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ABSTRACT

The Lord’s Prayer is one of the most discussed texts within the Christian scriptures (Matt 6:9-13/Luke 11:2b-4). Most commentators have focused on the Matthean version of the prayer and have overlooked the source from which it comes: Q and its context. Both canonical versions of the prayer alter it and place it in different literary settings. This re-contextualizing of the original prayer has produced interpretations that either obscure or reinterpret the message from Q. These efforts have been overly influenced by extraneous source material, often subject to certain interpretative tendencies involving Jewish prophetic, Jewish intertestamental apocalyptic literature, and/or Christian eschatological pronouncements. However, recent scholarship on the Q Prayer Instruction (Q 11:2b-4, 9-13) has shown that the attached aphoristic commentary (Q 11:9-13) provides both interpretative guidelines and controls that limit the range of possible outcomes and points to how the community understood the prayer. Specifically, Ronald Piper has established that the aphoristic clusters in the formative stratum of Q exhibit an intentional and identifiable literary design with the last verse, in this case Q 11:13, serving as the “interpretative key” to the entire speech. This dissertation, following Piper’s work, has examined the images within Q 11:9-13, especially v. 13, in order to highlight its climatic function in the set of aphorisms. Within Q 11:9-13, each subunit
(11:9-10, 11-12, and 13) builds to the conclusion (v.13). Q 11:13, therefore, controls the meaning of the entire Prayer Instruction (Q 11:2b-4, 9-13). Thus, it is the imagery of v. 13 that determines the parental behavior expected in vv. 11-12. This image is the attentive, providing, and protective parent. The meaning of and expected behaviors of the “father” in the invocation is defined by the responsive and generous parent of v. 13. Thus, in order to understand the Q “prayer” within its setting, (11:2b-4, 9-10, 11-12, 13) it is necessary to start with the attached aphorisms and grasp their contextual force and full meaning. This study argues that the complier of the Q speech intentionally attached the aphorisms to the prayer and structured them in a specific and progressive way in order to provide the lens through which the entire speech should be seen.
CHAPTER ONE

THE STATUS QUAESTIONIS

Introduction

The prayer ascribed to Jesus in Q (Luke) 11:2b-4, but usually quoted as the Lord’s Prayer from Matthew 6:9-13, has received a great deal of scholarly commentary. As a result, it is the Matthean perspective and context that controls the interpreter’s understanding of the praise and petitions that belong to Matthew’s version. One of the chief differences between the Matthean and Lukan forms of the prayer is the immediate contextual placement of the material. Luke creates a larger speech than is found in Q by inserting the “Friend at Midnight” pericope (11:5-8) in between the prayer (11:2b-4) and the accompanying aphorisms (11:9-13). These units are interrelated and create a unified message in the Luke’s gospel. In the reconstruction efforts of the Q Seminar, scholars view 11:5-8 as a Lukan insertion to an otherwise intact Q speech: the Q Prayer Instruction. Matthew, however, separates the prayer (Matt 6:9-13) from the sapiential cluster (7:7-11), thus disturbing the unity of the speech and the aphorisms that were designed to control the interpretative range of the entire unit. This will be discussed more fully in Chapter Three. Although Luke’s gospel disturbs the setting of the Q Prayer Speech less than Matthew, his insertion of the “Friend at Midnight” parable (Luke 11:5-8) also separates the direct influence of vv. 9-13 on the prayer Q 11:2b-4. Scholars who discuss the Lukan version, likewise, address Lukan theology due to the placement of the prayer in his gospel, as will be more fully explained. Furthermore, there are many
scholars who address the prayer on its own, without any context at all. This freestanding prayer material is then associated with extraneous verses used to support particular, often theologically motivated, interpretations. Additionally, a few scholars use Q/Luke 11:9-10/Matthew 7:7-8 in a general, de-contextualized way to support their arguments. Moreover, as will be shown in Chapter Three, the sweeping assumption of an eschatological character to the Q speech is the result of scholars focusing on one or two points found in Q 11:9-10. Current research, especially the work of Ronald Piper, will simply show such efforts to be misguided. This chapter addresses the current and general pattern of interpreting the prayer, commonly known as the “Lord’s Prayer,” outside the controls of Q.

Major Scholarly Interpretations of the Lord’s Prayer:

T. W. Manson and the Lord’s Prayer

One of the earliest and more influential commentators on the Lord’s Prayer has been T. W. Manson. It is proper, therefore, to begin the review of the major contributions of the study of the Lord’s Prayer with him. The majority of New Testament scholars today use the Two Document Hypothesis to describe the development of the synoptic gospels. Concerning our study, then, most scholars recognize that the original form of the Lord’s Prayer is Q 11:2b-4. Matthew (6:9-13) and Luke (11:2b-4) redacted this

---

1 The two sources are the Gospel of Mark and the Sayings Gospel Q. Both of these sources were used by Matthew and Luke in the creation of their respective gospels. Henceforth, the Two Document Hypothesis shall be referred to as 2DH. The history and scholarship of the synoptic gospels will be discussed in Chapter Two.
Manson is an important early contributor to Q studies. In his work, *The Sayings of Jesus*, Manson demonstrates a keen awareness that Q is one of two synoptic sources. However, when he discusses the Lord’s Prayer, he does so from a liturgical viewpoint. This liturgical Lord’s Prayer is an amalgam of Luke (11:2b-4), Matthew (6:9-13), and the *Didache* (8:2). Manson ignores the original Q version and gives his attention to the liturgical Lord’s Prayer. This refocusing away from Q and its crucial literary setting to a freestanding liturgical Lord’s Prayer has dominated discussion of the “prayer.” In so doing, the Q setting is lost, and more particularly, so is its interpretative context.

The shift of attention away from the Q prayer to the freestanding liturgical Lord’s Prayer is one of the curious features of the scholarly commentary on the prayer. In many cases, the prayer itself is often secondary to more primary concerns of commentators. Manson addresses the Lord’s Prayer in his book entitled *The Sayings of Jesus* and in two

---

2 A good example of how Q is viewed as part of the shared material in Matthew and Luke concerns the *hapax legomenon* “epiousios.” This unique word appears only in Matthew and Luke and is one of many reasons why scholars argue that a common source was used by these gospel writers. Somewhat typical in this regard is Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*, trans. David E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 147.


4 Most Q scholars agree that Matthew adds (6:13b) “…but rescue us from the evil one” to Q 11:4. The *Didache* (8:2), then, tacks on the doxology “for Thine is the power and the glory forever” to Matthew 6:13b, thus forming the liturgical Lord’s Prayer.

5 Since this study is concerned with the form of the prayer in Q, the petitions within the larger ‘liturgical Lord’s Prayer’ (*Did 8:2*) that are not found in the Q version will not be discussed.
articles. Understandably, with the entire scope of Jesus sayings, Manson provides only implied or indirect treatment of the Q prayer cluster. Nevertheless, Manson is right to appreciate the force of the accompanying aphorisms (Matt 7:7-11/Luke[Q]11:9-13) and this can be seen in the title he gives to the unit: “Free Access to God.” For Manson, this pericope emphasizes God’s responsiveness to human needs. Matthew 7:9-11/Luke[Q]11:11-12 pose parental responses to the desires of a child that are “deliberately and frankly absurd” with “each question” demanding “the answer, ‘Of course not.’”7 However, these aphorisms are not viewed in the continuous Q setting (Q 11:9-13) where they directly follow and interpret the preceding prayer (Q 11:2b-4).

When discussing the Lord’s Prayer, Manson does so by recognizing two forms. In the first, below, he considers the “the earliest recoverable form of the Lord’s Prayer.”8

Father, hallowed be thy name.
Thy kingdom come.
Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our bread for the coming day.
And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.
And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

In his John Rylands lectures, Manson’s focus was on the liturgical use and development of the prayer. As such, much of his discussion is based on the text from the Didache (8:2) and its setting, below.9

---


7 Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, 81-82.

8 Manson, "The Lord's Prayer: II," 436.

9 Manson, "The Lord's Prayer," 102.
And do not pray as the hypocrites do, but as the Lord commanded in his gospel: “Prayer thus, ‘Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done as in heaven so on earth; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for thine is the power and the glory for ever’. Pray thus three times a day.”

As can be seen, both versions of the prayer are viewed without a literary context.

Thus, the text Manson interprets does not represent any one gospel, let alone Q. Manson does provide his reconstructed Lukan text, but it has little bearing on his discussion. For the purpose of clarity, it is below.10

And when it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place, that when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, “Lord, teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples.” And he said unto them, “When ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation.”

This presentation highlights one of the most salient features of discussion of the Lord’s Prayer. That is, it is done so in a context-free fashion. This allows commentators to supply their preferred contexts as they examine words and phrases. In this way, Manson begins his interpretation with the invocation. After noting its simplicity and directness, Manson regards Luke’s “Father” (11:2) as more probable than the “Our Father” in Matthew 6:9.11 However, for Manson, behind the Matthean and Lukan Greek πάτερ is the Aramaic Abba.12 Here, Manson appeals to Romans 8:15 (“For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!”) and Galatians 4:6 (“And because you are children, God

---

10 Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 265.
11 Manson, "The Lord's Prayer," 104.
12 Ibid., 104.
has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!”), and argues that Paul’s use of the title is evidence of the way Jesus himself taught the prayer. The use of *Abba* may have been a way for Paul to recreate familiarity with God. However, without further argumentation, such an inference is unjustified.

Manson continues his liturgical focus by noting that the Matthean, “Our Father in heaven,” is a “stock phrase of Jewish Synagogue piety.” It becomes clear that Manson’s use of Matthew and Luke is focused on the reconstruction of its pre-gospel, liturgical form and the historical roots going back to Jesus himself. He does not search for the Sayings Source (Q) upon which Matthew and Luke relied, according to the Two Document Hypothesis.

In Manson’s second article, he describes his purpose as clarifying the “use of the [Lord’s] Prayer in the early Church and the extent to which this use for liturgical or catechetical purposes had modified its original form.” Said another way, he shifts his attention from his arguments of reconstruction to those of its function “as a religious exercise or ‘means of grace.”

Manson begins with his argument that stresses the importance of *Abba* as an address for God. He emphasizes Jewish traditions that revere the name God, and posits

---

13 All English citations of the Christian New Testament (not including Q texts) are from the *New Revised Standard Bible* unless otherwise noted.

14 Let us note that Manson does not supply any textual evidence to support his statement. Manson, "The Lord's Prayer," 105.

15 Ibid., 113.

16 Manson, "The Lord's Prayer: II," 436.

17 Ibid.
that the pious Jewish custom of avoiding pronouncing the Tetragrammaton and “hallowed be your name” in the Lord’s Prayer are in harmony with this sensibility. In this way, Manson attempts to create heightened significance for Jesus’ teaching that followers should address God as *Abba*. Manson argues that in first century Palestine, *Abba* was the equivalent of “Dad” as used in the U.K. or “Papa” on the “Continent.” For Manson, this prayer certainly reflects the exact teaching of Jesus that God should be understood as a loving and protecting father and will respond to our total dependence on him. This special relationship is signified by *Abba*. As we shall see, this interpretation was to have a great deal of influence on Jeremias and subsequent commentators. The notion of total dependence on God, which is invited by this appellation, teaches the “primary condition” for entry into the Kingdom, as he states: “This means that the primary condition of entry into the Kingdom of God is total trust in God springing from a sense of total dependence upon him.”

Commenting on Matthew 6:10 ("Your kingdom come; Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven"), Manson claims that the prayer underlines God’s kingdom as eternal and yet a present reality. He argues that this petition refers to a future eschatological event and, in support, he cites 1 Corinthians 16:22 (“Maranatha”) and Revelation 22:20 (“The one who testifies to these things, says, ‘Surely I am coming soon.’”). Here, we must note that Manson, of the many texts available to him, chooses ones that refer to the

---

18 Ibid., 437.
19 Ibid., 438.
20 It must be noted that Matt 6:10bc are not in Q. “Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.” Thus, it is removed from interpretations of the Q prayer, but is relevant to how Manson treats the Lord’s Prayer.
coming of Jesus and the beginning of the eschatological age. Additionally, given two segments of the same verse, Manson emphasizes the eschatological over the earthly. That is, the petition for God’s will to be done on earth does not necessarily connote an imminent end time. It may just as well imply a hope that God will bestow upon the inhabitants of this world his blessings and equip his followers to faithfully follow his will.

As he moves to the petition concerning bread, he translates *epiousios* as “tomorrow’s bread,” opining, “It seems clear that the meaning of the Greek word translated “daily” is something like “for the coming day,” so that, “give us bread for the coming day,” brings in the idea of future nourishment, “material provision that is necessary for God’s servants.” Thus, Manson sees an eschatological character to the petition that prepares the community for the imminent end time for which they have petitioned in Matthew 6:10a.

Then, after noting that the supplication of Matthew 6:13, “‘Lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil’…has always caused great perplexity,” his solution to the problematic idea of God deliberately “tempting” someone to sin is to observe that *πειρασμός* can also mean “trial” or “testing,” as seen in Sirach 2:1: “My child, when you come to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for testing (εἰς πειρασμόν).”

This reconstruction of what Manson considered to be the original form of the prayer became the foundational work for many scholars. Manson set out the main arguments and interpretations, and thereby shaped subsequent scholarly discussion of the

---

21 Manson, "The Lord’s Prayer: II," 442.

Lord’s Prayer. Yet, because Manson did not reconstruct the source upon which Matthew
and Luke depended, he was not able to use the contextual controls of the Q community to
secure, with textual evidence, the lens that the compilers of Q had put in place.

Ernst Lohmeyer

Ernst Lohmeyer has provided a more extensive treatment of the Lord’s Prayer in
his book entitled “Our Father: An Introduction to the Lord’s Prayer.” Lohmeyer is a good
example of how the Matthean version is given primacy (Matt 6:9-13).

The Lord’s Prayer has been handed down to us in two places in the New
Testament and in two versions. The first and most important form, indeed,
quite simply, the Lord’s Prayer, has been preserved by St. Matthew’s Gospel
in the Sermon on the Mount (6:9-19). It consists of the full address, “Our
Father who art in heaven”, and six or—according to another way of
counting—seven brief petitions. In some ancient manuscripts a concise
doxology and a simple “Amen” have also been transmitted as a conclusion to
the prayer… 23

When discussing the context of the prayer, Lohmeyer begins:

In Matthew, the Lord’s Prayer stands in a context which is distinguished by
similarity of form and affinities of content. The instructions about alms
giving, prayer and fasting (6:1-18) are not commands, but admonitions; they
are to be fulfilled like traditional exercises of piety. Nowhere is there an
explanation of these exercises or the reason for them; it is simply said how
they are to be carried out. The way in which this is to be done is determined
by the eschatological opposition of hiddeness and openness; all these
exercises are to be done in secret because God will reward them openly. For
now is already the time when the signs of God’s eschatological works are
beginning to appear; therefore those who recognize these signs live and work
in secret even from themselves, so that the left hand does not know what the
right is doing. 24

Lohmeyer’s. By comparison, Lohmeyer provides 246 pages for the analysis of the Matthean form and 23
pages for the Lukan text.

24 Ibid., 20.
Several important points need to be made concerning Lohmeyer’s comments. First, and again, the context of the Matthean version is accepted as “the” setting. Second, Matthean theology about piety dominates Lohmeyer’s interpretation. Third, not based on the literary evidence of the prayer, eschatological theology enters the discussion. One could quibble about whether Lohmeyer’s view of Matthean theology may or may not be accurate, but one must acknowledge that this discussion has nothing to do with the Q prayer, and in fact, it shades and generally overshadows the source from which Matthew’s text comes, Q.

The eschatological nuance is over and over again given a dominant position. This interpretation is developed before any specific verse or petition is analyzed by Lohmeyer. Note the following:

So for the Gospel according to St. Matthew the Lord’s Prayer is the basic prayer for the eschatological community of his disciples, not a prayer for individuals, but for the community, not for the necessities of human life but for the requirements of the life of a disciple, life in this eschatological time, which will presently emerge from its hiddenness into the eternal light of the eschatological day of God.\(^\text{25}\)

When Lohmeyer turns to the Lukan setting, he highlights the didactic element found in Luke 11:1 (“Teach us to pray.”). Luke’s version is said to present the hieros logos, that is, the “prayer is a holy heritage from a holy past.”\(^\text{26}\) Lohmeyer rightly explains, though partially, that “the difference between these two accounts of Matthew

\(^{25}\) Ibid., 21.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 22.
and Luke is not to be explained from one piece of tradition, but is connected with the
material and historical difference which characterize both Gospels all the way through.”

Lohmeyer begins his discussion of the specific verses of the prayer by broadly
discussing the notion of God as father in antiquity. While conceding that the designation
“Father” occurs abundantly in the surrounding world of Jesus, in Judaism and in Greek
religions, Lohmeyer argues that this way of referring to God is “taken over from a Jewish
pattern.” While conceding that Homer refers to God as “father Zeus, who rules over the
gods and mortal men,” Lohmeyer interprets this, based on a comment by Aristotle that
the fatherhood of Zeus is one of “paternal rule over children.” In keeping with the
popular reading and informed devotional tone of the book, Lohmeyer does not provide
the specific citation of this quote of Aristotle. Below is Lohmeyer’s statement without
identification of his source.

Paternal rule over children is like that of a king over his subjects. The male
parent is in a position of authority both in virtue of the affection to which he
is entitled and by right if his seniority: and his position is thus in the nature
of royal authority.

In this way, Lohmeyer tries to distinguish the flavor of divine fatherhood in Greco-
Roman sources from those from the Judeo-Christian tradition. For example, Lohmeyer
builds on the immediately above citation and states,

So the name ‘father’ first of all simply means the same as the word ‘lord’,
namely that there is an unconditional and mutual bond between father and

27 Ibid., 22.
28 Ibid., 41.
29 No citation of Homer is provided by Lohmeyer.
30 Lohmeyer does not provide the citation of this quote of Aristotle, generally keeping with the popular
child which on the one side has the character of sovereign will and on the other that of necessary obedience.\textsuperscript{31}

While conceding that within Jewish material, God as father is sometimes viewed as lord or master (e.g. Mal 1:6a: A son honors his father, and servants their master), Lohmeyer emphasizes an aspect of tradition where God is seen as having “natural paternity” with his people.\textsuperscript{32} However, Lohmeyer argues that this fatherhood is limited to being the “father of the [his] people.”\textsuperscript{33} For example, Lohmeyer comments, “But the special colouring and definition arises from the fact that this fatherhood relates solely to the chosen people.”\textsuperscript{34} In this way, Lohmeyer attempts to create a wedge between two related views. The first is the recognition that an aspect of the father-child relationship explicit in the prayer flows from Jewish traditions. The second is his argument that there exists a unique dimension of this relationship introduced by Jesus to his followers.

‘Father’ as a form of address to God and the idea behind it are anticipated elsewhere. But even if it has not been newly minted in the Lord’s Prayer, but taken over from a Jewish pattern, the question arises whether there is still something special in the address, and in what this consists. ‘Abba, Father,’ a cry preserved both in Aramaic and in Greek, and according to Mark 14:36, already used by Jesus, shows that Primitive Christianity knew and believed that the name Father was its special possession with a special significance. It is a cry not of the man who prays but of the holy Spirit (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6), and this very cry shows the complete change which has been achieved in the world among men and peoples by the gospel of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 38.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 40.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 40.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 40.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 41.
At the same time, Lohmeyer links this special relationship with the father in the prayer to his eschatological understanding of the fulfillment of the entire ministry of Jesus.

The one basic fact, however, that has not hitherto been included is that God reveals and will reveal himself as the Father in what happens and is proclaimed here and now, and will soon come to pass. The eschatological reality and presence of this one action and this one fact, the Fatherhood of God, is the new element which is contained in the address, ‘Our Father’. Just as the Spirit of God, through whom alone the faithful can cry ‘Abba, Father’, is a means and a way towards guaranteeing the beginnings and the eschatological consummation, so too the Fatherhood of God reveals itself as its ground and destiny.36

He is Father because he is now beginning to complete what he has made and to fulfill what he has promised. Just as the message of the kingdom of God proclaims an event which is coming and is present, whether men see it or not, so too the idea of the Father has a place in the strict objectivity of the eschatological event…The one common foundation is this: the Fatherhood of God is revealed in the fact that ‘the kingdom of Heaven’ is at hand and that the pronouncement of this nearness is now made clear.37

What must be stressed is that Lohmeyer’s views of the prayer, up to this point, are based on the invocation under discussion, “Our Father.” Nothing more is being considered. From this, it is not difficult to surmise that Lohmeyer brings to “the prayer” a predetermined sense of a special relationship that Jesus has with God, and by implication his disciples, due to his eschatological ministry. The only texts we have of the Lord’s Prayer (Matt 6:9:13, Luke 11:2b-4, Did. 8:2) all have πάτερ as part of the invocation and to go from familial discourse to an eschatological consummation based on one word is premature.

36 Ibid., 42.
37 Ibid., 52.
When discussing “hallowed be thy name,” Lohmeyer generally confines himself to Judeo-Christian usage.\(^{38}\) He notes that in the LXX ἁγιάζειν is the rendering of qādaš with the meaning of “to be made or kept holy,” or “to be recognized as holy.”\(^{39}\) For example, Lohmeyer argues for similar usage in the following verses:\(^{40}\)

Then Moses said to Aaron, “This is what the Lord meant when he said, ‘Through those who are near me I will show myself holy, and before all the people I will be glorified.’ And Aaron was silent. (Lev 10:3)

For I am the Lord who brought you up from the land of Egypt, to be your God; you shall be holy, for I am holy. (Lev 11:45)

But the Lord of hosts is exalted by justice, and the Holy God shows himself holy by righteousness. (Isa 5:16)

… and say, Thus says the Lord God: ‘I am against you, O Sidon, and I will gain glory in your midst. They shall know that I am the Lord when I execute judgments in it, and manifest my holiness in it;’ (Ezek 28:22)

So I will display my greatness and my holiness and make myself known in the eyes of many nations. Then they shall know that I am the Lord. (Ezek 38:23)

For when he sees his children, the work of my hands, in his midst, they will sanctify my name; they will sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and will stand in awe of the God of Israel. (Isa 29:23)

In a similar way, according to Lohmeyer, the Kaddish proclaims the holiness of God: “Magnified and sanctified be his great name in the world which he hath created according to his will.”\(^{41}\) Interestingly, Lohmeyer draws a connection between being holy or sanctified and being perfect as God is perfect. Although not providing an identifiable

---

\(^{38}\) In this discussion Lohmeyer cites many texts some of which appear within pp. 63-87: Ps 118:26; Isa 29:23; Mark 11:9; Acts 20:32; 26:18; 1 Cor 6:11; Rom 15:16; Rev 22:11.


\(^{40}\) Ibid., 67-69.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 66.
citation, Lohmeyer appears to quote Matthew 5:48 when he refers to this being “echoes in the words of the Sermon on the Mount: ‘you must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.’”\textsuperscript{42} In this way, Lohmeyer argues, “This is the essential thing about the concept of holiness, that it binds God and man together in one communion.”\textsuperscript{43} While reserving judgment on this view, it must be pointed out that the Matthean context is clearly influencing Lohmeyer’s view of the prayer.

When Lohmeyer begins to discuss the petition, “May your kingdom come,”\textsuperscript{44} he demonstrates an awareness of Hellenistic traditions when citing examples such as the \textit{Iliad} (23:770), when a god is called out to: “Hear, goddess, graciously come to my aid.”\textsuperscript{45} However, he distinguishes the Greek tradition of calling upon the gods from a Judeo-Christian understanding of a specific time that is hoped to come.

In the New Testament, the word, ‘come’, in a transferred sense, primarily denotes a certain point of time at which something will happen: ‘The days will come’, ‘the hour has come’, ‘the time had fully come’ (Matt 9:15; Mark 14:41; Gal 4:4); this also corresponds to the well-known Old Testament usage: ‘The day of the Lord comes’ (Joel 3:1; Isa 63:4; Mal 4:1, 5) or, ‘The days are coming’ (Amos 4:2; 8:11; 9:3; Isa 39:6; Jer 7:32; 9:25; 16:14; 19:6 etc.). One can recognize the different application of the phrases by comparing the familiar verse in Homer: \textit{ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ᾽ ἄν ποτ᾽ ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή} (\textit{Iliad} 4:448) (The day will come when holy Ilium shall fall).

In Homer, the day which ‘will be’ is one of a series of days; this is a constant and equal flow which runs according to its own laws from an unknown origin to an unknown goal. In the Bible, the days ‘come’ irregularly, like the visits of friends or the attacks of enemies; no fixed rule governs their sequence; … Other events or states come, like time, whether they are processes in nature or happenings in human or historical life; good and evil

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 70-71.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 71.

\textsuperscript{44} That is, forms of \textit{ἔρχομαι}.

\textsuperscript{45} Lohmeyer, \textit{Our Father: An Introduction}, 90.
(Rom 3:8), faith or apostasy (Gal 3:23-25), the law (Rom 5:20), temptations (Matt 18:7), perfection and the kingdom of God all come (1 Cor 13:10; Luke 22:18).

This matches Old Testament usage; there too good and evil (Jer 17:6), heat and cold, sunshine and hail, ‘the word of God’ (Jer 17:5), death and corruption, grace and mercy (Ps 55:15; Prov 1:26; Ps 119:41, 77), come, and Isa 5:19, very similar in form and content to the petition in the Lord’s Prayer, runs: ‘Let the purpose of the holy One of Israel draw near, and let it come, that we may know it!’

In this way, Lohmeyer argues that the petition for the kingdom to come is a thoroughly Judeo-Christian request. However, he attempts to distinguish a unique feature of the Christian, specifically New Testament, usage that has the character of a specific discontinuous event or an in-breaking of a divine kingdom.

In Judaism, God’s kingdom comes to pass in the eschatological future because it has been coming to pass through all the past and the present though concealed by the veil of history, while in the Gospels a kingdom ‘comes’ in an imminent ‘tomorrow’ which was not there before…it becomes the ‘coming world’ of God…

Furthermore, Lohmeyer argues that the petitions that hallow God’s name and the hope that his kingdom will come are connected. “For ‘to hallow God’s name’ also means to recognize and praise him as the sole Lord of creation: where his name is praised, there is his kingdom.”

Lohmeyer provides considerable discussion on the possible options for interpreting epiousios. For Lohmeyer, four possibilities exist:

1. Bread for today, as in a daily ration with epiousios being an abbreviation for ἐπιουσίων, that is sufficient for the day or the daily ration. Lohmeyer

---

46 These are continuous paragraphs in Ibid., 91-92.

47 Ibid., 99.

48 Ibid., 100.
conjectures that this may correspond to the Latin *diaria*, or “a day’s allowance for food.”

2. A second possibility considered views *epiousios* as a compound of *epi* + *ousia* (substance, being, essence): that is, bread for subsistence, necessary for existence, or essential for existence.

3. The third option is *epiousios* as a compound of ἐπί + ἰέναι which is the present infinitive of ἐῖμι indicating a future day or for the next day.

4. The last possibility discussed by Lohmeyer entertains the possibility of *epiousios* as a participial form of ἐπί + ἐῖμι, or ἔπειμι; to come, especially the next day.

Since *epiousios* is a *hapax legomenon*, commentators are forced to consider a wider range of possibilities for analysis. Lohmeyer does this by examining the Jesus’ sayings about eating and drinking. A prime example of which, for Lohmeyer, is Luke 22:30, where the eating and drinking will occur in his kingdom, that is, in the future Eschaton. Not surprisingly then, Lohmeyer argues for an eschatological rendering of *epiousios* in keeping with his general eschatological thrust for the entire prayer.

The idea of the eschatological coming is also stamped on the first three petitions and is concentrated in the one word *epiousios*, because this petition for bread shows that we must speak not only of an eschatological future but also of an eschatological present which makes today, the place of all need, at the same time the place of all blessing.

For Lohmeyer, the petition seeking forgiveness carries the essential feature of “give to get” or social reciprocity, one might say. That is, as we expect to be forgiven, so must we also forgive. This is clearly expressed, for Lohmeyer, in Sirach 28:2.

---

49 Ibid., 141-42.

50 LJS: οὐσία, or “that which is one’s own, one’s sustenance.”

Forgive your neighbor the wrong he has done, and then your sins will be pardoned when you pray.

However, for Lohmeyer, Sirach 28:2 does not carry the full meaning of what is being forgiven since it uses ἁμαρτία or the Greek sense of sin as a wrongdoing. For the prayer contains the word ὀφειλήματα or a sense of debt to God, according to Lohmeyer. In this way, Lohmeyer argues that New Testament texts such as the Parable of the Talents (Matt 25:14-30 par), the Unmerciful Steward (Matt 18:21-25), and the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8) suggest a sense of being entrusted with, so as to owe something in return, or to be obligated to God. This sense of indebtedness, for Lohmeyer, is not limited to legalities. Rather, it involves, “The creator and the creature, the master and the servant, even the father and the child, are bound together…God once gave man his earthly existence in freely or fatherly trust, to receive it back from him again…” This divine act of forgiving our indebtedness is not limited to this life for Lohmeyer. Rather, it carries an eschatological dimension. This is, “Wherever there is forgiveness, there is God’s eschatological act among men.”

Lohmeyer addresses the last petition, “lead us not into temptation,” as others have, by noting that πειρασμός can mean a temptation or a test. In support of this distinction, he cites James 1:13 (“No one, when tempted, should say, ‘I am being tempted by God’; for God cannot be tempted by evil and he himself tempts no one.”). That is,

52 For his discussion see Ibid., 168-77.
53 Ibid., 171.
54 Ibid., 177.
God does not tempt us, but can and does test us. This leads Lohmeyer to ask the question, “First, who brings about the temptation?” Given the previous discussion of his pervasive eschatological lens, Lohmeyer predictably turns to Rev 3:10 (“Because you have kept my word of patient endurance, I will keep you from the hour of trial that is coming on the whole world to test the inhabitants of the earth.”) and argues that a great end-time “temptation” is coming. This grave period of temptation comes from our own desires and the work of the devil, according to Lohmeyer.

The apocalyptic basis here is particularly clear; temptation is not the work of God, but the work of the devil, who still has rule of the world…Those who pray are still in this world, and so they can and may be spared…So this petition, like the fifth, characterizes the suppliants in a twofold, only apparently contradictory, fashion, which faithfully reflects the eschatological situation in which they stand.

As our discussion of the contribution of Lohmeyer comes to an end, concluding observations are in order. Even though Lohmeyer provides a “classic” articulation of the eschatological “liturgical Lord’s Prayer,” his influence has been limited. Later, we will see how the more programmatic efforts of Joachim Jeremias has had a greater impact on how the prayer has been viewed. In many ways, the biblical, theological, and devotional works of Jeremias have had a lasting influence for at least a generation.

Robert Leaney

Robert Leaney’s contribution to the commentary is unique and quite distinct from Lohmeyer, because he focuses on the Lukan version of the prayer rather than the

---

55 Ibid., 193-94.
56 Ibid., 197.
57 Ibid., 198.
58 Ibid., 204-05.
Matthean. He stands against B. H. Streeter’s theory, that the differences in the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew and Luke are due to the existence of two independent versions.\(^{59}\)

Rather, Leaney argues that both evangelists were dependent on the Sayings Gospel Q for their prayer material. Yet, it must be said that in Leaney’s day, the reconstruction of Q was still highly speculative and the unity of the Prayer Instruction, Q 11:2b-4, 9-13 was not established. Leaney is moved to examine the Lukan prayer because of several factors. First, the Lukan prayer is generally overlooked. Leaney states, “History bears powerful witness to the fact that the Matthean version has entirely supplanted the Lucan in liturgical and private use.”\(^{60}\) However, for Leaney, the brevity suggests that the Lukan prayer is not later than Matthew’s and deserves attention. Second, while not developing an argument that the Lukan form predates the Matthean, or whole-heartedly assigning Q as the common source, Leaney finds enough merit in Luke’s version to provide its own examination. Thus, Leaney’s contribution furthers the study of the Gospel of Luke but not Q studies.

Leaney begins by noting that Gregory of Nyssa states that “may thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us” (ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς) may well be the original concluding verse to Luke’s version.\(^{61}\) Thus, Leaney considers whether his existing Lukan version, below, is concluded with ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς.

\(^{59}\) Robert Leaney, "Lucan Text of the Lord’s Prayer (Luke xi :2-4)," \textit{Novum Testamentum} 1, no. 2 (1956), 103.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 105.

\(^{61}\) Leaney does not provide a citation for the statement supposedly made by Gregory of Nyssa.
Πάτερ, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν· καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοί ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.

Since our concern is the Q text and not the reconstruction of the Lukan prayer, we will not delve into this question. A few brief comments are relevant here. Leaney associates the statement above, attributed to Gregory, with the mention of the Holy Spirit in Lukan verse 11:13 (If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!). For Leaney, use of the term “Holy Spirit” coheres with Lukan eschatology. According to Leaney, the coming of the Holy Spirit was a concept found in early liturgies; liturgies available to Luke. Hence he states,

If Luke was taught the Lord’s Prayer, it was certainly a Lord’s Prayer found in contemporary liturgy, our knowledge of which is necessarily very scanty; and it is admittedly difficult to find evidence among liturgies which will bear weight in a discussion involving one part of the text of the gospels…

From here we can see that Leaney’s concern moves to early liturgical forms and whether he can coordinate such data with his reconstruction of the Lukan prayer. One of his main sources is the work of Dom Gregory Dix. However, even Dix writes,

The fact is that the liturgical tradition of the text of the eucharistic prayer [his main concern] is the great historic rites—Syrian, Egyptian, Roman and so forth—only begin to emerge into the light of secure and analyzable evidence in the third-fourth century, and even then there are big gaps in our knowledge.

---

63 Ibid., 106.
64 Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press, 1945), 4-5.
Leaney does not discuss individual petitions of the prayer and is focused on recreating the Lukan prayer with the concluding verse discussed above. Thus, we can see that Leaney’s work is generally not a concern to us. However, he is worth noting because he is one of the first to clearly recognize that the discussion of the Lord’s Prayer has become disproportionately focused on the Matthean and overlooks the Lukan version, and we would add, their common source, Q.

Joachim Jeremias

Joachim Jeremias is one of the scholars, who, unlike Leaney, was indeed persuaded by Streeter’s theory that the Lord’s Prayer (Matt 6:9-13; Luke 11:2b-4) existed in two distinct catechetical versions: the Matthean form addressed the needs of a Jewish-Christian community while the Lukan text served the needs of a Gentile-Christian group. This view has important implications for our study. First, Jeremias does not recognize the broadly held view that Matthew and Luke were dependent on the Sayings Gospel Q. Second, Jeremias, therefore, does not allow the intentionally attached aphorisms of Luke (Q) 11:9-13 to influence and guide, as interpretative controls, his

---

65 There is also a form of the prayer within the Didache (8.2). Most commentators view that text as based on the Matthean version. For a discussion see Fitzmyer, Gospel According to Luke, 2.897. Davies and Allison, Matthew, 1.592. Luz, Matthew 1-7, 1.370.

66 Jeremias does not address whether the prayer is original to Q. Instead, he focuses on the time period when both Matthew and Luke were written. See Joachim Jeremias, "Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," Expository Times 71, no. 5 (1960), esp. 142. “At the time when the gospels of Matthew and Luke were being composed (about A.D. 75-85) the Lord’s Prayer was being transmitted in two forms which agreed with each other in essentials…” Joachim Jeremias, The Lord's Prayer, trans. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964), 7-10, esp. 7. Joachim Jeremias, The Prayers of Jesus (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1967), 85-89.

67 Most scholars do not support this view. One of the strongest pieces of evidence is the hapax legomenon “epiousios” which is seen as the result of a common text. It is improbable that two different communities would create or use a word that had never appeared before and does not appear after. See Schweizer, The Good News According to Matthew, 147.
interpretation of the prayer. Third, after Jeremias reconstructs his two versions, he treats
the longer Matthean prayer as the default for interpretation. Fourth, even with his
preoccupation with the Matthean prayer, he does not allow the current context to have
much bearing. Instead, fifth, he treats the prayer as a freestanding unit and then searches
for others verses, found throughout Judeo-Christian materials, in order to supply a
context. Sixth, Jeremias, like Manson, is interested in the pre-gospel development of the
prayer and argues for an Aramaic original.

Certainly, Jeremias was influenced by his mentor, Gustaf Dalman, who supported
this argument, even to the extent of creating a retro-translation from extant Greek texts
into a proposed Aramaic prayer. Jeremias was also encouraged by the work of Manson,
whom he often cites. The “search” for, or recreation of, an Aramaic original was a
prominent issue at the time Jeremias worked. Subsequent research, especially the

---


69 One of the earliest, before Dalman, was Charles C. Torrey, "The Translations Made from the Original
Aramaic Gospels," in Studies in the History of Religions Presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils,
Colleagues, Friends, ed. David G. Lyon and George Foot Moore (New York: Macmillan, 1912). Also see
Lohmeyer, Das Vater-Unser. ET: Lohmeyer, Our Father: An Introduction, 27-30, 60. Manson, The
Sayings of Jesus, 9-20, 168-71. Manson, "The Lord's Prayer: II," 437-38. It should be noted that Jeremias
cites Manson in the following works. Jeremias, "Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," 144-45. Jeremias, The
Scribner's Sons, 1965), 19. Also see Fitzmyer, Gospel According to Luke, 2.901. Strecker, Die Bergpredigt:
Ein exegetischer Kommentar. ET: Georg Strecker, The Sermon on the Mount: An Exegetical Commentary,
Johannes C. de Moor, "The Reconstruction of the Aramaic Original of the Lord's Prayer," in Structural
Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press,
John P. Meier, A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, 3 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1991-
reconstruction of the Q document, has made the Aramaic proposal highly doubtful.  

Very few, if any, current scholars entertain the Aramaic theory today. To this question, we now turn.

*Evangelist’s Dependence on an Aramaic Lord’s Prayer*

A few things need to be kept in mind concerning this question. It is one thing to suggest that the earliest oral versions were expressed in Aramaic (this must be done cautiously), and quite another to argue that the text that is reconstructed from Matthew/Luke is a translation from that written language. To do so, one would have to establish, not that a retro-translation is possible, but that the only texts we have, our Greek texts, exhibit the types of evidence that would indicate a woodenness or awkwardness common to translated materials. Petros Vassiliadis, Heinz O. Guenther, and John S. Kloppenborg have provided the textual analysis which forces them to conclude that in the reconstructed prayer, Q 11:2b-4, there are no clear signs of a translation from Aramaic into Greek.

Once Jeremias posits an Aramaic original prayer, he then strenuously argues that the appellant “Father” (πάτερ) hearkens back to the Aramaic *abba*. It is not unrealistic to

---


71 This was suggested by Charlesworth. See James H. Charlesworth, "Jewish Prayers in the Time of Jesus," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 13(1992), 48 N. 36.

conjecture, that at the level of oral tradition, this is possible. But there is insufficient evidence that an Aramaic text ever existed, at least one that was supposedly the basis of our extant Greek texts. However, for Jeremias, once the proposal of an Aramaic abba was posited, he then argues that Jesus, (and thereby also his followers) through this intimate language, possesses a new and unique relationship with God.\(^{73}\) The linguistic data Jeremias cites to substantiate his position has been forcefully challenged by James Barr and James Charlesworth.\(^{74}\) Barr draws attention to the comment by Jeremias that, “in the colloquial language of Palestine, 'abi had entirely given way to 'abbā, both in Aramaic and in Hebrew.”\(^{75}\) Thus, if there is a Semitic word behind πάτερ, it could be understood as either 'abi or 'abbā. Barr notes, “In fact the question as between Aramaic and Hebrew makes little difference to the meaning of 'abbā."\(^{76}\)


\(^{76}\) “Abba Isn't Daddy,” 30.
Barr also challenges Jeremias’ conclusion that the use of such a title signifies a special intimacy and familiarity such as found in a child talking to a parent, (“daddy”) since he has found evidence that adults used the term as well.\(^\text{77}\) In the end, Barr argues that Jeremias may have overstated the evidence in making the term \textit{abba} both unique to Jesus and reflective of a new relationship with God characterized by parent-child endearment.

Jeremias’ claim that \textit{abba} refers to an intimate paternal term is also questioned by Charlesworth. First of all, Charlesworth notes that God is frequently mentioned as father in Jewish texts: \textit{Sib} 3.228; 3.550; 3.726; 5.285; 5.328; 5.360; 5.406, 5.488; 5.500.\(^\text{78}\) Besides some of the criticisms of the \textit{abba} proposal made by Barr, Charlesworth suggest that the interest behind the claim of a new and unique relationship between Jesus and God is motivated by the following:

Too often Christians seek to develop christologically some aspect of Jesus’ life or thought by stressing his uniqueness. Many Christians around the world affirm that Jesus was Jewish; but they contend that he was a unique Jew, different from all other Jews. This bewitching oxymoron is proved to be false by further research into pre-70 Jewish liturgy. It is also seriously questioned by passages in the New Testament that with a high degree of probability derive ultimately from Jesus and reflect his own thought.\(^\text{79}\)

\(^{77}\) Barr draws attention to Isa 8:4 as a good example. “The context is about a child learning to speak” to human parents, both father and mother. “But what he learns to speak are the words of adult Aramaic, corresponding to the adult Hebrew of the original” because the Targum uses ‘abbā and the Hebrew text employs ‘abi. In Gen 27:31 the adult Esau speaks to his father. The Targum contains ‘abbā and the Hebrew text has ‘abi. See “‘Abba, Father’ and the Familiarity of Jesus’ Speech,” 175. Barr also notes that ‘abbā is commonly used to express the Hebrew ‘abi in other Targums (Gen 20:12; 22:7, 31; 31:5, 42) and in fact was a loanword.

\(^{78}\) Also see Isa 63:16; 64:7; Wis 2:16; Sir 23:1; 3 Macc 6:4-8; T. Levi 18:2-6; T. Jud 24:1-2; 1QH 9:35; m. Soṭah 9:15.

In the end, five challenges are supported against the claims of Jeremias. First, one cannot confidently point to an exclusively Aramaic origin to the term *abba* or the prayer. Secondly, while agreeing that *abba* stems from familial discourse, it cannot be rendered as intimate and childlike as the English “dad,” or be used to establish a unique relationship. Both children and adults used the term in the first century C.E. Third, *abba* in Aramaic stands linguistically close to the Hebrew paternal reference “my father,” which was used with affection but with more respectful nuances than suggested by “daddy.” Fourth, when *abba* is translated into Greek, the nominative with a definite article is often used, thus creating a more deferential impression than “daddy.” Lastly, the term “father” (πάτερ) was frequently represented in Jewish texts within or near the period in question.

*The Interpretation of the Lord’s Prayer by Jeremias*

In interpreting the Lord’s Prayer, Jeremias focuses on Matthew’s version. His insight on Matthew 6:9b, “Hallowed be your name,” is the observation that Jesus here abides by Jewish convention in honoring God’s name, “for in the earliest texts of the *Qaddish* the two petitions about the hallowing of the name and the coming of the kingdom appear not to be connected by an ‘and.’” The proposed parallels between the Jewish *Kaddish* and the Lord’s Prayer are important evidence for him. For Jeremias, this is so because of the “supposed” likelihood that both prayers were written in the same period, in the same language, and they originate from the same socio-cultural setting.

Exalted and hallowed be His great Name
In the world which He created

---

According to His will.
May He establish His kingdom
(some rites add: and cause His salvation to sprout,
and hasten the coming of His messiah.)
In your lifetime and in your days,
And in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel,
Speedily and at a near time.
And say: Amen.

May His great Name be praised forever
And unto all eternity.

Blessed and praised,
Glorified and exalted,
extolled and honoured,
magnified and lauded
Be the Name of the Holy One, praised be He—
although He is beyond all blessings and hymns,
praises and consolations
Which may be uttered in the world.
And say: Amen.

May the prayers and supplications
of the whole household of Israel
be acceptable before their father in heaven.
And say: Amen.

May there be abundant peace from heaven,
and life,
for us all Israel.
And say: Amen.

May He who makes peace in His high heavens
make peace for us and for all Israel.
And say: Amen.\(^{81}\)

However, there are serious problems with this association. The difficulties have to do with form-critical variances and the fact that the Kaddish did not exist in a stable textual form until centuries later. Apparently, this was unknown to Jeremias and those who espouse this relationship.82

When Jeremias interprets Matthew 6:10, (“Your Kingdom come, your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven”) he generally follows Manson, that the kingdom prayed for involves an eschatological intervention by God.

We see the two Thou-petitions are eschatological. They implore God to reveal His final glory, they ask for the coming of the hour in which God’s profaned and misused name shall be hallowed forever, and in which the triumphant call sounds: ‘The kingdoms of this world are become [sic] the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever’ (Rev 11:15). Their contents are identical with the prayer of the first community Maran-atha (1 Cor 16:22), ‘Come, Lord Jesus’ (Rev 22:20).83

As we noted for Manson, two of the texts, 1 Corinthians 16:22 and Revelation 22:20, call for the Lord himself to come, in order to begin a new eschatological era. However, a complete reading of the subunits of Matthew 6:10 shows that equal emphasis is placed on the request for God’s will to be done on earth. This surely modifies any notion of a focus on the end time arriving as soon as possible. The earth seems to be considered an abode where God’s will could be done, and hence, a blessed place to live.84 Furthermore, the petition is hardly coordinated with the more apocalyptic call for the coming judgment on the world when the Parousia of the Lord takes place. That is, once

82 See Appendices D and E, where these issues are discussed.


84 It must be noted that Matt 6:10bc are not in Q. “Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.” Thus, it is removed from interpretations of the Q prayer, but is relevant to how Jeremias treats the Lord’s Prayer.
the last two subunits were joined to the first, the meaning of the coming kingdom was surely modified.

Jeremias follows Jerome in his interpretation of Matthew 6:11, “Give us this day our daily (ἐπιούσιος) bread,” as a request for the eschatological meal. He is also echoing the ideas of Manson who argues for the same interpretation on the basis that ἐπιούσιος means bread for tomorrow. Below is the comment made by Jerome, followed by the discussion of it by Jeremias.

In the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews [Nararenes], instead of “essential to existence” I found “mahar,” which means “of tomorrow” so that the sense is: Our bread of tomorrow—that is, of the future,—give us this day. 85

In my opinion, it is decisive that Jerome tells us that in the lost Aramaic gospel of the Nazarenes the translation mahar appears ‘for to-morrow’. It is true, this gospel of the Nazarenes is not older than the Gospel of St. Matthew, but it was a translation of the First Gospel into Aramaic. In spite of this, the translation mahar—‘bread for to-morrow’—must be older than the gospel of the Nazarenes, even than the Gospel of St. Matthew. For the translator, when coming to the Lord’s Prayer, of course stopped translating—he simply gave the holy words in the wording which he prayed day-by-day. In other words, the Aramaic speaking Jewish-Christians among whom the Lord’s Prayer lived on in its original language in unbroken usage since the days of our Lord prayed: ‘Our bread for to-morrow give us today’. Jerome tells us even more. He adds a remark telling us how the word ‘bread for to-morrow’ was understood: mahar quod dicitur crastinum id est futurum, ‘mahar is: for to-morrow and that means future’…. Accordingly, says Jerome, the bread for to-morrow was not meant as earthly bread but as the bread of life. This eschatological understanding was indeed, as we know from the old translations, the dominating sense given to the word in the first centuries in the whole Church, the Eastern as well as the Western Church.

They all understood the bread for to-morrow as the bread of life, the bread of the salvation-time, the heavenly Manna. The bread of life and the water of life have been since ancient times symbols of paradise, an epitome of the abundance of all corporal and spiritual gifts of God.\footnote{Jeremias, "Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," 145. See also The Lord's Prayer, trans. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964), 23-27.}

Several points need to be kept in mind as we evaluate this argument. First, at this time, we cannot adequately assess the claims made by Jerome since the source, the Gospel of the Nazarenes, is lost. Second, Jerome wrote in the fourth and fifth centuries, that is, hundreds of years after the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and the Sayings Gospel Q were penned. Linguistic arguments spanning that length of time become tenuous as expressive and interpretative customs enter and leave languages. Third, Jerome lived during a time of great and expanding developments in eucharistic theologies and christologies. The degree to which Jerome is under those influences would need to be assessed in order to be confident in Jeremias’ claim. Fourth, to support his position, Jeremias cites texts that have highly particular contexts and cannot be easily applied to Matthew 6:11/Q 11:4. Below is a citation used by Jeremias from the discourse Jesus has with the devil. This verse serves, in the Gospel of Matthew, to state a central tenet in Judaism, following God’s word, and can hardly be used to substantiate a future or eschatological interpretation.

But he answered, “It is written, ‘One does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.’” (Matt 4:4)

Jeremias continues by citing the Lukan form of the verse that closes the Q document. Let us examine the Q text in question.

You who have followed me will sit .. on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Q 22:28, 30)
…so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Luke 22:30)

Luke’s verse is redacted to develop his theology of the disciples eating and drinking at Jesus’ table in the kingdom of God. This material is not present in the Q text and therefore speaks to Luke’s redactional interests and not to Q. The Q text, part of the major redaction, serves to cast judgment on those who reject the message of the Q tradents. The last verse Jeremias uses to support his viewpoint comes from the Bread of Life Discourse in the Gospel of John.

I am the living bread that came down from heaven. Whoever eats of this bread will live forever; and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh. (John 6:51)

Such thought is quite out of character to Q, yet at home within the Johannine community. As such, it is not reasonable to associate this Johannine theology with the Sayings Gospel without much more evidence and analysis.

It is revealing to see how Jeremias begins his discussion of Matthew 6:12, “And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.”

Even now—this is also the meaning of the petition for forgiveness, “And forgive us our debts as we also herewith forgive our debtors.” This request looks toward the great reckoning which the world is approaching, the disclosure of God’s majesty in the final judgment. Jesus’ disciples know how they are involved in sin and debt; they know that only God’s gracious forgiveness can save them from the wrath to come. But they ask not for mercy in the hour of the last judgment—rather they ask, again, that God might grant them forgiveness already today. 87

All of this is said, apparently, without any consideration of the context of the prayer.

Rather, the imported eschatological context is interpreting the words of the prayer. Most

87 Jeremias, The Lord’s Prayer, 27.
revealing is the following phrase by Jeremias where he clearly recognizes a here-and-now context of the prayer but instead overrules the obvious in order to promote his impending judgment hermeneutic: “But they ask not only for mercy in the hour of the last judgment—rather they ask, again, that God might grant them forgiveness already today.”

Jeremias varies little, if at all, from how Manson understands Matthew 6:13: “And do not bring us to the time of trial, but rescue us from the evil one.” Following James 1:13, “No one, when tempted, should say, ‘I am being tempted by God’; for God cannot be tempted by evil and he himself tempts no one,” Jeremias distinguishes two definitions for πειρασμός. The first is “trial” or “test,” while the second is “to tempt.” Based on the James text, Jeremias accepted that God does not tempt, but rather, tests or tries his children. At the same time, Satan is assigned the role of the tempter.

