

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

Old Testament saint, not Christ, who declares that it is his delight to do God's will ; hence ' I am come ' in *v.* 7 cannot refer to the Incarnation : if further proof were needed, it would be found in *v.* 12, where the Psalmist speaks of his ' iniquities,' which, except by most strained and unnatural exegesis, can be understood only of the iniquities which he has himself committed. It is, of course, perfectly true that parts of the Psalm are appropriate to Christ, and might well have been taken up by Him upon His lips ; but to argue from this fact that the Psalm was written with reference to Him, or that the entire Psalm is applicable to Him, is to confuse two things that are entirely distinct. A possible *application* of a Psalm is no guide to its *interpretation*, and cannot determine its original intention. Rather, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews puts *vv.* 6-8a into Christ's mouth, not because the Psalm as a whole refers to Him, but because, as expressing a high ideal of obedience and spiritual service, these verses are, in the words of the present Dean of Ely, a ' fitting expression of the purpose of His life,' and of His perfect conformity to His Father's will. And so the Psalm is suitably appointed in the Anglican Church as one of the proper Psalms for Good Friday.

S. R. DRIVER.

STUDIES IN THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

IV. THE LORD'S PRAYER.

IN Luke xi. 2-4 the Lord's Prayer is communicated in a reply to a request from a disciple for instruction in this matter. The request is one of the few ascribed to the disciples which do not betray spiritual obtuseness ; and it was defensible on two grounds. On the one hand, as we learn from Seneca, Persius, and Juvenal, the subject of prayer occupied many men's minds in the first century,

the danger dreaded being not that prayer might not be answered, but that it might be answered to the ruin of the petitioner. On the other hand the community was now distinct from the community of John, and a different liturgical formula was desirable. John had remained at the very end of the old dispensation, but had not entered into the new, whence the least adherent of the latter was superior to him.

In Matthew vi. 7 the Prayer is attached to a maxim, *When ye pray, talk not much*, which is not indeed a text of the Old Testament, but a paraphrase of Ecclesiastes v. 1, "Let not thy heart hurry to utter a word before God, for God is in heaven, and thou on earth, therefore let thy words be few." The actual form of the text appears to be found in Ecclesiasticus vii. 14, "Be not tautologous in an assembly of elders, neither repeat a word in thy prayer." The character of the assembly is not specified; it is probably a religious assembly, and the "tautology" ¹ condemned was in preaching or expounding the Old Testament.

The ultimate source of both the text in Ecclesiasticus and that in Ecclesiastes is the narrative in 1 Kings xviii. 26, where the priests of Baal repeat the same formula endlessly; and this is probably the reference of the comment attached to the text in Matthew "as the heathen do." The apparent employment of Ecclesiasticus as *Scripture* can of course be paralleled from the Jewish Oral Tradition, where, however, we should ordinarily infer that the word *Scripture* was not identical with Holy Scripture. The attachment of the Prayer to a comment on a text, and indeed the paraphrase of a Biblical text, is similar to the process which was traced in connexion with certain other

¹ The word used in the text is so defined by Aristotle, *Topics*, 165, b, 16.

genuine precepts and sayings. And if the setting of Luke be compared with that of Matthew, the former appears to be historical, the latter based on theory.

We should expect the Prayer itself to be handed down without variation, and without obscurity; but such an expectation would be disappointed. The Matthaean tradition differs considerably from the Lucan tradition, and the Syriac versions of the Lucan tradition vary to a serious extent; in Matthew the text of LS fails save for the commencement of the Prayer. The relation between LS, CS, and PS in Luke is obvious; the brief text of LS is expanded in CS and completed by PS. LS runs: *Abba, may there be hallowed thy name, and come thy kingdom; and give us the faithful bread of every day; and forgive us our sins, and we too forgive every one who owes us; and bring us not to temptation.*

CS expands: *Our Father which art in heaven; adds at the end but deliver us from the evil; and interprets "and we too forgive" as and we too shall forgive; the Syriac idiom of LS being ambiguous.*

PS adds the petition, *may thy will be as in heaven so in earth; interprets "faithful bread" as the bread of our necessity, and substitutes every day for "of every day"; and alters "and we too shall forgive" into as we too have forgiven.*

In the Matthaean recension the differences between CS and PS are slight; CS offers "thy wills" for "thy will"; "the faithful bread of the day" for "the bread of our necessity to-day"; and "as we too shall forgive" for "as we too have forgiven." The relation between CS and PS in both recensions is therefore similar; alteration has gone on in the same direction, though the amount is not identical in the two cases.

The originality of the commencement in LS appears to

be attested by the reference in St. Paul's Epistles to the cry *Abba* "*Father*"; and the absence of both the clauses containing the word "heaven" is very noticeable. The representation by CS of one without the other is characteristic of the tentative and mediating character of that copy. It is worth noticing that the text of Ecclesiastes, with which Matthew brings the prayer into some sort of connexion, gives as the reason why prayer should be short that "God is in heaven and thou on earth."

