohmeyer asserted that the possessive genitive "thine" speaks of "what is, and always has been, God's" whereas the dative shows that the believer ascribes to God what "God is now to make his own."⁴⁷¹ In short, after the petitions are prayed, the believer avers and confesses in prayer that God can and does answer prayer. It is within his power, for example, to vindicate all evil (seventh petition) because his is the kingdom, power, and glory. The Lord's Prayer does not end on a "sour note" (evil), but on affirmation (Amen). If the distinction

⁴⁶⁹ Lohmeyer is difficult to follow here. He stated that primitive Christian doxology used the dative in Aramaic speaking regions (235). He also believed that the omission of the copula was a characteristic Aramaism (234-35). Then he concluded that the doxology of the Lord's Prayer having a copula and a genitive (σου ἔστιν) must have been derived from an Aramaic (Syrian) source (235).

⁴⁷⁰ Lohmeyer, 237; he also acknowledged a "subtle difference between praise and prayer." Note that Lohmeyer is one of the few who provides an exposition on the conclusion; most expositions of the Lord's Prayer treat only the address and petitions.

⁴⁷¹ Ibid.

Lohmeyer made between the dative and the genitive, albeit cryptically expressed by him, is correct, then the conclusion gives the Lord's Prayer a present orientation. The genitive "thine" affirms: "Everything that has been prayed for lies in God's hand, and he has the power to accomplish it, for 'thine is the kingdom'."⁴⁷²

Lohmeyer also provided an explanation for the "for" that begins the line: "The despairing plea for deliverance is answered by the thanksgiving that all power and glory is not of the evil one, but of God."⁴⁷³ He summarized this discussion by correctly saying, "what we have here is not such a testimony [praise, with the dative], but a prayer [with the genitive], not about the powers of the evil one but about the one God and Father."⁴⁷⁴ The prayer, "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever and ever" could easily be paraphrased, "Amen, amen. It is true that God's kingdom, power, and glory last forever!"

The great "Hallelujah" of Rev. 19:1-3 employs a similar infrequent use of the genitive: "Hallelujah! Salvation and glory and power belong to our God (τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν) . . . Hallelujah . . . εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων." God is the

⁴⁷² Ibid., 236. Note that in general Lohmeyer preferred an eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. In contrast, it would appear that the point of reference of affirmation is the present; it is the expression of confidence that God will accomplish the petitions for the believer and the Christian community now.

⁴⁷³ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., 238.

possessor of salvation and glory and power (the copula is absent; cf. Paul's non-copulative benediction in Rom. 11:36). These words in this Pauline example do not directly praise God by saying with the dative (σοί, *tibi*, to thee, to you), "To you be salvation and glory and power," but this verse also uses the genitive (σοῦ, *tui*, thine, yours). Man cannot do anything to contribute to the praise of God. He can only confess what already belongs to God. Significantly, this will be true in heaven (the setting of Revelation 19 is heaven; see v. 1).

The ingress *ὅτι* is both explanatory and affirmative, "yes, truly." For this reason, the embolism after Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer in the Byzantine text tradition is preferably called a conclusion rather than a doxology.⁴⁷⁵ The conclusion of the Lord's Prayer confesses that because of Jesus' First Advent the kingdom has now come and is being established on the basis of the Gospel. The conclusion is a joyful affirmation of God's salvific and benevolent activity among his people during the Gospel age, and it anticipates now the final revelation when God's reign will be complete and without challenge. As such, the σοῦ is placed forward in an emphatic position reflected also in the standard translation: "For thine is the kingdom . . ." As the Lord's Prayer descends from the "Thy petitions" to the "us

⁴⁷⁵ Smukal, 845, "But strictly speaking the Conclusion is not a doxology."

petitions" and ends far from God with τοῦ πονηροῦ, it now reascends to God (σοῦ) for its conclusion. Following the four "us petitions" the σοῦ of the triadic conclusion is added to the three "Thy petitions" of the triadic first strophe, thus bringing to a total the four pronouns "σοῦ" at last. Using σοί would not have fit the pattern. "Us" and "Thy" are balanced at the end, in a sense.

The Kingdom, Power, and Glory

Various combinations of the words kingdom, power, and glory are attested elsewhere in Scripture. Lohmeyer saw their interrelationships this way: "The first of the nouns then speaks of God's rank and his office, the second of the characteristic which makes his kingdom possible, and the third of the nature of his royal activity."⁴⁷⁶ He referred to several examples which bring these ideas together directly or indirectly. Ps. 24:8-10 alludes to *kingdom, power, and glory*: "Who is the King of glory? The Lord, strong and mighty, The Lord, mighty in battle! . . . The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory!" Note the emphases in Ps. 145:10-12: "All thy works shall give thanks to thee, O Lord, and all thy saints shall bless thee! They shall speak of the glory of thy *kingdom*, and tell of thy *power*." Rev. 15:4 may indirectly assume the concepts contained in the words kingdom, power, and glory, with its three ὅτι ("for") clauses:

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., 238-39.

"Who shall not fear and glorify thy name, O Lord? For (ὅτι) thou alone art holy (*glory*). [For] (ὅτι) All nations shall come and worship thee (*kingdom*), for (ὅτι) thy judgments have been revealed (*power*)."⁴⁷⁷ Rev. 12:10 may also point to both the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer and its seventh petition: "Now the *salvation* and the *power* and the *kingdom* of our God and the authority of his Christ have come, for the accuser of our brethren has been thrown down, who accuses them day and night before our God."⁴⁷⁷

Two elements, God's personal power and glory, are brought together in several places.⁴⁷⁸ Rom. 1:20 reports that God's "invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made." God's power is explained in verse 23 as being the "glory of the immortal God." Lohmeyer explained that "the Hebrew *kabod* and the Greek *doxa* have twin meanings of 'power' and 'glory.'⁴⁷⁹ The two words power and glory stand together in Matt. 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27; 1 Cor.

⁴⁷⁷ "Salvation" could be construed here as an alternative for "glory"; see Ps. 21:5 (Ps. 20 LXX): Μεγάλη ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σου. See also next note.

⁴⁷⁸ Black, "Doxology," 350, showed several possible words often used in doxologies. "Glory" is the one constitutive word used in nearly all doxologies. In the blessings which he analyzed "glory" generally means "greatness" instead of "honor" (*kabod*). He took Jude 25 as proof, where δόξα and μεγαλωσύνη are juxtaposed. He added that the Targums also used a genitive (not dative) formation: "of thee (or yours) is the glory" (332).

⁴⁷⁹ Lohmeyer, 240.

15:43; Eph. 1:18, 19; 3:16, 20-21; Col. 1:11, Rev. 7:12; 15:8; 19:1. The phrase power and glory often refers to the way God reveals himself.⁴⁸⁰

The kingdom describes the function of kingly rule, not the order which God will bring about at the *eschaton*.⁴⁸¹ Thus, the orientation of kingdom, power, and glory is very much for the present where and when God works redemptively on behalf of his people. The word kingdom figures prominently in the "doxology" of Rev. 11:15, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." The transformation of the "kingdom of the world" can only be accomplished by God's "kingdom of grace" (Jesus). The Bible is primarily interested in God's true kingdom, his soteriological reign. There is simply no notion of establishing a temporal rule or earthly kingdom.⁴⁸² Jesus said, "My kingship is not of this world" (John 18:36; cf. Acts 1:6-7). The kingdom, power, and glory describe God's revelation of grace, hidden to the world, but known of his own (John 17:24-26). Although God may seem weak and foolish to the world (1 Cor. 1:25-30), the Christian knows that God is stronger in the revelation of his grace than sin, death, and hell. The perceived impotence of Jesus demonstrates the power of God. His weakness proved to

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., 241.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid.

⁴⁸² I.e., all creation "belongs" to God and he has the temporal affairs of life under his control, whether or not his lordship is recognized by creation in general.

be the ultimate power over the last enemy, death (1 Cor. 15:26). 1 Cor. 1:18 declares, ". . . but to us who are being saved it [the word of the cross] is the power of God."⁴⁸³

A Jewish custom required mentioning the kingdom of God at the close of prayer. Rabbi Johanan (died A.D. 279) stated: "A benediction in which the kingdom of God is not mentioned is no benediction."⁴⁸⁴ Unlike Jewish tradition which was prone to equate the kingdom of God with the nationalistic interests of the Jews, Rev. 11:15 speaks of a spiritual transformation. The future aspect of the kingdom can only become possible because of the present reign of grace. The kingdom, of course, is the reign of God. The second petition definitely refers to the reign of grace through God's Son. The gift of the kingdom in the second petition is God's revelation of his grace in a salvific way. The kingdom, power, and glory of the conclusion are also "revealing" words. They declare that now in time, God reveals his *strength* against all the evils that his people face. These words affirm that God is powerfully in control. They invite trust in him. The word "kingdom" in the conclusion partakes of concepts generally attributed to the

⁴⁸³ Lochman, 168-69, "It is worth noting that the New Testament emphatically understands the glory of God in relation to the history of Jesus, and that in this connection the cross (as well as the resurrection) is of key significance. The glory of God is seen as the glory of the Crucified, the glory of self-sacrificing love."

⁴⁸⁴ Alfred Edersheim, The Temple (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), 155-56. Reference made also by Lohmeyer, 241, who admitted the lateness of this adage, but the possibility however of its coming from earlier unwritten tradition.

terms "kingdom of power" and "kingdom of glory." What God does mightily now in power, grace, and personal glory serves his everlasting kingdom (2 Tim. 4:18). The meaning of kingdom in the conclusion is broader than the same word in the second petition. It includes God's revelation in power, grace, and glory. God's kingdom, power, and glory are hidden to the world, but revealed by means of grace.

The concerns of the first strophe relate to God, yet they benefit man. Likewise, the conclusion relates to God, and yet man is included as both confessing *subject* and the receiving *object* of God's grace. Only a true Christian can sincerely pray the Lord's Prayer. It may even be possible to construe the conclusion as a summary or restatement of the first strophe, where the kingdom is related to the second petition, the power to the third petition, and the glory to the first petition.⁴⁸⁵

The terms kingdom, power, and glory stand in antithesis to the *gloria mundi*. The affirmative nature of the conclusion points to the *gloria Dei*. The anticipation of the unlimited expression of praise in the future when God's full revelation of glory will be perfected shows, in contrast, the temporal nature of the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer. What is affirmed weakly by faith is anticipation of God's final vindication over every opposing force (Jude 24-25; Rev. 20:10, 14). Then Satan, the old evil foe, will suffer

⁴⁸⁵ This was done by C. W. F. Smith, "The Lord's Prayer," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 1:57-58.

defeat. Future hope shapes the words of prayer spoken in the present. The contrast between God's future, final, and perfect reign and the present reign of diabolical darkness and boasting of the flesh (Rom. 3:23, 27) was vividly drawn by Ethelbert Stauffer:

Self-glorification comes to an end when every creature praises God's glory with united voice (cf. Psa. 68.34 f.; Jer. 9.22 f.; II Cor. 10.17; Rom. 3.27). Then the whole cosmos is a temple of God and the new age one continual Sabbath (Rev. 21.3; Heb. 4.9). The people of God will be a new people of priests, and clouds of incense will ascend continually to heaven (Ex. 19.6; Isa. 6.6; I Pet. 2.5, 9; Rev. 19.3; 20.6; 22.3). The peoples will fall down and offer sacrifice before his face (Psa. 86.9; Rom. 15.16; Rev. 15.4; 21.24). *The antiphony of universal history leads into a symphonic doxology.* At last God has attained the *telos* of his ways: the revelation of the *gloria dei* achieves its end in the hallowing of his name.⁴⁸⁶

Forever and Ever. Amen!

"Unto the ages" or "for ever" is added to finish the sentence under consideration. Such a formula is common in the Bible, with the Greek words either in the singular or the plural and in simple or more expanded versions and combinations of the plural. The expanded αἰῶνα αἰώνων (forever and ever) occurs some twenty-one times in the New Testament and is distinctive of the Pauline epistles and

⁴⁸⁶ Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, tr. John Marsh, (New York: Macmillan, 1955), 231; italics original.

Revelation.⁴⁸⁷ Besides its occurrence in the Lord's Prayer, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is used in Luke 1:33; Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 11:36; 2 Cor. 11:31; Heb. 13:8; Jude 25. According to Hermann Sasse, the plural may presuppose a plurality "of ages and periods of time whose infinite series constitutes eternity."⁴⁸⁸

Lohmeyer asserted that there is hardly a difference between the singular and the plural, although the plural may be a Christian development that hints at a long sequence of time.⁴⁸⁹ Hermann Sasse spoke of the "doctrine of two ages"

⁴⁸⁷ Hermann Sasse, "αἰών," in *TDNT* 1:199. Incidentally, three examples of this expansion notable because of their "doxological" wording that have affinities with the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer include 2 Tim. 4:18; Gal. 1:4-5; and 1 Pet. 4:11. The felicitous expression "forever and ever" has no strong textual foundation; including the expansionism are 14th cent. 2148, 4/5th cent. African Latin k, and one Sahidic MS. The German is simply "in Ewigkeit"; Tyndale's translation read "for ever." In Chapter I, *supra*, it was reported, with documentation, that the phraseology "for ever and ever" first appeared in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, evidently in imitation of oriental models. A conjecture is offered here by the present writer, to advance the conversation, that the English Prayer Book version might have also been imitative of the Latin conclusion to prayers and collects, "in saecula saeculorum," where there is a doubling of the same word. That typical termination is usually translated "world without end" but the doubled Greek termination at 2 Tim. 4:18 (εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων) and elsewhere appears literally as "in saecula saeculorum" in the Vulgate. Perhaps "in saecula saeculorum" should properly always be translated "for ever and ever." Further study beyond the scope of this paper would be profitable and interesting. Some of the events connected with the final form of the English Prayer and the developments of the *Book of Common Prayer* appear to be lost in the dust of history. In all events, "for ever and ever" is an adept translation of εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer and the fuller form is indeed used frequently in the New Testament.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸⁹ Lohmeyer, 242.

by noting that the Bible distinguishes this age from the age to come.⁴⁹⁰ These two antithetical categories are expressed, for example, in Mark 10:30 (Luke 18:30): “. . . who will not receive a hundredfold now in this time (νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ) . . . and in the age to come eternal life” (καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον). In Luke 16:8 the sons of this aeon are contrasted with the sons of light. In Luke 20:34–35 the sons of this age are contrasted with the sons of that age (αἰῶνος ἐκείνου). In Matt. 12:32 both ages are referred to (οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι). Eph. 1:21 can also be cited: οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, as well as Eph. 2:7: ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις. Sasse pointed out that believers are already redeemed from this present evil αἰών (Gal. 1:4) and have tasted the powers of the future αἰών (Heb. 6:5). This distinction is important for understanding the Lord’s Prayer.⁴⁹¹ In contrast with the future age (heaven) believers live in the present aeon of grace where the blessings of redemption are received from God. For Christians, the new aeon has already begun with Christ’s incarnation and resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20, 23).

The phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer means that God’s activity in respect to the previous

⁴⁹⁰ Sasse, 205.

⁴⁹¹ Ibid., 207.

seven petitions and the acknowledgment of his power in the conclusion begins now in time and will last forever.⁴⁹² The conception of "foreverness" brings the future into the present. What God does in the present is the beginning of the future. God vindicates himself over all his adversaries now. The believer does not have to wait for the eschatological future to taste of the Lord's goodness. Already now in space and time God works salvifically and benevolently (John 5:17).⁴⁹³

In short, the words "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever" partake more of the qualities of affirmation, rather than doxology. Their sense is not praise so much as "Amen." Therefore the word "conclusion" more appropriately describes this affirmation than the term "doxology." The conclusion affirms that God is in control and it expresses the assurance that God will prevail over contrary forces (1 Cor. 15:27; Heb. 11:1).