The enormous erudition and contribution by Jeremias to the discussion of the meaning of the Lord’s Prayer must be recognized. Although Jeremias generally follows Manson, he more forcefully set down the arguments which would bring the major issues to the light. At the same time, his work is more one of persuasion than of critical analysis where controls are established and followed in order to test his conclusions. By examining the Lord’s Prayer as a freestanding text apart from any gospel literary setting, Jeremias was overly impressed with certain “trends” in scholarship. One of those trends was searching for a kind of Ur-Christianity or Primitive Christianity that could more purely reveal the words and ministry of Jesus. Another fashion in his day was reading the

88 Ibid., 27.

89 For this discussion by Jeremias see, Ibid., 27-31.
synoptic gospels and Pauline letters as being under a pervasive eschatological influence. The methods of Jeremias and his findings have been challenged by a host of scholars yet it must be said, that he has influenced several others to follow his lead. At the same time, Jeremias has drawn attention to the need for a closer contextual reading of the prayer and texts that are supposedly associated with it. With this contextual reading method, his arguments for an eschatologically-oriented prayer dissolve. Furthermore, an analysis of the Q prayer in its own setting promises to be a more accurate representation of the view of the Q community.


Heinz Schürmann

Heinz Schürmann, whose work was appearing contemporaneously with Jeremias, shows his own dependence on Manson. What on the surface may appear to be a little devotional book, however, holds important scholarly arguments in the 488 footnotes. Influenced by Manson, and certainly Jeremias, Schürmann concurs with the proposal that *Abba* stands behind “πάτερ” (Matt 6:9). To support this position, Schürmann cites, Mark 14:36b (“He said, ‘Abba, Father, for you all things are possible’”) and in the letters of Paul, Romans 8:15c[16] (“When we cry, ‘Abba, Father!’ it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God.”) and Galatians 4:6 (“And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, ‘Abba!’”).

He agrees with Jeremias that such direct address departs “from the prevailing custom of his time, by using this more familiar form in addressing his heavenly Father.” Thus, he concludes that Jesus must be introducing his disciples to a more intimate, privileged, and special relationship with God: “Jesus therefore spoke to God in a completely new and intimate way, and so he instructed his disciples.”

Again, like Jeremias, Schürmann sees the petitions of the prayer as eschatological in their character, but he supplies more extensive argumentation than most. “May thy reign come” is the main point of his rationale. For Schürmann, the call for God’s reign to come indicates the “imminence of God’s kingdom.”

---

92 Schürmann, *Praying with Christ.*

93 Ibid., 9-11.

94 Ibid., 10.

95 Ibid., 11.
reveals the nearness of the eschatological actions of God and the divine struggle that was taking place. “Satan is Christ’s real enemy”, he notes, and “Satan’s rule must be overthrown.”

Schürmann’s image of the coming kingdom is drawn from a number of eschatologically-oriented pronouncements and parables. This kingdom of God is associated with the “new Israel,” the “people of God,” who are to “rule eventually over the ‘twelve tribes of Israel.’” When this community is “praying for the coming of God’s kingdom” they express their yearning for the “establishment of his dominion on earth.”

However, before God’s reign can be completely realized, “Satan’s rule must be overthrown,” for “Satan is Christ’s real enemy.” Thus, those who pray this petition “Your Kingdom come,” belong to the faithful who “are to sit with him as in a royal throne-room, sharing his rule, or we shall be as in a banquet-hall.” This eschatological kingdom is one “replete with happiness for men [sic].”

However, Schürmann also recognizes that the second petition concerning God’s Kingdom, “Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,” introduces divine care on earth, here and now as well. Thus, a singular focus on the “imminent” in-breaking of the Kingdom must be modified by this additional and equal focus on the establishment of God’s kingdom here on earth. He acknowledges this when he states,

96 Ibid., 31, 34.
97 Ibid., 33.
98 Ibid., 33.
99 Ibid., 34.
100 Ibid., 35.
101 Ibid., 35.
So ‘God’s kingdom’ really signifies two things: his supreme glory and dominion, and man’s salvation and eternal happiness. Therefore, wherever his rule has become a reality, there also will man find happiness. This combined result is actually what Christ is teaching us to pray for in the Our Father: that final condition of the world in which God is duly honoured and man attains true happiness…It looks indeed towards a future situation of universal blessedness for man and towards a renewal of all things…  

Since Schürmann fails to fully recognize both levels of God’s reign, now and in the future, he gives undue emphasis to the “renewal” of the earth in the coming end time. For Schürmann, the eschatological hope and fervent desire for it is the lens through which the prayer should be viewed and understood:

To this end, the world’s present condition must be changed, insofar as it is opposed to God. A new creation must come, since our present one is unable completely to reveal his glory. Man must be so thoroughly converted to the God of Revelation, to the “Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”, as St. Paul says, that a deep and joyful longing will move him to utter these prayer words.

Following Jeremias, Schürmann views several phrases within the Lord’s Prayer as bearing a resemblance with Jewish prayers, notably the Kaddish, with mention of the honoring of God’s name, the petition that his kingdom come, and that his will be done on earth as in heaven. These similarities force Schürmann to conclude that the Lord’s Prayer “originated” from Jewish customs and belongs to Jesus’ day.

The Lord’s Prayer has so much in common with Jewish prayers that we may regard them as having originated in substance during the time of Jesus. The petitions for the sanctification of God’s name, for the coming of his kingdom, and for doing his will, remind us of the kaddish, the two halves of the last petition of the Jewish morning and evening prayer. The opening address, the petitions for bread and forgiveness, have their analogies in the ‘Shimoneh Esreh’.

---

102 Ibid., 36.
103 Ibid., 43.
104 Ibid., 138 n. 461.
Although Schürmann sees similarities between the *Kaddish*, the “Shemoneh Esreh”\(^\text{105}\) and components of the Lord’s Prayer, especially the petitions for bread and for forgiveness, he fails to provide texts for comparison. Furthermore, there is no “one” *Kaddish* or “one” *Shemoneh Esreh*.\(^\text{106}\) Previously, the *Complete Kaddish* was provided.\(^\text{107}\) The *Eighteen Benedictions* is a long prayer and only relevant portions appear below.

*The Eighteen Benedictions* (Ancient Palestinian Version)

I.
You are praised, O Lord our God and God of our fathers,
God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob,
the great, mighty and awe-inspiring God,
God Supreme, Creator of heaven and earth,
our Shield and Shield of our fathers,
our trust in every generation.
You are praised, O Lord, Shield of Abraham.

III.
Holy are You,
and awe-inspiring in Your Name;
and beside You there is no God.
You are praised, O Lord, the holy God.

IV.
Our Father, favour us with knowledge of You,
and with discernment and insight out of Your Torah.
You are praised, O Lord, gracious Giver of knowledge.

VI.
Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned against You.
Blot out and remove out transgressions from before Your sight,

---

\(^\text{105}\) The *Shemoneh Esreh* is also commonly known as the Eighteen Benedictions, the *Amidah*, or the Standing Prayer. For a discussion of the many forms of the *Kaddish*, see Petuchowski, "Jewish Prayer Texts." Graubard, "The *Kaddish* Prayer."

\(^\text{106}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{107}\) See pp. 36-37.
for your mercies are manifold.
You are praised, O Lord, who abundantly pardons.  

Although, Schürmann specifically draws attention to a supposed resemblance between
the bread petitions in the Lord’s Prayer and the Eighteen Benediction, the version
supplied makes no mention of bread. It is possible that Schürmann has in mind the
“How Substance of the Eighteen.” This abbreviated version received rabbinic sanction from m.  

\textit{Ber} 4:3.  

Rabban Gamaliel says: A man should pray the Eighteen [Benedictions] every
day. R. Joshua says: The substance of the Eighteen. R. Akiba says: If his
prayer is fluent in his mouth he should pray the Eighteen, but if not, the
substance of the Eighteen.

Give us understanding, O Lord our God, that we may know Your ways.
Circumcise our heart that we may revere You.
Forgive us
so that we may be redeemed.
Keep us far from sorrow,
and feed us well in the pastures of Your land.
Gather our scattered ones
from the four corners of the earth.
May the erring ones be judged according to Your will;
and wave Your hand over the wicked.
May the righteous rejoice in the rebuilding of Your city, in the establishment of Your
temple,
in the flourishing of the horn of Your servant, David,
and in the perpetual dynasty of the son of Jesse, Your anointed.
Before we call,
you answer us.

---

108 Also see other versions in Petuchowski, "Jewish Prayer Texts," 27-30.

109 Petuchowski provides both the following comment and the “Substance of the Eighteen Benedictions.
Ibid., 35-6. “According to some early Rabbinic authorities, quoted in Mishnah Berakhoth 4: 3, it was either
sufficient to recite the “substance” of the Eighteen Benedictions for one’s daily prayer in any case, or, at
least, he could avail himself of the shortened version whose familiarity with the complete version left
something to be desired. Those rulings were, of course, given centuries before there were any written
prayerbooks. The “Substance of the Eighteen” has been retained in the traditional liturgy for use when
sickness or some other emergency prevents full devotional concentration on the full text of the Eighteen
Benedictions. It is envisaged that the first three and the last three benedictions of the regular Eighteen
Benedictions are recited in their normal form. But all the intermediate benedictions are contracted into one
single benediction, of which the text is here given.”
You are praised, O Lord, who hears prayer.

Here, we find mention of “feeding,” as well as a request for forgiveness. However, the Benedictions involve much more praise, many more petitions, and several theological markers absent in the Lord’s Prayer, such as “be redeemed,” “temple,” “your city,” “your anointed,” and “David.” This does not necessarily suggest a non-Jewish milieu for the Lord’s Prayer, so much as Schürmann discussing an association based on little evidence. Also, later it will be shown that Jewish prayers in the first century C.E. did not exist in any stable, written form, making such linkages tenuous at best and more often unfounded.

Concerning the petition for bread (Matt 6:11/Luke 11:3), Schürmann is rather surprising. He understands that “bread” is often used as a symbol for daily and necessary sustenance.\(^{110}\) Schürmann writes, “Bread is what we badly need, for which we must work hard…The fact that it is our bread indicates that it is absolutely indispensible to sustain life. No other interpretation is possible.”\(^{111}\) He finds a middle road in the ongoing argument over the meaning of *epiousios*, whether it should be translated “daily” bread, or as Manson and Jeremias claim, “tomorrow’s” bread. As seen above, the way the “tomorrow’s” bread has been interpreted is as an allusion to the eschatological banquet that will commence through the Parousia of the Lord. Schürmann holds that *epiousios* should be translated not “tomorrow’s” bread, but “daily” bread. Yet, he claims that the reference points to bread for the next day. He argues that one must place this petition

---


\(^{111}\) Ibid., 55.
against the backdrop of Palestinian life in the first century. The “daily” wage of the Palestinian worker is used “to buy flour for his wife to bake next morning…” So one would think that he would use this rather convoluted solution to return to the theme of the eschatological coming of the Lord’s kingdom. Instead, he seems to enter into the domestic life of the earliest followers, and claims that this petition points to the surrender of avarice and greed, the desire for things. As he says, “Thus it is clear, first, that in asking for bread, he [Jesus] teaches us to pray only for what is absolutely needed to sustain our life.” This request is made within a brief horizon of time, according to Schürmann, “So in this petition Jesus would not have us extend our request very far ahead. We are to ask only for what is needed now for the present moment, and not for what we are going to need all the days of our lives.”

What is interesting is that although Schürmann’s interpretation of the prayer up to this point is eschatological in orientation, the bread petition moves him to see the broader synoptic gospel ethic of living simply, not worrying, and trusting God. Schürmann builds his case for this view by citing certain texts and attempting to balance an imminent eschatological expectation with a call to live simply in the present day.

So do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will bring worries of its own. Today's trouble is enough for today. (Matt 6:34)

And why do you not judge for yourselves what is right? Thus, when you go with your accuser before a magistrate, on the way make an effort to settle the case, or you may be dragged before the judge, and the judge hand you over

---

112 Ibid., 56. Emphasis mine.

113 Ibid., 62. Emphasis Schürmann’s.

114 Ibid., 57.
to the officer, and the officer throw you in prison. I tell you, you will never get out until you have paid the very last penny. (Luke 12:57-59)\textsuperscript{115}

Schürmann’s commentary is worth noting directly.

Having now established the meaning of our petition, let us examine next who it is who is to pray in this way. Poor beggars surely who cannot worry about tomorrow because they are driven by the needs of today. They have to live from hand to mouth. Even the poorest hired-hand does not concern himself unduly about the next day: he gets his daily needs from his employer; his daily pay when evening comes suffices for the family’s needs on the following day. With this he is able to buy flour and oil, and perhaps a few fishes, and early next morning his wife can bake the bread for the day.\textsuperscript{116}

It is to the “poor” by voluntary choice that the petition of Jesus seems to be addressed above all, his own disciples who followed him and shared his poverty. On their lips therefore, such a prayer would have a special meaning and urgency, and could be interpreted literally. They had accepted Jesus’ call to follow him, leaving behind their families, their jobs, their possessions. But having done so, they could no longer provide “necessary bread” for themselves. Yet Jesus demanded clearly and forcefully, that they must resist every anxiety about material things, even about their physical sustenance: “Be not therefore solicitous for tomorrow” since “sufficient for the day is the evil thereof”. It was above all for these first followers that the injunction was meant: “seek not what you shall cat or what you shall drink, or wherewith you shall be clothed…But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you”.\textsuperscript{117}

When Schürmann addresses the petition seeking forgiveness, (Matt 6:12/Luke 11:4) his view falls generally in line with Jeremias. That is, the term “debt” is closer to the intended meaning than “sin” for Schürmann. When we live and behave in ways not in accordance with God, our wrongdoing is a debt that must be repaid. In support of this view, Schürmann draws attention to the Parable of the Unjust Servant,\textsuperscript{118} the Debtor’s

\textsuperscript{115} Also see Matt 20:1-15.

\textsuperscript{116} Schürmann, \textit{Praying with Christ}, 57-58.


\textsuperscript{118} “When he began the reckoning, one who owed him ten thousand talents was brought to him; and, as he could not pay, his lord ordered him to be sold, together with his wife and children and all his possessions, and payment to be made. So the slave fell on his knees before him, saying, ‘Have patience with me, and I
Forgiveness, the Unjust Steward, the Evil Husbandmen, and the story of money being entrusted to us. For Schürmann, “All of these are figures of our relationship to

will pay you everything.’ And out of pity for him, the lord of that slave released him and forgave him the debt. But that same slave, as he went out, came upon one of his fellow slaves who owed him a hundred denarii; and seizing him by the throat, he said, ‘Pay what you owe.’ Then his fellow slave fell down and pleaded with him, ‘Have patience with me, and I will pay you.’ But he refused; then he went and threw him into prison until he would pay the debt. When his fellow slaves saw what had happened, they were greatly distressed, and they went and reported to their lord all that had taken place. Then his lord summoned him and said to him, ‘You wicked slave! I forgave you all that debt because you pleaded with me. Should you not have had mercy on your fellow slave, as I had mercy on you?’ And in anger his lord handed him over to be tortured until he would pay his entire debt. So my heavenly Father will also do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother or sister from your heart.” (Matt 18:24-35)

“A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. When they could not pay, he canceled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will love him more? Simon answered, ‘I suppose the one for whom he canceled the greater debt.’ And Jesus said to him, ‘You have judged rightly’.” (Luke 7:41-43)

“Then Jesus said to the disciples, ‘There was a rich man who had a manager, and charges were brought to him that this man was squandering his property. So he summoned him and said to him, ‘What is this that I hear about you? Give me an accounting of your management, because you cannot be my manager any longer.’ Then the manager said to himself, ‘What will I do, now that my master is taking the position away from me? I am not strong enough to dig, and I am ashamed to beg. I have decided what to do, so that, when I am dismissed as manager, people may welcome me into their homes.’ So, summoning his master’s debtors one by one, he asked the first, ‘How much do you owe my master?’ He answered, ‘A hundred jugs of olive oil.’ He said to him, ‘Take your bill, sit down quickly, and make it fifty.’ Then he asked another, ‘And how much do you owe?’ He replied, ‘A hundred containers of wheat.’ He said to him, ‘Take your bill and make it eighty.’ And his master commended the dishonest manager because he had acted shrewdly; for the children of this age are more shrewd in dealing with their own generation than are the children of light.” (Luke 16:1-8)

“Then he began to speak to them in parables. ‘A man planted a vineyard, put a fence around it, dug a pit for the wine press, and built a watchtower; then he leased it to tenants and went to another country. When the season came, he sent a slave to the tenants to collect from them his share of the produce of the vineyard. But they seized him, and beat him, and sent him away empty-handed. And again he sent another slave to them; this one they beat over the head and insulted. Then he sent another, and that one they killed. And so it was with many others; some they beat, and others they killed. He had still one other, a beloved son. Finally he sent him to them, saying, ‘They will respect my son.’ But those tenants said to one another, ‘This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance will be ours.’ So they seized him, killed him, and threw him out of the vineyard. What then will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to others.’” (Mark 12:1-9)

“For it is as if a man, going on a journey, summoned his slaves and entrusted his property to them; to one he gave five talents, to another two, to another one, to each according to his ability. Then he went away. The one who had received the five talents went off at once and traded with them, and made five more talents. In the same way, the one who had the two talents made two more talents. But the one who had received the one talent went off and dug a hole in the ground and hid his master’s money. After a long time the master of those slaves came and settled accounts with them. Then the one who had received the five talents came forward, bringing five more talents, saying, ‘Master, you handed over to me five talents; see, I have made five more talents.’ His master said to him, ‘Well done, good and trustworthy slave; you
God: We are debtors to him.”¹²³ For Schürmann, our eternal tendency to not be mindful of God makes us completely indebted to God and we have an ever-present need to be released from that debt or sin.

The only “new thing” he [Christ] brought to them was the challenge if a new and deeper earnestness towards God, an unconditional surrender, complete love which must inform all moral conduct….Consequently, a new sort of obligation, a new “indebtedness”, has become incumbent upon man. He must love God perfectly, totally.¹²⁴

At the same time, there is a “stipulation” before we can expect to be forgiven—we must also forgive, according to Schürmann.¹²⁵

As we come to the last petition, “And do not bring us into temptation,” (Matt 6:13/Luke 11:4), we find that Schürmann follows Jeremias and others by differentiating divine testing from Satanic tempting. At the same time, this concern, to not be tempted, is related to the nearness of the eschatological judgment and the struggle between God and the devil.

It is therefore clear what we must consider to be the source of “temptation”.
It springs from the arena of Christ’s combat with the devil, which will attain

have been trustworthy in a few things, I will put you in charge of many things; enter into the joy of your master.’ And the one with the two talents also came forward, saying, ‘Master, you handed over to me two talents; see, I have made two more talents.’ His master said to him, ‘Well done, good and trustworthy slave; you have been trustworthy in a few things, I will put you in charge of many things; enter into the joy of your master.’ Then the one who had received the one talent also came forward, saying, ‘Master, I knew that you were a harsh man, reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you did not scatter seed; so I was afraid, and I went and hid your talent in the ground. Here you have what is yours.’ But his master replied, ‘You wicked and lazy slave! You knew, did you, that I reap where I did not sow, and gather where I did not scatter? Then you ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and on my return I would have received what was my own with interest. So take the talent from him, and give it to the one with the ten talents. For to all those who have, more will be given, and they will have an abundance; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away. As for this worthless slave, throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth’.”(Matt 25:14-30).

¹²³ Schürmann, Praying with Christ, 65.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 67.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 75.
its peak of intensity at the end of the world. But the battle has already been joined with the onset of his Passion. It still rages today, so that our lives are truly a “time of temptation” and of bitter testing, during which we all stand in constant danger of falling away. 126

From these observations, it is clear that Schürmann generally follows other commentators of his day by associating inappropriate contextual backdrops to the prayer, by beginning with a pervasive eschatological theology and reading it into the text, and by prematurely drawing analogies to prayers that arrived in final written form centuries later.

Raymond Brown

Raymond Brown has approached the Lord’s Prayer from a different posture. Where, most simply address the Lord’s Prayer and interpret it verse by verse, Brown begins with his conclusion, that the prayer is thoroughly eschatological in orientation, and then moves thorough the verses to support his argument. Although he generally follows Manson and Jeremias, his effort amounts to an apology for an eschatological Lord’s Prayer regardless of the context, be it Matthean or Lukan. Brown’s 1965 essay entitled, “The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer,” frankly argues for an eschatological lens for all the petitions of the prayer.127

In recent years there has been a great deal written on the Pater Noster (henceforth PN). Much of this literature has stressed the eschatological interpretation of the prayer as its more original meaning in the early Church. We wish to present here the case that can be made for such an interpretation.128

126 Ibid., 83-92, esp.87.


128 Ibid., 217.
Helpfully, Brown defines what he means by his use of the term “eschatological” so that his arguments for perfect coherence among the petitions have a control against which to measure the evidence:

At the outset we should make clear that by “eschatological” we refer to the period of the last days, involving the return of Christ, the destruction of the forces of evil, and the definite establishment of the forces of God’s rule.\(^{129}\)

With respect to the text, Brown does not appeal to the Sayings Gospel (Q) which the Two Document Hypothesis posits was the source of the Lord’s Prayer, redacted separately by Matthew and Luke. Brown recognizes that the briefer form found in Luke is probably the more original, but argues for Matthean vocabulary where they share one of the petitions. He accounts for the synoptic variance by positing that the Matthean form may have originally been written in an Aramaic and Syrian milieu, and the Lukan prayer from Gentile churches.\(^{130}\) For the sake of completeness, however, Brown notes the differences per text when he discusses each petition. The prayer in this form follows.

Title

Matt: Our Father who art in heaven (pl.)
Luke: Father
Did: Our Father who art in heaven (sing.)

\(^{129}\) Brown relies on the following to argue in order to argue that the gospels reflect the idea of a cosmic struggle between good and evil, and that God will triumph as Jesus ushers in an eschatological settling of affairs: The Temptation narrative, specifically Lk 4:6 (“To you I will give all the kingdoms of the world, their glory and all this authority; for it has been given over to me, and I give it to anyone I please.”); the prediction of the coming sufferings, after which Mark 9:1 holds the text, “Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see that the kingdom of God has come with power.” The Matthean redaction of the saying is found in Matt 16:28, “Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.” Brown also cites the prediction of the signs of the end time after which Jesus is said to proclaim “So also, when you see these things taking place, you know that the kingdom of God is near,” (Luke 21:31); the Last Supper speech of Jesus where he promises, “For I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.” (Luke 22:18); and the teaching in 1 John 5:19, “We know that we are God’s children, and that the whole world lies under the power of the evil one.” Ibid., 232-34.

\(^{130}\) Ibid., 220.
First Petition

Matt, Luke, Did: May your name be sanctified.

Second Petition


Third Petition

Matt, Did: May your will come about on earth as in heaven.

Fourth Petition

Matt, Did: Give us today our future [?] bread
Luke: Keep on giving us daily our future [?] bread

Fifth Petition

Matt: And forgive us our debts as we have forgiven our debtors
Did: And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors
Luke: And forgive us our sins, for, indeed, we ourselves forgive our every debtor

Sixth Petition

Matt, Luke, Did: And do not lead us into trial
Matt, Did: but free us from the Evil One

Like Jeremias and Lohmeyer, and Manson for that matter, Brown claims an Aramaic original prayer preceding the extant Greeks texts. He affirms the proposal of Jeremias, that this prayer suggests an early form of the Kaddish, and similarly, following the proposition of Manson, that it also resembles the Eighteen Benedictions.131

Brown begins his discussion of the specific phrases of the prayer by generally following Jeremias and arguing that the invocation “Father” signifies a unique relation Jesus has with God and is becoming available to his followers. The Greek word, πάτερ, 131 Ibid., 222 n.20, 29, 32.
was originally *Abba*, and as Manson, Jeremias, and Lohmeyer argue, it bespeaks to a new and special kind of intimacy between Jesus, his followers, and God. This unique relationship, says Brown, is signaling the perfection they will experience at the end time with the Lord’s arrival:

Hence, if in the PN the Christians can address God as “Father,” it is because they are anticipating their state of perfection, which will come at the close of the age. They are anticipating the coming of God’s eschatological kingdom which is already incipient in the preaching of Jesus.¹³²

It is notable that although Brown follows Manson, Jeremias, and Lohmeyer in terms of the *Abba*-special relationship argument, it is toned-down and the emphasis shifts to an eschatological and christological valance.

In the New Testament, God’s Fatherhood is not put on the basis of a national covenant, but on the basis of union with Jesus, who is God’s Son in a special way. He alone can call God “my Father” in a proper sense; those who unite themselves to Him share His power to do so through God’s gift…This New Testament concept of God’s Fatherhoods and Christian sonship give an eschatological tone to the title of the PN.¹³³

Thus, Brown’s effort to demonstrate that each part of the prayer has eschatological significance has brought that lens even to the title “Father.” Now, it is used in anticipation of the end time judgment, “the period of the last days, involving the return of Christ, the destruction of the forces of evil, and the definite establishment of the forces of God’s rule.”¹³⁴ How one would draw that inference from the simply vocative “Father” in Luke and in Q is less obvious.

¹³² Ibid., 227.
¹³³ Ibid., 226.
¹³⁴ Ibid., 217.
Brown begins to discuss the petition, “May your name be sanctified” by describing his view of the difference between the meaning of this phrase for the “Old Testament” and the “New Testament.” That is, the “Old Testament” understanding emphasizes the holiness of God. Yet, for Brown, the New Testament witnesses to Jesus as the “Holy One of God (Mk 1:24; Jn 6:69) who comes in the name of the Lord (Mk 11:9).” Further, then, as Jesus comes, so will God’s judgment and the end time reckoning: “In other words, the Christians are praying that God will manifest His holiness as Father and hasten the perfection of their sonship which is to come in His kingdom.”

In the same way, Brown interprets the petition, “May your kingdom come.”

“In the New Testament the establishment of God’s kingdom is to a certain extent identical with Jesus’ coming, for His ministry opens with the announcement that the kingdom of God is at hand. Yet, if Jesus through His word and work established God’s dominion on this earth, the fullness of that kingdom cannot come until Jesus returns again to destroy the prince of this world. As long as Satan has power in this world, God’s dominion is not perfected (Lk 4:6; 1 Jn 5:19).”

When Brown discusses the bread petition (Luke 11:3/Matt 6:11), he presents the case that, where, it has been simpler to assign the petitions for the coming of the kingdom and the establishment for God’s rule on earth as eschatological, the request for bread seems much more focused on the daily needs of life on earth, than on the eschatological end time.

Up to this point there has been reasonable agreement among recent Catholic writers on the eschatological interpretation of the PN. Here, however, most change over to interpreting the PN in terms of daily needs, pointing out that

---

135 Ibid., 229-30.

136 Ibid., 231.

137 Ibid., 233.
the end of the third petition has brought us down to earth. This would have a logically compelling force if all of the last three petitions dealt with the daily situation rather than with the eschatological. A non-eschatological interpretation would leave the fourth isolated among all the other petitions. But in our opinion a good case can be made for interpreting this petition eschatologically.138

In order to continue his eschatological reading of the prayer, Brown is forced to deviate from his colleagues. Whereas, most would read the bread petition as having to deal with daily real life needs, Brown tries to find support for his overall argument. He does this by siding with Manson, Jeremias, and Lohmeyer, who, as we have seen, translate epiousios not as “daily,” but in the sense derived from the participial form of ἔπειμι; “to come” as in the “next day.” Like Jeremias, he quotes the same portion of Jerome’s interpretation of the Gospel of the Hebrews. Thus, the bread petition is concerned about a certain kind of bread for tomorrow, that is, the bread of the eschatological banquet.

Those who favor the eschatological interpretation of this petition refer the second derivation of epiousios, which makes the petition for the bread of tomorrow, the bread of the future. We may agree that the Christian community was marked with poverty; but we believe that in this need the Christians yearned, not for the bread of this world, but for God’s final intervention and for the bread which would be given at the heavenly table.139

Brown finds support for this view as representative of Jesus’ teachings in his selection of Luke 6:21a (“Blessed are you who are hungry now, for you will be filled.”); Luke 14:15 (“Blessed is anyone who will eat bread in the kingdom of God.”); Luke 22:29-30 (“And I confer on you as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”); and Matthew 8:11/Luke 13:29 (“I tell you, many will come

138 Ibid., 238-39.
139 Ibid., 241.
from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.”).

Certainly, Brown has shown that the first and most obvious meaning of the bread petition, namely, that God would provide for his hungry people, can be interpreted eschatologically when placed in a context of other eschatological petitions, as he argues them all to be.

The petition seeking reciprocal forgiveness, that is, in order to be forgiven one must forgive, seems to deal with daily or ordinary life. But Brown claims that the eschatological continuity in the prayer means that it, too, should be seen as directed towards the end time. In this case, the petition prepares one to enter the coming kingdom before its divine judgment.\(^{140}\) He points to Matthew 5:23-25 in support of the need to forgive and be reconciled before a judgment is rendered.

So when you are offering your gift at the altar, if you remember that your brother or sister has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother or sister, and then come and offer your gift. Come to terms quickly with your accuser while you are on the way to court with him, or your accuser may hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you will be thrown into prison.

For Brown, this is best understood as part of the end time putting one’s life in order, for he states, “Once more, the Gospel background of fraternal obligations favors an eschatological interpretation, for the failure to deal properly with one’s brother is frequently spoken of in terms of judgment.”\(^{141}\) He finds validation in the Matthean parable of the Unforgiving Servant (Matt 18:23-35) as the “best illustration” of his point.

\(^{140}\) Ibid., 243-48.

\(^{141}\) Ibid., 246.
Clearly, forgiving in order to be forgiven is evident in this parable as it is in the prayer (Matt 18:35: “So my heavenly Father will also do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother or sister from your heart.”). However, whether this verse shares the same orientation as the prayer forgiveness petition is questionable. The parable is designed to focus on “settling accounts,” (Matt 18:23: “For this reason the kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who wished to settle accounts with his slaves.”) However, a settling of accounts context is not apparent in the prayer. Rather, the forgiveness petition speaks of mutuality and a “give to get,” or reciprocal ethic. For example, note the so-called Golden Rule, Q (Q 6:31) version (Matt 7:12/Luke 6:31), “And the way you want people to treat you, that is how you treat them.”

As we approach the end of Brown’s discussion of the eschatological foundation of the prayer, we turn to the petition to not be tempted. Brown sees the same problem as Manson in the use of πειρασμός, as though God would “tempt” his children. He solves this difficulty by arguing that, based on Matthew 6:13b (“…but rescue us from the evil one.”) that Satan is the tempter.

Raymond Brown illustrates the difficulties that arise when one does not allow context to serve as interpretative controls. That is, of the four extant versions of the prayer (Matt, Luke, Did, Q), each text must be interpreted within its own literary setting. This way, the range of meanings that each author/compiler/redactor intends can be articulated. By trying to interpret the prayer as though it was free-standing invariably leads to the importing of settings or the mixing of contexts. These efforts fail to draw out
the original meaning and instead create a new interpretation of the prayer based on the author’s supplied settings.\(^{143}\)

**Chapter Summary and the Problem of Interpreting the Lord’s Prayer**

1. As noted above, the Matthean form of the Lord’s Prayer is commonly the default representation of the prayer.\(^{144}\) Thus, the Lord’s Prayer is most often interpreted either narrowly within its Matthean setting, or more typically and broadly, within New Testament theology and other New Testament texts. Studies of the (Matthean) Lord’s Prayer generally fall into three groups: devotional,\(^{145}\) hybrid,\(^{146}\) or scholarly.\(^{147}\) On the other hand, there are few commentaries on the (Lord’s) prayer in the Q literary setting. The limited commentary that does exist on the Q prayer material generally focuses on narrow aspects of the text and does not address the whole cluster.\(^{148}\) However,

---

\(^{143}\) Hans Dieter Betz argues that the differences found in Matthew and Luke are explained by the fact that no specific fixed text existed at all, but that the prayer was developed for the particular liturgical needs of each community. See Betz, *Sermon on the Mount (Commentary)*, 370.


the Q community created the prayer (11:2b-4) and purposely linked it with selected aphorisms (11:9-10, 11-13), so that the wisdom sayings function to interpret the prayer. In this way, vv.9-10, 11-13 were used or created so that a particular perspective is revealed through the images within the prayer such as ‘father, bread, debt, ask, seek, knock, child, stone, fish, good gifts,’ etc. This dissertation will attempt to interpret the Q Prayer material based on the images provided by the Q tradents as an expression of the ethos within that community.

2. Some scholars have suggested translating the Greek backwards into Aramaic to discover the meaning of the prayer. Since Q shows no sign of being a translation document, such exercises are in no way helpful to recover the understanding Q held for the Q people.

3. Some scholars presuppose that an eschatological expectation governs the prayer, based on the assumption that all early Christian materials support that singular orientation. The accompanying clusters need to share that particular worldview to sustain such a proposal, for they were considered coherent with the prayer.

4. Matthew’s structure highlights three hallmarks of the rabbinic movement: prayer, almsgiving, and fasting. Influenced by this Matthean redaction, scholars have then appealed to Jewish texts, primarily the LXX, Mishnah, the Talmud, the Kaddish, and the Eighteen Benedictions in order to represent how prayer was understood by the Q people. However, these strictures are not in evidence within the accompanying aphoristic clusters.

---

CHAPTER TWO

THE Q DOCUMENT:

FOUNDATIONS, RECONSTRUCTION, AND THE SCHOLARSHIP THAT LOCATES THE PRAYER SPEECH WITHIN THE FORMATIVE STRATUM OF Q

Introduction

Current studies of the Sayings Gospel Q have established that Q 11:2b-4, 9-13 is an intact speech within this document. The thesis of this dissertation can be stated as follows: the aphorisms of Q 11:9-13 were intentionally attached to the prayer Q 11:2b-4. This editorial decision reveals that the Q complier(s) intended for the contents of the aphorisms to guide the range of possible meanings of the prayer. Thus, the aphorisms serve as interpretative controls for the entire speech. This dissertation, then, attempts to honor that editorial decision and to develop an understanding of the prayer based on those controls. In order to do so, several preliminary topics of the study of the Sayings Gospel Q need to be presented, such as: how the source was identified, its reconstruction, order, language, and date. Furthermore, redaction critical studies have led to a broadly held view of the compositional history of the Q, commonly known as Q stratigraphy. Before the thesis of this dissertation can be developed, these foundational topics merit discussion.
The History of the Investigations of Q

The Sayings Gospel Q is not an imaginary or virtual document. Rather, Q is a reconstructed text based on the near consensus opinion of the source-critical analysis of the synoptic gospels of the canonical books of the Christian scriptures. Scholars have used careful and detailed literary methods in this effort of reconstruction spanning nearly 200 years. This chapter will briefly present some of the pertinent critical studies and turning points in three relevant areas. First, the source-critical relationships and problems of the synoptic gospels will be discussed. Currently, there is no theory which completely accounts for all the evidence. Several proposals will be examined. In the end, the Two Source or Two-Document hypothesis (hereafter, 2DH) best addresses the issues and demonstrates why it holds the near consensus support of scholars. Second, since the 2DH requires the existence of Q, its character and documentary integrity will be presented. This involves a brief description of the text; its scope, language, and likely provenance. Important in this regard is the scholarship on the stratigraphical analysis of the Sayings Gospel Q. There are abrupt shifts in tone, topic, and rhetoric within the document. This has vexed commentators and led to widely differing proposals. The stratigraphical analysis of John S. Kloppenborg has received much attention and support and allows us to penetrate the document and to encounter the needs and concerns of its community at each redactional juncture. Third, the history of scholarly commentary on the Prayer

---

1 The fact that we do not have physical evidence of Q is not a problem. We know that there are other texts of similar status. For example, in 1 Cor 5:9 Paul mentions that he sent an earlier, now lost, letter to the community.
Instruction of Q 11:2b-4, 9-13 will be discussed.² A rationale for additional work will be presented.

Synoptic Source Criticism: Finding a Document within Documents

_Papias_

The first mention of possible sources for the synoptic gospels was made by the church father Papias. Although we cannot be sure whether Papias was referring to the Gospel of Matthew containing material similar to _λόγια_ or another, before unknown collection of oracles, his comments set the stage and search for synoptic sources. The two originators and developers of the 2DH, Christian Herman Weisse and Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (to be discussed later) both took Papias’ statement to mean that another pre-gospel source existed. For this reason it is beneficial to examine the account of Eusebius.

But it is worthwhile to add to the words of Papias already given other sayings of his, in which he tells certain marvels of other details which apparently reached him by tradition. (Eccl. Hist. 3.39.8)³

Eusebius goes on to report certain “strange parables and teachings” and “mythical accounts” handed down by Papias (Eccl. Hist. 3.39.11). Eusebius comments:

I suppose that he got these notions by a perverse reading of the apostolic accounts, not realizing that they had spoken mystically and symbolically. For he was a man of very little intelligence, as is clear from his books. (Eccl. Hist. 3.39.13)

Eusebius continues that Papias handed down the following tradition that:

Mark became Peter’s interpreter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, indeed, in order, of the things said or done by the Lord. (Eccl. Hist. 3.39.15)

---

² There is a consensus that Luke generally holds true to the order of Q (to be discussed). Therefore, it is customary that Lukan versification is used for the Q document as well.

³ All translations from the Loeb Classical Library are provided by each volume’s translator unless otherwise indicated.
This is related by Papias about Mark, and about Matthew this was said, “Matthew collected the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted them as best he could”. *(Eccl. Hist. 3.39.16)*

We cannot be sure precisely to what Papias was referring, less likely Q, and more probably the gospel of Matthew or its sources. His choice of the term λόγια is vague and inaccurate when referring to either Matthew or Q. Both gospels exhibit more structure than the *Gospel of Thomas* or any λόγια for that matter. From the context in Eusebius, it must be noted, the discussion has to do with the canonical gospels of Mark and Matthew and their sources. Also, the commentary by Eusebius reflects his assessment that Papias was not a reliable witness. Scholars have also noted a tendentious motive in Papias’ comments designed to strengthen the regard of the gospel of Mark which could easily have been seen as deficient when compared to Matthew and Luke. Furthermore, Papias’ statements touch upon the contentious and well-debated question of the language of Q, and will be discussed later. Yet despite these concerns, perhaps dimly, Eusebius provides from tradition what will later become, after much debate and refinement, the building blocks of the generally accepted 2DH (canonical Mark and a sayings source) of the synoptic gospels.

---


5 Black argues, following Manson, that the term τὰ λόγια used by Papias refers to Q. Black, "The Use of Rhetorical Terminology in Papias on Mark and Matthew."
Johann Jakob Griesbach

Centuries later, in 1776, Johann Jakob Griesbach developed a tool, the synopsis of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke in order to do, for the first time, a very careful source-critical analysis.⁶ Four of his findings have become established views in the field. First, the synopsis of Matthew, Mark, and Luke is now a standard and well-used tool for critical analysis. Second, the order or sequence of presentation reveals an important aspect of the synoptic relationship. Third, Griesbach has given articulation to the now universally held view that the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are related by source (literary dependence) and sequence. For example, Matthew contains roughly 90 percent of the Gospel of Mark and Luke about 55 percent.⁷ Fourth, the synoptic gospel writers, in this case Mark, used an active hand in their redactional activities. This last point, in particular, has allowed for broad advances in our research and knowledge base. Nevertheless, Griesbach’s view regarding the question of dependence delayed the development of the well supported 2DH. He argued, with a noteworthy degree of literary detail for the period, that Mark frequently and with abbreviating intent used (dependence) Matthew and Luke for his literary purposes. His argument was that Mark and/or his community saw little value in the things that “concerned Jews,” and therefore cut


Hebrew Bible citations. Related to this point, Griesbach also commented that all three synoptic gospels "emerge from one source, a Hebrew and not a Greek one." However, Griesbach’s proposal of Matthean priority makes him the bearer of the sayings tradition, thus eliminating Q. Griesbach’s efforts, though noteworthy, leave many questions unanswered. Problems remain in the patterns within the triple tradition, thus calling for continued debate. The issues will be discussed below. Recently, W. R. Farmer has tried to revive the Griesbach Hypothesis of a Two Gospel hypothesis with Matthean priority. By and large this view has failed to attract a following. Thus, a different sort of relationship must exist between the synoptic gospels.

Friedrich Schleiermacher

The obscure and unclear comment by Papias was brought back into discussion by Friedrich Schleiermacher in 1832. In his view, Matthew, and not Luke, had an additional source; a collection of Aramaic sayings. It must be remembered that at this point, all we have is an interpretation (Schleiermacher) of an interpretation (Papias) of the tradition. There is no real text to subject to literary analysis. Nevertheless, with the view

---


9 Ibid., 121.


11 Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Über die Zeugenisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien," Theologische Studien und Kritiken 5(1832), esp. 738, 57.
established of some sort of a relationship between the synoptic gospels, scholarly commentary had a new stimulus and lens through which to view the data. Both Weisse and Holtzmann based their work on Schleiermacher’s proposal. The tentative and suggestive nature of this comment has sometimes led to misdirected discussions. Nevertheless, at this point, the makings of the 2DH became available for analysis and criticism.

Schleiermacher placed back on the table the possibility of the existence of a pre-synoptic sayings source. Dieter Lührmann astutely reminds us that the Papias-Schleiermacher discussion is “not yet the two-document hypothesis” and that “nobody today argues for the existence of Q on the basis of the Papias quotation in Eusebius.”

Further literary investigations were needed to determine the nature and degree of this prospect. Nevertheless, again we have the record of some sort of awareness quite early in the tradition for the makings of the 2DH.

The Synoptic Problem: The Relationships of the Synoptic Gospels

Karl Lachmann

In 1835, Karl Lachmann focused on sources and compositional design in his analysis of the relationship of the synoptic gospels. In so doing, he focused on the problems of order and the behavior of the synoptic writers. Lachmann comments that,

…there is such precise and comprehensive agreement between both Matthew and Luke and the order of the gospel according to Mark that what little variations there are can be supposed made by them each for his own purposes…

---

12 For thoughtful discussion see Lührmann, "Q: Sayings of Jesus or Logia?", 98-102, esp. 99, 01.

By analyzing the sequence of material of the Synoptic gospels, Lachmann was able to identify certain behavioral patterns and choices of the redactors. For Lachmann, there is a clear and discernable order and that the occasions where a writer departs, a reason can be identified from the setting. At the same time Lachmann was able to consider the alternatives of order and see why Matthew might change Mark, but comes up empty as to why Mark would disrupt the more sophisticated design of Matthew. Lachmann concludes: “I hold that no good reason can be found by which we could suppose that Mark was led to alter Matthew’s order.” In this indirect way, Lachmann sets the stage for Mark to be seen as earlier than Matthew and Luke and a source for both. At the same time, it ultimately draws attention to the large body of other parallel material in Matthew and Luke which later becomes Q.

Christian Hermann Weisse, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, and Adolf Harnack

Two of the most important studies of synoptic source criticism were done in 1838 and 1863 by Christian Hermann Weisse and Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, respectively. Together, these efforts established the 2DH of synoptic studies. Weisse was a theologian more than a historian and textual critic. Two characteristics stood out for Weisse. First, that the Gospel of Mark was more primitive than Matthew and Luke. Second, when read together Mathew and Luke share a great deal of material that is not in Mark. This led him
to propose a different order of synoptic development with Mark and a body of sayings
being the sources for Matthew and Luke. Weisse took the comment by Papias to mean
that Matthew used as a source the previously mentioned λόγια. Holtzmann provided the
critical examination and commentary on the Two-Source proposal of Weisse. In so doing,
Holtzmann argued that Matthew and Luke used an early Ur-Markus form of the Gospel
of Mark which he identified as A. The second synoptic source (Redenquelle) he called Λ.
Holtzmann’s detailed analysis won many adherents.

By 1907, Q was in the mainstream of synoptic studies as exemplified by Adolf
Harnack’s publication of Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Mattäus und
Lukas.17 In this work, Harnack examines the grammar, vocabulary, and stylistic
peculiarities of Q. Harnack ends his examination by offering a translation of Q in
continuous document form. With a text upon which to base a view Harnack proposes that
Q was much more than a random collection of sayings. Rather, the text should be seen as
a whole composition with its own story to tell distinct from Matthew and Luke. This
proved to be germinative.

Q was no gospel like St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and yet it was
not a merely formless compilation of sayings and discourses of our Lord
without any thread of connection. Rather we learn from the beginning and
the conclusion (eschatological discourses) that it possessed a certain
definite arrangement of subject-matter and the outlines of a chronological
order.18

17 Adolf Harnack, Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Mattäus und Lukas (Leipzig: Hinrichs,
18 Ibid., 181.
In the English speaking world, the Weisse-Holtzmann 2DH developed a wide following. By 1908, Benjamin Bacon referred to the “Holtzmann-Weisse two-document theory”\textsuperscript{19} as a “turning point” in synoptic source analysis and it thereby achieved consensus status. The “finding” of Q, a document within the documents of Matthew and Luke now seen as alongside Mark set, off a series of studies. In 1924, Bacon proposed a theory of the nature and design of this synoptic source, signaling its secure place within New Testament studies.\textsuperscript{20} The Weisse-Holtzmann 2DH also stimulated more detailed analyses and proposals of synoptic gospel origins.

Burnett Hillman Streeter

Markan priority\textsuperscript{21} and the Sayings Gospel Q became the basis for Burnett Hillman Streeter in developing his far-reaching, and to many, over-reaching four-gospel hypothesis.\textsuperscript{22} Streeter organizes his argument around the notion of local gospels and local

\textsuperscript{19} Benjamin Bacon, "A Turning Point in Synoptic Criticism," \textit{Harvard Theological Review} 1, no. 1 (1908), 54.


\textsuperscript{21} Streeter argues for Markan priority on the basis of the following: Matthew abbreviates Mark’s unnecessarily awkward constructions (158); It is highly unlikely that Mark cut the infancy narratives, the Sermon of the Mount, and most parables (“only a lunatic would” 158); If Mark were the abbreviator, why would he add so many unnecessary details? (158); Matthew replicates roughly 600 to 661 Markan verses (159); “Mark’s style is diffuse, Matthew’s succinct” (159); Luke maintains 53 percent of Mark (160); Matthew and Luke almost never agree against Mark while Matthew and Mark do against Luke and Luke and Mark against Matthew. This suggests that Mark is medial (161); “The order of incidents in Mark is clearly the more original” (161); Mark’s Greek is clearly more primitive and both Matthew and Luke often improve it (163); the distribution of Mark in both Matthew and Luke suggests they used it as a source both for order and alternations of its order give evidence of specific editorial decisions (165-168). To these Fitzmyer adds that Mark’s resurrection material is “limited” and Fitzmyer raises the question, why would Mark cut the post-resurrection material in Matthew and/or Luke? See Burnett Hillman Streeter, \textit{The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins} (London: Macmillan & Co., 1924; reprint, 1961). Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke," in \textit{Jesus and Man's Hope} (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1985 <1970>; reprint, "The Priority of Mark." In \textit{The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal}, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, 37-52. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 39.

\textsuperscript{22} Streeter, \textit{The Four Gospels}. 
texts. That is, he links text-critical geographical identifications with the development of the intra-canonical gospels. With the lens of Markan priority and Q other synoptic data come into view. Specifically, the special material (Sondergut) of Matthew and Luke needs to be addressed in any synoptic theory. Streeter’s solution was to elevate Sondergut to near Ur-gospel status and to allow for multiple recensions of Q (QMt. and QLk.).

Besides developing a much more complex source-critical theory he also tries to link gospels and their earlier forms to specific locales. Streeter argues that:

1. Mark was written in and originates from Rome
2. Q was written in and originates from Antioch
3. Matthew was written in and originates from Antioch
4. M (Matthean Sondergut) was written in and originates from Jerusalem
5. Luke was written in and originates from Caesarea
6. L (Lukan Sondergut) was written in and originates from Corinth?

All of this was done, as Streeter describes, because “a plurality of sources is historically more probable” with multiple recensions of documents interacting with other documents. The notion of linking specific texts to locations is based on the tradition that Mark is associated with Rome (Papias). However, it is one thing to take this singular tradition and expand it to include Antioch, Caesarea, and Jerusalem. These text-locale associations, on their own terms may be more or less reasonable conjectures, but they ought not to be elevated beyond supposition.

---

23 Ibid., 227-70.

24 Ibid., 223.
Streeter and the Minor Agreements

Although most scholars consider Mark as medial within the triple tradition there are some occasions where Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. These so called minor agreements²⁵ seem to contest the theory that Matthew and Luke could not see each other, and were dependent on Mark and Q. Streeter’s method for handling this difficulty was to take each one separately and to argue them away on the basis of four situations, although Streeter never catalogues the minor agreements into the four specific groupings.²⁶ Rather, these arguments are used as they are seen fit. For example, some agreements can be as predictable syntactic improvements to obvious awkwardness in Markan vocabulary.²⁷ Another is simply due to a limited set of conventional expressions, in Matthew and Luke’s individual editing of a rough articulation in Mark.²⁸ Streeter argued, reasonably, that the extensive Q material available to Matthew and Luke had influenced each evangelist’s editing of Mark where a saying or parable showed signs of overlap.²⁹

Finally, the later harmonizing of documents by Christian copyists, who purposely


²⁶ Streeter, The Four Gospels, 179-81, 295-305.

²⁷ Irrelevant agreement examples: Mark 4:10 (“…those who were about him with the twelve asked him…”), Matt 13:10 (“Then the disciples came and said to him…”), Luke 8:9 (“And when his disciples asked him…”); Mark 4: 36, Matt 8:23, Luke 8:22.


²⁹ Examples of the influence of Q: Mark4:21 (“...he said to them, 'Is a lamp brought in to be put under a bushel, or under a bed, and not on a stand?'”), Matt 5:15 (“...Nor do men light a lamp and put it under a bushel, but on a stand, and it gives light to all in the house.'”), Luke 8:16 (“'No one after lighting a lamp covers it with a vessel, or puts it under a bed, but puts it on a stand, that those who enter may see the light.'”); Mark 4:22, Matt 10:26, Luke 8:17.
eliminated textual variance, resulted in overlapping material. In response, scholars have challenged this one by one approach of Streeter and called for an analysis of patterns that might provide evidence for another theory, but to date none have succeeded in doing so. To be sure, the issues of the minor agreements may never be completely resolved and unconvincing discussions have continued for decades. Nevertheless, Streeter has made a lasting contribution as evinced in Joseph A. Fitzmyer’s comment after studying the Griesbachian arguments of William Farmer; “In some instances, to be sure, Streeter’s explanations still command stronger assent.”

Although Streeter’s four-gospel hypothesis attracted few adherents, his efforts to confirm the notions of Markan priority and the existence of Q were clearly well-received. Also critical to Q studies, especially in the reconstruction of Q, is Streeter’s view that “Luke’s order (of Q) is the more original,” though he is far from first or alone on this question. But Streeter popularized the existence of Q and by providing an order to the sayings was able to attract a broader readership especially in the English speaking world.

