t&t clark

THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT IN MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

CHARLES NATHAN RIDLEHOOVER

Library of New Testament Studies

616

Formerly the Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement series

ii

The Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Gospel

Charles Nathan Ridlehoover

First published in Great Britain 2020

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com
and sign up for our newsletters.

Contents

Tables

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations

AASF	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible (Commentary)
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDAG	A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd ed.
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZNW	Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBR	*Current in Biblical Research*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
COQG	Christian Origins and the Questions of God Series
CTJ	*Calvin Theological Journal*
DJG	*Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* 1st ed. Edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992
DJG	*Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* 2nd ed. Edited by Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown, and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013
EBC	F. E. Gaebelein, ed., *Expositor's Bible Commentary*
EGGNT	Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament
ESV	English Standard Version
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
GNS	Good News Studies
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
IBS	*Irish Biblical Studies*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
Int	*Interpretation*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JEC	*Jewish-Christian Relations*

JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSHJ	*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSupp	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSupp	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTM	New Testament Message
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*
PNTC	Pelican New Testament Commentaries
RelStTh	*Religious Studies and Theology*
RevExp	*Review and Expositor*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RTR	*The Reformed Theological Review*
SBFA	Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCE	*Studies in Christian Ethics*
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk årsbok*
Semeia	*Semeia*
TBei	*Theologische Beiträge*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
THNT	*Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie*
TRENT	*Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament*
TS	*Theological Studies*
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW	*Word and World*

Pseudepigrapha/Apocrypha

Apoc. Bar.	*Apocalypse of Baruch*
Add. Est.	*Additions to Esther*

As. Mos.	*Assumption of Moses*
1 En.	*1 Enoch*
1 Macc.	*1 Maccabees*
3 Macc.	*3 Maccabees*
PsSol.	*Psalms of Solomon*
Sir.	*Sirach*
Tob.	*Tobit*
Wis.	*Wisdom of Solomon*

Other Early Jewish and Christian Literature

Gen. Rab.	*Genesis Rabbah*
Ex. Rab.	*Exodus Rabbah*
Pesiq. R.	*Pesiqta Rabbati*
Tg. Isa.	*Targum Isaiah*
Tg. Mic.	*Targum of Micah*
Tg. Neof. Ex.	*Targum Neofiti Exodus*
Tg. Onk.	*Targum Onkelos*
Tg. OnkE.	*Targum Onkelos of Exodus*
Tg. Zech.	*Targum Zechariah*
B. Bat.	*Baba Batra*
y. Ber.	*Jerusalem Berakot*
b. ʿAbod. Zar.	*ʿAbodah Zarah*
b. Ber.	*Babylonian Berakot*
b. Hag.	*Babylonian Hagigah*
b. Menah.	*Babylonian Menahot*
b. Ned.	*Babylonian Nedarim*
b. Sanh.	*Babylonian Sanhedrin*
b. Taʾan.	*Babylonian Taʾanit*
b. Yebam.	*Babylonian Yebamot*
t. Ned.	*Tosefta Nedarim*
m. ʿAbot	*Mishnah ʿAbot*
m. Ber.	*Mishnah Berakot*
m. Cant. R.	*Mishnah Canticles Rabbah*
m. Kil.	*Mishnah Kilʾayim*
m. Ned.	*Mishnah Nedarim*
m. Sanh.	*Mishnah Sanhedrin*
m. Šebu	*Mishnah Šebuʾot*
m. Sotah.	*Mishnah Sotah*
m. Taʾan.	*Mishnah Taʾanit*
m. Yoma.	*Mishnah Yoma*
Josephus	*Ant. Jewish Antiquities*
Did.	*Didache*
Gos. Thom.	*Gospel of Thomas*

Dead Sea Scrolls

1QH	*Hodayot*
4Q ʿAmram B	*Visions of Amram*
4QLevib	*The Prayer and Ablutions of Levi*
4Q280	*Curses*
4Q372	*Apocryphon of Joseph*[b]
4Q544	*Visions of Amram*
11QMelchizedek	*Melchizedek*
11QPs	*Psalms*
CD	*Damascus Document*

1

Introduction and Survey
of Scholarship

Matthew 6:9a: Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς

The Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount continue to be among the most discussed texts within Christian scriptures, particularly in their Matthean versions. Because of their rich literary and theological import, it is no wonder that students of Matthew continue to bring out "treasures new and old" (Mt. 13:51-52) from these texts. The Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount are found in two places in the Gospels. Matthew's Gospel has the Lord's Prayer (Mt. 6:9-13) in the center of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7), while Luke's Gospel presents a shortened sermon ("on the plain") in ch. 6 (vv. 20-49) followed by a shortened Lord's Prayer in ch. 11 (vv. 2-4).[1]

Luke's recording of the Lord's Prayer has Jesus responding to a disciple's inquiry on how to pray (Lk. 11:1). This question (Κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ) and response (i.e., the Lord's Prayer) forms the first part of an extended section on prayer (Lk. 11:1-13). Matthew, on the other hand, appears to have the Lord's Prayer "out-of-place" in the Sermon on the Mount. Consider the comments of Matthean scholar Donald Hagner:

> The Evangelist has here inserted further traditional material stemming from Jesus on the subject of prayer, thereby breaking the smooth sequence of the three parallel sections on the practice of righteousness (vv. 2-4; 5-6; 16-18). This entire pericope would hardly be missed if it were omitted from the present context. Vv. 9-15 (Lord's Prayer) in particular *do not fit well* their present context.[2]

Graham Stanton agrees: "The Lord's Prayer and two related sayings (6:9–15) *partly 'spoil'* the very impressive symmetry of this part of the Sermon."[3] France goes even further,

---

[1] For the sake of convention, I will refer to the authors of the Gospels as Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as they have been traditionally recognized. The question of authorship has no bearing on the method or results of the following analysis.
[2] Donald Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1993), 145. Emphasis mine.
[3] Graham Stanton, *Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 297–8. "This part of the Sermon" is referring to chs 5–6. Emphasis mine.

calling the insertion of the Lord's Prayer a "literary digression."[4] Each commentator has implied the insertion of something that does not seem to fit. Unfortunately, their assessments assert that the Lord's Prayer is intrusive instead of a careful placement. Through the failure to recognize the centrality of the Lord's Prayer in the Sermon on the Mount, the interpretation of both texts has been impoverished. In the church and the academy, the tendency is to study these texts in isolation from one another.[5]

Central to this study are the following questions: What is the relationship between the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Gospel? What role does the Sermon on the Mount have in properly understanding the Lord's Prayer? And, what role does the Lord's Prayer have in properly understanding the Sermon on the Mount? We will argue that the Lord's Prayer is placed in the center of the Sermon on the Mount structurally and becomes a focal point for lexical and thematic parallels with the surrounding material in the Sermon. As we shall see, the Prayer's centrality is not a new concept but, nonetheless, a concept that has lacked specificity and clarity. The aim of this book is not only to argue for the centrality of the Lord's Prayer within the Sermon on the Mount but also to give definition and purpose to the Prayer's central position. It is likely that Matthew noted similarities between the Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount from the traditions he received, leading him to establish the connection between the two texts. Matthew edited parts of the Sermon, and the Prayer itself, with a desire to increase the parallelism between the two texts, making prayer central. Matthew's desire to make prayer a central feature of the Sermon on the Mount also includes his editing and placement of the instruction to "ask, seek, and knock" at the end of the Sermon's body (Mt. 7:7-11). As we shall argue, the Sermon on the Mount was not built and ordered around the Lord's Prayer, but Matthew has seen and enhanced lexical and thematic parallels with the petitions, bringing out continuity between the two texts. No single petition parallels all the material in the Sermon on the Mount, but rather, each petition, through its parallels to the Sermon, makes a case for its integrated position (structurally, lexically, and thematically) as the "centerpiece" of the Sermon.[6]

The purpose, or "why," of this centrality for Matthew is to clarify what the answer to the petitions of the Lord's Prayer might look like in the life of the disciple of Jesus. The results are as follows: (1) a prayer in which the petitions are grounded in the passages of the Sermon, sharing lexical and thematic parallels; (2) the Sermon on the Mount describes what happens when the Lord's Prayer is answered in the disciple's life; and (3) this prayer to the Father is key to committing to and living by the Sermon's kingdom righteousness.

As we will show, little detailed historical and exegetical work has been done on the relationship between the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount. Although the

---

[4] R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 233.

[5] By analogy, the tendency is to study the Sermon and Prayer as separate as Luke records them. This comment is not meant to convey that the Matthean versions of both texts is better or should be preferred because they are together. Additionally, we want to avoid the implication that Matthew has it "right" and Luke "messed things up."

[6] Throughout the following book, we will primarily refer to each petition by its main subject (i.e., "Father" petition, "Name" petition, etc.) except for stylistic reasons or when noting that its numerical placement in the Prayer is relevant to the overall argument.

two sets of texts can be understood apart from one another, the following study will argue that in Matthew's Gospel, the best reading is one in which they are read together with consideration of their structural, lexical, and thematic relationship.

Why Is This Book Worth Writing?

This book is worth writing to contend for a fresh understanding of the Lord's Prayer. Admittedly, to propose a fresh understanding of the Lord's Prayer is a risky endeavor. Yet at an academic level, studies of the Lord's Prayer have hit a stalemate. New treatments of the Lord's Prayer typically reproduce the emphases of previous studies and little new understanding emerges. These previous studies have concentrated on the following: (1) the "form" in which the Lord's Prayer was transmitted; (2) the sources which gave rise to the Lord's Prayer; (3) a reconstruction of the communities that received their respective versions of the Lord's Prayer; (4) the original language of the Lord's Prayer; or (5) the various redactions in Matthew, Luke, and the *Didache's* version. While these issues are important for understanding the history behind the Lord's Prayer, they often become the sole means for understanding the Prayer.[7] The following book will argue for an understanding of the Lord's Prayer that takes into consideration the final or transmitted form of the text and its intentional placement by Matthew into the Sermon on the Mount. It will also seek to establish why Matthew has intentionally centered the Prayer within the Sermon.

