

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1952

An Interpretation of the First Three Petitions of the Lord's Prayer

Edgar Krentz

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

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Krentz, Edgar, "An Interpretation of the First Three Petitions of the Lord's Prayer" (1952). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 364.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/364>

This Thesis 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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

AN INTERPRETATION
OF THE FIRST THREE PETITIONS
OF THE LORD'S PRAYER

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of New Testament
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Edgar Krentz
June 1952

Approved by:

Victor Bartling
Advisor

Alex Humbert
Reader

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Certain parts of the Christian tradition are looked upon with particular reverence. About them is attached an aura of sacredness that is not to be dispelled. The Lord's Prayer is an example particularly holy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PERTINENT JEWISH PRAYERS	7
III. THE FIRST PETITION	12
IV. THE SECOND PETITION	44
V. THE THIRD PETITION	81
VI. THE FIRST STROPHE	97
VII. CONCLUSION	103
APPENDIX	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY	107

It would naturally conform to the customs of his people when it was possible. But scholars soon began to deny that the prayer which Jesus left us was at all original. Parallels were found in Jewish prayers. The prayer was put into the category of Jewish piety. It was said that the prayer was not essentially Christian. Any person of the Jewish

1. G. G. Gardner, *The Synoptic Gospels* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1897), II, 472.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Certain parts of the Christian tradition are looked upon with particular reverence. About them is attached an aura of sacredness that is not to be dispelled. The Lord's Prayer is an example of this. It seems particularly holy both because it is a prayer and because our Lord gave it to us.

The suggestion that I examine the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer did not make a great impression at first. I did not realize the relevance of the study. The research soon brought to light certain judgments and statements that challenged my conceptions of the Lord's Prayer. The customary procedure for every rabbi of the early Christian era was to compose a special prayer for his disciples.¹ This, of course, was not in itself disturbing. Jesus was a Jew. He would naturally conform to the customs of his people when it was possible. But scholars soon began to deny that the prayer which Jesus left us was at all original. Parallels were found in Jewish prayers. The prayer was put into the category of Jewish piety. It was said that the prayer was not essentially Christian. Any person of the Jewish

¹C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), II, 472.

nation could pray it without in the least noticing anything strange. An estimate of the prayer follows:

Das Vaterunser konnte und kann noch heute jeder Jude beten, der von Jesus nichts weisz oder nichts wissen will; und es sind zu allen wesentlichen Stuecken desselben treffende Parallelen aus den aeltesten juedischen Gebeten beigebracht worden.²

The view expressed above found many advocates. Commentator after commentator may be found that ascribes more or less of the prayer to Jewish influence. This does not mean that there were no men who objected strenuously to this view. They contended that Jesus was completely original in the prayer. They saw no agreement whatever between the Lord's Prayer and the cited parallels from Jewish prayers. The opposition contended that the dependence of Jesus on the Jewish prayers did not exist. This was the view of an older commentator, A. Tholuck.³ The question is definitely not settled as to how much Jesus depended on the Rabbis.

This paper will attempt to examine the originality of the Lord's Prayer. To do this the following method will be used. The study is based on the first three petitions. Each petition will be examined in order. The concept underlying each petition will be studied. The study will attempt

²Theodor Zahn, "Das Evangelium des Matthaeus," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1922), p. 270.

³A. Tholuck, Exposition, Doctrinal and Philological, of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, according to the Gospel of Matthew, translated from the German by Robert Manzies (Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1843), II, 143-145.

to determine what this concept meant to the Jew of Jesus' day, what it meant in the Old Testament, and what the New Testament teaching on the subject is. Then the pertinent parallels which have been found will be examined. Following this the three petitions will be examined in their interrelation and the conclusions drawn from this will be compared to Jewish petitions in their interrelations.

Such a study by concepts is a valid one. Mere word parallels are not always a sign of borrowing. It is the concept underlying the expression that is important. The important thing is to discover what the expressions of Jesus meant to his disciples who were acquainted with his meaning and not what they meant to the casual observer. Jesus' teaching is a unit, delivered in a short space of three years, a teaching that is "in regard to the fundamental conceptions, uniform and unvarying."⁴ The examination of the total message of Jesus is valid.

The examination of the prayer in relation to Jesus' entire message is valid from another viewpoint. Other groups in Palestine also had their own prayers and rules. These were regarded as containing that which held the group together and so bore the basic ideas of the group.⁵ On this basis,

⁴Gustav Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated from the German by D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902), p. 75.

⁵Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "Das Evangelium nach Lukas," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm (Goettingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1949), III, 141.

it is legitimate to take the basic proclamations of both Judaism and Christ and view them in their totality. The Lord's Prayer is, as Tertullian said, a summary of the entire gospel, "[ut] in oratione breviarium totius Evangelii comprehendatur."⁶

There are also certain basic assumptions that one ought to state before proceeding any further. These are not all points that are under debate. Some of them are. The scope of this paper does not allow us to enter into a discussion of every controversial point. Thus we must make some assumptions. The first of these is that Jesus spoke the Aramaic language. This means that in some cases light may be shed on the meaning of a particular word by the Aramaic word which may lie behind it. Again, some particular idioms may be explained by saying that they are translations of a corresponding expression in Aramaic. This assumption seems valid in consideration of the fact that Jesus would speak Aramaic in order to be understood by the people of Galilee.⁷

A second assumption that we are making is that the text of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew is as old and original as that in Luke. This means that the third petition is assumed to be an original member of the prayer. No preference is given to either recension as being more authentic. The view held

⁶Tholuck, op. cit., p. 147.

⁷Dalman, op. cit., p. 11.

is that they are records of two different occasions. Instead of two versions of the same tradition they are two separate occasions, two separate pronouncements of our Lord. The purpose of giving it on two separate occasions was to indicate that it is to be only a pattern for prayer and not a formula. It was intended to give guidelines for correct prayer.⁸ It is thus a private prayer and not intended for the liturgical use to which we put it. The Lord's Prayer was intended to teach people how to pray.⁹

One final thing need be stated. The text of the first three petitions offers no problem. The variants are so insignificant as to be negligible. The text as given by the Nestle edition of the Greek New Testament is completely reliable: Ἀγιοθνήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθάτω ἡ Βασιλεία σου· γενθνήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.¹⁰

The value of this thesis ought to be that it will enable

⁸Rengstorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-3. This is a very general view. See also Martin Dibelius, Sermon on the Mount (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), pp. 72-3. The later Jews also followed a summary prayer in addition to the liturgical prayers; see Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, c.1949), p. 77.

⁹For a presentation of the view that the Matthaean form is the older form of the two, see O. Klein, "Die Urspruengliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, VII (1906), 34-50. The opposite view is held by Dibelius, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-4.

¹⁰Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graeca cum apparatu critico, revised by Erwin Nestle (Eighteenth edition; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, c.1948), p. 13.

the writer to develop his own prayer life from the consideration of the model prayer. The content of prayer is set before one here. The study ought also to show the originality of Jesus in his composition of the prayer.

The question of originality is one that calls for some general definitions and observations in order that the discussion may not lose itself in too great a mass of details and in problems that are beyond the point. It will be clearly stated which prayers are of the religious history of mankind and which are allowable in the discussion. How ever the one face of the world is never always prayer to some deity, whether it was in the first place or in some antiquity. Some of the face of the world is in the nature of man to pray. Manually man of the surrounding area in the near past also had prayer. Man has discovered some beautiful hymns and prayers to the god of Abraham of Egypt. Similarly the literature of the ancient Greeks has brought down to us the records of prayers to the gods of their mythology. Ancient Persians and Indians have also contributed their prayers to the study of comparative religion. All this is to the good, but it must be clearly stated from the very outset that these prayers are not to be considered in a discussion of the originality of the Lord's Prayer. It is not a mere question of having a prayer, but also a question of showing that this prayer not only could have been used in Palestine before the

CHAPTER II

PERTINENT JEWISH PRAYERS

General Considerations

The question of originality is one that calls for some general definitions and observations in order that the discussion may not lose itself in too great a mass of detail and in problems that are beside the point. It must be clearly stated which prayers out of the religious history of mankind are allowable in the discussion. Men over the entire face of the world have always prayed to some deity, whether it was to the true God or to some animistically conceived form of the deity. It is in the nature of men to pray.

Naturally men of the surrounding area in the Near East also had prayed. Men have discovered some beautiful hymns and prayers to the god of Akhnaton of Egypt. Similarly the literature of the ancient Greeks has brought down to us the remnants of prayers to the gods of their pantheon. Ancient Persia and India have also contributed their prayers to the study of comparative religion. All this is to the good. But it must be clearly stated from the very outset that these prayers are not to be considered in a discussion of the originality of the Lord's Prayer. It is not a mere question of dating a prayer, but also a question of showing that this prayer not only could have been used in Palestine before the

time of Jesus, but was in use. Jesus probably never knew the prayers of the great religions of the ancient orient. Jesus could not borrow from prayers that he could not know.

Men have discovered many parallels to the words of Jesus in the prayers and sayings of the Jewish rabbis. Here the question of originality is a relevant problem, for Jesus could have known the prayers of his own people. On the basis of such prayers a Jewish scholar was able to say, "There is nothing in the Prayer which seems in the least unfamiliar to Jews; there is nothing new or original about it."¹ And another man is able to draw up a complete prayer out of parallels to the Lord's Prayer.²

It is in a connection such as this that the warning of Gerhard Kittel is entirely in place:

Die angeführten Beispiele sind lehrreich, denn sie zeigen, wie vorsichtig man in der Verwendung der talmudischen Worte sein musz. Es ist falsch, die rabbinische Literatur als eine gleichmaessige Flaechе anzusehen; das Prinzip der Zeitlosigkeit ist auch hier verfehlt.³

To this consideration of Kittel one might also add that not every prayer that is from the time of Jesus is applicable. The first consideration must, of course, be that it is either

¹O. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), II, 99.

²H. D. A. Major in H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1938), p. 459.

³Gerhard Kittel, Jesus und die Rabbinen (Berlin-Lichterfelde: Edwin Runge, 1914), p. 6.

contemporaneous to or earlier than Jesus in point of time. But to this must be added the necessary qualification that the prayer must have been available to Jesus. Not every private prayer would be so available. Therefore it is good, with E. F. Scott,⁴ to limit the prayers that may be legitimately used to the synagogue prayers and the morning and evening prayers of the Jews. A description of the three great synagogue prayers follows.

The Synagogue Prayers

The Shema: The Shema was composed of three sections from the Pentateuch: Deuteronomy 6: 4-9; Deuteronomy 11: 13-21; Numbers 15: 37-41. These three formed the first of the great synagogue prayers. Actually the Shema was more a confession of faith than a prayer. This prayer has no place in the Lord's Prayer, but is presupposed.⁵

The Kaddish: The Kaddish was the part of the synagogue service which was to insure that the one who was praying did so with the proper attitude and reverence. The text of the Kaddish is given here to facilitate comparisons. It is divided into two parts, one spoken before the service as a whole, the other immediately before the address by the rabbi.

⁴E. F. Scott, The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 41-42.

⁵Ibid., p. 42.

The text given is taken from the version of E. F. Scott.⁶

Part 1, spoken before the service as a whole:

May his great name be magnified and hallowed in the world, which he has made according to his will, and may his kingly rule be established in your life time--in your time and in the time of the whole house of Israel. May the name of the Lord be praised from now on and forever. May the prayer and petition of all Israel find acceptance before our Father who is in heaven.

Part 2, spoken before the address:

Upon Israel and the Rabbis and their scholars and those who learn from their scholars and all who study the Law in this place and everywhere, may there be grace and mercy and compassion and deliverance from our Father who is in heaven.

The Shemone Esreh: The Shemone Esreh is probably the outstanding prayer of the Jewish synagogue. It is also called the Eighteen Benedictions or, more simply, The Prayer (Tefilah). It is a series of eighteen petitions (in some recensions nineteen) that date back very far. The present forms may all go back to the redaction made under the authority of Gamaliel II near the end of the first century of the Christian era.⁷ The individual petitions themselves may be much older. "Die ältesten Partien, zu denen die ersten und die letzten Benediktionen gehören, mögen noch aus der vorchristl. Zeit stammen."⁸ It is probable that

⁶Ibid., pp. 42-3.

⁷George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: the Age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, c.1946), I, 292-5.

⁸Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, "Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1922), I, 407.

Jesus knew this prayer. Chronologically he could have used it as a source.

The content of the Shemone Esreh is varied. It follows the customary Jewish pattern of prayer. The prayer opens with the praise of God (1-3), contains the petitions in the middle section (4-16), and closes with thanksgivings (17-19).⁹ The first half is individual in nature, the second half is national. The second half, therefore, logically includes petitions for the blotting out of Israel's enemies.

These three prayers form the most logical source for Jesus' Prayer. It is with them, and especially with the Shemone Esreh, that we will be concerned.^{10 11}

⁹Moore, op. cit., I, 291-2.

¹⁰For more information on the nature of these prayers, see the articles in the Jewish Encyclopaedia, edited by Isadore Singer (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1907). For the Aramaic text of the prayers with translation, introduction, and notes, see David Hedegard, Seder R. Amram Gaon (Lund, A.-B. Ph. Lindstedts Universitets-Bokhandel, 1951). This contains the text and translation of the oldest extant Jewish prayer book.

¹¹For the English text of the Shemone Esreh, see Appendix.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST PETITION

The Semitic use of ὄνομα

The first petition is one that is strange to our ears, though we may not be aware of it. This petition is linguistically rooted in the Old Testament and in the piety of the people. The idea of the divine name had a special significance for the people of God. Our best procedure, therefore, is to examine the use of the word ὄνομα in the history of the Jewish people.

The New Testament is rooted in the Old, especially in the Septuagint, the Greek Old Testament. There ὄνομα is generally the translation of the Hebrew word נָוִי . In some places it even replaces שֵׁם .¹ So the starting point for us is naturally the Old Testament.

The use of נָוִי in the Old Testament. The usage can very quickly be stated. In the earliest times the שֵׁם נָוִי was used as name in our sense. It was a part of God's revelation to men. Later the use of נָוִי got greater significance. It became connected with the cult, being thought of in connection with the temple. Thus God says (I Kings 9:3) "I have heard thy

¹Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1950), V, 263.

prayer and thy supplication, that thou hast made before me: I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name there for ever." The same use of יְהוָה is apparent in I Kings 9:7 and II Kings 21:7. The name of God guaranteed that God was present in the temple. This was a clear division from God's throne in heaven.²

After the exile a many-sided use of the יְהוָה יְהוָה came into being. At times the יְהוָה יְהוָה was used in the sense of honor and dignity. This had already found expression in the mouth of Isaiah. "It shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." (Is. 55:13). It is set parallel to כְּבוֹד (honour, glory) in some passages (cf. Ps. 102:16 and Is. 59:19) and to תְּהִלָּה (praise) in others (cf. Ps. 106:47; 145:21).

This use was extended until יְהוָה יְהוָה became another mode of expression for Yahwe himself. This usage is especially to be found in the prophets and Psalms. The name stepped into the place of the person. As Bietenhard observes:

Es wird nicht mehr zwischen Jahve im Himmel und seinem Schem am Kultort unterschieden: im Schem offenbart sich Jahve selbst; er ist die dem Menschen zugewandte Seite Jahves.³

The summary of Calov is correct: "Nomen Dei est Deus ipse."⁴

²Ibid., pp. 254-6.

³Ibid., p. 257.

⁴Calov, Bibl. Novi Test. 111. (1676), p. 231. Quoted in Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Vater-Unser (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1946), p. 49.

The name of God expresses his personal being in the world of men. God is present.⁵

The concept of יהוה in Rabbinic Judaism. Rabbinic Judaism took over the idea that God's name is God himself and stressed the holiness of his name. The name became an ὄνομα ἄφρητον (an unutterable name) for the pious Jew. Various substitutes were devised. God was called יהוה (Lord), יהוה (the name), יהוה (the heavens).⁶ A magical papyrus of the second or third century A. D. spoke of τὸ ἄμουν ὄνομα ὃ οὐ λέγεται.⁷ In fact, giving Ex. 20:7 (the second commandment) a very severe interpretation, the use of the divine name in prayers was even severely punished. The name of God was not to be mentioned idly, so that (Nedarim 7b) "if a rabbi (who has authority to do so) hears a man using the name of heaven idly, he must excommunicate him, upon pain of a like sentence himself."⁸ Rather than pronounce the name in

⁵This usage is paralleled in the common Greek of the early Christian era. Papyri have been found where ὄνομα is used in the sense of character, fame, dignity, rank. Officials are said to devise offices (ὀνομαζα) for themselves. For examples see 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, Limited, c.1949), p. 451. See also G. Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, translated by Alexander Grieve (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901), pp. 146-7. He believes that it is not necessarily a Semitism.

⁶Karl Bornhaeuser, Die Bergpredigt (Guetersloh, Germany: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1923), pp. 131-2.