Vincent Taylor and the Original Order of Q

One of the more secure aspects in Q studies is the view that Luke best preserves the order of the Sayings Gospel. Vincent Taylor developed a series of studies to examine this question, although his main concern was supporting the 2DH. In his 1953 article, “The

30 Textual corruption agreement examples: Mark 1:40-42 (“And a leper came to him beseeching him and kneeling said to him, ‘If you will, you can make me clean.’”), Matt 8:2-3 (“…and behold a leper came to him and knelt before him, saying, ‘Lord, if you will, you can make me clean.’”), Luke 5:12-13 (“…there came a man full of leprosy; and when he saw Jesus, he fell on his face and besought him, ‘Lord, if you will, you can make me clean.’”); Mark 2:21-22, Matt 9:16-17, Luke 5:36-37; Mark 2:23, Matt 12:1, Luke 6:1.


Order of Q,” he argues that current debate used a two column (Luke and Matthew) method in order to examine which gospel best represented the original order of Q.33 Because both of these gospels deal with Mark as well, setting up a two column comparison of where the Q sayings occur leaves huge gaps. In fact, the gaps in the Lukan gospel are so great that scholars were more convinced that Matthew was probably the best representative of the Q order. Instead, Taylor developed a very involved six column approach, which took into consideration, not only where the Q material occurred, but where the Markan material appeared, as well as the special material used by Matthew and Luke.34 What he discovered was that, first, in multiple clusters of sayings, substantial agreement exists in both Matthew and Luke. Secondly, it became clear that Matthew’s order of sayings was often in the service of Markan material, improving it, or that Matthew was creating speeches for Jesus using both Markan and double tradition material plus his own Sondergut. Luke, on the other hand, seemed to draw from Mark alone, and did not contain speeches of Markan and double tradition (Q) material. Moreover, if one then examines the order of Matthew’s Q and compares it with Luke’s Q, the clusters in Luke’s Q followed in a logical manner. That is, the sets of sayings hinged to each other make one particular point. In fact, one could identify a set of speeches or clusters that were composed of aphorisms linked together in a unified way. Matthew’s order of Q, however, was less cohesive, since Q sayings and pronouncement stories were following Markan gospel order, and were designed to strengthen Markan arguments, and bolstering Markan stories. Thus, Lukan order presents a much more


34 The Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5-7), the Mission Charge (Matt 10), Discourse on Teaching in Parables (Matt 13), the Discourse on Discipleship (Matt 18), and the Eschatological Discourse (Matt 23-25).
coherent reconstruction of Q. For example, in considering the Prayer Speech of Q, as found in Luke, (Q/Luke 11:2-4, 9-13), Taylor notes that in Matthew’s gospel, the Lord’s Prayer (Matt 6:9-13/Q 11:2-4) is embedded in the Sermon on the Mount as part of the theme of forgiveness (6:14-15). While the injunction to ask with confidence and appeal to the love of parents for their children (Matt 7:7-11/Q 11:9-13) likewise in that sermon, is followed by Matthew’s “golden rule” (Matt 7:12). Since it is Matthew who rearranges Markan material, while Luke maintains it for the most part, it is far more likely that Matthew is the one who has separated the material to serve his extensive Sermon on the Mount, than it is likely that Luke refused to follow the Q order, withdrew these sayings from their position and united them. When the speeches are examined in Luke, they show more unity and logical flow. Thus, Taylor’s examination reveals that as Matthean editorial preferences show readiness to disrupt the Markan order of material to serve his gospel, so too he does with all his sources, including Q.

Summary

So, in briefly summarizing the arguments supporting the 2DH, we recognize that the significant degree of related content indicates shared source material (roughly Matthew 90 percent and Luke 55 percent). Matthew and Luke generally follow (except for redactional interests) the Markan order. Additionally, Matthew and Luke rarely agree against Mark, suggesting Mark is medial. The principle “from primitive to refined language” and the arguments for the Markan order suggest Mark is more original.

Although in the double tradition, Luke appears dependent on Matthew for the roughly

---

two hundred Jesus sayings, we see that in the triple tradition, Luke does not seem aware of Matthew’s better Greek and his improvements of awkward statements by Mark. This seemingly contrary literary behavior by Luke can be explained if one allows for the possibility that the Markan gospel and an additional two hundred Jesus sayings (Q) travelled independently to Matthew and Luke.36

**Challenges to the Two-Document Hypothesis: The Griesbach Hypothesis Revisited and Markan Priority without Q**

For the most part, the principle of parsimony or Ockham’s razor and a sufficient response to critics have won a large majority of supporters for the 2DH. Most scholars see no need to add additional hypothetical documents in order to account for a few anomalies. In this regard, the complex models have a limited and small following. A few more observers, however, support either a revival of the Griesbach hypothesis or a theory of Markan priority, but without Q. Each will be briefly discussed.

In a series of publications, William Farmer argues for reconsideration of the Griesbach hypothesis.37 He does so by examining the possible literary relationship the three synoptic gospels might have. Through a process of probable elimination, he argues that Matthean priority with Luke possessing Matthew and Mark possessing both most adequately accounts for the synoptic relationships and thereby answers the synoptic

---

36 Even though a large majority of synoptic scholars support the 2DH, it does not account for all the data. The two most common problems discussed concern the minor agreements and the Mark-Q overlaps. Earlier was noted that Streeter has addressed those passages where Matthew and Luke agree generally with no apparent previous source. Contemporary scholars build upon Streeter’s work and have generally won a strong majority of adherents. Another series of questions arise when Mark and Q appear to have similar material and wording or Mark-Q overlaps, though the 2DH posits that the texts are blind to one another. Supporters of the majority hypothesis argue that the presence of a few phrases or verses from the tradition is not sufficient to call for a reconsideration of the model. Yet, critics are not keen to share such a view.

problem. As we have seen, the Griesbach hypothesis, to the majority of scholars, insufficiently explains the Markan omissions and the probably medial position of Mark in terms of the synoptic disagreements. His sixteen theses generally rehearse previous arguments.38

A somewhat more plausible view offered by Austin Farrer. He begins with Markan priority and dispenses with Q, while attempting to account for the evidence in the double tradition.39 His position comes closer to the 2DH, but results in creating other problems. Farrer’s argument does account for the Matthew-Luke overlap, but it also introduces the notion that Luke possessed Mark and Matthew (Mark→ Matthew/Mark→ Luke) and the questions of order and the use of material arise. In the triple tradition, Luke follows the Markan order and never Matthew. This is highly unlikely, unless he was unaware of Matthew and followed Mark. Also, much of Matthew does not appear in Luke. This would indicate, if one were to follow Farrer, that Luke felt free to alter a well-defined order and excise strong material. This means that large portions of the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord’s Prayer, and the pastoral chapter 18 in Matthew, for instance, were cut and/or moved. We do not see such an aggressive approach with Luke’s use of Mark, which more readily provides improvements. The problem for Farrer and his proponents is why would Luke more radically change the stronger material he received while more carefully conserving the lesser? Additionally, to the satisfaction to most synoptic


scholars, Farrer is unable to explain why Luke would use the more primitive Greek of Mark.

Thus, the 2DH remains the most parsimonious theory which accounts for the synoptic evidence. Though it is not without residual questions, a large majority of scholars accept this view. To the nature of the Q Sayings Gospel, we now turn.

The Modern Reconstruction of the Sayings Gospel Q

Introduction: The Siglum Q, Text, Language, and Date

In 1983, the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) established the Q Seminar. In 1990, the Q Seminar became the Q Section of SBL. Related to the Q Section, the International Q Project (IQP) has collected all of the scholarship on the reconstruction of the text. This commentary, published within the Documenta Q series, has been subjected to analysis and the result has been the creation of the Critical Edition of Q. Although a review of this scholarship and discussion is interesting, it is unnecessary to present this commentary. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to present aspects of Q scholarship in order to establish the focal text of this dissertation, the Q Prayer Instruction Q 11:2b-4, 9-13.

---


The Siglum Q

A name is important. It carries descriptive value, possible nuances, and stimulates images. Few names, however, have been as argued as much as Q’s. Much like a tendentious political debate, the term a scholar uses often carries an intentional interpretation. How did Q get its name? Although most scholars do not believe Q was on the mind of Papias, he, according to Eusebius, referred to a λόγια “in the Hebrew dialect” (Eccl. Hist. 3.39.16). Although there is a general consensus which contests any link between the statement of Papias and Q, it does raise the question of the name of the synoptic sayings source. Also, there is no scholar who suggests that Q was written in Hebrew. Furthermore, scholars who have argued for an Aramaic version such as Charles Torrey, Gustaf Dalman, Ernst Lohmeyer, T. W. Manson, Joachim Jeremias, Joseph Fitzmyer, Georg Strecker, Jan Lambrecht, Matthew Black, Ulrich Luz,

42 Torrey, "The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels."
43 Dalman, Die Worte Jesu.
49 Lambrecht, The Sermon on the Mount, 133-36.
50 Black, "The Use of Rhetorical Terminology in Papias on Mark and Matthew."
51 Luz, Matthew 1-7, 1.372.
Hal Taussig, John Meier, and Douglas Oakman have had to depend upon so much special pleading in order to posit such a Vorlage that they have failed to attract a following.

C. H. Weisse proposed that the simplest answer to the evidence that arose from an analysis of the synoptic gospels was that Mark was one source (triple tradition), and the double tradition yet another: a sayings source, or a “spruch Quelle.” For his part, H. J. Holtzmann argued that this double tradition, the “Spruchequelle,” was an “Ur-text” and he identified it with the siglum Λ, apparently for λόγια. Frans Neirynck examined the history of the siglum for Q and points out that in 1890, Johannes Weiss used the sigla A (Ur-Mark) and Q to describe the synoptic sources. Neirynck suggests that he was following Holtzmann and that Q, in this case, stood for Quelle. Most scholars consider this the most plausible history. Even so, there has been no consensus regarding the

---

53 Meier, A Marginal Jew, 1.175, 2.291-94, 2.358 n. 20.
descriptors of Q.\textsuperscript{58} For example, some terms, such as Sayings Source, imply less organization than most Q scholars would accept. In response and for clarification, Kloppenborg offers the following summary of the terminology and the history of the siglum of Q.\textsuperscript{59} Although there is no indisputable citation, he proposes the most likely scenario.

The term \textit{Sayings Gospel} has, of course, no special claim to authenticity as the original title of Q, which is lost. German authors normally refer to Q as “die Spruchquelle,” “die Logienquelle” or “die Rede[n]quelle,” while French authors tend to use simply “Q” or “la source Q.” English and North American authors use “Q,” “the Q source,” or “the Synoptic Sayings Source.” The SBL Q Seminar has introduced “Sayings Gospel,” in part to avoid the term source, which inevitably obscures Q as a document of intrinsic interest in its own right (much like calling the second Gospel “the Mark source”). And in part, this designation is intended to convey the notion that Q represents a “gospel” as much as do the narrative Gospels.\textsuperscript{60}

\textit{Was Q Written or Oral?}

Earlier, the rationale in support of the 2DH of the synoptic gospels was presented. Thus, Q is now broadly recognized to be one of the two sources of these related gospels. There is little debate, based on the near-verbatim agreement within the double tradition, that Q must have been a written source. For example, Kloppenborg reports that the parallel texts of Matthew 3:7-10 and Luke 3:7-9 have between 80 to 87 percent agreement depending upon whether the measure is based on affinity with the Matthean or

\textsuperscript{58} Kloppenborg Verbin, \textit{Excavating Q}, 402-08.


Lukan form. Such agreement, found elsewhere within Q, cannot be accounted for on the basis of oral tradition. Rather, the high level of replication is most probably due to a common written text. The double tradition does not exhibit an even distribution of verbatim material. In some sections, such as Q 19:12-27, the exact replication is merely 22 percent. This has led to speculation of several documents instead of a single text of Q. These theories have not developed much of a following and the variance is more easily accounted for by the editorial preferences of Matthew and Luke. Although it is theoretically possible to have multiple, independent subtexts account for the material of Q, the principle of Ockham’s razor has been invoked by the majority of scholars and subsequent compositional analyses more strongly suggest that repetitive patterns, themes, and similarity across subunits more strongly point to a single text.

The Language of Q

The ambiguous comments by Papias, amplified by Schleiermacher, regarding other possible synoptic sources reintroduced the question of the original language of Q. Unfortunately, this has led some scholars to not look at the text of Q, but instead, to shift their attention to the unlikely possibility that Q was originally written in Aramaic. Rudolf Bultmann, though not devoting much attention to Q, suggested that it was translated from

---


63 For a discussion see Ibid., 60-72.

64 For a more detailed discussion see Delbert Burkett, "Q: Unity or Plurality?," in *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: The Unity and Plurality of Q* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 33-49.
a previous Aramaic version. Martin Dibelius thought the Q “text used by Matthew and Luke was Greek, otherwise there would have been no such agreement,” yet this Greek document originated from an Aramaic collection and was “assembled and then translated as a connected writing.” Both of these comments were made in an era when it was common to speak of a “primitive” or “Palestinian” Christianity. This “search” was based on many assumptions that later were viewed as unfounded. In the English speaking world, T. W. Mason uncritically followed this line of thought. Scholars who have carefully examined the reconstructed text of Q have generally come to other conclusions.

One of the first scholars to do so was Petros Vassiliadis. In his 1978 paper, “The Nature and Extent of the Q-Document,” he forcefully makes the case that Q was a written Greek source based on the careful review of scholars who analyzed the vocabulary and syntax of Q. For Vassiliadis, the Q document exhibits strong evidence of a Greek original and virtually no elements of a translated text can be detected. Kloppenborg makes a similar argument in his dissertation revised into his first book. Heinz O. Guenther has generally settled the issue for Q scholars, as he masterfully traces the history and basis of the arguments for an Aramaic original. He begins with Eichhorn’s hypothesis of an Aramaic primitive gospel and demonstrates that the position was based more upon assumptions than critical analysis. In the end, the consistency of the text across the

---


synoptic gospels and the integrity and unity of the material does not exhibit the necessary fragmentary and awkward syntax that would typify literature that was translated from a previous language. Q may have been born on Palestinian soil but its record is thoroughly at home in the Greek language and its larger Hellenistic world. Subgenres such chreiai, and common Jewish forms such as prophetic judgments, and sapiential clusters all were at home in Greek during the era that Q came into being. In the end, Guenther concludes,

The Aramaic hypothesis is thus in all its forms and at all levels based on ideology, not on textual evidence. None of the arguments and counterarguments advanced in favor of it convince….Q’s unique vision of Jesus was from the first couched in Koine Greek and addressed to a Greek-speaking audience, whatever its ethnic identity. A Christianity addressed itself in Greek to a Greek-thinking constituency, an audience steeped in Greek culture and ethos.69

Since then, scholars have repeated the views of Vassiliadis and Guenther70 and the Critical Edition of Q is based on this consensus.71

The Date of Q

The dating of ancient documents involves either or both the comments of known witnesses or clear chronological markers within the artifact. Q has neither. Instead, scholars have to rely on internal evidence, as imprecise as it is. The internal evidence within Q hinges upon the interpretation of Q 11:49-51, 13:34-45, and 17:23-37.

Therefore also Wisdom said: I will send them prophets and sages, and some of them they will kill and persecute, so that a settling of accounts for the blood of all the prophets poured out from the founding of the world may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, murdered


between the sacrificial altar and the House. Yes, I tell you, an accounting will be required of this generation! (Q 11:49-51)

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her nestlings under her wings, but you were not willing! Look, your house is forsaken! I tell you, you will not see me until the time comes when you say: Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord! (Q13:34-35)

If they say to you: Look, he is in the wilderness, do not go out; look, he is indoors, do not follow. For as the lightning streaks from Sunrise and flashes as far as Sunset, so will be the Son of Humanity on his day. Wherever the corpse, there the vultures will gather. As it took place in the days of Noah, so will it be in the day of the Son of Humanity. For as in those days they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark and the flood came and took them all, so will it also be on the day the Son of Humanity is revealed. I tell you, there will be two men in the field; one is taken and one is left. Two women will be grinding at the mill; one is taken and one is left. (Q 17:23-37)

There are only two dates with which we can coordinate these texts. One is the Jewish War of 66-70 C. E. The other is the report by Josephus (War 6.300-301) at Sukkôt in 62 C.E. that Jesus ben Ananias preached the ruination of the temple, though the period was one of relative peace. This is important because some scholars argue that Q 11:49-51, 13:34-35, and 17:23-37 reveal awareness of the Jewish War. Rather, the dire warnings with allusions to war may reflect other conditions such as eschatological punishments within the forensic material in the major redaction. Since there is no clear indication of an awareness of the war and to overlook its significance would be unlikely, one would have to conclude that a date at least prior to the war is reasonable for the final redaction (Q³).}

---

72 These data are provided by Kloppenborg. See Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 86-87.

73 This is Kloppenborg’s dating. Other recent scholars, though offering differing arguments, do not posit substantially discordant dates. Tuckett suggests 40-70 C.E. Oakman is the boldest, but argues on the basis of social scientific reconstruction for the date of late 20s to 54 C.E. (when the administrative center of
The Reconstruction of Q

In any reconstructed document, the question of the extent of the original must be raised. The most basic or minimal text would be the double tradition material found in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. However, there are drawbacks to this minimalist position. In the last century, redaction criticism has demonstrated that the gospel writers did not merely copy directly what stood in their sources. Rather, the gospels have been shown to have been shaped according to specific grammatical preferences and, more importantly, specific theological lenses consonant with the editors’ intentions. In the case of Q, scholars rely on the Gospel of Mark as their control for the degree and manner in which both Matthew and Luke can be expected to redact their sources. These controls serve as important evidence in cases where a single textual occurrence is attested in either Matthew or Luke for weighing whether this represents Sondergut, or one evangelist presenting a Q text, however redacted. 74 The questions which guide the reconstruction of Q involve the order of the document, the extent (contents) of the text, and the wording where there is variance between the Matthean and Lukan forms of double tradition material.

The Original Order of Q

When the compositional tendencies and use of sources by Matthew and Luke are examined, key differences can be observed. Luke tends to represent a source subsection


74 For a thoughtful early discussion see Vassiliadis, "The Nature and Extent of the Q-Document."
with little editorial intrusion, then adds another block from another text and then returns to the source from which he copied to use the next unit. That is, Luke more faithfully maintains the original order of other author-editor material and cuts and pastes those source units into his gospel. Matthew, on the other hand, while working with Mark, shows an ease in blending sources, changing the order of Markan miracles, joining parables, and creates two chapters of miracles, from Mark and Q and his own material.

The tendencies can be seen below.

### The Order of the Double Tradition (in Lucan Order)\(^\text{75}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sigla:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double vertical lines: agreement in absolute sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single vertical lines: agreement in relative sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid horizontal line: Matthean sayings joined to Markan context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Denotes sayings collected into second part of the Matthean mission speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>John’s preaching (1)</td>
<td>3:7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>John’s preaching (2)</td>
<td>3:16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Beatitudes (1)</td>
<td>6:20b-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Beatitudes (2)</td>
<td>6:22-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>On retaliation</td>
<td>6:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Giving freely</td>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Be merciful</td>
<td>6:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Disciples and teachers</td>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>*10:24-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>On hypocrisy</td>
<td>6:41-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Good and bad fruit</td>
<td>6:43-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Treasures of the heart</td>
<td>6:45</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Lord, Lord</td>
<td>6:46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{75}\) This chart is taken with slight modification from Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories*, 74-76.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Luke References</th>
<th>John References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Parable of the builders</td>
<td>6:47-49</td>
<td>7:24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Centurion’s son</td>
<td>7:1-10</td>
<td>8:5-10,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. John’s question</td>
<td>7:18-23</td>
<td>11:2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Jesus’ eulogy</td>
<td>7:24-26</td>
<td>11:7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Quotation of Mal 3:1</td>
<td>7:27</td>
<td>11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. None born of woman…</td>
<td>7:28</td>
<td>11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Children in the marketplace</td>
<td>7:31-34</td>
<td>11:16-19a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sophia saying</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>11:19b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Discipleship chreia (1)</td>
<td>9:57-58</td>
<td>8:19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Discipleship chreia (2)</td>
<td>9:59-60</td>
<td>8:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sheep among wolves</td>
<td>10:3</td>
<td>10:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Greeting of peace</td>
<td>10:5-6</td>
<td>10:12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Remain in one house</td>
<td>10:7a,c</td>
<td>10:11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. On support of missionaries</td>
<td>10:7b</td>
<td>10:10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Activity of missionaries</td>
<td>10:9</td>
<td>10:7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Threat</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. “Blessed are the eyes…”</td>
<td>10:23-24</td>
<td>13:16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Lord’s Prayer</td>
<td>11:2-4</td>
<td>6:9-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. On prayer (1)</td>
<td>11:9-10</td>
<td>7:7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. On prayer (2)</td>
<td>11:11-13</td>
<td>7:9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. A kingdom divided</td>
<td>11:17-18</td>
<td>12:25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Jewish exorcists</td>
<td>11:19</td>
<td>12:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Exorcism by the finger of God</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>12:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Binding the stronger one</td>
<td>11:21-22</td>
<td>12:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. “He who is not for me…”</td>
<td>11:23</td>
<td>12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Return of the evil spirit</td>
<td>11:24-26</td>
<td>12:43-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Demand for a sign</td>
<td>11:29</td>
<td>12:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Sign of Jonah</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Light saying</td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>5:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Sound eye</td>
<td>11:34-36</td>
<td>6:22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Woe: cleansing the outside</td>
<td>11:39-41</td>
<td>23:25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Woe: you burden men</td>
<td>11:46</td>
<td>23:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Sophia's oracle</td>
<td>11:49-51</td>
<td>23:34-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Woe: you lock the kingdom</td>
<td>11:52 23:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Revelation of the hidden</td>
<td>12:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>What is said in the dark</td>
<td>12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Do not Fear</td>
<td>12:4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>You are worth more…</td>
<td>12:6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Confessing Jesus</td>
<td>12:8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Anxiety about daily needs</td>
<td>12:22-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Treasures in heaven</td>
<td>12:33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Parable of the householder</td>
<td>12:39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Parable of the faithful servant</td>
<td>12:42-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>I cast fire on the earth</td>
<td>12:49,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>On divisions</td>
<td>12:52-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Agreeing with one’s accuser</td>
<td>12:57-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Two ways</td>
<td>13:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>I do not know you…</td>
<td>13:25-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>They will come from east and…</td>
<td>13:28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>First will be last</td>
<td>13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Great supper</td>
<td>14:16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Loving one’s parents</td>
<td>14:25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Take up your cross</td>
<td>14:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>14:34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Lost sheep</td>
<td>15:3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Serving two masters</td>
<td>16:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Law and prophets</td>
<td>16:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Endurance of the Law</td>
<td>16:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>On divorce</td>
<td>16:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>On scandal</td>
<td>17:1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>17:3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Faith as a mustard seed</td>
<td>17:5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>The day of the Son of Man (2)</td>
<td>17:26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>The day of the Son of Man (3)</td>
<td>17:28-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>He who saves his life</td>
<td>17:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>Two in the bed</td>
<td>17:34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Where the corpse is</td>
<td>17:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example of Matthean redactional efforts is the transition from the pericopae of the Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mark 4:13-20; Matt 13:18-23, Luke 8:11-15) and the teaching of Letting your Light Shine (Mark 4:21-25, Matt 5:15, 10:26; 7:2; 13:12; Luke 8:16-18). For Mark, the units are contiguous (4:13-20, 21-25) as they are for Luke (8:11-15, 16-18). Matthew, on the other hand, moves some of the Markan material to his Sermon on the Mount (5:15) and others to additional parts of his gospel (7:2; 10:26; 13:12). Thus, if one removes the Markan material from each evangelist, plus the material that belongs to them alone, and allows the remaining sayings (Q) to come together, the Matthean sayings seem disjunctive, while in Luke, the sayings show themselves to be connected speeches that fit together with greater harmony and coherence. When we examine the sayings in Matthew that appear “disjunctive” in the Q material, it is because those sayings are supporting a Markan passage or a particular speech that Matthew has created. The most reasonable conclusion then is, that Luke and not Matthew shows the greater conservatism in maintaining the original ordering of source material.

*The Original Extent of Q*

Another important area of scholarly endeavor is the question of the original extent of Q. As noted earlier, the minimalist position is to accept the material, less Mark, within the double tradition, and nothing more. But there are texts within the triple tradition where it is possible that the Markan account is highly discrepant with either Matthew or Luke and therefore comes from Mark sharing traditions with Q; thus the material can be

---

accounted for as stemming from Q. Good examples of this problem are the Beelzebul Accusation and the Temptation of Jesus. Mark has a brief account of the Beelzebul material (3:22-27), which is expanded in Luke (11:14-23) and Matthew (12:22-28). The same can be said for the Temptation of Jesus (Mark 1:12-13; Matt 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13). In these two cases, most Q scholars argue that a form of the accounts stems from Q and the brief parallels in Mark came to him from tradition. In situations such as these, arguments must be made to accept a Q version.77

Some material that appears either in Matthew or Luke, but not both, poses another problem for reconstruction. Petros Vassiliadis was the first to carefully examine this issue.78 Subsequent scholars have added refinements. Kloppenborg offers the following criteria.79

1. Is the text in question a component of texts already considered to be in Q?
2. Does the material stylistically cohere with other material in Q?
3. For singly attested material, is there evidence of existence prior (e.g. Mark or Gospel of Thomas) to the writing of Matthew or Luke? If so, it is unlikely one of these evangelists created the text (Sondergut).
4. Is it reasonable to suggest that one of the evangelists has a reason to omit a text?

Reconstruction of the Wording of Q

The principle which guides the reconstruction of wording in Q can be stated briefly: where there is disagreement between the content of Matthew and Luke the text

77 Kloppenborg has cataloged scholarly commentary in terms “In Q” or “Not in Q.” See John S. Kloppenborg, Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes and Concordance (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988).


79 Kloppenborg Verbin, Excavating Q, 91-101. Also see Kloppenborg, Q, the Earliest Gospel, 41-48.
which exhibits the least likely possibility of redactional activity is the most probable.\(^{80}\) The IQP uses a scoring system from A (most probable) to D (least probable) to identify their confidence in the reconstruction at the level of wording. The IQP has reviewed all of the scholarship and evaluated the strength of individual arguments to form a probable text of Q. Where there is ambiguity, it is so stated. In the end, these criteria for reconstruction leave us with a Q document containing about 4,500 words\(^{81}\) and depending upon a scholar’s specific reconstruction parameters, about 200\(^{82}\) to 235\(^{83}\) sayings.

**The Composition and Redaction of Q**

The Redaction Criticism of Q

When the entire order of Q is reproduced and examined for internally coherent segments, we find blocks of related material. These subunits are organized by catchword, topic, tone, and audience. For instance, Q 3:7-9, 16-17 contains the fiery castigations of John.\(^{84}\) The themes of the preaching of repentance, the mention and citation of the prophet Isaiah, a coming judgment, and an external Jewish audience clearly combine to provide an organization well beyond a simple wisdom collection. That is, the organization of Q indicates specific hortatory, argumentative, and narrative material. The coherence of the subunits indicates intact speeches. For example, Q 3:7-9, 16-17 is the prophetic preaching of John. This is followed by the Temptation narrative Q 4:1-13.

---


81 Kloppenborg, *Q, the Earliest Gospel*, 12.


84 John is never referred to as “the Baptist” in Q. That title is a theological development not evident in Q.
Then, right after, a noticeable shift is evident within Q 6:20b-49. The tone of Q 6:20b-49 is aphoristic. Four makarisms introduce the subunit and the use of imperatives suggests a sapiential and not a judgmental intent. This pattern is followed by Q 7:1-35, which is a speech dealing with the admirable faith of a centurion and additional material about John with allusions to Isaiah and a coming judgment. Throughout the remainder of Q we find the same pattern. That is, blocks of related material bound together by topic, catchword, audience, and generic tone. Below are the blocks from the order of Q. Space segments indicate subunits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Topical Material</th>
<th>Q Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. John’s preaching (1)</td>
<td>3:7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. John’s preaching (2)</td>
<td>3:16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Temptation story</td>
<td>4:1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Beatitudes (1)</td>
<td>6:20b-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beatitudes (2)</td>
<td>6:22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. On retaliation</td>
<td>6:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Giving freely</td>
<td>6:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Be merciful</td>
<td>6:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. On judging</td>
<td>6:37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Blind guides</td>
<td>6:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Disciples and teachers</td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. On hypocrisy</td>
<td>6:41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Good and bad fruit</td>
<td>6:43-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Treasures of the heart</td>
<td>6:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lord, Lord</td>
<td>6:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Parable of the builders</td>
<td>6:47-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Centurion’s son</td>
<td>7:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. John’s question</td>
<td>7:18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Jesus’ eulogy</td>
<td>7:24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Quotation of Mal 3:1</td>
<td>7:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. None born of woman…</td>
<td>7:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter References</td>
<td>Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Children in the marketplace</td>
<td>7:31-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sophia saying</td>
<td>7:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Discipleship <em>chreia</em> (1)</td>
<td>9:57-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Discipleship <em>chreia</em> (2)</td>
<td>9:59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. “The harvest is great…”</td>
<td>10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sheep among wolves</td>
<td>10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Carry no purse</td>
<td>10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Greeting of peace</td>
<td>10:5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Remain in one house</td>
<td>10:7a,c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. On support of missionaries</td>
<td>10:7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Activity of missionaries</td>
<td>10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Concerning rejection</td>
<td>10:10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Threat</td>
<td>10:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Woes against Galilee</td>
<td>10:13-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. “Whoever hears you…”</td>
<td>10:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Jesus’ thanksgiving</td>
<td>10:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. “Blessed are the eyes…”</td>
<td>10:23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Lord’s Prayer</td>
<td>11:2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. On prayer (1)</td>
<td>11:9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. On prayer (2)</td>
<td>11:11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Beelzebul accusation</td>
<td>11:14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. A kingdom divided</td>
<td>11:17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Jewish exorcists</td>
<td>11:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Exorcism by the finger of God</td>
<td>11:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Binding the stronger one</td>
<td>11:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. “He who is not for me…”</td>
<td>11:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Return of the evil spirit</td>
<td>11:24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Demand for a sign</td>
<td>11:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Sign of Jonah</td>
<td>11:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Jonah and Solomon</td>
<td>11:31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Light saying</td>
<td>11:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Sound eye</td>
<td>11:34-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Woe: cleansing the outside</td>
<td>11:39-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Woe: neglect of justice</td>
<td>11:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Woe: the best seats</td>
<td>11:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Woe: unseen graves</td>
<td>11:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Woe: you burden men</td>
<td>11:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Woe: murderers of the prophets</td>
<td>11:47-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Sophia's oracle</td>
<td>11:49-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Woe: you lock the kingdom</td>
<td>11:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Revelation of the hidden</td>
<td>12:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. What is said in the dark</td>
<td>12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Do not fear</td>
<td>12:4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. You are worth more...</td>
<td>12:6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Confessing Jesus</td>
<td>12:8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Blasphemy of the Spirit</td>
<td>12:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Assistance of the Spirit</td>
<td>12:11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Anxiety about daily needs</td>
<td>12:22-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Treasures in heaven</td>
<td>12:33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Parable of the householder</td>
<td>12:39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Parable of the faithful servant</td>
<td>12:42-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. I cast fire on the earth</td>
<td>12:49,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. On divisions</td>
<td>12:52-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Agreeing with one’s accuser</td>
<td>12:57-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Parable of mustard seed</td>
<td>13:18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Parable of leaven</td>
<td>13:20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Two ways</td>
<td>13:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. I do not know you...</td>
<td>13:25-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. They will come from east and...</td>
<td>13:28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. First will be last</td>
<td>13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Lament over Jerusalem</td>
<td>13:34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Great supper</td>
<td>14:16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Loving one’s parents</td>
<td>14:25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Take up your cross</td>
<td>14:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Salt</td>
<td>14:34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Lost sheep</td>
<td>15:3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Serving two masters</td>
<td>16:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Law and prophets</td>
<td>16:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Endurance of the Law</td>
<td>16:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. On divorce</td>
<td>16:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. On scandal</td>
<td>17:1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Forgiveness</td>
<td>17:3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Faith as a mustard seed</td>
<td>17:5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. “Lo, here, 10, there”</td>
<td>17:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. The day of the Son of Man (1)</td>
<td>17:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. The day of the Son of Man (2)</td>
<td>17:26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. The day of the Son of Man (3)</td>
<td>17:28-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. He who saves his life</td>
<td>17:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Two in the bed</td>
<td>17:34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Where the corpse is</td>
<td>17:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These blocks can be organized into distinct and well-organized speeches.85

1. John’s Preaching of the Coming One: Q 3:7-9, 16b-17
2. The Temptation: Q 4:1-13
3. The Inaugural Discourse: Q 6:20b-49
4. John, Jesus and “this generation”: 7:1-10; 18-28; (16:16); 7:31-35
6. The Prayer Instruction: Q 11:2-4, 9-13
7. Controversies with Israel: Q 11:14-52
8. On Fearless Preaching: Q 12:2-12
13. Other Parables: Q 15:3-7; 16:13, 17-18; 17:1-6

_**Rudolf Bultmann: Signs of Redaction**_

The compositional and stratigraphical analyses of Q have been primarily guided by several necessary observations. First, how material is arranged and where material is placed have revealed probable editorial activity. Second, the identification of recurring themes, formulas, and expressions has provided clues that have led to further examination. Third, the lack of coherence of specific subunits suggests the manipulation of originally independent material in the editorial process. In order to accomplish redactional critiques, two principles have guided these efforts. The first is the necessity of an agreement order of Q. With an established sequence of material, editorial shifts and

---

85 Adapted from Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories*, 92.
insertions can be identified. Second, such efforts must start with the final text and work toward earlier forms.

As previously noted, Bultmann did not give much attention to Q. For him Q is primarily a product of primitive Christianity and its *kerygma* and much less so a source inviting analysis. However, the interest in the early preaching of the community led Bultmann to note critical organizing themes. Writing during the period which emphasized an eschatological tendency in nascent Christianity first articulated by Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer, Bultmann identified the framing of Q (specifically the beginning and ending of the document) as being constituted in apocalyptic and eschatological terms. Similarly, Bultmann noted that much of the forensic material within Q uses the phrase “this generation” (γενεὰ αὕτη) as part of its condemnatory message. This insight by Bultmann became the starting point for the important redactional study of Dieter Lührmann. Lastly, reference to John and the preaching of judgment and repentance is central to this framing. Bultmann comments:

Q begins with the preaching of the Baptist and ends with an apocalyptic sermon. Thus eschatology is found at the beginning and at the end. Not only that, but eschatology is a pervasive motif in Q: as consolation for the present in the beatitudes, as motivation for admonishments concerning moral behavior, as the means by which to grasp the messiahship of Jesus, and as the keynote of the propaganda and the threat against the unbelieving generation.

The expectation of the end is not simply of a joyful hope; it can also take on the gloomy sound of threat. The threat is directed primarily at γενεὰ

---


αὕτη (“this generation”). The Q-community adopted the repentance sermon of the Baptist (Matt 3:7-10// Luke 3:7-9) for this purpose. 88

In later stratigraphical analyzes, these two comments have served as redactional markers and have proved to be seminal for further scholarly contributions.

Dieter Lührmann: First Complete Redaction Analysis

Building upon Bultmann’s efforts, Dieter Lührmann published his groundbreaking work, Die Redaktion der Logienquelle, which opened a whole new area of Q study. In analyzing the subunits or speeches of Q, he followed Bultmann’s lead and was particularly impressed with a collection of wisdom sayings that created a speech against “this generation.” Previously, fourteen speeches were identified as constituting the bulk of Q. The fourth speech, “Jesus, John, and ‘this generation’” (7:1-10; 18-28; [16:16]; 7:31-35) was of particular interest to Lührmann. In Q [Luke] 7:18-35, one finds:

1. The chreia in which a delegation from John asks Jesus if he is the one to come, and Jesus replies, “Go report to John what you hear and see: The blind regain their sight and the lame walk around, the skin-diseases are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised, and the poor are evangelized.” (Q 7:22)

2. To this is added the chreia from Jesus where he speaks to those listening about the identity of John and uses a scripture quotation to identify him as the precursor: “This is the one about whom it has been written: Look, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your path in front of you.” (Q 7:27)

3. This unit also contains a verse of great compliment to John: “But then what did you go out to see? A prophet? Yes, I tell you, even more than a prophet!” 89 (Q 7:26)

4. After which, a parable is supplied which places John and Jesus beside one another over against “this generation”:


89 All citations of Q are from the Critical Edition, unless otherwise noted.
To what am I to compare this generation and what is it like? It is like children seated in the market-place, who addressing the others, say: We fluted for you, and but you would not dance; we wailed, but you would not cry. For John came, neither eating nor drinking, and you say: He has a demon! The son of humanity came, eating and drinking, and you say: Look! A person who is a glutton and drunkard, a chum of tax collectors and sinners! But Wisdom was vindicated by her children. (Q 7:31-35)

Lührmann concluded that this is not a haphazard collection based on Stichworten, but a clear and ostensible polemic. That is, chreiai were deliberately positioned in such a way to assert Jesus’ ascendancy over John. This shows editing, not simply collecting through literary mnemonic constructions. Lührmann went on to analyze a total of ten subunits of Q and identified the literary devices of a condemnation against “this generation” and its coming judgment as organizing and interpretative themes. Additionally, Lührmann noticed that other sections, such as Q 6:20-49, were untouched by the hand of a redactor. In many ways, this represents a turning point and has led to a consensus in the scholarly commentary and our understanding of both the nature of the Q document and the history of the text and its community. No longer could Q be discussed without addressing the nature of the redaction. Perhaps more importantly, Q was seen thereafter as a literary specimen with identifiable layers and a more sophisticated organization, well beyond a product of “collecting by catchword and by common topic.”

---

90 Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. See (1.) Q 3:7-9, 16-17 (pp. 24-31); (2.) 7:18-35 (pp. 24-31); (3.) 11:14-23, 24-26, 29-32 (pp. 32-43); (4.) 11:39-44, 46, 52 (pp. 43-48); (5.) 12:2-9 (pp. 49-52); (6.) 9:57-60 (p. 58); (7.) 10:2-16, 21-22 (pp. 59-68); (8.) 12:39-40, 42-45 (pp. 69-70); (9.) 17:24, 26-30, 34-35, 37 (pp. 71-83); (10.) 19:12-27 (pp.70-71).

91 Ibid., 53-56.

Arland Jacobson: The Direction of Redaction of Q

Arland Jacobson was impressed with the redactional analysis of Lührmann and was convinced that Q was shaped by strong editorial intentions. Although his overall compositional analysis has not generated much support, the work of Jacobson is important because it raised the question that once the speech clusters were identified, what is the chronological direction of redaction? His research serves to highlight the issue and to set the stage for later investigations. At the time, Jacobson’s 1978 dissertation *Wisdom Christology in Q*, under the tutelage of James Robinson, was a major advancement in the field. Jacobson did three things no one else had done before. First, he analyzed all of the speech clusters in Q for redactional signs. Second, he brought the work of Odil Hannes Steck to the field. Third, Jacobson then offered a proposal for the direction of redaction.

Steck’s research on Second Temple Judaism highlights the prominence of “Deuteronomistic Theology” as an interpretative strategy. The first step of this rhetoric envisions the history of Israel as endless cycles of disobedience. Then, God as a loving father calls the people to repentance by sending prophets (See Q 3:7-9, 16-17; 6:20-49; 10:2-12; 7:31-35; 11:29-32; 11:39-52). However, Israel continues in disobedience and

93 Arland D. Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology in Q" (Ph.D. diss, Claremont Graduate School, 1978).

rejects the prophets. This leads to prophets being sent again to call the people to repentance, with the promise of restoration for Israel. However, Israel continues to sin and, speaking for God, the prophets announce an impending judgment and punishment unless the call to repentance is heeded. Within this cycle, the prophets are rejected and sometimes killed (e.g. 2 Chr 24:18-24; Q 6:23c; 11:49-51; 13:34-35; 14:16-24) and recalcitrant Israel is finally punished.\(^95\)

Jacobson saw the same sort of polemic and historical interpretations in Q as articulated by Steck. By examining the entirety of Q for redactional signs, his eye cued for Deuteronomistic ideology, Jacobson identified two distinct compositional segments. In so doing, Jacobson noted that some complexes are focused outward and the contents are forensic and condemning while others are directed inward and are pacific in tone and hortatory toward ethical and social ideals. Jacobson’s stratigraphical analysis generally places material that is Deuteronomistic and condemning in the compositional stratum. The same can be said for sections that deal with heavenly Wisdom as the sender of the prophets (7:35). Taking the identifiable speeches from the above fourteen blocks, the materials can be grouped in these divisions:

External audience, forensic, and condemning:

1. John’s Preaching of the Coming One: Q 3:7-9, 16b-17
2. John, Jesus and “this generation”: 7:1-10; 18-28; (16:16); 7:31-35
3. Controversies with Israel: Q 11:14-52

\(^{95}\) See Deut 4:29-31; 30:1-10; 1 Kgs 18:4, 13; 19:10, 14; 2 Chr 36:14-16; Neh 9:26-31; Jer 2:30; Jub 1:7-26.
Internal audience, hortatory, and pacific:

1. The Inaugural Discourse: Q 6:20b-49
3. The Prayer Instruction: Q 11:2-4, 9-13
4. On Fearless Preaching: Q 12:2-12
5. On Anxiety: Q 12:(13-14, 16-21), 22b-31, 33-34

The centrality of Deuteronomistic historical ideology in Q convinced Jacobson of significant editorial intrusion and influenced his proposal for the direction of redaction. Jacobson followed the ecclesial tradition and the timeline of the Acts of the Apostles and concluded that the formative layer was from an early Jewish and prophetic (judgment) community and the redactional insertions signify another compositional moment and stratum whose focus is pacific and membership gentile. Thus, for Jacobson, the earliest phase of Q expresses hostility toward those who rejected their missionary efforts (Mission Discourse). Given this, Jacobson characterizes the compositional level as dealing with prophetic motifs and the preaching of repentance by prophets. 96 Jesus and John, as well as the community, were understood as successors of the prophets. Their deaths are explained in 6:23c and 11:47-51 as typical for God’s prophetic envoys. Then, over time, the community became less angry, more conciliatory and Gentile, while also stressing secret revelation (10:21-22; 11:2-4, 9-13), radical enthusiasm, and defining the lesser or supporting role that John has to Jesus. Jacobson suggests that the final redaction, by stressing secret revelation, was moving toward “gnosticizing tendencies.”97

97 Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology in Q", 234-35.
Although we must recognize the importance of the work of Jacobson, it does have significant weaknesses. It is not a purely literary analysis. That is, Jacobson allows theology and tradition (Deuteronomistic and Wisdom, as well as secret revelation, and enthusiasm) to determine stratigraphical levels. In this sense, he over-applied the findings of Steck. He is correct that Steck’s work is central to teasing out strata, but literary, not theological means, are necessary, lest we create a circular argument. Jacobson is right to draw attention to the importance of prophetic forms in the creation of Q. But he fails to note that no prophetic formulae such as “Thus says the Lord” are used. Others, as we shall see, attempt to argue that the phrase within Q, “I say to you…” is prophetic as well, but they fail to note that it is more at home in later sapiential settings. Thus, prophetic forms function not as signs of community ethos so much as literary, and more importantly, redactional markers. Jacobson also underestimates that it is equally possible that members of a community could use prophetic forms as literary devices. Additionally, on the issue of prophetic tones in Q, Jacobson fails to demonstrate that there were prophets in Galilee at the time. Because Jacobson misinterpreted the redactional value of Deuteronomistic ideology, he insufficiently deals with the sapiential material and merely treats it as later filler in Q, often assigning it to his indeterminate status. Finally, even though the Deuteronomic tradition was concerned about specific historical interpretations and used the prophets to express those viewpoints, one should not assume their statements were the products of prophetic circles. Rather, Steck argues that the Deuteronomists were at home in wisdom and scribal communities.\footnote{Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten, 206-15.} This point was overlooked by Jacobson. Nevertheless, Jacobson drew on this research to observe that
this Deuteronomistic Theology was operative in several of the major speeches of Q, and certainly in the opening and closing of Q.99

_Ron Cameron: The Rhetoric of the Prophetic Judgment Speech_

Ron Cameron has also made a small but significant contribution by isolating the prophetic judgment speech used by the Q redaction. By surveying announcements of condemnation within Jewish material, Cameron was able to identify a four step form. The prophetic judgment speech entails:

1. An “introductory attention-getting,”100 often pejorative address
2. An accusatory component with an “indignant question”
3. A formula designating the judge
4. A “concluding statement” summarizing or repeating the announcement of judgment

When applied to Q 3:7-9, John’s announcement of judgment, we find:

Q 3:7: (1. The address) He said to the crowds coming to be baptized: Snakes’ litter! (2. The indignant question) Who warned you to run from the impending rage?

Q 3:8: So bear fruit worthy of repentance, and do not presume to tell yourselves: We have as forefather Abraham! (3. Designation of judge) For I tell you: God can produce children for Abraham right out of these rocks!

Q 3:9: (4. Concluding statement of judgment) And the ax already lies at the root of the trees. So every tree not bearing healthy fruit is to be chopped down and thrown on the fire

Cameron’s work places in bolder relief the intentionality of the redactional efforts in Q. Clearly, the pronouncements of judgment against opponents are critical to the

---


100 The citations are from Ron Cameron, _Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James_ (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984; reprint, 2004), 30-35, esp. 32.
polemics of Q. The efforts of Lührmann and Cameron, in part, inspired others to explore the polemics of the major Q redaction.101

Dieter Zeller: Sub-collections Come into View

The importance of the analysis of sub-collections cannot be overestimated, for this work brings into view material that suggests different moments of composition. One of the earliest efforts was published in German a year before Jacobson finished his dissertation. Zeller’s *Die weisheitlichen Mansprüche bei den Synoptikern*102 demonstrates the importance of the sapiential material in Q. Zeller identifies six (and perhaps seven, the last being more loosely organized so it is difficult to offer a secure opinion) sapiential blocks (*Logienkomplexe*).103

2. Instructions for missionaries: 9:57-50; 10:2-8a, 9-11a, 12 (16)
3. On prayer: 11:2-4, 9-13
4. Conduct during persecution: 12:2-9 (10)
5. Attitude toward possessions: 12:22-31, 33-34
6. Vigilance: 12:(35-37?), 39f


103 Ibid., 191.

By doing this, Zeller was able to execute a form-critical analysis and thereby draw attention to the fact that these large blocks were relatively undisturbed and the audience was not outward in the form of castigations but inward with pronounced sapiential tones. Thus, these wisdom discourses stand out as quite distinct from the Deuteronomistic and forensic material of other Q pericopae. Later, the significant contributions of Ronald Piper will be discussed in Chapter Two. His research helped to secure the unity and compositional integrity of the sapiential material in Q. The analyses of the large blocks of wisdom material in Q would catch the eye of other scholars who would advance the field in several important ways.

*John Kloppenborg: Literary Cues for the Direction of Redaction*

When John Kloppenborg first considered the compositional history of Q, he turned to methodological discussions within Johannine tradition source criticism.¹⁰⁴ As we have seen, non-literary methods, especially those involving theological, thematic, or distinctions based on church tradition, become self-fulfilling explorations. Robert Fortna and Urban von Wahlde have made important contributions in Johannine source criticism that are methodologically highly relevant to Q studies. Fortna demonstrated the importance of identifying “aporias” in a text, “…the many inconsistencies, disjunctures, and hard connections, even contradictions—which the text shows….that cannot be

Aporias or uneven movements within a document may suggest an editorial seam. These seams indicate that certain sections of documents are:

…the product of a development involving more than one literary stage, the seams being due for the most part to the transition not from oral to literary form, but from one literary form to another. One cannot know in advance how many such stages in the gospel’s literary history it will be necessary to postulate in order to account for the aporias.106

Fortna notes that the idea for this comes from observing the struggles within the source criticism in Pentateuchal studies and the need for more textual distinctions and fewer that involve ideology (e.g. covenant, genealogical interest, northern or southern loyalty), stylistic indicators (particular use of the divine name [J, E, or P]), or contextual distinctions (e.g. parallel stories, contradictions in accounts).107 By applying more literary methods to his source-critical examinations of the Gospel of John, Fortna was able to describe the Sign subdocument in terms of its basic language (Greek), stylistic preferences (vocabular and syntactical), and a probable social location of the community (having affinities with Jewish ways).108

In a similar vein as Fortna regarding aporias, von Wahlde developed the notion of the “repetitive resumptive” where, at the point of a seam, the redaction tries to resume the


106 Ibid., 3.

107 Ibid., 15-22.

focus of previous material. Although this technique has had limited influence in Q literary-critical analyses, since it features a collection of sayings rather than narratives, it does emphasizes a closer scrutiny of the text with an eye for observable breaks in the flow of material. With attention to Johannine analysis, von Wahlde itemizes in even more detail the techniques he applies to Johannine source-critical work: aporias, shifts in terminology, duplicate or nearly duplicate versions.

Kloppenborg used as a starting point the previous contributions to Q studies made by Bultmann, Lührmann, and Jacobson. Kloppenborg was further influenced by the literary analysis of Fortna. Reviewing the macrotext of Q, Kloppenborg drew upon the observation of Bultmann that the opening and closing speeches, the forensic preaching of John (Q 3:2b-3a, 7-9, 16b-17) and the “Q Apocalypse” (Q 17:23-24, 37b, 26-30, 34-35; 19:12-27; 22:28-3), respectively, are granted pride of place. That is, end-time judgment speeches frame the entire document. It is usual for the main lens of the redactor(s) to hold such important positions in a text. Moreover, among the clusters of speeches in Q (those composed of community-oriented wisdom aphorisms and those outwardly focused forensic speeches calling for judgment on opponents), Kloppenborg noted that sayings threatening final judgment could be seen attached at the end of certain speeches whose main character was community-centered wisdom, but the converse was never to be found. That is, no speech of Q composed of threats against “this generation,”


111 Bultmann, "What the Saying Source Reveals about the Early Church."
or promising end-time judgment had final sayings turning to the subject to peace, forgiveness, and trust in God’s mercy. Kloppenborg cites the Mission Discourse of Q 9:57-10:24 as the most obvious case where forensic material, 10:12, 13-15 is inserted to shade the character of the text.112

9:57 And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go. 58 And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes, and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head. 59 But another said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father. 60 But he said to him: Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead.

10:2 He said to his disciples: The harvest is plentiful, but the workers are few. So ask the Lord of the harvest to dispatch workers into his harvest.3 Be on your way! Look, I send you like sheep in the midst of wolves. 4 Carry no purse, nor knapsack, nor sandals, nor stick, and greet no one on the road. 5 Into whatever house you enter, first say: Peace to this house! 6 And if a son of peace be there, let your peace come upon him; but if not, let your peace return upon you. 7 And at that house remain, eating and drinking whatever they provide, for the worker is worthy of one’s reward. Do not move around from house to house. 8 And whatever town you enter and they take you in, eat what is set before you. 9 And cure the sick there, and say to them: The kingdom of God has reached unto you.10 But into whatever town you enter and they do not take you in, on going out from that town, 11 shake off the dust from your feet.