The second benefit of writing this book is to establish an ignored angle of the Sermon on the Mount, notably the thrust of its central text. It is widely agreed that the Sermon on the Mount is the greatest collection of Jesus's ethical teachings. If the Sermon on the Mount's shape and themes connect with the Lord's Prayer, it is reasonable to assume that the Lord's Prayer gives vital clues as to how to fulfill the Sermon's ethic. The standard themes of the Sermon on the Mount are generally agreed to be righteousness and kingdom living. By placing the Lord's Prayer at the center of the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew indicates that prayer is a prominent theme along with righteousness and the kingdom. As we will seek to argue, the Lord's Prayer is placed at the center of the Sermon on the Mount to serve as the interpretive key to living out the kingdom righteousness prescribed in the Sermon on the Mount.

---

[7] More recently, studies of the Lord's Prayer have moved into the study of reception history. See Dale C. Allison, *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1999); Simon J. Kistemaker, "The Lord's Prayer in the First Century," *JETS* 21.4 (1978): 323–8; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); Daniel L. Migliore, ed., *The Lord's Prayer: Perspectives for Reclaiming Christian Prayer* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); Kenneth Stevenson, *The Lord's Prayer: A Text in Transition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2004). More recently, David Clark, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Lord's Prayer from Jewish Prayer to Christian Ritual* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2017). On the interpretive history of the Sermon on the Mount, see Clarence Bauman, *The Sermon on the Mount: The Modern Quest for Its Meaning* (Macon: Mercer, 1991); Jeffrey P. Greenman, Timothy Larsen, and Stephen R. Spencer, eds., *The Sermon on the Mount through the Centuries: From the Early Church to John Paul II* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007); Harvey K. McArthur, *Understanding the Sermon on the Mount* (London: Epworth, 1960).

The third benefit arising from this book is the advance of compositional criticism and intratextuality in Matthean studies, as well as the Synoptic Gospels. The canonical writings of the Gospels were not created in a vacuum. Each writer used a variety of sources, both canonical and noncanonical. These written sources were a part of a shared cultural memory among the Jewish people. Studying the relationship between old and new texts/ideas and how they are shaped into new contexts is an exercise in intratextuality and part of the ongoing literary study of the New Testament. The present study will analyze how the Lord's Prayer works intratextually within the Sermon on the Mount.[8] If the relationship between these texts can be established by way of parallels, a fourth benefit arises.

By situating the Lord's Prayer in the Sermon on the Mount and asserting that the Sermon on the Mount helps to explain the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, a new aspect of New Testament prayer emerges. This aspect is the marrying of word and deed, prayer and praxis. Unfortunately, prayer is often seen only for its communicative aspects or as a mantra to be repeated. A petitioner comes to God offering thanks, lament, praise, and petition. Yet, Mt. 6:33 ("But strive first for the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well"[9]) uses prayer language ("strive") alongside a call to discipleship (i.e., "the kingdom and righteousness"). The Lord's Prayer as the "centerpiece" of the Sermon on the Mount would evidence an extended example of the combining of prayer and day-to-day discipleship. Conversely, the Lord's Prayer is then properly understood when the petitioner follows the demands of the Sermon on the Mount.

The Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount in Recent Research

The literature examining the relationship of the Sermon on the Mount and Lord's Prayer is noticeably smaller than the individual treatments of these texts. Because the texts are studied in isolation from one another, only the occasional observation about their relationship is found in scholarly work.[10] In fact, Günther Bornkamm,

---

[8] A recent study that also explores the intertextual links of the Sermon on the Mount/Lord's Prayer and Matthew's "cultural encyclopedia" is Jonathan Pennington, *The Sermon on the Mount and Human Flourishing: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017). The present book has significant overlaps with Pennington's work but is more focused on the Lord's Prayer and its relationship with the Sermon on the Mount. Pennington's commentary is focused on the Sermon's message of human flourishing and intertextual links with the Greek and Jewish traditions.

[9] All translations are from the NRSV unless otherwise stated.

[10] Scholarly treatments on the Lord's Prayer include: Craig A. Evans, *Matthew*, NCBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2012), 141–9; Birger Gerhardsson, "The Matthean Version of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:9b–13): Some Observations," in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honour of Bo Reicke*, vol. 1. (Mercer: Mercer University, 1984); M. D. Goulder, "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer," *JTS* 14 (1963): 32–45; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 104–8; Joseph Heinemann, "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition," in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*, ed. J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke (New York: Seabury, 1978), 81–9; Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, SBT 6 (London: SCM, 1967); Craig Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 214–26;

Mark Kiley, and Mary Hinkle are perhaps the only scholars in modern biblical studies who have devoted specific publications to the relationship between the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, even if in article form.[11] This section will provide an examination of Bornkamm, Kiley, and Hinkle along with some of the others who have noted the relationship between the Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount in broader works. Those who have commented on the relationship between the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer fall generally into four categories. These categories are the following: (1) no-consequence, (2) thematic, (3) expositional/structurally centric, and (4) combination. In the sections that follow, we will define each category along with examining the work of representatives of each position. We will argue that while these studies have made a notable observation concerning the relationship of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, they miss the entirety of Matthew's intentional "centering" and reading strategy for these two texts (Table 1.1).

