

## **THE TEMPTATION-CLAUSE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER**

**THE TEMPTATION-CLAUSE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER**

**By**

**MARGARET DEMERS, B.A. (Hons.)**

**A Thesis**

**Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies**

**in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements**

**For the Degree**

**Master of Arts**

**McMaster University**

**February 1993**

**(c) Copyright by Margaret Demers, February 1993**



MASTER OF ARTS (1993)  
(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: THE TEMPTATION-CLAUSE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. E. Schuller  
Dr. B. Meyer

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix + 75

## ABSTRACT

The thesis begins with an exegetical review of the Our Father as word of the historical Jesus. It progresses through exegetical reviews of the same prayer in the Matthean and Lucan traditions respectively. In all three analyses, the focus is on the sixth petition: "Lead us not into temptation."

By focusing on the sixth petition, the study brings maximum attention, first, to the difficulties raised by this text from early in the life of Christianity to the present time. Some of the incentive of the study derives from C. F. D. Moule's treatment of "An Unsolved Problem in the Temptation - Clause in the Lord's Prayer," Reformed Theological Review 33 (1974): 65-75. The study offers an answer to this "unsolved problem." Second, it attempts to answer the question of what is meant by the sixth petition not only at three phases in the tradition (Jesus, Matthew, Luke), but by reflection on the petition in all its parts, e.g., examining each of the words "and lead us not into temptation" and how each functions in the whole petition. (Hence, treatment of the verb εἰσενέγκῃς, the preposition εἰς, and the noun πειρασμὸν, their relationship to each other, and their collaboration to form one idea will be necessary.) In part two the object of reflection will be God's role in temptation as perceived in the Bible, and the

point of praying "lead us not into temptation." The study does not neglect treatment of temptation in the Old Testament, nor does it fail to deal with the reasons accounting for why this theme has the distinct contour that it assumes in the New Testament.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe many thanks to my Supervisor Dr. E. Schuller, and to the members of the supervisory committee Dr. Ben F. Meyer and Dr. S. Westerholm, and to the other professors from whose courses I have gained valuable insights.

	MATTHEW 6:9-13	LUKE 11:2-4	DIDACHE 8:2
Title	πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς	πατερ	πατερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ
Petition 1	ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου	ἁγιασθητω το ονομα σου	ἁγιασθητω το ονομα σου
Petition 2	ἐλθάτω ἡ βασιλεία σου	ελθατω η βασιλεια σου	ἐλθέτω η βασιλεια σου
Petition 3	γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς		γενηθητω το θελημα σου ως εν ουρανῳ και επι γης
Petition 4	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δος ἡμῖν σήμερον	τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον διδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν	τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον δος ημιν σημερον
Petition 5	καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν	και αφες ημιν τας αμαρτίας ημων και γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν παντὶ ὀφειλοντι ἡμῖν	και αφες ημιν την οφειλην ημων ως και ημεις αφιεμεν τοις οφειλεταις ημων
Petition 6	καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ	και μη εισενεγκῃς ημας εις πειρασμον	και μη εισενεγκῃς ημας εις πειρασμον αλλα ρυσαι ημας απο του πονηρου
Doxology			ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

NOTE: In the versions of Luke and the Didache, the accents are supplied only where the words differ from the version of Matthew, omitted where they agree with Matthew.

Text taken from Raymond E. Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," in New Testament Essays.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
Abstract . . . . .	iv
Acknowledgements . . . . .	vi
The Greek Text of the Lord's Prayer . . . . .	vii
Foreword . . . . .	ix
Introduction . . . . .	1
PART ONE: JESUS, MATTHEW, LUKE . . . . .	5
The Prayer as Word of the Historical Jesus . . . . .	5
Introduction to the Matthean and Lucan Our Father . . . . .	18
Matthew and Luke on the Sixth Petition . . . . .	27
Light from Lexical Definitions . . . . .	30
Exegetical Considerations . . . . .	33
Concluding Reflections on Scholarly Opinion . . . . .	44
PART TWO: THE MEANINGS OF TEMPTATION . . . . .	49
Biblical Horizons Supposed by "Testing" . . . . .	51
The Point of Praying "Lead Us Not Into Temptation" . . . . .	60
CONCLUSION . . . . .	67
WORKS CITED . . . . .	72

## Foreword

Biblical texts cited are the New Jerusalem Bible (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1985), the New Revised Standard Version (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989), the New International Version (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers, Inc., 1984), the Revised Standard Version (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1971), New Catholic Confraternity-Douay Version (New York: Catholic Book Publishing House, 1953), The Greek New Testament with Dictionary (Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1983), the New Testament, Greek and English (New York: American Bible Society, 1984), and Septuaginta Edited by Alfred Rahlfs (Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1979). (In keeping with the Greek term peirasmos found in the Lord's Prayer, the latter has been used when the question of how God's role in temptation in the Bible is examined). Following the standard of the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1988), the quoted sources are referred to parenthetically throughout the thesis, and listed fully under Works Cited after the conclusion.

## Introduction

In his Foreword to a recent volume by Nicholas Ayo, The Lord's Prayer, Lawrence Cunningham remarks that "the significance of a classic is never fully realized," and that "the classic always bears 'a surplus of meaning'" (ix). The present study is devoted to the investigation of a classic par excellence: the Our Father. We expect to meet here a surplus of meaning dramatically demonstrated by this classic prayer-text and its journey through many transformations. As Ayo observes, "It is not a text without many ambiguities, nor a text which lacks profundity. Hence, there remains room for disagreement, and room for various interpretations of each line and indeed, of almost every word" (2).

My examination of a particular line, "and lead us not into temptation," and of the specific words within that line will, I hope, supply answers to the first questions in this study: What did Jesus mean by the term "temptation" in the temptation clause of the Lord's Prayer? What meaning did the Matthean Christ attach to the term? What meaning does it have in the Lucan version of the prayer?

In an essay devoted to this selfsame issue, C. F. D. Moule addressed what he considered to be an unsolved problem in the temptation-clause. He found the clause to be "notoriously problematic" (65), and claimed that "since

temptation is inevitable, the prayer is usually turned by those who use it into a prayer, rather, for escape from succumbing to temptation" (65). "A substantial problem," wrote Moule, which "[his] paper is concerned to define, though it is able to offer no solution, is the meaning of 'bringing into temptation':

It is intelligible enough to pray 'Do not let us succumb to temptation when we are brought to the test'; but 'Do not let us even be brought to testing' is harder to explain. By way of starting to think round this problem, the familiar question of the meaning of peirasmos itself must be raised, although it is not this word so much as the phrase, 'into peirasmos', that constitutes the problem. The Vulgate tentatio and the English 'temptation' suggest, to most modern readers, some kind of enticement to sin. But peirasmos (like tentamentum in Latin) strictly means 'testing' rather than 'enticement'; and many scholars have urged that the word refers to external circumstances--testing times which need not, in themselves, be viewed as designed to entice--rather than to such inward, psychological allurements as is normally implied by 'temptation'. Further, there are those who relate the word to one notorious 'testing time' in particular, namely, the so-called 'messianic woes', the crisis that Jewish apocalyptic [literature] expected at the climax of history--the pains before the birth, the darkness before the dawn. (66)

Actually, in the last sentence above, Moule is referring to the view of the temptation-clause proposed by Joachim Jeremias, in an essay on the Our Father as word of the historical Jesus. In Jeremias's words, "This petition is meant to seem harsh and abrupt. To understand it, we must first note that peirasmos does not refer to everyday

temptations, but to the last great trial" (New Testament Theology 202).

Moule has suggested that the interpretation which Jeremias gives the sixth petition "is hinted at by the type of rendering that has become popular, and has been (for instance) accepted into the New English Bible both in the Lord's Prayer ('do not bring us to the test') and is proposed for an international version of the Lord's Prayer" (66). Certainly, the New Revised Standard Version, 1989, offers the temptation-clause 'and do not bring us to the time of trial'. Moule's effort sought to spell out the complex problem of the temptation-clause and to clarify it. In this he is not alone. The complexities of the clause have drawn the attention of C. W. F. Smith (the article "Our Father"), a monograph by the Abbé Jean Carmignac, Recherches sur le 'Notre Père', as well as the work on the peirazein-group of words by H. Seesemann, and on the term peirasmos by K. G. Kuhn.

In a literature like that of the gospels, which originated in large part in the words and actions of Jesus, and which took shape as "oral tradition," and new and final shape as written narratives, we are obliged to differentiate between the diverse originators of meaning and their intentions. We cannot simply speak of the Our Father as if it were an entity in a Platonic world of ideas. There is the Our Father of Jesus, the Our Father of

the Sermon on the Mount spoken by the Matthean Christ, the Our Father that the Lucan Christ taught his disciples while en route to Jerusalem; there is the Our Father of the Didache, of the old Latin versions, of the Vulgate of Saint Jerome, and so on through history.

The specific issue of the meaning of the last petition in the Our Father changes as we go through these diverse realizations of the Our Father. With respect to Jesus, there is a gathering consensus, which we shall examine, according to which the "temptation" in question is the great eschatological tribulation which figures so prominently in his public preaching. We would be naive, however, if we were to suppose that the sense of the word remained stable all through the history of the prayer.

In the present thesis we shall be satisfied to offer (a) an account of the Our Father as word of the historical Jesus, (b) an account of the prayer (and especially its last petition) as it is presented in the gospels of Matthew and of Luke, and (c) reflections on the final petition recovering the biblical horizons of "temptation" as "test" and proposing how to make sense of the petition today.

## PART ONE: JESUS, MATTHEW, LUKE

### The Prayer as Word of the Historical Jesus

Scholarship in our century has had a remarkable success in recovering the original prayer, owing to the insights bearing on an appropriate method of analysis. The first insight, which has won widespread acknowledgement, is the often verified observation that the tendency of the tradition is to expand prayer-texts (and, indeed, liturgical texts in general). This offers more than one clue to the relative originality of the Lucan text of the Our Father at the points where it is shorter than its Matthean parallel.

It follows that, insofar as we are intent on finding the more original version of the Our Father, the preference must fall on the Lucan "Father!" rather than on the Matthean "Our Father who art in heaven"; on the absence in Luke of "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"; and on the absence in Luke of "but deliver us from evil/the evil one."

The second insight turns on the comparison of words, where they differ in the two versions. Here, as we shall presently see concretely illustrated, the preference must fall on Matthew's tradition. He seems to have kept more of Jesus' own idiom whether in vocabulary or mode of speech.

The address "Father!" derives, no doubt, from Aramaic 'Abba' (see Mk. 14:36) which the Christian communities took over from Jesus (cf. Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6). The single instance in which this address to God in prayer is attested in Jewish literature is in the Targum to the classically messianic text of the oracle of Nathan in the form it takes in Ps. 89:26f. The chosen Davidid is appointed to call out to God, 'Abba'!

Let thy name be hallowed!  
Let thy reign come!

is a distich in synonymous parallelism. Both limbs of the distich call for the consummation of time and history and the moment at which salvation is to become definitive. The hallowing of God's name is the exultant cry of the whole world at that moment of God's final intervention.

The petitions for bread and for forgiveness (even apart from our main interest namely, the petition for protection from peirasmos/temptation/[the] ordeal) pose a number of challenging problems. The following brief observations may, however, help to advance the inquiry.

First, with respect to the bread petition, light is thrown on the puzzling adjective epiousios by a phrase in the Acts of the Apostles, tē epiousē hēmera/nukti (Acts 7:26; 16:11; 20:15; 21:18; 23:11). This is rendered "on the following day/night." Epiousē is a participial form of the verb epeimi/epienai (from eimi/come, not from eimi/be). In all probability, the adjective epiousios (we may



provisionally translate it as "pertaining to the following day"), derives from hē epiousē hēmera (the following day) just as the adjective tetartaios (pertaining to the fourth day) derives from hē tetartē hēmera (the fourth day).