The text continues with a redactional interpolation:

10:12 I tell you: For Sodom it shall be more bearable on that day than for that town. 13 Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the wonders performed in you had taken place in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, in sackcloth and ashes. 14 Yet for Tyre and Sidon it shall be more bearable at the judgment than for you. 15 And you, Capernaum, up to heaven will you be exalted? Into Hades shall you come down! 16 Whoever takes you in takes me in, and whoever takes me in takes in the one who sent me.

The text resumes:

10:21 At that time he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the learned, and disclosed them to children.

112 For fuller discussion of this hypothesis of redactional activity see Kloppenborg Verbin, Excavating Q, 143-53.
Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do. Everything has been entrusted to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father, nor does anyone know the Father except the Son, and to whomever the Son chooses to reveal him. Blessed are the eyes that see what you see… For I tell you: Many prophets and kings wanted to see what you see, but never saw it, and to hear what you hear, but never heard it.

The sudden intrusion of threats to the opponents upsets the balance of the Mission Speech in its otherwise unruffled explanation of what is necessary for the faithful “disciple.” The sapientially-oriented speech then receives this ending which emphasizes the coming judgment on the resisting towns. Kloppenborg notes that in the forensic speeches, however, there is never an interpolation or ending that brings a fiery discourse to a pacific closing. The Deuteronomistic theology that Jacobson identifies in these speeches brings the power of the Jewish traditions to bear on those who confront and reject the message. Kloppenborg’s own attention to the Jewish traditions that appear in the forensic speeches uncovers repeated references to the story of Lot, and also to the prophet Jonah. As Kloppenborg has noted, the phrase “around all the circuit of the Jordan” (πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) is a technical term indicating the “Arava, the southern Jordan rift valley from the Dead Sea to Zarethan.” This phrase appears within the Lot cycle seven times: Gen 13:10-12; 19:17, 25, 28. Within Q, reference or allusion to the Lot material appears in 10:12; 17:28-29, 34-35. This led Kloppenborg to conclude that elements within the Lot story are specifically designed as motifs to be applied to the righteous and the unrighteous in Q. As Kloppenborg points out, the Lot story carried great meaning to those who share its tradition and it was invoked throughout other settings. For example, Ezekiel proclaims:

113 Ibid., 94.
This was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had pride, excess of food, and prosperous ease, but did not aid the poor and needy. They were haughty, and did abominable things before me; therefore I removed them when I saw it. Samaria has not committed half your sins; you have committed more abominations than they, and have made your sisters appear righteous by all the abominations that you have committed. Bear your disgrace, you also, for you have brought about for your sisters a more favorable judgment; because of your sins in which you acted more abominably than they, they are more in the right than you. So be ashamed, you also, and bear your disgrace, for you have made your sisters appear righteous. (Ezek 16:49-52)

Similarly, Kloppenborg argues that just as the book of Jonah was meant to shame those who object to God’s outreach to the Gentiles, Jonah is used to condemn the rejecters of the Q mission. This evidence deepens the ways in which the condemnation of the outsiders receives justification by appeal to Jewish myths and prophecy.

To summarize, the evidence shows that it is not the internally-focused community sapiential speeches that indicate a secondary redaction on a formative set of forensic speeches, as Jacobson, basing his view on ecclesial traditions, had decided. Rather, a formative set of sapiential speeches were altered, as well as the entire document, toward a condemnatory message against those who rejected the earlier mission of the first tradents. The imposition of forensic endings on sapiential collections and the fact that the opening and closing speeches of Q proclaim the coming judgment leads one to conclude that, with respect to the history of this document, these forensic materials were added subsequent to a formative collection of sapiential aphorisms.

114 Q 11:29-32: “But he said, ‘This generation is an evil generation; it demands a sign, but a sign will not be given to it—except the sign of Jonah! For Jonah became to the Ninevites a sign, so also will the son of humanity be to this generation. The queen of the South will be raised at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and look, something more than Solomon is here! Ninevite men will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it. For they repented at the announcement of Jonah, and look, something more than Jonah is here!’”
The Development of the Argument of the Redaction

With the evidence of redaction in Q and the prominence of the organizing motifs of the macrotext, we are able to identify and follow the building of the argument for the Sayings Gospel.\textsuperscript{115} Q begins with the preaching of judgment by John. John proclaims that a “day is coming” (Mal 4:1/LXX 3:19) and that Elijah will appear “before the great and terrible day of the Lord” (Mal 4:5/LXX 3:22). The hearer learns (Q 3:16) that “one is coming” (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) and punitive judgment is imminent. Yet, following the judgment speech of John is the contradictory and hortatory sermon by a sapiential and peaceable Jesus (Q 6:20b-23b, 27, 35, 36-45, 46-49). To continue the prophetic theme, the Q redactor builds upon the previous John material (Q 3:7-9, 16-17) by having his disciples ask Jesus if he is the “one coming” (Q 7:18-23). In Q 7:24-30, Jesus describes John as “more than a prophet” but also as one who prepares the way for the “one coming.” In the latter half of the same speech, 7:31-35, Jesus and John are linked as rejected messengers, but their demise is both expected and seen in a positive light as divine envoys with the phrase, “Yet Wisdom is justified by her children.” The invocation of the title “the one coming” generates images of Elijah. But to apply this to Jesus is confusing. Q resolves to this problem, Kloppenborg points out, by having Jesus tell the disciples of John that “the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear (Q 7:22),” thus redirecting the images away from an end-time prophetic role to the miracle-making Elijah. Interestingly, Kloppenborg notes that 4Q521 contains similar characteristics.

\textsuperscript{115} For the argument of Q see Kloppenborg Verbin, \textit{Excavating Q}, 122-24.
attributed to the Messiah. Instead, Jesus continues by associating the “coming one” with John in Q 7:27 (“This is the one of whom it is written, ‘Behold I send my messenger before your face, who shall prepare your way before you.’”). In this way, the coming “great and terrible day” in Malachi (4:5/LXX 3:22) carries the force of judgment, while the roles within this reckoning from Malachi 3-4 are distributed between John and Jesus.

Besides the sorting out of eschatological roles within the Q redaction, the text contains allusions to the fate of the unrighteous within the Lot material. The Deuteronomistic depiction of history, the lack of repentance of the people, and the promise of judgment all serve to place Jesus and John within the long line of rejected and sometimes murdered prophets. All of these images function to pronounce judgment on “this generation” and to suggest what Jesus and John meant to the Q tradents. Specific Galilean communities (Q 10:13-15) are singled out for their evil and impending punishment is pronounced. Jerusalem (Q 13:34-35) is seen as a vile place perhaps suggesting that those who rejected the Q community may have invoked traditional Jewish beliefs and traditions associated with the religious capital. Jonah (Q 11:29-32), in the same way, is used to show that “this generation” rejects God’s commands and that Gentiles are more able to live Godly lives. The text ends with the Q Apocalypse, thus the redactional motifs frame and reshape the document.

---

116 All translations from the Dead Sea Scrolls, unless otherwise noted, are from Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook. The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation. New York: HarperCollins, 1996. See excerpts from 4Q521: “For the Lord seeks the pious and calls the righteous by name. Over the humble His spirit hovers, and He renews the faithful in His strength. For He will honor the pious upon the throne of His eternal kingdom, setting prisoners free, opening the eyes of the blind, raising up those who are bowed down….For He shall heal the critically wounded, He shall revive the dead, He shall send good news to the afflicted…”

From Redaction to Compositional History

The above redaction-critical analyses provide an editorial direction and probably compositional history for Kloppenborg. Q contains two types of literature that are significantly dissimilar, yet comprise the bulk of the document. When the macrotext is viewed, it is clear that the Deuteronomistic themes are granted pride of place. At the same time when the sapiential material is examined, Deuteronomistic material precedes, follows, or is inserted into the discourse unit. The opposite is never true in Q—that the forensic material ends on an uplifting sapiential note. This pattern is visible and predictable. The material that expresses the unifying motifs of coming judgment, Deuteronomistic view of history and the role of the prophets, allusions to the Lot cycle and stories of Jonah (Q 3:3, 7-9, 16-17; 6:23c; 7:18-35; 10:12, 13-15; 11:31-32, 49-51; 12:39-40, 42-46; 13:28-29, 34-35; 14:16-24; 17:23-37; 19:12-27; 22:28-30) begin to stand out as being likely created at one redactional juncture.

There are other sub-collections that are relatively untouched; pertinent examples are the Inaugural Sermon (6:20b-49) and the Q Prayer Instruction (11:2b-4, 9-13). These speech clusters suggest a different socio-historical moment and compositional intent. For example, when contrasted with the forensic material above, the sub-collection of 6:20b-49; 11:2b-4, 9-13; 12:2-7, (8-9), 11-12; 12:22b-31, 33-34 stands out in several critical ways. The forensic material castigates. Its audience is outward and the tone is combative. The sapiential material is addressed to an internal audience. The tone is didactic, supportive, and encouraging. The sum of the sapiential material forms an effort to shape a group’s ethos, its self-understanding, and its view of the larger world as well as the

---

118 In Chapter Three, the work of Ronald Piper will be presented, which shows that each of these sapiential blocks exhibits a common four-part rhetorical structure.
character of the divine. The forensic material does not directly inculcate and indicates a boundary between those inside (hearers) and those upon whom they are casting judgment. This is striking, since the sapiential material expresses forgiveness (11:4; 17:3-4) and admonishes the adherents to not judge (Q 6:37, “Do not pass judgment, so you are not judged. For with what judgment you pass judgment you will be judged.”), while the forensic texts are void of compassion and social acceptance. Thus, Kloppenborg concluded that the last pen on the document had Deuteronomistic interpretative intentions. What is most noteworthy and influential is that this stratigraphical argument is based on literary analysis.  

**Q as Expanded Instruction**

Previously, the Deuteronomistic theme and theology was presented. The bulk of Kloppenborg’s early work focused on understanding the nature of the sapiential blocks in Q. In looking for common patterns and literary precursors, Kloppenborg compared three wisdom traditions, Near Eastern instructions (Egyptian and Mesopotamian), Hellenistic gnomologia, and chreia collections. It is common for instructions to be ascribed to a king, famous sage, or father. The speaker-audience pairing is frequently father to son and the wisdom passed on can range from practical advice on character formation to financial, social, and business relations. The oldest extant text is *The

---

119 Kloppenborg’s earlier work begged clarification as to how much, if at all, it involved generic distinctions. He offers thoughtful clarifications in his preface to the second edition; see Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories*, ix-xiv.

120 Ibid., 171-245.
Examples of some of the older Mesopotamian traditions are The Instructions of Šušuppak, The Counsels of Wisdom, and The Words of Ahikar. This literature often has the speaker using the first person and communicating in terms of imperatives (wisdom admonishments). They are structured by topic and catchwords. These instructions were often created in scribal or palace schools. Besides the more practical emphases, the Egyptian instructional literature assumes as backdrop the pervasive and all-encompassing nature of divine order personified as the goddess Maʿat, daughter of Re.

---


123 Some of the instructions discussed by Kloppenborg are addressed to Kagemni and Merikare, The instructions of Ptahhotep, Any, Amenemope, Ankhsheshonq, Onchsheshonqy, and Papyrus Insinger.

The morphology of Hellenistic gnomologia is broader and less homogeneous. Some of the forms use a title, exordium, wisdom imperatives, and/or motive clauses. The contents are linked by topic, analogy, and catchword often with parental tones. Chreia collections, such as Demonax, are partly biographical and function as a tribute to and wisdom compendium of the sage. In all the cases of the wisdom traditions discussed, the attributions serve as a mechanism of legitimization.

The import of this area is to highlight the breadth of the wisdom tradition and its presence in many cultures over several centuries. The Jewish and Christians traditions fall in line as members of this literary trajectory. For example, it is well-known that Proverbs 22:17-24:34 is dependent on the Egyptian Instruction of Amenemope. Proverbs is probably the oldest representative of Jewish wisdom traditions while Sirach, being later, exhibits much more diversity of topical interests and greater complexity. M. 'Abot contains collections of the wisdom admonishments of many rabbis (quasi-fathers) addressed to followers organized by topic and catchword. The Gospel of Thomas portrays Jesus as a parental figure sharing secret wisdom with his followers organized mostly by catchword. For Kloppenborg, the sapiential material in Q exhibits sufficient similarity with these traditions (e.g. admonitions, practical wisdom from an esteemed speaker) to warrant probable affinity. However, even Kloppenborg recognizes that the fit, in terms

---

125 Some of the gnomologia and chreia collections discussed by Kloppenborg are Lucan’s Demonax, the Lives of Eminent Philosophers by Diogenes Laertius, the Sentences of the Pythagoreans, Pseudo-Phocylides, Sextus, and the Sayings of Democritus.

126 See McKane, Proverbs. Whybray, Composition of the Book of Proverbs.

127 It is both interesting and important to note that nearly coterminous to the initial work of Kloppenborg, Perdue examined the wisdom sayings of Jesus (and their form-critical antecedents) and developed form-critical typologies. For Perdue, when wisdom sayings are used in a step by step process to develop a coherent argument, they form an “instruction.” The following are relevant to the Q Prayer Instruction:
of which tradition, is not perfect. Q lacks the typical parent-child speaker-audience and the practical wisdom is highly peculiar, tailored to its specific, albeit, unconventional setting. General life, financial, business, and social relations are absent in Q. However, Q¹ is replete with admonitions, sapiential questions, and motive clauses, etc. Q¹ material focuses inward, to the community or group of devotees. It is parenetic in its character and thus, one would suspect, in function. In contrast, the speeches of Q² are focused outward, forensic in character. Interestingly, this material is more developed, not just aphorisms linked by *Stichworten*, but *chreia*. Even more, *chreia* are connected in a deliberate fashion as a part of a well-designed argument (i.e. Q 7:18-35). Kloppenborg and others have noted that the redaction of the formative stratum was highly sophisticated, being just steps away from a particular type of narrative. That is, the linked castigating *chreia* form an argument against the opposition (“this generation”). This material needed only a “literary” nudge to move closer to becoming a biographical narrative. This can be clearly seen in the largest insertion of Q³, the Temptation Narrative Q 4:1-13. Here, three *chreia* are linked, positioned, and have a climax. This material, most Q scholars would say, is part of the final redaction, and Kloppenborg argues, suggests that the document seems to be on the way toward being shaped as a *bios*.

---

Opening Admonishment(s); Rhetorical Question(s); Comparative Proverb(s) using “from lesser to greater” arguments. Instructions involve an introduction containing an addressee in the form of an imperative; a main section with supporting admonishments, and a Conclusion (often referring back to the introduction). Perdue applies these categories to Q 11:9-13 and sees sufficient alignment to deem the block 11:9-13 an Instruction. Note: Admonishments (11:9-10), Rhetorical Questions (11:11-12); and Conclusion (11:13). This supports Kloppenborg’s work. See Leo G. Perdue, "The Wisdom Sayings of Jesus," *Forum* 2(1986).


Chapter Summary and Implications for the Dissertation

This chapter has presented and discussed the scholarship that establishes, to the satisfaction of most specialists, the second source, Q, of the 2DH of the synoptic gospels. Once Q was identified and reconstructed, scholars have been able to examine its message and compositional history. The stratigraphic model of Kloppenborg has been met with broad agreement and places the Q Prayer Instruction (11:2b-4, 9-13) within the formative stratum.

We will now proceed to the Prayer Speech itself, in order to discuss important features of this cluster. As will be more clearly established in the following chapter, the Q Prayer Speech was constructed by connecting two previously unrelated subunits. This editorial decision reveals how the prayer was originally understood. That is, the aphorisms of Q 11:9-13 set the range of possible meanings for how the prayer can be interpreted. In this sense, vv. 9-13 are interpretive controls provided by the Q complier. Once the argument of Chapter Three is developed, it will be used to interpret the prayer in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER THREE

THE STRUCTURE, FORM, AND RELATIONSHIP

OF THE Q CLUSTER: Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13

9 λέγω ὑμῖν, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.

9 I tell you, ask and it will be given to you, search and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you.

10 πάς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κροῦοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.

10 For everyone who asks receives, and the one who searches finds, and to the one who knocks will it be opened.

***************

11 τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

11 What person of you, whose child asks for bread, will give him a stone?

12 ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσει, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

12 Or again when he asks for a fish, will he give him a snake?

13 εἰ οὖν ύμεῖς πονηροὶ οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτὸν.

13 So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

Introduction

This chapter presents the central position of this dissertation. It is argued that once Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13 were attached to 11:2b-4, an editorial decision was revealed. This decision displays how the Q complier(s) intends for the entire Prayer Speech to be understood. Thus, the aphorisms of Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13 serve as controls establishing,
and more importantly, limiting the range of possible meanings for how the prayer is be understood. These controls, or this lens, possess the greatest probability for representing the intentions of the compilers of the Q Prayer Speech, which later became, after others further redacting the text, the Lord’s Prayer. This discussion first begins by examining the form of vv. 9-10 and how those verses are related to one another. Scholarly proposals about their intended meaning, devoid of any particular context, will be discussed. Second, the chapter will address the subunit vv. 11-12, 13 and the message these verses impart, based on their images alone, apart from any context. Finally, the chapter will address the influence of vv. 11-12, 13 upon the previous cluster (11:9-10). This discussion concludes by applying the well-regarded contribution of Ronald Piper to the aphorisms of Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13, thus paving the way for the next chapter of the dissertation, which presents an interpretation of the Lord’s Prayer.

The Form, Relationship, and Message of Q 11:9-10

9 λέγω ὑμῖν, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.

10 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.

9 I tell you, ask and it will be given to you, search and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you.

10 For everyone who asks receives, and the one who searches finds, and to the one who knocks will it be opened.

It is widely recognized by scholars that the Q Prayer Speech is composed of three components. Two previously independent aphoristic subunits and the prayer were joined to one another in the formation of the Q Prayer Speech. Thus, not necessarily in chronological order, we have:
1. The aphorisms of Q 11:9-10

2. The aphorisms of Q 11:11-12, 13

3. The Q prayer, Q 11:2b-4

The purpose of this dissertation is to use the imagery within Q 11:9-10 and vv. 11-12, 13 as controls in order to interpret the prayer, Q 11:2b-4, in accord with the intended perspective of the author/redactor.

Raymond Brown

We begin by recalling the work of Raymond Brown, discussed in Chapter One. Brown’s purpose was to demonstrate the essential eschatological nature of the Lord’s Prayer. Brown does this by aligning other texts with the prayer that are thoroughly eschatological. He begins with the plea for God’s kingdom to come, associates this


2 Brown, "Pater Noster."
kingdom with eschatological texts from Judeo-Christian sources, and applies this eschatological perspective to the prayer.\(^3\) That is, the petitions for food, for forgiveness, and the petition to not be led into temptation, are viewed by Brown through an eschatological lens. This way, Brown is able to correlate the prayer a worthy number of texts in order to support his argument. On the surface, his work seems convincing. The problem for us in his effort, though, is that he mixes contexts, moving from the Lord’s Prayer to texts in a variety of New Testament documents. His findings, then, do not represent a particular author or text, let alone the Sayings Gospel. Thus, his conclusions cannot be applied to Q and its community without more discussion.

However, in terms of the Q Prayer Speech, Brown’s method can be corrected by aligning, not external and discontinuous texts, but internal and continuous texts with the prayer for interpretation. Thus, with the aphoristic subunits (Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13) attached to the prayer (Q 11:2b-4), it is possible, nay likely, that a proper understanding of the prayer can come to light. In this way, it is more probable that whoever attaches discrete aphorisms to the prayer deliberately favors one particular lens through which the teaching is to be understood.

Brown and others, however, did not consider the Lord’s Prayer in its Q context, where the cluster Q 11:9-13 immediately follows and, indeed, brings the “speech” on prayer to its conclusion. We invoke the same, but adjusted, principle here. Although the Lord’s Prayer, interpreted without context, leaves open the argument of the manner in which it should be understood, pace Brown, the Q collector’s choice to connect, or to accept the prayer already connected to vv. 9-10, 11-12, 13, allows us to study these

aphorisms in order to secure the interpretation most probably representative of those represented by Q¹ and accepted by the later redactors of Q². At this point, it is worthwhile to turn to scholars who comment on the discrete subunits of Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13 and how the views of these commentators can be applied to the formation and subsequent interpretation of the Q Prayer Speech. We begin with Paul Minear.

Paul Minear

Paul Minear has studied the form and development of the sayings cluster, Matthew 7:7-11/ Luke 11:9-13, and he has examined this complex for coherence in structure and symmetry in grammar and style. Below is his schema for analysis.

Form A
1. Ask, and it will be given you
2. Seek, and you will find
3. Knock, and it will be opened to you
   (Matt 7:7; Luke 11:9)

Form B
1. For every one who asks receives
2. and he who seeks finds
3. and to him who knocks it will be opened
   (Matt 7:8; Luke 11:10)

Form C
1. Or what person of you
2. Whose child asks for bread
3. Will give him a stone?
4. Or if he asks for a fish
5. Will give him a snake?
6. If you then, though evil
7. Know how to give good gifts to your children
8. By how much more will the Father
9. Give good things to those who ask him!
   (Matt 7:9-11; Luke 11:11-13)

*Minear does not discuss Q in “Ask, Seek, Knock.” Rather, his concern is Luke 11:9-10 and par. See Paul Sevier Minear, “’Ask, Seek, Knock’,” in Commands of Christ: Authority and Implications (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972).*
First, Minear notes that it is clear that Forms A and B are related in terms of vocabulary, syntax, and structure, while Form C is quite separate in form and structure. That is, Form B “answers” Form A. Thus, its function is to stress and increase the assurance that asking, seeking, and knocking will always result in the petitioner receiving, finding, and having the door opened. For this reason, Minear argues that Form A is the primary saying, while Form B is secondary and describes as an “innocuous and unnecessary restatement” of Form A.5

When Minear turns his attention to Form C, Matthew 7:9-11/Luke 11:11-12, 13, he notes that they function to limit and control the otherwise wide-open ask-receive, seek-find, and knock-be opened within Forms A and B. That is, the questions and final affirmation are controls and serve “to narrow the circle of meaning of Form A.”6 By “narrowing,” Minear means that the scope of possible invitations within ask, seek, and knock (Matt 7:7-8/Luke 11:9-10) are now, due to their attachment to Matthew 7:9-11/Luke 11:11-12, 13, conditioned to and limited by the parent-child roles, behaviors, and expectations of those verses, all of which are being applied to prayer.7

For Minear, Form A holds the key to the entire cluster, since Form B is a repetition, and Form C “provides an apt illustration of asking.”8 Thus, Form A is the driving interpretative force for the entire subunit of Matthew 7:7-11/Luke 11:9-13, for Minear. One must remember, though, that Minear is primarily interested in “ask, seek,

---

5 Ibid., 115.
6 Minear, "Ask, Seek, Knock," 117.
7 Ibid., 117.
8 Ibid., 117.
and knock” and this interest may overshadow his view of the parent-child sapiential questions and simile that follow Forms A and B. The conventions of “asking” and “seeking” are ubiquitous in the prayers and wisdom literature of many peoples, certainly including the Greek and Jewish religious traditions. 9 For example, in discussing the invitation to seek and find, Minear comments,

In the New Testament the collocation of finding/seeking has become axiomatic; it is applied to both trivial and ultimate matters. In the main, however, the object of seeking always represents an important concern: fruit (Luke 13:7), a lost coin (Luke 15:8), a lost sheep (Matt. 18:12) death (Rev. 9:6). Finding is by no means the automatic result of seeking (Mark 8:11). Yet seeking/finding has become a stereotype for the universal religious quest (Acts 17:27), while the refusal to seek spells sin and damnation (Rom. 3:11). As illuminating parallels to A 2, I shall select for examination three pericopes from among many passages.10

Focusing solely on Matthew’s gospel, Minear represents the Matthean interpretation of seeking and finding, as always directed towards the search for the Kingdom:

In Matthew the seeking/finding axis is central to the twin parables of the treasure hidden in a field and the merchant finding a pearl (13:44-46). Both are pictures of obedience to the command “Seek first the kingdom of heaven” (6:33). The act of seeking is here viewed as the most important thing a man can do, while the treasure found is the greatest value a man can receive. The search as a whole is viewed as relating a man to the kingdom of heaven.11

But for Minear, the particular key to understanding Matthew 7:7-8/Luke 11: 9-10 is in the unusual invitation to “knock” with the assurance that “it” will be opened.

In Form A 3 the image of knocking [Matt 7:7-8/Luke 11:9-10] readily came to represent for early Christians the difficulty of surviving the apocalyptic

---

9 The textual evidence is far too voluminous for any footnote. Please consult Appendix A: Asking and Seeking in Greco-Roman Prayer and Wisdom Literature.

10 Minear, "Ask, Seek, Knock"," 123.

crisis, while the promise of an opened door came to represent their incredible confidence in Jesus’ power over Death and Hades. In its context in Matt. 7:7, as interpreted by the parable of 7:9-11, the command to knock probably had lost some of this bright eschatological color, though as the word of a prophet of the kingdom of God it had originally glowed with such color. In this respect the prophet John in Revelation may be closer to the original meaning of the command than was the teacher in Matthew.”

Minear grants that the “narrowing,” as he describes Form C, has resulted in an apocalyptic character being assigned to “knock.” That is, doors may exclude; believers must pass through; the eschatological judge must permit, before entry is granted into the kingdom of God, etc. For Minear, the force of the “knock” metaphor carries over into the interpretation of both Forms A and B. Together, then, the entire subunit of Matthew:7-7-8/Luke 11:9-10, with its eschatological tone, becomes the hermeneutic for the images of “bread” and of “fish” to be seen as part of the “Eucharistic celebrations” that will be enjoyed in the “Messianic presence” by the children of God at the second coming of Christ. As we shall see, Minear goes in the opposite direction of Piper and this dissertation. That is, he begins with an eschatologically understood “ask, seek, and knock” and continues that orientation through his interpretation of the familial and reassuring images of Matthew 7:9-11/Luke 11:11-13.

12 Minear, "'Ask, Seek, Knock'," 121-22.

13 The following citations, among others, are found within Ibid., 118-22. Matt 7:13-14, 23; 16:18, 24:33; 25:10-12; Luke 13:31-35; Acts 5:19; 14:27; I Cor 16:9; 2 Cor 2:12; James 5:9; Rev 3:8.

14 Also note: “God’s grace in giving is commonly linked to God’s salvation as a whole as announced by Jesus, rather than to specific human requests.” Ibid., 130.
Richard Edwards

Richard Edwards briefly discusses Matt 7:7-11/Luke 11:9-13 in his 1976 book, *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom*. For Edwards, the use of the future tense in the verbs of Q 11:9-10 becomes proof that these commands are due to the pervasive influence of eschatology throughout the early Church. He reasons: “These gnostic statements [Q 11:9-10] take on eschatological significance when the future verbs are seen in the light of the coming judgment—and not merely earthly consequences of persistent activity.” Again, we see that “ask-receive, seek-find, and knock-be opened” are associated with a particular lens, in this case eschatological, external to the Q Prayer Speech.

Dale Goldsmith

Dale Goldsmith has studies the development of Matthew 7:7-8/Luke 11:9-10 within early Christian documents. Goldsmith begins by examining the parallel structure of the “ask, seek, knock” logion. Goldsmith notes that the almost perfect symmetry and use of the future tense is strong evidence of redactional activity. Below is Goldsmith’s working schema for analysis.

\[
\begin{align*}
A_1 & \quad \alphaἰτεῖτε \ καὶ \ δοθῆσεται \ υμῖν, \\
B_1 & \quad \zητεῖτε \ καὶ \ εὑρῆσετε \\
C_1 & \quad κρούετε \ καὶ \ άνοιγῆσεται \ υμῖν.
\end{align*}
\]

---

15 Edwards, *A Theology of Q*.

16 Ibid., 109.

17 It is important to note that Goldsmith does not explore earlier Greek, Hellenistic, Greco-Roman or Jewish related material.

18 Goldsmith provides the following chart in English, however, below is the Greek text.
A2 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει,
B2 καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει
C2 καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.

Goldsmith differs from Minear, however, in that the “asking” of Matthew 7:7a/Luke 11:9a should be seen as primary and earliest. That is, the imperative “to ask” (Matt 7:7a/Luke 11:9a) at first stood alone. The next stage in the development of the logion was for its confirmation to be added, hence, “For everyone who asks receives” (Matt 7:8a/Luke 11:10a). Only later was the saying expanded and elaborated with the other two invitations, that is, what is now Matthew 7:7bc, 8bc/Luke 11:9bc, 10bc. Once constructed, Goldsmith describes the symmetry and balance as “obvious and almost perfect.”

Goldsmith identifies the symmetry in the following ways:

1. A1, B1, C1 all begin with a plural imperative, and
2. A1 and C1 end with a passive
3. Only B1 ends in a second person plural future tense
4. A1, B1 and C1 all present a request followed by a promised fulfillment
5. The pairings in A2, B2, C2, are almost identical

For Goldsmith, “asking” with confidence in a free, open manner is the central message of the logion. He makes the point that asking and seeking are common in world literature, adventure stories, philosophical texts and wisdom literature in general and he notes, without exploring the fact, that the third imperative, “knocking” is rather unusual

---

19 Dale Goldsmith, "'Ask, and It Will Be Given...': Toward Writing the History of a Logion," *New Testament Studies* 35, no. 2 (1989), 255. Goldsmith, from his study, also concludes that this logion cannot be a translation from a previous language and that the extant text was originally constructed in Greek. This point is worth identifying, but the historical provenance of the sayings, however, is not in the scope of this dissertation.
and not common. Rather, Goldsmith goes on to note how the logion is under the influence of what precedes and follows it in each gospel. In terms of Luke 11:2-4b, Goldsmith notes that “asking” is being applied to prayer. Where, Matthew 7:7-8 is preceded by admonitions for prudence and respect for what is holy (Matt 7:6: “Do not give what is holy to dogs; and do not throw your pearls before swine, or they will trample them under foot and turn and maul you.”). When Goldsmith assesses each setting, Matthean and Lukan, he finds a distinct difference. In Luke, the invitations to ask, seek and knock are preceded by the prayer teaching and followed by particular examples of parents giving food to their young children. However, in Matthew, the asking, the seeking and knocking are much more “wide-open,” suggesting that Matthew left the “eschatological ethical direction” of the logion [Matt 7:7-8] “intact.”

When Goldsmith turns his attention toward assessing the pre-gospel meaning of the logion, he eschews what he considers as the more redacted and hence limiting (to prayer) Lukan setting. Instead, Goldsmith attends to what he considers the more “intact” Matthean context. Thus, he proposes that the earliest version of the logion is the first injunction, to ask and receive (Matt 7:7a, 8a):

What might the earliest setting for this logion have been? Certainly it is the eschatological message of Jesus. While it is not impossible that within that context Jesus could have used this logion to speak about prayer, Jesus’ concern was not for strictly ‘religious’ matters, but rather about the totality of the new order of God's rule in the world.

---

20 Goldsmith states: “As the various developments of the three logia show, each suggests its own ‘story’ and they need not necessarily be viewed as three aspects of one ‘story’ - a ‘prayer story.’” Ibid., 258.

21 Ibid., 261.

22 Ibid., 262.
And again we find,

We have attempted to indicate that the ask-logion of Matthew 7.7a, 8a is an independent saying (probably of Jesus himself) which originally called for or described a response within the context of the earliest, eschatological preaching of the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{23}

Even though Goldsmith agrees with Minear that the saying refers to the eschatological kingdom, his reasons are distinct. For it is not the unusual character of the invitation to “knock and it shall be opened,” as it is for Minear, but the wide-open character of the asking, which suggests for him a cosmic dimension. For Goldsmith, this “wide-open” admonition must refer to the eschatological arrival of the Kingdom of God.

This review of Brown, Minear, Edwards, and Goldsmith has identified that the admonitions of Matthew 7:7-8/Luke/Q 11:9-10 are often associated with eschatological settings. Both Brown and Edwards begin with an eschatological purpose and hermeneutic and find confirming, but external, textual associations for their arguments. Minear and Goldsmith are much more focused on the introductory admonitions of Q 11:9-10, but in the Matthean rather than the Lukan setting. Each of them recognizes that the Lukan context limits the interpretation of those verses to prayer, based on the influence of the preceding prayer (Luke 11:2b-4). However, since both Minear and Goldsmith are concerned about the “development” of the logion, they are drawn toward to the perceived more wide-open and seemingly less redacted, hence, limiting Matthean text. It this way, they break free the asking, seeking, and knocking and associate those sayings with eschatological texts. Thus, Minear and Goldsmith propose that a Matthean understanding should control the interpretation of Matthew 7:9-11/Luke 11:11-12, 13. The question to

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 264.
be posed at this point must be: Is Q 11:11-12, 13 ancillary or primary for understanding 
the entire sapiential cluster of Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13? It is to this question that we now 
turn.

**The Form, Components, Relationship, and Message of Q 11:11-12, 13**

\[\text{λέγω ὑμῖν, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν,} \]
\[\text{ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε κρούετε καὶ} \]
\[\text{ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.} \]

9 I tell you, ask and it will be given to you, 
search and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you.

\[\text{πᾶς γὰρ ὁ άιτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν} \]
\[\text{εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.} \]

10 For everyone who asks receives, and the one who searches finds, and to the one who knocks will it be opened.

***************

\[\text{τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ} \]
\[\text{υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;} \]

11 What person of you, whose child asks for bread, will give him a stone?

\[\text{ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσει, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;} \]

12 Or again when he asks for a fish, will give him a snake?

\[\text{εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ οἴδατε ὅτε δόσει} \]
\[\text{δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν,} \]
\[\text{πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει} \]
\[\text{ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτὸν.} \]

13 So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

Ronald Piper

This section will apply the well-regarded work of Ronald Piper to the aphorisms 
of Matthew 7:9-11/Luke/Q 11:11-12, 13. In one of his earlier articles, Piper explored the 
compositional form and possible development of the cluster Matthew 7:7-11/Luke/[Q] 
11:9-13. He first observed that the organization involves much more than mere 
catchwords and topics. As had Kraeling, Minear, and Goldsmith, Piper found that the 
close parallelism of Matthew 7:7-8/Luke[Q] 11:9-10 suggests they were intentionally 
formed to coexist. Thus, Piper argues that in these intertwined verses, “one unit has been 
modeled on the other.” Certainly, for Piper, it is clear that the “sole function” of Matthew
7:8/Luke[Q] 11:10 is to reinforce Matthew 7:7/Luke[Q] 11:9. Furthermore, the “ask and receive” couplet dominates the subunit and points back to the prayer. That is, the “ask and receive” amplifies the asking in the preceding prayer in Luke[Q]. The other injunctions, of “seek and find” and “knock and will be opened” appear to be additions or developments, in accord with the didactic practice of forming and reshaping texts.

Known as “elaboration,” this pedagogical technique was common within scribal schools. At the same time, the rhetorical questions of Matthew 7:9-10/Luke[Q] 11:11-12 that follow Matthew 7:7-8/Luke[Q] 11:9-10 “lack any reference to the images of “seeking” and “knocking,” and introduce the new imagery of a father-son relationship.”

Thus, it is likely that at an earlier point, Matthew 7:7-8/Luke[Q] 11:9-10 were separate from and later joined to Matthew 7:9-10/Luke[Q] 11:11-12.


---


25 Ibid., 411-12. Pace Minear who considers v. 10 as “an innocuous and unnecessary restatement” of v. 9. See Minear, "'Ask, Seek, Knock!',' 115.


In one of his initial articles analyzing the aphoristic clusters of Q,29 Piper identifies the structure of this cluster as being comprised of four components concluding with a qal wehomer, or lesser to greater argument. The first is the opening aphorism of Matthew 7:7/Luke[Q] 11:9. It is followed by the supporting aphorism of Matthew 7:8/Luke[Q] 11:10. These two wisdom sayings are followed by two sapiential questions, Matthew 7:9-10/Luke[Q] 11:11-12. The cluster concludes with a wisdom saying in the form of the qal wehomer argument. As we shall see, this final wisdom saying serves as the interpretative key or primary teaching for the entire cluster. Since we have previously discussed the opening aphorism, Matthew 7:7-8/Luke[Q] 11:9-10, let us examine the remaining discrete subunits.

The Sapiential Questions

11 τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; 11 What person of you, whose child asks for bread, will give him a stone?

12 ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσει, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; 12 Or again when he asks for a fish, will give him a snake?

---


First, we observe that these questions are shocking in their suggestion and therefore, invite the listener to expect the comforting and concluding wisdom statement. Recall that these words are being attributed to Jesus. Here, he asks parents if they would give harmful and even deadly look-alike items to their innocent child in response to a request for food. In their disturbing character, the questions beg for a statement of trust and reassurance.

The Pronouncement

13 So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

The qal wehomer argument underlines the confidence that one can have in trusting God with one’s requests, precisely on the basis of God’s parental, compassionate care. The innocence of an undiscerning and vulnerable child highlights the reassurance being taught.

What is being emphasized or corrected here? Seen as a discrete entity, separate from the Q speech and the aphorisms of 11:9-10, the lessons being taught in Q 11:11-12, 13 instruct the adult petitioner not to fear rejection or that their sinfulness will lead God to deny their requests. Rather, the message emphasizes that God will readily respond. Just as it is unthinkable that a loving human parent would give harmful look-alike items to their child, so too can believers trust that God will most certainly give what is being asked for. The wisdom teaching focuses on the enormous contrast between God’s goodness and the “evil” within humans, in order to teach confidence in God’s care. If, as sinful as these parents see themselves to be, they can show great tenderness toward their
children, how much more can they expect tenderness from God who sees them as unwise and inexperienced children needing care?

It must be said that the teaching that humans are the children of God is common in a variety of writings from the ancient and Greco-Roman world, in both Jewish and non-Jewish literature.  It must be said that the teaching that humans are the children of God is common in a variety of writings from the ancient and Greco-Roman world, in both Jewish and non-Jewish literature. 30 At this point, let us simply observe that just as it is unthinkable that an adult parent would trick an innocent and undiscerning child into believing harmful things are food, so too, it is unthinkable that God would fool his children as they ask for what they need. It is in this sense that the believer is to trust that God gives only good things (ἀγαθά). Let us now more fully examine how the sayings of Q 11:11-12, 13 relate to their previous verses, Q 11:9-10. Thus, we return to the structured argument contributions made by Piper.

**Ronald Piper and the Four Step Argument of Q’s Sapiential Clusters**

Bultmann’s cautionary comment, that a developmental reconstruction of Matthew 7:7-11/Luke[Q] 11: 9-13 is “bound to be subjective,” has been accepted by many scholars but in a series of works, Piper challenges that supposition. His 1982 article “Matthew 7:7-11 par Luke 11:9-13: Evidence of Design and Argument in the Collection of Jesus’ Sayings,” he critiques the singular and narrow scholarly focus on catchwords and topical associations, which ignores the process and development of the argument created through the arrangement of the sayings in the cluster. In fact, when examined, four steps of argumentation are evident in the individual subunits of the wisdom clusters

---

30 The literature that represents this theme is voluminous. For significant representative texts, with discussion on God as father in Jewish Literature see Appendix B. For significant representative texts, with discussion on God as father in early Greek, Hellenistic, and Greco-Roman literature see Appendix C.

in Q. This structure is a well-designed, progressive argument with the subunits serving as building blocks toward the ultimate teaching.\textsuperscript{32}

In his 1989 revised, book form, publication of his dissertation, *Wisdom in the Q Tradition*, Piper presents his discovery of the special structure and form of argumentation that characterizes Q wisdom speeches: Q [Lk] 6:37-42; 6:43-45; 11:9-13; 12:2-9; 12:22-31).\textsuperscript{33} As we can see, the attached aphorisms of the Q Prayer Instruction (Q 11:9-13), comprise one of those speeches. These clusters exhibit a four-step progressive argument.

First, each cluster begins with a general aphoristic saying; either a maxim or wisdom admonishment (admonition). Piper notes, “Maxims and aphorisms tend to express isolated observations about life rather than systemic understandings.”\textsuperscript{34} Thus, the force of an aphorism is directed toward a specific point and not a general lifestyle or programmatic worldview. For instance, Piper points out that one could use the maxim, “look before you leap,” while at the same time, in trying to make another point, the aphorism, “he who hesitates is lost” could be used.\textsuperscript{35} After this opening aphorism, a general supporting maxim typically follows (supporting maxim). The third stage involves a change of perspective often involving ordinary imagery, frequently in the form of a sapiential(s) or rhetorical question(s). Piper notes, that “hyperbole and exaggeration often


\textsuperscript{33} There is broad support for and agreement with Piper’s study. See Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition*. Piper was not the first to examine the aphorisms in Q. Zeller has argued that these sayings function as wisdom admonishments (*Mahnsprüche*) and are at home in sapiential settings. Zeller also noted that use of the second person plural, exhibited in Q, is dissimilar to the more common singular form in other wisdom materials. See Zeller, *Mansprüche*, 142-43, 85.

\textsuperscript{34} Piper, "Wealth, Poverty and Subsistence in Q," 248.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 248.
contribute to the success that aphorisms have in drawing the interest and response of the hearers.” Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition*, 22. Many Q scholars have noticed that the sum of the behavioral recommendations in Q suggests a lifestyle at odds with the larger culture. For example, teachings to love one’s enemies (Q 6:27), to pray for those who persecute you (Q 6:28), to not retaliate when slapped but to invite a second assault, to give to those who would take from you (6:29), to not make provisions when traveling (Q 10:4), to not fear mortal attack (12:4), and to not worry about daily necessities (Q 12:22b) are all strikingly outside of the norms of the period. This unusual and provocative posture has vexed scholars, leading to several interpretative proposals. For instance, Burton Mack has referred to this attitude of “countercultural practices” as “an uncommon wisdom,” while Kloppenborg describes Q’s recommended behavior as “countercultural.” John Dominic Crossan has argued that “Overstatement and exaggeration, hyperbole and paradox, are often mentioned as facets of aphoristic truth.” See Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel of Q: The Book of Q and Christians Origins* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993), 29-39, 134. John S. Kloppenborg, “Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Leif E. Vaage (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992), 82. Crossan, *In Fragments*, 27.

Piper notes that the promises in Matthew 7:7-11/Luke[Q]11:9-13, “are almost embarrassing in the scope of what is encouraged and promised…The optimism of these

---

36 Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition*, 22. Many Q scholars have noticed that the sum of the behavioral recommendations in Q suggests a lifestyle at odds with the larger culture. For example, teachings to love one’s enemies (Q 6:27), to pray for those who persecute you (Q 6:28), to not retaliate when slapped but to invite a second assault, to give to those who would take from you (6:29), to not make provisions when traveling (Q 10:4), to not fear mortal attack (12:4), and to not worry about daily necessities (Q 12:22b) are all strikingly outside of the norms of the period. This unusual and provocative posture has vexed scholars, leading to several interpretative proposals. For instance, Burton Mack has referred to this attitude of “countercultural practices” as “an uncommon wisdom,” while Kloppenborg describes Q’s recommended behavior as “countercultural.” John Dominic Crossan has argued that “Overstatement and exaggeration, hyperbole and paradox, are often mentioned as facets of aphoristic truth.” See Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel of Q: The Book of Q and Christians Origins* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993), 29-39, 134. John S. Kloppenborg, “Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Leif E. Vaage (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992), 82. Crossan, *In Fragments*, 27.


38 The translation is from the *Critical Edition of Q* unless otherwise noted through this work. This is true for the Greek and English texts.
maxims is of course striking.” 39 Further, Piper examined and compared a wide variety of wisdom clusters within the LXX and intertestamental material. 40 Piper, then, was able to observe that:

*These are not haphazard collections of aphoristic sayings; they display a design and argument unique in the synoptic tradition.*

This unique compositional activity employs several items such as extensive use of simile, lacking in other synoptic materials. To summarize Piper’s own assessment of his findings,

[This analysis of structure] …has proved attractive as a powerful and persuasive means of developing an argument at the hands of those skilled in its use….It is significant that relatively little can be found in the way of parallels to this structure in the Jewish wisdom literature. The closest example in Proverbs is the exhortation against adultery [6:25-29]… All of this serves to support the view that one is dealing with a highly individual style of argument, rather than one which can claim to have many parallels in tradition.42

William Arnal

For his part, William Arnal has studied the clusters that serve as the controls for Piper’s method (6:37-42; 6:43-45; 11:9-13; 12:2-9; 12:22-31). From this, Arnal was able to observe another tendency of the Q complier(s). Within the four-step arguments, the opening maxim, the message is shocking. However, the closing application is


40 Texts compared: Proverbs, Qoheleth, Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, Tobit, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *1 Enoch* 91ff, the *Didache*, the Epistle of James, and Barnabas 19-20. Piper notes there is broad similarity with Sirach 13:15-20. See Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition*, 67-77.

41 Emphasis original. See ibid., 64.

42 Ibid., 66, 68.
considerably less disturbing, what Arnal describes as "banal." He characterizes this rhetorical method as "inversionary." That is, the initial statement seems to intend to destabilize ones’ viewpoint. Then the attention-shifting sapientional questions prepare the listener for the more reasonable, straightforward and not unexpected, yet important wisdom summation.

Arnal then applies this observation to his interpretation of Q 11:9-13. First, he notes that the opening invitation Q 11:9 reads: “I tell you, ask and it will be given to you, search and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you.” The wide-open character of this imperative is remarkable, as both Minear and Goldsmith also observed. Seeing Q 11:10 as the second movement, where v. 9 is affirmed. In Arnal’s design, the rhetorical questions of vv. 11-12, are supposed to shift the attention of the listener. Arnal then points to v. 13, as the “banal” pronouncement: “So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good

---

43 William E. Arnal, "Q's Rhetoric of Uprootedness," in Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2001), 185. (Q 6:27, 35c: But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven (opening sentence: Matt 5:44-45/Q 6:27, 35c)/ Q 6:36: Be full of pity, just as your Father is full of pity (application: Matt 5:48/Q 6:36); Q 6:37: Do not pass judgment, so you are not judged. (opening sentence: Matt 7:1/Q 6:37)/ Q 6:42b Hypocrite, first throw out from your own eye the beam, and then you will see clearly to throw out the speck in your brother’s eye. (application: Matt 7:5/Q 6:42b); Q 6:43: No healthy tree bears rotten fruit, nor on the other hand does a decayed tree bear healthy fruit. (opening sentence: Q 6:43)/ Q 6:45 :The good person from one’s good treasure casts up good things, and the evil person from the evil treasure casts up evil things. For from exuberance of heart one’s mouth speaks. (application: Q 6:45); Q 12:4: And do not be afraid of those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. (opening sentence: Matt 10:28/Q 12:4): Q 12:7b: Do not be afraid, you are worth more than many sparrows. (application: Matt 10:31/Q 12:7b); Q 12:22b:: Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious about your life, what you are to eat, nor about your body, with what you are to clothe yourself. (opening sentence: Matt 6:25/Q 12:22b): Q 12:30-31: So do not be anxious, saying: What are we to eat? Or what are we to drink? Or what are we to wear? For all these the Gentiles seek; for your Father knows that you need them all. But seek his kingdom, and all these shall be granted to you. (application: Matt 6:31-33/Q 12:29-31).

things to those who ask him!” But Arnal’s pattern does not really operate for this cluster, because he has overlooked the outrageous character of the questions in vv. 11-12. Here, very unconventional behavior is questioned and it has to do with giving, and not asking, seeking, or knocking as in v. 9-10. That is, what parent would “give” dangerous things to an unsuspecting child? Moreover, the pronouncement in v. 13 is not commonplace, for it places the adult in the role of an undiscerning child dependent upon and vulnerable to what God gives.

These final verses vv. 11-12, 13 now, just as Minear says, “serve to narrow the circle of meaning,” and turn the wide-open, un-contextualized “asking,” “seeking,” and “knocking” to the reliance on God in prayer. In the light of Piper’s research, however, Minear’s conclusions misread the literary evidence. Because Minear argues that Q 11:11-12, 13 are little more than elaborations on the primary pronouncement of Q 11:9-10. Piper has shown, to the satisfaction of most Q scholars, that the relationship is the other way around. That is, Q 11:9-10 are preliminary and introductory teachings leading up to the “interpretative key” of Q 11:13.45 Much more than relating the asking, seeking and knocking to prayer, vv. 11:13 presents to the listener the image of how the petitioner is seen by God. Thus, vv. 11-13 does not simply explain the “kind” of wide-open asking, instead and more importantly, v. 13 provides the reason why believers may adopt this wide-open kind of prayerful asking.

---

CHAPTER FOUR

INTERPRETING THE LORD’S PRAYER IN THE Q' SPEECH: Q 11:2-4B, 9-13

Introduction

There is general agreement within Q studies that the cluster of aphorisms in Q 11:2b-4, 9-13 constitutes one of the speeches within the formative stratum. Furthermore, there is broad support for the view that the Q community/compiler specifically attached the aphorisms of Q 11:9-13 to the prayer, 11:2b-4, in order to create a perspective that embraces and entails both units. That is, by bringing together these clusters, an important teaching could be espoused by the Q community. These conjoined units, the prayer and the admonishments, thereby, establish the parameters of meaning, a lens through which we may now view the particular character and contents of the prayer speech. This editorial/compiling decision reveals, then, a central teaching, one that was not common knowledge at the time, otherwise its inclusion would be unnecessary.

The Text: Q 11:2b-4, 9-12, 13

2b ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε· πάτερ, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.
2b When you pray, say: Father - may your name be kept holy! - let your reign come:

3 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.
3 Our day’s bread give us today;

4 καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμ
4 and cancel our debts for us, as we too have cancelled for those in debt to us; and do not put us to the test!
πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.

For everyone who asks receives, and the one who searches finds, and to the one who knocks will it be opened.

*****************

τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

What person of you, whose child asks for bread, will give him a stone?

η καὶ ἱχθὺν αἰτήσει, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

Or again when he asks for a fish, will give him a snake?

eἰ οὖν ύμεῖς πονηροὶ οἴδατε ὅτι δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ύμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

**Interpretations that Do Not Observe the Stratigraphy Establishing Q¹**

In Chapter Two of the dissertation (“The Q Document: Foundations, Reconstruction and the Scholarship which Locates the Prayer Speech”), the Q Prayer Speech is shown to be located in the formative stratum of Q. As literary evidence demonstrates, this stratum was subsequently redacted with speeches that are characterized by forensic pronouncements and collections of chreia that are formed in order to create judgments against “this generation”. The lens through which the Lord’s Prayer should be understood, we have argued, can be most fairly assessed by establishing the perspective of the aphoristic cluster to which it is now attached, (Q 11:9-12, 13). These two conjoined clusters (the prayer, Q 11:2b-4; the wisdom sentences, Q 11:9-13) create the entire prayer speech.