Man cannot contribute to God's worth. The purest conception of Christian worship then (John 4:23-24) is when believers rejoice both in the glory that already belongs to God and in God's service to them by way of the divine service of his giving spiritual and temporal gifts to men (Eph. 4:8, 11-13; cf. 1 Cor. 12:1-11; 14:1).

⁴⁹² According to Scott, 110, it was customary in later Judaism to add the words "forever" in ascriptions of praise to protest the secular denial of the future world.

⁴⁹³ In terms of catechetical categories, the blessings of the second article (*redemptio*) are applied to the order of creation portrayed under the first article (*creatio*).

Many manuscripts add a final affirmation, "Amen," to the Lord's Prayer.⁴⁹⁴ Many prayers in the New Testament conclude with "Amen." "Amen" reflects its central meaning of affirmation following Old Testament and Jewish precedents. The word must be spoken in faith (1 Cor. 14:16). "Amen" presupposes God's people joining together for corporate worship. When the Christian prays individually and privately, he does so without forgetting the "our" of the brotherhood gathered around God the Father in heaven. In late Judaism it was not uncommon for doxologies based on 1 Chron. 29:10-11 to be spoken, even outside of corporate worship and by individuals, yet consistently employing the plural.⁴⁹⁵

Amen was used in the Old Testament as confirmation, asseveration, acceptance, or agreement (Num. 5:22; Deut. 27:15; 1 Kings 1:36; Neh. 5:13; Jer. 11:5), as a response to a doxology (1 Chron. 16:36; Neh. 8:6), and as the conclusion to the first four books of Psalms (4:13; 72:19; 89:52, *bis*; 106:48, plus Hallelujah). It is used in the New Testament in the sense of affirmation, often imperiously or absolutely by Jesus in the synoptic Gospels at the beginning of a sentence meaning "truly" and in John's Gospel in the double form (25 times).⁴⁹⁶ It was used by Christians at the end of prayers

⁴⁹⁴ Lohmeyer, 243, believed the *Amen* may have been added later as well as the entire conclusion: "So it was a liturgical need that caused earliest Christianity to add a doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer."

⁴⁹⁵ Strack-Billerbeck 1:424.

⁴⁹⁶ Heinrich Schlier, "ἀμην," in *TDNT* 1:337. See Is. 65:16 where the believer will be blessed by the God of "truth" (Amen, | אֱמֶת).

(Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 11:36; 16:27; Gal. 1:5; Eph. 3:21; Phil. 4:20; 1 Tim. 1:17; 6:16; 2 Tim. 4:18; Heb. 13:21; 1 Pet. 4:11; 5:11; Jude 25). Its affirmative quality can be appreciated where a "yes" is in close connection (2 Cor. 1:20). Jesus himself is "the Amen," "the reliable and true Witness of God" (Rev. 3:14; cf. 1:7; 22:20).⁴⁹⁷ Therefore, should it be objected that the Lord's Prayer does not mechanically end with the standard Christian termination for prayer "in Jesus' name" (John 14:13-14; 15:16; 16:23-24; Col. 3:17; Heb. 13:15), the final Amen does bring Jesus into the picture.⁴⁹⁸ He is the Amen of God (2 Cor. 1:20; Rev. 3:14). He is the reason believers have access to God the Father. Believers pray in faith which is the "conviction of things not seen" (Heb. 11:1).⁴⁹⁹ The little word "Amen" expresses that confidence (Matt. 18:5; 21:21-22; John 1:6-7; 1 Cor. 14:16; James 1:6-7; 1 John 5:14).⁵⁰⁰ Despite varying textual evidence for the "Amen" in the Lord's Prayer it serves as a suitable and traditional conclusion to this, and all, prayer.

⁴⁹⁷ Information from Schlier, *ibid.*

⁴⁹⁸ Jeremias, Lord's Prayer, 16.

⁴⁹⁹ Alexander Balmain Bruce, The Training of the Twelve (Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1894), 56, held that a prayer that included the phrase "in Jesus' name" given by Jesus to the Disciples for their present use before his death would not have been intelligible to them prior to that event.

⁵⁰⁰ Man's *Amen* to God cannot be spoken until God first speaks his promissory *Amen* to man; so, Robert Emory Golladay, The Lord's Prayer (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1921), 450-56.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Interpretation for the Present Gospel Age

In order for the Lord's Prayer to be appreciated it must be understood. The goal of fully comprehending the meaning of the Lord's Prayer has been the exegetical task of this study. One result of this study has been to vindicate the common traditional version of the Lord's Prayer in English translation. This was not the original purpose for embarking on this study of the Lord's Prayer. However, this study has yielded interesting results. The traditional English version was honed out by venerable ecclesiastics and students of Holy Scripture in previous generations. It has been demonstrated that the common vernacular form of the Lord's Prayer adequately represents the Greek texts for the most part over against most contemporary versions.

Several comments are in order. In making the effort to correspond to modern English idiom the minimal replacement of only a few of the following obsolete forms could be sanctioned. The use of the pronouns "Thy" and the verb "art" in the address *could* be modernized. The verb in the address is somewhat difficult to change. To omit it entirely would probably be the most desirable solution ("Our Father in heaven"). While the word "hallowed" is a dated word in

modern English, it still captures best the concept of the Greek passive imperative verb and should be retained. While "holy" has been suggested as a preferable modern term and is easily understood ("holy be Your name") it is not a verb, and may suggest ethical quality rather than divine activity. The verb "to sanctify" faithfully replicates the original Greek word. The third petition should always be printed without a comma. The adverbial expression "this day" is a suitable compromising rendition of Matthew's "today" and Luke's "day by day." The word "daily" should be retained since no other concise and succinct expression has ever been found for *epiousios*. The tentative conclusion of this study is that *epiousios* refers qualitatively to the kind of bread prayed for, that is, that it comes *regularly* (ἰέναι) as a gift from God to his people on earth (ἐπί). To replace the word "daily" by a futuristic adjective such as "tomorrow('s)" verges on interpretation rather than translation and is based on slender and questionable support. The word "debts" in the fifth petition is literal and therefore receives no objections. The word "sins" from Luke's version might be a more understandable modern term. The felt need to surrender the narrower term "debts" owing to its identification with fiscal matters may have originally dictated and preserved the selection of the more comprehensive word "trespasses" in the addendum at Matt. 6:14-15. The grammatically difficult sixth petition is probably best left untouched. While the results appear assured that it means: "Cause us to not enter (into)

temptation" the more direct literal translation should be left intact; instead, the meaning of the sixth petition remains best taught. The seventh petition should retain the broader "evil." To translate as the "evil one" verges on interpretation rather than translation. The conclusion should be retained since it does have some textual and historical support, however weak. This study has shown that the traditional English translation of the Lord's Prayer is superior to other contemporary versions. Modern revisions should be made hesitantly and cautiously.¹

The division of the Lord's Prayer into two strophes helps to understand the Christian life under God. First the Christian prays that the conditions of life be changed. Because of sin and the general fallen condition of man in this world, only God can ameliorate conditions. He did this by sending his Son, Jesus. Jesus glorified God's holy name by preaching the Gospel of grace, the Good News of the kingdom of God, and by doing God's will perfectly himself. The hallowing of God's name, the coming of his kingdom, and the doing of his will are also accomplished among his people as God moves them and works among them and through them. God's concerns precede human concerns. God is asked to do those three things in the first strophe for his own sake. In

¹ If an English modernization of the Lord's Prayer were desired, the following construction would fall within maximum tolerable limits: "Our heavenly Father, Your name be sanctified, Your kingdom come, Your will be done on earth even as in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our sins as we forgive those who sin against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen." Whether or not to capitalize references to the deity may be a matter of piety or style.

so doing, he simultaneously sends the gift of grace. For example, the coming of the kingdom is Good News for the sinner. Salvation has come through the advent of God's Son, Jesus! The Prayer which Jesus taught has parallels in Judaism, but it is not a remolding of old patterns; it is his new creation given as a gift for use in the Gospel age. It is the *Lord's Prayer*. By hallowing his name, God's salvific character is revealed. When God's will is done, this will is seen to be salvific. As such, while the concerns of the first strophe are related to God, in their answer they convey at the same time soteriological blessings from God to the sinner. When God hears and answers the petitions in the first strophe, man is blessed and God is vindicated.

The second strophe addresses the concerns of man. These petitions are directly related to man's temporal blessings. The fourth petition expresses this most clearly. Man needs daily bread in order to live and serve God. The next petitions are temporal insofar as they are related to the Christian's life while he lives in this present world. As requested, God forgives sin, guards against succumbing to temptation, and delivers from diabolical evil. These last three petitions are spiritual blessings related to everyday life. The believer learns humble trust and dependence on God by these petitions. At the conclusion of these petitions, the believer affirms his trust and confidence in the promises and power of prayer, ending with Amen, so may it be!

The *Lord's Prayer* emphasizes the "nearness" of God. Its words are real prayer. They are used to teach the

believer how to pray (a model), and they are used as a perfect prayer (form). In the catechesis of the church, the Lord's Prayer has also been successfully used to teach the faith throughout Christian history. The Lord's Prayer is one great petition to a gracious God for divine help. Evil in this life has the potential of depriving the unbeliever of eternal life. The believer is personally powerless to feed himself, to earn forgiveness, to flee temptation, to avoid evil, much less to hallow God's name, to introduce the kingdom of grace, and to satisfy God's will. Therefore the Prayer Jesus taught implores divine grace. Its petitions are spoken through the holy name of Jesus, for he taught the Prayer and he is the believer's high priest. The word "Father" in the address informs the entire Prayer. It teaches that the fellowship of believers embraces God's children who place faith in the One who both gave the Prayer and gave his life for man's sins. The Lord's Prayer is always prayed in the plural, even when spoken privately, for it presupposes membership in the body of Christ and it includes the brethren by way of intercession. Therefore, its accent is on the nearness of God and the *nowness* of man's conditions and circumstances. It prays for the real, tangible things of life without which there could be no future life with God forever. The everyday *noneschatological* interpretation recognizes this *incarnational* nature of the Lord's Prayer and its soteriological value. It is real and concrete. Its orientation is not ethereal and platonic.

This study has netted several results. Three deserve

special mention. First, it must be emphasized that the Greek aorist imperative is the standard tense for petition in prayer. This use of the aorist reached the zenith of its development in New Testament *koine* Greek. It corresponds with trust. The one who prays expects and knows assuredly that God has commanded prayer and that he has promised to hear prayer. The "prayer aorist" does not allow for uncertainty and distrust. As such, the prayer aorist abandons its character of *Einmaligkeit*. It does not claim a once-for-all, single response on the part of God. Rather, it reflects trust that now God will hear and answer prayer. Grammatically, this use of the aorist must be understood from the point of view of aspect, not of time. It must not be forgotten that with regard to all the petitions it is God who monergistically and sovereignly acts to accomplish the fulfilment or answers to such requests, even when he works in, by, or among his people. This should not at all imply that God's answers to this Prayer can only be reserved for the *eschaton*, and that if the petitions apply to the present, his sovereign role is somehow reduced. Ultimately, the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer turns on the verb tenses!

Secondly, the fourth petition occupies the center of the Lord's Prayer, which has seven petitions. The strongest defense for seven petitions lies in the seven primary aorist verbs. The central bread petition emphasizes now, "this day." In fact, this accent on "today" colors the whole Prayer. Its petitions center on what God promises to do for Christians now in time during life in the present Gospel Age.

The blessing of daily manna was the prototype for this petition. The fact that the Lord's Prayer is not viewed as an intrusion into the Matthean Sermon on the Mount, but that it occupies a central position, suggests that the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount particularly provides the context and valid parallels which help explain the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. The teachings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount apply to the present life of the believer. Matt. 6:31-34a emphasizes this present orientation of Jesus' teachings *vis-à-vis* spiritual and temporal blessings:

Therefore do not be anxious, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?' For the Gentiles seek all these things; and your heavenly Father knows that you need them all. But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well. Therefore do not be anxious about tomorrow, for tomorrow will be anxious for itself.

The believer is not to think of God as remote from his own spiritual and temporal needs. Because of Jesus, God is near. According to Jesus' teaching, God is not so transcendent that he is wholly removed from his creation. The Bible does not fall into the error of "docetism" whereby the material of this earth is viewed with disapprobation. This emphasis is reinforced by the sense of direction *from God in heaven to man on earth* intimated by the second clause in the third petition, "as in heaven, even on earth." The "us petitions" of the entire second strophe also confirm this temporal orientation, reinforced especially if the enigmatic word *epiousios* should also witness to this sense of regular, earthward direction which has been suggested as a tentative possibility. In fact, bread, forgiveness and forgiving, rescue

and deliverance, are all daily needs for which the Christian prays. The Lord's Prayer does not ask for heaven on earth, however. It asks for daily divine help for the believing pilgrim who travels through earth. This theme is clearly established by the centrally positioned fourth petition.

Thirdly, the Lord's Prayer, like all Scripture, is best interpreted literally unless warrant is given to justify figurative and spiritual interpretations. The Lord's Prayer, and the fourth petition particularly, have been subject to spiritualizing excesses from time to time. Martin Luther and many others have preferred to follow a course of literal, historical and grammatical interpretation of Scripture. Interpreted along these lines, the Lord's Prayer is full and rich in meaning for the *hic et nunc* of Christian life.

Reassessment of an Eschatological Orientation

Two contrasting approaches to the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer are possible, the *future* eschatological and the *present* noneschatological. Luther and other reformers by and large avoided any spiritual interpretation. This observation is especially significant when it is realized that Luther's theological thinking matured. Earlier, especially with regard to the fourth petition, a spiritual interpretation had been pursued by him. However, a palpable shift occurred by the time of his catechisms of 1529, so that his interpretation of the Lord's Prayer became completely oriented to the everyday existence of God's people.

In the last decades, especially, the eschatological

approach has gained in favor. Usually a spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition parallels an eschatological, future interpretation. The hegemony of an eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer has tended to dominate the literature in the last decades. In the process, scholarship with more empirical interests has been neglected.

However, the eschatological interpretation is not accepted by all authorities, as this study has revealed. For example, Ulrich Luz' recent commentary on Matthew reacts strongly against the current dominance of the eschatological interpretation.² Likewise, Leon Morris, in his commentary on Matthew objected to an eschatological approach:

Many recent scholars hold that the prayer that we commonly call "the Lord's Prayer" should be understood in eschatological terms. In this Gospel we have already found that the kingdom of heaven has come near in the person of Jesus (3:2; 4:17), and the suggestion is that Jesus is teaching his followers a prayer that they should pray mindful of the fact that the end of all things is upon them. It may well be granted that these words are suitable for use in the last days as in others, but there is nothing in the language of the prayer that shows that those days alone are in view; if that is what Jesus meant, why did he not use at least one expression that unambiguously gives expression to it? The experience of the church throughout the centuries makes it abundantly clear that the prayer applies well to the here and now. We should understand it as a model prayer to guide disciples in their devotional life.³

Those who prefer a noneschatological interpretation represent both Roman Catholic and Protestant scholarship.

² Ulrich Luz, Matthew 1-7: A Commentary, tr. Wilhelm C. Linss (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 380, et passim.

³ Leon Morris, The Gospel According to Matthew (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 142-43.

Ultimately, the exegetical task of interpreting the Lord's Prayer turns on a methodological issue. The methodology pursued in this study treats the Scriptures as the literal inspired word of God. In the case of the Lord's Prayer, Jesus taught words which have been delivered by the inspired Evangelists Matthew and Luke. As such, this Prayer is seen as being suited to the believer's present needs and life. This orientation is readily visible with regard to the first strophe, asking for God's concerns to be accomplished in the believer's life, and in the second strophe, where all of man's needs are within purview of the benevolence and beneficence of God. No less than spiritual needs, even daily needs are satisfied by the same divine blessing as when Jesus fed the multitudes.