Furthermore, Joachim Jeremias is doubtless right to appeal to a report by St. Jerome that at this place in the Our Father he found in the Gospel of the Nazoreans (a targum-like retroversion of Matthew into Aramaic) the word mahar. Mahar means "tomorrow." "It seems solidly probable that the translator of the Greek Our Father into Aramaic, when he reached this point in the Sermon on the Mount, simply cited the prayer as he had known it from childhood" (The Lord's Prayer 23-24).

The original sense of the petition was not, then, "give us this day our daily bread," but "give us this day our (share in the) bread of tomorrow!" And what could "bread of tomorrow" mean except final salvation under the image of the banquet of the end of time? Once again we meet here a markedly eschatological conception.

Precisely as a prayer taught by the historical Jesus, the petition for forgiveness must have drawn, like the Matthean version, on the Aramaism hobîn/opheilemata/debts, as a figure for "sins." We have a confirmatory indication of this even from the Lucan text, which did not keep "debts," but, in the second limb of this distich, reads:

kai gar autoi aphiomēn opheilonti

As we forgive anyone who is our debtor.

Whereas Luke uses the present "forgive" (aphiomēn, from aphiēmī), it is striking that the Matthean version uses the aorist aphēkamen. Why the aorist? It may be that the closest the Greek translator could come to an Aramaic "perfect of coincidence" (Jeremias) was either the ingressive aorist or the aorist of just completed action: "Cancel our debts (=forgive us our sins) as we (herewith) cancel those of our debtors (=forgive those who trespass against us)" (The Lord's Prayer 14).

We come finally to the verse that mainly fixes our interest. As a word of the historical Jesus, the text must be seen against its probable Aramaic substratum. Kai mē eisenēckes hēmas eis peirasmon/"and lead us not into temptation" presents us with two problems: the sense of "lead" and the sense of "into temptation."

As an isolated word, "lead" may signify "go before" or "cause to go" (by forcing or encouraging or inviting or showing the way). But in the clause "do not lead us" the candidates are swiftly reduced to two: (a) do not cause us to go, and (b) do not allow us to go. One of the most prolific sources of error, if we may judge from the many examples of defective Greek renderings of Aramaic expressions pointed out by Gustaf Dalman, Charles Fox Burney, Paul Joüon, and Joachim Jeremias, is failure to

render modal nuances. An example offered by Joüon and Jeremias is found in the last antithesis of the Sermon on the Mount. Joüon points out that the standard version,

You have heard that it was said:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy" (Matt. 5:43) overstates, for here as sometimes elsewhere (e.g., in the Hebrew Bible, Gen. 29:31; Mal. 1:2-3), "hate" may be used to signify no more than "not love," "not prefer" (L'Évangile de Notre-Seigneur Jésus Christ 31). Second, in Aramaic the future or imperfect (and [thou shalt] hate thine enemy) may express no more than "la nuance de licéité" or "permissive nuance" (NT Theology 213 n. 3). In short, ancient scribes working casuistically and pondering the limits of the precept in Leviticus 19:18, may have drawn this inference in principle; you must love your countryman, but this need not hold for the countryman who has made himself your personal enemy or adversary. Joüon and Jeremias would accordingly translate:

You have heard that it was said:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour, though thine adversary thou needst not love."

Similarly at this point in the Our Father, "lead" might well be a heavy-handed rendering of an intended modal: "and do not allow us to go."

In accord with the whole character of the prayer as a word of the historical Jesus, it is probable, as we shall

see below in greater detail, that peirasmos originally intended, primarily if not exclusively, the eschatological tribulation or ordeal. The early Church, as we learn especially from historical analysis of the parables, converted a mass of material in the synoptic tradition to a new post-Jesus thematic: watchfulness or vigilance in expectation of the parousia. The original referent of this mass of material, however, was not the parousia but the outbreak of the eschatological ordeal. (The word peirasmos is used sparingly in the gospels, but the reality intended by the word is attested ubiquitously, almost overwhelmingly, in the public preaching of Jesus).

Joachim Jeremias, in general (though not perfect) accord with K. G. Kuhn, reconstructs the Aramaic text as follows:

wělä' / ta'ēlinnan / lēnisyôn

and-not / allow-to-go + us / (in) to temptation.

Ta'ēlinnan is the 'afel (=causative) imperfect of 'ala "to go (up)"/rise (up), to which the first person plural pronominal suffix is attached as direct object. The verb has either of two nuances: to cause to go (=to lead, impel) or to allow to go. The phrase lēnisyôn (to or into temptation) is, as Jeremias has pointed out, paralleled by an ancient Jewish prayer in two versions, one for morning, one for evening, possibly old enough for Jesus to have known it:

Lead me not into the power of transgression,  
 And bring me not into the power of sin,  
 And not into the power of iniquity,  
 And not into the power of temptation,  
 And not into the power of anything shameful.

(The Lord's Prayer 30)

Here "lead" and "bring" are, again, a heavy-handed translation, for there is no doubt that they are intended to have the permissive nuance, "do not allow (me) to go." "Into the power of" is expressed by lîdê=literally, "into the hands of."

At this point we have Professor Moule's objection: "(in)to temptation" is not one and the same expression as "into the hands/power of temptation" (73). The question is, how solid is Professor Moule's objection? Here we must interject a swift sketch of how "the hands of" idiom figures in the New Testament, in the Hebrew Bible, and in the LXX. The sketch, I believe, will diminish the force of the objection.

First, we do find the Semitic idiom "the hands of" in the sense of "the power of" attested in the New Testament and used of God, the angels, and of Jesus, as a glance at a dictionary or a concordance will confirm. Moreover, we also find attested in the New Testament the same idiom in the specific sense of "hostile power" (Luke 1:71, 74; John 10:39; cf. 10:28f., and elsewhere). Finally, we find attested the use of this precise idiom in Jesus' prediction of his coming suffering: "the Son of man will be delivered into the hands of (the sons of) men"

(Mark 9:31 = Matt. 17:22 = Luke 9:44; Mark 14:41 = Matt. 26:45; Luke 24:7).

Second, there are numerous instances in the Hebrew Bible in which the idiom is shortened when translated into Greek or into today's vernacular languages. When ʿal-yēdê (literally, "into the hands of") means "alongside" or "along the borders," the "hands" figure is dropped in Greek (Num. 34:3; Jgs. 11:26; I Chron. 7:29). When the figure refers to supervision, as in "under the hands (=supervision)" of their fathers (I Chron. 25:2-6) "hands" is again left untranslated. It is true that, when "the hands of" signifies a hostile power of some sort, as in "to give/deliver into the hands/power of the sword" (Jer. 18:21; Ezek. 35:5; Ps. 62:11), the Greek translators usually give a slavishly literal rendering, expressing the words "hands." But we do have instances in which the Greek translators simplified: e.g., Ps. 141:9 (=LXX 140:9) says literally:

keep me from the hands of the snare they have laid  
for me, from the traps set by evildoers.

The Greek text:

phulaxon mē apo pagidos hēs sunestēsanto moi kai  
apo skandalōn tōn ergazomenōn tēn anomian.

To the Greek translator "from the snare" or "snares" serves as well as "from the hands/power of the snare." Do we not have here just one more parallel to the text under

discussion (do not allow us to go into temptation/into the power of temptation)? Vernacular translations moreover, are at one in dropping the "hands" image from phrases such as "the hands of the sword, of hell, of dogs, of the flame, of misfortune . . . ."

One might be inclined on this basis to withdraw Professor Moule's objection, or at least to acknowledge that there do exist parallels making credible that lěnisyôn and lîdê nisyôn are synonymous expressions and that, accordingly, the sense of lěnisyôn may well be, and indeed probably is, "into the power of temptation/(the) tribulation/ordeal." But we reserve the precise sense of this last phrase for fuller treatment below.

The sense of the Our Father as word of the historical Jesus has been set out in nearly synonymous terms by Karl Georg Kuhn and Joachim Jeremias, supplemented here and there by the later treatment of R. E. Brown and Philip Harner. All agree that the prayer as it came from Jesus was eschatological through and through. We shall see whether its ending may be limited to the eschatological ordeal, but the shadow of this looming time of affliction, so prominent in Jesus' warnings and admonitions to the indifferent crowds, can hardly be excluded from the prayer. Out of the darkness of the ordeal would come the cry Abba! Let Thy reign come (now)! Let Thy name be hallowed (now)! Bring us (now), today, the bread reserved for our tomorrow!

Forgive us as we (now) forgive! Do not let us fall victim to the ordeal! (=Save us from ourselves!)

We said above that the referent of peirasmos included the looming time of affliction. This, however, does not reveal the meaning of the word. We have all learned from developments in the linguistics of the past half-century to differentiate between meaning and reference (Gottlob Frege), as between connotation and denotation (John Stuart Mill), or intention and extension (Rudolf Carnap). "Reference," "denotation," and "extension" have to do with the application of meaning to some object. "Meaning," "connotation," and "intention" have to do with the intelligible content of some expression, writes Anthony Quinton (The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought 129-130). The object referred to by the expression "a red-and-yellow beach-ball" is one object or referent, namely, the ball, but red and yellow and for-the-beach are three different meanings. Karl Georg Kuhn has provided us with an engaging analysis of the meaning of peirasmos. For instance, Jesus' word on the peirasmos facing every believer has, Kuhn claims:

its roots in the imagery of a state of war between two powers in the world, that of God and that of Satan, in which the believer, as God's soldier is constantly exposed to the attacks of the devil and must therefore be watchful and armed at his post. (96)

Kuhn sees that "the entire set of concepts described above:



the two powers, the state of war, and the peirasmos of the believer" (97), was also found in the writings of the Essenes. He observes as well that "the eschatological structure of this thinking is fully developed as the main idea of the sect, and is most clearly shown in the basic doctrinal passage 1QS iii, 13--1v, 26" (97). Kuhn, however, is quick to indicate the all-important differences in their writings from what the New Testament documents. "One becomes a Christian in baptism, and accepts the Gospel of Christ in faith" (106). For the Christian "the historical act of salvation of Jesus Christ, the eschatological Saviour" (106) makes all the difference.

Kuhn points out that "when Jesus teaches us to pray: 'Lead us not into peirasmos,' no distinction can be made between the Now of the believer in the world and the Then of the battle to come. Both belong to one act" (111). In concluding their Excursus on the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer, W. D. Davies and Dale Allison note that Jesus and the church after him--including Matthew--"interpreted their present in terms of the 'messianic woes' (Mt. 10.34-36=Lk. 12. 51-53; Mt. 11. 12-13=Lk. 16. 16; Mk. 10. 38-9; 13. 5-13; Lk. 12. 49-50; Rom. 8.18; 1 Cor. 7.26; Col. 1.24; 2 Th. 2.7; Rev. 7. 9-17" (613). The entire teaching of Jesus is, as Kuhn reminds us, "dominated by the thought of pressing time. The final battle may stand in the foreground when the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer

speaks of peirasmos, and yet the complex view of the final peirasmos and the peirasmos here and now as one and the same act is not hereby jeopardized" (111). In his essay "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," Jeremias finds peirasmos not to "mean the small temptations of every-day-life but the great last test, which stands before the door, the revelation of the secret of evil, the abomination of desolation, Satan sitting on God's throne, antichrist's power revealed" (146).