⁷Deissmann, op. cit., p. 275.

⁸George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: the Age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, c.1946), I, 428-9.

prayer men called on the name of God. This was the awful name of God, τὸ φρικτὸν ἐπικαλούμενον ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ.⁹ Josephus also tells us that he did not even dare to write the name that God had given to Moses at the burning bush.¹⁰ Certainly, the periphrasis of the divine name was an essential part of Jewish folk-piety.

The New Testament usage of ὄνομα. The New Testament builds on the Old. Usually the use of the Name, that is, when it refers to God, is the same as in the Old Testament. Indeed, the expression "name of God" (ὄνομα Θεοῦ) occurs most often in Old Testament citations. Jesus generally must have used the Semitic precautionary mode of referring to God as ܢܦܫܐ (Aramaic ܢܦܫܐ), though that does not appear in the record of the evangelists (except in the phrase "kingdom of heaven"). This was natural since it would not be intelligible to Hellenists and Greeks.¹¹

The New Testament clearly ascribes to the name divine functions. One must fear (φοβέσθαι, Rev. 11:18) the name. The name is the source of belief, the object of belief (πιστεύω, I John 3:23). God's name is called holy (ἅγιος, Luke 1:49).

⁹Josephus, Jewish Wars, 5, 438. Quoted in A. Schlatter, Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus (Quetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1932), p. 112.

¹⁰Josephus, Antiquities, 2, 276. Quoted in Schlatter, op. cit., p. 60.

¹¹Gustav Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated by D. M. Kay from the German (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902), p. 183.

Jesus' claim to authority rests on the divine name (John 5:43; 10:25). Jesus prays that God keep his disciples faithful by saying *πάτερ ἄγε, ἐθήρσου αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου* (John 17:11). Since Jesus' authority rests on the name, so his name is the object of faith (John 1:12; 2:23; 3:18). Gentiles are to trust in his name (Matt. 12:21). The name has divine functions in the New Testament.

This concept of the name in the New Testament is continued in the Apostolic Fathers. I Clement 59:3 says: *ἐλπίζων ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρκέγονον πάσης κτίσεως ὄνομά σου*. In Hermes, Similitudes 9: 14,5 the writer speaks of the name that *τὸν κόσμον ὅλον βουλάσει*. Similarly I Clement 45:7 speaks of serving his name and I Clement 58:1 of obedience to his name. This usage corroborates the New Testament usage.

The phrase *ὄνομα θεοῦ* can also be said to denote a person. For only a person standing behind all the phrases that are based on "*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*" would give them power. Men baptise (Matt. 28:19), cast out devils (Luke 9:49), and are sent out by Jesus *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (John 14:26). Only a person standing behind the name could give that name power. This is also the view of Procksch.¹² We can certainly conclude with Plummer that "His Name represents His nature, His character,

¹²Procksch, "ὄνομα," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), I, 102.

Himself, so far as all this can be known,"¹³

It is not a valid question to ask, "Which name of God is meant in the word *ὄνομα*?" As God is one, so his name, standing for himself, is one. This means that we cannot say the word *ὄνομα* in the first petition refers to Father. It simply is not in the word. Nor can we say, as Thayer¹⁴ does, that the name is equal "to divinity, Lat. numen, (not his nature or essence as it is in itself), the divine majesty and perfections, so far as these are apprehended...." As God is one, his name is one. His name stands for him in his totality.

There are some other implications that can be drawn from the New Testament teaching about the name of God. A name possesses power. This was clearly shown above. Therefore, to know the name means to have power. This is still shown today in the phrase 'In the name of'. He who can act in the name of another possesses his power.¹⁵ He who knows God's name has God's power. That is why Peter said to the man at the Temple gate, "In the name (*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*) of

¹³ Alfred Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Elliot Stock, 1909), p. 97.

¹⁴ Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, (Corrected edition; New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: American Book Company, c.1889), p. 447.

¹⁵ Julius Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1950), p. 82.

Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk" (Acts 3:6). And the man did walk.

The name of God also carries another implication. It is only in his name that God can be known. Conversely the name can only be understood by the fulness of God. This has been said very beautifully by Ernst Lohmeyer:

Wenn Gottes Namen Gott selber ist, dann ist er auch nicht ohne diesen seinen Namen; er ist von ihm unabtrennlich und gehoert zu ihm wie das Wort zur Sache, wie der Begriff zum Gegenstand. Nur in seinem Namen ist Gott faszbar, der Name ist nur durch Gott erfuellbar.... Gottes Name bezeichnet ihn in der Ganzheit und Einzigkeit seines Wesens und Handelns. Wer daher den Namen Gottes kennt, der steht an der Pforte unsagbarer Geheimnisse und unsagbaren Lichtes oder mit spaeteren Worten gesagt: auf der Schwelle von dem Deus revelatus zu dem Deus Absconditus, auch auf der Schwelle von der Herrlichkeit Gottes zu seiner Heiligkeit. Darum webt um den Namen ein Schauer der Ehrfurcht und Anbetung, darum auch alle Herrlichkeit der himmlischen Welt, welche nicht muede wird, Gottes Namen zu preisen.¹⁶

The concept of name brings with it another thought.

If a name is also a revelation, then the thought of revelation inevitably brings in a world to which the revelation is made. The name is at the same time the means by which God reveals himself to this world as First and Last. Thus the name of God is eternal, was in existence before men were created, and will abide after this world has become mere memory. The name is as many sided and incomprehensible as God himself; and yet the name is a name, something that men

¹⁶Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

can cling to, that their minds can understand. This is the dual nature of the name of God. It is the eternal in contact with men.¹⁷

The Meaning of Hallow

The subject of the first petition is the name of God. This is to be "hallowed." "Hallowed" is a translation of a Greek word that meets us only in Biblical Greek, ἁγιασθε. The word is an ecclesiastical term, much as is our English word "hallow" today. Apparently the Greek speaking Jews did not want to take over the whole family of existing Greek words (ἁγιασθε, ἁγιονος, ἁγιασθησθε, ἁγιασθησθαι), for these already had a technical meaning in Greek religion. So the same basic root was used with the suffix -αγιασθε. Thus the term was understood by all Greeks and yet it maintained a sharp separation from the Greek religious terminology.¹⁸

The basic idea at the root of ἁγιασθε seems to be one of separation. According to Plummer¹⁹ the word has two basic meanings, to make known as holy and to regard as holy. We shall trace this idea more closely through the history of Jewish thought.

The Old Testament background. In the Septuagint ἁγιασθε

¹⁷This entire last section is taken from the work of Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 50-1.

¹⁸Moulton and Killigan, op. cit., p. 4.

¹⁹Plummer, op. cit., pp. 97-8.

is used to translate the Hebrew קִדְּשׁ . The Greek word takes over the color and meaning of the Hebrew concept. קִדְּשׁ occurs in the various Hebrew stems and has some of the coloring of each. These may be described as follows: Pi'el: to make something unholy holy, to keep something that is holy holy; Hiphil: to cause something to be held as holy or to be recognized as holy; Niphal and Hithpa'el: to reveal oneself as holy, to be held holy, to be made holy. The passive of קִדְּשׁ carries the rich meaning of the Niphal and Hithpa'el. The basic meaning is to reveal oneself as holy.²⁰ The word is at times used in the Old Testament in the sense of declaring holy (Gen. 2:3; Ex. 19:23), but these instances are mostly translations of a Pi'el form.

With the uniting of קִדְּשׁ to שׁוֹמֵר three basic thoughts of the Hebrews are important. The first of these is that God is holy. This is one of the fundamental thoughts for the Hebrew mind. Holiness is part of God's essence and is not a mere attribute of the Godhead. This holiness was in part an ethical holiness. But the thought goes beyond that. Holiness was that which made God God. "Heiligkeit ist hier was Gott zu Gott macht, der unfaszbare Grund seines Seins, das verborgene Wesen,....das er nur offenbart, wie es ihm gefaellt."²¹ Prophetic theology is full of the idea that

²⁰Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 44.

²¹Ibid., p. 47.

God is holy. "I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee" (Hosea 11:9). Isaiah speaks often of the "Holy One of Israel." The Trishagion (Is. 6:3) is a high-point, where God's holiness is raised to the third power by means of the triple statement.²² God is the Holy One of Israel.

The second basic Old Testament thought in *Exodus* is 'that God's holiness lays an obligation on man. "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev. 11:45). God desires men to sanctify his name. "Neither shall ye profane my name; but I will be hallowed among the children of Israel: I am the Lord which hallow you" (Lev. 22:32). In the Children of Israel men ought to see God's transcendence and purity.²³ The prophets also demand that the name of God be sanctified by the people (cf. Is. 29:23). It must be noted, however, that this hallowing of God's name is actually only a reaction to that which we have reserved as the third basic thought in hallowing, the hallowing of God's name by God himself. Leviticus 11:45 already showed that men's holiness was but the result of God's holiness. And all of the hallowing of God's name by men can be summed up in Ez. 28:22, "I will be glorified in the midst of thee."²⁴ Thus it is

²²Procksch, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-3.

²³Schniewind, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

²⁴Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

that the hallowing of God's name gets an ethical character among the people.²⁵ "God that is holy shall be sanctified in righteousness" (Is. 5:16). Men are made holy in that they hallow God. Holiness becomes a factor that unites God and man--and yet the greatest factor that separates God and man. God is holy, men are to become holy. Man is made to see God's holiness as his goal. The cult and moral action are both bent in this direction.

The idea that men are to hallow God contains in it the roots of the third basic idea (and the third petition also), for the Old Testament, especially the prophets, is full of the records of the defamation of the name of God by his people. Moses is not allowed to enter the holy land "because ye sanctified me not in the midst of the children of Israel" (Deut. 32:51). The children of Israel defile the name of God by idolatry (Lev. 18:21; 20:3), by the overstepping of cultic ritual (Lev. 21:6; 22:2), and by the evil life they live (Ez. 36:20ff.; Amos 2:7). Men of themselves did not hallow God's name. The name of God must be hallowed in some other way.

The third Old Testament motif underlying the concept of hallowing the name is that God himself hallows his name. This hallowing by God rather than man is spoken of much

²⁵E. F. Scott, The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 89.

oftener in the Old Testament.²⁶ God, properly speaking, is the only one who can hallow his name. So he becomes the subject of the verb in such passages as Lev. 10:3; Ex. 29:43; Is. 5:16; Ez. 20:41.²⁷ God himself acts that his name may be honored. Men have polluted it, so God now must himself sanctify it. "But when he seeth his children, the work of mine hands, in the midst of him, they shall sanctify my name" (Is. 29:23). "For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it: for how should my name be polluted?" (Is. 48:11; cf. Ez. 20:9; 36:22ff.). God does this when he has mercy on a people who have transgressed against him (cf. Ex. 32:12f.; Num. 14:6; Deut. 9:28; Is. 48:11; Ez. 20:9; 14:22; 36:22f.). When God promises his people a return, a new heart, a new spirit, even the gift of his spirit (Ez. 36:24ff.), this is described as being done for his "holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen" (Ez. 36:22). This passage (Ez. 36:22-9) is a complete commentary on the hallowing of God's name by God. It includes the new spirit and the new life.²⁸

These passages show yet another thing. In one sense God's name is holy and holiness is that which makes God God. In this sense God is the hidden God who dwells in a light to

²⁶Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

²⁷Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

²⁸For this section see Schniewind, *op. cit.*, p. 82 and Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

which no man may approach. God is "the Holy One". His holiness separates him from all men, is the inmost essence of God. God's holiness is also his majesty and glory.

"Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory" (Is. 6:3). It is on the basis of this that the verb *ἁγιάζω* is sometimes replaced by *δοξάζω* (glorify). Lev. 10:3 says, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people will I be glorified." "I will be glorified in the midst of thee....and shall be sanctified in her"(Ex. 28:22). To hallow and to glorify God are parallel.

Finally God's hallowing always has as its goal the hallowing of men. His hallowing of himself is always done in a nation, in a person, in a remnant, or in a church. This means that God desires to uplift all that is unholy and opposes the holiness of God. In this sense the holiness of God is opposed to men, for men always and only defame the name of God. It also has a positive aspect, the hallowing of men to the glory of God. In this view men are but incidents in the great hallowing of God by God. This process has begun before creation (for God's name was before creation) and will continue after creation (even as his name is eternal). Thus taken, the goal of God's hallowing is always God--and yet this does not contradict the above. All must work for God.²⁹

²⁹ Ibid., p. 49.

The hallowing of the name in Rabbinic Judaism. Rabbinic Judaism did not advance beyond the concepts that were given in the Old Testament survey. The only thing new about the rabbinic interpretation of the concept of hallowing the name was the emphasis that it placed on certain areas. We shall very briefly look them over.

Rabbinic Judaism also thought of God as holy. He was holy in the sense that he was the severe judge.

Gott heiszt heilig als der unerbittlich strenge Richter, der erhabene Koenig, als rex tremendae maiestatis, dem man nur mit Furcht und Zittern naht. Taeglich betet der Jude zu ihm, dem 'groszen, maechtigen und furchtbaren Gott': (Schemone-Esre, 1. Benediction) 'Heilig bist du und furchtbar ist dein Name' (Schemone-Esre, 3. Benediction). Darum reden auch die Rabbinen so haeufig von der Furcht Gottes und nennen Gott oft "מַלְאָךְ מַלְאָךְ מַלְאָךְ", womit gerade seine alles Irdische uebertragende Majestaet bezeichnet ist.³⁰

Israel did know of a true trust in God, but this also was accompanied by fear and trembling before God. God is called "the Holy One" --in fear.³¹

The Kaddish of the synagogue spoke of a hallowing of God's name. This prayer begins with the words מְגִדָּה וְקִדְּשָׁה "magnified and hallowed be thy name in the world which thou hast created according to thy will." This prayer does not think of men's actions in this respect, but lays the

³⁰Karl Georg Kuhn, "אֱלֹהִים", Der Heiligkeitsbegriff im rabbinischen Judentum, "Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament", edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, I, 98.

³¹Ibid., pp. 98-9.

emphasis on God's hallowing of his own name. This is shown by the continuation of the prayer: "and may his kingly rule be established in your life time." Since it is God who is to establish the rule, it must also be God who is to hallow the name.³² The same thought is expressed in the interpretation of the ten plagues, the crossing of the river Jordan, the saving of Daniel, and the saving of the three youths in the fiery furnace. Siphre Deuteronomium says that all of these were for the purpose of hallowing God's name. The power shown forced men to acknowledge God by terrifying them.³³ "Gott heiligt seinen Namen, indem er vor der Welt seine Heiligkeit erweist"³⁴ and forces men to recognize him.

The rabbinic theology put most stress on the hallowing of God's name by his people. In the Persian period of their history the idea contained in Lev. 11:45 was developed into a system. One of the basic thoughts of rabbinic Judaism in this system was that of a people, worthy of the holy God, that lived in a holy land, themselves holy and dedicated to God. This concept ruled in their entire life and thought.³⁵ It is illustrated in their prayer life by the Kaddish of the

³²Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus erlaeutert aus Talmud und Midrasch," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1922), I, 408-9.

³³Moore, op. cit., II, 102-3.

³⁴Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., I, 99.

³⁵Rudolf Kittel, Die Religion des Volkes Israel (Leipzig: Verlag Quelle und Meyer, 1921), p. 154.

Rabbis (a version of the Kaddish that never found its way into the Synagogue service). In this prayer men are encouraged to hallow God's name since he does so many wonderful deeds for them in the present.³⁶ This *קְדוּשַׁת שְׁמֵי שָׁמַיִם* (hallowing of the name) becomes the highest motive and principle of ethical living. Men were willing to die rather than profane the name of God.³⁷ The fulfilling of the Law was thought of in the talmudic writings as a glorifying of the name. This implied that the moral action of the people was to spread the honor of the name of God.³⁸ This meant doing even more than the Law demands, for "the duty of honouring the Name of God is of greater value than that of protecting it from being profaned."³⁹ This duty of honoring the name of God by obedience to the Law had been placed on Israel alone. It was not the duty of other nations.⁴⁰

Finally it must be noted that rabbinic Judaism had put a greater emphasis on the hallowing of the name as being a matter of glorification. Two words are found as synonymous

³⁶Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., I, 409.

³⁷Kuhn, op. cit., p. 99.

³⁸Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im Spät-hellenistischen Zeitalter, edited by Hugo Gressmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926), p. 416.

³⁹Gustav Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels, translated by Paul P. Levertoff (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929), p. 213.

⁴⁰Moore, op. cit., II, 103-7.

with *ἀγιαῶναι*, *μεγαλύνειν* and *δοξάζειν*. Thus it is shown that at the time of Jesus glorify was synonymous with hallow. (cf. Tobit 8:5; Sirach 36:3.)^{41 42}

In summary it might be said that Judaism placed the emphasis on the hallowing of the name by men, looking on it as the legal fulfillment of a demand laid down by God.