In contrast to the primary interpretation and application of the Lord's Prayer as being for the present Gospel age, the current vogue of scholarship tends to look at the petitions in terms of a single, final eschatological act of God, also tending to spiritualize the fourth petition either as being the "bread of life" or sacramental bread, or both. The "daily bread" then is often viewed as being "tomorrow's bread," actually or proleptically, on the basis of Jerome's remark, as already seen earlier in this study. Such a "tomorrow('s)" reading corresponds to an overly eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. Hence, the latter methodology tends to be neither literal, nor does it take into account the fullness of Scriptural revelation which reports the Gospel as being the Good News, the present

offer of and opportunity for divine grace addressing all of man's needs. The perfection and balance properly ascribed to the Lord's Prayer assumes a holistic approach to man's needs. Jesus was, and still is, the Savior who takes the poor, oppressed, ill, hungry, and spiritually burdened into his loving care and gives them rest (Matt. 11:28). The historical-grammatical method, while not ignoring patristic exposition or traditional interpretation, nevertheless prefers to allow the text itself to speak.

Several remarks can be made with regard to reassessing contemporary scholarship on the Lord's Prayer, taken in tandem with the three previous comments. First, this study has determined that the chief defense and the main support for an eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer lies in the employment of the aorist imperatives. The idea is wrongly conceived that in prayer they ask for one particular decisive event. The *Einmaligkeit* quality of the aorist, it is often claimed, must point *ipso facto* toward one event or one single fulfilment which obviously therefore must be at the end of history since it will happen only once. The eschatological interpretation, as already seen, would ask for God's kingdom to come, then, at the *parousia*. It asks for the Bread of life, Jesus, to come at the End of the ages. It asks for such forgiveness and deliverance that is necessary for the believer to be spared of the Final Judgment. This study has sought to demonstrate the proper application of the prayer aorist. In prayer, one asks *primarily* for present blessings. A future orientation that disregards the

application of divine blessings for the present Gospel age impoverishes the richness of the Lord's Prayer. The use of the aorist tenses cannot be solicited to defend an eschatological approach to the Lord's Prayer.

Second, the bread petition asks God for literal bread. To spiritualize it as the Bread of life (Jesus) or that this should be understood primarily as the future food of the eternal and heavenly banquet extends the meaning of literal words beyond license. Certainly Jesus is the Bread of Life. He claimed that about himself (John 6:35, 48). He, as the Word of God, brings life and salvation. But such an interpretation is foreign to the fourth petition. Rather, this petition teaches, along literal historical-grammatical lines, that God has a gracious and loving concern for the temporal welfare of his people, as the Scriptures often elsewhere present the benevolence of God. As for as the sacramental interpretation is concerned, this is not within the scope of the words of the fourth petition at all.⁴ The Lord's Prayer is a perfect prayer embracing all areas of the believer's life, including temporal needs.

That *epiousios* bread should somehow be tomorrow's bread has too frequently been blindly touted as an accepted fact on the basis of frequent repetition of the assertion more than by its being supported by actual evidence. Hence it was

⁴ Anton Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer: A Prayer for Jews and Christians?" in The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy, ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke (London: Burns & Oates, 1978), 99, called the sacramental and spiritual interpretation "overinterpretation."

appropriate to re-examine the primary evidence once again. The data points to the propriety of rehabilitating the bread of the fourth petition as temporal bread. The source of this erroneous claim is based on a statement made by Jerome attributing to a supposed Hebrew Matthew the sense of "tomorrow." The claim of future bread to be given once at the *eschaton* is not supported by the aorist imperative verbs.

Third, obviously, a strictly narrow eschatological interpretation forsakes literal interpretation of the Scriptures. It imposes a foreign element into the texts of Matt. 6:9-13 and Luke 11:2-4. Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer with its present tense verbs in the fourth and second clause of the fifth petition make especially clear the present nature of the Lord's Prayer and its application to the believer who lives in the present Gospel age. Therefore, it is necessary in studying the Lord's Prayer to be apprised of these two alternate and contrasting approaches to its interpretation. Modern scholarship on the Lord's Prayer cannot be fully understood and appreciated without first taking into consideration these two contrasting orientations.

A balanced and objective examination of the two possible ways of interpreting the Lord's Prayer will suggest that an exclusively eschatological approach appears to be deficient. The latter tends to disregard the needs of the believer living now in the present Gospel age who is dependent on God for physical blessings, forgiveness, strength against temptation, deliverance from evil, and who lives his life to God's glory as one of God's justified and

sanctified believers. The reformers and some patristic expositors understood this. This approach is both practical and defensible. A reassessment of typical eschatologically-oriented interpretation leads to the scripturally-based conclusion that the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer is primarily applicable to the present Gospel age. As such, the Lord's Prayer is the Savior's gift to his people.

By way of reassessing an eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, the term eschatology itself needs to be clarified. Future eschatology refers to the future and final manifestation of God's work accomplished through Jesus by way of judgment and mercy. This study has objected to the so-called eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer that is oriented primarily, if not solely, to the future. Reference to a present orientation and application of the Lord's Prayer has been conveniently called "noneschatological" throughout this study. Noneschatological parameters could be defined also in terms of "inaugurated eschatology" which was described in Chapter III. The contrast between the present and future aspects of eschatology have been described as follows:

The term *inaugurated eschatology* embraces everything that the Old and New Testament Scriptures teach concerning the believer's *present* possession and enjoyment of blessings which will be fully experienced whenever Christ comes again. *Future eschatology* focuses on events which still lie in the future, such as the resurrection, judgment, and new heavens and new earth.⁵

⁵ The "End Times": A Study on Eschatology and Millennialism. A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (St. Louis: Concordia, 1989), 17.

Proper interpretation of the Lord's Prayer embraces "inaugurated eschatology" primarily and "future eschatology" secondarily. A reassessment of scholarship and the results of exegesis done for this study confirm the propriety of this conclusion. The Christian prays the Lord's Prayer during this time of grace. Such grace is realized now on account of the first advent of the Son of the Father. The term "noneschatological" may have been cumbersome to use in this paper, but the term "inaugurated eschatology" is likewise inconvenient. However, if the term "eschatological" is often popularly understood to include that which has now been inaugurated in contrast to future events yet unfulfilled (its "broad" definition), then the term "noneschatological" should also serve as a functional term. The noneschatological position includes the following ideas, contained in the document mentioned earlier:

With the first advent of Christ, these Old Testament eschatological hopes are fulfilled. Jesus of Nazareth is the long-awaited, promised Messiah who has defeated Satan, sin and death (Matt. 12:22-29; John 12:31; Col. 2:11-15; Heb. 2:14-15; 1 Cor. 15:55-57; 1 John 3:8). In His life, death, and resurrection the eschatological kingdom of God has appeared in history (Matt. 12:28; Luke 1:32-33, 68-75; 11:20; 17:20-21; Col. 1:13-14; Rev. 1:6; Rom. 14:17). The New Israel (Gal. 3:29; 6:16; Rom. 9:6-8) now receives the forgiveness of sins and all the blessings of the New Covenant in Christ (1 Cor. 11:25; Hebrews 8-10). The promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit has already come in Christ (Acts 2; 8:14-17; 10:44-48; 19:1-7; Eph. 1:13-14; Titus 3:5-6; 1 Cor. 6:19). The great Day of the Lord has arrived in Christ (Luke 19:44; Matt. 3:10-12; 2 Cor. 6:1-2). And those who are in Christ already participate in the new creation; they are, in fact, "a new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17). The eschaton has been inaugurated; "the end of the ages has come" (1 Cor. 10:11). Through the Gospel and the sacraments the Christian already now receives God's promised eschatological blessings by

faith (Heb. 6:5; 1 Pet. 2:2-3; Rom. 8:37-39; 6:1-11).

Thus, the Christian now lives in the age of the fulfillment, in the last days (Acts 2:17; 3:20-21; Heb. 1:1-2; 9:26; 1 John 2:18; 1 Pet. 1:20). The New Testament declares that the messianic age promised in the Old Testament began at Christ's first advent. The promised Messiah is now graciously ruling on the throne of David through the Gospel and the sacraments, the means through which He extends His gracious invitation (Matt. 22:1-14). The messianic age which the New Testament declares a present reality cannot be viewed, therefore, as only in the future.⁶

It should be said that although this study has recognized that the Lord's Prayer applies primarily to the present Gospel age, certainly the eternal future with God cannot be overlooked. The hallowing of God's name now, the coming of God's kingdom now, the doing of God's will now, our bread today, our forgiveness today, our protection and deliverance of today are all viewed with an eye on the future kingdom of glory when all things will be perfected. Divine grace received in the present Gospel age is penultimate to eternal life. The kingdom of grace precedes the kingdom of glory! Until then, Christians live in the existential "here and now" of created space and time sustained by God's benevolence and grace. In hope they await their future and final adoption as sons, in the meanwhile ever praying with the words of their *Lord's Prayer*.

⁶ Ibid., 18-19; italics original.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Israel. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. 1st Series, 139-49; 150-67; 2nd series, 72-93; 94-108. Cambridge: University Press, 1924; repr. KTAV, 1967.
- Aland, Kurt. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.
- Alexander, James N. S. "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period." Interpretation 12 (1958): 272-80.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 74 (1983): 237-46.
- Albright, William Foxwell, and C. S. Mann. Matthew. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971.
- Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. Translated by Hilda Graef. New York: Herder, 1961.
- Ambrose. "De Sacramentis" 5.4.18-30. Patrologiae Latina 16, 469-74.
- _____. St. Ambrose On the Sacraments and On the Mysteries. Translated by T. Thompson. Edited by J. H. Srawley. London: SPCK, 1950.
- _____. "The Sacraments." In Saint Ambrose. Theological and Dogmatic Works. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari. The Fathers of the Church. Vol. 44. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1963, 314-18.
- Andersen, Richard. Living the Lord's Prayer: Our Power and Promise. St. Louis: Concordia, 1994.
- Angenieux, J. "Les Différents types de Structure du 'Pater' dans L'Histoire de Son Exégèse." Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 46 (1970): 40-77; 325-359.
- Apocrypha, The. Revised Standard Version. New York: Nelson, 1957.

- Arand, Charles P. "The Battle Cry of Faith: The Catechism's Exposition of the Lord's Prayer." Concordia Journal 21 (1995): 42-65.
- Arndt, William Frederick. Christian Prayer. St. Louis: Concordia, 1937.
- _____. The Sermon on the Mount: A Semi-popular Exposition. St. Louis: Concordia Seminary Mimeo Co., 1944. Pp. 33-36.
- _____. The Gospel According to St. Luke. St. Louis: Concordia, 1956.
- Ashton, John. "Our Father." The Way 18 (1978): 83-91.
- Atkinson, Donald. "The Origin and Date of the 'Sator' Word-Square." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 2 (1951): 1-18.
- _____. "The Sator-Formula and the Beginnings of Christianity." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 22 (October 1938): 419-34.
- Augustine. "De Sermone Domini in Monte secundum Matthaeum" 2.4.15-2.11.38. Patrologiae Latina 34, 1229-1308.
- _____. "Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount." In Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Translated by William Findlay. Revised by D. S. Schaff. Series 1, vol. 6. Edited by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956, 38-46 [abbreviated NPNF¹].
- _____, "Sermon on the Mount." In Ancient Christian Writers. Translated by J. J. Jepsen. Vol. 5. Westminster, Maryland, 1948, 100-27.
- _____. "Sermon on the Mount." In Commentary on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount with Seventeen Related Sermons. Translated by Denis J. Kavanagh. The Fathers of the Church. Vol. 11. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1951, 122-48.
- _____. "Sermones" 56 to 59. Patrologiae Latina 38, 377-402.
- _____. "Sermons. 56-59" In The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century. Vol. 3. Translated by Edmund Hill. New York: City Press, 1991, 95-131.

- _____. "Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament [Sermons 56-59, entitled Sermons VI-IX]." In NPNF¹. Translated by R. G. MacMullen. 6:274-87.
- _____. "130. Letter to Proba." In Saint Augustine: Letters. Vol. 2. The Fathers of the Church. Translated by Wilfrid Parsons. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953. Pp. 376-401, especially 392-395.
- _____. "Enchiridion." In NPNF¹. Translated by J. F. Shaw. 3:274.
- Aune, David E. The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- _____. "Eschatology (Early Christian)." In The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Vol. 2, 594-609. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Ayo, Nicholas. The Lord's Prayer: A Survey Theological and Literary. Notre Dame: University Press, 1992.
- Bahr, Gordon J. "The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church." Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (June 1965): 153-59.
- Bailey, Kenneth Ewing. Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Baines, William. "The Rotas-Sator Square: A New Investigation." New Testament Studies 33 (1987): 469-76.
- Baker, Aelred. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." New Blackfriars 52 (1971): 64-69.
- _____. "What Sort of Bread Did Jesus Want Us to Pray For?" New Blackfriars 54 (1973): 125-29.
- Bakker, Willem Frederik. The Greek Imperative: An Investigation Into the Aspectual Differences Between the Present and Aorist Imperatives in Greek Prayer from Homer to the Present Day. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1966.
- Bammel, E. "A New Text of the Lord's Prayer." The Expository Times 73 (1961): 54.
- Bandstra, Andrew J. "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism: A Response." Calvin Theological Journal 17 (1982): 88-97.

- _____. "The Original Form of the Lord's Prayer." Calvin Theological Journal 16 (1981): 15-37.
- Barclay, William. The Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer for Every Man. New York: Harper, 1968.
- Barr, James. "'Abba' Isn't 'Daddy.'" Journal of Theological Studies n.s. 39 (1988): 28-47.
- _____. The Semantics of Biblical Language. Oxford: University Press, 1961.
- _____. "Which Language Did Jesus Speak? - Some Remarks of a Semitist." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 53 (1970-71): 9-29.
- Barry, Alvin L. Presidential Series on the Lord's Prayer. In The Lutheran Witness 112 (1993): 206, 232, 258, 284, 336; and, 113 (1994): 26, 55, 84, 110, 136.
- Barton, George A. "Professor Torrey's Theory of the Aramaic Origin of the Gospels and the First Half of the Acts of the Apostles." The Journal of Theological Studies 36 (1935): 357-373.
- Barth, Karl. Prayer: According to the Catechisms of the Reformation. Translated by Sara Terrien. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
- Bassett, F. Tilney. "Give us this Day our Daily Bread." The Expository Times 3 (1891-1892): 27-31.
- Bauer, Johannes Baptista. "Libera nos a malo (Mt. 6,13)." Verbum Domini 34 (1956): 12-15.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and Wilbur F. Gingrich. Chicago: The University Press, 1957 [abbreviation BAG].
- Baumbach, Günther. Das Verständnis des Bösen in den synoptischen Evangelien. Theologische Arbeiten, vol. 19. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963. Pp. 76-77.
- Beare, Francis Wright. The Gospel according to Matthew. San Francisco: Harper, 1981.
- Becker, Karl, and Marie Peter. Our Father: A Handbook for Meditation. Chicago: Regnery, 1956.
- Behm, Johannes. See TDNT.