No-Consequence

The "no-consequence" category of scholars are those who note the centrality of the Lord's Prayer within the Sermon on the Mount but do not elaborate on this centrality. The centrality of the Lord's Prayer does not have any effect on the interpretation of the Prayer or the Sermon. Scholars who have noted the central position of the Lord's Prayer include Dale Allison, Jack Kingsbury,[12] and Charles Quarles.[13] We will consider the work of Dale Allison as exemplary of this approach.[14]

Dale C. Allison

Among modern Matthean scholars, few have written as much concerning the Sermon on the Mount as Dale C. Allison.[15] Allison's contribution to ongoing studies of the

---

Jan Milič Lochman, *The Lord's Prayer*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990); Ernst Lohmeyer, *The Lord's Prayer* (London: Collins, 2005); T. W. Manson, "The Lord's Prayer," *BJRL* 38 (1955/56): 436–88; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 279–93; Sjef Van Tilborg, "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer," *NovT* 14 (1972): 94–105. The standard view is that the Lord's Prayer is an interpolation into the Sermon on the Mount and primarily serves as an addendum or exemplar of the type of prayer instructed in Mt. 6:5-6.

[11] Günther Bornkamm, "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt," *NTS* 24 (1978), 419–32; Mary E. Hinkle, "The Lord's Prayer: Empowerment for Living the Sermon on the Mount," *WW* 22.1 (2002), 9–17; Mark Kiley, "The Lord's Prayer and Matthean Theology," in *The Lord's Prayer and Other Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Mark Harding, and Mark Kiley (Valley Forge: Trinity International, 1994), 15–27. Outside of Biblical studies, Oliver O'Donovan, "Prayer and Morality in the Sermon on the Mount," *SCE* 22.1 (2009): 21–33, has analyzed the relationship of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer from an ethical perspective. Also, William C. Mattison, *The Sermon on the Mount and Moral Theology: A Virtue Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2017), 9, 238–69.

[12] Jack Kingsbury, "The Place, Structure, and Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount within Matthew," *Int* 41 (1987): 141.

[13] Charles Quarles, *Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring Christ's Message to the Modern Church*, NAC Studies in Bible and Theology (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2011), 16.

[14] We will consider the implications of Allison's structural proposal separately in Chapter 3.

[15] Dale Allison's work includes: "The Configuration of the Sermon on the Mount and Its Meaning" in *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005); "The Sermon on the

Table 1.1 Scholars Who Have Noted the Centrality of the Lord's Prayer

Approaches	No-Consequence	Thematic	Expositional/ Structurally Centric	Combination
Key Figures	D. C. Allison J. Kingsbury C. Quarles	H. D. Betz O. O'Donovan D. Garland M. Hinkle W. Mattison	W. Grundmann G. Bornkamm R. Guelich A. Schweizer J. Lambrecht R. Schnackenburg J. Meier M. Kiley	U. Luz J. Pennington

structure of the Sermon has been especially helpful, as he has noted the repetition of triads throughout the Sermon on the Mount. The main body of the Sermon on the Mount consists of the triad of 5:21-48, 6:1-18, and 6:19–7:11. The central section, 6:1-18, is split into a further triad of 6:2-4, 5-15, and 16-18. Following this pattern, one encounters the uneven middle section on prayer (6:5-15). Within this section, Allison notes the triad of 6:5-6, 7-13, and 14-15. Verses 5-6 contrast righteous and hypocritical prayer generally, while vv. 14-15 address the topic of forgiveness. Regarding vv. 7-13, Allison notes, "Even Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer (unlike Luke's version) contains three 'your' petitions ('hallowed be your name, your kingdom come, your will be done') and three 'us' petitions ('give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts . . . do not bring us to the time of trial but deliver us from the evil one')."[16]

Allison concludes, "On this analysis, the Lord's Prayer, which is at the centre of the section on prayer, is at the very centre of the Sermon on the Mount as a whole. One wonders whether Matthew did not design it to be so."[17] He comments elsewhere, "The neat scheme is interrupted by 6:7–15, the section on the Lord's Prayer, which, like the irregular last beatitude, therefore calls attention to itself."[18] Although acknowledging the irregularity of the section on prayer, Allison does not elaborate on Matthew's purposes.

Allison's careful examination of the Sermon on the Mount and its structure is a careful balance of historical and literary concerns. His structural proposal illustrates the composition of the Sermon on the Mount as a unified whole and argues for the Prayer's integrated position. According to Allison, Matthew has inserted the Lord's Prayer into the middle section carefully. Yet, to Allison's rhetorical comment, "One wonders whether Matthew did not design it to be so," his implied answer seems to be no based on his treatment of the Lord's Prayer. He neither alludes to the Sermon in

---

Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain: Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49: A Review," *JBL* 117 (1998): 136–8; *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1999); "The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount," *JBL* 106 (1987): 423–45.

[16] Allison, *Sermon on the Mount*, 36. See also Allison, Studies in Matthew, 187.

[17] Allison, *Sermon on the Mount*, 36.

[18] Allison, *Sermon on the Mount*, 108.

his explanations of the Prayer's petitions nor uses the Prayer in a significant way when dealing with sections of the Sermon. In other words, the centrality of the Lord's Prayer is noted, but of "no consequence."