ἀγιαῶναι in the New Testament. As rich as the Old Testament is in speaking of the hallowing of God and his name, so poor is the New Testament. Mark never uses the word; in Luke it does not occur outside of the Lord's Prayer (Luke 11:2); in Matthew it occurs twice more (Matt. 23:17 and 19), where it is connected with the cultic separation of the Jewish ritual. We find the hallowing (*ἀγιαῶναι*) of God or his name nowhere in the New Testament outside of the Lord's Prayer. If these few passages were all that we could use in our interpretation, it would be hard to formulate a distinctive New Testament concept of *ἀγιαῶναι*.

There are, however, certain echoes of the word in the New Testament documents. The idea of a Christian as one who glorifies God in his life seems to be reflected in one of Paul's epistles. "That the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you", says Paul in II Thessalonians 1:12.

⁴¹Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 44-5.

⁴²The fact that *ἀγιαῶναι* and *δοξάζειν* are regarded as synonymous is strikingly illustrated by the Septuagint rendering of Isaiah 5:16, where *וְיִפְּזֵי* is translated *δοξάζουσιν*.

Echoes of this seem also to appear in passages where the Christian is told to pray or to live *ἐν ὀνόματι* of the Lord Jesus (cf. Col. 3:17 and Eph. 5:20). We may, perhaps, conclude with Bietenhard:

Wie im AT die Verherrlichung des Jahve-Namens das Ziel des Volkes Gottes ist, so (hat) das Gottesvolk des neuen Bundes durch die Gnadengaben das Ziel, den Namen des Stifters des neuen Bundes zu verherrlichen. Das ganze Leben des Christen steht unter dem Namen Jesu.⁴³

Another echo of the Old Testament appears in the one place in the New Testament where Jesus is spoken of as the object of *ἀγιασθῆναι*, I Peter 3:15 (cf. Is. 8:23f.). "As Lord sanctify Christ in your hearts, always ready to give an apology for the hope that is in you to him who asks a reason" (my translation). This seems to imply that for a Christian the hallowing of God's name consists in speaking about him. This same thought seems to underlie Hebrews 13:15. Thus the proclamation of Christ is a sanctifying of the name for the Christian. Lohmeyer summarizes as follows:

Heiligen und Gottes-Namen-verkuendigen sind also hier Wechselbegriffe, weshalb denn auch die Geheiligten vor allem aufgefordert werden: "Durch Ihn also lasset uns das Opfer des Lobes darbringen allenthalben fuer Gott, das ist die Frucht der Lippen, welche deinen Namen bekennen" (Hebr. 13,15), und ihr Werk und ihre Liebe gelten als "dem Namen Gottes erwiesen" (Hebr. 6,10), so dasz alles christliche Leben darin beginnt und sich vollendet, den Namen Gottes in Wort und Werk zu bekennen und zu preisen.⁴⁴

The New Testament does know also of the glorification

⁴³Bietenhard, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

⁴⁴Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-3.

of the name by God himself. This is shown by the prayer of Jesus, "Father, glorify (δοξάσου) thy name." The answer comes from heaven: "I have glorified it, and will glorify it again." This witness (John 12:28) allows us to say that the Gospel of John speaks much of the glorification (δοξάζειν) of the name. Whether or not this is synonymous with the ἀγιασμεν of the first petition remains to be seen. It must suffice here to say that the prayer of Jesus in John 12 and the answer from heaven show that in John the glorification of the name is intimately bound up with the life history of our Lord. In one sense this places us in the period of fulfillment. Jesus has come in the name of the Father (Mark 11:9), does glorify the name of the Father (John 5:41ff.; 17:6, 11, 12, 26), is himself the "Holy One" (Mark 1:24; John 6:69), and is hallowed by the Father (John 10:36).⁴⁵ The relevance of the parallels remains to be discussed under the interpretation of the first petition.

What all these echoes must show us is that the New Testament is dependent on the Old. One cannot understand the conception of Jesus without going back to the source of his religious inspiration. The Old Testament is the source of the first petition. With this we must reckon in our interpretation.

⁴⁵Schniewind, op. cit., p. 82.

Interpretation of the First Petition

These two concepts, the Semitic concept of the name and the Jewish concept of the hallowing of the name, are joined in the first petition, Ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομα σου. This petition is formed in the normal manner. The verb is in the aorist imperative, which is the true tense for instant prayer. It is an urgent tense showing the concern of the one praying.⁴⁶ The passive voice is the result of the pious desire to avoid the mention of the divine name.⁴⁷ This indicates that Jesus is instructing his disciples about the affairs of God. All of the petitions carry the nature of pious prayer. The remarks made here apply also to the second and third petitions.

The concept of the hallowing of the name in Jewish thought was rich. Similarly many interpretations of the petition are rich and varied, taking their key from the double meaning of the hallowing of the name in the Bible. The first, if it is based on any one passage in scripture, may lay claim to a basis of scripture in Isaiah 29:23, "But when

⁴⁶James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Third edition; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, c.1908), I, 173. This view is shared by A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Fourth edition; Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, n.d.), pp. 947-8. See also Friedrich Blass, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch, revised by Albert Debrunner (Eighth edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), pp. 149-50; appendix p. 56, par. 337,4.

⁴⁷Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., p. 408.

he seeth his children, the work of mine hands, in the midst of them, they shall sanctify my name, and sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and shall fear the God of Israel."⁴⁸ On the basis of this passage Holtzmann interprets it to mean that God's name is to be everywhere acknowledged and praised.⁴⁹

Augustine has an interpretation that is much the same:

cum ergo dicimus: sanctificetur nomen tuum, non admodum desiderare, ut nomen ejus quod semper sanctum est, etiam apud homines sanctum habeatur, hoc est non contemnatur.⁵⁰

This is done, according to Augustine, by a holy teaching and a pure life. Luther's⁵¹ interpretation follows much the same lines: "God's name is indeed holy in itself; but we pray in this petition that it may become holy among us also."

This same type of interpretation is adopted by the English scholar Plummer,⁵² by the lexicographer Bauer,⁵³ and by

⁴⁸H. J. Holtzmann, "Die Synoptiker," Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, edited by H. J. Holtzmann, R. A. Lipsius, P. W. Schmiedel, and H. von Soden (Third revised edition; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), c.1901), p. 217.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 52.

⁵¹Concordia Triglotta, edited by F. Bente (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, c.1921), p. 547.

⁵²Plummer, op. cit., p. 98.

⁵³Erwin Preuschen, Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen uehristlichen Literatur, revised by Walter Bauer (Second edition; Gieszen, Germany; Alfred Toepelmann, c.1928), p. 14.

T. H. Robinson,⁵⁴

These interpretations are all derived from God's Word. They are pious and pure. But the question must be asked, do they interpret the words of the first petition? In a close examination they seem to fail for two reasons. First, the petition says nothing about men and their hallowing of God's name. This is a prayer addressed to God and not to men. God himself is asked to hallow his name completely, in spite of all powers and sins on earth.⁵⁵ Second, the interpretation of Augustine and Luther speaks of a gradual hallowing of God's name. But does the first petition speak of a gradual hallowing of the name? We have described the aorist imperative as the true tense for instant prayer (vide supra, p. 31), a tense that gives urgency to the petition in which it is used. This rests on the fact that the basic meaning of the aorist is punctiliar, expressing point-action.⁵⁶ The basic sense of the present imperative is durative or iterative. A sharp division between the two tenses is, at times, artificial and impossible (e.g., Acts 13:15ff.;

⁵⁴Theodore H. Robinson, "The Gospel of Matthew," Moffatt New Testament Commentary, edited by James Moffatt (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), p. 50.

⁵⁵Bietenhard, op. cit., p. 275. Compare to this: Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 53.

⁵⁶Ludwig Radermacher, "Neutestamentliche Grammatik," Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Hans Lietzmann (Second revised edition; Tuebingen: J. B. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), c.1925), I, 154, and Blass, op. cit., p. 149, par. 335.

I Pet. 2:17). However, in connection with some New Testament concepts the basic distinction may legitimately be pressed. The force of the tenses may not always be viewed indifferently.⁵⁷ If the aorist verb is used in connection with an eschatological concept, its basic sense of point-action may be pressed. The hallowing of the name is an eschatological concept, perfectly realized only in the completion of the age (vide supra, p. 30). The aorist underlines the eschatological nature of the subject in red ink. Where the concept discussed is not in itself eschatological, the force of the aorist can not be stressed. The fourth petition may be cited as an example. Here, however, we may lay emphasis on the aorist in its punctiliar force. We may interpret the aorist as calling for a complete, once-and-for-all hallowing of the name, ruling out a gradual hallowing and Augustine's interpretation.⁵⁸

A second type of interpretation speaks of a double hallowing of God's name. This is regarded as a combination of the two Old Testament ideas. H. D. A. Major⁵⁹ takes this

⁵⁷J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, I, 174.

⁵⁸This same force of the aorist in an eschatological context will be used in later discussions. This will be noted simply as the "effect of the aorist" or the "demand of the aorist", all the while keeping in mind the argumentation on which it is based.

⁵⁹H. D. A. Major, T. W. Hanson, and C. J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1938), pp. 460-1.

view and concluded "this petition means TWO his italics things, both that God should hallow his name by his mighty acts and that man should acknowledge him as God." A different type of double interpretation is shown by W. C. Allen⁶⁰ and A. H. M'Neile.⁶¹ This thinks of a first, imperfect hallowing in the present and a perfect hallowing in the eschatological future. Any sort of a double interpretation, however, does not meet the requirement of the aorist imperative. The interpretation can be neither gradual, double, nor man centered. Thus every interpretation akin to Tertullian's⁶² comment ("Cum dicimus Sanctificetur nomen tuum, id petimus, ut sanctificetur in nobis") fails. This asks for nothing man-centered.

The criticisms of the above mentioned interpretations and clarifications lead us into the interpretation that seems to meet the words themselves. This interpretation must fulfill certain requirements laid down by the words themselves. The aorist usage of the petition leads us to state first that the petition points to one deed, one great hallowing of the

⁶⁰Willoughby C. Allen, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew," The International Critical Commentary, edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs (Third edition; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, c.1912), p.58.

⁶¹Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1915), p. 78.

⁶²Tertullian, De Orat., iii. Quoted in M'Neile, op. cit., p. 78.

name of God. This was the criticism of the first set of interpretations, that they thought of a gradual hallowing. But this petition seeks a complete hallowing, done but once in history. This meaning of the aorist is supported by the similar use of the aorist imperative *ἐλθάτω* in the second petition where it is linked to the idea of the *Βασιλεία* that is generally regarded as an eschatological concept.⁶³ This idea of the eschatological meaning of *ἔρχασθῆτω* has been summarized neatly by Theodor Zahn:

Dazu kommt, dass auch hier der Aorist *ἔρχασθῆτω* den Eintritt eines bestimmten Zieles ins Auge fassen heisst, mit dessen Erreichung das gewünschte *ἔρχασθῆτω* abgetan ist, und zwar, da dies an der Spitze eines Gebetes steht, den Eintritt eines endgültigen Zustandes, welchen Gott herbeiführen muss. Gegenüber der vielfältigen Misachtung seiner Heiligkeit und Entweihung seines Namens durch sundiges Verhalten der Menschen muss Gott selbst durch Taten des Gerichts fuer die Aufrechterhaltung seiner Heiligkeit sorgen (Lev 10,3; Num 20,13).⁶⁴

The words of Theodor Zahn lead us directly into the next requirement of the interpretation of the first petition. The petition for such a happening could only be done as a result of God's own action. It is a petition that asks God to keep his promises to hallow his name in Israel,⁶⁵ that he would finish the hallowing of his name, in spite of all

⁶³Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 53f.

⁶⁴Theodor Zahn, "Das Evangelium des Matthaeus," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, edited by Theodor Zahn (Fourth edition; Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Dr. Werner Scholl, 1922), I, 274-5.

⁶⁵Schniewind, op. cit., p. 82.

enemies and sinners,⁶⁶ that God, who alone is the proper subject of the verb *ἀγαλλῶ*,⁶⁷ should show forth his honor and glory by a divine action that has its source and power in the divine Godhead alone.⁶⁸ This meaning is further assured when we consider that the *ἀμωθῆτω* of the first petition must be a rendering of the Hebrew *אִתְּפָאֵר*, so that "Gott selbst es ist, der seinen Namen als heilig erweist."⁶⁹

This eschatological nature of the petition is borne out by two other considerations. It certainly must be as important as the petition that it precedes, the second, which helps to determine the content of Jesus' message. If the message of the *Βασιλεία* is eschatological, then the meaning of the *ὄνομα* ought also to have eschatological significance. Ernst Lohmeyer⁷⁰ cites a whole group of passages which show the eschatological flavor of *ὄνομα*. Jesus is the *ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ* (Mk. 1:24; cf. John 6:69). These confessions are the result of Jesus casting out a devil (*δύναμις* is always connected with the *ἐρχαίνου*) and of Peter's hearing the word of the Bread of Life. At the entry into Jerusalem the crowd salutes Jesus as him who comes in the name of the Lord (*ἐν*

⁶⁶Bietenhard, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

⁶⁷Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

⁶⁸Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, pp. 213-4.

⁶⁹Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

⁷⁰*Op. cit.*, pp. 56-7.

ὀνόματι κυρίου, Matt. 21:9). Jesus spread the name of God (John 17:26) and he prayed (John 12:28) that the name might be glorified. The Didache of the Holy Apostles seems to show that the early church understood it in this way:

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἄγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου·
οὗ κύριον ἠνώσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (Didache 10:2).

It may be that Bonhoeffer⁷¹ is partly correct when he says that the first petition embraces the whole content of the Gospel in the name. At least it is eschatological, be it Gospel or judgment.⁷²

The concept, eschatologically interpreted, encloses some few other thoughts within it. The eschatological hallowing of the name is in one sense a mission emphasis. The name of God can only be hallowed in the hallowing of the world--and so the hallowing of the name means the end of all that is here and now. It is a prayer for the final revelation. It must be God's act. Yet the passive contains in it also, rightly understood, according to Lohmeyer,⁷³ the concept of the hallowing of the world. It is, however, not expressed. The Christian leaves all in the hand of God, the how, the when, and the where. The prayer is for an act of God which

⁷¹Dietrich Bonhoeffer, The Cost of Discipleship, translated from the German by R. H. Fuller (New York: The Macmillan Company, c.1949), p. 143.

⁷²Schniewind, op. cit., p. 82, also discusses this question.

⁷³Op. cit., p. 55.

will level all differences of language and nation in the praise of God. Thus it can also be viewed (in this eschatological connection only) in the light of a missionary petition. The suggestion that *σεν* is emphatic and should be accented *σού* seems to be rooted in this missionary idea. First suggested by Fritzsche, it is adopted by Bruce.⁷⁴

A passage from Clement also seems to support this view: *ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκοτεινῶν εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν θεότητος ἰσχυροῦ* (I Clement 59:2).

The hallowing of men may be thought of in a correct way under this petition, even as the missionary emphasis can be correctly held. It is a thought of the Bible that God will hallow his people at the end of the days.⁷⁵ The idea of penitence on our part is out. The idea of a penitence worked in us by God finds its place in the great hallowing by God. The fact that the prayer is addressed to the "Father" shows that there is a relation to men in every petition. But it is always a relation that comes from God to men, never from men to God. For just as God is greater than men, so also the hallowing of God's name is not even to be restricted to the penitence and sanctification of men worked by God. The first petition deals with the eternal counsels of God.

⁷⁴Alexander Balmain Bruce, "The Synoptic Gospels," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), I, 120.

⁷⁵Zahn, op. cit., p. 275.

We are not to mediate between the mission emphasis in the petition and the thought of the hallowing in a people of God. To God's own plan should be left the methods and the aims.⁷⁶

A short note perhaps ought to be added on the relation of the first petition to the prayer of Jesus in John 12:28. This prayer could well be taken as the theme of the fourth Gospel. This petition is set in the context of the suffering of our Lord, and so must be interpreted in the light of the events of the last few days. The word *πάτερ* is directly attached to the petition. We might paraphrase it: Show yourself as father in the death and resurrection of your Son. The two prayers are related, but their very relation also serves to point up their difference. The prayer of Jesus has a definite program in mind; the prayer of the Christian does not presume to set out a program for God. The active *δοξάζω* is in contrast to the passive *ἐμαρτυρῶ* of the Lord's Prayer. Both have the same goal, but the method and manner of prayer are different. The Johannine petition could be found only in the mouth of Jesus. The synoptic petition is more general. It is the prayer of every Christian.⁷⁷

⁷⁶Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 54-8.

⁷⁷See Bietenhard, op. cit., p. 271; Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 57-8.