The light which the older Syriac copies throw on the word rendered "daily"¹ in the ordinary English version of the Prayer is very welcome. The difficulty of the Greek equivalent is well known; its natural rendering is "of to-morrow"; and some early authorities took that view of its meaning. Merx appears to agree with them, and to suggest that the prayer is for a modest competence; a theory which need not be further considered. He seems right in holding that the words *this day* in the Matthaean recension strongly favour the rendering "of to-morrow"; for otherwise the words are unnecessary. Apparently, however, there were two interpretations current of the words *the faithful bread*. They can mean "the true" or "genuine bread"; and we know that on two occasions the disciples were rebuked for thinking that when the Master spoke of *food*, He meant earthly, perishable food; for which He forbade them to labour or take thought, because there was no question that it would be provided. But they might also mean "the constant" or "regular bread"; on the analogy of Isaiah xxxiii. 16, "His bread shall be given and his water shall be *faithful*." And since it seems unthinkable that in a prayer containing so few petitions the first should be for that material bread for which they were told not to care, there can be little doubt that the

¹ ἐπιούσιος.

former view is correct. "Give us the true bread" is a petition in accordance with the spirit which pervades the four Gospels.

Although the LS recension has cut away much, we are therefore inclined to reduce it by yet one more phrase: "of every day," which appears to be an interpretation of "faithful," and an interpretation in the sense which is to be rejected. For that explanation authority could easily be cited from the Old Testament. The word *tâmîd*, applied to *daily* sacrifices, is rendered in the Peshitta of the Old Testament by the word here translated "faithful." But such a collocation as "faithful, i.e. daily," is clearly a text with a comment, not an original text. Merely for the critical process involved we might compare the Moslem formula "In the name of God, the *rahmān*, the Merciful"; where "merciful" is a translation of *rahmān*, which is not an Arabic word. The word "merciful" is attached in order to prevent a misunderstanding; and we know from certain traditions that the misunderstanding was likely to have serious consequences. The insertion of the explanation "of every day" in the earliest form of the tradition of the Prayer shows a definite desire to exclude another interpretation; for the word is also used in the sense of "genuine" in the Peshitta of the Old Testament.

Once then that we get the series of changes into proper focus by the aid of LS their evolution can be traced. The very rule to which the Prayer is attached, *not to repeat a word in thy prayer*, renders a repetition of this sort a difficulty. Meanwhile the presence of the interpretation "of every day" prevents a recurrence to the meaning "genuine," "true."

The easiest solution is that which CS offers, where "of every day" is altered to "of the day," which may be understood, as the Arabs say, "generically" (=of every

day), or "familiarily" (=of to-day). In the Greek of Matthew this interpretation ("of to-day") is finally adopted. The Greek of Luke is difficult; like the CS of Matthew it suggests both.

But for the word "faithful" the common tradition of the Greek Gospels has a difficult word, evidently selected with great care, meaning "of the morrow." The "morrow," literally "the oncoming," might be the oncoming of night or day, according to Eastern and Western systems. It seems possible that this word was suggested by the use of the Syriac "faithful" in the Old Testament for the Hebrew *tâmîd*, meaning "every morning and evening." With either "of every day" or of "to-day" this phrase would not constitute a tautology. The "constant sacrifice" was (as Josephus says) "at the beginning of the day and at the ceasing of the day."¹ Each of these could be (and indeed in Greek authors is) correctly described as "the oncoming."

With regard to the employment of the Peshitta Old Testament by New Testament writers, a convincing example has been given by Professor Nestle, who observes that the quotation "he shall not *strive* nor cry" in Matthew xii. 19 is to be explained from the Peshitta rendering of Isaiah xlii. 2. The same fact will explain part of the narrative of the Temptation. The quotation in iv. 6, as it figures in LS and CS, "in their *arms* shall they carry thee," which is the text of the Peshitta version of Psalm xci. 11, explains how this verse could be applied to Satan's purpose; for *carrying in the arms* is what is there required, rather than lifting up with the hand, to prevent stumbling against a stone. Further, the Syriac of Psalm xci. 11 omits "against a stone"; whence the idea suggested by the verse "they shall carry thee in their arms, lest thou stumble with thy

¹ *Antiquities*, III. x. § 1.

foot," expresses the idea required by the Tempter, who further omits the words "in all thy ways," which would imply not carrying through the air by angels, but being helped over obstacles by the aid of their hands. Here without the old Syriac texts the mode in which the Tempter distorts the verse to his purpose could not be traced.

The later Syriac versions rely on the Greek, and interpret the difficult word by etymology. The view represented by PS and HS is that it means "what is for existence," i.e. "needful." That of JS is rather "what is over existence," i.e. the food of our superabundance or wealth.