- Bengel, Johann Albrecht. Gnomon. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1915 (First ed., 1742).
- Bennett, William. "The Sons of the Father: The Fatherhood of God in the Synoptic Gospels." Interpretation 4 (1950): 12-23.
- Benoit, Jean-Daniel. "Le Notre Pere dans le culte et la priere des Eglises protestantes." Maison-Dieu 85 (1966): 101-116.
- Berger, Klaus. "Lord's Prayer." In Sacramentum Mundi. Vol. 3, 343-46. New York, Herder, 1969.
- Bergerac, Groupe de. "Lecture Critique de Matthieu 6/9-13." Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses 55 (1980): 556-59.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. ICC. Vol. 2. Edinburg: Clark, 1928.
- Bertheau, Carl. "Noch einmal die Luthersche Erklärung der vierten Bitte im Vaterunser." Theologische Studien und Kritiken 64 (1881): 161-171.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "A Jewish-Christian Cultic Didache in Matt. 6:1-18: Reflections and Questions on the Problem of the Historical Jesus." Chap. 4 in Essays on the Sermon on the Mount. Translated by L. L. Welborn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985. Pp. 55-70.
- Biarowsky, Wilhelm Eduard Immanuel. Das Vater Unser in Christenlehren. Nördlingen: Beck, 1850.
- Bible, The Holy. Revised Standard Version. New York: Nelson, 1946, 1952, 1959 [RSV].
- _____. New International Version. New York: International Bible Society, 1978 [NIV].
- _____. New King James Version. Nashville: Nelson, 1982 [NKJV].
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977, 1984 [BHS].
- Bietenhard, Hans. See TDNT.
- Bindley, T. Herbert. "Eschatology in the Lord's Prayer." The Expositor, Eighth series 18 (1919): 315-320.

- Birkeland, Harris. "The Language of Jesus." In Avhandlingar utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse. 1954, no. 1. Oslo: Jacob Kyrwad, 1954.
- Bischoff, A. "Ἐπιούσιος." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 7 (August 1906): 266-271.
- Black, Matthew. "The Aramaic of τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον (Matth. 6,11 = Luke 11,3)." The Journal of Theological Studies 42 (1941): 186-189.
- _____. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Clarendon, 1st ed., 1946; 2nd ed., 1954; 3rd ed., 1967.
- _____. "The Doxology to the Pater Noster with a Note on Matthew 6.13B." In A Tribute to Geza Vermes. Festschrift edited by Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 100. Pp.327-38.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University Press, 1961 [abbreviation BDF].
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Apropos of the Lord's Prayer." The Heythrop Journal 3 (1962): 51-60.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer and the Hill of Olives." The Heythrop Journal 3 (1962): 169-171.
- Bock, Joh. Peter. "Aphoristische Vaterunser-Analekten." Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 35 (1911): 395-405.
- _____. "Nachträgliches zur Brotbitte des Vaterunser." Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 36 (1912): 654-664; 869-886.
- _____. "Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie." Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 32 (1908): 776-782.
- Boer, P. A. H. de. Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Boff, Leonardo. The Lord's Prayer: The Prayer of Integral Liberation. Translated by Theodore Morrow. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1983.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. The Cost of Discipleship. Translated by R. H. Fuller. Chap. 15, 180-87. New York: Macmillan, 1949; 1959; 1963.

_____. S.v. Godsey, John D.

Bonnard, Pierre. L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1963.

Bonnard, Pierre, Jacques Dupont, and François Refoulé. Notre Père Qui Es Aux Cieux: La Prière oecuménique. Maubourg: Du Cerf, 1968.

Borg, Marcus. Jesus: A New Vision. San Francisco: Harper, 1987. Pp. 1-21.

_____. "A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus." Foundations & Facets Forum 2:3 (September 1986): 81-102.

Borgen, Peder. Bread from Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Conception of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

Borland, James A. "Re-Examining New Testament Textual-Critical Principles and Practices Used to Negate Inerrancy." In The King James Version Defended. Edited by Edward F. Hills. Philadelphia: Covenant and Reformed Presbyterian, 1956. Pp. 40-190.

Born, A. van den. "Manna." In Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by Louis F. Hartman. Col. 1434-1436. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Bornhäuser, Karl Bernard. Der Ursinn des Kleinen Katechismus D. Martin Luthers. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1933. Pp. 124-46.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt." New Testament Studies 24 (1977-78): 419-432.

_____. "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew." In Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held. Translated by Percy Scott. London: SCM, 1963. Pp. 15-51.

_____. Jesus of Nazareth. Translated by Irene and Fraser McLuskey and James M. Robinson. New York: Harper, 1956.

Botha, F. J. "Recent Research on the Lord's Prayer." Neotestamentica 1 (1967): 42-50.

- Bourgoin, Henri. "Ἐπιούσιος expliqué par la notion de préfixe vide." [unused, void] Biblica 60 (1979): 91-96.
- Braun, F. -M. "Le pain dont nous avons besoin (Mt 6,11; Lc 11,3)." Nouvelle Revue Théologique 100 (1978): 559-68.
- Bretscher, Paul G. "The Lord's Prayer in Worship and Catechism." Lutheran Forum 22 (1988): 12-14.
- Brightman, F. E. Liturgies Eastern and Western. Oxford: Clarendon, 1846.
- Broadus, John A. Commentary on Matthew. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886; repr. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1990.
- Brocke, George. "The Lord's Prayer Interpreted Through John and Paul." The Downside Review 98 (1980): 298-311.
- Brocke, Michael and Jakob Petuchowski, eds. The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. New York: Seabury, 1978.
- Brockington, L. H. "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament use of ΔΟΞΑ." In Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford, Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 1-8.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
- Brown, Raymond E. "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," Theological Studies 22 (June 1961): 175-208. Reissued in New Testament Essays, 217-253. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965 (citations are from the latter). A condensation appeared in Theology Digest 10 (1962): 3-10.
- Brown, Schuyler. Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke. Analecta Biblica 36. Rome: Pontifical, 1969.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain. The Training of the Twelve. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1894. Pp. 52-68.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. New Testament History. Garden City: Doubleday, 1972.
- Bruggen, Jakob Van. "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism." Calvin Theological Journal 17 (1982): 78-87.

- Bruner, Frederick Dale. The Christbook: A Historical/Theological Commentary. Matthew 1-12. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Buchan, William M. "Research on the Lord's Prayer." The Expository Times 100 (1989): 336-339.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. See TDNT.
- Burdett, K. C. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." The Expository Times 102 (1990-91): 148-49.
- Burgon, John William. The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels. London: Bell, 1896.
- _____. The Revision Revised. London: Murray, 1883.
- Burkitt, F. C. "As We Have Forgiven." The Journal of Theological Studies 33 (April 1932): 253-55.
- Burney, C. F. The Poetry of Our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.
- Burrows, Millar. "Thy Kingdom Come." Journal of Biblical Literature 74 (March 1955): 1-8.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. The Epistle to the Galatians. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1920, 1988.
- Bussche, H[enri]. van den. Understanding the Lord's Prayer. Translated by Charles Schaldenbrand. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- Butler, B. C. "God's Kingdom: Future or Present?" Downside Review 95 (1977): 164-175.
- _____. The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
- Cadbury, J. J. "Superfluous KAI' in the Lord's Prayer and Elsewhere." In Munera Studiosa. William H. P. Hatch Festschrift. Cambridge, Mass.: Episcopal Theological School, 1946. Pp. 41-47.
- Cahill, Lisa Sowle. "The Ethical Implications of the Sermon on the Mount." Interpretation 41 (1987): 144-56.
- Caird, George Bradford. The Language and Imagery of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.

- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion, 3.20. 34-48. (First Latin ed., 1536; last French ed., 1559). Translated by John Allen; American edition by Benjamin B. Warfield, vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- _____. Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. (1555) Translated by William Pringle. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Cameron, P. S. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." The Expository Times 101 (1990): 299-301.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Fais que nous n'entrions pas dans la tentation. La portée d'une négation devant un verbe au causatif." Revue Biblique 72 (April 1965): 218-226.
- _____. "Hebrew Translations of the Lord's Prayer: An Historical Survey." In Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor. Edited by Gary A. Tuttle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978. Pp. 18-79.
- _____. "Les Dangers de L'Eschatologie." New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71): 365-90.
- _____. Recherches sur le "Notre Père". Paris: Letouzey, 1969.
- Carr, G. L. "Manna." In The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by G. W. Bromiley. Vol. 3, 239-40. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Carson, Donald A. The Sermon on the Mount: An Evangelical Exposition of Matthew 5-7. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- Cassian, John. "De Oratione." Collatio 9.18-25. Patrologiae Latina 49, 788-802.
- _____. John Cassian: Conferences. Translated by Colm Luibheid. Classics of Western Spirituality. New York: Paulist, 1985. Pp. 101-24.
- Catchpole, D. R. "Q and 'The Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi. 5-8/9)." The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 34 (1983): 407-24.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

Charlesworth, James H. "The *Beth Essentiae* and the Permissive Meaning of the Hiphil (Aphel)." In Of Scribes and Scrolls. John Strugnell Festschrift. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, Thomas H. Tobin. College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5. New York: University Press of America, 1990. Pp. 67-78.

_____. "Jewish Prayers in the Time of Jesus." Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue no. 2 (1992): 36-55.

Charlesworth, James H. "A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of *Abba*: A Study of the Lord's Prayer." In The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity, 1994. Pp. 1-14 (good bibliography, 186-201).

Chase, Frederic Henry. The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Vol. 1, no. 3. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge: University Press, 1891.

Chomsky, W. "What was the Jewish Vernacular during the Second Commonwealth?" The Jewish Quarterly Review 42 (October 1951): 193-212.

Chrysologus. "Sermones" 67-72. Patrologiae Latina 52, 390-406.

_____. Saint Peter Chrysologus. Selected Sermons and Saint Valerian. Homilies. Translated by George E. Ganss. The Fathers of the Church. Vol. 17. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953. Pp. 115-23 (partial).

Chrysostom. "In Matthaem homilia" 19.4-6. Patrologiae Graeca 57, 278-82.

_____. "In Orationem Dominicam" Patrologiae Graeca 51, 44-48.

_____. "The Works of St. Chrysostom." Translated by George Prevost. Revised by M. B. Riddle. In Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Vol. 10. First Series. Edited by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950 repr., 130-40.

Clark, David J. "Our Father in Heaven." The Bible Translator 30 (1979): 210-213.

- Clark, Kenneth Willis. "The Meaning of APA." In The Gentile Bias and Other Essays. Edited by John Lawrence Sharpe III. Leiden: Brill, 1980. Pp. 192-206.
- Clifford, William. "Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread. A Prayer for the 'Meat That Endureth.'" The Expository Times 28 (August 1917): 523-524.
- Coates, Thomas. The Sermon on the Mount for Today. St. Louis: Clayton, 1978. Pp. 66-81.
- Collins, Raymond. "Thy Will Be Done on Earth As It Is in Heaven-Matthew 6:10." Bible Today 14 (1964): 911-917.
- Cook, Albert S. "The Evolution of the Lord's Prayer in English." The American Journal of Philology 12 (1891): 59-66.
- Corbishley, Thomas. The Prayer of Jesus. Garden City: Doubleday, 1977.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: Clark, 1975. Pp. 396-400.
- Cremer, Hermann. Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Translated by William Urwick. Edinburgh: Clark, 1878 (First ed., 1867) s.v. 'Ἐπιούσιος, 239-42; Περιούσιος, 242-44.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Salvation in History. Translated by Sidney G. Sowers. London: SCM, 1967.
- Cureton, William. Remains of a Very Antient [sic] Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac. London: Murray, 1858.
- Cyprian. "De oratione Dominica." Patrologiae Latina 4, 535-62.
- _____. St. Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer. Translated by T. Herbert Bindley. London: S.P.C.K., 1914.
- _____. St. Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer. See Clement M. O'Donnell, *infra*.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer." In Saint Cyprian. Treatises. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari. Vol. 36. The Fathers of the Church. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1958, 127-59.

- _____. "Treatise IV, on the Lord's Prayer." In The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 5. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Translated by Ernest Wallis. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986 repr., 447-57.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. "Mystagogical Catecheses" 5.11-18. Patrologiae Graeca 33, 1117-24.
- _____. Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa. Edited by William Telfer. The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. 4. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955.
- _____. St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments. The Procatechesis and the Five Mystagogical Catecheses. Edited by F. L. Cross. London: SPCK, 1951.
- _____. The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem. Vol. 2. The Fathers of the Church. Vol. 64. Translated by Leo P. McCauley, and Anthony A. Stephenson. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1970. Pp. 198-202.
- Cyster, R. F. "The Lord's Prayer and the Exodus Tradition." Theology 64 (1961): 377-381.
- Dahms, John V. "Lead Us Not into Temptation." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 17 (1974): 223-230.
- Dalman, Gustaf. Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Translated by Paul G. Levertoff. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- _____. The Words of Jesus. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: Clark, 1902. (N.B.: appendix A not in ET, see below)
- _____. Die Worte Jesu. Vol. 1, Zweite Auflage mit Anhang: A. Das Vaterunser, 283-365. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930; 1965 (N.B.: appendix not in first edition).
- Dalman, William. The Lord's Prayer. St. Louis: Concordia, 1924.
- Damerau, Rudolf. Luthers Gebetslehre Bis 1515. Vol. 1. Marburg: Selbstverlag [printed privately], 1975.
- _____. Luthers Gebetslehre 1515-46. Vol. 2. Marburg: Selbstverlag, 1977.
- Danby, Herbert, tr. The Mishnah, Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes. London: Oxford, 1950.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athlone, 1956.

Davids, Peter H. "The Meaning of ΑΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James 1.3." New Testament Studies 24 (1977-78): 392-410.

Davies, W. D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: University Press, 1964 (see also Appendix VIII, 451-53).

Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew. ICC, vol. 1. Edinburgh: Clark, 1988 (especially "Excursus: The Lord's Prayer: Matthew 6.9-13 = Luke 11.2-4," 590-617).

Dawes, Dorothy. "When You Pray, Say: ABBA!" The Bible Today 58 (1972): 635-41.

Debrunner, Albert. "Ἐπιούσιος." Glotta 4 (1913): 249-53.

_____. "Ἐπιούσιος." Glotta 13 (1924): 167-71.

_____. "'Ἐπιούσιος." Theologische Literaturzeitung 50 (March 1925): col. 119.

_____. "Zu Holzingers Erklärung von ἐπιούσιος." Philologische Wochenschrift 51 (1931): col. 1277-78.

Deissmann, G. Adolf. Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity. Translated by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: Clark, 1901; reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1988.

_____. "'Ἐπιούσιος." In Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag dargebracht. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914. Pp. 115-19.

_____. Light from the Ancient East. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. New York: Harper, 1927.

Delobel, J. "The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition: A Critique of Recent Theories and Their View on Marcion's Role." In The New Testament in Early Christianity. Edited by J. Sevrin. Louvain: University Press, 1989. Pp. 293-309.

- Dewailly, Louis-Marie. "'Donne-Nous Notre Pain': Quel Pain? Notes sur la quatrième demande du Pater." Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques 64 (1980): 561-88.
- _____. "Vilket bröd avses i Fader vår?" Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 45 (1980): 77-89.
- Dibelius, Martin. The Sermon on the Mount. New York: Scribner's, 1940.
- Dibelius, Otto. Das Vaterunser. Umriss zu einer Geschichte des Gebets in der Alten und Mittleren Kirche. Giessen: J. Ricker (=Alfred Töpelmann), 1903.
- Di Sante, Carmine. Jewish Prayer: The Origins of the Christian Liturgy. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- Dobschütz, E[rnst]. von. "The Lord's Prayer." Harvard Theological Review 7 (July 1914): 293-321.
- Donn, Thomas M. "The Lord's Prayer. Directory or Formula?" Evangelical Quarterly 9 (1937): 426-34.
- Dorneich, Monica. The Lord's Prayer: A Bibliography. Freiburg im Breisgau: Oratio Dominica Foundation, 1987 (n.b.: many inaccuracies).
- Dornseiff, Franz. "Ἐπιούσιος im Vaterunser." Glotta: Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache 35 (1956): 145-49.
- Dunn, James D. G. "Spirit and Kingdom." The Expository Times 82 (1970-71): 36-40.
- Dupont, Jacques, Pierre Bonnard. "Le Notre Père: Notes exégétiques." In La Maison-Dieu 85 (1966): 7-35; repr., see under Pierre Bonnard, Notre Père, 77-115.
- Dürig, Walter. "Die Deutung der Brotbitte des Vaterunsers bei den lateinischen Vätern bis Hieronymus." In Liturgisches Jahrbuch 18 (1968): 72-86.
- Ebeling, []. "Die vierte Bitte des Vaterunsers in Luthers Kleinem Katechismus." Theologische Studien und Kritiken 71 (1898): 171-82.
- Ebeling, Gerhard. The Lord's Prayer in Today's World. Translated by James W. Leitch. London: SCM, 1966.