Originality of the Petition

An oft quoted rabbinic saying says: "Any benediction, wherein no mention is made of the Name, is no benediction." On the basis of this saying, attributed to Rabbi Judah the Holy,⁷⁸ it is sometimes said that Jesus did no more than duplicate the petitions of prevalent Jewish prayer piety. Certain parallels are brought forward and said to show the source of Jesus' prayer. The Kaddish began, "May his great name be magnified and hallowed" (שְׁמֵיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁבַּח וְיִתְפָּאֵר וְיִקְדָּשׁ וְיִגְדָּל וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמַּח וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמַּח). The Shemone Esreh in the third benediction reads: "Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and the saints daily praise thee. Selah. Blessed art thou, O Lord; the God most holy."⁷⁹ Other parallels can be found from the prayers of individual rabbis, but these need not concern us here.⁸⁰

The words of our Lord Jesus do sound very similar to the expressions of the Jewish prayers. In both the verb stands at the head of the sentence; the verb is passive. The name of God is used, and God is not named directly. The words

⁷⁸David Smith, The Days of His Flesh (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917), p. 31.

⁷⁹This translation is taken from the German scholar Emil Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated from the German by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, c.1890), II, II, P. 86. The entire prayer is given in the appendix.

⁸⁰As, for example, a section from the prayer of Jannai (p. Ber. 7d): "May thy name not be profaned on us, and make us not an object of chatter to all people." Found in Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 215.

apparently could form the basis of the Lord's Prayer.

But a much more logical possibility is that both of them were taken from the same source, that their similar form is the reflection of the language of the Old Testament. Both could be the result, for example, of Ezekiel 38:23 being put into the patterns of speech used in the day of Jesus. The language of both is Biblically centered.

A second difference becomes clear on a closer comparison of the two. The Shemone Esreh (and also the Kaddish, perhaps) is not giving a petition here. Rather this is a doxology, an ascription of praise to God that is to prepare the mind of the pray-er and also to gain God's attention. But the first petition is petition and not doxology. Bengel⁸¹ in his day already observed "Modus in sanctificetur eadem vim habet, quam in veniat et fiat, adeoque est rogatio, non doxologia expressa." The only way that the first petition could be understood as a doxology would be that it speaks of God's glory, his name to be glorified. The difference is very sharp. If there is dependence, there is also sharp advancement--a sign of originality.

Finally, and this is conclusive, the entire concept brought to mind by the word "hallow" (ἁγιασῶ, ἡΓΙΩ) is different for the hearers of Christ than for the disciples

⁸¹J. A. Bengel, Gnomon Novi Testamenti: In Quo ex Nativa Verborum Vi Simplicitas, Profunditas, Concinnitas, Salubritas Sensuum Coelestium Indicatur, according to the third edition of 1773 (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, c.1860), p. 35.

of the great rabbis. Jewish prayers gave a great number of laudatory titles to God (cf. Shemone Esreh, Benedictions one to three, Appendix) and this was the hallowing of the name in one sense. Jesus spoke but one short four word sentence-- and that contained everything.⁸²

Further, the concept of sanctification of the name is sharply differentiated in the two streams of tradition. The Jewish concept was nationalistic; Jesus with the latent mission emphasis is universal in outlook. The Jews were legalistic with an anthropo-centric emphasis; Jesus spoke of a hallowing that was to be done by God, completely separated from all thought of men's cooperation. The Jewish conception was in part bound up with their cultic ritual; Jesus does not connect the hallowing of the name to any cult. Jesus' conception is in an almost completely different sphere from the Jewish conception.

We may conclude by saying that the verbal parallels are probably the result of a common source, the Old Testament and the folk-piety of the day. The content of the words is far separated, approached from opposite poles. Jesus has put new wine in old bottles.

⁸²Gerhard Kittel, Jesus und die Rabbinen (Berlin-Lichterfelde: Edwin Runge, 1914), p. 20.

CHAPTER IV

THE SECOND PETITION

The Biblical Use of *Basileia*

The second petition revolves about the meaning of the one term *Basileia*. The first petition was the joining of two ideas; the second is concerned with the one *Basileia* for whose coming we are to pray. This *Basileia* has been discussed as much as any concept in the Bible. Men have traced its sources to various places. The general translation of the word has shifted in the last century. We will do well to trace the word in its etymology and meaning and through the religious thought of the Jewish people.

The use and meaning of *Basileia*. The term *Basileia tou Theou* or *Basileia tou ouranou* occurs in the New Testament 119 times.¹ Matthew alone uses the expression *Basileia tou ouranou*, though he uses *Basileia tou Theou* three times.² The two phrases are regarded by modern scholars as equal in meaning, though which of the two Jesus used in Aramaic cannot be determined.³ There are two possible reasons why the

¹W. Arndt, "The New Testament Teaching on the Kingdom of God," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXI (January, 1950), 8.

²Matt. 12:28; 21:31; 21:43. Matt. 6:33 and 19:24 may also have the phrase, depending on the reading.

³K. L. Schmidt, "*Basileia*," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), I, 583.

variant "kingdom of heaven" is used: 1) it may indicate the transcendental character of the *Βασιλεία*; 2) the use of the customary periphrasis of the divine name by the pious Jew.⁴ When *Βασιλεία* is used without a modifier, it always refers to the *Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*.⁵ The *Βασιλεία ἡμετέρη* likewise is equal to the *Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as Luke 22:29 shows: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father has appointed unto me." Whatever we say of Christ's kingdom can be said of God's, and whatever is true of God's kingdom is also true of Christ's.⁶

The meaning of the term is not so completely agreed upon. K. L. Schmidt says that the basic meaning of the word lays emphasis on the existence, the essence of a king and so should be translated power or dignity. In the New Testament the phrase *Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ/ τῶν οὐρανῶν* always lays the weight on the basic meaning of rule, reign, dominion, Herrschaft. So Souter⁸ defines *Βασιλεία* as "kingship,

⁴The second seems more likely. This is the view of the great Aramaic scholar of Germany, Gustav Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated from the German by D. H. Kay (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902), p. 93. Dr. Arndt, op. cit., p. 8, holds to the first view.

⁵Schmidt, op. cit., p. 583.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 579.

⁸Alexander Souter, A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament (Oxford, England: At the Clarendon Press, 1916), p. 47. This view is shared by Dalman, op. cit., p. 94, and C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1936), pp. 34-5.

sovereignty, authority, rule, especially of God, both in the world and in the hearts of men." Thus *βασιλεία* is a nomen actionis. This use is also illustrated in the papyri of the pre-Christian era. Moulton and Milligan⁹ quote from a papyrus of the year 165 B.C.: *πάντας τοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν διακαιοδοτήσονται*. This meaning of the word is definitely the one to be used whenever the *βασιλεία* is spoken of as coming or appearing, as near or present.¹⁰

But, while the basic character of the word is that of reign, we must not close our eyes to the fact that there are certain passages which give a better meaning if the translation "kingdom" or "realm" is used (cf. John 3:5; Matt. 6:33; Luke 12:31). There are passages which refer to the kingdoms of this world with the term *βασιλεία* (Matt. 12:25; 24:7). In Mark 11:10 the term seems to be applied to the God-chosen people. This usage of the word *βασιλεία* is also apparent in the Septuagint: *καὶ ἠδοξάσθη ἡ βασιλεία ἐνώπιον Ἀντιόχου, καὶ ὑπέταξεν βασιλεύσασαι τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὅπως βασιλεύσῃ ἐπὶ εἰς δύο βασιλείας* (I Maccabees 1:16). Both meanings of *βασιλεία* are illustrated here. That the word can mean "Kingdom" is shown also by the passages that speak of earthly kingdoms

⁹James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated From the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), p. 104.

¹⁰Wilhelm Bousset, "Das Reich Gottes in der Predigt Jesu," Theologische Rundschau, V(1902), 405-6.

(Matt. 4:8; 24:7). The possibility must always be left open that the context will determine that "kingdom" is the better rendering in a specific passage. Vincent Taylor¹¹ counts sixty sayings and parables about the "kingdom" in the Gospels and finds traces of a community in only nine.¹² The translation "sovereignty" seems best.

The Old Testament Background. The Old Testament was the source of Jesus' teaching, his Bible and storehouse of religious information. This does not mean that any originality or authority is denied to Jesus. Jesus took the heritage of the Old Testament and on it based his proclamation. The starting point for Jesus was always the Old Testament.¹³ A study of the background is necessary.

The Old Testament has a group of passages that speak of God as king. The phrase "kingdom of God" (מְלִכְוּת אֱלֹהִים) does not occur in the Old Testament itself.¹⁴ Yet the idea

¹¹Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, pp. 8-9. Quoted in R. Newton Flew, Jesus and His Church: a Study of the Ecclesia in the New Testament (New York: The Abingdon Press, c.1938), p. 31.

¹²An interesting attempt to combine both thoughts in one translation was proposed by Rudolph Otto. He proposed translating *Baumreich* "realm of royal sovereignty," thus hoping to include both ideas in a phrase that can be used where either is emphasized. The translation seems cumbersome. Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, translated from the revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), p. 53.

¹³Schmidt, op. cit., p. 585.

¹⁴Lohmeyer, Das Vater-Unser (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1946), p. 66.

occurs early in the Bible and runs throughout the Old Testament (Ex. 15:18; Nu. 23:21; I Kings 22:19; Is. 6:5). "The Lord is king forever and ever" (Ex. 15:18) is the sure theme that runs throughout the Old Testament.¹⁵ God is king over the entire world, over all nations and peoples (cf. Nu. 24:7). "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all" (I Chr. 29:11).

God is also viewed as king of Israel, the nation, in a special sense. He has chosen her, has made a covenant with her, is the king in her midst (Nu. 23:21). Whether this is an earlier or a later development is not agreed upon by scholars. Otto¹⁶ thinks it first becomes apparent in I Chr. 17:14, while von Rad¹⁷ says that in the early days Yahweh was king over Israel only and that the meaning was extended to cover all the nations in Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah. The view of Otto seems preferable.

This reign of God over Israel was eternal (Ps. 145:11 and 13). Even if Israel were to rebel, God would have the

¹⁵No special weight attaches to Gerhard von Rad's statement that "king" was the general oriental designation for God. It does not mean dependence or syncretism. Cf. Gerhard von Rad, "*Baardata*," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), I, 568.

¹⁶Otto, op. cit., p. 35.

¹⁷von Rad, op. cit., p. 568.

last word. His מְלִכּוּתָא does not equal people but power.¹⁸ As king God possesses the מְלִכּוּתָא, the sovereignty. This מְלִכּוּתָא can be exercised where and when God will, whether it be over the children of Israel in the Davidic throne (II Sam. 7:16; I Chr. 17:14; 28:5) or over any nation or people that he chooses (Dan. 2:44; 4:22). God as king has dominion.¹⁹ The meaning of this for the Israelite has been summarized by Wilhelm Bousset:

Die ganze Summe dessen, was Israel von der Zukunft erwartet, faszt sich indem Begriff des Malkuth Jahwe (מְלִכּוּתָא יְהוָה) zusammen....Die israelitische und juedische Froemigkeit denkt dabei in erster Linie an das Regiment Gottes, hoechstens erst in zweiter an ein beherrschtes Gebiet. Diese Herrschaft Gottes ist nun zwar in einem gewissen Sinne immer, also auch in der Gegenwart, vorhanden. Und an zahlreichen Stellen reden unsere Quellen von dieser nie aufhoerenden, ewigen Gottes-herrschaft.²⁰

But while God was king in the present, Israel saw that God's rule was not, apparently, perfect. There were forces that opposed the kingdom of Israel. The chosen people were at times forced to pay tribute to the kings of Assyria. The periods in the history of both the Northern and Southern kingdoms when they were without the threat of impending catastrophe in the form of one of the great world powers

¹⁸Flew, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁹von Rad, op. cit., p. 569.

²⁰Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im Spaet-hellenistischen Zeitalter, revised by Hugo Gressmann (Third edition; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926), pp. 213-4.

were few indeed. This state of affairs led to the second great series of passages in the Old Testament.

The Old Testament מלכות viewed as a future blessing.
 The idea of a kingdom, a reign by God, a מלכות is not in itself eschatological. The idea rather seems to come in with the Exile that God's rule will one day be perfect, unhindered by the enmity of people and men or demoniac forces of any type.²¹ The Jews did not conceive of this as a contradiction of the first group of passages which speak of Yahweh as king in the present. Rather it was thought of as the perfection of the present state. "Man erwartet nur die endliche Manifestierung seiner ganzen Koenigsmacht."²²
 "And the kingdom shall be the Lord's" (Obadiah 21) could well serve as a summary of this view. Other passages that give the same thought are Is. 52:7 (LXX); Micha 4:7; Zechariah 14:9; Is. 24:23. The group of Psalms from 93-9 state often that Yahweh has become king. The Old Testament looks forward to the perfected kingdom of God.²³

²¹Otto, op. cit., pp. 55-6; also Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 66. Otto feels that the eschatological strain may have been due to the Persian influence on the Jews in the Exile. While Persian culture must have made an impact on the Jews, it seems unnecessary to credit it with an emphasis that could have arisen from the condition of the Jews themselves.

²²von Rad, op. cit., p. 567.

²³It is interesting to note in this respect that the kingdom must be future, for the Old Testament never speaks of entering the kingdom. Rather, like rabbinic Judaism, it waits for the revelation of the kingdom. Thus one can do nothing to hurry its coming. This confirms the future hope of the kingdom. Cf. Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 67.

The Old Testament Concept of the Messiah-King. The Old Testament contributed a third stream of thought to the New Testament thought about the *Ben David*. The Son of Man in Daniel 7:13 was linked to the concept of the *בן אדם*. He was not thought of as an earthly king, but was pictured in a glorious state of majesty. In verse 27 of the same chapter Daniel links the Son of Man to the *בן אדם* of the holy ones of Israel. The stream of Isaiah 9 and 11 had also contributed to the thought of this king. The second half of Isaiah with its references to the Servant of the Lord helped to color the picture also. This idea of the Son of Man was used by Christ to complete the picture of the Kingdom of God. These three basic thoughts are the source of the idea of the *Ben David* in the preaching of Jesus of Nazareth.²⁴

In every case where the Old Testament hope of the relates to the future, it is better to render it with "reign" than "kingdom."²⁵ This rendering is shown by the Septuagint translation in certain passages (cf. I Kings 15:28; Esther 3:6). The translation "realm" is also possible, of course, but these passages are clearly marked out by the context in which they are found (cf. Ps. 67:33; 134:11). We are safe

²⁴von Rad, op. cit., pp. 565-9. Cf. also Archibald M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 70-2, where the whole idea of the Old Testament background of *Ben David* is discussed.

²⁵Bousset, "Das Reich Gottes in der Predigt Jesu," p. 401, and Dalman, op. cit., p. 94.

then God began to be made known upon earth.²⁷ Even then, "the throne of God is not secure as long as the recognition of the kingship is only the possession of a few individuals."²⁸ This caused Yahweh to select a people for himself, to guarantee himself a kingship. This kingship was, at times, imperiled by the relapses of the people into sin. But this never was able to stop the achievement of one great thing: there was a people, a nation, which did once select God as king and so assured him of a reign.²⁹ This thought of God as king in the present was always in the mind of the rabbinical teachers.

But the idea of a present kingship in Israel pales into insignificance beside those sayings and thoughts which saw the *מלכות* as a future hope. Only in the future would the reign of God achieve true reality.³⁰ This thought of an eschatological, future reign of God can also be illustrated from Jewish prayer life. "May his kingly rule be established in your life time--in your time and in the time of the whole house of Israel," so the Jew prayed as he recited the

²⁷Siphre Deuteronomium 115 (Fr. 154b), basing its remarks on Gen. 24:7, says: "Before our father Abraham came into the world, God was, as it were, only the king of heaven; but when Abraham came, he made Him to be king over heaven and earth." Quoted in Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 96; also in Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

²⁸S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923), p. 84. The statements of this man may be regarded as having special weight, for he is a Jewish authority, not a Christian.

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 85-8.

³⁰Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, p. 214.

Kaddish (vide supra, p. 10) The eleventh benediction of the Shemone Esreh prayed for a future reign: "Restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove us from sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone."³¹ The idea of a future king was surely predominant in the Jewish mind. It was the repository of all the Jewish hopes for the future.³²

This form of the idea, the future hope, was taken by the Jews and made into the vehicle for the expression of all their hopes. The idea of the מַלְכוּת was transformed by various groups. One group in later Judaism gave the a completely transcendent character, made it a kingdom that was in complete contrast to the present world. The Wisdom of Solomon 10:10 uses *Βασιλεία* in this sense of the world above: *ἔθεθεν αὐτῷ βασιλείαν θεοῦ καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτῷ γνῶσιν ἀγίων*. This kingdom stands in complete contrast to the world. Here the *Βασιλεία* is viewed as a kingdom, and not a reign.³³ This view of the *Βασιλεία* as a kingdom also caused the messianic hope to be relegated to a little corner. The stone of Daniel 2:34 that was loosed without hands needed no messiah in the rabbinic hope. God and his holy Angel would do all that was needed (Dan. 12:1ff.). It was

³¹See the Appendix for the complete prayer.