Thematic

The "thematic" category refers to those scholars who emphasize the thematic connections between the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount. Structural elements between the Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount are mentioned but only serve as introductions to the "deeper" and more important thematic connections. Scholars who have noted thematic connections between the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount include Oliver O'Donovan,[19] David Garland,[20] Mary Hinkle, and Hans Dieter Betz. We will consider the work of Hans Dieter Betz and Mary Hinkle because of their specific focus on the thematic parallels between the Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount.[21]

Hans Dieter Betz

Hans Dieter Betz is known primarily for his scholarship on the book of Galatians and exhaustive commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, both in the *Hermeneia* series. Betz's acknowledgment of the Prayer's centrality is stated in his discussion of Matthew's redaction. He states,

> If, as I assume, the author/redactor took over the two instructions of 6:1–6, 16–18, and 6:7–15, and merged them, it is not difficult to see why he did so. These sections provided the ideal building blocks for the second main part of the SM dealing with worship. As the composition of the SM now stands, the Lord's Prayer is found in the centre not only of the cultic teaching in 6:1–18 but of the SM as a whole.[22]

Betz does not elaborate on his structural proposal but nonetheless notes the Prayer's centrality. Unlike the no-consequence category, Betz sees exegetical significance to the Prayer's centrality. He states, "The centrepiece within the central subsection is the Lord's Prayer (6:9b–13). This architecture points to the central importance of prayer for the SM (prayer is mentioned also in the first subsection [5:44], and in the following subsection [7:7–11])." Betz's argument is that prayer is featured within the Sermon and

---

[19] O'Donovan, "Prayer and Morality in the Sermon on the Mount," 21–33.

[20] David Garland, "The Lord's Prayer in the Gospel of Matthew," *RevExp* 89 (1992): 215–28.

[21] O'Donovan's argument is more concerned with the connection of prayer and ethics and thus uses the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer as examples of this connection in his article. David Garland's work is focused on the Lord's Prayer and its connection with Matthew's Gospel. Garland mentions several Sermon parallels to the Lord's Prayer but has a wider focus.

[22] Hans Dieter Betz, *Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain: Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1995), 351.

even at its center. Prayer is therefore thematically significant to the Sermon's rhetorical patterns.[23] He states later,

> In one sense, the Beatitudes form the beginning of the Two Ways pattern, using the image of the ways of life. In another sense, the eschatological goals (7:13–23) determine the construction of the SM; even its beginning Beatitudes (5:3–12) contain eschatological promises. In yet another sense, the centrepiece of the Lord's Prayer calls attention to the centrality of approaching God in prayer; it also reminds us that this prayer is the oldest part of the tradition, going back, for all we know, to the historical Jesus. Thus, the SM begins historically in the centre as well.[24]

Betz's conclusion is an exciting prospect in understanding the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount. Although acknowledging the centrality of the Lord's Prayer, Betz fails to show any detailed exegetical consequences within his exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. This omission is even after asserting that the Lord's Prayer is a "building block." Betz does make a step forward with his conclusion that prayer is thematically significant to the Sermon on the Mount, but he fails to note any direct connections with the individual petitions. We will argue that each petition is thematically related to differing portions of the Sermon on the Mount and these connections function reciprocally. The Sermon on the Mount describes what happens when the Lord's Prayer is answered in the disciple's life, and the praying of this prayer is a commitment to the kingdom righteousness as described in the Sermon on the Mount.

Mary Hinkle

In writing on the Lord's Prayer, Mary Hinkle seeks to advance an insight noted in Allison's *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. In response to the suggestion that the Sermon is an impossible ideal, Allison offers three means that a hearer of the Sermon on the Mount can perform the ethic prescribed.[25] Hinkle's proposal seeks to add a fourth, namely prayer. She states, "In the midst of a seemingly relentless barrage of imperatives addressed to disciples is a small collection of imperatives addressed to God. At the heart of the intricately structured Sermon on the Mount is the Lord's Prayer."[26] She continues, "In this prayer, the community of Jesus'

---

[23]   In his structural proposal of the Sermon on the Mount, Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 50–8, esp. 51–7, shows how the rhetoric of the Sermon on the Mount is patterned on the Greco-Roman *epitome*. Betz argues that the rhetorical effect of the Sermon is to persuade one to adopt a "way of life" that mimics Jesus. For further discussion on the Sermon as paraenesis, see James G. Williams, "Paraenesis, Excess, and Ethics: Matthew's Rhetoric in the Sermon on the Mount," *Semeia* 50 (1990): 163–87. For a counter argument, see Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 307–25, who argues that the Sermon is not an *epitome* but shaped and reinterpreted in ways that are consistent with the rest of the Gospel.

[24]   Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 64–5.

[25]   Allison, *Sermon on the Mount,* 28–30. The three sources of empowerment are as follows: (1) Jesus's healing ministry, (2) the rewards/hope of the future, and (3) God's promise to care for his children.

[26]   Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 11.

followers ask for what it needs to live the sermon. As God answers this prayer, God is empowering a community to live the sermon as a whole."[27] In what follows, Hinkle addresses the connections between each petition and the material in the Sermon.