- _____. Luther: An Introduction to his Thought. Translated by R. A. Wilson. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
- Eckhardt, E. "Vater Unser." In Homiletisches Reallexikon. Vol. 7. Battle Creek, Nebraska and St. Louis: Success, 1917. Pp. 57-96.
- Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1942.
- _____. The Temple. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d. Pp. 152-57.
- Edmonds, Peter. "The Lucan Our Father: A Summary of Luke's Teaching on Prayer?" The Expository Times 91 (1979-80): 140-43.
- Edwards, J. K. "The word ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ in the Fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer." Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie 29 (1886): 371-378.
- Eisler, Robert. "Das letzte Abendmahl. 6. τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 24 (1925): 190-192.
- Eitrem, S. "The sator arepo-formula once more." Eranos 48 (1950): 73-74.
- Elbogen, Ismar. Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Leipzig: G. Forck, 1913. ET, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History. Translated by Raymond P. Scheindlin. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1993.
- _____. "Gebet. In Judentum." In Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Third ed., edited by Kurt Gallig. Vol. 2, 1217-1218. Tübingen: Mohr, 1958.
- Elliott, James Keith. "Did the Lord's Prayer Originate with John the Baptist?" Theologische Zeitschrift 29 (1973): 215.
- Ellis, Edward Earle. Eschatology in Luke. Facet Books, Biblical Series 30. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Emerton, J. A. "MARANATHA and EPHPHATHA." The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 18 (October 1967): 427-431.

- The "End Times": A Study on Eschatology and Millennialism. A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. St. Louis: Concordia, 1989.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. See IDB.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." Journal of Biblical Literature 93 (1973): 386-414.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. A Deuout treatise vpon the Pater noster [Precatio Dominica]. A Quincentennial Symposium, 97-124. Translated by Margaret More Roper (1505-1544), and edited by Richard L. DeMolen. New York: Twane, 1971.
- Eusebius. The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine. Translated by G. A. Williamson. Baltimore: Penguin, 1965.
- Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 37-53.
- Evans, Owen E. See IDB.
- Eyton, Robert. The Lord's Prayer: Sermons. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893.
- Falcone, Sebastian A. "The Kind of Bread We Pray for in the Lord's Prayer." In Essays in Honor of Joseph P. Brennan. Edited by R. F. McNamara. Rochester, New York: St. Bernard's Seminary, 1976. Pp.36-59.
- Falconer, R. A. "Doxology." In A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. 1, 492-93.
- Farmer, William R. The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis. Dillsboro, N.C.: Western North Carolina Press, 1976.
- Farrar, Frederic W. "Exegetic Studies on the Lord's Prayer." The Expositor, fourth series, 7 (1893): 38-49; 283-293.
- _____. History of Interpretation. London: Macmillan, 1886.
- Farrer, A. M. "On Dispensing with Q." In Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 55-88.
- Fensham, F. Charles. "The Legal Background of MT. vi 12." Novum Testamentum 4 (1960): 1-2.

Fiebig, Paul. Jesu Bergpredigt. Rabbinische Texte zum Verständnis dargeboten und mit Erläuterungen und Lesarten versehen, 103-122; 48-56. In Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Neu Folge, Heft 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924.

_____. Das Vaterunser. Ursprung, Sinn und bedeutung des christlichen Hauptgebetes. In Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, vol. 30, no. 3. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1927.

Filson, Floyd V. "How Much of the New Testament Is Poetry?" Journal of Biblical Literature 67 (1948): 125-134.

_____. "Were there Christians in Pompeii?" The Biblical Archaeologist 2 (May 1939): 14-16.

Finkel, Asher. "The Prayer of Jesus in Matthew." In Standing Before God. John M. Oesterreicher Festschrift. Edited by Asher Finkel and Lawrence Frizzell. New York: KTAV, 1981. Pp. 131-169.

Finkelstein, Louis. "The Development of the Amidah." The Jewish Quarterly Review, n.s. 16 (1925-26): 1-43; 127-170.

Fishwick, Duncan. "On the Origin of the Rotas-Sator Square." The Harvard Theological Review 57 (January 1964): 39-53.

Fitzmeyer, Joseph. "Abba and Jesus' Relation to God." In À Cause de L'Évangile. P. Jacques Dupont Festschrift. Saint-André: Cerf, 1985. Pp. 15-38.

_____. The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV). The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985. Pp. 896-907.

_____. "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1970): 510-31.

Flunk, Matthias. "Ὁ ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος." Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 13 (1889): 210-12.

Flusser, David. "Qumrân and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers." Israel Exploration Journal 16 (1966): 194-205.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Kirsopp Lake. The Beginnings of Christianity. Part 1, The Acts of the Apostles, Prolegomena, 402. London: Macmillan, 1942.

Foerster, Werner. See TDNT.

- Ford, J. Massingberd. "Yom Kippur and the Matthean Form of the Pater Noster." Worship 41 (1967): 609-619.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. Jahwebund und Kirche Christi. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.
- Franzmann, Martin H. The Word of the Lord Grows. St. Louis: Concordia, 1961.
- Freudenberger, Rudolf. "Zum Text der zweiten Vaterunserbitte." New Testament Studies 15 (1968-69): 419-32.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. "ΑΠΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΘΥΣΙΟΣ." Symbolae Osloenses 2 (1924): 31-41.
- _____. "ΑΠΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΘΥΣΙΟΣ. Eine Nachlese." Symbolae Osloenses 9 (1930): 62-68.
- Friedlander, Gerald. The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount. Chap. 10-12, 123-165. London: Routledge, 1911; repr. New York: KTAV, 1969.
- Froehlich, Karlfried. "The Lord's Prayer in Patristic Literature." Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue no. 2 (1992): 71-87.
- Fuller, David Otis. Which Bible? Grand Rapids: International, 1970.
- Furberg, Ingemar. Das Pater Noster in der [Lutheran] Messe. Lund: Gleerup, 1968.
- Gärtner, Bertil. John 6 And the Jewish Passover. Coniectanea Neotestamentica XVII. Lund: Gleerup, 1959.
- Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation. Garden City: Doubleday, 1956; 3rd ed., 1976.
- Geldenhuis, Norval. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1951.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. "The Matthean Version of the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9b-13): Some Observations." In The New Testament Age. Bo Reicke Festschrift. Vol. 1. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Mercer, 1984. 207-220.
- _____. The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1-11 & Par): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash. Lund: Gleerup, 1966. Pp. 25-35.

- George, Alfred Raymond. Communion with God in the New Testament. London: Epworth, 1953.
- Gill, Alfred. "Daily Bread." The Expository Times 3 (1891): 24.
- Giordani, Iginio. The Social Message of Jesus. Translated by Alba I. Zizzamia. Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild, 1943. Pp. 61-90.
- Girgensohn, Herbert. Teaching Luther's Catechism. Translated by John Doberstein. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959. Pp. 199-306.
- Gnilka, J. "Vaterunser, das 'Gebet des Herrn.'" In Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. 2nd edition. Edited by Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner. Vol. 10, 624-27. Freiburg, Herder, 1965.
- Godsey, John D. Preface to Bonhoeffer: The Man and Two of His Shorter Writings. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965. Pp. 27-48.
- Golladay, Robert Emory. The Lord's Prayer. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1921.
- Goodenough, Ervin R. "Fish, Bread, and Wine." Chap. 3, 62-95. In Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. Vol. 5. New York: Pantheon, 1956.
- Goodwin, William W. A Greek Grammar. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Goulder, M. D. "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer." The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s., 14 (April 1963): 32-45.
- _____. The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture. London: SPCK, 1978.
- _____. Midrash and Lection in Matthew. London: S.P.C.K., 1974.
- Graebner, Martin. The Lord's Prayer and the Christian Life. St. Louis: Concordia, 1937.
- Grant, D. M. "'Debts' or 'Trespases'?" The Expository Times 36 (1924-25): 526.
- Grant, Frederick C. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. New York: Macmillan, 1959.

Grant, Robert M. Gods and the One God. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

_____. A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible. New York: Macmillan, 1948, 1963.

Grassi, Joseph A. "Abba, Father (Mark 14:36): Another Approach." The Journal of the American Academy of Religion 50 (1982): 449-58.

Graubard, Baruch. "The Kaddish Prayer." In The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. Edited by Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. London: Burns & Oates, 1978. Pp. 59-72.

Grayston, Kenneth. "Sin." In A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson, 226-229. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

The Greek New Testament. Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. 3rd corrected edition. New York: United Bible Societies, 1983. [Also see Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece]

Greeven, Heinrich. Gebet und Eschatologie im Neuen Testament. In Neutestamentliche Forschungen, Dritte Reihe, no. 1. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1931.

Gregory of Nyssa. "De oratione Dominica." Patrologiae Graeca 44, 1119-1194.

_____. "The Lord's Prayer." Translated by Hilda C. Graef, in Ancient Christian Writers. Vol. 18. Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1954.

Greig, J. C. G. "Abba and Amen: Their Relevance to Christology." In F. L. Cross, ed., Studia Evangelica V (TU 103), Berlin, 1963. Pp. 3-13.

Greiner, Albert. Die Freude Des Vaterunsers. Munich: Dietz, 1964.

Grelot, Pierre. "L'Arrière-Plan Araméen du 'Pater'," Revue Biblique 91 (1984): 531-56.

_____. "La Quatrième Demande du 'Pater' et Son Arrière-Plan Sémitique." New Testament Studies 25 (1979): 299-314.

Grintz, Jehoshua M. "Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple." Journal of Biblical Literature 79 (March 1960): 32-47.

- Grundmann, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
- _____. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.
- _____. See TDNT.
- Guardini, Romano. The Lord's Prayer. Translated by Isabel McHugh. New York: Pantheon, 1958.
- Guelich, Robert. The Sermon on the Mount. Dallas: Word, 1982.
- Gundry, Robert H. "The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine." Journal of Biblical Literature 83 (December 1964): 404-408.
- _____. Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Theology. Third edition. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1981.
- Hadidian, Dikran Y. "The Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper in the Early Church." Studia Liturgica 15 (1982-83): 132-44.
- _____. "The Meaning of ἐπιούσιος and the Codices Sergii." New Testament Studies 5 (October 1958): 75-81.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. The Titles of Jesus in Christology. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. New York: World, 1969. Pp. 307-17.
- _____. The Worship of the Early Church. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert. God the Father. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- _____. "God the Father in the Bible and in the Experience of Jesus: The State of the Question." In God as Father? Edited by Johannes-Baptist Metz and Edward Schillebeeckx. New York: Seabury, 1981. Pp. 95-102.
- Hamman, Adalbert G. Le Pater expliqué par les Pères. Paris: Frasnicaines, 1962.
- _____. "Le Notre Père dans la Catéchèse des Pères de l'Église." La Maison-Dieu 85 (1966): 41-68.

- _____. "Prayer." In The New Encyclopedia Britannica. Macropaedia Vol. 14. 15th ed. Chicago: Benton, 1981. Pp. 948-53.
- _____. Prayer: The New Testament. Translated by Paul Oigny. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1971.
- Hanson, R. P. C. Allegory and Event. Richmond: Knox, 1959.
- Harder, Günther. See TDNT.
- Harnack, Adolf von. Erforschtes und Erlebtes. 2. Der ursprüngliche Text des Vater-Unsers und seine älteste Geschichte. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1923. Pp. 24-35.
- _____. Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. repr. Berlin: Akademie, 1960.
- _____. New Testament Studies II: The Sayings of Jesus, the Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. New York: Putnam, 1908. Pp. 63-66; 136.
- _____. What Is Christianity? Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Harnack, Theodosius. Katechetik und Erklärung des kleinen Katechismus Dr. Martin Luthers. Erlangen: Deichert, 1882.
- Harner, Philip. Understanding the Lord's Prayer. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- _____. "Matthew 6:5-15." Interpretation 41 (1987): 173-78.
- Hartman, Lars. "Your Will Be Done on Earth As It Is in Heaven." African Theological Journal 11 (1982): 209-18.
- Harvey, A[nthony]. E[rnest]. Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament Including the Apocryphal Books. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.
- Hauck, Friedrich. "ἄριστος ἐπιούσιος." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 33 (1934): 199-202.
- _____. See TDNT.

- Haußleiter, Johannes. "Vaterunser." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Edited by Albert Hauck. Vol. 20, 431-455. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer." In The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by George William Gilmore. Vol. 7, 21-23. Grand Rapids: Baker and Funk & Wagnalls, 1910.
- Haverfield, F. "A Roman Charm from Cirencester." The Archaeological Journal 56 (1899): 319-323.
- Heaton, Eric William. Everyday Life in the Old Testament Times. New York: Scribner's, 1956. Pp. 81-83.
- Hebart, Friedemann. "The Role of the Lord's Prayer in Luther's Theology of Prayer." Lutheran Theological Journal 18 (1984): 6-17.
- The Heidelberg Catechism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Heiler, Friedrich. Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion. Translated by Samuel McComb. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Heinemann, Joseph. "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition." In The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. Edited by Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. London: Burns & Oates, 1978. Pp. 81-89.
- _____. Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1977.
- Heinemann, Joseph, and Jakob J. Petuchowski. Literature of the Synagogue. New York: Behrman House, 1975.
- Heller, Johannes. "Sie sechste Bitte des Vaterunser." Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 25 (1901): 85-93; see French trans. by Jean Le Moyne, in Carmignac, Recherches, Appendix II, 437-445.
- Hemer, Colin J. "Ἐπιούσιος." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 22 (1984): 81-94. See also Hemer under NIDNTT.
- Henke, Fritz. "Auflösung der AREPO-Zeile in der SATOR-Formel." Theologische Zeitschrift 5 (July-August 1949): 316-17.
- Hennecke, Edgar. New Testament Apocrypha. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, vol. 1, 1963; vol. 2, 1964.

- Hennig, John. "Our Daily Bread." Theological Studies 4 (1943): 445-454.
- Hensler, Joseph. Das Vaterunser: Text-und Literarkritische Untersuchungen. In Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Vol. 4, no. 5. Münster-im-Westphalia: Aschendorff, 1914.
- Herrmann, Johannes. "Der alttestamentliche Urgrund des Vaterunsers." In Festschrift Otto Procksch, 71-98. Leipzig: Deichert and Hinrichs, 1934.
- Hill, David. The Gospel of Matthew. New Century Bible. Sheffield: Oliphants, 1972.
- _____. "'Our Daily Bread' (Matt 6.11) in the History of Exegesis." Irish Biblical Studies 5 (1983): 2-10.
- Hiers, Richard H. Jesus and the Future. Atlanta: Knox, 1981.
- _____. "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts." New Testament Studies (1974): 145-55.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "Lead us not into temptation. Some Latin Variants." The Journal of Theological Studies 46 (1945): 179-183.
- Hills, Edward F. The King James Version Defended. Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984.
- Hoare, J. N. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." The Expository Times 50 (April 1939): 333.
- Hodges, Zane C. "The Greek Text of the King James Version." In Which Bible? Edited by David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids: International, 1970. Pp. 25-38.
- Hodges, Zane C., and Arthur L. Farstad. The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text. 2nd ed. New York: Nelson, 1985.
- Hoekema, Anthony A. The Bible and the Future. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Hoffmann, Oswald C. The Lord's Prayer. San Francisco: Harper, 1982.
- Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

- Holzinger, Karl. "Zur Lösung der ἐπιούσιος-Frage." Philologische Wochenschrift 51 (July 4, 1931): col. 825-830; 28 (July 11, 1931): col. 857-863.
- _____. "Ἐπιούσιος. Erwiderung auf Sp. 2277 (1931)." Philologische Wochenschrift 52 (March 26, 1932): col. 383-84.
- Horwill, H. W. "Our 'Daily' Bread." The Expository Times 2 (1891): 254-55.
- Hoskier, Herman C. Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment. London: Quaritch, 1914.
- Houk, Cornelius B. "Παράκλησις, The Lord's Prayer, and the Massah Tradition." Scottish Journal of Theology 19 (June 1966): 216-225.
- Houlden, J. L. "Lord's Prayer." In The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Vol. 4, 356-62. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Hultgren, Arland J. "The Bread Petition of the Lord's Prayer." In Christ and His Communities: Essays in Honor of Reginald H. Fuller. Edited by Arland J. Hultgren and Barbara Hall. Anglican Theological Review Supplementary Series 11 (March 1990): 41-54.
- Hunter, Archibald M. A Pattern for Life. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955; repr. of Design for Life. London: SCM, 1953.
- Iersel, Bas van. The Bible on the Temptations of Man. Translated by F. Vander Heijden. De Pere, Wisconsin: St. Norbert Abbey Press, 1966.
- The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. with supplement. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1962 and 1976 [abbreviation IDB].
- s.v. Barrois, Georges Augustin. "Debts." 1:809-10.
- s.v. Ibid. "Olives, Mount of." 3:596-99.
- s.v. Branton, James Rodney. "Versions, English." 4:760-70.
- s.v. Cook, Michael J. "Judaism, Early Rabbinic." Supp.: 499-505.
- s.v. Enslin, Morton Scott. "Hebrews, Gospel According to." 2:570-71.
- s.v. Evans, Owen E. "Kingdom of God." 3:17-26.
- s.v. Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "Eschatology of the N.T." Supp.:271-77.