³²For a much more complete citation of the evidence, see Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, p. 215.

³³Otto, op. cit., pp. 36-7.

an absolute wonder, a total change through a miracle of God.³⁴ The apocalyptic view could not express the messianic hope. A different terminology was needed for this.³⁵ This view of a transcendent kingdom was the one that caught the popular imagination. The common man thought of a physical Jerusalem that would come down from heaven. This kingdom would change the earth in a wonderful way. It was a sort of fairy-wonderland for the average Jew.³⁶ This view was very general.

Yet, this kingdom was thought of as a cause that a man could take upon himself in the present. The idea of a kingdom of God to which men gave allegiance now led to a new thought in connection with the kingdom.³⁷ Rabbinic Judaism added one expression to the terminology of the kingdom concept: "to take the yoke of the kingdom upon oneself."³⁸ The taking of the yoke was often identified with the reciting of the Shema, for which elaborate preparations were made.³⁹ The

³⁴Bousset, "Das Reich Gottes in der Predigt Jesu," pp. 401-2.

³⁵Dalman, op. cit., p. 101.

³⁶Otto, op. cit., p. 37.

³⁷Martin Dibelius, Jesus, translated from the German by Charles B. Hedrick and Frederick C. Grant (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949), pp. 64-5.

³⁸Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 67.

³⁹Berachoth 14b, 15a says: "He who is desirous to receive upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven let him first prepare his body, wash his hands, lay his Tephilin (phylacteries) [*sic*], read the Shema, and say his prayers." Quoted in Schechter, op. cit., p. 66.

elaborate preparations give some idea what the yoke of the kingdom meant to a Jew. The recitation of the Shema meant that the Jew acknowledged God as Lord and placed himself under the obedience of the Law.⁴⁰ This was not conceived of as a pleasant thing, but was a true yoke. God could force men to accept his service, if necessary.⁴¹ The idea also took another turn when men began to conceive of this act as something they could do either to found the kingdom themselves or to force God to reveal his kingdom. Jewish ethics came to play a part in the hope of the kingdom.⁴² And it was this that led in part to the self-righteous attitude of the Pharisees. Men began to place themselves into the center in the founding of the kingdom.

The third type of kingdom hope in rabbinic theology has been most abused. Often commentators have singled this out as the predominant feature, ignoring the two other types given above. This third type is the nationalistic hope expressed in the idea of the kingdom of God. Basing their hopes on a nationalistic interpretation of Daniel's prophecy⁴³ about the future מְלִכּוּת , the Jews in some cases identified

⁴⁰Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1942), I, 269. Cf. also Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., pp. 172-3.

⁴¹Dalman, op. cit., p. 97.

⁴²Otto, op. cit., p. 37-8.

⁴³Dan. 2:44 and 7:27.

the kingdom of God with the political status of Israel. This identification of the political with the spiritual is an explanation of why the kingdom of God does not have the central place in the religious literature of the Jews that we expect it to have.⁴⁴ Men felt that Israel as a nation had taken the yoke of the kingdom upon itself at the Red Sea and Sinai. Solomon, for example, sat on God's throne. When Israel sinned the kingdom was taken away from them. But the rule by the nations and the rule of God were contrary to each other. They were irreconcilable opposites.⁴⁵ Feeling thus, it was easy to identify the kingdom of God with the reestablishment of the political kingdom of Israel. If God is to rule perfectly, "Israel must be set free from the sway of the peoples and the Gentile world be subjugated to God."⁴⁶ The literature of the period is full of this hope.⁴⁷ In the twelfth benediction of the Shemone Esreh men could even pray for the "humbling of the tyrants," referring to Rome.⁴⁸ This hope was a fervent one, as the opening sentences

⁴⁴Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, pp. 215-6.

⁴⁵Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., p. 172.

⁴⁶Dalman, op. cit., p. 98.

⁴⁷See, for example, the eleventh benediction of the Shemone Esreh; Assumption of Moses 10:1; Seder Rab Amram: i. 9a; II Maccabees 2:17; Book of Jubilees 32:19.

⁴⁸Schechter could even cite one rabbi from a later period who went so far as to say that the kingdom could not be established without the destruction of the Amalakites (Jer. 3:17), identifying the Amalakites with Rome, op. cit., p. 99.

of the Kaddish show. Israel desired the establishment of the kingdom of God to come quickly.

It is clear from the above discussion that Jesus was not proclaiming an unknown quantity when he said, "The kingdom is at hand." And yet, how perverted was the hope of the kingdom in Israel! It was a mixture of apocalyptic mysticism, legalistic Phariseeism, and nationalistic hopes. Into such a thought world Jesus stepped with his proclamation of a completely spiritual, religious reign of God. Seen against such a background the proclamation of Jesus gains in size, in grandeur, in demand upon men, in religious quality. If anything would set off the message of Jesus in its newness, it would be the world into which he came. It is to this message of Jesus that we now turn.

The Proclamation of the *Bevndela* in the Words of Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus stepped into public life in Galilee as a Jewish teacher. The heart of his message was a declaration of the kingdom of God, the reign of God. With such a message Jesus stands in the line of Jewish teachers that began with the apocalyptic writers of the intertestamental period, was carried into rabbinic Judaism through the great masters of the Law, and from there went on in the tradition of the Jewish nation down into the middle ages.

Men reverence Jesus yet today. When the names of other Jewish teachers are long forgotten except for the curiosity of historians, Jesus' name still means something.

One cause for this lasting meaning must lie in the message Jesus proclaimed. While Jesus took over the form of the proclamation, he radically changed the spirit and content. Jesus based his proclamation on the Old Testament and the linguistic heritage of rabbinic thought. All other influences on his message of the *Basileia* are to be ruled out.⁴⁹

Jesus spoke in Old Testament language in his proclamation. He spoke of a *Basileia* which was yet to come. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 7:21). "I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come" (Luke 22:18).⁵⁰ This preaching of a future kingdom is often linked to the prophecy of the end of the world. This is the case in Lk. 21:29-31 and Matt. 25:34. In this context one point is especially worth noting. Thought of the future kingdom does not inspire Jesus to give a multitude of apocalyptic, fantastic signs--as the Jewish apocalyptic

⁴⁹Rudolph Otto sees Iranian influences in the message of Jesus. He goes to great lengths in his book on the kingdom of God to find all sorts of parallels (op. cit., passim). Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 38-9, examines Otto's conclusions with great care. His refutation is recommended.

Similarly, Schmidt, op. cit., p. 588, rules out any form of mystical Greek thought from the kingdom. There is no trace of Greek thinking in Jesus' message of the *Basileia*.

⁵⁰See also Matt. 6:10; 8:11; 25:34; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 9:27; 19:11; 21:29-31 for other examples of the kingdom as future.

writers did.⁵¹ Indeed, he repudiated the Pharisees who demanded to know the time of the coming by saying, "It does not come, this kingdom of God, with perceptible circumstances, nor can you say 'Here it is!' or 'There it is!', for behold, the kingdom of God is right now among you" (my paraphrase).⁵² While following the Jewish apocalyptic literature in speaking of a future kingdom, his message about it is quite different. The kingdom is not national in character (Matt. 8:12). Indeed, this is a new message in an old word pattern.

Jesus' message about the kingdom, however, was not only a message for the future. Rather, "the new and arresting feature was that it was coming, perhaps even tomorrow; indeed that it had come."⁵³ This feature, that the kingdom is near, yea, even is here, finds very adequate expression in Jesus' words. His opening proclamation was Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (Mk. 1:15). From then on Jesus did not cease to proclaim the nearness and the presence of the reign of God. The great number of expressions that suggest this show that it is a dominant feature of his preaching. Many

⁵¹Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 5-8.

⁵²On the meaning of ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι in Luke 17:21, see P. H. Bretscher, "Luke 17:21," Concordia Theological Monthly, XV (November, 1944), 730-5 and "Luke 17:20-21 in Recent Investigations," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII (December, 1951), 895-907.

⁵³Otto, op. cit., p. 47.

verbs are used to give this idea: ἤγγικεν (Mk. 1:15; Matt. 3:2; 4:15 and 17; 10:7; Lk. 10:11), ἐγγύς ἐστί (Lk. 21:31), ἔρχεται (Lk. 17:20; 22:18), ἀναβαίνεισθαι (Lk. 19:11). Other passages reveal the same thought. Mark 9:1, where it is promised that the kingdom will come in power, presupposes a previous existence without power.⁵⁴ In his answer to the Pharisees in Luke 17:20-1 Jesus definitely states that the βασιλεία is present, no matter how one renders the εὐαγγέλιον ὑμῶν. Matt. 12:28 speaks with equal clarity: "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come upon you" (ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ). Jesus proclaimed a reign that was present. The reign was there whether men accepted it or not (Lk. 11:20; 10:23-4; 11:31-2; Matt. 11:2-11). The decisive point of Jesus' message is: "The reign of God is at hand." The proclamation of Jesus is not predominantly one of a future kingdom, as E. F. Scott says,⁵⁵ but that of a present reign. C. H. Dodd summarizes this as follows:

Here then is the fixed point from which our interpretation of the teaching regarding the Kingdom of God must start. It represents the ministry of Jesus as "realized eschatology," that is to say, as the impact upon this world of the "powers of the world to come" in a series of events, unprecedented and unrepeatable, now in actual progress.⁵⁶

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 147.

⁵⁵E. F. Scott, The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 93.

⁵⁶Dodd, op. cit., p. 51.

The present kingdom makes demands upon men. Men must seek the kingdom (Matt. 6:33). This is a demand for exertion and struggle. It demands also repentance (Mk. 1:15; Matt. 4:17), a *μετάνοια* that includes a renunciation of the world (Matt. 22:1-14) and not the giving of excuses. Men must be ready to pay a great price (Matt. 5:29f.; 13:44-6), even to the extent of becoming eunuchs for the kingdom (Matt. 19:12). This proclamation of repentance was the same as the proclamation of the kingdom. As Friedrich Buechsel puts it:

Jesu Verkuendigung war ebensowohl Himmelreichspredigt wie Buszpredigt. Indem er zur Umkehr aufrief, sagte er zugleich das Kommen des Himmelreichs an. Beides war letztlich fuer ihn dasselbe. Man kann deshalb seine Verkuendigung sowohl unter dem einen wie dem anderen Gesichtspunkte zusammenfassen.⁵⁷

This call to repentance was the purpose of Jesus' coming (Lk. 5:32). Since it was made by Jesus, it was the ultimate call for repentance (Matt. 12:39-41), demanding a total reversal of life and new obedience (Matt. 7:21), a doing of the will of God. One must be ready to leave family and wealth (Matt. 10:37) to follow Jesus. Thus the preaching of repentance is a sharp either/or, a demand for a complete reversal (Matt. 22:14; 7:13ff.), a road that permits no turning back, not even a backward glance (Lk. 9:62).

⁵⁷Friedrich Buechsel, Jesus: Verkuendigung und Geschichte (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1947), p. 41.

Jesus makes an unescapable demand for repentance.⁵⁸

This demand of Jesus also shows that man cannot enter the kingdom by his own power. Jesus demands perfect obedience. But no man can give perfect obedience. Rather the kingdom is a gift of God to those who believe as little children. "All views of human cooperation are excluded, if we bear in mind that the basileia tou theou really means the reign, the rule of God."⁵⁹ Many parables emphasize this same thought. The meaning of the seed growing by itself (Mk. 4:26-8) and the receiving of the kingdom of God as little children (Mk. 3:26-9) is that God brings in this rule. The same thought is expressed in the passages which speak of God's *Basileia* as a gift (Lk. 12:32; Matt. 16:9; 21:43). The kingdom is bequeathed (*Scatizō* *u* *mas*) to us by Christ (Lk. 22:29) and so can be described as an inheritance (Matt. 25:34). No one can be a fellow-worker of God in establishing the kingdom. Luther caught this idea when he spoke of a kingdom that came "of itself."

⁵⁸This demand for repentance is very similar to the preaching of John. John also spoke of a kingdom that was near (Matt. 3:2). The comparison of the two messages does not lie in the scope of this paper. The answer does not lie in a solution that regards the preachment of the kingdom by John as a later interpolation or interpretation by the church. One may merely say here that the difference lies in the fundamental message underlying the proclamation of the reign of God by each. For a detailed examination of each message, see Otto, op. cit., pp. 67-81.

⁵⁹Heinz Dietrich Wendland, Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus, p. 36. Quoted in Arndt, op. cit., p. 16.

The reign comes entirely without the aid of men. It comes whether men accept it or not. Men can only enter the kingdom after it has come.⁶⁰ So it is in many places that the expression "enter" (*εἰσερχομαι* or *εἰσπορευομαι*) is used of the relationship of man to the *βασιλεία*. Men do not bring it; they enter it (Matt. 5:20; 7:21; 18:3; 19:23; 19:11; 23:13; Mk. 9:47; John 3:5; Acts 14:22). They who enter it are the poor in spirit (Matt. 5:3). To enter the *βασιλεία* one must become like a little child (Mark 3:26-9). It is given to those who are persecuted for his name's sake (Matt. 5:10); it can be entered now (Matt. 6:33). One must be born again to enter the kingdom (John 3:5; Mark 9:1). The attitude of one who enters the kingdom of God must be that of one who has waited for it (*προσδεχόμενος*, Mk. 15:43 and Lk. 23:51). It is not dependent on men, for publicans and whores enter before the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 21:31). One who has entered the kingdom is only a son of the kingdom (Lk. 9:62). All thought of human aid in the establishment of the kingdom is denied.

Jesus had denied any apocalyptic sign that the kingdom was present or that one could even predict the future advent of the kingdom by signs. Yet he saw in himself the great sign of the *βασιλεία*. The kingdom was present. How was one to know? After reading from the prophecies of Isaiah, he said,

⁶⁰Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

"Today is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." (Lk. 4:21). Jesus saw in himself the kingdom of God. He rebuked the Pharisees when they sought a sign by saying that Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, "and behold, a greater than Jonah is here" (Matt. 12:38-45). Jesus, claiming to be the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy in the present (*σήμερον*), was the only sign that he would give. The kingdom was present in his person. It is this message that the "sign" of Luke 11:20 gives.

Thus it is that parallel passages in the synoptics seem to equate Christ and the *Βασιλεία*. In Mark 10:29 (also Matt. 19:29) Jesus speaks of those who forsake house, children, etc., *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ*, while the parallel in Lk. 18:29 speaks of forsaking them *ἕνεκεν τῆς Βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Mark 9:1 (cp. Luke 9:27) speaks of the coming of the kingdom of God in power, while Matt. 16:28 speaks of the coming of the Son of Man. Other examples could also be cited. These show that the kingdom and the Christ are equated. We may conclude with K. L. Schmidt:

So laeszt sich sprachlich begruenden, was zudem aus dem ganzen Sachverhalt heraus deutlich ist: das hereinbrechende Gottesreich weisz Jesus in seiner Person in die Zeit und in die Welt gekommen, was johanneisch mit dem Satz: *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* Jl,14 ausgedrueckt ist.⁶¹

It is certainly true that Jesus sees in himself the inbreaking of the kingdom of God, sees himself as the

⁶¹Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 590-1.

eschatological saviour.⁶² It is this that Marcion⁶³ had in mind when he said, "In evangelio est dei regnum Christus ipse."⁶⁴

Since the *Βασιλεία* enters with the person and work of Jesus, the natural thing is to equate the *Βασιλεία* with the *εὐαγγέλιον*. One feature of the *Βασιλεία* in Christ's preaching is that the gospel is connected to it. It is a message of joy and hope. This was not a nationalistic hope, for Jesus saw only pain and bitterness in the future of his people (Matt. 23:37-9; Mk. 13:14-23; Lk. 21:5, 20-4; 19:41-4; 23:27-31). Rather it was the saving power of the Gospel, the good news of the power of God, that he proclaimed (Matt. 4:23; 9:35). The verbs characteristically used of the proclamation of the gospel are also used of the kingdom: *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* (Lk. 4:43; 8:1; 16:16), *κηρύσσειν* (Matt. 4:23; 9:35), and *διαγγέλλειν* (Luke 9:60). In the same strain, miracles (*σημεῖα*) are connected with it (*ἐλθεῖν*, Lk. 9:2; Matt. 10:7) as well as power (*δύναμις*). The devils were cast out in the coming of the kingdom (Matt. 12:28).

⁶²Otto, op. cit., pp. 97-107.

⁶³Quoted in Schmidt, op. cit., p. 591.

⁶⁴It is interesting to note in connection with this equation of Christ with the *Βασιλεία* that the earliest confession of the church was probably *κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, a testimony to faith in Christ as *Βασιλεύς*. Cf. Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, translated from the German by J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth Press, c.1949), passim, especially p. 59.