Jeremias and Kuhn were in agreement on the application of these meanings to the coming of affliction, but R. E. Brown has also followed them with a heavy accent on the illumination of the historic context of eschatology provided in our time by the Dead Sea Scrolls. He writes:

The eschatological interpretation of our petition becomes all the more likely now that the Qumran literature has thrown some light on the theological views of the Jewish world in which Jesus lived. We find the Essene community living in fearful anticipation of the attack of the forces of Satan. Sons of light themselves, and under the aegis of the spirit of truth, they have already drawn up their battle plans for meeting the sons of darkness under Belial, the spirit of perversion. This angel of darkness is already trying to lead them astray by persecution and affliction (1QS 3. 22-25), but God is on their side. He has set a limit to Satan's activities in the world (1QS. 4:14-19). When it is up, the battle will be engaged, and Belial's authority will be destroyed (1QS. 4:20). The Christian community has an eschatological outlook not too far from that of the Essenes. (251)

Not only does Brown view the sixth petition in an

eschatological sense, but in the penultimate paragraph to his essay he also claims,

We can see how coherently the eschatological viewpoint binds together the petitions into one picture. The Christian community of the first century, anxiously expecting the Second Coming prays that God will completely glorify His name by establishing His kingdom, which represents the fulfilment of the plan He has willed for both earth and heaven. (253)

Although this community was caught up with the imminence of the parousia, which the disciples believed would take place soon, what is significant here is how Brown views the sixth petition. He gets right to the heart of the matter in stating that the sixth petition "binds the petitions together in one picture." The Christian community of the first century showed the force of the eschatological hope by praying "hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven" (253).

Philip Harner finds that some scholars connect the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer with "a verse in revelation, which speaks of 'the hour of trial [temptation] which is coming on the whole world' (3:10)"; Harner reasons, "if Jesus thought of the future in this way, then this interpretation of 'temptation' cannot be excluded" (110). But Jean Carmignac suggests that "it is important to notice that Jesus himself never used the word 'temptation' with the strictly future reference that it has in Rev. 3:10" (245).

This exceedingly brief sketch will serve to set the stage for a fuller treatment of the last phase (into [the power of] temptation). But even this brief treatment of the prayer as a whole may serve as a general indication of the point of departure for the Our Father as it was to be prayed by Christians all through Christian history. As we shall see, there is already a lessening of the eschatological intensity of the prayer as it appears in the great narrative redactions of Matthew and Luke.

#### Introduction to the Matthean and Lucan Our Father

Each of the gospel writers presents Jesus to us in his own characteristic way. Matthew, as Howard Marshall observes, "concentrates on the relationship of Jesus to the Jewish faith. He shows how Jesus came to fulfil the Old Testament, but at the same time to judge the Jews for their unfaithfulness to their religion" (470). Francis Beare notes that "Matthew alone explains the significance of the name Jesus, and links it with the 'Emmanuel' oracle of Isaiah vii" (30). Hence, "the Jews are called to see Jesus as the promised Messiah, the Son of David, and judgement is pronounced upon them for their failure to respond to him" (Marshall 470). The Matthean redaction, having probably originated under Palestinian, Aramaic-speaking, rigorously Torah-observant auspices, took final shape in a Greek-speaking community bent on the world mission, likely in Antioch.

As it stands, its structure is complex. In the first place, it is organized from 3:1 to 26:1 on the basis of alternating narrative and discourse, so yielding five great discourses and five great units.

Secondly, it is organized from 3:1 to the end as a developing drama of judgment and salvation -- the last and climactic encounter of the Lord God of Israel with his people. Judgment: at the end of the encounter the Lord's last envoy cries out: "For I tell you, you will not see me again, until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!'" (23:39). But this harsh word of judgment is simultaneously a promise comparable to the revelation of the "secret" in Romans 11. Israel's salvation will come with the acknowledgement of the parousiac Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover, the salvation aspect of the drama is realized in the long hoped-for restoration of Israel in the remnant of those who acknowledge God's messianic proclaimer, healer, and teacher (Matt. 16:13-20). The phases of this two-edged drama: 3:1-4:11; 4:12-16:12; 16:13-18:15; 28:16-20.

Thirdly, the story is organized geographically, as in Mark: Galilee (4:12-15:20); Journeys (15:21-20:34); Jerusalem (21:1-28:15); Galilee (28:16-20).

Fourthly, there are signs of a concentric structuring of the gospel. In between the beginning (the infancy gospel) and the end (passion and resurrection), the

centre is the middle of the parables-discourse in Chapter 13. This is the shift of focus--innocent in itself, perhaps, but fateful in context--from the crowds, who learn nothing from Jesus, to the disciples, who are initiated into the mysteries of salvation. The themes of division run almost obsessively through Matthew in the infancy gospel (Jerusalem/Gentiles from the east) to a kind of sealing of fates in Jerusalem (26:63-64; 27:17-25) and on Golgotha (27:50-54).

In the four sections in Matthew 6:1-18, On Almsgiving; On Prayer; The Lord's Prayer; On Fasting, the evangelist "brings together materials which bear upon another aspect of the contrast between the old order of Judaism and the new order of Christ" (Beare 61). In vv. 1-6 and 16-18, the general theme--the contrast "between deeds of 'righteousness' done ostentatiously, to win the approval of men, and deeds done 'in secret', seeking only the approval of God-- is developed simply and consistently under the three headings of Almsgiving, Prayer, and Fasting" (Beare 61). However, the Lord's Prayer does not enter into the general theme of contrast between true and ostentatious piety; as Beare notes, "Matthew introduces it here simply because he is putting together materials which have to do with Prayer" (61). We notice, too, that the verses 7 and 8, which preface the Lord's Prayer "no longer bear upon the fundamental contrast between human approval

and divine approval, but upon the contrast between heathen prayers and prayers directed to the true God" (Beare 61).

The Matthean Account of the Lord's Prayer found in the Revised Standard Version:

Our Father who art in heaven,  
 Hallowed be thy name.  
 Thy kingdom come,  
 Thy will be done,  
 On earth as it is in heaven.  
 Give us this day our daily bread;  
 And forgive us our debts,  
 As we also have forgiven our debtors;  
 And lead us not into temptation,  
 But deliver us from evil. (6:9-11)

In the course of the treatment of the Matthean Our Father one important factor should be noted. Even if Matthew were to have meant to refer in the sixth petition to the eschatological tribulation, his view of the eschatological tribulation is not that of Jesus. Jesus referred to the ordeal as breaking out with his own suffering and death. As for Matthew (and the other evangelists), the eschatological ordeal breaks out in the indefinite future as a sign of the imminent parousia. This is made clear in Chapter 24, the first half of the eschatological discourse, which offers a preview of the coming events of crisis and cosmic crack-up. But it is not at all clear that Matthew wishes to make "temptation" refer mainly to this coming ordeal.

It is clear, however, how Matthew wishes to interpret Jesus' mission, because in the passages in Chapter 5: 17-19, he shows that Jesus did not come to

destroy the law but to fulfil it. The "six antitheses" of the Sermon on the Mount follow (5:21-48), and reveal Jesus as the new Moses pronouncing a new law transcending the old. Even the setting suggests, by the phrase "on a mount" its being played off against the first revelation of the law upon Mount Sinai. But where Moses prayed for the people, Num. 11:2; 21:7; Deut. 26, Jesus spontaneously gives us a personal prayer, a model prayer, the prayer of the New Testament. Although Jesus had been speaking about prayer, this seems not the only reason why the Lord's Prayer becomes part of the Sermon on the Mount. Actually Jesus is not done teaching. His exhortation 'Pray then like this', which prefaces the Lord's Prayer, sets out a new and specific directive on how to pray. The verse which follows the giving of the prayer deals with the attitude that one should and must adopt in prayer.

But before we concentrate on the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount itself must be considered, even if briefly. The Beatitudes, which open the Sermon, show that Matthew did not regard ethics as a mere conformity to legal standards. As Howard Kee, Franklin Young, and Karlfried Froehlich point out, Matthew depicts God's People as "those who have received as a gift of [God's] grace all that they have" (281). These People are blessed: the poor, the bereaved, the despised, the persecuted; but in the age to come, "theirs is the kingdom of heaven, they shall inherit



the earth, they shall see God" (Matt. 5:3-11). Jesus distinguishes these people as "the salt of the earth" (5:13); "the light of the world" (5:14); and he counsels and consoles them: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven" (5:16).

Those who responded to the Baptist and to Jesus were the poor and disenfranchised, celebrated especially in the late works of the Old Testament. Jesus' words, indeed, might have been harking back not only to Ezekiel (22:29) but, even earlier, to Amos (2:7; 4:1; 5:11) and Isaiah (3:15; 5:8; 10:2). In the later texts and Zephaniah (3:12), the remnant that survives judgment is made up of the poor and needy. The revolutionary nature of Jesus' statement makes the poor the especially favoured heirs of the kingdom of heaven. In Matthew 11:5; Luke 4:18, we find that the good news is brought to "the poor in spirit," those who acknowledge their need.

Perhaps the revolutionary character of Jesus' words on the law, that he had not come to "abolish the law and the prophets," "but to fulfil them" (Matt. 5:17-18) should be examined. How do we reconcile the five examples with which Jesus deals <sup>with</sup> and the law? He is explicit about murder, (5:21-26); adultery and divorce, (5:27-32); oaths, (5:33-37); retaliation, (5:38-42); and love of neighbours and enemies, (5:43-48), and goes beyond the bounds of the

Ten Commandments. Actually, it is this well developed blueprint for living a life devoted to God and the compassionate recognition of other human beings, and an attempt to attain the perfection of righteousness, which act as a prelude to Jesus' gift of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew's gospel. Therefore, it was important and significant in Matthew's scheme of things for the Lord's Prayer to be included in the Sermon on the Mount, and to have been prefaced by the way in which Jesus' teaching took shape. In writing about the section 5:17-48 in Matthew, Howard Marshall makes the following observations:

Nothing can ever supersede or do away with the law God gave Moses. But the law is a minimum standard. It can only deal with actions, not with the thoughts that give rise to them. Jesus takes five examples to show what the principles expressed in the law involve at the personal level. Sin begins in the mind and will. That is where it must be rooted out. The standards of the new society - God's kingdom - are way above the standards of the law-courts.  
(478)

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus had prepared his disciples for the Lord's Prayer. By pointing out to each listener the importance of considering one's thoughts which led to actions, and of recognizing that one's will performed the consenting to deeds, Jesus was advocating the examined life which could lead to one of righteousness.

We now turn to Luke. The writer of the Gospel of Luke, Philip Harner observes, "is Gentile rather than Jewish in background. He evidently thinks of the Lord's

Prayer as especially meaningful for those followers of Jesus who are also Gentile in background" (6). Jeremias refers to the two different groups of people to which the Lord's Prayer is addressed:

The Matthean catechism on prayer is addressed to people who have learned to pray in childhood but whose prayer stands in danger of becoming routine. The Lucan catechism on prayer, on the other hand, is addressed to people who must for the first time learn to pray and whose courage to pray must be roused. Matthew is transmitting to us instruction on prayer directed at Jewish-Christians, Luke at Gentile-Christians.

(The Lord's Prayer 9-10)

In his commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Alfred Plummer points out that "the immediate object of his Gospel, as told in the preface, was to give Theophilus increased confidence in the faith which he had adopted" (xxxiii). Although we learn nothing of who Theophilus was or where he lived, "the tone of the Gospel leads us to regard him as a representative Gentile convert, who was anxious to know a good deal more than the fundamental facts which were taught to catechumens" (Plummer xxxiii).

