neuter; the introduction of the mention  
of the ‘evil one’ would seem here to be  
incongruous. Besides, compare the words  
of St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 18, which look very  
like a reminiscence of this prayer: see  
note there) these words form a seventh  
and most affecting petition, reaching far  
beyond the last. They are the expression  
of the yearning for redemption of the sons  
of God (Rom. viii. 28), and so are fitly  
placed at the end of the prayer, and as the  
sum and substance of the personal petitions.

The *doxology* must on every ground of  
sound criticism be omitted. Had it  
formed part of the original text, it is absolutely inconceivable that almost all the  
ancient authorities should with one consent  
have omitted it. They could have had no  
reason for doing so; whereas the habit of  
terminating liturgical prayers with ascriptions of praise would naturally suggest  
some such ending, and make its insertion  
almost certain in course of time. And  
just correspondent to this is the evidence.  
We find, *absolutely no trace of it in early  
times*, in any family of MSS. or in any  
expositors. The ancient Syriac version  
*has* it, but whether it *always had*, is  
another question. It is quite open for us  
to regard it with Euthymius as “*a solemn  
ending, added by the holy lights and leaders of the Church,*” and to retain it as such  
in our liturgies; but in dealing with the  
sacred text we must not allow any *à priori*  
considerations, of which we are such poor  
judges, to outweigh the almost unanimous  
testimony of antiquity. The inference to  
be drawn from the words of St. Paul, 2  
Tim. iv. 18, is rather against, than for the  
genuineness of the doxology. The fact  
that he there adds a doxology, different  
from that commonly read here, seems to  
  
testify to the practice, begun thus early,  
of concluding the Lord’s prayer with a  
solemn ascription of glory to God. This  
eventually fell into one conventional form,  
and thus got inserted in the sacred text.

**14, 15**] {14} Our Lord returns (**for**) to  
explain the only part of the prayer which  
*peculiarly* belonged to the new law of  
Jove, and enforces it by a solemn assurance.  
{15} On the sense, see Mark xi. 25, and the  
remarkable parallel, Ecclesiasticus xxviii. 2:  
“*forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he  
hath done unto thee, so shall thy sins also  
be forgiven when thou prayest.*”

**16—18.**) THIRD EXAMPLE. *Fasting*.  
Another department of the spiritual life,  
in which *reality in the sight of God*, and  
not appearance in the sight of man, must  
be our object. While these verses determine nothing as to the manner and extent  
of Christian fasting, they clearly recognize  
it as a solemn duty, ranking it with almsgiving and prayer; but requiring it, like  
them, (see ch. ix. 14–17,) to spring out of  
reality, not mere formal prescription.

**16. disfigure**] The word literally means  
*make to disappear*. Hence some have explained it, *hide, cover up*, viz. in mourning  
costume. But in later Greek the meaning  
was to *disfigure*. One writer uses it of  
women who paint their faces. The allusion is therefore not to *covering* the face,  
which could only be regarded as a sign of  
*mourning*, but to the squalor of the uncleansed face, and hair of the head and  
beard, as the contrast of washing and  
anointing shews.

**17.**] i.e. ‘*appear  
as usual:*’ ‘seem to men the same as if  
thou wert not fasting.’ It has been observed that this precept applies only to  
voluntary and private fasts, (such as are  
mentioned Luke xviii. 12,) not to public  
and enjoined ones. But this distinction