It must be noted at once, that a scholar such as Christopher Tuckett who does not accept Q stratigraphy, interprets the prayer relying on the later redaction with its forensic threats of the coming judgment in the eschaton.
The sayings here about answer to prayer [Q 11:9-10] have always been felt to be difficult in view of their enormous scope. Without a specific context, the sayings become almost embarrassingly absurd in their unconditional promise that prayers will be answered. However, the Q context of the section, whereby the sayings follow immediately after the Lord’s Prayer, may provide a rather more precise context for the interpretation of the sayings. Here the dominant (if not exclusive) theme is eschatology and the kingdom of God. The Q Christians pray to God as their Father to bring in the kingdom, and they are given an assurance that their prayer will be answered: if they ask, they will receive; if they seek, that is the kingdom of God, they will find; if they knock, the door will be opened (and Q language elsewhere makes it clear that such vocabulary can be understood eschatologically: cf. Q 13:25). On this interpretation the context for Q 11:9 is, for Q, eschatological, and the ‘good things’ which the Father will give to those who ask Him are the gifts of the Eschaton. Further, this concern for the kingdom is one which overrides concern for material needs. The overriding concern, which must dominate the Christians’ lives, is the kingdom of God.¹

The purpose of this dissertation, however, is to allow the lens created solely by the Q¹ compilers to be represented, by the cluster that belongs to the formative stratum.

**An Interpretation of the Prayer in Q**

Q 11:2b

ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε· πάτερ, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·

When you pray, say: Father - may your name be kept holy! - let your reign come:

We have noted earlier in Chapter One, and in the Appendix B, how ubiquitous it is in both Greek and Jewish writings to find God identified as the father of humankind.

Notice how important vv. 11-12, 13 are for Kloppenborg’s conclusion that the God of the

¹ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 154-55. It must be remembered that Q 13:25 belongs to the major redaction of Q. The text from the Critical Edition follows: “When the householder has arisen and locked the door, and you begin to stand outside and knock on the door, saying, Master, open for us, and he will answer you: I do not know you”. Also see, Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories*, 94.
prayer is to be seen as “a generous provider of the necessities of life.”² This is only possible however, if one can assert that, in fact, the final portion of the wisdom aphorism, Q 11: 11-12, 13 is the climax, and v. 13 the interpretative key. This is important for scholars such as Minear allow an eschatologically understood Q 11:9-10 to dominate their interpretation and control how vv. 11-12, 13 is seen. Minear’s view, then, regards Q 11:11-12, 13 as mere commentary and expansion of the eschatologically understood Q 11:9-10.³ As we recall, Minear argues that Q 11:9-10 is the major focus. Thus, he allows the wide-open eschatologically interpreted injunctions of ask, seek, and knock to characterize his view of the aphorisms 11:11-12, 13. However, the work of Piper has secured the fact, through his research and rhetorical analysis, that Q 11:11-12, 13 does not serve to develop the eschatological saying in Q11:9-10. Rather, that wide-open saying loses its eschatological character, when considered as a discrete saying, once it is followed by the images and situation of the domestic home life where parents actually care for children in Q 11:11-12, 13.

The two invocations, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· demonstrate clear symmetry, both are third person singular aorist imperatives. One calls for God’s holiness to be acknowledged, while the other calls for God’s kingdom to arrive. Although they are separate petitions, most scholars discuss them together or in direct sequence with similar outcomes.

² Kloppenborg Verbin, Excavating Q, 125.

³ Minear does not discuss Q, rather the aphorisms in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. For convenience, we will simply use the Q/Luke versification since our concern is the interpretation of this text within the Sayings Gospel.
That God’s Name Be Recognized as Holy

As has been reported in Chapter One, Lohmeyer, Jeremias, and Schürmann are typical in noting that the desire that God’s name should be blessed or recognized as holy, is conventional to Jewish prayer, as witnessed by the Kaddish (“Exalted and hallowed be his great name”). Schürmann adds to this, the Eighteen Benedictions, where the third benediction in particular states, “Holy are You, and awe-inspiring Your Name; and beside You there is no God. You are praised, O Lord, the holy God.” The point being made here is that the immediate concern that God’s name be made holy, or that God be recognized as holy, is not unique, but at home in Jewish tradition.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer assigns an eschatological character of the prayer with his suggestion that the reverence for and hallowing of God’s name points to the coming eschatological judgment. He does this by associating this verse with prophetic texts where God promises that the profaning of his name will meet with punishment, as seen for example in Ezekiel 36:22-28. In particular, note v. 23 where God proclaims,

I will sanctify my great name, which has been profaned among the nations, and which you have profaned among them; the nations shall know that I am the Lord, says the Lord God, when through you I display my holiness before their eyes.4

Thus, Fitzmyer connects both the petition for the sanctification of God’s name and the plea for God’s kingdom to come so that the character of the Father’s arrival at the end time with his judgment will bring about the hallowing of his name.

---
The second invocation, the petition calling for God’s reign to come, in particular, leads scholars to posit that eschatological expectations in this verse, and hence the prayer. Manson, who is followed by Jeremias and Schürmann, sees proof of this interpretation in such early Christian texts as 1 Corinthians 16:22b and Revelation 22:20. Schürmann adds to these, Matthew 19:28/Luke 22:28-30 where those faithful to Jesus are promised they will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Lohmeyer, as noted in Chapter One, points to the Jewish tradition in the Psalms where a longing is expressed for God’s “purpose” to come. We recall his distinction characterizing a difference between the Hebrew and Christian texts when he states:

In Judaism, God’s kingdom comes to pass in the eschatological future because it has been coming to pass through all the past and the present though concealed by the veil of history, while in the Gospels a kingdom ‘comes’ in an imminent ‘tomorrow’ which was not there before… it become the ‘coming world’ of God…”

For Brown, what for him is the obvious, eschatological meaning of “your kingdom come,” must also affect the interpretation of the address to God, “Father” and “hallowed be your name.” He explains, “the Christians are praying that God will manifest His holiness as Father and hasten the perfection of their sonship which is to come in His kingdom.”

Stressing the continuity of lens that must obtain, Brown sees in the prayer for the coming kingdom the key to explain all other petitions of the prayer.

Minear begins with the “ask, seek, knock” aphorism(s) (Q 11:9-10) and associates those “wide-open” verses with eschatological verses. In doing so, he argues that vv. 9-10

---


6 Brown, “Pater Noster,” 231.
are the dominate verses for interpretation and vv. 11-12, 13 are secondary. With this, he
then views the prayer eschatologically. In a similar fashion, Goldsmith argues that
Luke[Q] 11:9-10 is thoroughly eschatological in character. Although “ask, seek, knock,”
by themselves do not specifically refer to prayer, yet, once attached to Luke[Q] 11:2-4,
the prayer takes on eschatological meaning. Goldsmith writes that,

> We have attempted to indicate that the ask-logion of Matthew 7. *(sic)* 7a, 8a
is an independent saying (probably of Jesus himself) which originally called
for or described a response within the context of the earliest, eschatological
preaching of the Kingdom of God.⁷

Among those who are considered Q scholars, Tuckett also holds to an
eschatological understanding of the kingdom. At the same time, he does not accept the
scholarship that identifies the six clusters of material which belong to the formative
stratum, Q¹. Instead, Tuckett characterizes the kingdom sayings as having the same
thrust and purpose as the forensic sayings of secondary (redactional) stratum of Q, i.e. Q².

In response to these arguments, we are in agreement with Brown and Tuckett that
there must be a continuity of lens throughout the prayer, and we add, the entire Q¹ Prayer
Speech as well. Tuckett’s interpretation belongs to a discussion of the whole redacted
document and not here where we contextualize the interpretation of the Lord’s Prayer in
the context of the Q¹ group’s decision to add the aphoristic “commentary,” and the
context of the Q¹ stratum alone, such has been explained in Chapter Two.

Concerning Manson, Jeremias, Schürmann, and Brown, it must be said that their
efforts to uncover the meaning of the call for God’s kingdom relies on internal evidence,
in conjunction with eschatological teachings of Paul and Revelation. By interpreting the

---

prayer as though it was free-standing, without context, these scholars create a circular argument. That is, they assign verses as context and background based on their predetermined views. At the same time, we want to recognize that it is perfectly possible for the Lord’s Prayer, according to their interpretation, to be portrayed with an eschatological intent. What we can say, is that as the prayer has been amplified in meaning by the attachment of the aphorisms Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13, in Q¹, that “commentary” holds the key to how that group understood the prayer in Q 11:2b-4.

If Minear and Goldsmith were correct that the sense of Q 11:9-10, with its eschatological character, controls Q 11:11-12, 13, then it would have to be concluded that, however the prayer had been understood, its “commentary” in Q 11:9-10, 11-12, 13 secured an eschatological lens for it as a whole. However, as we have seen, in Chapter Three, the work of Ronald Piper has shown that rhetorically, Q 11:11-12, 13 now control Q 11:9-10, so that the urging to ask, to seek, and to knock is given a practical scenario, in the domestic scene of the child’s asking parents for nourishment. The “wide-open” character of the saying, as Minear noted, has become connected to the issue of prayer, but not so that the prayer is subordinate to an eschatological longing, but rather that the prayer issue is the primary topic, and Q 11:9-10 leads to that significance of God’s benevolent giving.

Therefore, the call for God’s kingdom to arrive in the Q¹ speech, Q 11:2, cannot be assumed to refer to an in-breaking end time for that group simply because an eschatological expectation of God’s coming Kingdom might have existed at some time in the discrete prayer, or because such expectations occur in Paul, and in Revelation, or in other sayings of Q that belong to a later redaction. If Piper is right that Q 11:11-12, 13 is
the climax and “interpretative key” to the aphoristic cluster, then other possible meanings of “kingdom” must be allowed.

In Chapter Two, and now here, basing an analysis on speeches of the Q¹ literary setting below, one discovers three other usages of the Kingdom of God.

1. The Inaugural Discourse: Q 6:20b-49
3. The Prayer Instruction: Q 11:2-4, 9-13
4. On Fearless Preaching: Q 12:2-12
5. On Anxiety: Q 12:(13-14, 16-21), 22b-31, 33-34

Besides the use of “Kingdom” in the Prayer Speech which is the third speech, the use of “kingdom” occurs three more times.

Speech One: The Inaugural Discourse

Q 6:20

καὶ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺ αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων, ἐξακολούθησαν ὁ Παῦλος, ὅτι καὶ ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

And raising his eyes to his disciples he said: Blessed are you poor, for God’s reign is for you.

Speech Two: The Mission Discourse

Q 10:9

This occurs in the follow context, Q 10:7-9:

ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν. ἐξακολούθησαν ὁ Παῦλος, ὅτι καὶ ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

8 Or Luke’s, ἔλεγεν.
And at that house remain, eating and drinking whatever they provide, for the worker is worthy of one’s reward. Do not move around from house to house. And whatever town you enter and they take you in, eat what is set before you. And cure the sick there, and say to them: the kingdom of God has reached you.

Speech Five: On Anxiety

Q 12:31

This occurs in the following context, Q 12:29-31:

μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες· τί φάγωμεν; ἢ· τί πίωμεν; ἢ· τί περιβαλώμεθα; πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἐθνῆ ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ότι χρῄζεται τούτων ἀπάντων. ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ύμῖν.

So do not be anxious saying, “What are we to eat?” Or “What are we to drink?” Or: “What are we to wear?” For all these the Gentiles seek; for your Father knows that you need them all. But seek his kingdom, and all these shall be granted to you.

In these contexts, the arrival of the kingdom of God seems to be understood more as Lohmeyer argues. That is, expressing a Christian expectation of God’s kingdom as an immediate in-breaking or coming into being without cataclysm:

In Judaism, God’s kingdom comes to pass in the eschatological future because it has been coming to pass through all the past and the present though concealed by the veil of history, while in the Gospels a kingdom ‘comes’ in an imminent ‘tomorrow’ which was not there before…it becomes the ‘coming world’ of God…

Each of these contexts suggests a kingdom of God that is “coming to pass…” and “concealed by the veil of history,” rather than an “an imminent ‘tomorrow’” which was not there before.” We do not see in these sayings the ferocity and forensic threats that characterize the secondary stratum material of Q².

9 Lohmeyer, Our Father: An Introduction, 99. Also see, Chapter One of the Dissertation, 16.
In his own discussion of the meaning of Q 11:2 in the Lord’s Prayer, Leif Vaage discusses these four Q¹ texts concerning the character of the Kingdom. Notice, however, that he does so with his eye on the connection between v. 2 and v. 3, that is, the petitions for the kingdom to come and for bread:

It is not uncommon for the first lines of the “Lord’s Prayer” to be read by scholars as somehow related to the Jewish “Kaddish” prayer, which begins similarly. But the comparison, in my opinion, cannot be sustained beyond a certain superficial correspondence. In terms of Q itself, there are good reasons for understanding what is meant by “your kingdom come” in 11:2 together with the petition in 11:3 for bread. The kingdom of God is here a matter of bodily sustenance, just as in 6:20b having a share in God’s kingdom meant being happy, and in 10:9b the experience of complete well being. For the persons whom Q represents, without a beggars bag or other visible means of support (10:4), depending on the hospitality of strangers (10:5-6), hoping that the good fortune of the ravens and the lilies would be theirs as well (12:22-31), regular nutrition could reasonably be called a kingdom come.¹⁰

In his discussion of one of the four Kingdom of God sayings, he shows how another of the sayings Q 6:20b fits this teaching about trusting the nearness of a caring God who is father and who cares for his children, here and now.

The basic problem addressed in 12:22-31 is worry about what to eat and wear. The text’s extended reasoning elaborates the somewhat cryptic equation made in 6:20b between poverty and happiness…Instead of struggling to get more of what human society offers as food and clothing, 12:31 urges: “Seek [God’s] kingdom, and all these will be yours as well”. To seek “his” kingdom means to seek the father who, in 12:30b, knows what you need, as demonstrated by the ravens (12:24) and the lilies (12:27).¹¹

These observations have led Vaage to propose that the character of the wisdom teachings in the formative layer bear a strong resemblance to the philosophical teachings of the

---


¹¹ Ibid., 223.
Cynics. Perhaps that is why he understands Q 6:20b to be inviting an acceptance of poverty as a good. This question of whether Q sayings, at the formative layer, bear a resemblance to Cynicism, would take us outside the concerns of this dissertation. What his observations do show, however, is the degree to which the Kingdom of God sayings fits a “this world” realization of God’s reign here and underway, such as Lohmeyer identifies with Jewish tradition. Thus, the mention of God’s kingdom in Q 6:20, 10:9, and 12:31 do not conform to an end time expectation.

Kloppenborg, for his part, carefully distinguishes the character of the Kingdom of God sayings in Q¹ from those that belong to the later redaction of the document, since as he says, the center of Q’s theology is not Christology but the reign of God:

The center of Q’s theology is not Christology but the reign of God. In the first stratum of Q the focal point is the characterization of that reign, seen as an expansive power (13:18-21) that is able to subvert or invert conventional relationships, benefiting especially the disadvantaged (6:20; 11:2; 12:31) and the sick (10:9). The kingdom sayings of Q¹ are connected with exhortations to a countercultural lifestyle that includes love of enemies, non-retaliation, debt forgiveness, and a willingness to expose oneself to danger, all undergirded by appeals to the superabundant care of a provident God. Both of the Son of Man sayings found in this stratum (6:22b; 9:58) function in appeals to emulate the exposed and endangered lifestyle of Jesus. ¹²

Our point here, is that the control of the stratum’s context is necessary, if one is to reconstruct the lens through which the community understands the arrival of God’s kingdom.

The Petition for Bread: Q: 11:3

τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον

Our day’s bread give us today.

Poetically, the word “bread” can be used to symbolize food in general, of course, but it can also reference sustenance for human life. Musonius Rufus, the Roman Stoic, reflects, “For what do mortals need besides two things only, the bread of Demeter and the drink of the Water-carrier, which are at hand and have been made to nourish us?” The Jewish man of letters, Philo, similarly states, “Now the simple wealth of nature is food and shelter. Its food is bread and the spring water gushes up in every part of the inhabited world.” In Vaage’s remarks, above, on Q 6:20b, he represents the Cynic call for simplicity of life. Outside these philosophical ruminations, however, bread as the poor person’s sustenance is attested, certainly in the Jewish scriptures, such as Sirach 34:25, “The bread of the needy is the life of the poor; whoever deprives them of it is a murderer.” Note the association of bread with the “homeless poor” in Isaiah 58:7, “Is it [the fast I choose] not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house.” Similarly, Ezekiel writes, “[A person shall surely live if he/she] gives his/her bread to the hungry and covers the naked with a garment” (Ezek 18:7), while the Psalmist presents the promises of the Lord to Zion, “I will abundantly bless its provisions; I will satisfy its poor with bread” (Ps 132:15 [LXX 131:15]).

Is This the Bread for Today or for Tomorrow?

In Chapter One, it was noted that Manson, was influenced by Jerome’s who stated notation that the Gospel of the Hebrews uses mahar (of tomorrow) where epiousios occurs in that gospel. Thus, those who wish to construct an eschatologically oriented Lord’s Prayer often follow this meaning, of bread for tomorrow, noted by Jerome. Seen

13 Lutz, Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates, ch. 9, p. 70, lines 29-31.

14 Philo, Rewards, 99; also Alleg. Interp. 3.162, 169, 174, 169, 174, 251 bis.
in this light, the prayer for bread does not refer to the need for nourishment on earth but, rather, suggests the ultimate nourishment in the eschatological banquet. Lohmeyer follows Manson, as we recall, but only after a thorough investigation of other possible meanings of *epiousios*\(^\text{15}\) and, therefore, we would have to wonder why that translation occurs here. Why didn’t the Christian author describe the bread meant for tomorrow with \(\alpha\omicron\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\)? This argument over the appearance of \(\textit{mahar}\) in the Gospel of the Hebrews is not only relying on a text that is known for its aberrant theology, but it also relies on special pleading with regard to how \(\textit{mahar}\) was regularly translated by LXX authors. Nowhere did it occur to them to use *epiousios*. This suggests that the use of \(\textit{mahar}\) belongs to a particular version of the prayer unique to their group. This is important because there is no instance where the LXX represents \(\textit{mahar}\) with *epiousios*, creating the nuance necessary for this bread to have a future orientation.\(^\text{16}\)

As we recall, Lohmeyer searched for the sense of *epiousios* in other sayings of the New Testament canon. Since he had already presumed that earliest Christianity held a uniform eschatological expectation of the end time, he finally settled on Manson’s theory that the “bread” is “not for the necessities of human life but for the requirements of the life of a disciple, life in this eschatological time.”\(^\text{17}\) It becomes ever clearer that for Lohmeyer, the prayer must hold a continuous lens for all the petitions. Indeed, a

\(^{15}\) Chapter One, 17-18.

\(^{16}\) *Mahar* is used in the sense of “the next day” in only three texts (MT: Exod. 8:10 [LXX 8:6]; 1 Kgs 19:2; Josh 11:6) and elsewhere \(\alpha\omicron\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\) is used (only in Exod 13:14 \(\textit{mahar}\) has the meaning ‘tomorrow’ in the sense of the future).

continuous or singular hermeneutic or lens is the platform on which Raymond Brown would construct his entirely eschatological view of each part of the prayer.  

It is therefore, interesting to recall that Schürmann broke with a homogenous or uniform perspective for the prayer when he addressed the petition for bread. Schürmann, we recall, thought that the mahar influence gave the sense of “tomorrow’s” bread. Yet, in order to support this view he created a scenario where the workman was paid at the end of the day, thus providing for the “bread” for tomorrow. This shows that he had noted that the adjective occurs mostly in the sense of “the next day” (MT: Ex 8:6, 1 Kgs 19:2, Josh 11:6) with only one instance meaning “in the future” (MT: Ex 13:14). As we recall, he posed the scene where the plea is that the Lord make the grain available one day, so that bread can be made the next day. Here, it fulfills the sense of epiousios as mahar with a nuance of a very near term tomorrow, in order to fulfill a “this world” interpretation of the needs of the poor. So this argument, espoused by Manson’s and upheld by Lohmeyer and Jeremias, did not move Schürmann, though his overall view argues for an eschatological prayer, to overlook the real-life and daily plea for bread from the needy poor.

Kloppenborg turns to the aphorism of Q 11:13 in order to find the character of the plea for bread in the Q¹ prayer speech. For Kloppenborg, the bread petition (11:3) and supporting, qal wehomer argument (11:11-12, 13) more strongly suggest real bread and the common domestic activity of the feeding and care of children and not an

---

18 Van Tilborg dismisses the interpretations of scholars who espouse an eschatological interpretation, on the grounds that their logic is “strained.” He does this, however, without providing sufficient argumentation. See Tilborg, "Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer," 94-105, esp. 94.
“eschatological banquet.”\(^{19}\) When this is set within the context of prayer, it emphasizes “parent-child relationships” and portrays God as a “generous provider of the necessities of life.”\(^{20}\)

Kloppenborg is presuming that the Q 11:11-12, 13 controls the prayer. But one can easily see that scholars following the arguments of Manson, Lohmeyer, Jeremias, and Brown would be further supported in their eschatological interpretations for the whole of the Q\(^1\) speech if convinced by the arguments of Minear. Since Minear has argued for the prominence of Q 11:9-10, and relegated Q 11:11-12, 13 to the role of a commentary which describes the eschatological bread, this image of bread would coordinate with the interpretation of 11:3 by Manson and those who support him. It is only the work of Piper, working solely on the cluster 11:9-10, 11-12, 13, who has shown that the progression of the sayings was intended to make v. 13, the real key to the cluster. The images of God giving good things to his children and the domestic scene of familial care, therefore dominates the aphorisms and the entire prayer cluster. With this identification, arguments that the bread of Q 11:3 is meant to refer to the heavenly banquets, along with the bread of Q 11:11, cannot hold. It is the scene of the parents in the home taking care of children that moves the image of Father and food into the reality of the present world. And this corresponds with the use of “kingdom” that we have seen in the other usages of Kingdom of God in Q\(^1\). There is, here, a continuity which cannot be ignored, and it is the lens of a present world where God’s reign in ever more increasing.


καὶ ἁφῄς ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν

And cancel our debts for us, as we too have cancelled for those in debt to us

The key words for understanding Q 11:4ab are ἀφίημι and ὀφείλημα. Well used words commonly take on several meanings and this is clearly the case with ἀφίημι, which can be defined as, “to send forth, discharge, let fall, give up, set free, put away, divorce or release.” On the other hand, ὀφείλημα has a narrower range of meaning and is generally associated with indebtedness.

As we shall see the call to have debts cancelled is being proposed not only as a call to forgive someone their offenses as the petitioner hopes for forgiveness from God, but also, as Kloppenborg will insist, it seems to call for a release of any debts for the many poor who were held in their misery by the system of indebtedness in the culture. The language of the prayer invites these ideas of fiscal indebtedness, it must be said: Below are examples where ὀφείλημα deals with financial transactions between humans, often in terms in financial indebtedness.

Euclides the lapidary owes (ὀφείλει) me three minae. (Diogenes Laertius, Lives 3.42)

To Crito of Chalcedon I also remit (ἀφίημι) the purchase-money for his freedom and bequeath to him four minas. (Diogenes Laertius, Lives 5.72)

To Syrus who has been set free I give four minas and Menodora, and I remit to him any debt (ὀφείλει) he owes (ἀφίημι) me. (Diogenes Laertius, Lives 5.73)

When you make your neighbor a loan (ὀφείλημα) of any kind, you shall not go into the house to take the pledge. (Deut 24:10)
Every debt (ὀφείλημα) you owe to the royal treasury and any such future debts shall be canceled (ἀφιέσθω) for you from henceforth and for all time. (1 Macc 15:8)

An example occurs in Matthean Sondergut, where the king describes his magnanimous forgiveness of financial debt to a slave who was ready to imprison his fellow slave for a relatively small sum: “You wicked slave! I forgave (ἀφῆκά) you all that debt (ὀφειλὴν) because you pleaded with me” (Matt 18:32). The second meaning is presented by Ben Sira, where this time it refers to a wrong committed by one’s neighbor:

Forgive (ἀφες) your neighbor the wrong he has done, and then your sins will be pardoned when you pray. (Sir 28:2)

This promise on the part of the petitioner is a mighty one. The honor-shame society of the Greco-Roman world held honor as the supreme goal, as is well known in today’s scholarship. Bruce Malina notes three degrees of social dishonoring. The first and most dishonoring act, for which there was no revocation possible, included:

…murder, adultery, kidnapping, bearing false witness, and total social degradation of a person by depriving one of all that is necessary for one’s social status. These in sum, include all the things listed in the second half of the Ten Commandments aside from theft, for this is in fact what is listed there: outrages against one’s fellow Israelite that are simply not revocable but require vengeance.21

The second degree is the deprivation of honor, but with a possible revocation, like theft, seduction of an unmarried daughter. Some kind of restitution was possible. The least of the deprivations belong to “the regular and ordinary interactions that require normal social responses, such as repaying a gift with one of equal or better value, allowing others

to marry my children if they let my children marry theirs.”

Malina sums up the social sense of maintaining one’s honor with the statement, “In other words, any implicit or explicit dishonor must allow for satisfaction commensurate with the degree of dishonor present.”

Malina explains the importance of a person’s respected name in the society, “A good name fundamentally means adequate honor to carry on the social interactions necessary for decent human existence...Physical affronts are always symbolic affronts that require a response. Failure to respond means dishonor, disgrace.”

In the light of these remarks, the petitioner’s promise to forgive the “debts” of another, calls for a new way to live. There is no demand that the debtor acknowledge the debt, but only that the child of the Father promises forgiveness.

Richard L. Rohrbaugh explains the social implications of the maintenance of loss of honor because,

…the honor of the whole family was at stake in the honor of one of its members, a whole family’s honor would be damaged by a situation that got out of control. The offended family would feel honor bound to retaliate, which in turn would cause retaliation in response. The resulting feuds could escalate into violence and disrupt the stability of an entire village.

It is significant that the prayer presumes a plurality of persons:

And cancel our debts for us, as we too have cancelled for those in debt to us.

---

22 Ibid., 44-45.

23 Ibid., 46.

24 Ibid., 55.

This promise from the group to forgive and not to exact vengeance, not to demand restitution but to allow the offense, the “debt,” to be cancelled suggests a group life style in contradistinction to the expectations of society, with the readiness to endure disgrace, rather than respond in kind.

This promise also amounts to a recognition that the same grounds upon which the petitioners call on God’s forgiveness—weakness, lack of intent to offend, etc.—must be extended as well to those who have offended the members. The magnanimity shown by God should be shown by his children to each other and all others. This recognition of the need to be as generous as the Father has been generous is seen throughout the sayings that belong to the Q¹ speeches.

In the first major speech cluster of the formative document Q, such programmatic teachings form the core of the message attributed to Jesus:

First there is the magnanimity to be shown to others as one has experienced it from God:

To the one who asks of you, give; and from the one who borrows, do not ask back what is yours. And the way you want people to treat you, that is how you treat them. If you love those loving you, what reward do you have? Do not even tax collectors do the same? And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what reward do you have? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? Be full of pity, just as your Father is full of pity. (Q 6:30-34, 36)

The general rule, then, for treating others is found in Q 6:31, “And the way you want people to treat you, that is how you treat them.” Note how this is repeated in the teaching about the measure you use for your neighbor will be used for you and is echoed in Q 11:4ab:

Do not pass judgment, so you are not judged. For with what judgment you pass judgment you will be judged. And with the measurement you use to measure out, it will be measured out to you. (Q 6:37-38)
In another speech of Q, the bountiful character of forgiveness that is enjoined, is understood to reside in the mercy the forgiver has received from a merciful God:

If your brother sins against you, rebuke him; and if he repents, forgive him. And if seven times a day he sins against you, also seven times shall you forgive him. (Q 17:3-4)

Debt Release for the Poor

John Kloppenborg has posed that the teaching about releasing the neighbor from debt has other implications besides the forgiveness of sins that is usually understood by Q 11:4ab. The dire situation of most poor across the first century was largely due to their necessary debts in order to survive and keep their families alive. Kloppenborg holds that the forgiveness of “debts” means precisely that, to let go of any financial debts. This consciousness of the poor and the manner in which God’s reign is expressed when there is this magnanimity is demonstrated in Q 6: 20b-21:

Blessed are you poor, for God’s reign is for you. Blessed are you who hunger, for you will eat your fill. Blessed are you who mourn, for you will be consoled.

Kloppenborg posits that the idea of the Jubilee Year is at the root or is the inspiration for this liberation of the people, in the name of God. It is a time of both kinds of forgiveness, financial debt release and personal offense forgiveness.26 Thus Kloppenborg points to the coherence between Q 6:30-34, 36, and also the injunction to forgive ones’ brother and sister as many times as he or she sins (Q 17:3-4), with the rules for the observance of Jubilee:

Every seventh year you shall grant a remission of debts. And this is the manner of the remission: every creditor shall remit the claim that is held against a neighbor, not exacting it of a neighbor who is a member of the

---

community, because the Lord’s remission has been proclaimed. Of a foreigner you may exact it, but you must remit your claim on whatever any member of your community owes you. (Deut 15:1-3)

Kloppenborg also quotes from the “Words of Moses” Scroll 1 Q 22:

[Every creditor who has lent something to] someone, or [who possesses something from his brother,] will grant a release to] his [fell]ow for [a release] for [God, has been proclaimed. One may demand restitution] from the fore[igner, but from one’s brother no-[one shall demand restitution,] for in [that] year [God will bless you, forgiving you your sins…] … (1Q22 3.5-7)²⁷

Likewise he quotes expectations concerning Jubilee from the Dead Sea Scroll 11Q 13, “The Coming of Melchizedek”:

[…] And concerning what Scripture says, “In [this] year of jubilee [you shall return, every one of you, to your property” (Lev. 25:13) and what is also written, “and this is the manner of [the remission]: every creditor shall remit the claim this is held [against a neighbor, not exacting it of a neighbor who is a member of the community, because God’s] remission [has been proclaimed” (Deut. 15:2): [the interpretation] is that it applies [to the Last Days and concerns the captives, just as [Isaiah said: “To proclaim the jubilee to the captives” (Isa. 61:1)…just] as […] and from the inheritance of Melchizedek, f]or…Melchize]dek, who will return them to what is rightfully theirs. He will proclaim to them the jubilee, thereby releasing th[em from the debt of a]ll their sins. (11Q13 2.1-6)²⁸

For Kloppenborg, the petitions dealing with forgiveness (Q11:4 [also Q 6:30-35; 17:4]) suggest “sabbatical or jubilee debt release” mentioned in the texts above. These ideas that mercy should be shown not only concerning personal debt, but social need were already in place as an ideal in Jewish religious documents.²⁹


²⁸ Also known as 11QMelch. Text from Wise, Abegg, and Cook.

According to Kloppenborg, the interest in debt forgiveness is also supported with other archaeological and textual studies describing the harsh socio-economic conditions in the region in the period. K. R. Dark describes the landscape surrounding Sepphoris and Tiberias as having starkly differing remains where the city dwellers had villas and luxury goods, yet neither are found in the hinterland. The population densities suggest very small land plots in rural areas. Josephus (Ant. 15.299-304) records that the drought of 25/24 B.C.E. led to widespread poverty. Harsh social conditions may have been a factor in the revolt and Jewish War of 66 to 70 C.E. It is interesting that Josephus (War 2.426-27) states that after attacking and burning the house of the high-priest, the Galileans burned down the courthouse where debt records were kept. This is curious since without such legal indebtedness, the revolutionaries would more predictably raid the treasury or the prisons in order to release compatriots and family members after destroying the home of the main perpetrator of oppression.

The victors [brigands] burst in and set fire to the house of Ananias the high-priest….they next carried their combustibles to the public archives, eager to destroy the money-lenders’ bonds and to prevent the recovery of debts, in order to win over a host of grateful debtors and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich…

The notion of debt relief (Neh 10:31) was in all likelihood more of an ideal than a reality. Martin Goodman has shown that in late Second Temple Judaism and early in the rabbinic period, the mandate for debt relief could be suspended by means of the Prosbul

and this may have been one of the causes of the war. Also in terms of textual studies, Piper has described the literary evidence in Q as depicting harsh economic realities and suspicion of courts and legal settings (Q 12:58-59). These data cannot confirm the situation, but they do suggest it is one of the possibilities of how the Prayer Instruction might be read. Thus Kloppenborg writes,

The Q prayer proposes a quid pro quo: God will cancel their debts if the Q folk cancel each other’s debts. This resembles the Qumran covenanters’ rules for the sabbatical year…

Q thus proposes a social praxis in which indebtedness is replaced by a general reciprocity.

In the end, we need not concur with Kloppenborg to nevertheless suggest that (some form of) reciprocity is at the heart of the Q prayer. However, it is clear that the petitions within Q 11:3-4 are pleas from a people in need of sustenance and aid on a daily basis. The socio-theological contract, though, is one of being so reassured by divine attunement and generosity that one need not be afraid.

Are not five sparrows sold for two cents? And yet not one of them will fall to earth without your Father’s consent. But even the hairs of your head all are numbered. Do not be afraid, you are worth more than many sparrows. (Q 12:6-7)

---


33 Kloppenborg, Q. the Earliest Gospel, 90.

34 Ibid., 91.
When they bring you before synagogues, do not be anxious about how or what you are to say; for the holy Spirit will teach you in that hour what you are to say. (Q 12:11-12)

Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious about your life, what you are to eat, nor about your body, with what you are to clothe yourself. Is not life more than food, and the body than clothing? Consider the ravens: They neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet God feeds them. Are you not better than the birds? And who of you by being anxious is able to add to one’s stature a cubit? And why are you anxious about clothing? Observe the lilies, how they grow: They do not work nor do they spin. Yet I tell you: Not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these. But if in the field the grass, there today and tomorrow thrown into the oven, God clothes thus, will he not much more clothe you, persons of petty faith! So do not be anxious, saying: What are we to eat? Or: What are we to drink? Or: What are we to wear? For all these the Gentiles seek; for your Father knows that you need them all. But seek his kingdom, and all these shall be granted to you. (Q 12:22b-30)

It is this sort of reassurance that is at the core of the Q Prayer Instruction. It is stated in the prayer (Q 11:3-4), exemplified in the admonishments of 11:9-10, graphically declared in 11:12-13, and proclaimed with clarity and boldness in 11:13.

So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

Q 11:4c

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν

And do not put us to the test!

Manson noted that the word, πειρασμός can express two meanings, one meaning “to tempt” and the other “to test.” Since the former usually is used in contexts where someone makes something illicit attractive, the idea of God “tempting” his children seems inappropriate in the context. Manson concluded that the concept of “testing” is
meant here, as in Sirach 2:1, “My child, when you come to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for testing.”

The concept of God’s testing his people for their faith and loyalty is common in the Jewish scriptures. A few examples would include Exodus 20:20, “Moses said to the people, ‘Do not be afraid; for God has come only to test (πειράσαι) you and to put the fear of him upon you so that you do not sin,’” and Deuteronomy 8:2, “Remember the long way that the Lord your God has led you these forty years in the wilderness, in order to humble you, testing (ἐκπειράσῃ) you to know what was in your heart, whether or not you would keep his commandments.”

The Psalms hold multiple instances of testing for faith and love of God. In Psalm 7:10, God proclaims his right to test, “I the Lord test (ἐτάζων) the mind and search the heart, to give to all according to their ways, according to the fruit of their doings.” Psalm 66:10 [LXX 65:10] testifies to the experience of the severity of God’s testing, “For you, O God, have tested (ἐδοκίμασας) us; you have tried us as silver is tried.”

Some Psalms express the strength of their commitment of God by asking him to test them, so sure they are of their faithfulness. Psalm 26:2 [LXX 25:2] invites God, “Prove me, O Lord, and try (πείρασόν) me; test my heart and mind,” as does Psalm 139:23 [LXX 138:23], “Search me, O God, and know my heart; test me (ἔτασόν) and know my thoughts.” Divine Wisdom means testing:

For at first she will walk with them on tortuous paths; she will bring fear and
dread upon them, and will torment them by her discipline until she trusts
them, and she will test (πειράσει) them with her ordinances. (Sir 4:17)

Scholars who see the Lord’s Prayer as eschatological have struggled with the
meaning of this petition. They settle for the end time struggle between Satan and
the petitioner in the cosmic conflict during the Eschaton. Lohmeyer appeals to
Revelation 3:10: “Because you have kept my word of patient endurance, I will
keep you from the hour of trial that is coming on the whole world to test the
inhabitants of the earth.” Further he explains:

The apocalyptic basis here is particularly clear; temptation is not the work of
God, but the work of the devil, who still has rule of the world…Those who
pray are still in this world, and so they can and may be spared…So this
petition, like the fifth, characterizes the suppliants in a twofold, only
apparently contradictory, fashion, which faithfully reflects the eschatological
situation in which they stand.36

Schürmann, too, sees the petition as a plea to be saved from a confrontation with Satan,
the source of the temptation.

It is therefore clear what we must consider to be the source of “temptation”.
It springs from the arena of Christ’s combat with the devil, which will attain
its peak of intensity at the end of the world. But the battle has already been
joined with the onset of his Passion. It still rages today, so that our lives are
truly a “time of temptation” and of bitter testing, during which we all stand
in constant danger of falling away.37

As has been noted throughout this dissertation, it may well be that this petition was
prayed with those eschatological intentions. The context of the Q¹ speech, however, does
not support that lens for this petition. We may draw Brown’s emphasis on the argument
of continuity to note that the aphoristic cluster, with Q 11:13 as the key, creates a sense of

36 Lohmeyer, Our Father: An Introduction, 204-05.
37 Schürmann, Praying with Christ, 83-92, esp. 87.
“this world” reality to the prayer. The tradition from the Jewish scriptures where it is God’s prerogative to test “the child” seems to fit this prayer which calls on God as Father, and asks for bread for today. In Q 11:13, the climax which focuses on God’s reliability as a loving provider assures the listener of the confidence with which the prayers can be offered, given the tender image of the child who needs tending and kindness for survival.

This petition counters the confident invitations of the psalmist whose prayer welcomes God’s testing: Psalm 26:2 [LXX 25:2] invites God, “Prove me, O Lord, and try (πείρασόν) me; test my heart and mind,” as does Psalm 139:23 [LXX 138:23], “Search me, O God, and know my heart; test me (ἐτασόν) and know my thoughts.”

In this prayer, the petitioners fear that they lack the strength yet, are still too fragile to stand up on their own against such tests. It is a humble prayer for the Father not to use his prerogative to test them, any more than we test the very young child. The prayer closes on this plea which amounts to humble recognition of the Father’s support.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, which applies the research of the dissertation to the Lord’s Prayer, the proposals that the prayer belongs in an eschatological framework is challenged by the work of Ronald Piper’s on Q 11:9-10-11-12, 13, which proves that the climax of the aphoristic cluster is v. 13, and the interpretive *qal wehomer* argument that God, as Father, is beyond the imagination in his tender loving care for his children. That domestic, homey teaching, that arises from the outrageous sayings, picks up on the theme of Father in Q 11:2b. The Kingdom that is coming finds its backdrop for meaning in the other three usages of Kingdom in the Q¹ stratum. There, the notion of God’s reign as gradually
taking over the earth is the one supported in the prayer, attached as it is to the Q¹ cluster as its commentary. The bread of today that is requested of the Father is further underlined by Q 11:11-13, where the example of a child asking his parent for bread, does away with the un-contextualized speculations that it refers to the eschatological banquet. The rest of the prayer, on the grounds of continuity, must fit with that attention to life here. The promise of forgiveness to those who owe debts to us is the abandonment of the cultural criteria for maintaining one’s honor when disgraced, through retaliation. It is a commitment to magnanimity, mercy, and peace even if it does mean that others will see one remaining in disgrace. Kloppenborg brings in the ramifications for actual financial debts owed as well. Here the promise to let go of debts, open the way to freedom for others, just as God’s pardon frees his children. Finally, the prayer ends with the humble request to the Father not to use his prerogative to test, for the petitioners feel unready yet. The image of the very young child in Q 11:11-13 seems to best express the sense of the community as still learning, and finding its way, and relying on the Father for every day’s life and progress.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND SUMMARY

Brief Summary of Conclusions

This dissertation has addressed the manner in which the Lord’s Prayer of the Q¹ community was understood by the Q tradents. Although there have been many advances in Q scholarship, especially the stratigraphy that identifies the contents and characteristics of the formative stratum (Q¹) and the major redaction (Q²), no one has applied those findings to the interpretation of the Lord’s Prayer with its adjacent aphorisms. This dissertation has applied those scholarly contributions and subjected the Q prayer to further analysis. Many previous studies have relied on the internal evidence of the prayer and attempted to coordinate it with a worldview thought to be evident at the time. This dissertation, however, has used a literary method in the interpretation of the prayer. More specifically, the Q Prayer Speech is composed of two clusters. By linking these clusters, the Q complier(s) has provided a specific perspective, or lens, through which to view and understand the entire speech. That is, it is now possible through recent developments in Q stratigraphy and literary analysis, to follow the interpretative roadmap provided by the Q community based on the editorial decision to attach the two clusters.

Although these scholarly building blocks have been available, Q scholarship has yet to apply the literary finding that Q 11:9-13 serve as commentary, and more importantly, that v. 13 functions as the interpretative key for the entire prayer speech. In
this way, it is possible to follow the directives of the Q community rather than be guided by other texts available at the time.

In order to illustrate the manner in which this scholarship makes any difference to the interpretation of the Prayer, we began in Chapter One with a review of the major voices that have examined the prayer for its meaning. The interpretations of the Lord’s Prayer, as we have shown, have been many and varied. The vast majority of commentators have focused on the Matthean version and its context. This has lead to two significant problems related to the “original” prayer from Q. First, even if the “prayer” is studied within its Matthean setting, it is interpreted through the perspective and influence of Matthean tradition. Second, Matthew separated the prayer (Matt 6:9-13/Q 11:2b-4) from the aphorisms (Matt 7:7-11/Q 11:9-13) that were attached to it by the Q compiler. This redactional decision has obscured the intentions and interpretive guidance provided by the Q community. Furthermore, as was shown in Chapter One, many scholars do not even interpret the Matthean prayer in its Matthean setting, but take a singular cue from its internal evidence and draw on external source material, other texts in the canon, to secure a meaning.

The problem is, based on the internal evidence alone, it is possible to argue for a number of equally plausible interpretations. The eschatological character of the prayer has been most commonly proposed, as we have seen. This is largely based on the petition “your kingdom come” (Q 11:2). Scholars we reviewed, such a Manson, Jeremias, and Brown, use the argument of continuity to represent all the petitions as aspects of that coming end time, so that the plea for bread refers to the eschatological banquet, while the plea that God not put the petitioners to the test belongs to a confrontation with Satan. It
was notable that Schürmann could not agree on the complete continuity, because the request for bread seems to belong to the ordinary life of the poor, while the promise to forgive others also suggests the day-to-day difficulties that arise between people. Thus, Schürmann had to conclude that there was a kind of mixed character to the prayer, one that combined the eschatological expectation of the world to come with the situations of life on earth in the prosaic present.

The controls to discover what the prayer did mean for the compiler(s) who present it in the source document Q, are found in the aphoristic clusters that were attached by the compilers to create a prayer speech, Q 11:2b-4, 9-13. Luke allowed the prayer and the attached aphorisms to remain somewhat connected. We say “somewhat” because Luke added additional commentary by inserting a parable, The Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:5-8). Luke apparently did so because he thought the aphorism Luke 11:9-10 would serve to explain proper behavior toward friends, even at midnight. Thus, vv. 9-10 is more directly applied to his parable than to the prayer (Luke 11:9-10). Thus, in order to read the prayer as it was intended, the link must be restored to the prayer and the adjacent aphorisms in the Q Prayer Speech.

Chapter Two prepares for such a conversation. First, the scholarship that recognizes and establishes the Synoptic Sayings Source is reviewed. Second, the redactional and compositional history of Q is discussed. This scholarship shows that through literary evidence, a formative layer of six aphoristic clusters can be identified. This material is internally focused on the group and its common life. This material is
characterized by counsels for peace, love, forgiveness, and the recognition of God’s kingdom. This formative material was later redacted, so that a series of forensic speeches, created by linking chreia and prophetic denunciations is directed outward against “this generation,” promising a coming end time judgment and punishment for obstructing the realization of God’s will, and “killing the prophets.” This research, then, has identified the Prayer Speech as belonging to the formative stratum identified as Q¹.

Chapter Three has addressed the interpretation of the Lord’s Prayer by focusing on the aphoristic cluster as a control, so to speak, or the lens through which the Q¹ community understood the petitions of the prayer. In that chapter, the compelling work of Paul Minear was explored. As was demonstrated, Minear argues that the cluster Q 11:9-13 is composed of two discrete units: vv. 9-10 and vv. 11-13. The first of these convinced him, as we saw, that it was primary. The wide-open pronouncement to ask, seek, and knock invites a wide-open freedom. For Minear, the mention of “knocking” suggests the knocking to enter the Kingdom of God. Minear’s certitude that this meant the eschatological kingdom also affected his interpretation of vv. 11-13. Thus, Minear makes the “ask, seek, and knock” logion primary and it is used to interpret the rest of the aphoristic cluster, vv. 11-13. Thus, the questions of vv. 11-13 (whether a parent would give a child a stone instead of bread, or give a snake in place of a fish), for Minear, must be understood through the “ask, seek, and knock” logion. Minear, then, views the bread and fish as potent symbols of the coming end time banquet in the Kingdom. Goldsmith, too, supported the view that vv. 9-10 were certainly eschatological, as we recall. If Minear’s arguments hold, then even Q scholars like Kloppenborg, who calls on vv. 11-13 to support his conclusion that the Lord’s prayer reflects this world, would be without
foundation. If one argues that vv. 9-13 must have the same lens as the prayer, and Minear argues that vv. 9-10 commands the meaning of vv. 11-13, i.e. as an eschatological reference, then that lens would have to be applied to the entire prayer. At this point, the contributions of Piper enter the discussion. His analysis is the key to this research. Piper analyzed the aphoristic clusters of Q (Q¹) and found a specific and identifiable rhetoric. This rhetoric contains four steps, with the last being the “interpretative key,” or statement that controls the range of possible meanings for all the other associated verses. Thus, with respect to the aphoristic cluster Q 11:9-13, Piper has shown that Minear is mistaken, and that it is the final saying of v. 13 that explains the asking, seeking, and knocking.

Therefore, the image of how utterly unthinkable it is for an earthly parent to offer harmful things to an unsuspecting child is coordinated with “how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him,” in order to demonstrate how caring and responsive God is for the Q community. With this in place, the dissertation then discusses the meaning of the Lord’s Prayer in the light of the controlling key, Q 11:13: “So if you who are evil, know how to give good gifts to our children, by how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him.”

Based on the all-responsive parenting exemplified in v. 13, the Q¹ community clarifies the kind of father God is when he is addressed as such in the opening of the prayer, Q 11:2, “father.” It is the intention of the Q¹ compiler(s), from the invocation and the brief praise (Q 11:2b), through the petitions (vv. 3-4), that the unconditionally nurturing parent-God will respond. The call for the Father’s name to be honored and his kingdom to come are symmetrically formed praise sentences. “Your kingdom come” is seen against the backdrop of the other three references to God’s kingdom in Q¹. The
kingdom in this phrase is portrayed in the present-term real world settings. This is how the kingdom should be understood in Q 11:13. The pervading presence of the father caring for his children, who call to him, fits the other instances where the kingdom coming means ever greater goodness on earth. These kingdom references in Q¹ exhibit no evidence to suggest an immediate in-breaking of the Eschaton. Rather, the intimacy of a father close at hand seems to be what is wished for in the present world. Here, ironically, Lohmeyer’s effort to show how distinct the meaning of this text is from Jewish notions of God’s gradual reign over the earth only supplies a clearer view of how like the Jewish idea this text really is.

Similarly, Q 11:13, proven to be key by Piper, clarifies that for this community, the plea for bread is not a reference to an eschatological banquet, but for the nourishment to sustain daily life. The subsequent image in Q 11:11-12 where children ask their parents for bread and for fish increases the sense of the petitioners’ reliance on God for all nourishment. There is a humble awareness that ultimately, one depends on the fatherly providence of God for daily life itself.

In this way, Q 11:2b-3 play a significant role in how the petition to be forgiven and to forgive others is understood. The setting is characterized by a dependence upon a compassionate parent-God. However, this relationship involves the obligation to forgive others, other children of the family. Forgiveness can be magnanimous, but in the social context of the honor-shame society, it can also be disgracing. The petitioners reject any form of retaliation or vendetta, which is an expectation within the larger society. Their reason is expressed in the prayer: as children of God, they bring to others the mercy they have experienced from their father. Scholars like Malina and Rohrbach bring out the
social implications of honor-shame obligations. Clearly, this petition holds the promise that if the petitioners endure being shamed without retaliating, one can expect a climate of love and mercy wherever they are.

The final petition, in continuity with the rest of the prayer, governed as it is by Q 11:13, eschews any notion of God protecting the petitioners from a contest with Satan at the end time. Seen in the context of the entire Prayer Speech, this humble plea that closes the prayer asks the father to forego his privilege of testing their virtue. Q 11:13 suggests that the community sees itself not as stalwart followers of Jesus ready to prove their mettle, but as toddlers, needing the support and help of God. The unspoken implication of the plea is that, if the father tests them, there is every possibility that the members of the will fail.

All in all, the prayer, as found in the Q¹ Prayer Speech, emphasizes the fragility of the believers who come to their parent-God as his children. The whole of the prayer speech, as shown by Piper’s research, is made clear by that teaching, that commentary that urges the community to leave any fears behind and to trust in their father from heaven who gives good things to those who ask him.
APPENDIX A

ASKING AND SEEKING IN GRECO-ROMAN AND JEWISH PRAYER AND WISDOM LITERATURE
The Three Sapiential Pairs

Introduction to the Three Sapiential Pairs within Q 11:9-10

Earlier, we examined the work of Minear and Goldsmith, who argued that each of the three sapiential pairs within Q 11:9-10 (ask-will be given/receive [vv. 9a-10a]; seek-find [vv. 9b-10b]; knock-will be opened [vv. 9c-10c]) were originally separate and distinct with their own usage histories. Piper argues that the similarities within vv. 9-10 suggest they were modeled after one another. Kloppenborg goes further and takes the likely and reasonable position that the close parallelism within Q 11:9-10 suggests these verses were written at the same time from previously distinct material. Goldsmith, Piper, and Kloppenborg have noted ask-will be given/receive (vv. 9a, 10a) originally had nothing to do with prayer, but were attached to Q 11:2b-4. Continuing in this line of inquiry, it should be recognized that Q is fond of using multiple images to make or strengthen a point. Note the following:

1. Within the Temptation, we have three trials: the devil challenges Jesus to change stones to bread (Q 4:3), the devil tests Jesus by inviting him to throw himself down from the pinnacle of the temple requiring angels to care for him (4:9), and Jesus is offered all of the kingdoms if he would worship the devil (4:5)

2. Three makarisms begin the Inaugural Sermon (Q 6:20, 21, 22)

3. Within John’s inquiry if Jesus is the one coming, the followers are told to report: that the blind regain their sight, the lame walk, the diseased are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised (Q 7:22)\(^1\)

4. Jesus teaches that: foxes have holes, birds have nests, but the Son of Humanity has nowhere to lay his head (Q 9:58)

5. Within the Mission Charge followers are told to: carry no purse, carry no knapsack; no sandals, no stick; greet no one on the road (Q 10:4)

---

\(^1\) This verse may be constructed with images and phrases from Isa. For example see Isa 29:18b; 35:5-6; 61:1. Also see 4Q521 and brief discussion by Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, nn. 16, 17.
6. The woes against Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (Q 10:13, 15)

7. The four woes against Pharisees (Q 11:42-44)

8. Three woes against lawyers (Q 11:46b, 52, 47)

9. Jesus teaches that: what is concealed, will be exposed; what is hidden, will be known; what is in the dark, will have light; what is whispered will be proclaimed on the housetops (Q 12:2-3)

10. Jesus teaches to not store treasurers: on earth; where moths consume, robbers steal (Q 12:33)

11. Jesus teaches not to be anxious about your life: what you are to eat; or about your body, or your clothing (Q 12:22b)

12. Jesus teaches not to be anxious about: what to eat, what to drink, what to wear (Q 12:29)

13. Before the Days of Noah people were careless: eating, drinking, marrying (Q 17:27)

These data support the idea that the close parallelism within Q 11:9-10 may be reasonably explained as a creation of Q, or Q found material that shared a similar redactional temperament. Let us now briefly examine each of these units.