The Gospel of Luke is part one of a two-part work structured on the basis of two factors: the overarching theme is prophecy and fulfilment (Lk. 24:25-27, 44-47), the whole Lucan work being the history of fulfilment (Lk. 1:1-4 on history and fulfilment), specified more concretely in Lk. 24:46 (for the gospel) and 24:47 (for the Acts of the Apostles). Second, this history is organized

geographically, and the geography is organized theologically. In the gospel the movement is all toward Jerusalem; in Acts it is from Jerusalem to the end of the earth (either Rome, where the story seems to end, or Spain). Obviously, "history" is understood here in Lucan, not modern, terms. "Departure" below (Lk. 9:31) refers globally to Jesus' passion, death, resurrection, and ascension, but from the standpoint of a theology of "ascension/parousia" or "departure/return."

The outline of the gospel would appear to follow the following lines:

Literary prologue to the account of fulfillment  
(Lk. 1:1-4)

History of the Infancy and Childhood (Lk. 1 and 2)

History of the Ministry and the Departure (3:1-  
24:53)

Initiation Events (3:1-4:13)

Galilee (4:14-9:50)

Travel (9:51-19:27)

Jerusalem (19:28-24:53)

In Luke's gospel Jesus gives the Lord's Prayer to his disciples after he had just finished praying, and one of his disciples said to him, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples" (11:1). In Matthew's gospel, Jesus gives the prayer without being asked. There is some similarity in the fact that, in Luke, Jesus had just been

engaged in prayer, whereas in Matthew, he had been teaching about prayer. What Luke's text significantly adds is that the disciples received the prayer "as a distinguishing characteristic of their group," like the prayers that John taught his followers (Harner 4).

The two evangelists have transmitted the prayer in slightly different wordings. We are assured that text-critically "we today know the text of approximately the second century" (Jeremias 7). The Lucan version, according to the oldest manuscripts, has five petitions, while the Matthean version has seven. The Lucan version in the translation by Joachim Jeremias:

Father,  
Hallowed be thy name.  
Thy kingdom come.  
Give us each day our bread for tomorrow.  
And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive  
everyone who is indebted to us.  
And let us not succumb to the trial. (7)

("and let us not succumb to the trial" is likewise Jeremias' rendering of the Matthean version.) The following is the Revised Standard Version of Luke:

Father, hallowed be thy name.  
Thy kingdom come.  
Give us each day our daily bread;  
and forgive us our sins,  
for we ourselves forgive everyone  
who is indebted to us;  
and lead us not into temptation (Luke 11:2-4).

### **Matthew and Luke on the Sixth Petition**

We may begin by indicating the relationship between Matthew's version and Luke's. We will see in the following

form, supplied by Philip Harner, the words and phrases in Matthew that have a parallel in Luke are underlined. Solid lines indicate exact parallels in the Greek text. Dotted lines indicate approximate parallels.

Address:            Our Father who art in heaven:

"Thou" petitions: Hallowed by thy name,  
Thy kingdom come,  
 Thy will be done,  
 on earth as it is in heaven.

"We" petitions: Give us this day our daily  
bread,  
And forgive us our debts,  
as we also have forgiven our  
debtors,  
And lead us not into temptation,  
 But deliver us from evil. (7)

Apropos of diverse transmission-traditions of the two texts, Jeremias observes:

The Gentile-Christian church has handed down the Lord's Prayer without change, whereas the Jewish-Christian church, which lived in a world of rich liturgical tradition and used a variety of prayer forms, has enriched the Lord's Prayer liturgically. Because the form transmitted by Matthew was the more richly elaborated one, it soon permeated the whole church. (The Lord's Prayer 12)

The final request in Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer petitions deliverance from "evil" or "the evil one." In this case we have either a neuter (evil) or a masculine (the evil one). There is no example of Jesus' reference to Satan as "the evil one" in Mark or Luke, but there are two examples in Matthew. According to Matthew 13:19, Jesus spoke of "the evil one," but the parallels in

Mark and Luke have "Satan" or "the devil" (Mark 4:15; Luke 8:12). The verse in Matthew 13:38, in which the evangelist records that Jesus spoke of the devil as "the evil one," has no parallels in the other gospels.

We do have synoptic parallels for Jesus' use of "temptation," chiefly in Luke. But in the Gethsemane scene we have a truly synoptic parallel. Jesus admonishes his disciples, "Pray that you may not enter into [the power of] temptation" (Matt. 26:41; Mark 14:38; Luke 22:40, 46). Aware that his own death would place his followers in danger, Jesus urged them to pray that they hold fast to their faith in this crisis situation. "It is very possible," observes Philip Harner, "[Jesus] had this kind of situation in mind when he gave the Lord's Prayer and taught his disciples to ask for God's help in avoiding temptation" (109). In view of the closeness or exactness of the parallel, this seems not only "very possible," but highly probable. Moreover, it is not temptation that is to be avoided, for that is impossible; it is apostasy under pressure that is to be avoided.

We stated earlier that we intend to present a fuller treatment of the last phase (into [the power of] temptation). In the process of dealing with this phrase, however, we might well keep in mind the admonition of R. G. Collingwood:

To suppose that a word, in whatever context it appears, ought to mean one thing and no

more, argues not an exceptionally high standard of logical accuracy, but an exceptional ignorance of the nature of language. (Speculum Mentis 11)

### Light from Lexical Definitions

In the Louw and Nida lexicon the following notations are offered for the words of the sixth petition. καὶ functions as a co-ordinate conjunction; it is "a marker of co-ordinate relations" (789), providing a link with the preceding petition on forgiving debts. μή is a marker of negative propositions (665). It precedes the aorist subjunctive active form εἰσενέγκης, from the verb εἰσφέρω.

The lexicon offers the following definition of εἰσφέρω: "to cause to, to lead to" (810). (As we have seen above, this is a heavy-handed rendering of an original nuance: allow to go.) The word ἡμᾶς, first person pronoun, plural, accusative, is the direct object "us". The preposition εἰς is followed by the noun temptation in the accusative. Although usually translated "into", εἰς can convey various meanings. The lexicon supplies at least forty-two different senses stemming from various circumstances where it is used. So far as the gospels of Matthew and of Luke are concerned, the question is whether the original sense of the petition was successfully carried over into Greek. Is there any clear way of deriving from mē eisenēgkes hēmas the meaning "do not allow us to go ..."? Again, whereas the original phrase lēnisyôn was



clear enough, the straightforward Greek translation eis peirasmon may have fallen short of crystal clarity.

In a dictionary compiled by Barclay Newman the noun peirasmos is defined as "a period or process of testing, trial, test." Newman offers an example from 1 Peter 4:12. Here πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν is translated as "the fiery ordeal" (138). The verb peirazo often functions in passages where the sense "to make proof or trial of, to test," is quite clearly intended. This field of meaning is shared among several words, among them dokimazo, which "almost always implies that the proof is victoriously surmounted, the proved is also approved (2 Cor. viii.8; 1 Thess. ii.4; Tim. iii. 10)." Peirazo and dokimazo are carefully distinguished, however, as Richard Trench shows (Synonyms of the New Testament 281).

Karl Kuhn in his essay "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament" observed that the Greek word peirasmos has "in fact, a double or triple sense (temptation-trial-tribulation) which is impossible to hold together in any English translation" (265). Jean Carmignac also drew attention to this richness of meaning, which poses a problem for any translator or interpreter:

In the post-classical Latin 'tentatio' had come to be distinguished from 'probatio', as in our language 'tentation' from 'épreuve', or 'temptation' from 'trial', or 'Versuchung' from 'Prüfung'. All these terms designate the confrontation with a moral order, but in the case of the test, the aim of this moral wrestling is to

manifest our intimate dispositions or to improve them by the exercise of training, while in the case of temptation, the aim is to impel against evil and to draw from sin. (241)

To conclude our review of lexical sources Heinrich Seesemann, in the Kittel-Friedrich Theological Dictionary of the New Testament has provided a treatment of the meaning of words peirazo, peirasmos, and related terms in secular Greek (Pindar, Homer, Plutarch, Herodotus, Aristophanes), the Old Testament and later Judaism, and the New Testament:

Peirazo in secular Greek carried the meaning "to make an attempt" or "to test (someone)", but in the Septuagint and later Judaism the word acquired a distinctly religious tinge. The God of the OT makes demands, requiring man's fear, faith, and confidence. But man is tempted to seek to be as God (Gen. 3:1-19), to rebel against God's commandment and transgress it. Thus, from the time of the fall his obedience to God is subject to constant threat through trial, whether it be that God tests and proves him or that the adversary (Satan) is at work. (24)

Dietrich Bonhoeffer reminds us that Scripture names the various authors of temptation: "the devil, the lust of man, God himself" (Creation and Fall 109). Still, only one who consents to temptation commits a sinful action. "An action," according to Collingwood, "is the unity of the outside and inside of an event" (The Idea of History 213). Despite the obvious, visible thing which the outside of an event is, the inside of an event, as Collingwood sees it, is "that in it which can only be described in terms of

thought" (213). The action of one's consenting to anything, including temptation, is an action of thought. Although one's thoughts are often viewed as inward actions taking place within one's own head, they often produce outside or exterior manifestations of having occurred.

### Exegetical Considerations

In a sense we have already evoked the main elements of the exegetical problem that the sixth petition of the Our Father poses in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; we have even touched on some of the elements of its solution. Originally, Jesus taught his disciples to pray:

and do not let us fall victim to the ordeal!

The petition might be summed up as a cry to God for help, a cry arising from acute awareness that the final ordeal of history was imminent, that the petitioners were about to be put to the test. Help us in our weakness, they prayed. Keep us from cracking under pressure!

Between Jesus' own teaching of the prayer and the text of the prayer in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, however, three developments combined to make the original prayer and especially its final petition problematic.

First, there was Jesus' resurrection on "the third day" after his death, according to the testimony of witnesses to his having "appeared", living, to them. His resurrection took place, not as a public event, but as an event revealed to a limited circle of witnesses. The

gospel tradition includes Jesus' prophecy of coming vindication and glory, but analysis (e.g., Jeremias New Testament Theology 285f.) of the relevant data reveals that Jesus' prophecy of the future originally included the outbreak of the ordeal with his suffering: his death was to inaugurate a series of dreadful events comprising, for example, the persecution and martyrdom of his disciples, the ruin of Jerusalem and the temple ... until the Son of man (i.e., Jesus himself, to be publicly vindicated as Son of man) would bring in the Reign of God. In short, the vindication had not been prophesied as to take place on a literally "third day" following his death. (Apart from predictions of his coming resurrection, all "third-day" words attributed to Jesus had been clearly meant in figurative and symbolic terms.) Consequently, the event of the resurrection as it was actually attested came as a stunning surprise to his followers. It obliged them to devise a scenario that accommodated Jesus' resurrection on the third day after his death and distinguished between resurrection and public vindication (=parousia).

The scheme that we find in Matthew and in Luke not only separates the resurrection from the parousia, it moreover specifies the interim between them as the era of the church and the world mission. Both gospels appear (we shall test this below) to postpone the outbreak of the ordeal to an indefinite future, as a sign of the imminence

of the coming parousia. Hence, it is difficult to say that Jesus' original conception of the ordeal remained intact after his resurrection. According to Jesus' original conception, the ordeal was to have begun with his arrest, suffering and death, to have been followed by the persecution and martyrdom of his disciples, the ruin of Jerusalem and the temple, and to have come to an end only with the advent of the Son of man and the Reign of God. The life of the church had originally been thought of as confined to the brief but fierce time of the ordeal.

Second, the acts and words of Jesus were first recounted orally, in Aramaic, with elements of the tradition translated into Greek almost from the first. Translation of oral tradition was often slavishly literal, occasionally mistaken, commonly subject to variously motivated alterations. In the sixth petition of the Our Father, as elsewhere in the prayer, there were defective renderings of what had once been clear.