- s.v. Grant, Frederick C. "Matthew, Gospel of." 3:302-13.
 s.v. Gribomont, Jean. "Latin Versions." Supp.:527-32.
 s.v. Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. "Matthew, Gospel of." Supp.:
 580-82.
 s.v. Hamilton, R. W. "Beth-shan." 1:397-401.
 s.v. Hempel, Johannes. "Doxology." 1:867.
 s.v. Jeffery, Arthur. "Aramaic." 1:185-90.
 s.v. Koester, Helmut. "Literature, Early Christian."
 Supp.:551-56.
 s.v. Martin, Ralph P. "Liturgical Materials, N.T."
 Supp.:556-57.
 s.v. McCasland, S. Vernon. "Luke, Gospel of." 3:180-88.
 s.v. Ménard, Jacques-E. "Thomas, Acts of."
 Supp.:902-905.
 s.v. Metzger, Bruce M. "Versions, Ancient." 4:749-60.
 s.v. Mihelic, Joseph L. "Manna." 3:259-260.
 s.v. Moule, C. F. D. "God, NT." 2:430-36.
 s.v. Robinson, Jr., William Childs. "Luke, Gospel of."
 Supp.:558-60.
 s.v. Ross, James F. "Bread." 1:461-64.
 s.v. Shepherd, Massey H. "Didache." 1:841-43.
 s.v. Smith, Charles W. F. "Lord's Prayer." 3:154-58.
 s.v. Ibid. "Prayer." 3:857-67.
 s.v. Vööbus, Arthur. "Syriac Versions." Supp.:848-54.

James, D. T. "ἐπιούσιον (Luke xi,3, Matt. vi,11)." The Expository Times 32 (June 1921): 428.

Jannaris, A. N. "The English Version of the Lord's Prayer." The Contemporary Review 346 (October 1894): 580-591.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Das Gebetsleben Jesu." Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 23 (1926): 123-140.

_____. The Lord's Prayer. Facet Books, Biblical Series 8. Translated by John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress Books, 1964. This is a revision of the original monograph from The Expository Times 71 (February 1960): 141-46 and later revised as Das Vater-Unser im Lichte der neueren Forschung. Calwer Hefte 50. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1962. It also appears as chapter 3 of Jeremias' Prayers of Jesus (*infra*).

_____. New Testament Theology. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1971.

- _____. The Prayers of Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology, Second series 6. Translated by John Bowden, John Reumann, and Christoph Burchard. London: SCM, 1967. This collection of four essays, with the exception of no. 3, "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of Recent Research" = The Lord's Prayer (Facet Books, *supra*) was originally published as Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966.
- _____. Unknown Sayings of Jesus. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- _____. "Vaterunser." In Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 3rd edition. Edited by Kurt Galling. Vol. 6, cols. 1235-1238. Tübingen: Mohr, 1962.
- Jerome. "Commentariorum in Evangelium Matthaei ad Eusebium. Libri Quatuor [sic]." 1.6 Patrologiae Latinae 26, 43-45.
- The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1912. S.v. "Habinenu," 6:126.
- Johnson, Norman B. Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Study of the Jewish Concept of God. JBL Series, vol. 2. Philadelphia: JBL, 1948.
- Juel, Donald. "The Lord's Prayer in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke." Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue no. 2 (1992): 56-70.
- Jungmann, Joseph A. The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development. Translated by Francis A. Brunner. Vol. 2, 275-93. New York: Benziger, 1959.
- Kasch, Wilhelm. See TDNT.
- Kate, R. ten. "Geef ons heden ons 'Dagelijks' brood." Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 32 (1978): 125-39.
- Kauchtschischwili, S. "Ein Beitrag zur ἐπιούσιος-Frage." Philologische Wochenschrift 50 (September 20, 1930): col. 1166-1168.
- Kay, W. "On the Derivation and Meaning of ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ." The Journal of Philology 5 (1874): 48-51.
- Keegan, Terence J. Interpreting the Bible. New York: Paulist, 1985.

Keller, Weldon Phillip. A Layman Looks at the Lord's Prayer. Chicago: Moody, 1976.

Kenny, A. "Transfiguration and the Agony in the Garden." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 19 (1957): 444-52.

The King's Book or A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, 1543. London: SPCK, 1932.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. Matthew As Story. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

_____. Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

_____. The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction-Criticism. Richmond: Knox, 1969. Pp. 1-21.

_____. "The Place, Structure, and Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount Within Matthew." Interpretation 41 (1987): 131-43.

Kirchengesangbuch für Evangelisch-Lutherische Gemeinden. St. Louis: Concordia, n.d.

Kittel, Gerhard. See TDNT.

Kleber, Albert. "The Lord's Prayer and the Decalog." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 3 (1941): 302-320.

Klein, G. "Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 7 (February 1906): 34-50.

Klein, Günther. "The Biblical Understanding of 'The Kingdom of God'," Interpretation 26 (1972): 387-418.

Klijn, A. F. J. The Acts of Thomas. Introduction-Text-Commentary. Nos. 144, 142-143, 293. Leiden: Brill, 1962.

Köberle, Adolf. The Invitation of God. Translated by Roy Barlag. St. Louis: Concordia, 1968. Pp. 131-137.

Kodjak, Andreij. A Structural Analysis of the Sermon on the Mount. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.

Koenig, John. Rediscovering New Testament Prayer. San Francisco: Harper, 1992. Pp. 40-52.

Köstlin, Julius. The Theology of Luther. Translated by Charles E. Hay. Vol. 2, 257-270.

Krentz, Edgar. An Interpretation of the First Three Petitions of the Lord's Prayer. Unpublished B.D. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., 1952.

Kruse, Heinz. "'Pater noster' et Passio Christi." Verbum Domini 46 (1968): 3-29.

Kuhn, G. "Unser tägliches Brot." Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift. 35 (1918): 191-196.

_____. "Zum Verständnis des Wortes ἐπιούσιος im Unservater." Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift. 31 (1914): 33-38.

Kuhn, Karl Georg. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament." In The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl, 94-113. New York: Harper, 1957; originally Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 49 (1952): 200-222.

_____. Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, no. 1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1950.

Kuhn, Karl Georg, and Otto Procksch. See TDNT.

Kuhn, Karl Georg, and Karl Ludwig Schmidt. See TDNT.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1956.

Kuss, Otto. "Das Vaterunser." In Auslegung und Verkündigung, vol. 2. Regensburg: Pustet, 1967. Pp. 277-333.

Lachs, Samuel Tobias. "On Matthew VI.12." Novum Testamentum 17 (1965): 6-8.

Ladd, George Eldon. Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

_____. "Eschatology." In The International Standard Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 2, 130-43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

_____. The Gospel of the Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

_____. The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. Évangile selon Saint Luc. Études Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1922; 1941.
- _____. Évangile selon Saint Matthieu. Études Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1948.
- Lake, Kirsopp, tr. Apostolic Fathers. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 1. London: Heinemann, 1965.
- Lambert, J. C. "Lord's Prayer." In A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. 2, 60-63. Edinburgh and New York: Clark and Scribner's, 1913.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writing of St Luke." In Studies in the Gospel: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 159-200.
- _____. "'Our Father' In the Fathers." In Christian Spirituality. Gordon Rupp Festschrift. London: SCM, 1975. Pp. 11-31.
- Lange, John Peter. Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Translated by Philip Schaff. Vol. 8, 121-30; 178-80. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1960.
- The Larger Catechism of the Westminster Assembly. Philadelphia: Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1925.
- LaSor, William Sanford. "Aramaic." In The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Vol. 1, 229-33. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Last, Hugh. "The Rotas-sator Square: Present Position and Future Prospects." The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 3 (April 1952): 92-97.
- LaVerdiere, Eugene A. "The Prayer of Jesus." The Bible Today 66 (1973): 1165-1172.
- Laymon, Charles M. The Lord's Prayer in its Biblical Setting. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.
- Leaney, Robert. "The Lukan Text of the Lord's Prayer (Lk xi2-4)." Novum Testament 1 (April 1956): 103-111.
- Lehmann, Martin. Luther and Prayer. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1985.

- Lenski, Richard C. H. Commentary on the New Testament. 12 vols. Minneapolis: [copyright assigned to] Augsburg, for repr. 1961.
- Léon-Defour, Xavier. The Gospels and the Jesus of History. New York: Desclee, 1968. Pp. 228-250.
- Lessmann, Paul G. The Lord's Prayer and the Lord's Passion. Lenten Sermons. St. Louis: Concordia, 1965.
- Lewis, John J. "The Wilderness Controversy and Peirasmos." Colloquium, 1974, 42-44.
- Liefeld, Walter L. "Lord's Prayer." In The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Vol. 3, 160-64. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Lietzmann, Hans, Heinrich Bornkamm, Hans Volz, and Ernst Wolf, eds. Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963 [abbreviated Bek.].
- L[ietzmann], H. "Notice sur le carré 'Sator.'" Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 35 (1936): 313-14.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament. 2nd ed. Appendix: "On the Words ἐπιούσιος, περιούσιος," 195-242. London: Macmillan, 1872, 1891.
- Lipman, Eugene J. The Mishnah: Oral Teachings of Judaism. New York: Schocken, 1974.
- Littmann, Enno. "Torreys Buch über die vier Evangelien." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 34 (1935): 20-34.
- Lochman, Jan Milič. The Lord's Prayer. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- _____. The Theology of Praise. Atlanta: Knox, 1982.
- Löhe, Wilhelm. Predigten über das Vater unser. 3rd ed. Nürnberg: Raw, 1853.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. The Lord's Prayer. Translated by John Bowden. New York, Harper, 1965; originally Das Vater-unser. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946, 1952.
- Lowe, John. The Lord's Prayer. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

- Luther, Martin. D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. 61 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau and successors, 1883-1983 [abbreviated WA].
- s.v. "Auslegung deutsch des Vaterunser für die einfältigen Laien. 1519." WA 2:80-130.
 - s.v. "Betbüchlein. 1522." WA 10.2:375-501 [esp. 395-407].
 - s.v. "Deutsche Messe. 1526." WA 19:72-113 [esp 95-97].
 - s.v. "Vaterunser. 14 Dezember." WA 30.1:95-105.
 - s.v. "Wochenpredigten über Matth. 5-7." WA 32:299-555 [esp.413-27].
 - s.v. "Eine einfältigen Weise zu beten für einen guten Freund. 1535." WA 38:358-75.
-
- . Tischreden. 6 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1912-1921 [abbreviated WATr].
- s.v. No. 4190. WATr 4:190.
 - s.v. No. 5318. WATr 5:57.
-
- . Luther's Works. American Edition. 55 vols. Edited by Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Fortress, and St. Louis: Concordia, 1959-1986 [abbreviated AE].
- s.v. "An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer for Simple Laymen." Translated by Martin H. Bertram. AE 42:15-21.
 - s.v. "Personal Prayer Book." Translated by Martin H. Bertram. AE 43:11-43 [esp. 29-38].
 - s.v. "The German Mass and Order of Service." Translated by August Steimle. Revised by Ulrich Leupold. AE 53:62-90.
 - s.v. "Ten Sermons on the Catechism, 1528." Translated by John W. Doberstein. AE 51:169-82.
 - s.v. "The Sermon on the Mount." Translated by Jaroslav Pelikan. AE 21:3-294 [esp. 141-55].
 - s.v. "A Simple Way to Pray [for a Good Friend]." Translated by Karl J. Schindler. AE 43:193-211.
- Lutheran Cyclopedia. Edited by Erwin L. Lueker. St. Louis: Concordia, 1954.
- Lutheran Worship. St. Louis: Concordia, 1982.
- Lüthi, Walter. The Lord's Prayer: An Exposition. Translated by Kurt Schoenenberger. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Luz, Ulrich. Matthew 1-7: A Commentary. Translated by Wilhelm C. Linss. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- Maclean, A. J. "Abba." In A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. 1, 1-3. New York: Scribner's, 1917.

- Malina, Bruce J. The Palestinian Manna Tradition. The Manna Tradition in the Palestinian Targums and Its Relationship to the New Testament Writings. In Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Späteren Judentums und des Urchristentums, Band 7. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Manson, T. W. "The Lord's Prayer." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 38 (September 1955; March 1956): 99-113; 436-448.
- _____. The Sayings of Jesus As Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke. In The Mission and Message of Jesus, part 2. London: SCM, 1937. Pp. 459-63; 557-58.
- _____. The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1953; repr. 1984. Pp. 1-35.
- _____. The Teachings of Jesus. Cambridge: University Press, 1931.
- Marchel, W. Abba, Père! La prière du Christ et des chrétiens. Analecta Biblica 19. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1963.
- Margoliouth, Moses. The Lord's Prayer: No Adaptation of Existing Jewish Petitions. London: Bagster, 1876.
- Marietti, Petro. The Lord's Prayer in 250 Languages. Edited by Wendell J. S. Krieg. Evanston: Brain, 1870.
- Maritain, Raissa. Notes on the Lord's Prayer. New York: Kenedy, 1964.
- Marmorstein, Arthur. The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature and The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God. New York: KTAV, 1968 repr. Pp. 54-62.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "The Divine Sonship of Jesus." Interpretation 21 (1957): 87-103.
- _____. The Gospel of Luke. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- Marshall, J. T. "Our Morrow's Bread." The Expository Times 3 (October 1891): 25-27.
- Martin, Bernard. Prayer in Judaism. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Marty, Martin. The Hidden Discipline. St. Louis: Concordia, 1962. Pp. 65-87.

Massey, Isabel Ann. Interpreting the Sermon on the Mount in the Light of Jewish Tradition as Evidenced in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch. Lewiston: Mellen, 1991. Pp. 1-32.

Maurice, Frederick Denison. The Prayer-Book and The Lord's Prayer. London: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 283-399.

Maximus Confessor. "Orationis Dominicae Brevis Expositio." Patrologiae Graeca 90, 872-910.

_____. "Commentary on the Our Father." In Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings. Translated by George C. Berthold. Classics of Western Spirituality. New York: Paulist, 1985.

McCaslund, S. Vernon. "Abba, Father." Journal of Biblical Literature 72 (1953): 79-91.

McCaughey, Davis. "Matthew 6.13A. The Sixth Petition in the Lord's Prayer." Australian Biblical Review 33 (1985): 31-40.