In her exposition, Hinkle explains the meaning of each petition before moving to thematic parallels in the Sermon on the Mount. For example, Hinkle focuses on the name of God in the first petition as the opposite of falsehood. This allows her to parallel the first petition to the teachings on vows in Mt. 5:34-37. She asks, "How does one let his word be 'Yes, Yes,' or 'No, No'?" God's people should pray the first petition. Hinkle similarly addresses the rest of the petitions, showing how each petition is thematically linked to various portions of the Sermon. "Your kingdom come" relates to Mt. 5:17-19 in which the law and prophets are fulfilled as people keep God's commandments. The kingdom is where moth, rust, and thieves do not corrupt the heavenly treasure (Mt. 6:19-21) and the king gives good gifts to those who ask (Mt. 7:11). The will petition is thematically connected with Mt. 7:21 in which the "will" is explicitly mentioned. Additionally, Hinkle connects the will petition to Mt. 5:16 (the disciples' work bringing glory to the Father) and Mt. 5:44 (love your enemies).

The focus changes in the second half of the Sermon. Whereas the first half is specifically addressed to God, the latter half addresses the needs of those praying. Hinkle states, "In these petitions, as in the others, those who pray the prayer ask for what they need to live in the kingdom Jesus describes."[28] In the fourth petition, Hinkle draws attention to the discussion of worry in which bread is explicitly mentioned (Mt. 6:25-34).[29] The petition allows the hearer to avoid the anxiety of even the barest of necessities, food, and clothing. Hinkle interestingly also connects the fourth petition to Jesus's teaching in Mt. 5:42. In 5:42, Jesus instructs his followers to give to everyone who begs from you, whether coat or cloak.

In the fifth petition, the vertical (God and people) and horizontal (interpersonal) relationships intersect.[30] Hinkle highlights the places in the Sermon that address strained relationships. She connects the petition to Mt. 5:22-24 and 5:48. What is the empowerment for reconciliation? She states, "Those who pray the Lord's Prayer ask for forgiveness from God; forgiveness of the brother and sister follows from the forgiveness that God offers." Hinkle finishes with an analysis of the last two petitions, dealing with them together. She points out two passages in which hearers of the Sermon are instructed to endure persecution (5:11-12, 39). She asks, "Does the Sermon on the Mount urge followers of Jesus toward their own self-defeating surrender to evil?"[31] Without the last two petitions, one might succumb to evil. Instead, they appeal to God for deliverance from the evil one.

Hinkle's analysis of the thematic connections between the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer furthers the observations of Betz. She sees the Lord's Prayer as a focal point of the Sermon and basis for connections between prayer and discipleship.

---

[27] Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 11.
[28] Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 14.
[29] Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 15.
[30] Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 15.
[31] Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 16.

Unfortunately, Hinkle's analysis misses several insights. First, Hinkle conflates the structural proposals of Allison, Kingsbury, and Luz.[32] As we have partially argued above and will argue more extensively in Chapter 3, each of these proposals has different implications. The structural consequences of noting the centrality of the Lord's Prayer do not lead to a de facto interpretation. Second, and more importantly, Hinkle neglects several parallels that are signaled by lexical and thematic clues. For the sake of brevity, we will only note a few examples. In Hinkle's analysis of the Name petition, she mentions the connection of speaking God's name and truthfulness. This connection leads to Hinkle's association of the first petition with taking vows (Mt. 5:33-37).[33] While truthfulness is inherent in the Name petition, Hinkle misses the connection of the Name petition with Mt. 7:21 in which a specific name of God is mentioned ("Lord, Lord"). Also, Mt. 7:21 addresses "doing the will of the Father" and contrasts those who truly know the name of God and those who do not. Arguably, this reference to doing God's will is the definition of "hallowing." Therefore, Mt. 7:21 appears to be a substantial parallel to the Name petition, but Hinkle ignores its lexical and thematic parallels. In Hinkle's dealing with the evil petition, she mentions connections with Mt. 5:11-12 and 5:39. Hinkle's recognition of these two instances misses the other seven examples of "evil" being mentioned (Mt. 5:37, 45; 6:23; 7:11, 17-18, and 23). As we will argue in Chapter 4, these instances of evil are not only lexically parallel but also share parallel themes.

Expositional/Structurally Centric

The "expositional/structurally centric" category refers to those scholars who believe that the Lord's Prayer controls the ordering of the Sermon on the Mount.[34] In other words, the Lord's Prayer is central, as the petitions dictate the order of the material around it. The Sermon does not point to the Prayer's centrality; instead, the Prayer is central because it orders sections of the Sermon and the sections function as an exposition of their respective petition. Scholars who have noted the structuring significance of the Lord's Prayer include Walter Grundmann, Günther Bornkamm, Robert Guelich,[35] Eduard Schweizer,[36] Jan Lambrecht,[37] Rudolf Schnackenburg,[38] John Meier,[39] and Mark Kiley.[40] Because of their influence on later scholarship, we will

---

[32] See Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 11, fn.8. She states that most commentators see the Lord's Prayer as the heart of the Sermon on the Mount. This assertion is just not true. Outside of the scholars mentioned in the following survey of scholarship, few people see this relationship.