Third, time passed, and as it did, the church--particularly, as we have already seen, the Jewish wing of the church--developed its liturgical traditions, including that of the Our Father. Hence, in particular, the shape and sound of the Matthean version, which converted the prayer's final petition into a distich by the addition of "but deliver us from [the] evil [one]".

All three developments contributed to the emergence

of exegetical problems. We shall not survey all the problems touching the Our Father, but shall concentrate on the sixth petition. We take the Matthean and Lucan texts of the Our Father just as they stand in Greek and first ask how each redactor, so far as we can judge, understood his own text.

How did Matthew understand the last petition? We are better positioned to say how he did not, than we are to say how he did. He did not suppose that God deliberately induced or enticed his children to sin, or that God had to be dissuaded from this. He certainly did not think of God as deliberately leading them into dangers too great for them. It is possible that Matthew understood this petition in the originally intended sense. But one might wonder, if that were the case, why he would have kept the reading mē eiseneḡkēs, "do not lead ..." Did he keep it out of a natural, instinctive conservatism with respect to the tradition of the Lord's own words (even though Matthew was doubtless aware that the words were originally spoken in Aramaic and had been translated into Greek)? Perhaps. We can hardly exclude, however, the possible--or even probable--view that the precise nuance of the original sense (do not let us go into [the power of] temptation/the ordeal; or, do not let us fall victim to temptation/the ordeal) had been forgotten, and that Matthew took the words to bear a closely similar but slightly different sense (do

not let us succumb to temptation).

Did Matthew understand the peirasmos as the eschatological ordeal? We have already mentioned the view of Davies and Allison, who offer their reasons for saying "Yes". But if we are right in taking the text of Matt. 24 to place the ordeal in an indefinite future, then it is very improbable that Matthew entertained this meaning of peirasmos. The problems raised by Moule, Carmignac, and others support the view that peirasmos had a wider reference in Matthew's view, namely, to all the difficulties, external and internal, that burdened the life of the petitioners and, by putting them under pressure, exposed them to the danger of sin.

The only passage in Matthew's gospel other than the Our Father in which the word peirasmos appeared was the scene of Gethsemane, mentioned above. What we find in the Gethsemane scene does not quite settle the concrete sense of the term "temptation", but it strongly suggests that, whatever the term meant in the Gethsemane text it means also in the Our Father, and vice versa. The two passages are almost precisely parallel.

Luke does offer more passages in which peirasmos occurs. From beginning to end Jesus' public life was beset by tests and trials (Luke 4:13; 22:28). In the two apocalyptic passages (Luke 17 and 21) there is a scenario of the future, and in the second of these texts traits

typical of the eschatological ordeal or tribulation are assigned to the future (Luke 21:8-36). On the other hand, we know that Luke set the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost in the context of "the last days" (Acts 2:17).

Moreover, the long debate instigated by Hans Conzelmann in the 1950s on the Lucan conception of eschatology has failed to issue in consensus (though Conzelmann's own views have been widely rejected). It is accordingly difficult to know whether or not Luke saw a reference to the eschatological tribulation in the peirasmos of Luke 11:4 (final petition of the Our Father). We can at least reaffirm the cautious but solid observation of Karl Georg Kuhn that the referent of peirasmos is inclusive: there is a bond between the trials and temptations of the followers of Jesus and those of the eschatological battle that belongs to the end of time. It is tempting to go further, that is, flatly to identify the trials and temptations referred to in this petition with the ordeal itself, making them part of the ordeal. But it would seem that any real assurance on this point supposes what we cannot yet suppose, namely that we have available to us a fully satisfactory account of the Lucan conception of eschatology. It would seem, from texts such as Acts 2:17, that Luke understands the era of the church to be comprehended in "the last days", but this does not resolve, for example, the issue of how Luke conceives of the ordeal.



In Rev. 3:10 the hour of the peirasmos that is destined to come upon the whole world is referred to in the most determinate way. It is just this kind of determinate reference that might have clarified Luke's conception of the ordeal, but this is just what is missing both in his gospel and in Acts.

Before bringing part one of this study to a conclusion with reflections on scholarly opinions we have already encountered, it may be well to ask, apropos of the ambiguities of the Greek text, whether the early church itself found the text puzzling. There is one strong indication that it did. This is a text in the Epistle of James, 1:12-15.

Blessed is the man who endures trial, for when he has stood the test he will receive the crown of life which God has promised to those who love him. Let no one say when he is tempted, "I am tempted by God"; for God cannot be tempted with evil and he himself tempts no one; but each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desires. Then desire when it has conceived gives birth to sin; and sin when it is full-grown brings forth death.

This text has the earmarks of an effort to make certain necessary distinctions called for by the ambiguities of the last petition of the Our Father. James does not make the effort to resolve the ambiguities by reference to the earliest form of the prayer, as we have done, following the Aramaic specialists. James, rather, proceeds doctrinally. Peirasmos, meaning "trial", is perfectly neutral. Becoming

dokimos, i.e., standing the test, is altogether good. God does not "tempt" in the sense of "entice to evil". C. F. D. Moule went through this analysis with exemplary attention to detail. He explains that attempts at defining temptation have uncovered two sets of circumstances:

(i) between peirasmos as (a) external circumstances and (b) inward lust; and (ii) between peirasmos as (a) experiment, (b) refining process, (c) attempt to pervert. (1) (b) is almost necessarily equal to (ii) (c) (unless one interprets lust in a neutral sense such as it does not normally bear); but (ii) (c) might also take an external form, (i) (a). Further, it is evident that (ii) (c) can act, even if not so intended by its author, in those other ways, as a test ((ii) (a)), or a refining ((ii) (b)). The devil may apply the pressure (external or inward) with intent to pervert; but God may use it as a test and a refinement, or may enable the sufferer so to use it. (68)

Moule cites the Matthean and Lucan narratives of the temptation of Jesus as an example of (ii) (b), the refining process in which the devil may apply the pressure, but God may use it as a refinement or may enable the sufferer so to use it. If one does not relate peirasmos in the Lord's Prayer, however, to the climactic test, "a case certainly remains for interpreting it with reference to external circumstances - testing times - rather than to inward, psychological enticement - temptation in the commonly accepted sense of the word.

The way from the use of peirazein for 'testing' to its use for 'temptation,' is, therefore intelligible enough; and there is at least one passage in the New Testament

where that way has clearly been traversed. In James 1:13, the verb peirazein is explicitly enlarged upon in such a way that it means what we normally mean by 'tempting' as contrasted with 'testing'. (Moule 67)

In the Letter of James, the attitude and disposition of the believer toward trials act as thematic threads laced throughout the whole epistle. We notice, at once, that the brethren considering it, counting it, thinking about it (ἡγήσατο) as all joy to encounter trials (1:2) ties in with, and is explained by, their knowing (γινώσκοντες) that the testing (dokimion) of their faith produces steadfastness (1:3). In verse 2 peirasmois is used for trials, but dokimion for testing in verse 3. Again, in 1:12 we find the same situation of pairing peirasmos and dokimos: "Happy is the person who remains faithful under trials, because when he succeeds in passing the test, he will receive as his reward the life which God has promised to those who love him." However, in the following verse, "If a person is tempted by such trials, he must not say, 'This temptation comes from God'. For God cannot be tempted by evil, and he himself tempts no one" (1:13). Here, the writer is constant in using either the verb peirazo or a form of it when dealing with a person being tempted, and the adjective apeirastos in writing about God who cannot be tempted by evil.

In James 1:14 the reason why one is tempted is

stated: "But a person is tempted when he is drawn away and trapped by his own evil desire." Here, the author of the epistle underscores the teaching of Jesus by forcing the people to examine their inner selves and so to take full responsibility for their actions. What is distinctive about the letter of James is that its writer addresses it to all Christians in general, rather than to any one specific church or community. He offers a good idea of how the Christian should behave. His terse language, kind but firm, emphasizes what testing and temptation mean, and at the same time he is positive in pointing out the beneficial results, which endurance in such cases can bring about. Thus, though he starts in chapter one with testing of faith which produces steadfastness (1:3), he then ranges out to include wisdom (1:5; 3:13-18), prayer (1:5-8; 4:2-3; 5:13-18), faith (1:6; 2:14-26), the rich (1:9-11; 2:1-13; 5:1-6), the sins of speech (1:19, 26; 3:1-12; 4:11), and the doers of the word (1:22-25; 2:14-26). His outline of how the active process of Christ's teaching was to be lived out in the day to day lives of his followers is given with succinct comprehensiveness.

About those passages of James which deal specifically with temptation, Martin Dibelius writes:

The temptations whose origins are discussed in 1:13-15 are not the 'trials' in 1:2 over which one is supposed to rejoice; while these must be dangers from without, 1:13-15 deals with dangers of the inner life. Hence, the latter saying is connected with

v12 only by means of a catchword: πειρασόμενος ('tempted') - πειρασμός ('trial'). Its contents is: 'Temptations, i.e., dangers to the soul, do not come from God' - and as proof of this it could then have been said: 'for only good things come from God'. Instead, the saying in vv 16-18 says, 'all good comes from God'. (71)

In James 1:13-18, where the source of temptation is spelled out, the writer of the epistle forces individuals to recognize that it is human desire, not God, from which temptation comes. The verbs used in 1:14, in their participial form and passive voice ἐξελκόμενος lure away, draw away, and σελεάζόμενος lure, entice, catch, entrap, have to do with the person who is tempted by desire. The onus is on the person; here is the why and wherefore of temptation. In distinguishing inordinate from appropriate desire one learned about oneself.

Peter Davids offers some interesting information about the suffering and testing theme germane to the temptation focus. He makes the following observations:

James shares with late Judaism the desire not to attribute the testing situation to God, while at the same time he refrains from directly involving Satan because of his interest in calling people to repentance and responsibility. Yet the presence of the devil is not entirely masked. (37)

Davids, in commenting on James chapter one in which the tempter does not appear, on 3:15 where he is first seen as a source of "wisdom" which divides the community, then on 4:7 where those led astray by the evil impulse are told to

resist the devil, notes that James "does not stress this dualism for pastoral purposes, but just as clearly recognizes the power of spiritual-demonic evil behind the internal evil in the person" (37).

### Concluding Reflections on Scholarly Opinion

We are now ready to profit from a brief return to the views surveyed earlier. Heinrich Seesemann notes that "weakness and susceptibility of the flesh" (31) impose a constant demand for watchfulness on human beings, and that these factors are at the heart of the temptation-clause. The notion of vigilance against temptation in Jesus' warning to the disciples in Gethsemane (Mark 14:38; Matt. 26:41; Luke 22:46) has, says Seesemann, "a close connection with the 6th petition of the Lord's Prayer; watching consists in prayer in view of our defencelessness in temptation" (32). He finds that in the sixth petition "the Lord is rather teaching His disciples to ask God not to withdraw His hand from them, but to keep them against temptation by ungodly powers" (31).

Jeremias aligns himself with these views:

That this reference in the final petition of the Lord's Prayer is indeed not to preservation from temptation but to preservation in temptation, is corroborated by an ancient biblical extra-canonical saying of Jesus. (The Prayers of Jesus 105)

Jeremias refers to the saying spoken on that last evening, prior to the prayer in Gethsemane. It is recorded in De

baptismo by Tertullian: "'No man can obtain the kingdom of heaven that hath not passed through temptation'" (Unknown Sayings of Jesus 73). Jeremias informs us that "Tertullian's citation gives us the context in the passion narrative just before Gethsemane" (Unknown Sayings of Jesus 73-74).