*Ask-Be Given/Receives*

Although there is some debate about the likely prehistories of “ask-be given/receive, seek-find, knock-be opened” and the formation of Q 11:9-10, there is general agreement that the sapiential pairs show, form-critically, that they are discrete and therefore exhibit no necessary dependence. Their particular conjunction, then, demonstrates literary choice on the part of the formulators. In particular, there is scholarly consensus that the admonishment which features ask-be given/receive (Q 11:9a, 10a) does not require the topic of prayer. Rather, in this Q setting, it functions as a framing device clarifying Jesus’ injunction to have confidence in prayer. Theories
concerning the history of these teachings in their discrete functioning are outside the parameters of this dissertation. Further, whether the sapiential subunits were joined (vv. 9-10) by the Q formulators or already attached in the tradition is not the concern of this study. Instead, our focus is how the images within Q 11-13 shape and limit the interpretation of the entire Q Prayer Instruction.

Many scholars have assumed that Q 11:9-10 reflects Jewish wisdom traditions and later Jewish-Christian thought. To some extent, this is probable but the evidence (especially the injunction which features seek-find) is broader than generally recognized. For example, Hans Dieter Betz has drawn attention to representative specimens within Greco-Roman literature. Further, it is important to recall Crossan’s contribution that under the influence of performance and didactic elaboration sapiential literature can be reshaped in a multitude of forms without losing its core meaning. Thus, exact or highly similar parallels may be useful for source criticism, but an eye for the broader representations of these sapiential pairs benefits interpretation.

2 Davies and Allison cite in support of this view the following texts: Prov 1:28; 8:17; Wis 6:12; Jer 29:13; John 14:13-14. But these are only a few of the uses of these pairs. See Davies and Allison, Matthew, 1.678-79. See also Stock, Matthew, 113-14. Luz, Matthew 1-7, 1.421.

3 Betz, Sermon on the Mount (Commentary), 501-02.

4 See Crossan, In Fragments, 12-18, 20-29, 37-66. This oversight led Goldsmith to look for close phrasings in order to draw parallels. See Goldsmith, "'Ask, and It Will Be Given...',' 256-57, esp. n. 4 (57). Dale Goldsmith, "

Early Greek Literature

Our examination begins with the wide lens observation of the association between asking and prayers to the divine. Homer records several examples. Below are the battle prayers of Diomedes and Aias:

Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, Atrytone! If ever with kindly thought you stood by my father’s side in the fury of battle, so now again show your love to me, Athene. Grant (δὸς) that I may slay this man, and that he come within the cast of my spear, the man who struck me unawares, and boasts over me, and declares that not for long shall I look on the bright light of the sun. ([Iliad] 5.115-20)

So he spoke, and they made prayer to lord Zeus, son of Cronos; and thus would one speak looking up to the broad heaven, “Father Zeus, who rule from Ida, most glorious, most great, grant victory to Aias and that he win glorious renown; or if you love Hector too, and care for him, grant (δὸς) to both equal might and glory.” ([Iliad] 7.202-05)

Each of these prayers begins with an invocation and contains a request using an inflected form of δίδωμι. In other Homeric instances, the invocation involves formulaic language, especially “hear me (κλῦθί),” and the identity of the god being petitioned. 7

Hear me (κλῦθί), Poseidon, Earth-bearer, and do not begrudge in answer to our prayer to fulfill these requests. To Nestor, first of all, and to his sons vouchsafe renown, and then to the rest grant (δῖδου) gracious requital for this glorious hecatomb, to all the men of Pylos. Grant (δὸς) furthermore that Telemachus and I return home having accomplished that for which we came here with our swift black ship. ([Odyssey] 3.55-61)

Note that after the invocation, an additional image, one of a son speaking to (praying) his father, is used before the request to receive is made.

---


7 See also [Odyssey], 6.322-328.
So I spoke, and he then prayed to the lord Poseidon, stretching out both his hands to the starry heaven: “Hear me (κλῦθί), Poseidon, earth-bearer, dark-haired god, if indeed I am your son and you declare yourself my father; grant (δὸς) that Odysseus, the sacker of cities, may never reach his home”…..So he spoke in prayer, and the dark-haired god heard him. (Odyssey 9.526-536)

Although the link is faint, it is nonetheless observable that Homeric prayers involve the recognition of a relationship and an asking element in hopes of receiving or being granted a request.

Septuagint and Jewish Intertestamental Literature

Jewish literature continues the tradition of “asking” through prayer. Note the following excerpts:

That night God appeared to Solomon, and said to him, “Ask (αἴτησαι) what I should give (δῶ) you.” (2 Chr 1:7)

Ask (αἰτεῖσθε) rain from the Lord in the season of the spring rain, from the Lord who makes the storm clouds, who gives (δώσει) showers of rain to you, the vegetation in the field to everyone. (Zech 10:1)

In each of these examples, the penitent is instructed to “ask” God with the clear implication that the request will be granted. In other prayers the “giving” is requested by the suppliant.

…give (δὸς) me the wisdom that sits by your throne, and do not reject me from among your servants. (Wis 9:4)

Below, we see how Philo mixes the images of finding, asking, opening, all of which serve for the penitent to receive the generic “good things” from God.

What he does not find (εὑρίσκῃ) in his own store, he asks (αἰτεῖται) for at the hands of God, the only possessor of unlimited riches; and He opens

...ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἔκεινη ὄφθη ὁ θεὸς τῷ Σαλωμων καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ αἴτησαι τί σοι δῶ. (2 Chr 1:7)

Λαῖτεσθε ύετόν παρά κυρίου καθ’ ὀραν πρόκμων καὶ ὕμιον κύριος ἐποίησεν φαντασίας καὶ ὑετόν χειμερινόν δώσει αὐτοῖς ἐκάστῳ βοτάνῃ ἐν ἄγρῳ (Zech 10:1).
(ἀνοίξας) his heavenly treasury and sends His good things (tà ἀγαθὰ)…
(Migration, 121)

Below, we find a text from the Psalms of Solomon that expresses confidence that if the suppliant calls out to God for food and basic necessities, his needs will be satisfied.

For if I am hungry, I will cry out to you, O God, and you will give (δώσεις) me [something]. You feed the birds and the fish, as you send rain to the wilderness that the grass may sprout. To provide pasture in the wilderness for every living thing, and if they are hungry, they will lift up their faces to you. You feed kings and rulers and peoples, O God, and who is the hope of the poor and the needy, if not you, Lord? And you will listen. For who is good and kind but you… (Pss. Sol. 5:8-12)¹⁰

From this brief survey of how asking and receiving is used in prayer we find representations across religious cultures and time periods. We also find asking is more commonly observed within Jewish materials along with an emphasis on the relationship between the divine and humans. So far, it would seem that asking, giving, receiving, seeking, finding, opening and “good things” are part of the language of prayer in antiquity. Will the other sapiential pairs confirm this preliminary observation? To that question, we now turn our attention.

Seek-Will Find

Hellenistic Literature

Of the three sapiential pairs within Q 11:9-10, seek-find is the most frequently and broadly represented in the literature of antiquity. As will be seen, this is true to the extent that it is unlikely that anyone would not associate seeking desirable things (victory, redemption, food, wisdom, etc.) from the divine. One of the plainest examples is from Plato in Gorgias. In this dialogue, Socrates and Callicles are discussing how difficult it is,

even for those inclined, to rightly identify beneficial desires from harmful ones. At this point in the repartee, Socrates raises doubts that any person can consistently discern the difference. Callicles responds,

Ah, but if you search (ζητῇς) properly you will find (εὑρήσεις) one. 
(Gorgias 503D)

The above citation involves seeking and finding within a philosophical or ethical discussion. Yet, there is little difficulty for Plato in shifting to a more cosmological and theological discourse, below, using the same imagery. Note, however, that the same philosophical language can be applied to human and divine interaction. The following example explicitly mentions how seeking (implied) is related to finding within a relationship between God and humankind.  

Now to discover (εὑρεῖν) the Maker and Father of this Universe were a task indeed; and having discovered (εὑρόντα) Him, to declare Him unto all men were a thing impossible. However, let us return and inquire further concerning the Cosmos… (Timaeus, 28c-29A)

Besides Plato, Epictetus used and appreciated the imagery of seeking and finding and he did so in a variety of ways. The simplest is related to general knowledge acquisition.

Does a man, then, differ in no wise from a stork? Far from it; but in these matters he does not differ.—In what wise, then, does he differ?—Seek (ζήτει) and you will find (εὑρήσεις) that he differs in some other respect. (Diss. 1.28.19-20)

In what, then, is the good (τὸ ἀγαθόν), since it is not in these things? Tell us, Sir messenger and scout. It is where you do not expect (ζητῆσαι) it, and do not wish to look for it. For if you had wished, you would have found (εὑρέτε) it within you, and you would not be wondering outside, nor would you be seeking (ἐζητεῖτε) what does not concern you…. (Diss. 3.22.38-39)

---

11 See also Plato, Apology, 23D.
The following reflection on the true nature of human freedom continues to intentionally pair ζητέω and εὑρίσκω.

But if you look (ζητῇς) for it where it does not exist, why be surprised if you never find (εὑρίσκεις) it? (Diss. 4.1.32)

Later, within the same text and concerning the same theme ζητέω and εὑρίσκω are linked.

When, therefore, neither those who are styled kings live as they will, nor the friends of these kinds, what freemen are left?—Seek (ζήτει) and you will find (εὑρήσεις). For nature has given you resources to find (εὕρεσιν) the truth. (Diss. 4.1.51)

Our concern is not to do an exhaustive study on the seek-find metaphor in antiquity. Rather, our interest is to see in what settings such discourse would be at home.

At this point, modestly, we can see that the seek-find metaphor was useful to those writing within broadly understood wisdom traditions. We will see that this is especially true for Jewish sapiential literature.

Septuagint and Jewish Intertestamental Literature

The “seek-find” metaphor is used several ways within Jewish literature. For instance, it can be deployed in a general way to describe human seeking.

All this I have tested by wisdom; I said, “I will be wise,” but it was far from me. That which is, is far off, and deep, very deep; who can find (εὑρήσεις) it out? I turned my mind to know and to search out and to seek (ζητῆσαι) wisdom and the sum of things, and to know that wickedness is folly and that foolishness is madness. I found (εὗρον) more bitter than death the woman who is a trap, whose heart is snares and nets, whose hands are fetters; one who pleases God escapes her, but the sinner is taken by her. See, this is what I found (εὗρον), says the Teacher, adding one thing to another to find (εὑρεῖν) the sum, which my mind has sought (ἐζήτησεν) repeatedly, but I have not found (εὗρον). One man among a thousand I found (εὗρον), but a woman among all these I have not found (εὗρον). See, this alone I found (εὗρον), that God made human beings straightforward, but they have devised (ἐζήτησαν) many schemes. (Qoh 7:23-29)
Seek-find can also indicate a faithful inclination toward God and his ways as an expression of devotion. Note the following:

From there you will seek (ζητήσετε) the Lord your God, and you will find (εὑρήσετε) him if you search after (ἐκζητήσητε) him with all your heart and soul. (Deut 4:29)

Seek (ζητήσατε) the Lord while he may be found (εὑρίσκειν), call upon him while he is near; (Isa 55:6)

Glory in his holy name; let the hearts of those who seek (ζητοῦσα) the Lord rejoice. Seek (ζητήσατε) the Lord and his strength, seek (ζητήσατε) his presence continually. (1 Chr 16:10-11)

At other times, “seek-find” language is used for the knowledge and benefits that come when one is faithful to God.

The poor shall eat and be satisfied; those who seek (οἱ ἐκζητοῦντες) him shall praise the Lord. May your hearts live forever! (Ps 22:26/LXX 21:27)

But may all who seek (οἱ ζητοῦντές) you rejoice and be glad in you; may those who love your salvation say continually, “Great is the Lord!” (Ps 40:16/LXX 39:17)

Seek (ζητήσατε) the Lord and his strength; seek his presence continually. (Ps 105:4/LXX 104:4)

The evil do not understand justice, but those who seek (οἱ δὲ ζητοῦντες) the Lord understand it completely. (Prov 28:5)

Wisdom is radiant and unfading, and she is easily discerned by those who love her, and is found (εὑρίσκεται) by those who seek (ζητοῦντων) her. (Wis 6:12)

Yet these people are little to be blamed, for perhaps they go astray while seeking (ζητοῦντες) God and desiring to find (εὑρεῖν) him. (Wis 13:6)

Observe how the seek-find metaphor can be used to imply a conditional, or if-then response by God.

And you, my son Solomon, know the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart; for the Lord searches every mind, and
understands every plan and thought. If you seek (ζητέσαις) him, he will be found (εὑρεθέσαι) by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever. (1 Chr 28:9)

He went out to meet Asa and said to him, “Hear me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: The Lord is with you, while you are with him. If you seek (ἐκζητήσητε) him, he will be found (εὑρεθήσεται) by you, but if you abandon him, he will abandon you.” (2 Chr 15:2)

For I was ashamed to ask (αἰτήσασθαι) the king for a band of soldiers and cavalry to protect us against the enemy on our way, since we had told the king that the hand of our God is gracious to all who seek (ζητοῦντας) him, but his power and his wrath are against all who forsake him. (Ezra 8:22)

I love those who love me, and those who seek (ζητοῦντες) me diligently find (εὑρήσουσιν) me. (Prov 8:17)

The if-then structure can take the form of a promise as well.

Then when you call upon me and come and pray to me, I will hear (εἰσακούω) you. When you search (ἐκζητέω) for me, you will find (εὑρίσκω) me; if you seek (ζητέω) me with all your heart, I will let you find me, says the Lord, (Jer 29:12-14a)

I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when panic strikes you, when panic strikes you like a storm, and your calamity comes like a whirlwind, when distress and anguish come upon you. Then they will call upon (ἐπικαλεσθήσεται) me, but I will not answer; they will seek (ζητήσουσίν) me diligently, but will not find (εὑρήσουσιν) me. Because they hated knowledge and did not choose the fear of the Lord… (Prov 1:26-29)

The seek-find metaphor was found to be flexible and highly adaptable in the literature of antiquity. In the case below, it is used to describe God’s pleasure or displeasure with his people.

Nevertheless, some good is found (ηὑρέθησαν) in you, for you destroyed the sacred poles out of the land, and have set your heart to seek (ἐκζητῆσαι) God. (2 Chr 19:3)

With their flocks and herds they shall go to seek (ἐκζητῆσαι) the Lord, but they will not find him (εὑρωσίν); he has withdrawn from them. (Hos 5:6)
Run to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, look around (ζητήσατε) and take note! Search its squares and see if you can find (εὕρητε) one person who acts justly and seeks (ζητῶν) truth—so that I may pardon Jerusalem. (Jer 5:1)\(^{12}\)

It can also function as a prophetic call to faithfulness, or a way to separate the faithful from the unfaithful.

In those days and at that time, says the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought (ζητήσουσιν), and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and none shall be found (εὑρεθῶσιν); for I will pardon the remnant that I have spared. (Jer 50:20/LXX 27:20)\(^{13}\)

Lastly within this section, seeking and finding is used to describe how one is to desire Wisdom. This suggests that the image of seeking and finding is very much at home within an instructional and aphoristic milieu.

Come to her with all your soul, and keep her ways with all your might. Search out and seek (ζήτησον), and she will become known (γνωσθήσεται) to you; and when you get hold of her, do not let her go. For at last you will find (εὑρήσεις) the rest she gives, and she will be changed into joy for you. (Sir 6:26-28)

Dead Sea Scrolls

Within the Dead Sea Scrolls literature, we find similar usage of the seek-find imagery, though in these two citations, “finding” is implied. Also, the thrust of the language is clearly sectarian with the faithful being exhorted to seek God by following his precepts with implied benefits.

A text belonging to [the Instructor, who is to teach the Holy Ones how to live according to the book of the Yahad’s Rule. He is to teach them to seek God with all their heart and with all their soul, and to do that which is good. (1QS I, 1-2)\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{12}\) See also Hos 2:7 [LXX 2:9].

\(^{13}\) See also 1 Kgs 18:10; Isa 41:12; 65:1.

\(^{14}\) Translations are from Wise, Abegg, and Cook.
…For the heavens and the earth shall listen to his Messiah, [and all w]hich is in them shall not turn away from the commandments of the holy ones. Strengthen yourselves, O you who seek the Lord, in his service! Will you not find the Lord in this, all those who hope in their heart? For the Lord seeks the pious and calls the righteous by name. Over the humble His spirit hovers, and He renews the faithful in His strength. (4Q521 Frags. 2 col. II. 1-8)

Philo

Philo of Alexandria continues the Jewish tradition of using the images within of Q 11:9-10. We have “seeking,” “finding,” and now “asking,” being associated with and connected to God providing, “opening his treasury” and offering to the faithful “good things.” It is noteworthy that by the time of Philo, the seek-find metaphor could be readily attached to the knock-be opened unit. Clearly, both sapiential pairs were well-known and were at home within an aphoristic setting. These metaphors seem to be very much a part of Jewish wisdom, Jewish devotion, and prayer.

What he does not find (εὑρίσκῃ) in his own store, he asks (αἰτεῖται) for at the hands of God, the only possessor of unlimited riches; and He opens (ἀνοίξας) his heavenly treasury and sends His good things (τὰ ἀγαθὰ)… (Migration, 121)

As for the divine essence, though in fact it is hard to track and hard to apprehend, it still calls for all the inquiry possible. For nothing is better than to search (ζητεῖν) for the true God, even if the discovery (ἡ εὐρεσις) of Him eludes human capacity, since the very wish to learn, if earnestly entertained, produces untold joys and pleasures. (Spec. Laws 1.36)

For Moses the revealer prays that the Lord may open (ἀνοίξῃ) to us His good (τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθὸν) treasure, the heaven, to give us rain (Deut. xxviii. 12), and the prayers of him whom God loves are always heard. (The Unchangeableness of God, 156-157)

For if anyone cares to examine closely the motives which led men of the earliest times to resort to sacrifices as a medium of prayer and thanksgiving, he will find (εὑρήσει) that two hold the highest place. (Spec. Laws 1.195)

For if thou art seeking (ζητεῖς) God, O mind, go out from thyself and seek (ἀναζήτει) diligently; but if thou remainest amid the heavy encumbrances of
the body or the self-conceits with which the understanding is familiar, though thou mayest have the semblance of a seeker (ζηταζ), not thine is the quest for the things of God. But whether thou wilt find (εὑρήσεις) God when thou seekest (ζητοῦσα) is uncertain, for to many He has not manifested Himself, but their zeal has been without success all along. And yet the mere seeking (ζητεῖν) by itself is sufficient to make us partakers of good things (ἀγαθῶν), for it always is the case that endeavours after noble things, even if they fail to attain their object, gladden in their very course those who make them. (Alleg. Interp. 3.47-48)

Now finding (εὑρεῖν) favour is not as some suppose equivalent only to being well-pleasing, but something of this kind besides. The righteous man exploring (ζητῶν) the nature of existences makes a surprising find (εὕρημα), in this one discovery, that all things are a grace of God…. (Alleg. Interp. 3.78)¹⁵

Gnostic Texts and Christian Pseudepigrapha

Many scholars believe that Gnostic thought forms grew out of Jewish wisdom speculation. For this reason, it is both reasonable and interesting to see how the same images within Q 11:9-10 were used within texts generally regarded as having some relationship to emergent and developing Gnosticism as well and material from the Christian Pseudepigrapha.

From the Gospel of Thomas, we find below a simple seek-find stich being placed within a secretive or speculative context and devoid of prayer or parent-child imagery.

Jesus says, “Seek and you will find. (2) But the things you asked me about in past times, and what I did not tell you then, now I am willing to tell you, but you do not seek them.” (Gos. Thom. Logion 92)¹⁶

Below, the simple seek-find stich has been expanded and connected to a paradoxical setting.

¹⁵ Italics are from the LCL translated edition.

Jesus says, “The one who seeks (ζητῶν) should not cease seeking (ζητεῖν) until he finds (εὕρῃ). (2) And when he finds (εὕρη), he will be dismayed. (3) And when he is dismayed, he will be astonished. (4) And he will be king over the All.” (Gos. Thom. Logion 2 [POxy 654])

In a similar fashion, the seek-find metaphor appears within the Gnostic text, Dialogue of the Savior and the Christian Pseudepigraphic work, the Gospel of the Hebrews.

(9) His [disciples said, “Lord], who is it who seeks, and […] (10) [The Lord said to them,] ‘He who seeks […] reveals…[…]’” (Dial. Sav. 9)

As it stands in the Gospel of the Hebrews: “He that marvels shall reign, and he that has reigned shall rest.” To those words this is the equivalent: “He that seeks will not find rest until he finds; and he that has found shall marvel; and he that marvels shall reign, and he that has reigned shall rest.” (Gos. Heb. 4a, b)

The last specimen from the Gospel of Thomas demonstrates that, as with Philo, the seek-find image could be linked with the knock-be opened unit. That is, by the time of the writing of the Gospel of Thomas, both sapiential pairs were well-known and were at home within aphoristic settings.

Jesus [says], “The one who seeks will find. (2) [The one who knocks], to him it will be opened.” (Gos. Thom. 94)

Knock-Be Opened

Philo, Jewish Intertestamental, and Enochic Literature

As noted earlier, the sapiential pair knock-be opened is the least represented unit within Q 11:9-10. However, it is not completely absent, either. Previously, we identified

---

17 Translation from Plisch.
19 Kloppenborg, Q Parallels, 87.
20 Ibid.
two citations from Philo that exhibit the utility of the metaphor and its affinity with both the seek-find image as well as the “good things” God provides to the faithful.

What he does not find (εὑρίσκῃ) in his own store, he asks (αἰτεῖται) for at the hands of God, the only possessor of unlimited riches; and He opens (ἀνοίξας) his heavenly treasury and sends His good things (τὰ ἀγαθὰ)… (Migration, 121)

For Moses the revealer prays that the Lord may open ((ἀνοίξῃ)) to us His good (τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθὸν) treasure, the heaven, to give us rain (Deut. xxviii. 12), and the prayers of him whom God loves are always heard. (The Unchangeableness of God, 156-157)

Intertestamental literature by and large exhibits less similarity to the Q 11:9-10 logion. To “open” in divine passive form seems to be used as a metaphor to describe the raining down of blessings to the faithful.

The heavens will be opened (ἀνοιγήσονται), and from the temple of glory sanctification will come upon him, with the Fatherly voice, as from Abraham to Isaac. (T. Levi 18:6)

And the heavens will be opened (ἀνοιγήσονται) upon him, to pour out the spirit as a blessing of the Holy Father. (T. Jud. 24:2)

In 1 Enoch, “open” is used to connote a benevolent action by God. But this citation lacks the pairing and structure of the Q logion. Nevertheless, since knocking implies a request or an “asking,” the image of opening suggests a “giving” and a “receiving,” or a positive response.

And in those days I shall open (ἀνοίξω) the storerooms of blessings which are in the heavens, so that I shall send them down upon the earth, over the work and toil of the children of man. (I En 11:1a)

21 The Greek texts from the Intertestamental literature within this section are from the database TLG.

22 All Intertestamental citations (and translations) are from Charlesworth et al. unless otherwise noted; in this case E. Isaac. See Charlesworth, ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.
This review makes it clear that each of the three subunits, now joined in Q (ask, be given/receive, seek/ find, knock/ be opened) represent wisdom teachings widely available across the Greco-Roman world and easily modified according to situation and circumstance, but most especially with regard to confidence in God’s care for humankind. It must be noted, however, that they are especially prominent in the extant Jewish wisdom literature, although the general availability of these ideas make it impossible to conclude that the formulators of the cluster were necessarily Jewish. These ideals of approaching God were “in the air” of the Greco-Roman world.
APPENDIX B

GOD AS FATHER IN JEWISH LITERATURE OF THE PERIOD
God as Providing Parent
Septuagint and Jewish Intertestamental Literature

When Jewish texts are examined in terms of the images of God as providing parent, God as teaching-testing parent, and God as trustworthy parent, similarities and differences from Hellenistic literature come into view.¹ The parent-child imagery occurs more often, in less formulaic rhetorical ways, and is palpably emotionally warmer. Below is an example of Jewish material that uses a model of parent-child nurturing interaction to describe the relationship between God and humankind.²

I said to you, “Have no dread or fear of them [enemies]. The Lord your God, who goes before you, is the one who will fight for you, just as he did for you in Egypt before your very eyes, and in the wilderness, where you saw how the Lord your God carried you, just as one carries a child, all the way that you traveled until you reached this place. But in spite of this, you have no trust in the Lord your God, who goes before you on the way to seek out a place for you to camp, in fire by night, and in the cloud by day, to show you the route you should take.” (Deut 1:29-33)

What is particularly noteworthy is that the model of the parent-child bond draws upon additional allusions of a more defenseless, small child in need of protection. Whereas, early Greek and Hellenistic literature generally focuses on the instruction and formation of young adults (adolescents), Jewish material employs models with two parental-child developmental periods: one for “responsible” children, teens (teaching, testing, disciplining) and adults, and another for the very young and vulnerable who simply need care. The second parent-child model involving the very young uses more emotional and

¹ The comparison here is between Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions. It must be noted, however, that Jewish texts and ancient Near Eastern sources and traditions often describe God in terms of human parenthood. Thus, Jewish texts that share the metaphor of God as parent do so broadly with other ancient Near Eastern materials. In no way, then, does this discussion imply uniqueness to Jewish texts. Rather, the discussion identifies differences with Greco-Roman materials.

² For additional texts describing God as parent to humans, see the following: Ps 89:26/LXX 88:27; Prov 3:12; 24:13; Job 29:16; Jub 1.24-25.
affectionate images. Thus, we have texts where God tests and corrects and texts that exhibit an unconditional nurturing love. For example, note how the two passages below apply the image of a nursing child to the care and trustworthiness of God.

Can a woman forget her nursing child, or show no compassion for the child of her womb? Even these may forget, yet I will not forget you. (Isa 49:15)

As a mother comforts her child, so I will comfort you; you shall be comforted in Jerusalem. (Isa 66:13)

Hosea deploys several images of a very small helpless child being tended to by an attuned and loving parent in the service of describing the relationship between God and humankind: teaching a child to walk, being held by a parent, healing an ill or injured child, providing human kindness and bands of love, the soft cheek of an infant, and the feeding small children.

When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son. The more I called them, the more they went from me; they kept sacrificing to the Baals, and offering incense to idols. Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk, I took them up in my arms; but they did not know that I healed them. I led them with cords of human kindness, with bands of love. I was to them like those who lift infants to their cheeks. I bent down to them and fed them. (Hos 11:1-4)

What is important to recognize is that even though the images are quite tender, sometimes the parent-child models blend together. That is, God may still require, as heavenly father, conditions before love is offered. In this sense, we have a third less common hybrid model.

As a father has compassion for his children, so the Lord has compassion for those who fear him. (Ps 103:13/LXX 102:13)

The Lord is far from the wicked, but he hears the prayer of the righteous. (Prov 15:29)
Other similes are used to describe God’s parental tie to humankind. Below, the parent-child relationship is characterized by God as the potter and humans as the potter’s clay.

Yet, O Lord, you are our Father; we are the clay, and you are our potter; we are all the work of your hand. (Isa 64:8/LXX 64:7)

Yet, just as the potter needs to smooth rough edges and eliminate what is undesirable, so God does the same toward humankind. God as instructing parent emphasizes right acting, heeding God’s word, and not hating. Note:

Listen to me your father, O children; act accordingly, that you may be kept in safety. (Sir 3:1)

I tell you this (λέγω ὑμῖν), my children, from experience, so that you might escape hatred and cling to love the Lord. (T. Gad 5:2)

…so that your children, whom you loved, O Lord, might learn that it is not the production of crops that feeds humankind but that your word sustains those who trust in you. (Wis 16:26)

In terms of daily sustenance, the text below describes God as understanding the needs of humans. Also, note how this passage may be alluded to in Q 11:3-4, 11.

Then the Lord said to Moses, “I am going to rain bread from heaven for you, and each day the people shall go out and gather enough for that day. In that way I will test (πειράσω) them, whether they will follow my instruction or not.” (Exod 16:4)

At this point, we have identified two pure and one hybrid model within Jewish literature that describe the relationship of God to humankind. At the earliest developmental level, the very young, God expresses his unconditional love and care for humankind. This model uses images of a parent and small child. A second model employs images of God as parent guiding, shaping, and disciplining an older and

---

3 All citations from Intertestamental literature are from Charlesworth (The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha) unless otherwise noted.
responsible child. There are conditions and if-then promises of reward and punishment. Lastly, there are texts that seem to draw upon a hybrid model.

**Philo of Alexandria**

Philo was both philosophically inclined and well-versed in Hellenistic thought. Resembling aspects of Hellenistic cosmological reflection, we see his emphasis on God as father in creation and his on-going generativity. There is a progression to Philo’s views and notion of God. It begins with creation and God as maker and father. It then builds upon that image to declare that as maker and father, God cares for his offspring.

> Now just such a power is that by which the universe was made, one that has as its source nothing less than pure goodness….that the Father and Maker of all is good… (*On Creation* 21)

> Now it was most proper to God the universal Father… (*On Creation* 74)

> For it stands to reason that what has been brought into existence should be cared for by its Father and Maker. For, as we know, it is a father’s aim to regard of his offspring…to preserve them… He keenly desires to provide for them in every way all that is beneficial and to their advantage… (*On Creation* 10)

> That these benedictions will be fulfilled we must believe, for he who gave them was beloved of God the lover of all men….the Maker and Father of all. (*On the Virtues* 77)

None of these passages involve the if-then paradigm of a parent shaping the behavior of an older responsible child. Even though Philo’s interest is generally focused on God as creator, his imagery of God is not confined to a philosophical “big-picture.” Note how

---

4 Josephus, on the other hand, perhaps attempting to appeal to Roman court sensibilities emphasizes God as “universal father,” but avoids the nurturing, tender dimensions of the Jewish parent-child model. Note: “Seeing that God, the Father and Lord of the Hebrew race….” (*Ant.* 5:93); “For neither could the lawgiver himself, without this vision… nor would any…unless before all else they were taught that God, as the universal Father and Lord who beholds all things,…” (*Ant.* 1:20); “At this all the people rejoiced, and David, seeing the zeal and rivalry in giving of the chiefs and priests and all the others, began to bless God in a loud voice, addressing Him as father and source of the universe, as creator of things human and divine…” (*Ant.* 7:380).
Philo uses the model of intimate parental nurture to describe God’s relationship with humankind.

Fifthly, that God also exercises forethought on the world’s behalf. For that the Maker should care for the thing made is required by the laws and ordinances of Nature, and it is in accordance with these that parents take thought beforehand for children. (On Creation 171-72)

Nature has endowed on every mother as a most essential endowment teeming breasts, thus preparing in advance food for the child that is to be born. The earth also, as we all know, is a mother, for which reason the earliest men thought fit to call her “Demeter,” combining the name of “mother” with that of “earth…” (On the Creation, 133)

This brief survey of Philonic work demonstrates that Philo was aware of a Jewish understanding (model) of the relationship of God to humans that was unconditional. This does not imply that it was the only model of the divine relationship in Philo’s thought—just that it was present.

Early Rabbinic Literature

We see a continuation of both the creator dimension of God as father and a more developed model of God as parent to humankind in early rabbinic literature. For instance note below the emphasis on being children of God.

He used to say: Beloved is man for he was created in the image [of God]; still greater was the love in that it was made known to him that he was created in the image of God, as it is written, For in the image of God made he man. Beloved are Israel for they were called children of God; still greater was the love in that it was made known to them that they were called children of God, as it is written, Ye are the children of the Lord your God. Beloved are Israel, for to them was given the precious instrument; still greater was the love, in that it was made known to them that to them was given the precious instrument by which the world was created as it is written, For I give you good doctrine; forsake ye not my Law. (m. ’Abot 3:15)\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) All citations from the Mishnah are from Danby unless otherwise noted. Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (New York: Oxford University Press, 1933).
Previously, we have seen that fathers took on a stern, testing, and challenging role. Such a parenting style is not reflected within the Q Prayer Instruction where the suppliant is instructed to simply ask without condition and can rightly expect gratification. Two texts below provide a possible rationale for the existence of at least two parent-child relational models. The first, from the Babylonian Talmud, suggests that the innocence and neediness of small children receive special affirmative attention from God.

Ḥanan ha-Neḥba was the son of the daughter of Ḥoni the Circle-Drawer. When the world was in need of rain the Rabbis would send to him children and they would take hold of the hem of his garment and say to him, Father, Father give us rain. Thereupon he would plead with the Holy One, blessed be He [thus], Master of the Universe, do it for the sake of these who are unable to distinguish between the Father who gives rain and the father who does not. (b. Ta’anith 23b)\(^6\)

The very young are unable to discern who is the “Father who gives rain and the father who does not.” That is, the small child is not sufficiently mature and capable enough to be expected to know and make proper decisions. This leaves the parent with the only reasonable option of simply giving to the child what she or he needs. So when the world was in need of rain, the prayers of the very young were more likely to be heard and granted.

Plutarch, in his biography of the Spartan king Agesilaus, also suggests that little children are in a difference class, one that suspends demands and is more readily gratified.

It is a fact that Agesilaus was excessively fond of his children, and a story is told of his joining in their childish play. Once, when they were very small, he bestrode a stick, and was playing horse with them in the house, and when he was spied doing this by one of his friends, he entreated him not to tell anyone, until he himself should be a father of children. (Agesilaus 25.5)

\(^6\) All translations from the Talmud unless otherwise noted are from Isidore Epstein, ed. The Babylonian Talmud, 35 vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1935-1960).
It is this sort of image that is frequently found within Jewish material, that is, of a helpless, compassion-inspiring child being loved and cared for by an attuned and nurturing parent. Note the texts below.

  Can a woman forget her nursing child, or show no compassion for the child of her womb? Even these may forget, yet I will not forget you. (Isa 49:15)

  As a mother comforts her child, so I will comfort you; you shall be comforted in Jerusalem. (Isa 66:13)

  Did I conceive all this people? Did I give birth to them, that you should say to me, “Carry them in your bosom, as a nurse carries a sucking child,” to the land that you promised on oath to their ancestors? (Num 11:12)

Although Jewish instructional material frequently admonishes children to be aware of righteous thought and do righteous action, we also have texts that exhibit both an earlier developmental, helpless period, one in which demands are premature. It would seem from the Q teaching to ask and be confident in receiving, that the model of the relationship of God to humankind is based on this earlier, helpless infant image and his or her parent. At this point, let us examine more closely Jewish teachings that involve a parent that teaches and tests their older child.

**God as Teaching-Testing Parent**

The Septuagint

As we have seen, Jewish literature describes the relationship of God to humankind in two distinct developmental models: one that defines the primary relationship in terms of a compassionate, nurturing parent indulging the requests and needs of the very young, helpless infant and another period when the child is older and able receive and benefit from instruction. Such instruction is often defined in terms of

---

7 See Prov 1:8, 10, 15; 2:1; 3:1, 11, 21; 4:10, 20; 5:1, 7; 6:1, 3, 20; 7:1; 10:1 bis; Sir 2:1, 3:12, 17; 4:1; 6:18, 23, 32.
parental discipline, yet is understood as formation. We repeat the potter to clay image presented earlier, as it fits this setting as well. Note:

Know then in your heart that as a parent disciplines a child so the Lord your God disciplines you. (Deut 8:5)

Yet, O Lord, you are our Father; we are the clay, and you are our potter; we are all the work of your hand. (Isa 64:8/LXX 64:7)

Recalling and living by previous instruction is another frequent theme.

Hear, my child, your father’s instruction, and do not reject your mother’s teaching; for they are a fair garland for your head, and pendants for your neck. (Prov 1:8-9)

My child, do not forget my teaching, but let your heart keep my commandments; for length of days and years of life and abundant welfare they will give you. (Prov 3:1-2)

Those who walk uprightly fear the Lord, but one who is devious in conduct despises him. (Prov 14:2)

The end of the matter; all has been heard. Fear God, and keep his commandments; for that is the whole duty of everyone. (Qoh 12:13)

For the fear of the Lord is wisdom and discipline, fidelity and humility are his delight. (Sir 1:27)

Those who fear the Lord do not disobey his words, and those who love him keep his ways. (Sir 2:15)

The fear of the Lord is another theme suggesting an if-then, parent-to-child expectation for school age children (not infants).

As a father has compassion for his children, so the Lord has compassion for those who fear him. (Ps 103:13)

Serve the Lord with fear, with trembling. (Ps 2:11)

Who are they that fear the Lord? He will teach them the way that they should choose. (Ps 25:12)
Come, O children, listen to me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord. (Ps 34:11)

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge; fools despise wisdom and instruction. Hear, my child, your father’s instruction, and do not reject your mother’s teaching; for they are a fair garland for your head, and pendants for your neck. My child, if sinners entice you, do not consent. (Prov 1:7-10)

He fulfills the desire of all who fear him; he also hears their cry, and saves them. The Lord watches over all who love him, but all the wicked he will destroy. (Ps 145:19-20)

The fear of the Lord prolongs life, but the years of the wicked will be short. (Prov 10:27)

Using the image of God as a teaching-testing parent has helped identify nuances in texts where that role is lacking. This may explain why we have some passages which express unconditional generosity and nurture and others that contain an “if you do, then you will receive” promise. The unconditional may be modeled after the frailties of an infant and the “if-then” relationship is applied for those old enough to be expected to show proper judgment and right behavior. So, how is this distinction related to the image of God as a trustworthy parent? To this question, we now turn.

**God as Trustworthy Parent**

The Septuagint

Trust, right religious observance, and ethical behavior are intertwined within models of the relationship of God and humankind in Jewish literature. As an expression of piety and relationship to the divine, trust is a dominant motif in the LXX, appearing nearly 200 times. Besides πιστεύω and πίστις, ἐλπίζω is often translated as “trust” in the LXX. Furthermore, there is a bi-directionality to trust: God offers reliable promises and humans recite their faithful history to call upon a trustworthy God to intervene on their
behalf. Sometimes it is not expressly mentioned, but clearly implied. Note Jacob’s plea for safety.

And Jacob said, “O God of my father Abraham and God of my father Isaac, O Lord who said to me, ‘Return to your country and to your kindred, and I will do you good (εὖ σε ποιήσω),’ I am not worthy of the least of all the steadfast love and all the faithfulness that you have shown to your servant, for with only my staff I crossed this Jordan; and now I have become two companies. Deliver me, please, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, for I am afraid of him; he may come and kill us all, the mothers with the children. Yet you have said, ‘I will surely do you good, and make your offspring as the sand of the sea, which cannot be counted because of their number.’” (Gen 32:9-12)

Below, Moses calls upon past promises and implores God to show beneficence.

But Moses implored the Lord his God, and said, “O Lord, why does your wrath burn hot against your people, whom you brought out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand? Why should the Egyptians say, ‘It was with evil intent that he brought them out to kill them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth?’ Turn from your fierce wrath; change your mind and do not bring disaster on your people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants, how you swore to them by your own self, saying to them, ‘I will multiply your descendants like the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants, and they shall inherit it forever.’” (Exod 32:11-13)

There are times when God either offers a promise or is reminded of one.8

Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he the child I delight in? As often as I speak against him, I still remember him. Therefore I am deeply moved for him; I will surely have mercy on him, says the Lord. (Jer 31:20)

---

8 Also see; “You hate those who pay regard to worthless idols, but I trust in the Lord (Ps 31:6/LXX 30:7).” “But I trust in you, O Lord; I say, ‘You are my God’ (Ps 31:14/LXX 30:15). Many are the torments of the wicked, but steadfast love surrounds those who trust in the Lord (Ps 32:10/LXX 31:10).” “But I am like a green olive tree in the house of God. I trust in the steadfast love of God forever and ever (Ps 52:8/LXX 51:10).” “...when I am afraid, I put my trust in you. In God, whose word I praise, in God I trust; I am not afraid; what can flesh do to me? (Ps 56:3-4/LXX 55:4-5).” “...in God I trust; I am not afraid. What can a mere mortal do to me? (Ps 56:11/LXX 55:12).” “But I am like a green olive tree in the house of God. I trust in the steadfast love of God forever and ever (Ps 52:8/LXX 51:10).” “O Lord, my Lord, my strong deliverer, you have covered my head in the day of battle (Ps 140:7/LXX 139:8).” “But my eyes are turned toward you, O God, my Lord; in you I seek refuge; do not leave me defenseless (Ps 141:8/LXX 140:8).” “Let me hear of your steadfast love in the morning, for in you I put my trust. Teach me the way I should go, for to you I lift up my soul (Ps 143:8/LXX 142:8).”
Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will hear. (Isa 65:24)

And those who know your name put their trust in you, for you, O Lord, have not forsaken those who seek you. (Ps 9:10/LXX 9:11)

O my God, in you I trust; do not let me be put to shame; do not let my enemies exult over me. (Ps 25:2/LXX 24:2)

There are other occasions where humans are instructed to trust in God and his promises.9

Blessed are those who trust in the Lord, whose trust is the Lord. (Jer 17:7)

Trust in the Lord forever, for in the Lord God you have an everlasting rock. (Isa 26:4)

You will pray to him, and he will hear you, and you will pay your vows. (Job 22:27)

Offer right sacrifices, and put your trust in the Lord. (Ps 4:5/LXX 4:6)

Trust in him at all times, O people; pour out your heart before him; God is a refuge for us. (Ps 62:8/LXX 61:9)

Trust in the Lord, and do good; so you will live in the land, and enjoy security. (Ps 37:3/LXX 36:3)

The citations above demonstrate that the “student” or suppliant can surely trust God. However, there may be times when God does not comply with petitions. These situations involve someone who is expected to be old enough to make decisions and be held responsible. There are times when God turns his back in judgment and punishment. Below, because the sin of the people has displeased God, Jeremiah is told that he is not to pray or intercede for them.

9 See also; “O Israel, trust in the Lord! He is their help and their shield (Ps 115:9/LXX 113:17).” “The Lord is far from the wicked, but he hears the prayer of the righteous (Prov 15:29).” “Trust in the Lord with all your heart, and do not rely on your own insight (Prov 3:5).” “Commit your way to the Lord; trust in him, and he will act (Ps 37:5/LXX 36:5).”
As for you, do not pray for this people, do not raise a cry or prayer on their behalf, and do not intercede with me, for I will not hear you. (Jer 7:16)

As for you, do not pray for this people, or lift up a cry or prayer on their behalf, for I will not listen when they call to me in the time of their trouble. (Jer 11:14)

Below, are several noteworthy passages. The first continues the theme of God’s loving relationship to humans. Also within this text is the sapiential pair, seek-find, found within Q 11:9-10. The next three verses contain the sapiential pair “ask-be given” that is in Q 11:9-10 as well. It is implied in each of these texts that the asking is in the form of prayer. The text from 2 Chronicles 1:7 records God instructing Solomon to ask of him in prayer implying that God will answer and comply.

I love those who love me, and those who seek (ζητέω) me diligently find (εὑρίσκω) me. (Prov 8:17)

That night God appeared to Solomon, and said to him, “Ask (αἰτέω) what I should give (δίδωμι) you.” (2 Chr 1:7)

Ask (αἰτέω) rain from the Lord in the season of the spring rain, from the Lord who makes the storm clouds, who gives (δίδωμι) showers of rain to you, the vegetation in the field to everyone. (Zech 10:1)

Ask (αἰτέω) me and I will give (δίδωμι) you the nations as your inheritance, and the ends of the earth your possession. (Ps 2:8) ¹⁰

Though a parental term is not expressly mentioned, it is reasonable to assume they are implied in the texts above, given the frequency of parent-child imagery in Jewish literature. The first text seems to be based on the “adolescent” parent-child model with the last three suggesting the “helpless child” and the giving parent model.

---

¹⁰ Translation is this author’s.
Intertestamental Literature Jewish

Jewish Intertestamental literature generally continues the interwoven themes of trusting God as an integral aspect of our relationship to him. We need not repeat similar data but a few texts both develop and strengthen this association of trusting God.\(^{11}\) Below are several passages which offer unconditional divine care.

Trust in him, and he will help you; make your ways straight, and hope in him. (Sir 2:6)

Take courage, my children, cry to God, and he will deliver you from the power and hand of the enemy. (Bar 4:21)

Take courage, my children, and cry to God, for you will be remembered by the one who brought this upon you. (Bar 4:27)

Those who trust in him will understand truth, and the faithful will abide with him in love, because grace and mercy are upon his holy ones, and he watches over his elect. (Wis 3:9)

For your sustenance manifested your sweetness toward your children; and the bread, ministering to the desire of the one who took it, was changed to suit everyone’s liking. (Wis 16:21)

…but that your children, whom you loved, O Lord, might learn that it is not the production of crops that feeds humankind but that your word sustains those who trust in you. (Wis 16:26)

I cried out, “Lord, you are my Father; do not forsake me in the days of trouble, when there is no help against the proud.” (Sir 51:10)

---

\(^{11}\) See also; “Let me hear of your steadfast love in the morning, for in you I put my trust. Teach me the way I should go, for to you I lift up my soul (Ps 143:8/LXX 142:8).” “The one whose service is pleasing to the Lord will be accepted, and his prayer will reach to the clouds (Sir 35:20/LXX 35:16).” “The prayer of the humble pierces the clouds, and it will not rest until it reaches its goal; it will not desist until the Most High responds (Sir 35:21/LXX 35:17).” “Reward those who wait for you and let your prophets be found trustworthy. Hear, O Lord, the prayer of your servants, according to your goodwill toward your people, and all who are on the earth will know that you are the Lord, the God of the ages (Sir 36:21-22/LXX 36:15-16).” “Let me hear of your steadfast love in the morning, for in you I put my trust. Teach me the way I should go, for to you I lift up my soul (Ps 143:8/LXX 142:8).” “The one whose service is pleasing to the Lord will be accepted, and his prayer will reach to the clouds (Sir 35:20/LXX 35:16).” “He prays to the Lord for all his household, and the Lord has heard the prayers of all who fear God (Pss. Sol. 6:5).”
My child, when you are ill, do not delay, but pray to the Lord, and he will heal you. (Sir 38:9)

These passages suggest the author had in mind the early parent-child model. Below, we see how this model can be applied to the hungry, the desperate, the needy, the distressed, the poor, orphans, widows, and those wronged.

Do not grieve the hungry, or anger one in need. Do not add to the troubles of the desperate, or delay giving to the needy. Do not reject a suppliant in distress, or turn your face away from the poor. Do not avert your eye from the needy, and give no one reason to curse you; for if in bitterness of soul some should curse you, their Creator will hear their prayer. (Sir 4:2-6)

He will not show partiality to the poor; but he will listen to the prayer of one who is wronged. (Sir 35:16/LXX 35:13)

He will not ignore the supplication of the orphan, or the widow when she pours out her complaint. (Sir 35:17/LXX 35:14)

For if I am hungry, I will cry out to you, O God, and you will give me (something) you feed the birds and the fish, as you send rain to the wilderness for every living thing, and if they are hungry, they will lift up their faces to you. You feed kings and rulers and peoples, O God, and who is the hope of the poor and the needy, if not you, Lord? And you will listen. For who is good and kind but you… (Pss. Sol. 5:8-12)

For you are our protection, and we will call to you, and you will hear us (Pss. Sol. 7:7).

Your eyes (are) watching over them and none of them will be in need. Your ears listen to the hopeful prayer of the poor. (Pss. Sol. 18:2)

These data support, again, a view of two operative models of divine-human and parent-child relationships. The helpless and needy receive an unconditional beneficial response from God, but others, either mature, not in great need, or those capable of being held responsible for their decisions and actions, have more of an “if-then” model.
Philo

Philo, as we have noted, exhibits attitudes that are thoroughly Hellenistic and thoroughly Jewish. For example, Philo’s image of God is more closely tied to creation and cosmology than to parenting models. Note the following on Abraham:

…he who craved for kinship with God and strove by every means to live in familiarity with Him, he who while ranked among the prophets, a post of such excellence, put his trust in nothing created rather than in the Uncreated and Father of all…. (On the Virtues, 218)

Philo does recognize the fatherhood of God elsewhere as well, and expresses it in terms of a parent-child model, though clearly it is not central to his philosophy within this passage.

And therefore, slow to trust in himself, he besought and entreated God, who surveys the invisible soul and to whom alone it is given to discern the secrets of the mind, to choose on his merits the man most fitted to command, who would care for his subjects as a father. And stretching up to heaven his pure, and, as it might be out figuratively, his virgin hands, he said, “Let the God of spirits and all flesh look to find a man to set over the multitude to guard and protect it, a shepherd who shall lead it blamelessly that the nation may not decay like a flock scattered about without one to guide it.” Yet who of those who heard this prayer would not have been astounded? (On the Virtues, 57-59)

However, Philo’s writing also portrays an affectionate bond with humankind.

For Moses the revealer prays that the Lord may open (ἀνοίγω) to us His good (τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθόν) treasure, the heaven, to give us rain (Deut. xxviii. 12), and the prayers of him whom God loves are always heard. (The Unchangeableness of God, 156-157)

Nevertheless, trusting God, for Philo, is one of the highest virtues.