When perfect it would come *ἐν δυνάμει*, cf. Mk. 9:1.

The same content of the *Βασιλεία* is shown by the attributive and parallel words and phrases used with it: *δικαιοσύνη*, *εἰρήνη*, and *χαρά* (Rom. 14:17). Rebirth (*παλιγγενέσια*) is parallel to the *Βασιλεία* in Matt. 19:28 (cf. John 5:3ff.). The kingdom is set parallel to *δόξα* in Mark 10:37 and Matt. 20:21. The kingdom is *ἐπουράνιος* (II Tim. 4:18), *αἰώνιος* (II Pet. 1:11), and *ἀσάλευτος* (Heb. 12:28). These all show the nature of the kingdom in the proclamation of Jesus Christ. This is a proclamation of a purpose of God "directed principally to the bestowal of blessing on men, and not to the mere exaltation of the divine majesty over the world."⁶⁵ This is joyous news.

Jesus' message of the kingdom separated itself, as did the Old Testament message and the rabbinic message, into two definite groups. "The *Βασιλεία* is here," was the dominant theme of all his preaching. Jesus had overcome the world (John 16:33). But Jesus also spoke in places, as we saw, of a *Βασιλεία* that still lay in the future. This *Βασιλεία* was to come *ἐν δυνάμει* (Mk. 9:1). Here are two sets of passages that seem to be completely antagonistic.

Yet we may feel certain that the message of Jesus is not contradictory. If it were, the evangelists would not

⁶⁵Palman, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

have presented it in such a way. They were also thinking men.⁶⁶ There must be a solution.

The least we can say about the *Basileia tou Theou* is that it is a wonder. It is something that is not generated in this world, but is something reaching into this world from somewhere else.⁶⁷ Yet the kingdom of God was also and still is truly a regnum dei in terra, a rule of God that operates here on earth.⁶⁸ A wonder on earth, that is the nature of the kingdom. To state it in other words, the kingdom of Jesus is eschatological. Jesus, while he was in himself the breaking in of the new age, also looked for the age when the *Basileia* would be there in perfection. He viewed the kingdom as already at work, but secretly and quietly. A Christian can still pray for its revealing.⁶⁹ The full realization of the kingdom is yet in the future. This future already gives certitude to man in the present. But the final hope of the kingdom remains something to be fulfilled (Matt. 13:39f.; 49f.; 16:28; 25:34; Luke 9:27; 22:29). A Christian can pray for the coming of the

⁶⁶Arndt, op. cit., p. 14.

⁶⁷Schmidt, op. cit., p. 598.

⁶⁸Frederick C. Grant, The Gospel of the Kingdom (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940), p. 13.

⁶⁹Otto, op. cit., pp. 72-3.

kingdom.⁷⁰

The Implications of ἐλθῆτω

The use of ἐπινοια in the Old Testament and in the rabbinic literature is of little significance, for it is used in as great a variety of meanings as we use the English word "come." In fact, about the only place where come is used with the idea of the kingdom is in Daniel 7:22 where we may merely draw the inference that it asks for the coming at a definite time. Very often the word merely means "happen" or "come to pass." The parallels in Greek prayers such as are cited by Lohmeyer⁷¹ also have little weight. They often merely express a hope for a theophany that will guarantee the fulfilling of the prayer of the petitioner.

⁷⁰This entire discussion of the kingdom has taken very little cognizance of Ernst Lohmeyer's discussion. He sees the concept of the βασιλεία as the uniting of three Old Testament concepts: the city of God (or house), the world of God, and the kingdom of God. He views the New Testament concept of βασιλεία as a spiritualizing, de-cultizing process in the treatment of these three ideas. Because the world is in the kingdom it is a temporal and spatial concept. Because the house is in the kingdom it is a fellowship. As a kingdom it is a present, historical function of God, eschatological in nature. The unity of these three accounts for the dual nature of the kingdom as here and not here. Cf. Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 64-8. This view has been relegated to a footnote because it does not seem to do justice to the βασιλεία. It pulls in concepts as basic which at best are subsidiary. The idea that a fellowship is included is not part of the βασιλεία concept, but is rather the result of the βασιλεία on the part of God. This discussion of Lohmeyer's rather belongs to a discussion of ἐκκλησία.

⁷¹Ibid., pp. 60-2.

Of a bit more importance, perhaps, is the Hebrew concept of time as compared with the Greek. The Greek conceived of time as a series of days following end upon end in a steady flow. Time moves of itself. The Hebrew looked at time more as the result of a will that governed the flow of days than as a haphazard bit of chance. Time is existence (cf. the use of *αἰών* for the world) and is a result of God's creative activity. Time in the Hebrew thought was connected with God's creative activity. Time is a continual renewal of God's grace. The thought of a creative act of God may be connected to the verb *ἐρχομαι*. More than this cannot be said about the verb in general.⁷²

The importance of the form *ἐλθαίνω*⁷³ in the second petition is greater. Some pertinent observations can be based upon the use of the word here. Not much can be learned from other New Testament passages that link *βασιλεία* and *ἐρχομαι* (Mk. 9:1; 11:10; Lk. 17:20; 22:18). More weight may be attached to its difference from other verbs which indicate that the kingdom either has come or should come. Two other verbs are important, *ἐπιπέσει* and *ῥαίνεσθαι*.

⁷²Ibid., pp. 62-4. Lohmeyer is a bit more sure about the relevance of the Hebrew concept of time than I can be. He goes to great lengths to draw inferences from it. These seem to belong more to the realm of philosophy than theology.

⁷³It does not matter whether one reads *ἐλθαίνω* with Nestle, or *ἐλθέτω* with H. J. Vogels. The variant is of historical interest only.

The first is found in Matt. 3:2; 4:7; 10:17; and Mk. 10:9-11. The second is found in Matt. 12:28 (cf. Mk. 11:20). The verb $\phi\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ differs from both $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in that it has only a temporal sense, while the last two have both a temporal and a spatial sense. The verb $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ differs from $\phi\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in that it says nothing at all about the subject already being on the way, while the latter imply that it is. The word $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, therefore, speaks of a coming in time and space, but does not imply that such a coming has begun.⁷⁴

The following things can also be deduced from $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ with a certain degree of surety. The use of the word asks for a deed, a visible deed from the hand of God. This assures the meaning of "rule" for $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$.⁷⁵ The use of $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ also assures us that the petition is for something future that is to happen in the world.⁷⁶ Lastly, the combination of the idea that the word $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ points to a definite time at which something is to happen with the use of the aorist assures us that this asks for the eschatological, final coming of the $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$. The joining of the form $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ to the $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ concept assures us that the eschatological interpretation of $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is correct.

⁷⁴Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 60.

⁷⁵A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthaeus (Stuttgart: Calver Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1929), p. 209.

⁷⁶Zahn, op. cit., p. 272.

Interpretation of the Second Petition

The second petition has as many interpretations as there are views of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God has been stressed in many different ways. A positive idea is often best understood in its antitheses. An examination of some interpretations of the kingdom petitions will help us to clarify our thinking.

One stream of interpretation stresses the present aspect of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God is identified and equated with the church. This is the type of interpretation that was popular in the Greek church beginning with Origen. Through the Greek church it was also perpetuated by Zwingli and Calvin. The idea of a present kingdom leads one to interpret the second petition as a missionary prayer. May God extend his church on earth, enlarge his tents, make of us a great body. This interpretation often points to the description of Isaiah 55 and the parable of the mustard seed to show that it is Biblical. The church must grow.⁷⁷ This view is expressed in the comment of John Chrysostom: *πρὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, εἶπεν ἰησοῦς οὐρανόθεν ἐκέλευσε ποιῆσαι.*⁷⁸ Other interpretations of modern time have followed much the same course. This has, probably,

⁷⁷Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 68-9.

⁷⁸Quoted in Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1915), p. 78.

been the most popular type of interpretation. Plummer is a modern example of this type of exegete:

It asks that God's rule may everywhere prevail over all hearts and wills. It sums up the Messianic hopes of the Hebrews and the still more comprehensive hopes of the disciples of Christ, who began His Ministry on earth with the proclamation that this Kingdom was about to begin. He founded it, and it has been developing ever since. This petition asks that its progress may be hastened by increased knowledge of God's commands and increased obedience to them. It asks that the principles of God's government may be victorious over the principles of the world and of the evil one; victorious in the individual heart, and also in the workings of society. It is a missionary prayer; but we unduly limit its meaning if we interpret it merely as a petition for the spread of Christianity.⁷⁹

He goes on to speak of the triumph of the kingdom in the individual heart. This interpretation has been taken and given a twist by the moderns Ritschl and Herrmann. They thought of a kingdom to be established by human progress and effort on earth.⁸⁰ Johnson⁸¹ apparently adopted this view in his recent commentary.

These interpretations all fail for one reason. They do not meet the words of the petition. The words demand a single coming, a complete coming, a quick coming. That

⁷⁹ Alfred Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According To St. Matthew (London: Elliot Stock, 1909), p. 98.

⁸⁰ Flew, op. cit., pp. 27-8.

⁸¹ Sherman E. Johnson, "The Gospel according to St. Matthew, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), VII, 311-2.

is the effect of the aorist verb when joined to the eschatological *Banideia* (vide supra, pp. 33-4.). The petition also does not speak of a goal for men, but is rather a petition for action from God. Finally, the patristic literature of the first four centuries never equated the earthly *Banideia* to the *Banideia* which Jesus preached. Not even St. Ambrose, who had a high regard for the Church, made this equation.⁸² The interpretations fail for lack of both linguistic and historical evidence.

The second major stream of interpretation has been the exact opposite of the first type of interpretation. It lays the emphasis on the final revelation of the Lord on judgment day. Bengel said, "Adventum regni dei ad seculi finem refert."⁸³ This has been the general interpretation of the Latin church down through the ages. Thus Jerome said that it is "grandis audaciae, et purae conscientiae, regnum Dei postulari et iudicium non timere."⁸⁴ This view is based, in part at least, on the old dogmatic distinction between the regnum gratiae and the regnum gloriae. This distinction, it is true, is only an attempt to formulate the tension between the realized and the future aspects of the kingdom. Lutheran dogmatics does not think of two separate

⁸²Flew, op. cit., p. 30.

⁸³J. A. Bengel, Gnomon Novi Testamenti (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1860), p. 33.

⁸⁴Quoted in M'Neile, op. cit., p. 78.

kingdoms, though it does speak in such a manner. Popular understanding of the two kingdoms, however, does. I cannot document such a claim, but must assume it. But a kingdom that involves an eschatological appearance in the person of Jesus Christ cannot be thus divided. This same criticism can be leveled against any interpretation that attempts to combine the two and speak of a primary and a secondary hallowing. It cannot be done. This is what Broadus⁸⁵ and Luther⁸⁶ do. The words of Luther speak of a happening in time and in eternity.⁸⁷

What do we then pray for? Apparently there is nothing left. An interpretation that makes it the church seems out; final judgment is also out. What is left? The petition is one that asks for the completion of the goal of history. It asks that God (and all thought of men's action is left out) fulfill his promises made to us. The kingdom that Jesus spoke of is asked for. Jesus has men pray as though all were yet in the future. Men are to pray as the angels pray. These think of the needed perfection of the world and

⁸⁵John A. Broadus, "Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew," An American Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Alvah Hovey (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886), I, 134.

⁸⁶Concordia Triglotta, edited by F. Bente (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, c.1921), p. 547.

⁸⁷Julius Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950), II, 83, defends the interpretation of Luther as correct.

so pray to God. This prayer arises out of the worry about the eschatological relationship of earth and heaven.⁸⁸ Such a prayer involves all that will attend the glorious *Baoudeia*. It includes judgment and overcoming of the powers of this world. It includes the spirit promised to men by the Lord. It means the action of God himself in history. Since this is true that we ask God to carry out his plans, the petition remains simple. It does not prescribe how God is to do what is asked. He may destroy, recreate, or create to do his purposes. The petitioners who stand in the *Baoudeia* as his Son revealed it to them cry for the completion of his plans. It is only out of this *Baoudeia* that one can pray this petition. The entrance and existence in the *Baoudeia* of Jesus Christ make it all the more clear to men that this petition is the fitting one. Men who are "Sons of the Kingdom" know how futile human efforts are. The severity and starkness of these words conceal the heartfelt longing and the deep need of the one who prays and show the deep faith and trust in the greatness of the grace and mercy of God. He who would object that this interpretation lacks concreteness needs to stand once more under the demands of the kingdom for obedience and penitence. Then a prayer such as this acquires meaning. Lord, come, *μαρτύριον* *ἰδί*, that was the prayer of the early Church, just as stark and bare in its pleading with God. That is the petition of our Lord.

⁸⁸Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 71.

Originality of the Petition

The originality of Jesus' petition depends not upon verbal analogy, but upon thought content. Thus the finding of a rabbinic saying that "A Benediction in which there is no mention of the מְלִכּוּת is no benediction."⁸⁹ does not mean that Jesus is necessarily not original. Nor do the parallels which can be found in the Kaddish and the Shemone Esreh. It is not the fact that a kingdom is prayed for in both prayers, the rabbinic and the Christian, that decides the originality, but the nature of the kingdom prayed for. Jesus' prayer does stand in the Jewish tradition of prayer for the מְלִכּוּת , and Jesus would himself have said that the prayer for the kingdom was a necessary part of the prayer.⁹⁰ We will compare the two ideas here. The discussion will be kept very brief.⁹¹

1) The *Benedictio* is the central thought in the preaching of Jesus. When he uses the absolute *Benedictio*, it always means the *Benedictio dei dei*, e.g., Matt. 8:12; 24:14. In the rabbinic literature the מְלִכּוּת is not so prominent. If one mentions the absolute מְלִכּוּת one would

⁸⁹Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., p. 184.

⁹⁰Scott, op. cit., p. 92.

⁹¹This discussion is to a large extent based on the work of Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., pp. 180-3.

immediately think of some world power.⁹²

2) The decisive difference in the preaching of Jesus and rabbis is that he preached a present kingdom. The rabbis always preached an apocalyptic or national future kingdom. There was no concept in the rabbinic mind of a present, spiritual kingdom.⁹³

3) The message of the *Basarêta* was accompanied by a demand in the message of Jesus, a demand for *metanoia*. The rabbinic *מִשְׁכָּחַת* had no preaching of repentance. They felt that the people, at least the best of them, were already prepared for the kingdom.⁹⁴

4) On the other side of the coin the message of Jesus was a message of gospel, of good news, of freedom. It was a gift of God that he proclaimed. Men only had to repent and believe the Gospel. Rabbinic Judaism was in complete opposition to this view. The *מִשְׁכָּחַת* in rabbinic thought demanded recognition, submission, obedience. Salvation was a fruit of the *מִשְׁכָּחַת*, but not the *מִשְׁכָּחַת* itself. The rabbinic message was legalistic.⁹⁵

5) In the *Basarêta* of Jesus there was a thought of a world mission that needed to be fulfilled, Matt. 28:20.

⁹²Ibid., p. 183.

⁹³Otto, op. cit., pp. 74-5.

⁹⁴Bousset, "Das Reich Gottes in der Predigt Jesu," pp. 445-6.

⁹⁵Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., pp. 180-1.

The beginning of the *Beorndek* was not her end. In the rabbinic thought of Palestine there was no thought of a world mission. Rather the kingdom, the מְלִכְוּת , contained the thought of the destruction of the nations. The past, the present, and the future of all peoples were regarded as fixed. They had an iron-clad predestination for the nations.⁹⁶

6) Jesus' *Beorndek* was not at all political. He proclaimed an inner kingdom. The rabbinic hope was national in character. No rabbi could have said: "My מְלִכְוּת is not of this world." The Shemone Esreh speaks of the nationalistic hope.⁹⁷

7) Jesus saw only suffering in the future of his nation; the Jews saw the מְלִכְוּת as a glorious future.⁹⁸

8) Jesus' proclamation of the *Beorndek* gave no apocalyptic fanciful details for the future. The Jewish apocalyptic writers gave all types of detailed pictures.⁹⁹

9) The *Beorndek* of the New Testament can mean an organization. The מְלִכְוּת of the rabbis never can.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 181-2. Cf. Edersheim, op. cit., I, 85.

⁹⁷Schmidt, op. cit., p. 587.

⁹⁸Bultmann, op. cit., p. 4.

⁹⁹Ibid., pp. 4-5.

¹⁰⁰Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., pp. 182-3.

I can think of no better way to close than with a quotation from F. C. Grant:

From the historical point of view, then, Jesus appears as a Jewish teacher, and his doctrine of the Kingdom of God is nothing new and revolutionary--not even in the sense in which the doctrines of the apocalyptists were new and revolutionary. If anyone thinks the Jewish apocalypses...throw all the light we need upon the teaching of Jesus, let him but read further and discover how far apart are the views of the apocalyptists from his, how vindictive and puerile, how narrow and partisan, how crude and fantastic, how prejudiced and bitter are the minds that have produced these writings, how utterly unlike the mind and the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹Grant, op. cit., pp. 169-70.