McClellan, J. B. "On the Rendering 'Daily Bread' in the Lord's Prayer." The Expository Times 2 (1890-91): 184-88.

McKee, Elsie Anne. "John Calvin's Teaching on the Lord's Prayer." The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue, no. 2 (1992): 88-106.

McNamara, Martin. Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1972.

McNeile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel according to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan, 1915, 1949, 1957.

Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael. Edited by Jacob Z. Lauterbach. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933-35.

Metzger, Bruce. The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

_____. "Num bis relata sit, extra orationem Dominicam, vox *epiousios*?" Verbum Domini 34 (1956): 349-350; revised as "How Many Times Does 'Epiousios' Occur Outside the Lord's Prayer?" The Expository Times 69 (November 1957): 52-54; repr. in Historical and Literary Studies: Prayer, Jewish and Christian. (New Testament Tools and Studies. Vol. 8, 64-66). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

- _____. "The Prayer that Jesus Taught His Disciples." In Sowing the Word. Edited by Patrick Rogers. Dublin: Dominican, 1983. Pp. 126-33.
- _____. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke. Translated by Robert Ernest Wallis and William P. Dickson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884. Pp. 397-99.
- Meyer, Johannes. Historischer Kommentar zu Luthers Kleinem Katechismus. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929.
- Meyer, Rudolf. See TDNT.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. See TDNT.
- Miegge, G. "Le 'Notre Père' prière du temps présent." Études théologiques et religieuses 35 (1960): 237-253.
- Migliore, Daniel, ed. The Lord's Prayer: Perspectives for Reclaiming Christian Prayer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. Originally issued as The Princeton Bulletin, Supplementary Issue No. 2, 1992. See individual bibliographic entries under James H. Charlesworth, Karlfried Froehlich, Donald Juel, Elsie Anne McKee, Patricia Wilson-Kastner.
- Migne, Jacques Paul, ed. Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca. Paris: Migne, 1857-1866 [abbreviated PG].
- _____. Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina. Paris: Garnier, 1844-1900 [abbreviated PL].
- Millgram, Abraham E. Jewish Worship. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1977.
- Milligan, George. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952. Appendix F, 145-151.
- Mitton, C. Leslie. The Epistle of James. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.
- Moeller, Henry R., ed. The Legacy of Zion: Intertestamental Texts Related to the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977, sections 52-54, pp. 148-49.
- Moeller, Walter. O. The Mithraic Origin and Meanings of the Rotas-Sator Square. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

- Montefiore, C. G. Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings. New York: KTAV, 1970.
- _____. The Synoptic Gospels edited with an Introduction and a Commentary. Vol. 2, 532-536. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- Moor, Johannes C. de. "The Reconstruction of the Aramaic Original of the Lord's Prayer." In The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament supplement series. Sheffield: University Press, 1988. Pp. 397-422.
- Moore, Ernest. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." The Expository Times 102 (1991): 171-72.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim, vol. 2, part 6, chap. 1, "The Father in Heaven," 201-211. Cambridge: Harvard, 1927.
- Morag, S. "'Εφραθά (Mark VII.34): Certainly Hebrew, Not Aramaic?" Journal of Semitic Studies 17 (1972): 198-202.
- Morison [sic], E. F. "Hallowed be Thy Name." The Expository Times 28 (1916-17): 298-300.
- Morris, Leon. Luke. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- _____. The Gospel according to Matthew. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- _____. The Gospel according to John. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- _____. "Parousia." In The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by G. W. Bromiley. Vol. 3, 664-670. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Moule, Charles F. D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- _____. "An Unresolved Problem in the Temptation-Clause in the Lord's Prayer." Reformed Theological Review 33 (1974): 65-75.

- _____. "' . . . As we forgive . . .': A Note on the Distinction between Deserts and Capacity in the Understanding of Forgiveness." In Donum Gentilicium. David Daube Festschrift. Edited by E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, W. D. Davies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978. 68-77 (also in Moule, Essays, 278-286).
- _____. The Birth of the New Testament. New York: Harper, 1962.
- _____. "The Influence of Circumstances on the use of Christological Terms." The Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 10 (1959): 247-63.
- _____. See IDB.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: Clark, 1908, p. 173; and Vol. 3, 1963 repr., p. 77, 330.
- Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Artos epiousios." Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 40 (1939): 247-55.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "The Use of ΩΣ in the Greek Bible." Novum Testamentum 7 (1964-65): 51-72.
- Mussner [Mußner], Franz. Tractate on the Jews. Translated by Leonard Swidler. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979. [Also s.v. The Greek New Testament]
- Nestle, Eberhard. "Unser täglich Brot." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 1 (1900): 250-52.
- _____. "Lord's Prayer." In A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. 2, 57-60. Edinburgh and New York: Clark and Scribner's, 1913; 1917.
- _____. "Lord's Prayer." In Encyclopedia Biblica. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. 3, col. 2816-2823. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.

- _____. "Zum Vaterunser." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 6 (1905): 107-108.
- _____. "'Επιούσιος in Hebrew and Aramaic." The Expository Times 21 (October 1909): 43.
- The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology.
 Edited by Colin Brown. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- s.v. Aalen, S. "Glory." 2:44-48.
 s.v. Achilles, E. "Evil, Bad, Wickedness." 1:561-567.
 s.v. Bauder, W. "Sin. paraptoma." 3:585-86.
 s.v. Brown, C. "Holy." 2:224-32.
 s.v. Ibid. "The Form of the Lord's Prayer." 3:869-73.
 s.v. Ibid. "The Parousia and Eschatology in the NT." 3:901-31.
 s.v. Günther, W. "Sin. hamartia." 3:577-83.
 s.v. Harris, M. J. "1. apo and ek." 3:1180-81.
 s.v. Hofius, O. "Father." 1:614.
 s.v. Klappert, B. "Basileia." 2:372-389.
 s.v. Merkel, F. "Bread." 1:249-51.
 s.v. Morganthaler, S. "Earth; Earthly." 1:517-18.
 s.v. Schneider, J. "Rescue." 3:200-205.
 s.v. Ibid., and C. Brown. "Tempt." 3:798-808.
 s.v. Vorländer, H. "Forgiveness." 1:697-702.
- O'Donnell, Clement M. St. Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer.
 Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1960.
- Oddie, William. What Will Happen to God? London: SPCK, 1984.
- Oesterley, William Oscar Emil. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.
- Orchard, Bernard. "The Meaning of Ton Epiouision. (Mt 6:11 = Lk:3)." Biblical Theology Bulletin 3 (1973):274-82.
- Origen. "De Oratione." Patrologiae Graeca 11, 416-562.
- _____. Origen's Treatise on Prayer. Translated by Eric George Jay. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- _____. "On Prayer." Alexandrian Christianity. Translated by John E. L. Oulton and Henry Chadwick. The Library of Christian Classics, vol. 2. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954.
- _____. "On Prayer." In Origen, 81-170. Classics of Western Spirituality. Translated by Rowan A. Greer. New York: Paulist, 1979.

- _____. The Lord's Prayer. Translated by John J. O'Meara. Ancient Christian Writers. No. 19. Westminster, Maryland: Newman, 1954.
- Ott, H. "Um die Muttersprache Jesu: Forschungen seit Gustaf Dalman." Novum Testamentum 9 (January 1967): 1-25.
- Ott, Wilhelm. "Gebet und Heil." In Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Edited by Vinzenz Hamp and Joseph Schmid. Vol. 12. Munich: Kösel, 1965. Pp. 92-123.
- Overduin, Daniel Ch. Reflections on Luther's Small Catechism. Book 3, Lord's Prayer. St. Louis: Concordia, 1980.
- Owen, E. C. E. "'Επιούσιος." The Journal of Theological Studies 35 (October 1934): 376-80.
- The Oxford Classical Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.
- Page, Thomas Ethelbert. "Critical Notes on the Lord's Prayer." The Expositor, 3rd series, 7 (1888): 433-40.
- Palmer, George Herbert. "The Lord's Prayer." Harvard Theological Review 13 (1920): 124-35.
- Pascher, Joseph. "Das Vaterunser der Christen des Deutschen Sprachgebietes." Liturgisches Jahrbuch 18 (1968): 65-71.
- Pax, E. "Beobachtungen zum biblischen Sprachtabu." [sic] Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus, vol. 12 (1961-62): 66-112 (Excursus: "Das sog. Passivum theologicum," 92-110).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. From Luther to Kierkegaard. St. Louis: Concordia, 1950.
- _____. Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings. Luther's Works. American Edition. Companion Volume. St. Louis: Concordia, 1959.
- Perrin, Norman. The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- _____. "Matthew." In Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black. London: Nelson, 1962. Pp. 769-798.
- _____. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. San Francisco: Harper, 1976.

- Perry, Alfred M. "The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount." Journal of Biblical Literature 54 (1935): 103-15.
- Peters, Albrecht. Kommentar zu Luthers Katechismen. Vol. 3, Das Vaterunser. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Peterson, Werner. "The Gospel in the Lord's Prayer: A Lecture-Sermon." Bibliotheca Sacra 87 (1930): 284-97.
- Petuchowski, Jakob J. "Jewish Prayer Texts of the Rabbinic Period," and "The Liturgy of the Synagogue." In The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. Edited by Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. London: Burns & Oates, 1978. Pp. 21-44; 45-58.
- Pieper, Francis. Christian Dogmatics. 3 vols. and index. St. Louis: Concordia, 1953. Pp. 3:306, 310.
- Pieper, Reinhold. Der Kleine Katechismus Luthers aus der Heiligen Schrift und Luthers Werken. Vol. 2. Milwaukee: Germania, 1901.
- Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1910.
- _____. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew. London: Paternoster, 1909.
- _____. "Lord's Prayer." In A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. 3, 141-44. New York: Scribner's, 1900; 1931.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4: 'Lead us not into temptation.'" The Expository Times 101 (1990): 359-362; addenda in The Expository Times 103 (1992): 21-22.
- Potwin, Lemuel S. "Does the Lord's Prayer Make Mention of the Devil?" Bibliotheca Sacra 48 (April 1891): 332-39.
- _____. "Further on τοῦ πονηροῦ in the Lord's Prayer." Bibliotheca Sacra 48 (October 1891): 686-91.
- _____. "'Ἐπιούσιος.'" Journal of Biblical Literature 12 (1893): 15-22.
- _____. "The Old Syriac version of the Lord's Prayer: Its Rendering of 'ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ.'" Bibliotheca Sacra 51 (1894): 165-68.

- Powell, W. "Lead Us Not Into Temptation." The Expository Times 67 (1955-56): 177-78.
- Prayers We Have in Common: Agreed Liturgical Texts Proposed by the International Consultation on English Texts. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970; rev. 1975.
- Preisigke, Friedrich. Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten. Vol. 1. Strassbourg: Trübner, 1915.
- Prentice, William K. "Our 'Daily' Bread: Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον." The Review of Religion 11 (January 1947): 126-31.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures. Princeton: University Press, 1958.
- Procksch, Otto. See TDNT.
- Procter, Francis and Walter Howard Frere. A New History of the Book of Common Prayer. London: Macmillan, 1955.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. "'Be opened' = 'Ἐφαθά (Mark 7, 34): Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?" Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 53 (1962): 229-38.
- Rahlf's, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935, 1962.
- Ramm, Bernard. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. Boston: Wilde, 1950.
- Reed, Stephen A. "Bread." In The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Vol. 1, 777-80. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Reicke, Bo. The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Reumann, John. Jesus in the Church's Gospels: Modern Scholarship and the Earliest Sources. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968. Pp. 88-109.
- Richardson, R. D. "The Lord's Prayer as an Early Eucharistia." Anglican Theological Review 39 (1957): 123-130.
- Riddle, Donald W. "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek." Journal of Biblical Literature 51 (1932): 13-30.

- Ridderbos, Herman. The Coming of the Kingdom. Translated by H. de Jonste. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1962.
- Rimbach, James A. "God-Talk or Baby-Talk: More on 'Abba'," Currents in Theology and Mission 13 (1986): 232-35.
- Roberts, Alexander. Greek: The Language of Christ and His Apostles. London: Longmans & Green, 1888.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- _____. A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Robinson, John A. T. Redating the New Testament. London: SCM, 1976.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer." In Twelve More New Testament Studies. London: SCM, 1984. Pp. 44-64.
- Roehrs, Walter R. "The Typological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." Concordia Journal 10 (1984): 204-16.
- Rogge, Christian, "'Επιούσιος und kein Ende." Philologische Wochenschrift 47 (September 10 1927): col. 1129-1135.
- Rönsch, Hermann. "Wie und aus welchem Grundgedanken ist die griechische Fassung der vierten Bitte im Vaterunser zu erklären?" Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie 27 (1883): 385-93.
- Rordorf, Willy. "Le 'pain quotidien' (Matth. 6,11) dans l'histoire de l'exégèse." Didaskalia 6 (1976): 221-36.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of its Liturgical Use in the Early Church." Studia Liturgica 14 (1980-81): 1-19.
- _____. "'Wie auch wir vergeben haben unsern Schuldner' (Matth. VI, 12b)." In Texte und Untersuchungen. Vol. 107. Berlin: Akademie, 1970. Pp. 236-41.
- Rowe, Alan. The Topography and History of Beth-Shan. Philadelphia: University Press, 1930.
- Sabugal, Santos. Abba! . . . La Oración del Señor. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1985.

Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.

Sanders, J. A., ed. The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll (11 Q Ps^a). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Saphir, Adolph. Our Lord's Pattern for Prayer. London: Nisbet, 1872; repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1984.

Sasse, Hermann. See TDNT.

Schechter, Solomon. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: Macmillan, 1923; repr. 1961 under Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.

Schelbert, Georg. "Sprachgeschichtliches zu 'abba,'" in Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Edited by Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981. Pp. 395-447.

Schlatter, Adolf. Der Evangelist Matthäus. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1929.

Schlier, Heinrich. See TDNT.

Schlink, Edmund. "Die Gemeinde Jesu Christi und die Anfechtung." In Theologische Existenz Heute, Vol. 59. Munich: Kaiser, 1938. Pp. 3-24. Nota bene: Review by Theodore Engelder in Concordia Theological Monthly 11 (1940): 75-6.

Schmid, W. "Ἐπιούσιος." Glotta 6 (1914-15): 28-29.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. See TDNT.

Schmiedel, Paul Wilhelm. "Die vierte Bitte im Vaterunser." Protestantische Monatshefte 18 (1914): 358-64.

Schmoller, Alfred. Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1989.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. God's Rule and Kingdom. Translated by John Murray. New York: Herder, 1968.

Schneider, Gerhard von. "Die Bitte um das Kommen des Geistes im lukanischen Vaterunser (Lk 11,2 v.1.)." In Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments. Edited by Wolfgang Schrage. Heinrich Greeven FS. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986, 344-373.