For if you should be willing to search more deeply and not confine yourself to the mere surface, you will clearly understand that to trust in God alone and to join no other with Him is no easy matter, by reason of our kinship with

---

12 See also: “What he does not find (ἐὑρίσκω) in his own store, he asks (αἰτέω) for at the hands of God, the only possessor of unlimited riches; and He opens (ἀνοίγω) his heavenly treasury and sends His good things (τὰ ἀγαθὰ)…” (Philo, Migration, 121).
our yokefellow, mortality, which works upon us to keep our trust placed in riches and repute and office and friends and health and strength and many other things. To purge away each of these, to distrust created being, which itself is wholly unworthy of trust in God, and in Him, alone, even as He alone is truly worthy of trust—...for nothing is so just or righteous as to put in God alone a trust which is pure and unalloyed. (Who is the Heir, 92-95)
God as Providing Parent

Early Greek Literature

Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, Aeschylus, and Xenophon

Dieter Zeller, representing many scholars, is surely right when he states that the history of religions demonstrates that God as father “is a widespread phenomenon in antiquity.”¹ But that is a broad stroke comment in need of clarification. There are nuances and traditions that can be observed when examining the evidence of the period. For example, early Greek literature frequently refers to Zeus as father in formulaic ways. Observe the invocation within the prayer of Thetis in Homer’s *Iliad* (1.503-507):

Father Zeus (Ζεῦ πάτερ), who rules from Ida, most glorious, most great, and you Sun, who see all things and hear all things, and you rivers and you earth, and you who in the world below take vengeance on men who are done with life, whoever has sworn a false oath: be witnesses, and watch over the solemn oaths. If Alexander kills Menelaus, then let him keep Helen and all her treasure; and let us depart in our seafaring ships. But if tawny-haired Menelaus kills Alexander, then let the Trojans give back Helen and all her treasure, and pay to the Argives such recompense as is proper, such as will remain in the minds of men who are yet to be. But if Priam and the sons of Priam are not minded to pay recompense to me when Alexander falls, then

will I fight on even then, to get recompense, and will remain here until I find an end of war. (*Iliad* 3.276-291)

The “if-then” nature of this prayer implies a contract between the one who offers the prayer and Zeus and is preceded by the invocation. This way of speaking of and referring to divine Zeus appears frequently elsewhere within Homeric material.\(^2\) To a lesser extent, Hesiod and Euripides conceive of and write about Zeus as father.\(^3\) However, there are other instances within Homeric material that exhibit another address formula: Zeus as “father of men and gods” (“πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν”).\(^4\) Both the Homeric Hymn to Dionysus and Hesiod in *Theogony* and *Works and Days* continue this tradition.\(^5\) The tenor of these citations is more one of title than relationship. There is little to suggest the kind of day-to-day bonds of affiliation expected between a parent and a child in this material. The focus is one of recognition, petitioning, and contracting, not nurture.

The playwright Aeschylus reveals other aspects to the understanding of Zeus as paternal god.\(^6\) Note another dimension associated with Zeus:

May Zeus, god of suppliants, look graciously upon our band…

(Aeschylus, *Suppliants* 1)

---


\(^4\) *Iliad*, 1.544; 4.68;


\(^6\) For fatherhood of Zeus, also see Aeschylus, *Seven against Thebes* 512; Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 1; *Olympian Odes* 2, 27; *Pythian Odes* 3 98; *Pythian Odes* 4 23; Frag. 93.2.
As god of those who supplicate, Zeus is also known as the savior (*Suppliants* 26). As we shall see in a later chapter, just because Zeus is petitioned does not guarantee a favorable response. This is in spite of the fact that he is also recognized as the “all-seeing Father” (*Aeschylus, Suppliants* 139). The following text typifies the images of Zeus as both father and possible grantor of requests.

> On what account could I appropriately call on account of actions that give me a juster claim? The Lord and Father himself, with his own hand, was my engenderer, the great, wise, ancient artificer of my race, the all-resourceful one, Zeus, who grants fair winds. (*Aeschylus, Suppliants* 590-595)

Although the granting of requests involved judgment and decision on the part of Zeus, if promised, petitioners were confident of execution. Note:

> …except at the bidding of Zeus, father of the Olympians….and I tell you to follow the counsel of the Father; for an oath can in no way be stronger than Zeus. (*Aeschylus, Eumenides* 618)

However, the notion of Zeus as father may not have been universally held as it is rarely, if at all, represented in Xenophon. Xenophon suggests that the ties between Zeus and humankind do not always have to be seen in familial terms. For instance, note what Cyrus, speaking to his father, says:

> “Yes, indeed, father,” said he; “So I feel toward the gods, as if they were my friends.” (*Xenophon, Cyropaedia* 1.6.4)

Nevertheless, Xenophon does demonstrate how the image of a good or representative father would be expected to behave toward his child.

> What father, whose son bears a good character so long as he is with one master, but goes wrong after he has attached himself to another, throws the blame on the earlier teacher? Is it not true that the worse the boy turns out with the second, the higher is his father’s praise of the first? Nay, fathers

---

7 Also Xenophon, *Anabasis* III.2.9; IV.825.

8 Also note: “O Father Zeus, child of the Earth!” *Suppliants*, 892, repeated 902.
themselves, living with their sons, are not held responsible for their boys’ wrongdoing if they are themselves prudent men.
(Xenophon, Memorabilia 1.2.27)

The comments by Xenophon above raise two important questions. First, what is the nature of the relationships between the gods and humankind? Is it one of parent-child, or powers and friends? Second, is the typical nurturing human parent-child relationship a model for how the divine interact with humankind?

Concern for Humans

Within the Homeric tradition, there are two terms which suggest a selective bond between certain humans and Zeus. The term διίφιλος within Homeric material denotes a special attachment between Zeus and a particular person. In this case, Calchas, who was “far the best of diviners, who had knowledge of all things that were,” was about to speak:

He with good intent addressed their assembly and spoke among them:
“Achilles, dear to Zeus (διίφιλε), you ask me to declare…” (Iliad 1.74)

In response, Achilles replies:

Take heart, and speak out any oracle you know, for by Apollo, dear to Zeus (διίφιλον), to whom you pray, Calchas, and declare oracles to the Danaans… (Iliad 1.84-87)

It was said that Odysseus, Hector, and others had a special bond with Zeus.9

A second term, διοτρεφής, was used to signify more of a parental or nurturing bond between Zeus and a human. For instance, in the following citation, Agamemnon speaking of himself and to Menelaus, declares;

Need have we, both you and I, Menelaus, nurtured by Zeus (διοτρεφής), of cleaver counsel that will save and protect the Argives… (Iliad 10.43)10

---

9 All citations Iliad; Odysseus 10.527; 11.419; 11.473; Hector 8.493; 13.674; Patroclus 11.611; the Trojans 8.517.
Homeric material mentions that others were perceived as special to and nurtured by Zeus.\textsuperscript{11} It is interesting to note that the Homeric tradition of signifying a unique relationship to Zeus generally did not continue. However, \textit{Diotrephēs} came to be used as a personal name.\textsuperscript{12} Even beyond the specific terms, the Homeric corpus seems to accept the fact that certain persons are favored by Zeus.

\begin{quote}
Blind as I was, I myself denied it not. Worth many men is the man whom Zeus loves in his heart… (\textit{Iliad}, 9.116-117)
\end{quote}

At the same time, the needs and requests of humans are not always fulfilled by Zeus.

\begin{quote}
But Zeus fulfills not for men all their purposes. (\textit{Iliad} 17.328)
\end{quote}

Hellenistic Literature

\textit{Plutarch, Seneca, Musonius Rufus, and Epictetus}

Turning to Hellenistic material, we find a continuation of the notion that God is in some way a parent to humanity. Representative of this literature is Plutarch. For example, citing Homer Plutarch notes that;

\begin{quote}
…exemplifying those verses of Homer: But Zeus the father, throned on high… (\textit{Lives}, “Pompey” 72.1-2)
\end{quote}

Also citing Homer;

\begin{quote}
….which the father of men and gods… (\textit{Letter to Apollonius} 104E)
\end{quote}

Plutarch also places these words on the lips of Alexander,

\\[\texttt{\textsuperscript{10} Also see \textit{Iliad} 17.34; 17.238; 17.652; 17.679; 17.685; 17.702; \textit{Odyssey} 4.138, 4.156, 4.235, 4.291, 4.316; 4.561; 10.266, 10.419.}\]

\\[\texttt{\textsuperscript{11} Eurypylus, \textit{Iliad} 11.819; Antilochus, \textit{Iliad} 17.685; Peteos, \textit{Iliad} 4.338; Priam, \textit{Iliad} 5.464; Agamemnon says this of certain kings, \textit{Iliad} 1.1176; 2.98; 2.196; 2.445; Achilles was said to be “nurtured by Zeus” \textit{Iliad} 9.229; 18.203; 21.75. Also see \textit{Iliad} 24.553, 24.635; others \textit{Odyssey} 22.136 (Agelaus), 24.122.}\]

\\[\texttt{\textsuperscript{12} See 3 John 1:9; Diodorus Siculus, \textit{Hist.} 15.14.1; Hesiod, \textit{Theogony} 82.}\]
In the shrine of Ammon he was hailed by the prophetic priest as the son of Zeus. “That is nothing surprising,” said he, “for Zeus is by nature the father of all, and he makes the noblest his own.”

(Sayings of Kings and Commanders 180E)

In the case of Plutarch, it must be remembered that much of his conception of God is influenced by his Middle Platonist preoccupation with cosmology and ethics. For example, we see below that God is reflected in virtue;

Consider first that God, as Plato says, offers himself to all as a pattern of every excellence, thus rendering human virtue, which is in some sort an assimilation to himself, accessible to all who can “follow God.” For man is fitted to derive from God no greater blessing than to become settled in virtue… (Plutarch, Moralia, “The Divine Vengeance” 550 D)

Also in the writings of Plutarch, God is depicted as father in a generative and cosmological sense.

I am reassured when I hear Plato (Timaeus 28C) himself naming the uncreated and eternal god as the father and maker of the cosmos and of other created things. (Moralia, “Table-Talk VIII” 718A)

Since, then, the universe…which god sowed from himself…has come into being a living thing, god be named at the same time father of it and maker. (Moralia, “Platonic Questions” 1001B)

So he most manifestly teaches that god was father and artificer not of body in the absolute sense…but of symmetry in body and of beauty…whereas the one neither was brought into being by god nor is the soul of the universe… (Moralia, “Generation of Soul”1017A)

If not a single one of the parts of the cosmos ever got into an “unnatural” condition but each one is “naturally” situated, requiring no transposition or rearrangement and having required none in the beginning either, I cannot make out what use there is of providence or of what Zeus, “the master-craftsman” is maker and father-creator. (The Face of the Moon 927B)

Since, then, the universe…which god sowed from himself…since the universe has come into being a living thing, god be named at the same time father of it and maker. (Plutarch, Platonic Questions, 1001B)
These comments by Plutarch demonstrate a clear sense of God as father. However, the image is built upon an understanding of God as cosmological creator more than nurturing parent. This, therefore, raises the question of the nature of the ties between human and divine, to which we now turn.

Concern for Humans

Although there is a broad understanding of God as functioning in some sort of fatherly role within early Greek and Hellenistic literature, there is little to suggest a clear view modeled after domestic family relations. The evidence is ambivalent at best.

Perhaps as a baseline, we can say that the Gods were conceived as at least having no ill-will toward humankind.

…and they do not believe that I am doing this out of benevolence, for they are a long way from knowing that no god is malevolent towards men and that neither so I do any such deed out of malevolence but that it is quite illicit for me to admit falsehood and suppress truth.

(Plutarch, *Moralia*, “Platonic Questions”, 999D)

Also, we can say that in a more general way, God has a fatherly care for humans as an accepted principle, but the specifics are not always evident.

For who knows but that God, having a fatherly care for the human race, and foreseeing future events, early removes some persons from life untimely? Wherefore we must believe that they undergo nothing that should be avoided. (Plutarch, *Letter to Apollonius* 117D)

In terms of providing for humans, Plutarch states,

For we believe that there is nothing more important for man to receive, or more ennobling for God of His grace to grant, than the truth. God gives to men the other things for which they express a desire, but of sense and intelligence He grants them only a share, inasmuch as these are His especial possessions and His sphere of activity. (*Isis and Osiris* 351D)

Nature prescribes to all creatures that they should love and rear their offspring, not destroy them. (*Moralia*, “On Affection for Offspring” 497E)
The divine giving to humankind what is desired, in this setting, is secondary to the “truth.” Also, in some sense, the force driving human parental nurture is the philosophical notion of nature (φύσις) common within the period. Though this is stated in a general way, Plutarch envisions, modeled after what should concern statesmen, that God is not concerned with small or ordinary things.

…but only for necessary and important missions, so the statesman should employ himself for the momentous and important matters, as does the King of the Universe, “For God great things doth take in hand, but small things passing by he leaves to chance,”… (Moralia, “Precepts of Statecraft” 811D)

Plutarch repeats this notion, suggesting a clear and constant viewpoint.

It may be, as Euripides says, that God, “Will intervene in matters grown too great, But small things he lets pass and leaves to Fate,” but I am of the opinion that a man of sense should commit nothing to Fate, nor overlook anything at all, but should trust and use for some things his wife, for other servants, for others friends, as a ruler makes use of overseers and accountants and administrators, but himself keeps under his own control the most important matters by the use of reason. (On the Control of Anger 464A-B)

What seems clear here is that Plutarch’s philosophy is driving his theology. That is, his high regard for rational and virtuous action shapes his view of what concerns God. In a sense, small things should be under the control of humans and the inability to secure ordinary needs is a sign of a lack of virtue. But this does not allow for a dire situation or people struggling with the basic necessities of life. In terms of the concrete developmental needs of teens, Plutarch suggests “not a single god or divinity” need be concerned.

But the case is otherwise, of course with boys and striplings: when they are at the ripening and flowering season and are being shaped and educated, it is the office of not a single god or divinity to sustain and promote their progress; nor is there a god whose care it is that a man grows straight in the direction of virtue… (Moralia, “The Dialogue of Love” 757F)
Although, conceiving the relationship between the divine and humankind from a different Stoic vantage point, Seneca notes that God is a particular kind of father; one who would test and stress humans as if for their own good.

Toward good men God has the mind of a father, he cherishes for them a manly love, and he says, “Let them be harassed by toil, by suffering, by losses, in order that they may gather true strength.” (Seneca, *Moral Essays*, “On Providence” II, 5-6)

In like manner, all those who are called to suffer what would make cowards and poltroons weep may say, “God has deemed us worthy instruments of his purpose to discover how much human nature can endure.” (*Moral Essays*, “On Providence” IV 8)

Do you imagine that the Lacedaemonians hate their children when they test their mettle by lashing them in public? Their own fathers call upon them to endure bravely the blows of the whip, and ask them, though mangled and half-dead, to keep offering their wounded bodies to further wounds. Why, then, is it strange if God tries noble spirits with severity? No proof of virtue is ever mild. (*Moral Essays*, “On Providence” IV 12)

Later, we will see that Plutarch’s view of family relations reflects norms common within economic elite circles and does not envision the sorts of needs reflected within the Q Prayer Instruction.

Musonius Rufus and Epictetus provide insight into viewpoints of the divine and relations with humankind. Within the chapter “Should Every Child that is Born Be Raised?” Musonius Rufus exhibits several images of God: guardian of the race; God of friendship, God of hospitality, and guardian of the family. This would imply, especially as guardian of the family, some sort of bond with and support of families. However, it would seem that this image does not include a nurturing or food-providing role. Rather, Zeus would guard and support the members within families.
How, then, can we avoid doing wrong and breaking the law if we do the opposite of the wish of the lawgivers, godlike men and dear to the gods (θεοφιλῶν), whom it is considered good and advantageous to follow? And certainly we do the opposite if we avoid having many children. How can we help committing a sin against the gods of our fathers and against Zeus, guardian of the race, if we do this? For just as the man who is unjust to strangers sins against Zeus, god of hospitality, and one who is unjust to friends sins against Zeus, god of friendship, so whoever is unjust to his own family sins against the gods of his fathers and against Zeus, guardian of the family, from whom wrongs done to the family are not hidden, and surely one who sins against the gods is impious.13

Yet, in a more philosophical sense, Musonius Rufus does suggest that;

…the common father of all men and gods, Zeus, bids you and exhorts you to do so. His command and law is that man be just and honest, beneficent, temperate, high-minded, superior to pain, superior to pleasure, free from all envy and all malice; to put it briefly, the law of Zeus bids man be good. But being good is the same as being a philosopher. If you obey your father, you will follow the will of a man; if you choose the philosopher’s life, the will of God.14

This passage posits that God is father in some sort of ethical or philosophical sense, one that is generally devoid of the kinds of relations human fathers have with their children.

In fact, one must choose what sort of father we follow.

The student of Musonius Rufus, Epictetus, has extensively written on the subjects of the fatherhood of God and the types of bonds between the divine and humankind.

Within the discourse titled “From the Thesis that God is the Father of Mankind How May One Proceed to the Consequences?” He writes:

If a man could only subscribe heart and soul, as he ought, to this doctrine (δόγματι), that we are all primarily begotten of God, and that God is the father of men as well as of gods, I think that he will entertain no ignoble or mean thought about himself. (Diss. 1.3.1-2)


14 Ibid., ch. 16, p. 106 lines 2-12.
A few observations are in order. First, Epictetus demonstrates an unquestioning acceptance of the fatherhood of God.\textsuperscript{15} Second, he reflects on the nature and specifics of that viewpoint. Third, the view of the fatherhood of God clearly functions at the life-organizing level of principle (δόγμα). However, the fatherhood of God continues to emphasize the creative and generative sense of the divine as artificer (\textit{Diss.} 1.3.1-6, 1.6.7-11). Yet, at the same time, Epictetus also speaks in terms of “kinship” with God.

And are we not in a manner akin to God, and have we not come from Him? (\textit{Diss.} 1.9.13-14)

At this point, two questions need to be answered in order to understand the views of Epictetus. Is it reasonable to assume some sort of attachment from God toward humankind? If some sort of relationship exists, can divine care be expected? To these questions, we now address our attention.

Epictetus and the Question of God’s Concern for Humans

The basis upon which Epictetus forms his opinion (δόγμα) is found within the discourse entitled, “Of Family Affection.” Epictetus writes,

Does family affection seem to you to be in accordance with nature and good?—Of course. (\textit{Diss.} 1.11.17-18)

That is, it seems perfectly expected and according to the philosophical notion of nature (φύσις) for affection to exist within families. Epictetus even muses that the often perceived pugnacious Socrates loved his own children.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, the naturalness of familial affection becomes paired with the doctrine of the fatherhood of God for Epictetus and the nature of the bonds between human and divine is explained in those terms.

\textsuperscript{15} Elsewhere Epictetus affirms the fatherhood of God. See \textit{Diss.} 1.3.3; 3.24.16.

\textsuperscript{16} In the form of a rhetorical question, he writes, “Did not Socrates love his own children?” \textit{Diss.} 3.24.60.
Why should he not call himself a son of God? And why should he not fear anything that happens among men?...but to have God as our maker, and father, and guardian,—shall this not suffice to deliver us from griefs and fears?—And wherewithal shall I be fed, runaways, on what do they rely when they leave their masters? On their lands, their slaves, or their vessels of silver? No, on nothing but themselves; and nevertheless food does not fail them. And shall it be necessary for our philosopher, forsooth, when he goes abroad, to depend upon others for his assurance and his refreshment, instead of taking care of himself, and to be more vile and craven that the irrational animals, every one of which is sufficient to himself, and lacks neither its own proper foods nor that way of life which is appropriate to it and in harmony with nature (φύσιν)? (Diss. 1.9.6-9)

A key difference arises from this text. Though affectionate family ties are used to describe the relationship between humans and God, the Stoic doctrine of self-sufficiency limits what ought to be expected from the divine. However, in other texts Epictetus emphasizes trust and that God and friends will provide. This is evident within the discourse entitled, “To Those Who Fear Want.”

Does a good man fear that food will fail him? It does not fail the blind, it does not fail the lame; will it fail a good man? A good soldier does not lack someone to give him pay, or a workman, or a cobbler; and shall a good man? Does God so neglect His own creatures, His servants, His witnesses, whom alone he uses as examples to the uninstructed, to prove that He both is, and governs the universe well, and does not neglect the affairs of men, and that no evil befalls a good man either in life or in death? —Yes, but what if He does not provide food? —Why, what else but that as a good general He has sounded the recall? I obey, I follow lauding my commander, and sing hymns of praise about His deeds. For I came into the world when it so please Him, and I leave it again at His pleasure...God does not give me much, no abundance, He does not want me to live luxuriously; He did not give much to Heracles, either, though he was His own son... (Diss. 3.26.27-31)

A little later within the same reflection, Epictetus states,

And when Odysseus was shipwrecked and cast ashore, did his necessity make abject his spirit, or break it? Nay, but how did he advance upon the maidens to ask for food which is regarded as being the most disgraceful thing for one person to ask of another? (Diss. 3.26.33)
The answer to this question for Epictetus is trusting in God and friends.

In what did he (Odysseus) trust?...Yes, but what if I fall ill?—You will bear illness well.—Who will nurse me?—God and your friends. (Diss. 3.26.37)

As we can see trusting in God and having some confidence in divine responsiveness is embedded within the thought of Epictetus.

Remember God; call upon Him to help you and stand by your side, just as voyagers, in a storm, call upon the Dioscuri. (Diss. 2.19.29-31)

Thus he reflects and comes to the thought that, if he attach himself to God, he will pass through the world in safety. (Epictetus, Diss. 4.1.98)

The evidence from Epictetus suggests a more developed and integrated view of God as parent and provider of necessities. However, his notion of self-sufficiency suggests there are limits to what requests will be fulfilled. Nevertheless, the writings of Epictetus demonstrate a view of the fatherhood of God that is more clearly based on a model of human domestic life than other Hellenistic writers. The literature of the period suggests other images of how typical parents are to function. Fathers were expected to test so as to strengthen their children, especially sons. This could take the form of not fulfilling requests and needs in order to build self-sufficiency. This then raises the issue of the degree to which one could trust that God will provide. These issues will now be addressed.

God as Teaching-Testing Parent

Hellenistic Literature

Plutarch and Seneca

Before we begin to examine the image of God as teaching-testing parent several points need to be kept in mind. First, the evidence we have comes from the literate class
and reflects the values from that socio-economic station. This population segment, by definition, did not know economic hardship, or was too ashamed to write about it. For example, more than most writers, Plutarch took an interest in the education and formation of children. Yet his comments clearly reflect a well-off social class.

Let us consider what may be said of the education of free-born children, and what advantages they should enjoy to give them a sound character when they grow up. (*Moralia*, “The Education of Children” 1A)\(^{17}\)

It is perhaps better to begin with their parentage first; and I should advise those desirous of becoming fathers of notable offspring to abstain from random cohabitation with women; I mean with such women as courtesans and concubines. For those who are not well-born, whether on the father’s or mother’s side, have an indelible disgrace in their low birth…

(*Moralia*, “The Education of Children” 1B)

The evidence concerning the less advantaged can be only inferred through side comments which are likely to be highly prejudicial and pejorative. Second, for whatever reason, writers of antiquity were generally less inclined to discuss parenting issues. Third, there are clear gender differences with mothers\(^{18}\) were expected to provide tender, hands-on care while fathers took an interest in moral and intellectual development, often using stern means. Note:

Do you not see how fathers show their love in one way, and mothers in another? The father orders his children to be aroused from sleep in order that

\(^{17}\) The essay, “The Education of Children” is not considered to be written by Plutarch. However, it does reflect his views and, in this regard, the values of the social group to which he writes. See comments by Babbitt in the Introduction in Plutarch, *Moralia I*, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927; reprint, 2005), 3. For social class audience see also 1C; 9D.

\(^{18}\) In terms of how female animals go to extraordinary lengths to care for their young (while males generally do not), Plutarch writes, “But there would be no benefit in these many kinds of equipment for procreation, or in such ways and means, such zeal and forethought, if Nature has not implanted in mothers affection and care for their offspring” (*Moralia*, “On Affection for Offspring” 496 A-B) Plutarch describes the unpleasant and unattractive condition and appearance of a new-born as: “For there is nothing so imperfect, so helpless, so naked, so shapeless, so foul, as man observed at birth…defiled with blood and covered with filth and resembling more one just slain than one just born, he is an object for none to touch or lift up or kiss or embrace…” Yet, “…mothers can kiss and embrace and fondle the infant…” (*Moralia*, “On Affection for Offspring” 496 B).
they may start early upon their pursuits, — even on holidays he does not permit them to be idle, and he draws from them sweat and sometimes tears. But the mother fondles them in her lap, wishes to keep them out of the Sun, wishes them never to be unhappy, never to cry, never to toil. (Seneca, *On Providence*, 2.5)

Given that the ancients considered Zeus, as the Jewish God, to be male, we are, therefore, dealing with the fatherly dimension of domestic life. Although Isis was a highly regarded and well-esteemed deity, the Q text, with its gender specific invocation (πάτηρ), necessitates a limited focus. The parallelism of divine father to human and human father to son (daughter?) provides an example of virtuous and faithful living. Note:

Toward good men God has the mind of a father, he cherishes for them a manly love, and he says, “Let them be harassed by toil, by suffering, by losses, in order that they may gather true strength.” (Seneca, *Moral Essays*, “On Providence” 2.6)

Fathers ought above all, by not misbehaving and by doing as they ought to do, to make themselves a manifest example to their children, so that the latter, by looking at their fathers’ lives as at a mirror, may be deterred from disgraceful deeds and words. (Plutarch, *Moria*, “The Education of Children” 14A)

In these two texts, we can see that the ideal father was mindful that he serves as an example of admirable behavior and attitudes. To pass on desired moral attitudes, fathers were to induce in their children “toil,” “suffering,” and “losses” in order to “strength” and “deterred [them] from disgraceful deeds and words.” Thus, the good father ought to be intentional in creating challenging and testing situations. Earlier, it was noted that Seneca (*Moral Essays*, “On Providence” 4.12) used the Lacedaemonians to support his view that it was the duty of both a human and heavenly father to test their children with hardships. Seneca was not alone in this role expectation. For example, Plutarch writes;

Wise fathers ought, therefore, especially during this time [adolescence], to be vigilant and alert, and to bring the young men to reason by instruction, by
threats, by entreaties, by pointing out examples of men who through love of pleasure have become involved in misfortunes…  
(Moralia, “The Education of Children” 12C)

The educative role of fathers included “threats.” Seneca goes on to say that God is no “mild taskmaster” and ought to be severe with his children.

Friendship, do I say? Nay, rather there is a tie of relationship and a likeness, since, in truth, a good man differs from God in the element of time only; he is God’s pupil, his imitator, and true offspring, whom his all-glorious parent, being no mild taskmaster of virtues, rears, as strict fathers do, with much severity. And so, when you see that men who are good and acceptable to the gods labour and sweat and have a difficult road to climb, that the wicked, on the other hand, make merry and abound in pleasures, reflect that our children please us by their modesty, but slave-boys by their forwardness; that we hold in check the former by sterner discipline, while we encourage the latter to be bold. Be assured that the same is true of God. He does not make a spoiled pet of a good man; he tests him, hardens him, and fits him for his own service.  
(Moral Essays, “On Providence” 1.5-6)

In fact, there is a linear relationship to the severity of fatherly testing and the degree to which a child attains virtuous living. Thus, it was up to the father to push and test his child in order to “discover how much” his child’s “human nature can endure” toward the goal of moral development. Note:

In like manner, all those who are called to suffer what would make cowards and poltroons weep may say, “God has deemed us worthy instruments of his purpose to discover how much human nature can endure.”  
(Seneca, Moral Essays, “On Providence” 4.8)

In terms of assessing the image of God as teaching-testing parent, one must avoid generalizations and unsupported attributions. The evidence comes from the remains of the well-heeled literati class and may not reflect how the disadvantaged understood both the roles of God as parent and a human father and his children. It is clear that those of a higher social station took as a parental obligation toward their offspring the necessity of inflicting various hardships as a way to inculcate desired attitudes and behaviors. The link
of God to humankind and human father to his children is clearly evident. Furthermore, good fathers were expected to apply the same methods as God does to us. This included challenging, testing, and generally not occupying a sustenance fulfilling role. Those “small things” were left to mothers. In terms of those of lower social standing, there is no reason to believe that the parental parallelism of God to humans and parents to children was not in place. However, given that their lives undoubtedly experienced various hardships on a daily basis, it does not seem likely that poor parents would intentionally test their children in the ways Plutarch and Seneca describe. It is one thing to temporarily deprive a child of food when it is normally readily available. It is quite another to deny a starving child of his daily bread. Although within the elite classes of the period, there does seem to be some evidence that human domestic relations (of the two dimensions explored to date) was a model for understanding how God related to humans. At the same time, there may have been other images or philosophies that describe a different divine-human bond. Before we turn to those theologies, there is another dimension within the literature of the period that needs to be briefly explored. If the relationship between God and humankind was modeled after domestic relations, how trustworthy is God as our parent?

**God as Trustworthy Parent**

*Early Greek Literature*

*Homer and Aeschylus*

Earlier, we discussed how Q 11:9-13 serves to control the range of possible interpretations of the Q prayer (11:2b-4). Of the three sapiential pairings (“ask-be given to/receive,” “seek-find,” and “knock-be opened”), ask-be given to/receive dominates both
the interpretation of the supporting sapiential material and any understanding of the prayer. That is, one is to confidently ask and God will provide. At the same time, the qal *wehomer* argument in v. 13 equates how utterly confident one may be that a human father will give sustenance to his child and how certain we may be that our heavenly Father will answer our prayers.

This raises the issue of how trustworthy God is as a heavenly Father. Earlier, we noted a citation from Aeschylus that suggests that if Zeus was inclined to do something, one can surely trust that it will happen.\(^{19}\) The Homeric corpus contains many prayers with an observable structure. They begin with an invocation calling upon the deity and ending with the result, “so he spoke in prayer and [said deity] heard him.” Note the excerpts from the prayer of Chryse to Apollo:

> Hear me, you of the silver bow, who have under your protection Chryse and sacred Cilla, and who rule mightily over Tenedos, Smintheus, if ever I roofed over a pleasing shrine for you, or if ever I burned to you fat thigh pieces of bulls and goats, fulfill for me this wish: let the Danaans pay for my tears by your arrows. (*Iliad* 1.35-42)

> So he spoke in prayer, and Phoebus Apollo heard him. (*Iliad* 1.43)

This prayer draws a clear connection with sacrifice, right and consistent observance, and the hopeful expectation of a fulfilled request. Below, we can see how formulaic the structure is. The ritual begins with an offering and continues with an invocation and request. It ends with the response and further sacrifice.

> So saying he placed her in his arms, and he joyfully took his dear child; but they quickly set in array for the god the holy hecatomb around the well-built altar, and then washed their hands and took up the barley grains. Then Chryses lifted up his hands, and prayed aloud for them: (*Iliad* 1.446-49)

\(^{19}\) “…except at the bidding of Zeus, father of the Olympians…and I tell you to follow the counsel of the Father; for an oath can in no way be stronger than Zeus.” (*Eumenides* 618).
Hear me, god of the silver bow, you who have Chryse and sacred Cilla under your protection, and rule mightily over Tenedos. Just as you have heard me when I prayed before—you honored me, and mightily struck the army of the Achaeans—so now also fulfill for me this wish: now ward off the loathsome destruction from the Danaans. (*Iliad* 1.450-56)

So he spoke in prayer, and Phoebus Apollo heard him. Then, when they had prayed, and had sprinkled the barley grains, they first drew back the victims’ heads, and cut their throats, …and cut the thigh pieces and enclosed them inside layers of fat….and the old man burned them on billets of wood, and poured a libation of ruddy wine over them…(*Iliad* 1.457-63)

This is a common pattern within the *Iliad*. Also inflected forms of δίδωμι, especially δός, are a part of the structured request.

Then in prayer he spoke to Apollo, who strikes from afar: Hear me (κλῦθί), lord, who are perhaps in the rich land of Lycia or perhaps in Troy…But you lord, at least heal me of this terrible wound, and lull my pains, and give (δὸς) me might so that I may call to my comrades….So he spoke in prayer, and Phoebus Apollo heard him. At once he made his pains to cease, and dried the black blood… (*Iliad* 16.514-29)

Father Zeus, protect from the darkness the sons of the Achaeans, and make clear sky, and grant (δὸς) us to see with our eyes. In the light even slay us, since such is your pleasure. So he spoke, and the father had pity on him as he wept, and immediately scattered the darkness and drove away the mist, and the sun shone on them and all the battle was made plain to view. (*Iliad* 17.645-50)

However, not all prayers within Homeric material have definitively positive answers. For example, the soldier’s prayer (*Iliad* 7.179-80) and the battle prayer of Aias (*Iliad* 7.202-05) have uncertain responses. There are other prayers that have either clear postponements or denials. Below is the prayer of one of the Achaeans and Trojans:

---

20 Also see other fulfilled prayers: By Athene; *Iliad* 2.166-67; 5.115-24; both prayers10.277-82 and 10.283-94 are answered in 10.295; by Apollo; 1.43-44; 1.457-58; 16.514-30; by Hera; 1.595-96; by Zeus 24.308-14; the River God saves Odysseus, *Odyssey* 5.438-52.

21 See also *Odyssey* 3.55-61; 6.322-28; 9.526-36.
Zeus, most glorious, most great, and you other immortal gods, whichever army of the two will be first to work harm in defiance of the oaths, may their brains be poured out on the ground just as this wine is, theirs and their children’s; and may their wives be made to serve other men. (Iliad 3.298-301)

The response follows:

So they spoke; but not yet would the son of Cronos grant them fulfillment. (Iliad 3.303-304)

In another scene, Agamemnon offers a fat bull to Zeus and offered this prayer:

Zeus, most glorious, most great, lord of the dark clouds, who dwell in the sky, let not the sun go down, nor darkness come on us, until I have cast down headlong Priam’s halls, blackened with smoke, and have burned its gates with consuming fire, and split Hector’s tunic about his breast, tattered by the bronze; and may many of his comrades about him fall headlong in the dust, and bite the earth. (Iliad 2.412-418)

However, the sacrifice was accepted but the prayer was not immediately granted.

So he spoke; but not yet would the son of Cronos grant him fulfillment; he accepted the sacrifice, but continued to increase the toil of war. (Iliad 2.420-422)

Elsewhere, the goddess Athene outright rejects the prayer of Theano.22

Lady Athene, you who guard our city, fairest among goddesses, break now the spear of Diomedes, and grant also that he himself may fall headlong before the Scaean gates, so that we now immediately sacrifice to you in your shrine twelve year-old heifers that have not felt the goad, if you will take pity

---

22 There are various proposals offered to explain the denial of prayers. Jon Mikalson suggests three reasons. 1.) Imprecise language. 2.) A prayer is offered to a non-deity; 3.) The impiety of the suppliant. To support his view Mikalson cites the tragedy Electra by Sophocles. Clytemnestra prays to Apollo (634-659) to kill Orestes, but in fact, Orestes kills Clytemnestra. At the same time, Electra offers a similar prayer and offering for the opposite (1376-83). Mikalson describes this as the most “unanswered prayer of Greek tragedy” (p. 90). The reason is impiety; “I ask, I fall before you, I implore, be an active helper in this plan and show mortals with what wages the gods reward impiety (τῆς δυσσεβείας)!" (1380 -1383). It is important to note that Mikalson generally restricts his comments to early Greek tragedies. See Jon D. Mikalson, “Unanswered Prayers in Greek Tragedy,” Journal of Hellenic Studies 109(1989): esp. 90. Also see Simon Pulleyn, Prayer in Greek Religion (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), esp. 196-216. F. S. Naiden, Ancient Supplication (New York: Oxford, 2006), esp. 3-27, 160-69, 301-38. Though this is an important discussion, for our purposes the reason is less a concern than the confidence expected by the suppliant.
on the city and the Trojans’ wives and their little ones. So she spoke praying, but Pallas Athene denied the prayer. (Iliad 6.305-11)

The play Suppliants by Aeschylus records two prayers that are not answered. In this drama, Egyptians are sailing to Argos to marry the daughters of Danaus. The daughters (Danaids) offer a prayer to the “ancestral gods,” the “chthonic gods,” and “Zeus σωτήρ” requesting that the Egyptians die at sea. However, they arrive safely and the drama unfolds as the Danaids seek the refuge of Pelasgus.23

O ancestral gods of Argos, to whom the city, the land and its clear waters—both the gods above, and the chthonic gods below inhabiting their highly-honoured abodes, and thirdly Zeus the Saviour (σωτήρ), protector of the houses of pious men—receive as suppliants this female band, and may the country show them a spirit of respect. As for the numerous, wanton male swarm of the sons of Aegyptus, before they set foot on this marshy shore, send them to the open sea, them and their swift-oared vessel; and may they meet the battering storm and squall, thunder and lightning, and the rain-bearing winds of the savage sea, and perish… (Suppliants 23-36)

The Request is repeated;

O King of Kings, O most blest of the blest, O power most perfect of the perfect, Zeus giver of prosperity, listen to us, and in thorough loathing of those vicious men keep them away from your descendents; cast into the purple-coloured sea the black ship… (Suppliants 524-530)

Nevertheless, the prayer by the Danaids is not answered in the affirmation.

Aeschylus provides a similar storyline in the tragedy Agamemnon where the prayer of Paris, who “shamed the table of hospitality by stealing away a wife (Agamemnon 400-03),” is rejected. Thus, impiety and shamefulness are at least two reasons why prayers are rejected by this playwright.

None of the gods hears his prayers, and Justice destroys the man who is involved with these things. (Agamemnon 395-398)

23 Details provided by Mikalson, "Unanswered Prayers in Greek Tragedy."
Aeschylus offers a third rationale for unanswered prayers. In *Eumenides* we find the following;

> In the middle of the eddies, unable to fight his way out, he calls [the gods] but they pay no heed; the deity laughs at the headstrong man…

(*Eumenides* 558-560)

A final explanation in the writings of Aeschylus suggests that asking too much of the gods may also lead to denial.

> Argive Soldiers: Then make your prayer a moderate one.
> Chorus: What are you instructing me is the right choice?
> Argive Soldiers: Not to ask too much of the gods.

(*Suppliants*, 1059-1061)

It is important to remember that the literature just discussed resides within a dramatic and not a sapiential or liturgical setting. Often, a playwright feels obligated both to increase the theatrical effect and to insert moral justifications for his or her literary creation. A literary creation is not first and foremost an instructional or theological work. There may be intellectual and theological aspects to the drama, but fiction is not nonfiction. Nevertheless, Homer and Aeschylus provide insights into the imagined reasons why prayers were not accepted. For our purposes, it seems reasonable to suppose that a Greek speaking public would be aware of possible tragic denials of what is hoped for. Thus, it would be hard to imagine that those with early Greek sensibilities would have had great confidence in the divine answering all prayers.

**Hellenistic Literature**

*Plutarch and Epictetus*

Within the Hellenistic era, we find a different view of the trustworthiness of God. Both Homer and Aeschylus accept a world of multiple deities and divine forces with
personalities, desires, and for some, a degree of fickleness. By the time Plutarch and Epictetus wrote, the influence of philosophy had resulted in references to one Divine spirit, i.e. Zeus. In fact, one may view Plutarch’s *Isis and Osiris* as an exercise of comparative religion as he discusses divinities from Ammon (367C) to Zoroaster (369D) as well as Egyptian, Stoic, and Greek Olympian (368EF), Pythagorean (370D), and Jewish traditions (363D). Plutarch demonstrates the convergence and plasticity of divine images and how he compares them in this essay.

In recounting various traditions and thinking through commonalities, Plutarch writes;

> The fact is that all this is somewhat like the doctrines promulgated by the Stoics about the gods; for they say that the creative and fostering spirit is Dionysus, the truculent and destructive is Heracles, the receptive is Ammon, that which pervades the Earth and its products is Demeter and the Daughter, and that which pervades the Sea is Poseidon. (367C)

> Isis is, in fact, the female principle of Nature, and is receptive of every form of generation, in accord with which she is called by Plato (*Timaeus* 49A) the gentle nurse and the all-receptive…… (372E)

As the “female principle of Nature,” Isis embodies all that nature is and prescribes. In terms of a parent loving his or her child Plutarch, in another essay, writes that:

> Nature prescribes to all creatures that they should love and rear their offspring, not destroy them. (*Moralia*, “On Affection for Offspring” 497E)

Although earlier we saw how Plutarch’s view of God as parent is primarily shaped by his cosmological interests and that he represses some inconsistencies in this regard, here it is somewhat reasonable to assume that he would envision that a divine parent would care for his or her child and provide for them in line with Q 11:13 and its parallelism. At least these two citations imply that it is possible that one could trust God as divine parent to care for his or her offspring as human parents, by nature, would.
Epictetus is clearer in the care and providing of sustenance by the divine father modeled after human parents.

Does a good man fear that food will fail him?...Does God so neglect His own creatures, His servants, His witnesses, whom alone He uses as examples to the uninstructed, to prove that He both is, and governs the universe well, and does not neglect the affairs of men, and that no evil befalls a good man either in life or in death? —Yes, but what if He does not provide food? — Why, what else but that as a good general He has sounded the recall? (Diss. 3.26.28-29)

Below, we see an interesting qualification. One must “attach himself to God” in order to feel a sense of security and trust in God. That is, God as provider is not unconditional, at least for Epictetus.

Thus he reflects and comes to the thought that, if he attach himself to God, he will pass through the world in safety. (Diss. 4.98)

In a similar vein, we see Epictetus state that for safety and confidence, one must invoke the aid of God. That is, one cannot assume divine care without right observance.

But no man sails out of a harbor without first sacrificing to the gods and invoking their aid, nor do men sow hit-or-miss, but only after calling upon Demeter; and yet will a man, if he has laid his hand to so great a task as this without the help of the gods, be secure in so doing, and will those who come to him be fortunate in so coming? (Diss. 3.21.10-14)

Before we leave early Greek and Hellenistic traditions, one must recognize that for the most part, we have highlighted portions of texts; some epic poetry, some dramas and tragedies, and others that are essays. None should be lifted up as “position papers” systematically formulated to answer as many questions a possible. As with Pauline material, whose literary status was that of occasional letters addressing specific issues, it is wise to not press the ancients discussed too hard. Often, in the service of making one point, another may be clouded. Nevertheless, we do see some consistency that God, in whatever form, was seen as parent. The evidence is mixed in terms of providing for
humankind. For Homer, God as father was more likely to show care for specific individuals, often through the designations “dear to Zeus,” or “nurtured by Zeus.” By the time of Plutarch, Seneca, and Epictetus, parenting was seen as a dimension of nature and models from nature were applied to God. However, nature functioned as a philosophical construct with an emphasis on creation and order, thereby making secondary parenting and domestic life. Also within these philosophical systems, God functioned as a generative (artificer) and cosmological force. Thus philosophically understood, nature and cosmology were the primary images for God as father. This can be seen in other texts by these authors wherein God was conceived as being concerned with the big picture and patterned after the ideal statesman who was not interested in the “small things” of everyday life. Also, by the turn of the era, a clear gender difference is evident with the ideal well-educated father testing, depriving, and at times punishing his children, especially males in the service of moral formation. Lastly, we explored the question of the degree to which a suppliant could be confident and trust that God will respond to requests. Here, the evidence does not allow for a consistent affirmative. Prayers were answered, requests were fulfilled. But prayers were also denied for a variety of reasons. In other instances, for example Epictetus, even with a high regard for God showing fatherly concern for humans, held a view conditioned on being attached to God through virtuous living and right observance. Thus, the images of God as providing parent, God as teaching/testing parent, and God as trustworthy parent do not line up with the image of God modeled after an attuned and nurturing human parent identified in Q 11:13. Next, we will apply the same questions to Jewish traditions.
APPENDIX D

THE FORM CRITICISM OF GRECO-ROMAN AND JEWISH PRAYERS
Introduction

The Greek noun εὐχή means both prayer and vow. In some ways, ancient piety saw little difference between the two meanings. The Greek term εὖχος is defined as “the thing prayed for.”1 Each nuance is tied to the other. Prayer creates the conditions wherein one asks for divine assistance and in return promises to do an obligation. Through honoring the gods and sacrificing to them, one “builds up” goodwill through χάρις. Thus, communication with the divine usually involves a request or εὖχος and a promise (εὐχή; i.e. vow) to do something in return.

Below is a Homeric hymn to the Earth Mother of All. While it is the suppliant’s praise of and dedication to the goddess which receives scholarly note, the last two lines are examples of the familiar promise to the deity to fulfill an obligation in return for the granting of the prayer request.

Of Earth the universal mother I will sing, the firmly grounded, the eldest who nourishes everything there is on the land, both all that moves on the holy land and in the sea and all that flies; they are nourished from your bounty from you they become fertile in children and crops, mistress, and it depends on you to give livelihood or take it away from mortal men. He is fortunate whom your heart favors and privileges, And everything is his in abundance. His plowland is weighed down with its vital produce, in the fields he is prosperous with livestock, and his house is filled with commodities. Such men are lords in communities where law and order prevail and the women are fair, and much fortune and wealth attend them; their sons exult in youthful vigor and good cheer, and their girls in flower-decked dances delight to frolic happily through the soft meadow flowers— so it is with those whom you privilege, august goddess, bounteous deity.

---

I salute you, mother of the gods, consort of starry Heaven:  
be favorable, and grant comfortable livelihood in return for my singing. 
And I will take heed both for you and for other singing.²

Below is a Jewish prayer which contains an implied request and votive offering as well as a promise to fulfill an obligation.

Praise is due to you, O God, in Zion; and to you shall vows (εὐχὴ) be performed, O you who answer prayer! To you all flesh shall come. 
When deeds of iniquity overwhelm us, you forgive our transgressions.  
(Ps 65:1-3/LXX 64.1-4)

The subtle differences between these two prayers are the subject of this chapter.

**Hellenistic Prayer Traditions**

**Reciprocity**

One of the essential facets of human social relations is the shared recognition that as one receives, so should one give in return. In particular, favors done by those above one in rank merit special gifts of appreciation. It is only a small step from ordinary cultural ideas of obligation to a gift-giver (especially if he or she is from the elite) and the notion of necessary votive offerings to beneficent deities.

As H. S. Versnel has noted,

First of all, however, it will be useful to ascertain that in Antiquity nothing was given free….The element of exchange was fundamental to dealings with the deities…The commercial nature of the transaction was often prosaically expressed by calling the favour returned a “debt” which had to be “paid.”³

---


³ H. S. Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," in *Faith, Hope, and Worship: Aspects of the Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, ed. H. S. Versnel (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 42-57 esp. 56. Also note the following scholarly commentary: “The sacrifice, it is known, creates a relationship between the sacrificer and the god…” and Intercourse with the deity is conducted through gifts. …The bond between man and the sacred is consummated in the continuous exchange of gift for gift.” And “The votive offering, the gift made to a god in consequence of a vow, differs from the first fruit offering more in occasion than in substance. It pervades all ancient civilizations and plays an essential part in defining the relation between
The sacrifice, it is known, creates a relationship between the sacrificer and the god…

Thus, εὐσέβεια involves prayer, sacrifice, and the expected exchange of gifts. It is hard to deal with one and not the others. What unites these aspects of faithful life is the notion of reciprocity.

Richard Seaford has provided an insightful view of what binds together human societies and our relations with the divine. Although his concern is primarily the importance of the ritualization of exchange (reciprocity) within the Homeric polis, Seaford has offered an argument which illuminates the centrality of prescribed giving and promising within Greek observance. Seaford builds his case by emphasizing the importance of reciprocity in all the major events of life, for example, in the gift giving at wedding feasts and in honoring the dead. In its negative aspects, reciprocity can be seen in the exacting of vengeance. In fact, tragedy can be understood as the subversion of reciprocity which creates the obligation for a right ritual for restoration.

4 Also see Klauck, The Religious Context of Early Christianity, 38-39.

5 “A dual crisis of reciprocity and of ritual is characteristic of tragedy as it is of epic.” See Richard Seaford, Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State (New York: Oxford, 1995), 368-405, esp. 368.
With attention to reciprocity in divine worship, Simon Pulleyn, in his revised dissertation, *Prayer in Greek Religion*, examines a wide range of literary and epigraphic data. From this analysis, Pulleyn has found that reciprocity requires the creating, building up, and maintaining of favor (χάρις) in a give-and-take manner between humans and their god(s). Pulleyn argues,

First, prayer for a Greek meant asking the gods for something. Secondly, one had to give as well as to take.⁶

It is important to be aware, Pulleyn reminds us, that the exchange was not mere barter as the following satirical Platonic dialogue suggests:

Socrates: Then, tell me my friend; what would the art which serves the gods serve to accomplish?...What do you say the holy, or holiness is? Do you not say that it is a kind of science of sacrificing and praying?

Euthyphro: Yes.

Socrates: And sacrificing is making gifts to the gods and praying is asking from them?

Euthyphro: Exactly, Socrates.

Socrates: Then holiness, according to this definition, would be a science of giving and asking.

Euthyphro: You understand perfectly what I said, Socrates.....

Socrates: ...Would not the right way of asking be to ask of them what we need from them?

Euthyphro: What else?

Socrates: And the right way of giving, to present them with what they need from us? For it would not be scientific giving to give anyone what he does not need.

Euthyphro: You are right Socrates.

---

Socrates: Then holiness would be an art of barter between gods and men?

Euthyphro: Yes, of barter, if you like to call it so. (Euthyphro 13E-14E)

Rather, the exchanges between the gods and humans involve a genuine relationship with mutual concern and support. Through χάρις, Pulleyn claims, “…the worshipper establishes with the god a relationship not of strict indebtedness but rather one where the god remembers the gift and feels well disposed in future.” Pulleyn clarifies his purpose when he writes:

The central thesis of this book is the importance of χάρις in Greek prayer. That word is often translated “grace” or “favour.” In fact, it refers to a whole nexus of related ideas that we would call reciprocity. When one gives something to a god, one is giving χάρις in the sense that the offering is pleasing; but equally one is storing up a feeling of gratitude on the part of the god, which is also called χάρις. The whole two-way relationship can be called one of χάρις.8

The feeling that the relationship between men and gods was essentially one of give-and-take through sacrifice and prayer is very clear from the frequent association in our surviving texts of the verbs θύειν (“to sacrifice”) and εὔχεσθαι (“to pray”).9

This is a very good demonstration not only of the intimate link between sacrifice and the expectation of material benefits, but also of the fact that the Greeks saw prayer as “asking for good things.”10 David Aune also discussed the centrality and significance of reciprocity in antiquity.11 Addressing first the Greco-Roman culture at large, he notes that one of the central behavioral patterns has to do with the need to respond when a gift, service, or kind

---

7 Ibid., 13.

8 Ibid., 4.

9 Ibid., 7.

10 Citing as an example Euripides, Helen 754ff see Ibid., 8.

act is offered. Not to respond in some way is to create and imbalance or obligation between parties with one having given more than another. This obligation demands that a relatively equal gift or service be given in return. From this overall social pattern, we can see that reciprocal relations existed between humans and divines in antiquity. For example, a god’s giving of rain required the gift of an equal sacrifice to that deity. Aune concurs with Pulleyn that χάρις was the driving force—the creation and maintenance of goodwill or favor between humans and the divine. Thus need, favor, and gratitude motivate giving and obligation in social and devotional realms.