CHAPTER V

THE THIRD PETITION

The Will of God

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

The word *θέλημα* is almost unknown outside of Biblical Greek. While the word as such is rare in classical Greek, petitions similar to this can be found in classical literature. These examples from Epictetus, Seneca, Homer, and Socrates contain the idea of a harmonization of the divine and the human wills. They desire that the god's will might become their own.¹

The Septuagint *θέλημα* is the translation of the Hebrew word *רָצוֹן*. In I Maccabees we find a parallel to the third petition: *ὡς δ' ἐν ᾧ θέλημα ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὕτως ποιήσει* (3:60). The Hebrew standing behind the Septuagint usage does not have the character of a resolution formed by logical thought, but rather a passionate desire that forms a will. Outside of this the Old Testament does not play a great role in the formation of the thought.²

In rabbinic thought the will of God was not equated with the Greek thought of harmony in prayer. The Jew thought

¹Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Vater-Unser* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1946), pp. 78-9.

²*Ibid.*, p. 76.

primarily of the will of God as law, as that which he must obey. The will of God was for him the norm and rule of life. It demanded obedience and not harmony. The will of God is not recognized in history, but rather in his Word. Man is not necessarily to will what he does, but he is to do what he ought. It was a legal relationship that was set up with God. An old rabbinic order of the synagogue service shows this: "Lord, we have done what you ordered us; do thou to us what you have promised" (Sota 39a).³ It is an oft recurring formula in rabbinic Judaism to speak of "doing the will of the Father."⁴ The basis for such a legalistic interpretation seems to have been a misunderstanding of the covenant relationship with God. Outside of this there is not much that could be found on the will of God in rabbinic thought. The Law seemed to cover it for the Jewish mind.

In the New Testament, where one would expect to find many references to the will of God, the word does not often occur. It is found once in Mark, once in Luke, six times in Matthew and seven times in John. (It does occur in other contexts where it is used of the will of men.) Thayer divides the use into two meanings: 1) the thing willed;

³Ibid., pp. 79-80.

⁴Gottlob Schrenk, "Θελουσα," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1938), III, 54.

2) the abstract act of willing, the will.⁵ What the will of God means in the New Testament will depend on closer examination of the New Testament passages.

The use of *θέλημα* in the New Testament, especially in the third petition, will not fit either the rabbinic or the Greek conception of God's will. The rabbis thought of the will as irresistible, so there would be no need to pray that it come to pass. If the Greek thought were to be identified with the will of God, there would be no need of the modifying phrase that the Lord added. The New Testament must itself determine what is meant by God's will.

There is one passage that ascribes to the will the work of creation, Revelation 4:11: *σὺ ἐκτίσας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν*. This passage shows that the power of God, yes even the creative power of God, is active in his will. God's will is not only a state of mind, but also an activity. God's will has effective power.

The book of John is especially instructive about the will of God. The entire work of Jesus is grounded in the will of him who sent him. Jesus speaks of this as his food (John 4:34), that he is to do the will of him who sent him. When accused of breaking the Sabbath by healing the man by the sheep gate, he answered that he did nothing on

⁵Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition; New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: American Book Company, c.1889), p. 285.

his own authority: *ὅτι οὐ θετέω τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψοντός με* (John 5:30). The same thought is repeated in John 6:38. Jesus' entire life was bounded and directed by the will of God.

This will of God in Jesus Christ had as its purpose the salvation of men. *τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ ἑορτάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* (John 6:40).

Ephesians 1:5-14 is a complete commentary on this verse written by a man who felt the will of God at work in him.

"Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him" (Eph. 1:9-10). The will of God is always the will of salvation in the New Testament (except in Rev. 4:11).⁶

The will of God is also an eschatological will. The will of God is done when the work desired by God is finished. The *ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα* is equated to *τελεθεῖν τὸ ἔργον* in John 4:34. In the will of God are found the basis, the power, and the goal of Jesus' work.⁷ The eschatological nature of the *θέλημα* is further shown by the linking of the

⁶Schrenk, op. cit., pp. 56-7.

⁷Ibid., p. 55-6.

resurrection to the *ἑλγημα* in John 6:38-9. This same eschatological nature is linked to the will in Matthew. The revelation of the mysteries of the kingdom to the simple (*ἄπλοοι*) and their concealment from the wise (*σοφῶν*) is called the gracious will of God (*οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου*) in Matthew 11:26. God does not desire one little one to perish, and that is called his *ἑλγημα* (Matt. 18:14.) Jesus, the eschatological saviour, comes under the will of God to do the will of God by the power of the will of God. The *ἑλγημα* is eschatological in nature.⁸

When the will of God is understood as the eschatological will, then the passages in Matthew about the doing of the will fall into their proper niche. Jesus seems to speak of the will of God as a demand on men in some passages. It is a condition of entrance into the kingdom: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21). "For whosoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt. 12:50). The will of the Father is that men see and believe (John 6:40). This ethical demand is the same that John the Baptist made when he said, "Bear fruit worthy of repentance" (Matt. 3:8). These are ethical demands, with the indicative of the *Βασιλεία* presupposed. Ernst Lohmeyer⁹

⁸Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 82-3.

⁹Ibid., p. 82.

has pointed out that the Aramaic behind the expression *παιεῖν εἰς θέλημα* is "work out God's good pleasure or desires." This doing is regarded by Scripture as a work of God himself. "May the God of peace equip you with all good that you may do his will, working in you that which is pleasing before him through Jesus Christ" (my translation, Heb. 13:21). "And do not be conformed to this present age, but be remade by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what the will of God is, the good and acceptable and perfect" (Rom. 12:2). Lenski summarizes very well: "His will is not a mere statement of what he wants, but he himself in his action of willing and accomplishing his will."¹⁰

The New Testament conceives of the will of God as a unit. It never speaks of wills (as the Jews did), but only of *εἰς θέλημα*.¹¹ It does not separate a moral, ethical will from the eschatological will. So the will of God is that which perfects us (Col. 4:12). Both aspects of the will are the work of God. Everything can be called God's good-pleasure. The third petition speaks also of the will of God.

¹⁰R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1943), p. 268.

¹¹Schrenk, op. cit., p. 54.

Heaven and Earth

The phrase which modifies the third petition is the first extension of any idea that we have in the Lord's Prayer. It is logical to assume that a prayer consisting of just seven short petitions must lay some weight on the phrase if it attaches it to a petition in so short a prayer. It deserves our close attention.

The first matter is the meaning of the two words heaven and earth (*οὐρανός* and *γῆ*). The two words are used in two different ways in the Bible. They are used in places to express a sharp difference. On earth moth and thief corrupt or cause us to lose our treasure. So we are advised to lay up treasure for ourselves in heaven (Matt. 6:19-21). Heaven is set higher, for it is the throne of God while earth is but his footstool (Matt. 5:34). While this is true, both are alike in other respects. Both shall pass away (Matt. 5:18; 25:34). Both were created by God. They reveal an old oriental expression expressing the totality of the created world, all creation. Such a background seems plausible in the consideration of such passages as Mk. 13:31; Matt. 5:18; Lk. 16:17; Heb. 1:10; Rev. 21:1. Since heaven and earth can be conceived of in two almost opposite ways, the context must determine the meaning.

Ernst Lohmeyer¹² points out that there is a difference

¹²Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 78.

in number between heaven in the introduction (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) and in the third petition (ἐν οὐρανῷ). This may be accounted for by the Septuagint usage. When the Septuagint uses the plural, it emphasizes the fact that heaven is something completely different from earth, is separate, is the special home and seat of God. When the singular is used, it emphasizes the closeness of earth and heaven as parts of God's creation. Then it is used as a unit with earth to mean all creation. This finds support in the work of Josephus,¹³ who never uses οὐρανός in the plural, for he always means heaven as the place of the stars. The same is true of Philo. It seems as though the weight of the evidence is to regard heaven and earth as expressing the whole of creation and not as two opposite entities in the third petition.¹⁴

The use of ὡς and καί in a series does not eliminate the possibility of the above interpretation. These not only have the function of comparing two items, but also of drawing them together. In the opinion of Lohmeyer¹⁵ they may even confirm one item of a series by the other. It is enough

¹³A. Schlatter, Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus (Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1932), p. 8.

¹⁴Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, translated from the revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), pp. 39-41, thinks that the two are sharply opposed to each other. He bases his view on the dualistic thought of Iranian apocalyptic. I cannot take his conclusion, for I do not agree with his premise.

¹⁵Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 77.

to say that they permit the interpretation of heaven and earth given above.

The fine shade of difference in meaning between $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ and $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ in the parallel construction also will have no effect on the interpretation of heaven and earth. The preposition is taken in the sense of "in" (cf. Matt. 18:18) and not in the meaning "on" (cf. Rev. 12:1).

One last question remains to be decided about the modifying phrase. Does "as in heaven so on earth" modify only the third petition, or does it modify all three petitions of the first strophe? Here there is variance of opinion. Lenski very definitely says that it can modify only the third petition, "for in the second we cannot say that the kingdom can 'come in heaven'; it has always been there."¹⁶ This same view is voiced by other commentators, one basing it on a quotation from Chrysostom.¹⁷ Other commentators take the phrase with all three petitions and say it makes excellent sense. The British scholar M'Neile¹⁸ takes it to refer to all three petitions, basing it on rhythm and a reference in Origen. The objection seems to be based on the interpretation of heaven and earth as two antagonistic spheres.

¹⁶Lenski, op. cit., p. 267.

¹⁷J. A. Broadus, "Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew," An American Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Alvah Hovey (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886), p. 141.

¹⁸Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1915), p. 79.

It seems better to take the phrase as modifying each one of the petitions. It expresses the totality of the thought in each petition and so emphasizes the eschatological character of each. This seems to be the particular emphasis and reason for the addition of the phrase. While it does not add to the thought, it underscores the eschatological nature of each petition and assures us that the petition asks for a fulfillment in the created world.

Interpretation of the Third Petition

Historically the interpretation of the third petition falls into three main strata of interpretation. We shall look at each type. The first type can be called an ethical interpretation of the petition. It is the successor to the Hebrew idea of the law. Men are to live in accord with God's commandments. The petition asks for God to prepare men who will live in this manner. Cyprian already seems to have viewed the interpretation this way when he said: "non ut Deus faciat quod vult, sed ut nos facere possimus quod Deus vult."¹⁹ Bengel likewise appears to be following this type of interpretation when he says, "Non rogatur, ut haec in coelo fiant, sed coelum norma est terrae, in qua aliter

¹⁹Cited by M'Neils, op. cit., p. 78.

alia fiunt omnia."²⁰ Some modern interpreters have also gone along with this view. Bruce, for example, says that the petition asks "that the right as against the wrong may everywhere prevail."²¹ This ethical interpretation is the first major type. Men are to live so that God's will is done.

The interpretation of the petition as a moral obligation laid on man is correct in assuming that there are wills in the universe that are opposed to the will of God. But the interpretation is wrong in assuming that the petition asks for a doing of the will of God by men. The petition says nothing of men. It is directed only to God who is asked to do his will finally and completely. This petition does not ask a gift of grace from God, but action, an action that is to be the doing of his will to the uttermost.

The second type of interpretation looks upon the third petition as a petition for the painful endurance of suffering. It is almost a stoic denial of self in the face of fate, which the Christian calls the will of God. Men are to reconcile their wills to the will of God. So Lenski says: "In this petition God's children put their own wills into complete harmony with their Father's will and thus into

²⁰J. A. Bengel, Gnomon Novi Testamenti (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1860), p. 33.

²¹A. B. Bruce, "The Synoptic Gospels," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoli (London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), I, 120.

opposition to the will of all his foes."²² This type of interpretation claims to find an analogy in the prayer of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane: "My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, thy will be done" (Matt. 26: 42). Men who pray the third petition pray that their will might be reconciled to the will of the Father, even as Jesus also prayed before his passion.

This interpretation is also not in harmony with the words of the third petition. The thought of men bringing their wills into harmony with the will of God is a Greek thought and not properly found in the mind of Jesus. Nor is a human agent allowed in the doing of the will, just as no human is in mind in the first two petitions. The reference to the prayer of Jesus demands a bit more attention. If the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane was a prayer for painful endurance, then the interpretation would have some basis, for the words are an exact linguistic parallel to the third petition. The prayer is spoken by Jesus at the beginning of the actual suffering. The prayer is not a prayer that Jesus may subject his will to God. Jesus had lived under the $\delta\epsilon\iota$ of divine necessity. He was conscious of the path ahead and so looks once again at the counsels of God. The key to a right understanding of the prayer of Jesus lies in the statement "Arise, let us go hence" with which he leaves

²²Lenski, op. cit., p. 267.

the garden.²³ This does not indicate the person who is going ahead in spite of what he wills. This person has not been captured, but gives himself over. The trembling that he felt was the trembling of a prophet at his call, of one who stands in the presence of the council of God. This is not painful endurance, but rather it is the prayer of one who feels that things are following a course that he has known all along.²⁴ This prayer is eschatologically conceived and prayed. The manner in which it was used by Polycarp at his arrest seems to indicate that this is the correct interpretation (Mart. Pol. 7:1).²⁵

The third type of interpretation might be called the heaven on earth interpretation. God's will is to be done on earth to such an extent that earth becomes a second heaven. The church is identified with this petition, for then earth would most certainly be a heaven on earth, God's kingdom. This was the view of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Augustine. Men are so to yearn for heaven that

²³Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 84-5.

²⁴Julius Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950) II, 83.

²⁵This interpretation disagrees with the entire tradition of English interpretation of the prayer of Jesus. The English commentators interpret the prayer as one in which Jesus brings his will into subjection to the will of the Father. In interpreting in this way they are all following the lead of H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan and Co., 1913), pp. 344-6.

they will what God wills. This interpretation does not seem to fit because it divides heaven and earth too sharply. The interpretation also is too concrete, more than the words of the petition warrant. Finally, it is conceived of as a gradual petition, one that men can fulfill by their action. This interpretation also seems untenable.²⁶

The interpretation of this petition is something that cannot be definitely stated, just as the interpretation of the first two cannot be all neatly laid out. We are here speaking of something that is future, and that is still connected to the work of Christ in the historical present. We pray as though all lay yet in the future. This is an eschatological petition, as Theodor Zahn²⁷ has said. The petition prays for that which is the innermost will of God, that it happen without means, even the means of the Word. It is a petition that puts men out of the picture, thinking of them only in so far as God must needs think of them to do his will. The petition includes a prayer for the conquering of all of the powers that oppose God. The petition asks that God will be victorious (Rev. 11:5,17; 12:10). It is the final, ultimate, complete, utter doing of the will that is asked for by the petitioner (vide supra, pp. 33-4).

²⁶Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 87-9.

²⁷Theodor Zahn, "Das Evangelium des Matthaeus," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, edited by Theodor Zahn (Fourth edition; Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Dr. Werner Scholl, 1922), I, 273-4.

The petition is eschatological, God-centered, and one of finality.

Such a petition presupposes the work of Jesus. For God's will runs through history in a concealed manner. It became most evident in the life and death of Jesus. Men who have faith in that Jesus know the will of God. They see that God has good-pleasure and does not desire only death. These are the people who can pray, "Thy will be done." One who prays this petition prays as one who has his citizenship in heaven and is yet bound on earth. He prays for the complete doing of God's will.

Because men live in the world and yet are not of the world they have the feeling that they live now under the will of this God, under the soteriological-eschatological will that accompanies them in all their doing and actions.²⁸ Their mind sees the will of God in all that is done, as Paul does in Acts 21:14. Their prayer goes ahead to the final doing of God that is to perfect their knowledge of his will, to complete that which he wills. It is this men pray for. "Thy will be done."

Originality of the Third Petition

The originality of this petition can be treated very quickly. This is one of the few sayings of our Lord to

²⁸Ibid., p. 276.

which no exact parallel is claimed. Even the Jewish scholar Montefiore²⁹ says this. The originality of the statement is not in question.

²⁹C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), II, 101.

The things remain to be discussed: the relationship of the first three petitions and the question of originality in their relation. We will discuss them in that order.

We may begin by stating that the entire first stanza is ecumenically conceived. The petitions are all ecumenical, as Hans Windisch³⁰ has said. They all pray for an edification of the Church in history. Since these petitions are contained in the same stanza, it is necessary to consider their relationship.

First of all we may begin with the relation of the first two petitions. Bengel saw a distinction in the fact, as he said, that the first petition was a continuation of Old Testament thought while the second was proper to the New Testament alone.³¹ This, as we have seen, is not a valid distinction. There have been the second petition as well as the first. This is questionable; for that why did not the second petition stand at the head of the prayer?