Carmignac's interpretation of the temptation-clause stresses the relationship which we have with God:

When we implore God's help against temptation, so that he might prevent our frail will from yielding to the lures of evil and from acquiescing to its seductions, we fall back on the power of his intervention, which, without violating the autonomy of our freedom, can hold it fast to his precepts and his rules. (142)

Carmignac shows why misinterpretation at this point is dangerous:

One can better see the seriousness of the misinterpretation that would be committed were one to require of Our Heavenly father not to expose us to, or not to submit us to, temptation; such an assumption would do injury to his fatherly goodness and would contradict our attitude of filial adoration. (146)

Ernst Lohmeyer reminds us "that every affliction, and therewith every peirasmos, is an eschatological tribulation or temptation, according to the total understanding of the preaching of Jesus" (144). He considers:

Luke 8:13 is to be taken in this sense. In the exposition of the parable of the Sower Luke, as distinct from Mark 4:17 and Matthew 13:21, when tribulation or

persecution arises on account of the word, has Jesus utter words of warning to those who believe for a while and in time of temptation fall away. (146)

Seesemann remarks:

Luke's substitution of peirasmos for diogmos or thlipsis dia ton logon shows what he understands by the term. For him peirasmos consists in persecution and oppression for the faith. There can be little doubt that he took the 6th petition of the Lord's Prayer in the same way. (31)

Gustaf Dalman observes that through the Lord's Prayer the disciples were privileged to learn of the "unique personal relation which subsists between God and, in the first place, Jesus Himself, but also between God and those who are His, who can be spoken of as 'sons of the theocracy,' Matt. 13:38" (190). The "attitude of filial devotion", which Carmignac found relevant to the sixth petition, is specifically for the disciples, for Dalman insists on the sharp line which Jesus drew between Himself and his disciples. He purposely set aside "the usual Jewish 'our Father in heaven' where He Himself is concerned," and yet He prescribed its use for His disciples in Matt. 6:9 (190). This holds also for Luke. Both evangelists put it "beyond doubt that Jesus in this case merely puts the expression in the mouth of His disciples; He does not pray with them in these terms" (H. J. Holtzmann 268).

About the eschatological reference found in the sixth petition C. W. F. Smith remarks:



Probably an eschatological reference is here modified in a prayer which seeks deliverance from, but comes to imply deliverance within, testing. To limit the petition to enticement to sin is to narrow its meaning to the point of distortion.  
(157)

But Professor Moule finds something lacking in Smith's statement, and claims that "the question of what justifies such an interpretation remains" (75).

My own conclusion is that, despite the difficulties occasioned by (a) the new eschatological scenario which earliest Christianity found itself obliged to adopt in accord with the actually unfolding events, e.g., the need to redefine the eschatological ordeal in post-Jesus terms, and (b) the relatively inept translation of wělá' ta'ēlinnan lěnisyôn by kai mē eiseneqkēs hēmas eis peirasmon, the early church was not really misled into erroneous religious views. True, the earliest Christians did not have the resources of philological inquiry, which are available to us and exemplified in the work of Dalman, Kuhn, Jeremias, Brown, Harner, and others. But Matthew, Luke, and James show that the ancients did have other resources. It is noteworthy that these other resources led Christians to undertake a kind of existential examination of themselves. For the sixth petition of the Our Father obliged them, as it obliges us, to see the petitioners as the sinners that we all are, and to be realistic about the constant need for God's unsparing help.

Basically, the prayer has to be seen through the lens of the teaching of Jesus, and what his teaching aimed at accomplishing. In the part of the prayer termed the "thou" petitions, Jesus teaches his disciples to address and acknowledge God as their heavenly Father, and to pray that his name be revered. Yet, if Jesus had offered only "Father" or "Our Father" as a prayer, the person with spiritual depth could have recognized either form as complete prayer. Such a person would have the assurance that God, as Father and Creator of all, would fulfil any of his or her needs. Jesus, however, fleshes out the prayerful salutation, and perceives that people need a model of explicitness, even, and especially, in prayer.

## PART TWO: THE MEANING OF TEMPTATION

A fuller form of the title of this second part of the thesis might well be: "The Field of Meaning in Which It Makes Sense to Pray, 'Lead Us Not into Temptation'". Throughout Part One we have been engaged in an effort of historical interpretation: what Jesus, Matthew, and Luke meant by the Our Father and especially by its final petition. In Part Two we turn to the present in an effort to answer the question, what sense does it make--for us, today--to pray "Lead us not into temptation"?

To be sure, the two parts cohere, for we answer the question of Part Two against the background of Part One, and the opening considerations of Part Two include reflection on the prayer within the horizons of historical, biblical tradition. Still, our main interest in Part Two is focused not on the past but on the present.

The New Testament presents itself to the reader as a many-faceted witness to the definitive saving act of God. According to this witness, "God was in Christ"; that is, God was in Jesus of Nazareth, the prophet and Messiah, effecting the salvation of the world by his death, resurrection, and exaltation as Christ and Lord. In the religious language of the New Testament, this saving act of God offered the world the forgiveness of sins and communion

with God in Christ. In the language of philosophy it offered the solution to the human problem.

Once New Testament faith is set in the context of competing cults and philosophies similarly claiming to offer a solution to the human problem (as happened historically in the Mediterranean theatre of the world mission), it reveals a remarkable trait. Whereas other "solutions" feature great promises of protection from ill health, ill fortune, ongoing war and other conflicts, the great promises of the new faith (e.g., of personal immortality and resurrection, a judgment of the whole world that would right every wrong, personal and social communion with God in Christ destined to culminate in boundless blessedness) nevertheless left intact a human dilemma within history. This dilemma included physical and psychic pain, disappointment and frustration, struggle ending often in failure, the bitter need to battle for control over an unruly, unreliable selfhood, the seemingly irresistible power of evil in the world, liability to sickness and death. Some solution! No wonder that the gospel story pictured the many ways in which "the word" promising salvation failed to take lasting root in human hearts. And yet the same story evoked the great harvest of the saved.

The Our Father coheres perfectly with this field of meaning. It supposes just the kind of "salvation" or "solution" that the New Testament in general proposes. The

destiny of Christian life is great, but neither Christians as a group nor the individual Christian is freed or protected from struggle. Rather, all those evils that burden human life are thought of as putting the Christian to the test, just as Jesus himself had been put to the test. Whether or not the "temptation" evoked in the Our Father be brought into relation to the Jewish notion of an eschatological "tribulation", "test", or "ordeal", those who prayed the Our Father stood in need of God's gracious will to help them in their hour of trial.

#### Biblical Horizons Supposed by "Testing"

Usage of the biblical vocabulary of "testing" includes a wide variety of meanings and purposes. God, for example, tests the fidelity of his servants, individually and as a group. Occasionally in scenes when the LXX depicts peirasmos, the hand and control of God are evident and we can safely say that here God administers the test or act of testing. Satan's connection with peiramos in the LXX is minimal. When we come to the sense or point of praying "lead us not into temptation," we shall naturally focus on the New Testament use of peirasmos. But first we shall examine the Greek Old Testament.

We have ample evidence that "God tested Abraham" (Gen. 22:1) and tested or proved Israel. In dealing with Hezekiah, "God left him to himself, in order to try him and to know all that was in his heart" (2 Chron. 32:31). These

are famous instances, but they are not the only ones in which God has been portrayed as the agent of peirasmos.

If a person desires to show fidelity to God, this, according to Ben Sira, includes a readiness to be tried: "My child, if you aspire to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for an ordeal" (2:1). These passages of wisdom literature associate wisdom with God. Wisdom tries God's servant "with her discipline till she can trust him" and tests him "with her ordeals" (4:17).

Rewards are great for those who are tested. Their refining is seen as a perfect burnt offering, as the book of Wisdom shows: "God was putting them to the test and has proved them worthy to be with him; he has tested them like gold in a furnace, and accepted them as a perfect burnt offering" (3:6). Ben Sira promises that "No evil will befall one who fears the Lord, such a one will be rescued even in the ordeal" (33:1). Again, "Someone who has never had his trials knows little" (34:10). Here, we find no reference to God. The experience of trials (the verb ἐπειράθη is used here) is itself seen as an aid to self-knowledge.

In the story of David's census of Israel and Judah, "Yahweh's anger was roused against Israel and he incited David against them" (2 Sam. 24:1). According to Chronicles, "Satan took his stand against Israel and incited David to take a census of Israel" (1 Chron. 21:1).

In these two accounts there is no mention of peirasmos; the verb Πειράζω does not occur, rather, ἑπισηΐω is used for inciting David. The agent behind the inciting action differs: in Samuel it is God, in Chronicles it is Σιάβολος. With regard to the mention of Satan:

It must not be forgotten that one of the most noteworthy features of the Old Testament theology is the rare reference made to Satan. There is no express mention in the Hebrew Scriptures of Satan as a personal spirit of evil, who is the enemy of God and His kingdom. (Friedlander 160)

What in reality is the Jewish view of the source of evil?

In the Jewish prayer (Daily Prayer Book, p. 7) the evil inclination within man's heart is the source of all evil. This Jewish view is ultimately based on Genesis viii. 21, which says, 'for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth,' and on Genesis vi.5, which teaches that 'every imagination of the thought of man's heart is only evil'. (Friedlander 159)

God tests a person's heart: "Remember the long way that the Lord your God has led you these forty years in the wilderness, in order to humble you, testing you to know what was in your heart, whether or not you would keep his commandments" (Deuteronomy 8:2). When his people journeyed in the wilderness, God led them through the arid waste, delivered them from snakes and scorpions, made water flow from flint for them, and gave them manna unknown to their ancestors. All this "that he might humble you and test you, to do you good in the end" (Deuteronomy 8:16).

In Judith the people of Bethulia say, "Let us

rather give thanks to the Lord our God who, as he tested our ancestors, is now testing us" (8:25). The Old Testament writers interpret God as Divine Alchemist, and the world as his laboratory. In it human beings are tested, tried, and, at times, refined. Biblical tradition presents him as Maintainer, Protector, and Rescuer of his creatures. He, the Teacher who, in humbling his creatures, allows them to understand themselves, and so to take their place according to his plan of things. God is above all the author of love. As C. S. Lewis's fictional demon, Screwtape, puts it, "He really loves the hairless bipeds he has created" (74).

The biblical writers attribute everything to the omniscient and omnipotent Lord. Not a sparrow falls to the ground against his will. Every animal in the forest is his and he knows every bird in the mountains (Ps. 51:10f). Dietrich Bonhoeffer adds: "Satan also is in God's hands" (Creation and Fall 112). Hence Satan's need to ask permission from God for Job's temptation.

Throughout the whole of Jewish theology the Devil plays a comparatively little part compared with that assigned to him in Christian theology. Already in the Talmud, the Devil, or Satan, is identified with the 'Yezer Hara, or evil inclination within man (Baba Bathra, 16 a). (Friedlander 159-160)

Is the figure of Satan bound up with "temptation" as bait or lure? The answer, surprisingly is, No; and this holds. He simply serves as God's instrument in "testing." We have



only drawn attention above to the incident in Chronicles in which the "devil" (Σάβωας) is said to have incited David to take the census, and to Satan as having played a part in the story of Job. But Prince Mastema does play such a role in intertestamental literature. We meet him in the Book of Jubilees in the retelling of Abraham's ordeal (Genesis 22:1), but found in Jubilees in 17:16:

Then Prince Mastema came and said before God: 'Abraham does indeed love his son Isaac and finds him more pleasing than anyone else. Tell him to offer him as a sacrifice on an altar. Then you will see whether he performs this order and will know whether he is faithful in everything through which you test him'. (Jubilees 105)

Jubilees 18:1 then relates closely to Genesis 22:1-11. But in Jubilees 18:9 we find: "Then I stood in front of him and in front of Prince Mastema." In this part of Genesis (22:11) Abraham is standing with the knife raised over the boy, when "the angel of the Lord called to him from heaven." In Jubilees 18:12 "The prince of Mastema was put to shame" (107), when Abraham was, indeed, found to be faithful to God. Abraham's faithfulness is told in Genesis (22:15-18), and in Jubilees 18:15-16 (108-109). An earlier reference to Mastema is found in 10:8 Jubilees, and the note tells us that Syncellus uses ὁ Σάβωας for the leader of the spirits and undoubtedly connects Mastema with the Devil or Satan (59).