[33] Hinkle, "Lord's Prayer," 12–13. Hinkle mistakes the numerical reference for taking vows on p. 12. She notes the leading verse of 5:33-37 as "6:33."

[34] The following section will only serve as a brief summary. We will survey structural proposals more extensively in Chapter 3.

[35] Robert Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation of Understanding* (Waco: Word, 1982), 36–7.

[36] Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 202–3.

[37] Jan Lambrecht, *The Sermon on the Mount: Proclamation and Exhortation*, GNS 14 (Wilmington: Glazier, 1985), 155–64.

[38] Rudolf Schnackenburg, *All Things Are Possible to Believers: Reflections on the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount*, trans. James S. Currie (Louisville: Westminster, 1995), 27–8.

[39] J. P. Meier, *Matthew*, NTM 3 (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1980), 59.

[40] Kiley, "Lord's Prayer and Matthean Theology," 15–27.

consider the work of Grundmann and Bornkamm specifically. Bornkamm's proposal influenced the work of Guelich, Schweizer, Lambrecht, Schnackenburg, Meier, and Kiley with little revision.[41]

Walter Grundmann and Günther Bornkamm

Walter Grundmann[42] and Günther Bornkamm[43] were among the first to note a structuring purpose to the Lord's Prayer. Both scholars have argued that the centrality of the Lord's Prayer is used to structure major sections of the Sermon (Mt. 5:3–7:12). Grundmann contended that each petition of the Lord's Prayer is assigned a different portion of the Sermon. The first half of the Sermon (Mt. 5:1-48) corresponds to the first half of petitions (Mt. 6:9-10) collectively, while the latter half of the Sermon (Mt. 6:19–7:23) corresponds to the latter half of the Prayer (Mt. 5:1-2 and 7:7-12 to Petition 1; 5:3-16 to Petition 2; 5:17-48 to Petition 3; 6:19-34 to Petition 4; 7:1-6 to Petition 5; and 7:13-23 to Petitions 6 and 7).

Bornkamm amended the argument of Grundmann by reducing the Prayer's structuring to the second half of the Sermon (Mt. 6:19–7:11).[44] He reasoned that the teachings on prayer found in the Sermon (Mt. 6:9-13; 7:7-11) are combined in Lk. 11:1-13. Bornkamm argued that Matthew has split the teaching on prayer (Mt. 6:7-15; 7:7-11) to form an *inclusio* around 6:19–7:6. Within this *inclusio*, Mt. 6:19-24 connects to the first three petitions, Mt. 6:25-34 connects to the fourth petition, Mt. 7:1-5 connects to the fifth petition, and Mt. 7:6 connects with the last two petitions. To establish these connections between the Sermon and Prayer, Bornkamm points out the similar vocabulary and shared thematic elements.

Grundmann and Bornkamm both have noted an important point concerning the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer. The structure between the two texts is indicative of Matthew's reading strategy. We will argue that the centrality of the Lord's Prayer is significant for how the Sermon is understood, but the Lord's Prayer does not structure the Sermon in which it is found. While this exegesis is intriguing, it is plagued with two major problems. First, many of the exegetical parallels between the Sermon and the respective petition are stretched. Examples include: (1) the connection of Mt. 7:6 in Grundmann's proposal to the forgiveness petition,[45] (2) in Bornkamm, connecting Mt. 6:19-24 to God's will being accomplished,[46] and (3) in both proposals,

---

[41] Kiley, "Lord's Prayer and Matthean Theology," 15–16, has recently argued that the connections between the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer extend beyond 7:7-11.

[42] Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, *THNT* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1981), 204–6.

[43] Bornkamm, "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt," 419–32.

[44] See also Lambrecht, *Sermon on the Mount*, 155–64. Schnackenburg, *All Things Are Possible to Believers*, 27–8, is sympathetic to this view, although he doubts that it can be proven with certainty.

[45] The aphoristic nature of the phrase does easily lend itself to being about forgiveness. The phrase explains that one should not give "what is holy" to the unholy, but the prayer petition commands that forgiveness be given without condition. As we will argue, a clearer connection can be made between Mt. 7:6 and the temptation petition. See Bornkamm, "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt," 427–30.

[46] Bornkamm's connection here is problematic in two ways: (1) He splits 6:19-24 and 25-34. Taken as a whole (6:19-34), the section speaks to material needs and God's provision for even the "least of

the connection of Mt. 7:1-5 to the forgiveness proposal.[47] The second major issue is the disproportionate arrangement that occurs when each scholar assigns the Sermon's content to its respective petition. Two examples will suffice: (1) In both proposals, the bread petition governs fifteen or more verses, and the temptation and evil petition govern one verse; (2) In Bornkamm's proposal, Mt. 6:19-24 governs the first three petitions collectively, while the rest of the Sermon is split among the remaining petitions. These critiques will be explored more heavily in Chapter 3.

Combination

The "combination" approach refers to scholarship that considers both the structural and thematic clues concerning the Prayer's centrality. The Sermon's structure is indicative of the importance of the Prayer's "centrality." The Prayer is also thematically linked to the material found in the Sermon on the Mount. In this approach, the structure of the Sermon on the Mount indicates how it should be understood, with the Lord's Prayer being central. The thematic connections strengthen the marrying of the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount. Ulrich Luz and Jonathan Pennington's work is representative of the "combination" approach. Because of his pioneering work in this approach, we will specifically consider the work of Ulrich Luz.