**Greek Traditions of Reciprocity in Prayer**

The three texts below exhibit the theme of reciprocity, the first two from the Homeric traditions and the third, a Hellenic text from Xenophon. Notice in the first citation, Odysseus prays to the goddess seeking her aid in defeating the Trojans.12 Diomedes then follows Odysseus and prays to Athena that if their prayers are answered, he will sacrifice a heifer to her;

Hear me (κλῦθί μευ) now as well, child of Zeus, Atrytone. Follow now with me now as you once followed with my father, noble Tydeus, into Thebes, when he went ahead as a messager of the Achaeans. Them, the bronze-clad Achaeans, he left by the Asopus and he was bringing gentle words there to the Cadmeians; but as he journeyed back he devised deeds very grim together with you, fair goddess, for eagerly you stood by his side. So now be minded to stand by my side, and guard me. And to you in return will I sacrifice a yearling heifer, broad of brow, unbroken, which no man has yet led beneath the yoke. Her will I sacrifice to you and will overlay her horns with gold. (*Iliad* 10.283-94)13

---

12 Notice, however, that Odysseus, who prays to Athena first, simply calls on the goddess’ favor to grant him his prayer without a promise of reciprocity. This may well signal the boldness of his character: “‘Hear me,’ he cried, ‘daughter of aegis-bearing Jove, you who spy out all my ways and who are with me in all my hardships; befriend me in this mine hour, and grant that we may return to the ships covered with glory after having achieved some mighty exploit that shall bring sorrow to the Trojans.’” *Iliad* 10.279-282.

13 Also see *Odyssey*, 10.525-26
The Homeric Hymn to the Dioscuri describes how the devotees of the sea-rescuing brother deities are protected through their votive offerings.

…when winter tempests race over the implacable sea, and the men from the ships invoke the Sons of great Zeus in prayer, with (sacrifice of) white lambs,…suddenly they appear…and at once they make the fierce squalls cease, and lay the waves amid the flats of a clear sea—fair portents, and release from travail; the sailors rejoice at the sight, and their misery and stress are ended. (*Homeric Hymn to the Dioscuri* 6-17)

Notably, even by the Hellenic period, the promise of gifts of reciprocity to the gods remains a convention of prayer:

So Xenophon went and asked Apollo to what one of the gods he should sacrifice and pray in order best and most successfully to perform the journey which he had in mind and, after meeting with good fortune, to return home in safety; and Apollo in his response told him to what gods he must sacrifice. (*Anabasis*, III. 1. 6)

The inscriptions to Asclepius that date about the same period offer more evidence of the pervasive expectation of reciprocity.

A certain man vowed to Asclepius that if he lived in health throughout the year, he would sacrifice a cock to him. Then, having waited a day, he vowed again to Asclepius that if he did not suffer from ophthalmia, he would offer another cock to him. And at night he dreamt that Asclepius said to him, “One cock is sufficient for me.”14

The famous quotation of Socrates’ last words underlines the seriousness of the obligation to fulfill one’s vows.

…he [Socrates] said—and these were his last words—“Crito,” he said, “we owe a cock to Asclepius. Pay it and do not neglect it.” (*Plato, Phaedo*, 111A)

Pulleyn notes that there are prayers with no evident exchange. He argues two points. First, reciprocity was so well understood in antiquity that it was assumed. Second,

reciprocity also resides in memory.\textsuperscript{15} That is, χάρις was built up over years of devotion and, in some cases where ancestors are cited, over generations. Thus, many prayers involve recitals of positive past relations with the god(s) and a request without a promise or vow in exchange.\textsuperscript{16}

One can see that the relationship of the Greeks with their gods in prayer as in all other aspects can best be thought of as a continuum of reciprocal χάρις extending both forwards and backwards in time. It is not necessary for every prayer to be accompanied by an offering as long as it is understood that it is made within a framework of reciprocal trust between god and votary.\textsuperscript{17}

Thus, the recollection of relationship through observance, time, and generations was important. A pertinent example is found in Homer’s \textit{Iliad}.

Hear me (κλῦθί μευ), you of the silver bow, who have under your protection Chryse and sacred Cilla, and who rule mightily over Tendedos, Smintheus, if ever I roofed over a pleasing shrine for you, or if ever I burned to you fat thigh pieces of bulls and goats, fulfill for me this wish: let the Danaans pay for my tears by your arrows. (Homer, \textit{Iliad} 1.35-44)\textsuperscript{18}

This remembered χάρις is especially common within Jewish prayers. For example, note the recitation below.

And Jacob said, “O God of my father Abraham and God of my father Isaac, O Lord who said to me, ‘Return to your country and to your kindred, and I will do you good,’ I am not worthy of the least of all the steadfast love and all the faithfulness that you have shown to your servant, for with only my staff I crossed this Jordan; and now I have become two companies. Deliver me, please, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, for I am afraid of him; he may come and kill us all, the mothers with the children.’

\textsuperscript{15} Especially see Chapter Two, “Reciprocity and Remembrance” in Pulleyn, \textit{Prayer in Greek Religion}, 16-38.

\textsuperscript{16} Pulleyn writes, “The fact that I know of no instance of a da-quia-dedi (t) [“Give because I have given”] prayer offered in conjunction with a vow reinforces my belief that the two types served different, but complimentary purposes.” See Ibid., 31.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 37.

\textsuperscript{18} Also see \textit{Iliad} 5.115-20; 10.277-82; 10.283-94; \textit{Odyssey} 9.526-536.
Yet you have said, ‘I will surely do you good, and make your offspring as the sand of the sea, which cannot be counted because of their number’. ” (Gen 32:9-12)

But Moses implored the Lord his God, and said, “O Lord, why does your wrath burn hot against your people, whom you brought out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand? Why should the Egyptians say, ‘It was with evil intent that he brought them out to kill them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth’? Turn from your fierce wrath; change your mind and do not bring disaster on your people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants, how you swore to them by your own self, saying to them, ‘I will multiply your descendants like the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants, and they shall inherit it forever’. ” (Exod 32:11-13)

**Roman Traditions of Reciprocity in Prayer**

Reciprocity in prayer is just as much in evidence within Roman as well as Greek traditions. Livy records an example in his *History of Rome*. Below, Camillus promises a tenth of the spoils to Apollo and the creation of a temple in Rome for Queen Juno if victory can be secured.

A vast throng went out, and filled the camp. Then the dictator [Camillus], after taking the auspices, came forth and commanded the troops to arm. “Under thy leadership,” he cried, “Pythian Apollo, and inspired by thy will, I advance to destroy the city of Veii, and to thee I promise a tithe of its spoils. At the same time I beseech thee, Queen Juno, that dwellest now in Veii, to come with us, when we have gotten the victory, to our City —soon to be thine, too —that a temple meet for thy majesty may there receive thee.” (Livy, *History* 5.21.1-3)

The concept of reciprocity, or *quid pro quo*, in prayer was not isolated to invocations to the gods of the Greek and Roman pantheon, but is also evident in Apuleius’ *Metamorphosis*, one of the rare, extant examples of prayers to the Mystery deities. In this specimen, Lucius has pleaded with the great goddess Isis to free him from the ignominy of his form as a donkey, due to his foolish dabbling in magic. Now the goddess replies, announcing to Lucius her expectations for his rescue:
You will clearly remember and keep forever sealed deep in your heart the fact that the rest of your life’s course is pledged to me until the very limit of your last breath. Nor it is unjust that you should owe all the time you have to live to her by whose benefit you return to the world of men. Moreover you will live in happiness, you will live in glory, under my guardianship. And when you have completed your life’s span and travel down to the dead, there too, even in the hemisphere under the earth, you will find me, whom you see now, shining among the shades of Acheron and holding court in the deep recesses of the Styx, and while you dwell in the Elysian fields I will favour you and you will constantly worship me. But if by assiduous obedience, worshipful service, and determined celibacy you will the favour of my godhead, you will know that I—and I alone—can even prolong your life beyond the limits determined by your fate. (Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, XI.6)

Now, following Isis’ restoration of Lucius to his human form and as her initiate, he is addressed by one of the priests of Isis who has received, through revelation, the whole truth of his story. In his speech to Lucius he urges,

Behold! Lucius, set free from his tribulations of old and rejoicing in the providence of great Isis, triumphs over his Fortune. But to be safer and better protected, enlist in this holy army, to whose oath of allegiance you were summoned not long ago. Dedicate yourself today to obedience to our cult and take on the voluntary yoke of her service; for as soon as you become the goddess’s slave you will experience more fully the fruit of your freedom. (Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* XI.15, emphasis author’s)

Before we leave Roman traditions of reciprocity, the custom of *evocatio* must be mentioned. The Romans believed that if they honored the gods of their enemies more faithfully, that they would be blessed with victory and divine favor would be transferred from the local residents to them.19 Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price define *evocatio* as “literally “summoning away”; the ritual by which the Romans won over the protecting deity of an enemy city, so depriving it of divine aid.”20 Below is an example.

---


The Romans were locked in battle with the Latins. The Roman general Decius offers himself and the enemy soldiers in return for a Roman victory.

Decius cried out to them [his troops] to tell him whither they were fleeing...he cried aloud on the name of his father Publius Decius. “Why, he asked, ‘do I seek any longer to postpone the doom of our house? It is the privilege of our family that we should be sacrificed to avert the nation’s perils. Now I offer up the legions of the enemy, to be slain with myself as victims to Earth and the Manes’.”

On going down to the field of battle he has ordered Marcus Livius the pontifex not to leave his side. He now commanded this man to recite before him the words with which he proposed to devote himself and the enemy’s legions in behalf of the army of the Roman people, the Quirites. He was then devoted with the same form of prayer and in the same habit as his father, Publius Decius, had commanded to be used, when he was devoted at the Veseris, in the Latin war; and having added to the usual prayers...having uttered, I say, these imprecations upon himself and the enemy, he spurred his charger against the Gallic lines, where he saw that they were thickest, and hurling himself against the weapons of the enemy met his death.

From that moment the battle seemed scarce to depend on human efforts. The Romans, after losing their general—an occurrence that is wont to inspire terror—fled no longer, but sought to redeem the field.  
(Livy, History of Rome 10.28.12-10.29.1)\(^{21}\)

As Beard, North, and Price point out, the ritual involved language that was contractual. The structure always involved prayer, sacrifice, and a promise or vow in exchange for victory. However, it must also be understood that the deity was not obligated to do as requested. But once the offering was accepted, then fulfillment was expected. In essence, then, \textit{evocatio} was based on reciprocity.\(^{22}\) There is another form of prayer that needs to be explored, the prayer of supplication. To this area, we now turn.

\(^{21}\) Also see Livy, History of Rome 8.9-11.1.

Ancient Supplication

Pulleyn has shown that there is one circumstance where reciprocity is less evident; supplication, or ἱκετεία. He defines ἱκετεία as,

...an action whereby one person, who is normally in dire straits, requests the aid and protection of another, thereby putting him under an almost sacral compulsion to comply. The rights of suppliants are upheld and enforced by the gods. It might therefore seem odd to speak of humans putting gods under any sort of sacral compulsion by means of prayer. None the less, ἱκετεία is not exclusively an inter-human institution. There are examples of human beings supplicating the gods.\(^{23}\)

Below is an example where the suppliant petitions the god and calls for mercy. In this instance, Odysseus petitions the River God to save him.

Making his (Odysseus) way out of the surge where it belched upon the shore, he swam outside, looking continually toward the land in hope to find shelving beaches and harbors of the sea. But when, he swam, he came to the mouth of a fair-flowing river, where seemed to him the best place, since it was smooth of stones, and there was shelter from the wind there, he knew the river as he flowed forth, and prayed to him in his heart:

"Hear (κλῦθι) me, king, whoever you are. As to one greatly longed-for do I come to you seeking to escape out of the sea from the threats of Poseidon. Reverend even in the eyes of the immortal gods is that man who comes as a wanderer, as I have come to your stream and to your knees, after my toils. Pity me, king; I declare myself your supplicant (ἱκέτης)."

(Odyssey, 5.438-452)

F. S. Naiden has examined the manner in which supplication operated in the ordinary culture and sheds light on the nature, role, and customs familiar to the ordinary person in the ancient world. His research reveals some of the dynamics that occur in

\(^{23}\) Pulleyn, *Prayer in Greek Religion*, 56. Although not mentioned by Pulleyn, Zeus is referred to as the God of suppliants. See Aeschylus, *Suppliants*, 1, 381-386; 478-479. Also see 630-642.
prayers as well. He shows that the tradition of supplication (ἵκετείο) often has its own vocabulary. The act of supplication is ἰκετεύω, and the one who supplicates is the ἱκέτης, or ἱκέτις. It is common to find the verb λίσσομαι (to beg, pray, entreat, beseech) used. Although Naiden establishes these conventions with regard to human superiors, his findings lead him to view prayers as a special subset with its own expectations and behaviors. This is clearly shown in the ordinary dynamics of social/civic interchange:

Naiden has identified four steps in supplication to human superiors:

1. The approach
2. A distinctive gesture seeking mercy (often clasping of the knees of the superior, falling at the feet of the supplicandus)
3. The request
4. The response

Naturally, the face-to-face supplication of an inferior (ἱκέτης) to a superior (patron, ruler, judge) is different from prayers of supplication. In prayer, the deity is invisible and does not respond personally. Instead, the god must be represented by a human being consecrated to the divine service, such as a priest. For Naiden, one can only identify

---

24 Naiden’s sources are literary and epigraphic as well as images from ancient pottery and art. Although not relevant to this study, Naiden discusses the civic and legal dimensions and support for supplication in ancient Greece and Rome. See F. S. Naiden, Ancient Supplication (New York: Oxford, 2006), 171-279.


26 Naiden, Ancient Supplication, 3-8, 29-167.

27 Naiden cites the following: Homer, Iliad 1.495-503; 6.45-46; 9.444-452; 20.460-469; 21.64-88; 24.477-570; Odyssey 7.139-171; 10.264-173, 10.323-347, 10.480-495; 14.276-280; 22.310-329, 22.330-356, 22.361-377. Sometimes hands were kissed. See Iliad 24.4478-480. Less frequently through images of art, pottery etc. is the clasping of the chin of the supplicandus. Lastly, at times the feet or foot of the supplicandus were (was) kissed. See Ps 2:11-12; Ester 13:13.

28 Naiden takes great pains to distinguish the formal act of supplication, generally human inferior to superior, with prayers of supplication. Thus a prayer is a supplication if the divinity is present through epiphany. However, Naiden notes, “In Latin literature no such epiphany occurs. In Greek literature it occurs once.” The primary source Naiden cites is Aeschylus, Eumenides 276-488. However, for our purposes, pleas to God without evident reciprocity may be considered a prayer of supplication. See Naiden, Ancient Supplication, 7-8.
supplication if the one petitioned is visibly present to respond. Thus, he distinguishes between human supplications and “prayers of supplication,” the one exception being cases of divine epiphany where the god, in fact, is made manifest to communicate with the supplicant.

All of these forms of social interaction are based on reciprocity. However, Naiden’s main interest is on reciprocity and social relations and not prayer. His focus is on the if-then contract. That is, if the request is granted, it is on the basis of either recalled previous service or a promise to do so in the future.²⁹

The Q Prayer Instruction does exhibit some of the dimensions discussed by Naiden as characteristic of supplication. For instance, Jesus may be seen as a representative of the divine. Also, the Q prayer involves a child making supplication to a parent. There is, however, no clear sign of reciprocity. Two possibilities are reasonable to assume. The first is a divine gift, or χάρις, which creates memory and future obligation. The second possibility is the kind of parent-child communicative interaction discussed in Appendices B and C where a helpless child is not expected to give in return. Of course, both could be involved. Nevertheless, Naiden’s work provides additional support for and a different vantage point from which to view the pervasiveness of reciprocity in antiquity.

**Form Criticism**

The form criticism of prayers in antiquity isolates common features in terms of types, components, and literary traditions. However, the literary diversity of prayer forms in the period also reveals how flexible the practices and rituals were.

²⁹ Ibid., 79-84.
Greek Prayers

We should note, first of all, that Greek prayers are most often associated with sacrifice as a reciprocal gesture, although the nature of χάρις allowed for delayed fulfillment of a promise. Pulleyn has identified three steps typical in Greek prayers: an invocation, an argument, and a request.31 Invocations often include the name of the deity in the vocative and a “calling to” in the aorist imperative (κλῦθι). Other times, the invocation takes the form of a request to be approached by the deity (ἐλθέ). As we have seen in Chapter Two, “father Zeus” is a frequent invocation.33 Each type of invocation attempts to establish an immediate and direct communication between the one who prays and a god.34

In his treatment of the three steps often found in prayer, Aune provides examples of invocations and responses. Earlier, the prayer of Chryse to Apollo was discussed:

Invocation:35

Hear me (κλῦθι μευ), you of the silver bow, who have under your protection Chryse and sacred Cilla, and who rule mightily over Tenedos, Smintheus, if

30 Earlier we have discussed occasions when the argument is minimal or lacking.

31 Pulleyn, Prayer in Greek Religion, 5, 132-55. Also see Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World."

32 See Iliad 1.446-461; 5.115-20; 10.277-82; 10.283-94; 16.514-530; Odyssey 3.55-61; 6.322-328; 9.526-536. Aune cites W. F. Bakker, The Greek Imperative: An Investigation into the Aspectual Differences between the Present and Aorist Imperatives in Greek Prayer from Homer up to the Present Day. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1966, 16-17., that the aorist imperative is the most common construction of Greek invocations (as opposed to the present imperative). See Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World," 32. Also see Pulleyn, Prayer in Greek Religion, 134.


34 David Aune defines prayer this way: “To begin with, ‘prayer’ in the Greco-Roman world maybe defined as the human propensity to communicate with super natural beings who are regarded as more powerful than those who worship them.” See Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World," 25.

35 Aune also notes that that in Greek religion gods were not omnipresent and had to be called to attend to prayers, thus an invocation is a near universal element of prayer. See Ibid., 32.
ever I roofed over a pleasing shrine for you, or if ever I burned to you fat thigh pieces of bulls or goats.

Request:

Fulfill for me this wish: let the Danaans pay for my tears by your arrows. So he spoke in prayer, and Phoebus Apollo heard him. (Iliad 1.35-42)

Aune points out that over time, the form of prayers expanded to include a rationale or argument. Citing the prayer of Odysseus to Athene we see this sort of expansion:

Invocation:
Hear me (κλῦθί μευ), child of Zeus, who bears the aegis,

Argument:
You who always stand by my side in all manner of toils, nor am I unseen by you wherever I move, now again show your love, Athene, as never you did before,

Request:
…and grant that with noble renown we come back to the ships, having performed a great deed that will be a sorrow to the Trojans. (Iliad 10.277-82)

The following prayer of Diomedes to Atrytone exemplifies elaborations of the same structural components. Besides the typical invocation, argument, and request, an additional component (second argument) is added, offering to “sacrifice a yearling heifer.”

Invocation:
Hear me (κέκλυθι) now as well, child of Zeus, Atrytone.

Argument:
Follow now with me just as you once followed with my father, noble Tydeus, into Thebes, when he went ahead as a messenger of the Achaeans. Them, the bronze-clad Achaeans, he left by the Asopus, and he was bringing gentle words there to the Cadmeians; but as he journeyed back he devised deeds grim together with you, fair goddess, for eagerly you stood by his side.

Request:
So now be minded to stand by my side, and guard me.
Argument:
And to you in return will I sacrifice a yearling heifer, broad of brow, unbroken, which no man has yet led beneath the yoke. Her will I sacrifice to you and will overlay her horns with gold. (Iliad 10.283-94).

Jewish Prayer Traditions

Introduction

The last four decades have seen a great deal of interest in Jewish prayer forms and traditions. These efforts have identified several important features. Two of the more salient contributions on Jewish prayer are the edited volume by Jakob Petuchowski, Understanding Jewish Prayer and the monograph by Joseph Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud: Form and Patterns. Petuchowski, besides his fine scholarship, brought other commentators together to illuminate Jewish prayer traditions. Heinemann’s effort provides form-critical and historical details that have been well received and highly influential and will play an important part of our form-critical analysis. Two introductory points need to be highlighted. First is the perspective that within Jewish traditions, there is a sense that God, being omniscient, knows what is needed, so a suppliant need not ask for things, but rather offers praise and declares thanksgivings to God. Petuchowski describes this view:

Since, therefore, the petitionary prayers could not have been meant for the purpose of conveying information to God [because God is omniscient], it would follow that they have been devised for the benefit of man. It is as though the Rabbis were telling us: “Even though God does not have to be told about your needs, He has given you an opportunity of opening your heart to Him, of sharing your concerns with Him. Petitionary prayer does not convey any information to God, which He previously lacked, but it affords

you the relief of verbalizing, in His prescience, whatever it is that you are striving for.”

Petitionary prayer, as we have seen, is a human need rather than something required by God. God knows our needs before we utter them, and He will do what is good in His sight. But man was afforded an opportunity of rehearsing his wants and his concerns before God. 38

The second point is the notion that right observance (avodah) allows for confidence in prayers being answered.

Petitionary prayer, sanctioned by Tradition, also gives us the confidence that what we are asking for is in consonance with the teachings of our religion. We do not pray for the attainment of goals which would be contrary to the aims of our faith or irreconcilable with the nature of God as Judaism conceives Him. Consequently, knowing that what we express in prayer is acceptable to God, we can feel all the more assured of divine help in the attainment of our verbalized goals.39

Petuchowski argues that the suppliant may have confidence that God will both hear prayers and provide. In support, he cites the following:

Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will hear. (Isa 65:24)

Blessed art thou, O Lord, that hearest prayer! (m. Ber. 4:4)

R. Joshua says:…before we call mayest Thou answer; blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearkenest to prayer. (b. Ber. 29a)

Our Rabbis taught…R. Eliezer says: Do Thy will in heaven above, and grant relief to them that fear Thee below and do that which is good in Thine eyes. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. R. Joshua says: Hear the supplication of Thy people Israel and speedily fulfil their request. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok says: Hear the cry of thy people Israel and speedily fulfill their request. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearkenest unto prayer. Others say: The needs of Thy people Israel are many and their wit is small. May it be Thy will, O Lord our God,


39 Ibid., 37.
to give to each one his sustenance and to each body what it lacks. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearkenest unto prayer. (b. Ber. 29b)

Heinemann provides a similar viewpoint.

The Talmudic Sages do not for one moment doubt a man’s right to cry out to God in the hour of distress with the full conviction that his cry will be answered.  

All of this is based on the view of an omniscient, caring, and providing God who responds to the pleas of his people.

Heinemann’s work is perhaps the first modern study of Jewish prayers from a form-critical rather than a historical-philological approach. His study has highlighted the variability and complexity of traditions to the extent that no conclusive or definitive statements can be made form-critically. Instead, we can speak only of tendencies. For example, even though prescribed liturgical prayers often use indirect, third person address to God, so do many personal prayers, though private prayers have the opposite tendency and typically use direct address. Below are two spontaneous prayers that use indirect address.

Then the women said to Naomi,

Blessed be the Lord, who has not left you this day without next-of-kin; and may his name be renowned in Israel! He shall be to you a restorer of life and a nourisher of your old age; for your daughter-in-law who loves you, who is more to you than seven sons, has borne him. (Ruth 4:14-15)

Blessed be the Lord, the God of our ancestors, who put such a thing as this into the heart of the king to glorify the house of the Lord in Jerusalem, and who extended to me steadfast love before the king and his counselors, and before all the king’s mighty officers. I took courage, for the hand of the Lord

---

40 Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 18-19.

41 For a discussion see Ibid., 77-103.
my God was upon me, and I gathered leaders from Israel to go up with me.
(Ezra 7:27-28)

Nevertheless, Heinemann has identified three\(^{42}\) broad types of Jewish prayers:\(^{43}\)

1. Statutory liturgical prayers of the regular synagogue service\(^{44}\)
2. Private prayers
3. Prayers done within synagogues, after the public sermon but not specifically a component of the prescribed liturgy

An important distinction that will be developed below is that statutory prayers were generally text-based or memorized, while private prayers needed to be fresh and never the same, though perhaps following a general form-critical outline. Note the following general structure:\(^{45}\)

1. An address or invocation frequently but not always in the vocative
2. Praise or recitation of history and/or promises
3. Petitions of need, requests for forgiveness, intercessions, or supplications
4. Thanksgivings and/or blessings

Although conforming to the overall structure, many prayers are brief and contain only some of the elements. For example, the first prayer below from 1 Kings offers a simple blessing or praise, while the second from 2 Maccabees contains a clear invocation, recitation of previous blessings, and a petition:

\(^{42}\) Heinemann has identified other prayer types, one that is patterned after the “law court” and another that he calls “prayers of Bêt Midrāš.” But these forms of prayer are sufficiently dissimilar to the Q prayer that they need not be a concern. See Chapters 8 and 10 respectively in Ibid., 193-217, 51-75.


\(^{44}\) Examples: The Shema ("Hear O Israel..."), Amidah (standing prayer), Kaddish (Aramaic prayer, “holy”), Eighteen Benedictions or Semonah Esrah will appear at the end of the chapter section on Jewish prayers. See Jakob J. Petuchowski, "The Liturgy of the Synagogue," Ibid.

Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, who today has granted one of my offspring to sit on my throne and permitted me to witness it. (1Kgs 1:48)

He called upon him in these words: “O Lord, you sent your angel in the time of King Hezekiah of Judea, and he killed fully one hundred eighty-five thousand in the camp of Sennacherib. So now, O Sovereign of the heavens, send a good angel to spread terror and trembling before us. By the might of your arm may these blasphemers who come against your holy people be struck down.” With these words he ended his prayer. (2 Macc 15:22-24)

Below is the longer Prayer of Manasseh that exhibits all of the dimensions identified above.46 Emphasis has been added to demark portions of structural units.

O Lord, God of our fathers,
God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their righteous offspring;
He who made the heaven and the earth with all their beauty;
He who bound the sea and established it by the command of his word,
he who closed the bottomless pit and sealed it by his powerful and glorious name;
You (before) whom all things fear and tremble; (especially) before your power.
Because your awesome magnificence cannot be endured;
none can endure or stand before your anger and your fury against sinners;
But unending and immeasurable are your promised mercies;
Because you are the Lord, long-suffering, merciful, and greatly compassionate;
and you feel sorry over the evils of men.
You, O Lord, according to your gentle grace,
promised forgiveness to those who repent of their sins, and in your manifold mercies appointed repentance for sinners as the (way to) salvation.
You, therefore, O Lord, God of the righteous, did not appoint grace for the righteous, such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,
those who did not sin against you;
but you appointed grace for me, (I) who am a sinner ...
And now behold I am bending the knees of my heart before you;
and I am beseeching your kindness. I have sinned, O Lord, I have sinned;
and I certainly know my sins.

I beseech you; forgive me, O Lord, forgive me!
Do not destroy me with my transgressions;
do not be angry against me forever; do not remember my evils;
and do not condemn me and banish me to the depths of the earth!
For you are the God of those who repent.
In me you will manifest all your grace;
and although I am not worthy,
you will save me according to your manifold mercies.
Because of this (salvation) I shall praise you continually all the days or my
life;
because all the hosts of heaven praise you, and sing to you forever and ever.

The Mishnah contains statutes on prayer for the Passover celebration that stress the
necessity of recollecting the historical blessings and the need to offer praise:

Therefore are we bound to give thanks, to praise, to glorify, to honour, to
exalt, to extol, and to bless him who wrought all these wonders for our
fathers and for us. He brought us out of bondage to freedom, from sorrow to
gladness, and from mourning to a Festival-day, and from darkness to great
light, and from servitude to redemption; so let us say before him the
Hallelujah. (m. Pesah. 10:5)

Notice that within the above texts, explicit expressions of reciprocity are less
evident or explicit. This does not mean, however, that it is not understood to be there.
Rather, Jewish prayer is a part of right observance (avodah) and therefore, it is more
reasonable to assume that the usual expression of gratitude through sacrifice or other
forms of devotion and obedience to the Jewish law was simply understood. This will
become clearer as the presentation unfolds. Greek prayers, both early and later, have a
more clearly identifiable argument, while Jewish prayers tend to focus on praise and
thanksgiving, assuming God will entertain their request. For example, below is a Psalm
attributed to David that states needs (“my flesh faints for you, as in a dry and weary land
where there is no water”), yet offers praise instead of a petition:

O God, you are my God, I seek you, my soul thirsts for you; my flesh faints
for you, as in a dry and weary land where there is no water.
So I have looked upon you in the sanctuary, beholding your power and glory. Because your steadfast love is better than life, my lips will praise you. So I will bless you as long as I live; I will lift up my hands and call on your name. My soul is satisfied as with a rich feast, and my mouth praises you with joyful lips when I think of you on my bed, and meditate on you in the watches of the night; for you have been my help, and in the shadow of your wings I sing for joy. My soul clings to you; your right hand upholds me. (Ps 63:1-8)

Below is a prayer hymn replete with praise and recitation of historical relatedness offered to God by Moses and the people:

I will sing to the Lord, for he has triumphed gloriously; horse and rider he has thrown into the sea. The Lord is my strength and my might, and he has become my salvation; this is my God, and I will praise him, my father's God, and I will exalt him. The Lord is a warrior; the Lord is his name. Pharaoh's chariots and his army he cast into the sea; his picked officers were sunk in the Red Sea. The floods covered them; they went down into the depths like a stone. Your right hand, O Lord, glorious in power—your right hand, O Lord, shattered the enemy. In the greatness of your majesty you overthrew your adversaries; you sent out your fury, it consumed them like stubble. At the blast of your nostrils the waters piled up, the floods stood up in a heap; the deeps congealed in the heart of the sea. The enemy said, “I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil, my desire shall have its fill of them.” I will draw my sword, my hand shall destroy them. You blew with your wind, the sea covered them; they sank like lead in the mighty waters. Who is like you, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like you, majestic in holiness, awesome in splendor, doing wonders? You stretched out your right hand, the earth swallowed them. In your steadfast love you led the people whom you redeemed; you guided them by your strength to your holy abode. The Lord will reign forever and ever. (Exod 15:1-18)
The Prayer of Jesus ben Sirach implies grave need, yet has a greater focus on the recitation of relationship and praise.

I give thanks to your name,
for you have been my protector and helper and have delivered me from destruction and from the trap laid by a slanderous tongue, from lips that fabricate lies. In the face of my adversaries you have been my helper and delivered me, in the greatness of your mercy and of your name, from grinding teeth about to devour me, from the hand of those seeking my life, from the many troubles I endured, from choking fire on every side, and from the midst of fire that I had not kindled, from the deep belly of Hades, from an unclean tongue and lying words—

the slander of an unrighteous tongue to the king. My soul drew near to death, and my life was on the brink of Hades below.
They surrounded me on every side, and there was no one to help me; I looked for human assistance, and there was none.
Then I remembered your mercy, O Lord, and your kindness from of old, for you rescue those who wait for you and save them from the hand of their enemies.
And I sent up my prayer from the earth, and begged for rescue from death.
I cried out, “Lord, you are my Father; do not forsake me in the days of trouble, when there is no help against the proud.
I will praise your name continually, and will sing hymns of thanksgiving.” My prayer was heard,
for you saved me from destruction and rescued me in time of trouble. For this reason I thank you and praise you, and I bless the name of the Lord. (Sir 51:1-12)

As exemplified above, one feature that typifies Jewish prayer is a recalling of the various ways in which the petitioner and God share a relationship with one another, sometimes taking the place of the praise section. These relational histories function as a kind of rhetorical argument of sorts. Aune observes that this is where non-Jewish prayers
of the broader Greco-Roman world differ. Such traditions are considered ancient in Jewish tradition as this prayer for deliverance from Genesis attests.\(^{47}\)

And Jacob said, “O God of my father Abraham and God of my father Isaac, O Lord who said to me, ‘Return to your country and to your kindred, and I will do you good’, I am not worthy of the least of all the steadfast love and all the faithfulness that you have shown to your servant, for with only my staff I crossed this Jordan; and now I have become two companies. Deliver me, please, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, for I am afraid of him; he may come and kill us all, the mothers with the children. Yet you have said, ‘I will surely do you good, and make your offspring as the sand of the sea, which cannot be counted because of their number’.”

\(^{48}\) (Gen 32:9-12)

It is important to restate that Jewish prayers typically do not exhibit all of the structural elements identified by Heinemann. One cannot press, then, the form-critical units to the point of universal requirement. Below are several samples which demonstrate part, but not all of the form-critical units. The following praise and thanksgiving offered to God also expresses confidence that prayers will be answered:

Praise is due to you, O God, in Zion; and to you shall vows be performed, O you who answer prayer! To you all flesh shall come. When deeds of iniquity overwhelm us, you forgive our transgressions.

\(^{47}\) (Ps 65:1-3/LXX 64:1-4)

This prayer for beneficence recalls the previous promises God made to his people.

For you, O Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, have made this revelation to your servant, saying, “I will build you a house”; therefore your servant has found courage to pray this prayer to you. And now, O Lord God, you are God, and your words are true, and you have promised this good thing (τὰ ἄγαθὰ ταῦτα) to your servant; now therefore may it please you to bless the house of your servant, so that it may continue forever before you; for you, O Lord God, have spoken, and with your blessing shall the house of your servant be blessed forever. (2 Sam 7:27-29)

When David realized the gravity of his sin, he prayed for forgiveness.


\(^{48}\) See also Exod 32:11-13; 2 Sam 7:25.
David said to God, “I have sinned greatly in that I have done this thing. But now, I pray you, take away the guilt of your servant; for I have done very foolishly.” (1Chr 21:8)

When King Jeroboam tried to inhibit the words of a man from God, his hand was withered. Distraught, Jeroboam then asked the holy man for a prayer of intercession.

The king said to the man of God, “Entreat now the favor of the Lord your God, and pray for me, so that my hand may be restored to me.” So the man of God entreated the Lord; and the king’s hand was restored to him, and became as it was before. (1Kgs 13:6)

The following prayers clearly indicate that through proper observance (avodah), one may be confident that God will respond when called upon (emphasis provided).

_I sought the Lord, and he answered me_, and delivered me from all my fears. Look to him, and be radiant; so your faces shall never be ashamed. This poor soul cried, and was heard by the Lord, and was saved from every trouble. The angel of the Lord encamps around those who fear him, and delivers them. O taste and see that the Lord is good; happy are those who take refuge in him. O fear the Lord, you his holy ones, _for those who fear him have no want_. (Ps 34:4-9; LXX 33:5-10)

_Give ear to my words, O Lord; give heed to my sighing._ Listen to the _sound of my cry, my King and my God, for to you I pray._ O Lord, in the morning you hear my voice; in the morning I plead my case to you, and watch. For you are not a God who delights in wickedness; evil will not sojourn with you. The boastful will not stand before your eyes; you hate all evildoers. You destroy those who speak lies; the Lord abhors the bloodthirsty and deceitful.

_But I, through the abundance of your steadfast love, will enter your house, I will bow down toward your holy temple in awe of you._ Lead me, O Lord, in your righteousness because of my enemies; make your way straight before me. For there is no truth in their mouths; their hearts are destruction; their throats are open graves; they flatter with their tongues.
Make them bear their guilt, O God; let them fall by their own counsels; because of their many transgressions cast them out, for they have rebelled against you.

But let all who take refuge in you rejoice; let them ever sing for joy. Spread your protection over them, so that those who love your name may exult in you. For you bless the righteous, O Lord; you cover them with favor as with a shield. (Ps 5)

Form-Critical Features of Statutory Prayers

Since Jewish statutory prayers did not exist in a fixed form in the first century, they are less of a concern to us, except when scholars draw parallels as discussed above. Nevertheless, they exhibit the same general form-critical components as previously noted, with a few qualifications mentioned below. Since each prayer has its own prescriptions, it need not include the four units:

1. The invocation avoids direct address of God, and typically uses the “The Lord” or other forms of indirect address to the divine

2. Praise or recitation of history and/or promises

3. Various types of petitions are requested but with highly differential language, for example, “May it be Thy will…”

4. Concluding thanksgivings and/or blessings

Statutory prayers within the main content nearly always use “we,” since the prayer is said in a public setting. Below is an example of a statutory prayer, the ‘Amîdāh, from the Palestinian rite.

---


50 Ibid., 84.

51 Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 15.
Have compassion, O Lord Our God,
In thine abundant mercy,
Upon Israel thy people,
And upon Jerusalem thy city,
And upon Zion thy glorious habitation,
[and upon they sanctuary and upon thy dwelling place]
And upon the royal seed of David, they anointed.
[Rebuild thy House, restore they sanctuary.]
Blessed art thou, O Lord,
God of David; Rebuilder of Jerusalem.\(^{52}\)

Here, we find the formal invocation and within the content, the shift to the third person address. The main content features praise and requests for blessings. The prayer ends with the standard, “Blessed are thou, O Lord.”

There is one prayer form that, although still not fixed in the turn of the era, cuts across prescribed public settings and private devotion. Heinemann defines this prayer, the liturgical *Berăkāh*, in a more limited and technical sense. This *Berăkāh* is required to be said at certain times and in specific settings:

1. When fulfilling a commandment as a sign of respect and devotion
2. Before food is consumed
3. Offering praise and thanksgiving in recognition of blessings

The *Berăkāh* also involves:

1. The introductory formula (note it uses direct second person address like private prayer): “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe…”\(^{53}\)
2. The main content: Follows the introductory formula in response to one of the above three settings and frequently addresses God in the third person. Also in this

\(^{52}\) *Amīdāh*, Palestinian rite from Ibid., 71.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 11-12, 104.
section, many extensive blessings, words of praise, or recollections of past promises are typical

3. Conclusion: The benediction always concludes with praise, sometimes repeating “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe,” functioning as a eulogy

As another indication of a complex tradition history, this “liturgical” or statutory prayer stands outside of the more differential divine address and speaks to God in direct second person form, more typical of personal or private prayer. Heinemann argues that the liturgical Berakāh, in all probability, retains the ancient tradition of the priest using “you” language to bless the people on behalf of God.54 As we can see from the above structural outline, the Berakāh can occur in public within one of the prescribed Jewish liturgies or in private to fulfill the requirement to praise God when receiving a blessing such as when consuming food. In any case, the traditions concerning the Berakāh were formed during the Tannaitic and early rabbinic periods after the Q prayer was formed.

Form-Critical Features of Jewish Private Prayers

Private or personal prayer exists in the shadows, it might be said. Often, the door is shut or the words are not vocalized. While mention of private prayer is plentiful in the Psalms, they were infrequently written, and when they were, they most often appear in historical narratives as a part of the broader narrative. Also, most obviously, few were literate and papyrus was expensive, beyond the means of most. Moreover, if the prayer is personal, it almost stands in contradistinction to formal liturgical prayers which must have, a priori, a certain stable character to allow for the people to respond together in some way.

54 Ibid., 104-11.
Yet, Jewish custom and expectation of daily prayer assures us that private prayer was practiced. There is no extant evidence as to whether certain obligations concerning the form and content of prayers were taught to the child in the home. Instead, we must rely on the references with either indirect information from tradition or the halakic dictates of the sages of the early Tannaitic period, which admittedly represent the growing rabbinic movement.  

Although examples of private prayers are relatively rare, given their nature, their existence is indisputable within Jewish traditions. Petuchowski offers this discussion:

Now, nothing is easier than to affirm the principle of private prayer, and the superiority of spontaneity over tradition. Nothing, however, is harder than finding the appropriate words for actual communion with God. It is not surprising, therefore, that the disciples of the great Rabbis should have made a point of finding out what kind of prayers their masters were uttering during that period of the worship service which was devoted to private prayer. A number of those private prayers of the Rabbis are recorded in the Talmud:  

R. Eleazar, on concluding his prayer, used to say the following:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to cause to dwell in our lot love and brotherhood and peace and friendship, and mayest Thou make our borders rich in disciples and prosper our latter end with good prospect and hope, and set our portion in Paradise, and confirm us with a good companion and a good impulse in Thy world, and may we rise early and obtain the yearning of our heart to fear Thy name, and mayest Thou be pleased to grant the satisfaction of our desires! (b. Ber. 16b)

R. Johanan, on concluding his prayer, added the following:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to look upon our shame, and behold our evil plight, and clothe Thyself in Thy mercies, and cover Thyself in Thy strength, and wrap Thyself in Thy lovingkindness, and gird Thyself with Thy

---

55 Although Heinemann has extensively examined Jewish prayer traditions within the Mishnah, a sizable amount of his data is from the Talmudic period or the Tosefta and for our concerns, both are less relevant.

56 Petuchowski, "Spontaneity and Tradition," 11. Some of the following texts, but not all, were cited by Petuchowski.
graciousness, and may the attribute of Thy kindness and gentleness come before Thee! (b. Ber. 16b)

R. Zera, on concluding his prayer, added the following:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, that we sin not nor bring upon ourselves shame or disgrace before our fathers! (b. Ber. 16b)

R. Hiyya, on concluding his prayer, added the following:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, that our Torah may be our occupation, and that our heart may not be sick nor our eyes darkened! (b. Ber. 16b)

Rab, on concluding his prayer, added the following:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to grant us long life, a life of peace, a life of good, a life of blessing, a life of sustenance, a life of bodily vigour, a life in which there is fear of sin, a life free from shame and confusion, a life of riches and honour, a life in which we may be filled with the love of Torah and the fear of heaven, a life in which Thou shalt fulfil all the desires of our heart for good! (b. Ber. 16b)

R. Alexandri, on concluding his prayer, added the following:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to station us in an illumined corner and do not station us in a darkened corner, and let not our heart be sick nor our eyes darkened! (b. Ber. 17a)

Heinemann’s examination of biblical and early rabbinic sources has resulted in a few form-critical observations concerning private prayers.57

1. God is frequently addressed in the second person, thus being less formal and more personal. Although it seems permissible to praise God following the address, these prayers lack a formal liturgical benediction

2. The prayers are to be simple, direct, and brief, often omitting praise language

3. The prayer ought to be “fresh” in the sense of not repeating a set form

4. The petition is made through direct discourse often using the imperative

---

57 Heinemann, "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition." Also see Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 156-92.
These characteristics can be seen in the following five examples. Especially note that these prayers often lack a concluding praise section:

R. Nehunya b. ha-Kanah used to pray a short prayer when he entered the House of Study and when he came forth. They said to him, “What is the nature of this prayer?” He replied, “When I enter I pray that no offense shall happen through me, and when I come forth I give thanks for my lot.” (m. Ber. 4:2)

R. Joshua says: “He that journeys in a place of danger should pray a short prayer, saying ‘Save, O Lord, the remnant of Israel’ at their every cross-road let their needs come before thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, that hearest prayer!” (m. Ber. 4:4)

R. Simeon said: Be heedful in the reciting of the Shema’ and in the Tefillah; and when thou prayest make not thy prayer a fixed form, but [a plea] for mercies and supplications before God, for it is written, For he is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy, and repenteth him of the evil; and be not wicked in thine own sight. (m. ’Abot 2:13)

Our Rabbis taught: One who passes through a place infested with beasts or bands of robbers says a short Tefillah. What is a short Tefillah? — R. Eliezer says: Do Thy will in heaven above, and grant relief to them that fear Thee below and do that which is good in Thine eyes. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. R. Joshua says: Hear the supplication of Thy people Israel and speedily fulfil their request. (b. Ber. 29b)

R. Simlai expounded: A man should always first recount the praise of the Holy One, blessed be He, and then pray. (b. Ber. 32a)
APPENDIX E

THE PROBLEM OF ASSOCIATING THE LORD’S PRAYER WITH JEWISH STATUTORY PRAYERS
Petuchowski articulates the main difficulty in trying to establish a genealogical relationship with Jewish statutory prayers and Jewish conventions and practices in the first century:

Jacob J. Petuchowski, representing many others, is clear and categorical:

There was no prayer book in the biblical period. There was no actual book of prayers in the Rabbinic period. In fact, the Rabbis were opposed to the writing down of prayers \([b. \text{ Šhabb.} 115b]\), considering those who did write down prayers to be as reprehensible as those who would burn the Torah. Not until the ninth century C.E. do we get a written Order of Service for Jewish worship.

One might ask how this could be, given the prolific composition and scribal activity even centuries before the turn of the era? The particular religious perspective that governs this issue seems to be addressed in the following citation from the Babylonian Talmud: “They who write down Benedictions are as though they burnt a Torah” \([b. \text{ Šhabb.} 115b]\). Other rabbinical texts reinforce the notion of sacrilege in copying sacred prayers to God so that they become “fixed” prayers:

\[\text{R. ELIEZER SAYS: HE WHO MAKES HIS PRAYER A FIXED TASK etc. What is meant by a FIXED TASK? -R. Jacob b. Idi said in the name of R. Oshaiah: Anyone whose prayer is like a heavy burden on him. The Rabbis say: Whoever does not say it in the manner of supplication. Rabbah and R. Joseph both say: Whoever is not able to insert something fresh in it. R. Zera said: I can insert something fresh, but I am afraid to do so for fear I should become confused. (}b. \text{ Ber.} 29b)\]

The same R. Eliezer is attributed with the saying, “He that makes his prayer a fixed prayer, his prayer is no supplication” \(((m. \text{ Ber.} 4:4)\). But also R. Simeon is said to have warned:

Be heedful in the reciting of the \textit{Shema}’ and in the \textit{Tefillah}; and when thou prayest make not thy prayer a fixed form, but [a plea] for mercies and

\[\text{Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 17.}\]
supplications before God, for it is written, For he is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy, and repenteth him of the evil; and be not wicked in thine own sight. (m. 'Abot 2:13)

It must be qualified immediately that these citations belong to the Babylonian Talmud and Mishnah, and as later documents, one cannot be assured that the attributions are accurate or that the teachings were current in the first century. However, the frequency of the pronouncements against the writing down of prayers suggests that it was a feature of Jewish religious sensibility not to make a “fixed prayer” until well after the end of Second Temple Judaism. This tradition may have been a reaction to many customs in the non-Jewish world, where prayers were written and manipulated in a rather magical rite of calling on deities.² In the Jewish tradition, the petition should be non-formulaic.

Of course, there were common or statutory prayers in synagogue worship. But there was a clear tension during the transition from Second Temple to Rabbinic Judaism, between the need for order and the prohibition to write down or fix prayers. Petuchowski comments:

Until the tenth century CE, there was no such thing as a fixed prayerbook, although many of the prayers went back to the first century and beyond. But there was a reluctance to commit prayers to writing, no doubt in an effort to preserve the spontaneity of the spoken word. Therefore it was natural for different versions of one prayer to be in use at the same time. For a long period, no one version was the “authorized” one. In fact, it was not until the end of the first century CE, under the auspices of Gamaliel II in Yavneh, that an attempt was made to bring some order and uniformity into the service of the synagogue. Even then, it was not the actual wording of the prayers which was fixed, but the number of individual components and their sequence.

Only the heads of the later Babylonian academies, the *geonim* from the sixth to the end of the eleventh century, strove for uniformity in the actual texts and word of the prayers. But they were not altogether successful. The Palestinian liturgy continued to be more flexible and innovative than the liturgy of the Babylonian Jews, and the latter itself gave rise to a variety of different rites, some of which have been in use to the present day.3

Stefan Reif reports the majority opinion of scholars that the petitioner was to depend on memory, which forced a kind of fresh and personal appeal rather than the questionable dependence on a written prayer, as he says:

> It is the current scholarly consensus that the wide variety of prayers and blessings that are attested in the Talmudic literature were normally recited from memory, and transmitted orally, and that there was a distinct preference not to commit them to an authoritative, written text.4

Thus, scholars know that Jewish prayer forms existed in the first century C.E. (and before), such as the *Kaddish* and *Eighteen Benedictions*, but the rabbinic versions of them cannot be supposed to perfectly reflect the earliest representations,5 as Heinemann concludes:

> Therefore, we must lay down as a fundamental axiom for liturgical studies which would examine developmentally the texts of the various prayers that from the first no single “original text” of any particular prayer was created, but that originally numerous diverse texts and versions existed side by side. It follows, then, that the widely accepted goal of the philological method—viz., to discover or to reconstruct the “original” text of a particular composition by examining and comparing extant textual variants one with another—is out of place in the field of liturgical studies.6

---

3 Both paragraphs are from the following work: Petuchowski, "Liturgy of the Synagogue," 47.


5 For discussion see Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Form and Patterns* (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1977), 13-69. Heinemann notes: “Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to conclude that the *Eighteen Benedictions* antedate the destruction of the Temple by a considerable period of time.” (p. 22). Petuchowski comments: “The fact that eighteen berakhoth were ‘arranged’ under official auspices at the end of the first century CE does not, however, tell us anything about the date when various individual berakhoth originated.” See Petuchowski, "Liturgy of the Synagogue," 51.

This conclusion is critically significant for any comparison of the Lord’s Prayer to the *Kaddish* and/or *Eighteen Benedictions*. Even though some scholars have sought to draw genealogical parallels,⁷ these same commentators appear to be unaware of the fact that these formulations do not appear “until the end of the Talmudic period in the fifth century CE,” hence the *Kaddish*, “can hardly be considered an example of ‘Jewish norms of prayers’ in the first century.”⁸ As we have noted, moreover, even the current representations of the *Kaddish* and *Eighteen Benedictions* that are extant were not even in a fixed form in the pre-70 period, the era of the formation of Q. At most, we can argue for “family resemblance,” which we tentatively accept, although more analysis is needed.

As mentioned, there was never an Ur-text of the *Kaddish* and/or the *Eighteen Benedictions*. Today, we have multiple forms of each.⁹ Below is the *Complete Kaddish* provided by Petuchowski. Within the first and fourth lines of the *Kaddish*, respectively,

---


⁸ Heinemann, "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition," 81.

we do see the hallowing of God’s name and mention of his kingdom. But the prayer is not brief, involves extensive praise, and is clearly written as a communal prayer.

*The Kaddish*

Exalted and hallowed be His great Name  
In the world which He created  
According to His will.  
May He establish His kingdom  
(some rites add: and cause His salvation to sprout,  
and hasten the coming of His messiah,)  
In your lifetime and in your days,  
And in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel,  
Speedily and at a near time.  
And say: Amen.

May His great Name be praised forever  
And unto all eternity.

Blessed and praised,  
Glorified and exalted,  
extolled and honoured,  
magnified and lauded  
Be the Name of the Holy One, praised be He—  
although He is beyond all blessings and hymns, praises and consolations  
Which may be uttered in the world.  
And say: Amen.

May the prayers and supplications  
Of the whole household of Israel  
Be acceptable before their Father in heaven,  
And say: Amen.

May there be abundant peace from heaven,  
and life,  
for us and for Israel.  
And say: Amen.

May He who makes peace in His high heavens  
make peace for us and all Israel.  
And say: Amen.
The Eighteen Benedictions is a long prayer and only portions (relevant to the Q prayer) appear below. The most significant feature is the understanding of God as father. This prayer also has extensive praise and a recitation of historical relationship. The sixth benediction seeks God’s forgiveness, but does not suggest one should forgive as one is forgiven (Q 11:4).

*The Eighteen Benedictions (Ancient Palestinian Version)*

I.
You are praised, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob, the great, mighty and awe-inspiring God, God Supreme, Creator of heaven and earth, our Shield and Shield of our fathers, our trust in every generation.
You are praised, O Lord, Shield of Abraham.

III.
Holy are You, and awe-inspiring in Your Name; and beside You there is no God.
You are praised, O Lord, the holy God.

IV.
Our Father, favour us with knowledge of You, and with discernment and insight out of Your Torah.
You are praised, O Lord, gracious Giver of knowledge.

VI.
Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned against You. Blot out and remove out transgressions from before Your sight, for your mercies are manifold.
You are praised, O Lord, who abundantly pardons.¹⁰

¹⁰ Text from Petuchowski. Also see other versions in Ibid., 27-30.
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