As we approach the New Testament we should recall to mind, first, that Jesus and his disciples were Jews,

heirs not only of the Old Testament but of non-biblical religious traditions. Some of these traditions belonged to what M. E. Stone has called, in his Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, "the 'surprising' Judaism of the second century B. C. E." The sources of this surprising Judaism, apart from the Book of Daniel, were extra-biblical. "Indeed, almost all of the them were preserved outside the Jewish tradition, either by various Christian churches or by archaeological chance" (Stone 188). This literature had its impact on Jesus and his disciples.

The Hastings Dictionary offers the following theological remarks on the history of the doctrine of the personality and agency of Satan:

The complete revelation of such a being as the malignant author of evil was reserved for the time when, with the advent of Christ's Kingdom, the minds of God's people were prepared, without risk of idolatry, to recognize in the serpent of Eden and in the Satan who appeared as the Adversary of Job and of Joshua, the great Adversary of God and man, whose power is to be feared and his temptations, resolutely resisted, but from whose dark dominion the Son of God had come to deliver mankind. (570)

In Matt. 26:41 and in Mk. 14:38 the disciples are advised by Jesus to "Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak." Luke, too, records the warning but slightly differently: "Rise and pray that you may not enter into temptation" (22:46). The occasion for the advice was the

Gethsemane scene where Jesus finds his disciples asleep. As we have argued above, these passages are connected with the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer. "To enter into" temptation is somehow to fall victim to it.

In the parable of the Sower, who is spreading the word of God, "Satan immediately comes and takes away the word which is sown in them" (Mk. 4:15b). The imagery of "some seed fell along the path, and the birds came and devoured it" (Mk. 4:4) is paralleled in Jubilees 11:11. There, too, we find reference to Satan: "Then Prince Mastema sent ravens and birds to eat the seed which would be planted in the ground and to destroy the land in order to rob mankind of their labors" (66).

In his essay "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered", Brown notes, "Many find this metaphor dealing with the sower, soil, and birds very artificial," and he refers to Cadoux as one scholar who points out that "the fault should be attributed to the soil, and not to the birds" (262). Brown agrees that Cadoux makes a good point, but he finds that "there is no real reason to think that the basic imagery of this part of the Gospel explanation would not have been intelligible to Jesus' hearers, and the opposition of Satan to the kingdom seems to be a perfectly authentic echo of Jesus' ministry" (262).

In the New Testament Satan or the devil or the evil one appears frequently, as John McKenzie observes:

Satan is also called the strong one (Matt. 12:29; Mk. 3:27; Lk. 11:21), the evil one (Matt. 13:19), the prince of this world (Jn. 12:31). Satan is a tempter who even tempts Jesus (Matt. 4:1; Mk. 1:13; Lk. 4:20). When Peter attempts to dissuade Jesus from His passion, Jesus calls him Satan; his thoughts are human, not divine (Matt. 16:23, Mk. 8:33). Satan figures in the parable of the Sower, (already mentioned). He puts the betrayal of Jesus into the heart of Judas (Jn. 13:2), and then entered Judas for the consummation of the deed (Lk. 22:3; Jn. 13:27). Satan tries to sift the disciples like wheat (Lk. 22:31). He filled the heart of Ananias with deceit (AA 5:3). He tempts with designs (1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:11) and with wiles (Eph. 6:11) and with snares (1 Tim. 3:7; 2 Tim. 2:26). He disguises himself as an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14). He seduces some of the faithful (1 Tim. 5:15). He is the enemy who sows cockle in the field of the Lord's wheat (Matt. 13:39; Lk. 8:12). He is like a roaring lion seeking prey (1 Pt. 5:8). Christians should give him no room to work (Eph. 4:27).

Satan also has power to do bodily harm. He has a house and a kingdom (Matt. 12:26; Mk. 3:23; Lk. 11:18). He claims that all the kingdoms of the world are in his power (Lk. 4:6). Luke so constructs the temptation narrative as to show that the power of Satan, which is frustrated in the temptation "until an opportunity" (Lk. 4:13), finds its opportunity in the passion of Jesus, the hour of the power of darkness (Lk. 22:53). The power of Satan is the power of darkness opposed to the power of light also in AA. 26:18. Satan bound a paralyzed woman for 18 years (Lk. 13:16), and his angel is the 'thorn in the flesh' from which Paul suffered (2 Cor. 12:7). It is to Satan as the agent of bodily harm that sinners and adversaries of the apostles are delivered (1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20). Satan hindered Paul from making a journey to Thessalonica (1 Th. 2:18). The Antichrist comes with the active power of Satan (2 Th. 2:9). In the millennium Satan

is bound in the pit (Apc. 20:2); he is then released and permitted to work destruction in the final world period (Apc. 20:7). But the time granted to the devil is short (Apc. 12:12). He has the power to kill (Heb. 2:14). But Satan is subject to the power of God and is ultimately to be subdued. If Christians resist the devil he will flee from them (Js. 4:7); God will crush Satan under their feet (Rm. 16:20). (Dictionary of the Bible 775)

While McKenzie presents a complete listing of the many references in the New Testament to Satan and his activities, and Hastings offers a reasonable explanation of the agency of Satan, Ruth Anshen in her work, The Reality of the Devil: Evil in Man certainly does not deny the existence of the devil or evil, but she takes a very different view from those of Hastings and McKenzie. She claims:

According to the doctrine of redemption dominating Christian theology, men are indeed slaves of Satan. Not even the tragic conflict between the forces of darkness and the forces of light, culminating in the crucifixion of the Son of God and His resurrection could triumph over Satan. For with the doctrine of the everlastingness of hell, Christianity assigned an eternal existence to Evil and suffering. (xvi)

Despite Anshen's view which seems to question God's right, as Christians see it, for punishing evil, she is not completely without hope for human beings themselves. Thus, she offers the existential viewpoint that "perhaps for the fleeting moment that each person's life fills, man may rise above time and an indifferent eternity and transcend the

diabolic forces which infuse both nature and man" (xvii).

When writing about evil in man, Anshen seems to suggest that man alone might resolve the problem. Leonardo Boff cites a document of Vatican II, to the contrary, "Man finds that by himself he is incapable of battling the assaults of evil successfully so that everyone feels as though he is bound by chains" (Gaudium et Spes 13 211). The significant phrase "by himself" leads on to the next two paragraphs in Gaudium et Spes:

But the Lord Himself came to free and strengthen man, renewing him inwardly and casting out that prince of this world (cf. Jn. 12:31) who held him in the bondage of sin. For sin has diminished man, blocking his path to fulfillment.

The call to grandeur and the depths of misery are both part of the human experience. They find their ultimate and simultaneous explanation in the light of God's revelation. (13 212)

The view of Vatican II and Boff's reference to it in his study of The Lord's Prayer (101), lead us, finally, back to our text and its meaning today.

#### **The Point of Praying "Lead Us Not Into Temptation"**

We wish to determine the point of praying "and lead us not into temptation" in the Lord's Prayer. First, we naturally situate ourselves in continuity with the Lord's first followers and disciples. Of them Jesus demanded a full personal surrender. Because the disciples were the ones to whom Jesus gave the Lord's Prayer, an examination of how they understood themselves and their experiences with Jesus

may help us to understand Jesus and his words. "The disciples," no doubt, should themselves be understood in the totality of their experience of discipleship. This includes their experiences of deserting and denying Jesus, their memory of Judas's betrayal of him, and Jesus' poignant words of warning about the need for prayer in standing up against temptation, despite their own frailty (Mk. 14:38; Matt. 26:41; Lk. 22:46).

Originally, Jeremias argued, the testing in question was "the final, most severe proving of faith at the disclosure of the mystery of evil, the final persecution and imminent seduction of God's saints by pseudoprophets and false saviours "(The Lord's Prayer 29). Although during the ministry of Jesus the disciples shared many experiences with him, we gather that with the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, their discipleship took on a more significant meaning. With the coming of the Holy Spirit, as the Acts of the Apostles makes clear, their discipleship came to fruition. Yet, one cannot help wondering why these men, who had been so privileged by Jesus, had taken so long to comprehend his message. They were taught by Jesus, they witnessed the miracles he had performed, they ate and travelled with him during his ministry. Still, even toward the end of Jesus' career these men had not learned "the way" of Jesus.

Did the experience of temptation in which they

deserted and denied Jesus bring the disciples to know themselves better? Peter's sorrow and contrition tell us it did. Bonhoeffer points out that "the heart of man is revealed in temptation. Man knows his sin, which without temptation he could never have known, for in temptation man knows on what he has set his heart" (Creation and Fall 112).

To be chosen as a disciple was a unique privilege. To them it had been given "to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 13:11). The significance of discipleship is evident in Jesus' giving this special prayer to them. By it they are privileged to address God as Father. "Although we cannot always be certain of the audience, there is some evidence that Jesus used the expression "Your Father" when he was speaking to his disciples rather than to people in general" (Harner 52). In certain passages, though, such as those which come from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount or Luke's Sermon on the Plain (Matt. 5:44, 48; 6:14-15, 30-32; 7:11; Luke 6:27-28, 36), we are unsure whether Jesus is addressing his disciples or people in general (cf. Matt. 5:1; Luke 6:17-20). Here too, however, it is possible that Jesus originally addressed his sayings to his disciples. Harner observes:

The similarity between these sayings and the Lord's Prayer helps to support this view. When Jesus used the expression "Your Father," he was reassuring his audience that God would forgive them, God knew their needs, God would answer their prayers, and



God had promised to give them the kingdom.  
(52)

As earlier suggested the word "Father" could have been offered as a prayer complete in itself. Though it functions in the Lord's Prayer as the address and salutation to God, it "also continues to govern the remainder of the prayer," as Harner suggests. He states what this new relationship with God meant to the disciples:

By expressing the new relationship that the disciples have with God, it establishes the context within which they continue to pray and trust that their prayers will be answered. Because the disciples regard God as their Father, they can pray for the coming of his kingdom, the forgiveness of sins, or protection from temptation. In this sense the word "Father" not only introduces the prayer but makes the entire prayer possible. (56)

Mindful of the force of temptation which had brought them to desert or deny their Lord, the disciples surely would have realized what the point of praying the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer was for them. Transformed by the Easter events, the disciples oversaw the tradition of Jesus' acts and words (Luke 1:1-2).

We find no explicit record informing us that the apostles taught the Lord's Prayer to their congregations.

Nevertheless, the high probability is that they did, for the Synoptic Gospels are largely written records of the oral tradition. Moreover, the Oldest Church Manual (early second century), is the Didache, the Teaching of the Twelve

Apostles. In this manual, Chapter 8, the Lord's Prayer is preceded by a short introduction evidently taken from the directions on prayer in the Sermon on the Mount. The prayer is followed by the injunction 'Pray thus thrice a day' (187-189).

We know, too, that the early Christians had their share of temptation encounters. The Christian ideal called for courageous moral struggle, resistance to evil and the evil one. In 1 Cor. 10:8 Paul warns Corinthians against "sexual immorality," and in 11:21 about their abuses at the Lord's Supper. In his first epistle Peter tells the people they "had already spent enough time in doing what the Gentiles like to do, living in licentiousness, passions, drunkenness, revels, carousing, and lawless idolatry" (4:3). He then exhorts them in the words: "discipline yourselves, keep alert. Like a roaring lion your adversary the devil prowls around, looking for someone to devour. Resist him, steadfast in your faith, for you know that your brothers and sisters in all the world are undergoing the same kind of suffering" (5:8-9).