Ulrich Luz

In his *Hermeneia* commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, Ulrich Luz presents a concentric proposal for the Sermon.[48] Luz couples his structural proposal with his understanding of the dynamics of oral compositions. An attribute of oral compositions is the use of the *inclusio*. Luz argues that Matthew uses six such *inclusios* (5:1-2//7:28–8:1a; 5:3-16//7:13-27; 5:17-20//7:12; 5:21-48//6:19–7:11; 6:1-6//6:16-18; 6:7-8//6:14-15) around the Lord's Prayer, making it the centerpiece of the Sermon on the Mount.

In terms of his structural proposal, Luz has created a sensible proposal that attempts to do justice to the structural markers, major themes, and redactional clues in the Sermon. Luz highlights the role of prayer as a major thrust in the Sermon based on its centrality. This emphasis is evident in his summation of the structure of the Sermon, when he states,

---

these." (2) The emphasis in the Prayer's petition is on earth but also clearly in heaven. The emphasis in 6:19-24 focuses more on the earthly aspect, pointing out that man should not be subservient to wealth while on earth.

[47] The problem with this connection is not the connection itself but the way the connection is described. Each respective phrase has differing emphases. The forgiveness petition prefaces man's forgiveness with God's forgiveness. Matthew 7:1-5 emphasizes judgment among men. See Allison, "Structure of the Sermon on the Mount," 426; and Lambrecht, *Sermon on the Mount*, 164. We will argue that the forgiveness petition parallels Mt. 7:1-5 based on their shared emphasis on debt language and their triangular shape. This will be explained in more depth in Chapter 5.

[48] Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 172. Luz's proposal is based on the work of two earlier studies: Josef Kürzinger, "Zur Komposition der Bergpredigt nach Matthäus," *Bib* 40 (1959): 569–89; and Rainer Riesner, "Der Aufbau der Reden im Matthäus-Evangelium," *TBei* 9 (1978): 173–6.

The Lord's Prayer is its central text. Thus, the Sermon on the Mount takes its readers along a way that leads them from God's radical demands into the "interior" of faith where they experience the Father's nearness in prayer. Then it leads them back into the praxis of renouncing possessions and of love.[49]

A major strength of Luz's proposal is his connection between the literary structure and the theology of the Sermon. In each case, the one helps the other.

Luz's work on the relationship between the Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount has not received a great deal of scholarly attention.[50] Luz neglects three aspects of the textual connection between the Lord's Prayer and Sermon on the Mount. First, Luz's explanation of the second half of the Sermon on the Mount misses a thematic thread that runs through Mt. 6:19–7:12. The section addresses social issues, as Luz notes, but also centers on the theme of heaven and earth. We will seek to demonstrate this theme further in Chapter 4.

Second, Luz's connections between petitions and Sermon parallels are underdeveloped in the latter half of the Lord's Prayer. A comparison of Luz's analysis of the invocation and the evil petition serve as evidence. Luz notes each instance of "Father" throughout the Sermon and parallels these instances to the invocation.[51] In Luz's treatment of the evil petition, he does not mention any of the other references to "evil" in the Sermon. This omission is puzzling due to the high number of references to "evil."[52]

Third, Luz's proposal leaves the centrality of the Lord's Prayer ambiguous. He does not clearly define what "centrality" means. In his structural proposal, the Lord's Prayer appears as a hinge between the demands in 5:21-28 and 6:19–7:12, drawing the reader into the "interior" of faith. This statement would appear to signal a major theme for the Sermon on the Mount, but Luz does not address prayer in his "Sermon themes" section.[53] In fact, the centrality of the Lord's Prayer is not mentioned again until Luz summarizes his findings on the Sermon on the Mount. In his explanation of the interplay between deeds and grace within the Sermon (point 2 of 7), Luz gives three examples. In his second example, Luz states, "In its centre (6:9–13), the Sermon on the Mount wants to bring the acting person to prayer to the Father. An interpretation that overlooks the reality that in the Sermon on the Mount praxis is at its core prayer misunderstands the evangelist."[54] Although Luz's wording (i.e., "centre," "core") appears to reemphasize his initial statements in the exegetical sections, his overly brief summary has the effect of softening his argument for centrality. The Lord's Prayer is not a hinge to move readers "up" one side of the Sermon and "down" the other. Rather, the Lord's Prayer "stands" atop the mountain of the Sermon.[55] The structure and textual connections signal a

---

[49] Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 172.
[50] This omission is hinted by France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 155, fn.8, who is sceptical of this approach.
[51] See Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 295; see also 208.
[52] See Chapter 4.
[53] Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 176–7.
[54] Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 391.
[55] The metaphor of a "mountain" was helpfully suggested by Francis Watson at the 2014 Trinity College Bristol Postgraduate Conference. After we argued for differing structuring levels throughout the Sermon in the following paper, "The Sermon's Prayer: Seeing the Lord's Prayer in Context," Watson commented that the proposed structure builds upward "almost like a mountain." Recently,