- Schneider, Johannes. See TDNT.
- Schniewind, Julius. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1950; 1964.
- Schnurr, Klaus Bernhard. Hören und handeln: Lateinische Auslegungen des Vaterunser in der Alten Kirche bis zum 5. Jahrhundert. Freiburg: Herder, 1985.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. See TDNT.
- Schürer, Emil. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. Revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Clark, 1973-87. 2:454-63, *et passim*.
- Schürmann, Heinz. Praying with Christ: The Our Father for Today. Translated by William Ducey and Alphonse Simon. New York: Herder, 1964.
- Schwarz, Günther. "Matthäus VI.9-13/Lukas XI.2-4. Emendation und Rückübersetzung." New Testament Studies 15 (January 1969): 233-47.
- Schweizer, Eduard. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1973.
- _____. The Good News according to Matthew. Translated by David Green. Atlanta: Knox, 1975.
- Scott, E[rnest]. F[indlay]. The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation. New York: Scribner's, 1952.
- Scrivener, Frederick Henry Ambrose. Criticism of the New Testament. Vol. 2. London: Bell, 1894. Pp. 323-25.
- Seeberg, Alfred. "Vaterunser und Abendmahl." In Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70 Geburtstag dargebracht, 108-114. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914.
- Seesemann, Heinrich. See TDNT.
- Selbie, W. B. The Fatherhood of God. New York: Scribner's, 1936.
- Selms, Adrianus van. "Bread." In The International Standard Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 1, 540-44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

- Shearman, Thomas G. "Our Daily Bread." Journal of Biblical Literature 53 (1934): 110-17.
- Sheward, C. G. "The Lord's Prayer: A Study in Sources." The Expository Times 52 (December 1940): 119-20.
- A Short Instruction into Christian Religion Being a Catechism Set Forth by Archbishop Cranmer in MDXLVIII: Together With the Same in Latin Translated from the German by Justus Jonas in MCXXXIX. Oxford: University Press, 1829. Part 1, 128-81; part 2, 109-154. [German to Latin to ET]
- Shriver, Donald W. "The Prayer that Spans the World." Interpretation 21 (1967): 274-288.
- Sigal, Phillip. The Emergence of Contemporary Judaism: Volume One. The Foundations of Judaism from Biblical Origins to the Sixth Century A.D. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1980. Pp. 449-50; 473-507.
- Silva, Moisés. Biblical Words and their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983. Pp. 39, 42.
- Simpson, Robert L. The Interpretation of Prayer in the Early Church. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Smith, Charles W. F. See IDB.
- Smith, George Albert. "Did Our Lord Speak Greek?" In The Groundwork of the Gospels. Collected papers by Robert Oswald Taylor. Oxford: Blackwell, 1946. Pp. 91-105.
- Smith, Graham. "The Matthaean 'Additions' to the Lord's Prayer." The Expository Times 82 (1970): 54-55.
- Smith, Robert H. "History and Eschatology in Luke-Acts." Concordia Theological Monthly 29 (1958): 881-901.
- Smukal, G[otthold]. H. "The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer." Concordia Theological Monthly 16 (1945): 145-153, 236-249, 301-306, 396-404, 466-473, 505-513, 583-91, 661-72, 757-65, 842-48.
- Soden, Hermann Freiherr von. "Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers." Die Christliche Welt 18 (March 3 1904): col. 218-24.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels." In Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Pp. 241-262.

Spence, R. M. "'Επιούσιον." The Expository Times 2 (1890-91): 255-56.

Stählin, Gustav. See TDNT.

Stambaugh, John E., and David L. Balch. The New Testament in Its Social Environment. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Standaert, Benoit. "Crying 'Abba' and saying 'Our Father.'" In Intertextuality in Biblical Writings. Bas van Iersel Festschrift. Kampen, Kok, 1989. Pp. 141-58.

Starcky, Jean. "La Quatrième Demande du Pater." Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971): 401-409.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective." In The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl, 1-17. New York: Harper, 1967.

_____. "Matthew." In Peake's Commentary on the Bible London: Nelson, 1962. Pp. 778-79.

_____. "Prayer and Forgiveness." Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 22 (1957): 75-86. Revision: "Prayer and Forgiveness: The Lord's Prayer." In Meanings. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984. Pp. 115-125.

_____. "Your Kingdom Come." Cross Currents 32 (1982): 257-66.

Stiebitz, Ferd. "Zu ἐπιούσιος." Philologische Wochenschrift 57 (July 16, 1927): col. 889-92.

Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 4 vols. and supplements. Munich: Beck, 1926-28; 1956.

Strecker, Georg. The Sermon on the Mount: An Exegetical Commentary. Translated by O. C. Dean. Nashville: Abingdon, 1988. Pp. 105-28.

_____. "Vaterunser und Glaube." In Glaube im Neuen Testament. Hermann Binder Festschrift. Edited by Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982. Pp. 11-28.

- Sturz, Harry A. The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism. New York: Nelson, 1984.
- Swetnam, James. "Hallowed Be Thy Name." Biblica 52 (1971): 556-63.
- The Sibylline Oracles. Books 3-5. Edited by H. N. Bate. London, SCM, 1918.
- Sykes, Marjorie H. "And Do Not Bring Us To the Test." The Expository Times 73 (March 1962): 189-90.
- Tappert, Theodore, Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, and Arthur C. Piepkorn, eds. The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959 [Tapp.].
- Taussig, Hal. "The Lord's Prayer." Forum 4:4 (1988): 25-40.
- Taylor, Charles. Sayings of the Jewish Fathers: Pirke Aboth. Excursus 5: "The Lord's Prayer," 124-130. Cambridge: University Press, 1877; repr. New York: KTAV, 1969.
- Taylor, T. M. "'Abba, Father' and Baptism." Scottish Journal of Theology 11 (1958): 62-71.
- Tertullian. "Adversus Marcionem" 4.26. Patrologiae Latina 2, 425.
- _____. "De Oratione" 2-9. Patrologiae Latina 1, 1245-1304.
- _____. "On Prayer." In The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Translated by S. Thelwall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986 repr., 681-91.
- _____. Tertullian's Tract on the Prayer. Translated by Ernest Evans. London: S.P.C.K., 1953.
- _____. The Fathers of the Church. Translated by Rudolph Arbesmann, Emily Joseph Daly, and Edwin A. Quain. Vol. 40. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1959), 157-68.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia. Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. Translated by A. Mingana. Woodbrooke Studies 6, 1-16. Cambridge: Heffer, 1933.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-74 [abbreviation, TDNT].

- s.v. Behm, Johannes. "ἄρτος." 1:477-78.
 s.v. Bietenhard, Hans. "ὄνομα." 5:242-81.
 s.v. Bultmann, Rudolf. "ἀφήμι, κτλ." 1:509-12.
 s.v. Foerster, Werner "ἐπιούσιος." 2:590-99.
 s.v. Grundmann, Walter. "δόκιμος (δοκιμάζω), κτλ." 2:255-60.
 s.v. Harder, Günther. "πονηρός, κτλ." 6:546-66.
 s.v. Hauck, Friedrich. "ὀφείλω, κτλ." 5:559-66.
 s.v. Kasch, Wilhelm. "ῥύομαι." 6:998-1003.
 s.v. Kittel, Gerhard. "ἄββᾶ." 1:5-6.
 s.v. Ibid. "δοκέω, δόξα, κτλ." 2:232-37; 242-53.
 s.v. Kuhn, Karl Georg, and Otto Procksch. "ἅγιος, ἀγιάζω, κτλ." 1:97-100 (Kuhn); 88-97, 100-115 (Procksch).
 s.v. Kuhn, Karl Georg, and Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "βασιλεύς, κτλ." 1:571-74 (Kuhn); 574-90 (Schmidt).
 s.v. Meyer, Rudolf. "Μάννα." 4:462-66.
 s.v. Michaelis, Wilhelm. "παραπίπτω, παράπτωμα." 6:170-72.
 s.v. Procksch, Otto. See Karl Georg Kuhn, *supra*.
 s.v. Sasse, Hermann. "αἰών." 1:198-209.
 s.v. Ibid. "γῆ." 1:677-80.
 s.v. Schlier, Heinrich. "ἀμήν." 1:335-38.
 s.v. Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. See Karl Georg Kuhn, *supra*.
 s.v. Schneider, Johannes. "ἔρχομαι, κτλ." 2:666-78.
 s.v. Schrenk, Gottlob. "θέλω, κτλ." 3:44-62.
 s.v. Ibid. "πατήρ." 5:974-1022.
 s.v. Seesemann, Heinrich. "πεῖρα, κτλ." 6:23-36.
 s.v. Stählin, Gustav. "ἁμαρτάνω, κτλ." 1:293-96.
 s.v. Traub, Helmut. "οὐρανός." 5:509-543.
 s.v. Weiss, Konrad. "εἰσφέρω." 9:64-65.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, eds. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-.

- s.v. Botterweck, G. J. "hapes." 5:92-107.
 s.v. Ringgren, Helmer. "abh." 1:1-19.
 s.v. Preuss, Horst Dietrich. "bo." 1:20-49.

Thielicke, Helmut. Our Heavenly Father. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper, 1960.

Thirtle, James W. The Lord's Prayer: An Interpretation Critical and Expository. London: Morgan and Scott, 1915.

Tholuck, August. Exposition, Doctrinal and Philological, of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, according to the Gospel of Matthew. Translated by Robert Menzies. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1843; rev. 1874 as Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount.

Thompson, G. H. P. "Thy Will Be Done in earth, as it is in Heaven (Matthew vi. 11): A Suggested Re-interpretation." The Expository Times 70 (1958-59): 379-81.

Tiede, David. Jesus and the Future. Cambridge: University Press, 1990.

_____. "The Kingdom Prayer." In A Primer on Prayer. Edited by Paul R. Sponheim. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. Pp. 107-20.

Tilborg, Sjef van. "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer." Novum Testamentum 14 (1972): 94-105.

_____. The Sermon on the Mount as an Ideological Intervention. Wolfeboro, New Hampshire: Van Gorcum, 1986.

Tod, Marcus N. "Our Daily Bread." Church Quarterly Review 158 (January-March 1957): 49-51.

Torrance, T. F. "The Eschatology of the Reformation." In Eschatology. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 2. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1952. Pp. 36-62.

Torrey, Charles C. Documents of the Primitive Church. New York: Harper, 1941. Pp. 251-52.

_____. Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence. New York: Harper, 1936.

_____. "A Possible Metrical Original of the Lord's Prayer." Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 28 (March 1914): 312-17.

_____. "The Translations Made From the Original Aramaic Gospels." In Studies in the History of Religions Presented to Crawford Howell Toy By Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends. New York: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. 269-317.

Traub, Helmut. See TDNT.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. "Lecture on the Lord's Prayer." In Hints to Theological Students. London: Skeffington, 1883. Pp. 54-99.

- Trites, Allison A. "The Prayer Motif in Luke-Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors and Edinburgh: Clark, 1978.
- Trudinger, Paul. "The 'Our Father' in Matthew as Apocalyptic Eschatology." The Downside Review 107 (1989): 49-54.
- Turner, M. M. B. "Prayer in the Gospels and Acts." In Teach Us to Pray. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, and Paternoster Press, on behalf of the World Evangelical Fellowship, 1990. Pp. 58-83.
- Tyndale, William. The New Testament. Edited by N. Hardy Wallis. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.
- _____. The Work of William Tyndale. The Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics. Edited by G. E. Duffield. Appleford, Berkshire, England: Sutton Courtenay, 1964. Pp. 260-65.
- Underhill, Evelyn. "Abba: Meditations based on the Lord's Prayer." In The Fruits of the Spirit. London: Longmans, 1940; collection, 1956.
- VanGemeren, Willem A. "Abba in the Old Testament?" Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 31 (1988): 385-98.
- Verity, G. B. "Lead Us Not into Temptation but . . ." The Expository Times 58 (May 1947): 221-22.
- Vermes, Geza. "He is the Bread." In Neotestamentica et Semitica. Matthew Black Festschrift. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: Clark, 1969. Pp. 256-263.
- _____. Jesus and the World of Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- _____. Jesus The Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. London: Collins, 1973.
- Vicedom, Georg F. A Prayer for the World: The Lord's Prayer-- A Prayer for Mission. Translated by Edward and Marie Schroeder. St. Louis: Concordia, 1967.
- Voelz, James W. "The Language of the New Testament." Austieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. 25/2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984. Pp. 893-977 (especially 966-70).

- V[ogt], E[rnst]. "Ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐπιούσιος = ὁ ἄρτος ὁ τῆς ἐπιούσης." Biblica 35 (1954): 136-37; 274.
- Vögtle, Anton. "Der 'eschatologische' Bezug der Wir-Bitten des Vaterunser." In Jesus und Paulus. Werner Georg Kümmel Festschrift. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Erich Gräßer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975. Pp. 344-62.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer: A Prayer for Jews and Christians?" In The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. Edited by Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. London: Burns & Oates, 1978. Pp. 93-118.
- Vokes, F. E. "The Lord's Prayer in the First Three Centuries." In Studia Patristica. Vol. 10, part 1. Edited by F. Cross. 1970, 253-60.
- Völter, Daniel. "Unser täglich Brot." Protestantische Monatshefte 18 (July 1914): 274-76.
- Volz, Carl. "Prayer in the Early Church." In A Primer on Prayer. Edited by Paul R. Sponheim. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. Pp. 36-40.
- Votaw, Clyde Weber. "Sermon on the Mount. h. The Lord's Prayer." In A Dictionary of the Bible. Extra vol. = vol. 5, 32-39. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh and New York: Clark and Scribner's, 1931.
- Wahrmann, P. "Stiebitz" (review). Glotta 17 (1928): 215.
- Walker, William O. "The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in John." New Testament Studies 28 (1982): 237-56.
- Walther, Georg. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Griechischen Vaterunser-Exegese. Texte und Untersuchungen, 40, no. 3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914.
- Watson, Thomas. The Lord's Prayer. Edinburgh: n.p., 1692; repr., London: Banner of Truth, 1965.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic. Translated by Talcott Parsons. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- Weiss, Konrad. See TDNT.
- Werner, Eric. "The Doxology in Synagogue and Church." In The Sacred Bridge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. Pp. 273-312.

- Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort. Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek. New York: Harper, 1882; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988.
- White, Walter G. "The Lord's Prayer." The Expository Times 36 (November 1924): 90-91.
- Williams, A. Lukyn. "'My Father' in Jewish Thought of the First Century." The Journal of Theological Studies 31 (October 1929): 42-47.
- Williams, William R. Lectures on the Lord's Prayer. Boston: American Tract Society, 1851.
- Willis, Geoffrey G. "Lead Us Not into Temptation." The Downside Review 93 (1975): 281-88.
- _____. "The Lord's Prayer in Irish Gospel Manuscripts." In Studia Evangelica, vol. 3. Papers presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1961, 222-228. Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 88. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964.
- Wilson-Kastner, Patricia. "Pastoral Theology and the Lord's Prayer." The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue, no. 2 (1992): 107-124.
- Wimmerer, R. "'Επιούσιος." Glotta 16 (1927): 137.
- _____. "Noch einmal ἑπιούσιος." Glotta 12 (1923): 68-82.
- Wolf, Carl Umhau. "Daniel and the Lord's Prayer: A Synthesis of the Theology of the Book of Daniel." Interpretation 15 (1961): 398-410.
- Wordsworth, John, and Henry Julian White, ed. Nouum Testamentum Latine. Vulgate of Jerome. Oxford: Clarendon, 1920.
- Wright, C. H. J. "Family." In The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Vol. 2, 261-69. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Wright, R. F. "Our Daily Bread." Church Quarterly Review 157 (July-September 1956): 340-45.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M. "The 'Daily Bread' Motif in Antiquity." Westminster Theological Journal 28 (1966): 145-56.
- Zahn, Theodor. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Leipzig: Deichert, 1924⁴.

_____. Das Evangelium des Lucas. Leipzig: Deichert, 1922⁴,
ad loc. and Excursus 9, pp. 767-72.

_____. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by
John Moore Trout, William Arnot Mather, Louis Hodous,
Edward Strong Worcester, William Hoyt Worrell, and
Rowland Backus Dodge. New York: Scribner's, 1909; 1917.

Zeitlin, Solomon. Studies in the Early History of Judaism.
Vol. 1. (collection) New York: KTAV, 1973.

Zeller, Dieter. "God as Father in the Proclamation and in the
Prayer of Jesus." In Standing Before God. John M.
Oesterreicher Festschrift. Edited by Asher Finkel and
Lawrence Frizzell. New York: KTAV, 1981. 117-129.

Zenner, J. R. "Die vierte Bitte im Vater unser." Zeitschrift
für katholische Theologie 17 (1893): 173-74.

Zerwick, Maximilian. Biblical Greek. Adapted by Joseph Smith.
Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1990.

Zorell, Franz. "'Επιούσιος." Biblica 6 (September 1925):
321-22.