In 1 Timothy, the writer notes that certain false teachers have been teaching the faithful to occupy themselves "with myths and endless genealogies that promise speculations rather than the divine training that is known by faith" (1:4). The writer then declares "the aim of such instruction is love that comes from a pure heart, a good

conscience, and sincere faith. Some people have deviated from these and turned to meaningless talk" (1:5-6).

In the epistle of Jude the writer is advising against false teachers. These have been abusing the freedom of the gospel. The writer is intent on combatting their influence and describes them as "ungodly persons who pervert the grace of God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" (4).

In 2 Peter the writer strongly encourages the people to keep steadfast in faith. He advises "You must make every effort to support your faith with goodness, and goodness with knowledge, and knowledge with self-control, and self-control with endurance, and endurance with godliness, and godliness with mutual affection, and mutual affection with love" (1:5-7). He vows not to stop reminding them of the lawless, and of those especially who indulge their flesh in depraved lust and who despise authority (2:10). Acts 5:9 uncovers the lie of Ananias and Sapphira, who keep back part of the proceeds of the land. Paul faces the Corinthians with the practices of sexual immorality in the case where "a man is living with his father's wife" (1 Cor. 5:1). He counsels them "not to associate with anyone who bears the name of brother or sister, who is sexually immoral or greedy, or is an idolater, reviler, drunkard, or robber" (1 Cor. 5:11). In very strong words Paul continues to instruct them: "Do you

not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers - none of these will inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 6:9-10).

Persecution lent a special relevance to our topic. When Christians came under persecution in Rome, their need for the Lord's Prayer and its sixth petition to enable them to withstand apostasy in the face of severe suffering and even death became clear. The leaders of the church in the 60's of the first century were martyred (Peter, Paul, James). This drama of blood-witness highlighted Jesus' purpose in giving them the Lord's Prayer and its sixth petition. This was a prayer for hard times, dark times, times of pain. The ultimate trial called for the ultimate protection, which only God could give. The sixth petition had a special significance for a church threatened by fire, by the sword, by the terrors of the arena. In the face of the test of faith only one who would lose "his life for my sake" would find it (Matt. 10:39, 16:25; Mk. 8:35; Lk. 9:24). This was the central meaning of the sixth petition.

## CONCLUSION

Through the centuries the temptation-clause of the Lord's Prayer has been debated. Though Matthew 6:13 and Luke 11:4 are the same in all MSS, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, Marcion (110-165) contributed his interpretation, Tertullian (160-230) in De Oratione, his, and Martin Luther (1483-1546) in The Small Catechism, his. Professor Moule's essay is joined by the efforts of many scholars today who turn their attention to the demands of the Lord's Prayer. His objection to understanding the expression εἰς πειρασμόν as 'into the hands/power of temptation/the test' was at one level resolved in the light of semitic parallels. Nevertheless, the Greek text remained problematic in antiquity, as the text from the Epistle of James showed with good probability. Again, the expression μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς was illuminated by reference to the imperfect tense (of the causative of 'alā'), which originally carried a permissive nuance: "Do not allow us to go." However, the Greek expression was problematic to early Christians, as the same text from James showed.

We found it easier and more certain to say what Matthew and Luke did not mean by the last petition of the Our Father than to show in detail how exactly each interpreted the text. We had to qualify carefully our positive recovery of their interpretations. We understood

both to agree in substance with the instruction of James.

One cannot be involved in a study of the Lord's Prayer without receiving many benefits. The present inquiry has allowed me to become most appreciative of the success of the historical-Jesus studies as well as of redaction-critical commentaries on Matthew and Luke. Although I had long been aware of the Lord's Prayer as a paradigm of praise and petition, I had not concentrated in so focused a way on the significance of the sixth, -- the only negative--petition. I had also not paused sufficiently to consider the amazing positive side of temptation or testing, the entry into discipleship which this searing experience can effect. The examination of test/temptation/ordeal in various biblical scenes and contexts has reinforced the meaning of temptation as a revelation of the self. The words of the Old and New Testament hold up a mirror of complex surfaces and depths for any one willing to experiment with different angles of vision.

Interpreting temptation has had many rewards for me. It has forced me to see the Lord's Prayer as the prayer of the historical Jesus, to view it in its Matthean version and in its Lucan form, and to enjoy the many explorations in the Bible which such analyses promoted. At the same time it has afforded the opportunity of becoming familiar with the works of many fine scholars who have

devoted their writing to the Lord's Prayer. I was pleasantly surprised in the course of my research to find yet another recent work on the Lord's Prayer, the 1992 volume by Nicholas Ayo. In each of the various enquiries which scholars present of the Lord's Prayer a similar and constant statement can be found. In commenting on it, each one, at one time or other, declares that the Lord's Prayer is unique, a prayer of lasting character. We are told that Tertullian in his third-century commentary on the Pater defined it as "a compendium [breviary] of the whole gospel" (Ayo 5). Ernst Lohmeyer declares it to be "a breviary of the breviary" (297), and Heinz Schürmann states that "the gospel is the context for understanding the Lord's Prayer, and the Paternoster is the context for understanding the gospels" (Praying with Christ 3-4).

In his poem of sonnet sequence entitled "Altarwise by Owl-Light," which stretches in its references from Genesis to Revelation, Dylan Thomas offers five lines in sonnet seven, which I find suitable to bring this study to a near conclusion:

Now stamp the Lord's Prayer on a grain of  
 rice,  
 A Bible-leaved of all the written woods  
 Strip to this tree; a rocking alphabet,  
 Genesis in the root, the scarecrow word,  
 And one light's language in the book of  
 trees. (476)

I think the poem is relevant here because of the actual pondering which it can provoke within us. H. H. Kleinman,

who interprets the poem, has drawn attention to the verb "strip," the preposition "to," which introduces the adverbial phrase "to this tree," and the noun "tree," which follows the preposition. We will see that the interpretation which he offers, has much to do with the way these three parts of speech function. To some degree, we are perhaps reminded of the difficulties which the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer seems to suggest because of the way its verb, preposition, and noun work.

Kleinman gives his meaning for lines one and two:

The inscribed rice grain, like the mustard seed, has now sprouted into a many-leaved Bible made of all the trees in the world; it is the multiplication of the Word into many words. 'Written woods' is a play on the written words or printed pulp. It is this book or Bible which Thomas commands to be stripped to the tree. (86)

However, in raising three questions, "does Thomas ask that the Tree of Knowledge be stripped of its fruit, or does he refer to the bark-stripped rood, or does he mean Christ, stripped of his garments" (86), Kleinman is ready to offer his answers. He shows that it is the preposition "to" in the group "strip to this tree" that gives "strip" a special meaning in the context of Thomas's imagery of books, because it is a bookbinding term. Next, he claims that "strip" can also be seen as a logger's term for tree cutting. But lastly, he finds that "strip" may also mean "bind," and it is in this sense that "Thomas asks that the Bible be stripped or bound to the tree as a posted warning



containing an alpha-omega history, literally the ABC christcross-row of creation and destruction" (86). Here, Thomas has brought us to face the reality that we are God's creation, but even so that we can be destroyed. Bleak as the destruction notion is, Thomas concludes the tenth sonnet "in a spiralling ascent of faith" (11), which reminds us to savour the assurance and benefaction we receive in praying the Lord's Prayer, and in asking in its sixth petition that God will save us from ourselves.

## WORKS CITED

- Abbott, M. Walter. General Editor. The Documents of Vatican II. New York: America Press, 1966.
- Anshen, Ruth. The Reality of the Devil: Evil in Man. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Ayo, Nicholas. The Lord's Prayer. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- Beare, Francis Wright. The Earliest Records of Jesus. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Boff, Leonardo. The Lord's Prayer. Translated from The Portugese by Theodore Morrow. New York: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. Creation and Fall. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Bonhoeffer for a New Generation. Edited by Otto Dudzus. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1986.
- Brown, F., S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1907.
- Brown, Raymond E. "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," in New Testament Essays. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered," in New Testament Essays. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1965.
- Carmignac, Jean. Recherches sur le "Notre Père". Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1969.
- Collingwood, R.G. Speculum Mentis or The Map of Knowledge. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Idea of History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Conzelmann, Hans. Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.

- Dalman, Gustaf. The Words of Jesus. Authorized English Version by D.M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Davids, Peter H. The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.
- Davies, W.D. and Dale Allison, Jr. editors. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited, 1988.
- Dibelius, Martin and Heinrich Greeven. A Commentary on the Epistle of James. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Friedlander, Gerald. The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1969.
- Harner, Philip B. Understanding the Lord's Prayer. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Hastings, James. Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings with the assistance of John Selbie and John C. Lambert. Vol. 11. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich. Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie, Vol. 1. Leipzig: I.B. Freiburg, 1897.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Lord's Prayer. Translated by John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Prayers of Jesus. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Unknown Sayings of Jesus. Translation by Reginald H. Fuller. London: S.P.C.K., 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Testament Theology. Vol. 1. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research", Exp. Times 71 (1960), 141-146.
- Joüon, Paul. L'Évangile de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ. Traduction et commentaire du texte original grec compte tenu du substrat sémitique. Paris: Beauchesne, 1930.

- Kee, Howard Clark, Franklin W. Young, Karlfried Froehlich. Understanding the New Testament. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957.
- Kleinman, H. H. The Religious Sonnets of Dylan Thomas. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- Kuhn, Karl. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," in The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1957.
- Lewis, C.S. The Screwtape Letters. London: The Centenary Press, 1942.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst, "Our Father": An Introduction to the Lord's Prayer. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Louw, Johannes, P. and Eugene A. Nida. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Marshall, I. Howard. Eerdmans' Handbook to the Bible. Edited by David Field, Donald Guthrie, Gerald Hughes, Alan Millard, I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1973.
- McKenzie, John L. Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1965.
- Moule, C.F.D. "An Unsolved Problem in the Temptation-  
Clause in the Lord's Prayer," Ref. Theo. Rev. 33 (1974), 65-75.
- Newman, Barclay M. Jr. A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament, in The Greek New Testament. Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. Stuttgart: Biblia Druck, 1966.
- Petuchowski, Elizabeth R. Trans. "The Spiritual Wealth of the Lord's Prayer" from Recherches sur le 'Notre Père'. By Jean Carmignac, in The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy. Edited by Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. New York: The Seabury Press, 1978.
- Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1960.

- Quinton, Anthony. Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought. Edited by Alan Bullock and Oliver Stallybrass. London: William Collins Sons & Co., Ltd., 1977.
- Schaff, Philip. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, The Didache and Kindred Documents. With translations by Philip Schaff. New York: Funk & Wagnall, Publishers, 1895.
- Schürmann, Henry. Praying with Christ: The "Our Father" for Today. Translated by William Michael Ducey and Alphonse Simon. New York: Herder, 1974.
- Seesemann, Heinrich. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translator and Editor Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. VI., 23-36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- Smith, C.W.F. "Lord's Prayer" in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, 154-158.
- Stone, M.E. Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha. New York: E.J. Brill, 1991.
- Thomas, Dylan. "Altarwise by Owl-Light" in The Pocket Book of Modern Verse. Edited by Oscar Williams. New York: Washington Square press, 1973.
- Trench, Richard. Synonyms of the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Co., 1880.
- Vanderkam, James C. Translator. The Book of Jubilees. Louvain: In Aedibus & Peters, 1989.