The renderings of LS and CS exhibit very different views of the import of the clause attached to the prayer for forgiveness. In LS it is a promise to forgive all debtors on condition of being forgiven sins (or trespasses); and CS makes this still clearer by substituting the future for the participle, which has the same meaning, though not so decidedly. In PS (Luke) forgiveness is asked on the ground that the petitioner has himself done what is analogous; what in the earlier recensions is an undertaking has become a plea. In the Matthaean recension all substitute a request for forgiveness of debts for the request for forgiveness of sins; the analogy has become an identity. But PS exhibits another difference; there is here neither an undertaking nor a plea, but a restriction: "forgive us our debts to the same extent as we forgive debts to us."

Here again the great variety in the interpretation of the clause suggests at least that it was parenthetical—i.e. interpretation of the prayer or justification of it—rather than part of the prayer itself. The maxim that prayer should be preceded by forgiveness of offences is found in Ecclesiasticus, and is there based on Leviticus xix. 18. But it is not difficult to see that the introduction of the doctrine into the prayer produced problems. The

undertaking in the earliest form seemed to be at variance with the maxim that the performance should precede the request; the plea in the second stage sounded like a man justifying himself before God, claiming where he should be supplicating. The final form gets rid of these objections, yet implies a certain independence in the petitioner. It may be doubted, therefore, whether even the final revision is absolutely satisfactory.

With regard to the omission of the prayer "thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," this was probably rejected by Luke on the ground of exhaustive investigations, such as were illustrated previously. Its difficulties are of course very great. "Thy will be done" is an expression of acquiescence, not a petition; but with the addition "on earth as it is in heaven," it becomes a wish; further, it implies that God's will is not, or at least may not be, done on earth, a proposition from which the human mind ordinarily recoils. It also implies knowledge of what goes on in heaven, which the Author of the prayer may well have possessed, but which the ordinary worshipper would not claim. Hence if this were part of the original prayer, it might be best to interpret it "whose will is done in heaven and earth alike," supposing that the original Aramaic form was a clause admitting either interpretation, the tone of the voice alone distinguishing which was meant. The mention of heaven seems, however, to be connected with the epithet "which art in heaven," which in Ecclesiastes is the ground for using no superfluous words, but which from the original form preserved by LS and attested by St. Paul is shown not to have formed part of the original. With that epithet the introduction of the clause "whose will is done in earth and heaven alike" becomes a ground for the offering of the petition. Without it the reason for its introduction is lost.

The reasons for the omission of the last clause in the Third Gospel, "but deliver us from the evil," are likely to have been critical—i.e. that the best authorities consulted were against its genuineness. The desire to complete the number seven may well have been a reason for its insertion; but the author of the Third Gospel was probably right in attaching no importance to the number in this context.

The two remaining clauses, "may thy name be hallowed" and "thy kingdom come," are attested by all the texts: only LS and CS in Luke insert the conjunction "and" between them. They then connect the prayer for bread with "and," which PS omits. Even this slight difference has doubtless some import: the question being whether all the petitions were co-ordinate, or whether the introductory clauses were expressions of reverence rather than petitions. The former view seems to be that of the earliest authorities, the latter that of the later. Probably in the original dialect only the tone of voice could distinguish between the senses "whose name is hallowed, whose kingdom comes," and the petitional form.

It is characteristic of Oral Tradition that it retains strange words with great tenacity, while varying their environment. It is clear that the word "of the morrow" in the Greek texts must have been found among all or most of the communities whom Luke consulted, though otherwise there was great variety. It appears that the interpretation "of every day" had become attached to the text before the Aramaic was translated into Greek, yet rather as a perpetual comment than as actually part of the prayer, whence its form was not at first stereotyped. The character of the difficult word used for "faithful," if rightly interpreted above, implies that the comment already existed side by side with "faithful"; else some Greek word signifying

“constant” might well have been employed. Yet the nature of that word, which Origen thought was invented by the Evangelists, has the appearance of *official* translation. For the ordinary translator does not invent words.

It would seem that the original words employed are to be found in LS and CS or are not to be obtained at all. A scholar of merit suggested in this magazine many years ago that the variation between *sins* and *debts* in the petition for forgiveness implied that the Aramaic original was the word which signifies both. It seems at least as probable that the occurrence of the word *debts* in the Matthaean recension is accommodation of the petition to the clause attached to the petition, wherein a human debt is made analogous to a sin against God ; and that the true inference is that the Matthaean recension exhibits further alteration than the Lucan recension, the original word being the equivalent for “sins.” Meanwhile the critic of to-day, who can compare texts in his study, has clearly an easier task than that of the ancient Evangelist, for whom each of the questions noticed in these verses may have meant a difficult and dangerous journey.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

SIN AS A PROBLEM OF TO-DAY.

IV. SIN IN ITS PRINCIPLE AND DEVELOPMENT.

SIN is now to be more exactly considered in its own nature—not simply in its formal character as transgression of moral law, nor in its enormity as contradiction of the divine Holiness, not even in its obliquity as departure or turning aside from the true moral end, but in its own inmost *principle* and *genesis*, in that deepest spring within the soul from which all its baleful manifestations proceed. Is there such a “principle” of sin ? If there is, it must be of the