³⁰Hans Windisch, The Meaning of the Service on the Mount, translated from the German by E. F. Schlegel (London: Hodder, The Westminster Press, 1951), p. 37.

³¹H. J. Bengel, Inaugural Essay (Berlin: Gust. Reclam, 1850), p. 37.

CHAPTER VI

THE FIRST STROPHE

The Inter-relation of the Petitions

Two things remain to be discussed: the relationship of the first three petitions and the question of originality in their relation. We will discuss them in that order.

We may begin by stating that the entire first strophe is eschatologically conceived. The petitions are all eschatological, as Hans Windisch¹ has said. They all pray for an action of God in history. Since these petitions are conceived in the same manner, it is necessary to consider their relationship.

First of all we may begin with the relation of the first two petitions. Bengel saw a distinction in the fact, as he said, that the first petition was a continuation of Old Testament thought while the second was properly from the New Testament alone.² This, as we have seen, is not a valid distinction. Some have seen the second petition as containing the first. This is questionable; for then why did not the second petition stand at the head of the prayer?

¹Hans Windisch, The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, translated from the German by S. MacLean Gilmour (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1951), p. 39.

²J. A. Bengel, Gnomon Novi Testamenti (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1860), p. 33.

We may rather compare the two by saying that the subject matter of the first has to do with God's name which is the same in all eternity, while the second speaks of God's eschatological kingdom which is an age, which has a beginning. Thus the name of the first petition was in existence before the kingdom of the second and deserves the former place. Further, the first names the Father in his essence, while the second speaks of an activity of the Father. The first prays to God, the second prays to the Lord.³ We may say with Allen⁴ that the first petition leads naturally to the second, that where the name of God is hallowed his rule is also present. The first and second petitions are not mere tautology. This also seems to exclude any view that would regard the second petition as the chief petition in the prayer, as E. F. Scott⁵ does.

The second petition again leads to the third petition. Where the name is hallowed and the kingdom is, there the will of God will be perfectly done. The relation of the

³Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Vater-Unser (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1946), pp. 74-5.

⁴W. C. Allen, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew," The International Critical Commentary, edited by Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, c.1912), p. 58.

⁵E. F. Scott, The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 91-2.

second to the third may be one of foundation.⁶ Yet the third petition is not mere repetition. In the phrase "heaven and earth" it leads to the fourth petition. This is the first reference to anything that is earthly and so it prepares for the mention of daily bread.⁷ The third petition also has another function that separates it from the two before. It is the widest of the three and so grasps the first two and ties them all together in the will of God. What the first two have said is united in the third.⁸ Seen in this way the third petition can be viewed as the climax of the first strophe.⁹ Each petition has its own emphasis and weight. It is this last point, especially when the important function of the third is considered, that leads me to regard the third petition as originally a part of the prayer. Its position in the prayer is so natural and important that it must have been there from the beginning.

If one were then to state the relationship of the three petitions in a short way, the summary of Ernst Lohmeyer seems as good as any, if not better.

⁶Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, translated from the revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), pp. 38-9.

⁷Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 91.

⁸Ibid., p. 90.

⁹Allen, op. cit., p. 58.

Die erste beginnt bei Gottes innerstem Wesen, die zweite geht ueber zu dem aeuszeren Reich oder auch dem aeuszeren Tun Gottes, die dritte endet bei der bestehenden Welt, Himmel und Erde, so dasz diese Bitten wie konzentrische Kreise sich um den einen Mittelpunkt legen, um die Anrede: "Vater unser in den Himmeln." In immer weiteren Raeumen und mit immer staerkerer Macht strahlt das Geschehen der eschatologischen Vollendung aus, welches alle Bitten erlehen; die dritte Bitte gibt die letzte und aeuszerste Grenzen.¹⁰

The attempts to find the difference in the petitions by ascribing one to each of the Trinity, or by saying that the first begins the work, the second gives the means, and the third gives the goal do not meet the true meaning of the words.

Having thus shown that there is a difference in each petition, we might now say that they yet are all very similar. Viewing each as having its particular emphasis, we can then say that they all start from the same source and end at the same goal. Each petition is rooted in the proclamation of Jesus and asks for one mighty act of God. They can thus be viewed as three parallel lines, or perhaps more exactly, as three lines lying one on top of the other. They are similar and yet dissimilar.

Originality of the First Strophe

The question of originality is one that must first be defined. Originality is not complete newness of thought or word. If this were the case, little would be original.

¹⁰Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 90.

Originality is the right combination of the material selected from the past and filled with the correct content by the writer or speaker. One may say not a single new word or sentence and yet be original. It is this type of originality we mean when we discuss the originality of the first strophe of the Lord's Prayer.

The Old Testament was a natural and legitimate source of thought for Jesus. He knew it from his youth. He regarded it as a revelation from God. It is therefore natural and normal that he would express himself in the thought of the Old Testament when praying. Men do the same in the collects that we pray today. We do not accuse the writers of these prayers of lack of originality. Similarly, Jesus could use the Old Testament and remain original.

Jesus did use rabbinic expressions such as the name of God and the kingdom of God. This was natural since they were rooted in the Old Testament. Jesus would naturally also speak the religious terminology of his day in order to be intelligible to his hearers. His use of rabbinic language patterns is understandable.

It has been pointed out by Gerhard Kittel¹¹ that the rabbinic parallels quoted often reveal the best that is in rabbinic thought. These high points are given as parallels to that which was customary and normal in the teaching of

¹¹Gerhard Kittel, Jesus und die Rabbinen (Berlin-Lichterfelde: Edwin Runge, 1914), p. 10.

Jesus. The originality of Jesus consisted also in the selection of material that he presented. When so much in his day was nationalistic, legalistic, self-seeking, and of low religious content, Jesus consistently and without fail preached that which was noble and good. He used the old words to make men ponder their meaning and so to make his prayer what a prayer ought to be. This is the very height of prayer.¹²

Some say the order of the first three petitions has been borrowed from a similar connection in rabbinic prayer. The openings of the Kaddish and Shemone Esreh are cited. One reason for this may be that the three thoughts belong together so naturally. It is not the result of borrowing, but the result of the subject matter that makes Jesus link the three concepts together. As has been shown, his petitions are also true petitions and not the result of a desire to ascribe praises to God. The Lord's Prayer is also original in this respect.

Finally, the fact that there is no parallel to the third petition and the additional fact that the prayer of Jesus is a natural result of his teaching must prove conclusive for the originality of the prayer. Rabbinic expressions there are, but these are filled with a new content that is original. The Lord's Prayer is a Christian prayer filled with the highest of thoughts.

¹²Scott, op. cit., p. 38.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

We may in summary say that the first three petitions are all eschatological in nature. They express the prayer of the petitioner for an act of God that is to be the final, ultimate, complete revelation of his name, his kingdom, and his will. The three petitions are ultimately alike, yet each has its own emphasis. They are not redundant.

Having accepted this as our primary understanding of the first strophe, we may now reexamine the interpretations that have been rejected in the body of the thesis. The Church today is living in the final age (Acts 2:16f.; I Cor. 10:11; Heb. 9:26). Christ has come, has drunk the cup, has ushered in the age of fulfillment. We are today living in the eschatological age. The interpretations of Luther and others can receive a correct interpretation in the light of the eschatological nature of the Church. The first meaning of the petitions, however, must remain that outlined in this paper. It remains for someone else to reexamine the other interpretations and our teaching practices. It was not in the nature of this paper to do so.

The question of originality can be summarized in one sentence. The Lord's Prayer is an original creation, though it does reflect the thought patterns and linguistic patterns of the Judaism of our Lord's day. It is essentially a Christian prayer.

APPENDIX

THE SHEMONE ESREH¹

1. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favours and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham.

2. Thou art mighty for ever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustaineest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness unto those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto thee, Lord, the Almighty One; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead.

3. Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and the saints daily praise Thee. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord; the God most holy.

4. Thou graciously impartest to man knowledge, and teachest to mortals reason. Let us be favoured from Thee with knowledge, understanding and wisdom. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who graciously impartest knowledge.

5. Cause us to turn, O our Father, to Thy law, and draw us near, O our King, to Thy service, and restore us in perfect repentance to Thy presence. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance.

6. Forgive, us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed; ready to

¹The text is taken from Emil Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated from the German by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1890), II, II, 85-7.

pardon and forgive Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, most gracious, who dost abundantly pardon.

7. Look, we beseech Thee, upon our afflictions, and plead our cause and redeem us speedily for the sake of Thy name, for a mighty Redeemer Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel.

8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for our praise art Thou; and bring forth a perfect remedy unto all our infirmities; for a God and King, a faithful healer, and most merciful art Thou. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who healest the diseases of Thy people Israel.

9. Bless unto us, O Lord our God, this year and grant us an abundant harvest, and bring a blessing on our land, and satisfy us with Thy goodness; and bless our year as the good years. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who blessest the years.

10. Sound with the great trumpet to announce our freedom; and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel.

11. O restore our judges as formerly, and our counselors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest Righteousness and justice.

12. To slanderers let there be no hope, and let all workers of wickedness perish as in a moment; and let all of them be speedily cut off; and humble them speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who destroyest enemies and humblest tyrants.

13. Upon the just and upon the pious and upon the elders of Thy people the house of Israel, and upon the remnant of their scribes, and upon righteous strangers, and upon us, bestow, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, O Lord our God, and grant a good reward unto all who confide in Thy name faithfully; and appoint our portion with them forever, and may we never be put to shame, for our trust is in Thee. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the support and confidence of the righteous.

14. And to Jerusalem Thy city return with compassion, and dwell therein as Thou hast promised; and rebuild

her speedily in our days, a structure everlasting; and the throne of David speedily establish therein. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the builder of Jerusalem.

15. The offspring of David Thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation; for Thy salvation do we hope daily. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causeth the horn of salvation to flourish.

16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God, pity and have mercy upon us, and accept with compassion and favour these our prayers, for Thou art a God who heareth prayers and supplications; and from Thy presence, O our King, send us not empty away, for Thou hearest the prayers of Thy people Israel in mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer.

17. Be pleased, O Lord, our God, with Thy people Israel, and with their prayers; and restore the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of Thy house; and the offerings of Israel, and their prayers in love do Thou accept with favour; and may the worship of Israel Thy people be ever pleasing. O that our eyes may behold Thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest Thy glory unto 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, Thou art for ever and ever. We will render thanks unto Thee, and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are delivered into Thy hand, and for our souls which are deposited with Thee, and for Thy miracles which daily are with us; and for Thy wonders and Thy goodness, which are at all times, evening and morning and at noon. Thou art good for Thy mercies fail not, and compassionate for Thy loving-kindness never ceaseth; our hopes are in Thee for ever. And for all this praised and extolled be Thy name, our King, for ever and ever. And all that live shall give thanks unto Thee for ever, Selah, and shall praise Thy name in truth; the God of our salvation and our aid for ever. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for all-bountiful is Thy name, and unto Thee it becometh us to give thanks.

19. Great salvation bring over Israel Thy people for ever, for Thou art King, Lord of all salvation. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Willoughby C. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew." The International Critical Commentary. Edited by Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer. Third edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, c.1912.
- Arndt, W. "The New Testament Teaching on the Kingdom of God," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXI (January, 1950), pp. 8-29.
- Bengel, J. A. Gnomon Novi Testamenti: in quo ex Nativis Verborum VI Simplicitas, Produntitas, Concinnitas, Salubritas Sensuum Coelestium Indicatur. Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, c.1860.
- Bible, Holy. Authorized Version.
- Bietenhard. "ὄνομα," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. V. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1950. Pp. 242-81.
- Blass, Friedrich. Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Eighth edition, revised by Albert Debrunner. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. The Cost of Discipleship. Translated from the German by R. H. Fuller. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.
- Bornhaeuser, Karl. Die Bergpredigt. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1923.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. "Das Reich Gottes in der Predigt Jesu," Theologische Rundschau, V (1902), pp. 397-407; 437-49.
- . Die Religion des Judentums in Spaethellenistischem Zeitalter. Edited by Hugo Gressmann. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926.
- Bretschler, Paul M. "Luke 17:21," Concordia Theological Monthly, XV (November, 1944), pp. 730-5.
- . "Luke 17:20-1 in Recent Investigations," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII (December, 1951), pp. 895-908.

- Broadus, John A. "Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew." An American Commentary on the New Testament. I. Edited by Alvah Hovey. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain. "The Synoptic Gospels." The Expositor's Greek Testament. I. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.
- . The Training of the Twelve. Cincinnati, Ohio: Jennings and Graham, n.d.
- Buechsel, Friedrich. Jesus: Verkuendigung und Geschichte. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1947.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. I. Translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Concordia Triglotta. Edited by F. Bente. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated from the German by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, c.1949.
- Dalman, G. Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Translated from the German by Paul G. Levertoff. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929.
- . The Words of Jesus. Translated from the German by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.
- Deissmann, G. Adolf. Bible-Studies. Translated from the German by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- Dibelius, Martin. Jesus. Translated from the German by Charles B. Hedrick and Frederick C. Grant. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949.
- . The Sermon on the Mount. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.
- Dodd, C. H. The Parables of the Kingdom. Revised edition. London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1950.
- Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1942.

- Flew, R. Newton. Jesus and His Church. New York: The Abingdon Press, c.1938.
- Friedlander, Gerald. The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount. London: George Routledge and Sons, Limited, 1911.
- Grant, Frederick C. The Gospel of the Kingdom. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940.
- Hedegard, David. Seder R. Amram Gaon. Lund: A.-B. PH. Lindstedts Universitets-Bokhandel, 1951.
- Holtzmann, H. J. "Die Synoptiker." Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. I. Edited by H. J. Holtzmann, R. A. Lipsius, P. W. Schmiedel, and H. von Soden. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901.
- Huck, Albert. A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. Ninth revised edition. Edited by Hans Lietzmann and Frank Leslie Cross. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936.
- Hunter, Archibald M. The Work and Words of Jesus. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Jewish Encyclopaedia. Edited by Isadore Singer. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1907.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "The Gospel According to St. Matthew, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible. VII. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Jesus und die Rabbinen. Berlin-Lichterfelde: Edwin Runge, 1914.
- Kittel, Rudolf. Die Religion des Volkes Israel. Leipzig: Verlag Quelle und Meyer, 1921.
- Klein, G. "Die Ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, VII (1906), pp. 34-50.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg and Otto Procksch. "Ἰησους," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. I. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933, pp. 87-116.
- Lake, Kirsopp, editor and translator. The Apostolic Fathers. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1912.

- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1943.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Vater-Unser. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, c.1946.
- Major, H. D. A., T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright. The Mission and Message of Jesus. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1938.
- M'Neile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1915.
- Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. II. London: Macmillan and Co., 1927.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, c.1946.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. I. Third edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908.
- 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, Limited, c.1949.
- Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Third edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, c.1926.
- Nestle, Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. Eighteenth revised edition by Erwin Nestle. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949.
- Otto, Rudolph. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Translated from the revised German edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1943.
- Plummer, Alfred. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Elliot Stock, 1909.
- Preuschen, Erwin. Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen Urchristlichen Literatur. Second edition, revised by Walter Bauer. Giessen, Germany: Alfred Toepelmann, 1928.

- Rad, Gerhard von, and Karl Ludwig Schmidt. "*Βασιλειά*," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. I. Edited by Gerhardt Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933. Pp. 563-92.
- Radermacher, Ludwig. Neutestamentliche Grammatik. Second revised edition. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1925.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, editor. Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes. Third edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, c.1935.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "Das Evangelium nach Lukas." Das Neue Testament Deutsch. III. Edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Fourth edition. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, n.d.
- Robinson, Benjamin Willard. The Sayings of Jesus. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- Robinson, T. H. "The Gospel of Matthew." The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Schechter, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Schlatter, A. Der Evangelist Matthaeus. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1929.
- . Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1932.
- Schniewind, Julius. "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus." Das Neue Testament Deutsch. II. Edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. "*δέντρον*," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. III. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1938. Pp. 52-62.

- Schuerer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ. Translated from the German by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. II, II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1886.
- Scott E. F. The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose, and Interpretation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Smith, David. The Days of His Flesh. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.
- Souter, Alexander. A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1916.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus Erlaeutert aus Talmud und Midrasch." Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. I. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1922.
- Swete, H. B. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913.
- Thayer, J. H. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Corrected edition. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: American Book Company, c.1889.
- Tholuck, A. Exposition, Doctrinal and Philological, of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, according to the Gospel of Matthew. II. Translated from the German by Robert Menzies. Second edition. Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1843.
- Vogels, H. J. Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine. Third edition. Freiburg, Germany: Herder and Co., c.1949.
- Windisch, Hans. The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount. Translated from the German by S. Maclean Gilmour. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1951.
- Zahn, Theodor. "Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus." Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. I. Fourth edition. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Dr. Werner Scholl, 1922.