

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

of a beast are not writings on the rocks to tell of Israel passing by. There is a musing do-nothingness that dawdles, and then, tempted by the devil, is active with a sort of have-at-everythingness, to the neglect of noble duties and toils.

He who has true genius, enthusiasm for self-improvement, discerns in the organs and functions of the lower animals, in forest sounds and wave music, that preparation by the Almighty Father which pointed onward to human life. He will recognise that past and present melodies are preludes to a greater harmony, and not one note but is a preparation for the Great Peacemaker Who opens wide the gates of heaven. Like can only come from like, and evens from evens; but everything is so different that no two things are quite the same. Yet all are so related that the far-off and near, the similar and the diverse, are in such degree akin that everywhere is the inscription, "One Mind contrived, one Hand did the work." There was a vast previous work of God amongst lower creatures in arranging for Adam the first. There was a more wonderful preparation amongst men for Adam the Second. Now the fulness of time is being occupied in making the descendants of the first Adam brothers and sisters of the Second Adam, that they may dwell above the stars in the nearer glory of God for ever.

JOSEPH W. REYNOLDS.



ART. II.—THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF 'ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ IN THE LORD'S PRAYER.

A DEEPLY interesting paper by the Rev. A. H. Wratislaw appeared in the pages of THE CHURCHMAN of July on ἐπιούσιος, which produced further evidence in support of the view maintained by the learned Bishop of Durham in his well-known essay on the passage. Feeling sure that all true students of Scripture always welcome the *audi alteram partem*, I venture, with all respect for the learning and painstaking investigations of the great scholars who support the derivation of ἐπιούσιος from εἶναι, to advance some arguments in behalf of the alternative derivation from εἶναι (οὐσία).

The preliminaries of the discussion are already before our readers, and need not be repeated; it will be enough to recapitulate for the sake of perspicuity the cardinal points on which the question hinges, and then submit them to a fair examination.

The word ἐπιούσιος stands in utter solitude. It is nowhere else found, either in classical or Hellenistic usage, except in the

two places in the Gospels and, of course, in Patristic quotations of these passages. Its derivation is uncertain, and hence its precise meaning also. It may be derived from *ivai*, and refer to the future in *time*, or from *ivai*, and refer to the supply of our *wants*. The first step in our endeavour to arrive at a decision will be to investigate how the word was represented in the early translations of the Gospels. The Syriac testimony claims the first place in evidence, as it was in that language (as most scholars are of opinion) that our Lord conversed with His disciples, and revealed to them the great lessons of His mission. The Syriac Gospels are of the highest value in this point of view, because they must either retain the very words which the Divine Teacher uttered, or else, if translated back again from a Greek copy, would recall the original words, or give a rendering which we cannot doubt, at that early age, while the language was a spoken one, would be known to be a proper equivalent. But here a difficulty meets us at the outset. There are two very ancient Syriac texts, the one known as the Peshito, which may be called the Authorized Syriac Version, and the fragments of the Gospels known as the Curetonian, so called after the name of their learned editor. Much controversy has gathered round these documents as to the priority and purity of their respective texts. No one can read these two authorities side by side without seeing, I think, that they come from separate sources, and that one could not be an edition of the other; among the many differences that distinguish these versions our word is one. In the former it is represented by *d'sunkonan*, "of our necessity," and in the latter by *amino*, generally rendered "continual;" the later Syriac versions follow the Peshito. In the Gospel according to the Hebrews St. Jerome tells us, in his Comm. in Matt. vi. 11: "Instead of *supersubstantial* bread I found *מחר*, that is to say, *of the morrow*; making the sense, "Our bread of the morrow" (that is, of the future) "give us to-day."¹ This strange rendering seems to be preserved in the Memphitic version, and the Thebaic gives also a future sense. The old Latin versions appear to have translated the word by *quotidianum*, "daily," but in St. Matthew's Gospel, St. Jerome, in his revision, changed this into *supersubstantialem*. It will thus be seen that the Peshito, and later Syriac and St. Jerome favoured the derivation from *ivai*, *subsistence*, and the Curetonian Syriac, the Hebrew Gospel, the two Egyptian versions, and the old Latin the derivations from *ivai*; the one class regarding the *need of food*, and the other the *time of its supply*. Can we trace with any probability the sources of this dif-

¹ See Nicholson's "Gospel according to the Hebrews," p. 44.

ference? The original word which fell from the lips of the Lord we cannot decide, but it would seem that the compilers of the two Syriac versions, probably finding a difficulty in the word, traced its supposed connection to two distinct sources. What are they? As we find the adverb *aminoith* in Numb. iv. 7, in the Syriac, as a translation of the Hebrew תמיד ("the continual bread"), it has been thought that there is good ground for supposing that the Curetonian translator derived his rendering, *amino*, from that source, and identified the bread which we ask for *continually* with that bread which was *continually* set before the presence of God (see Lev. xxiv. 8). Can we trace with any probability the origin of the Peshito interpretation? Perhaps only approximately—still, I think we can approximately. In Prov. xxx. 8, as we have seen, there is a prayer that has direct reference to our temporal wants; the petitioner asks for neither poverty nor riches, and adds, לחם חקי, *feed me with food convenient for me*—literally, *bread of my statute*, or of my appointment, *i.e.*, the bread which Thou hast appointed for me. The LXX. rendered this, לחם חקי by τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ ἀράρη, *the things necessary and the things sufficient*. Aquila, in his translation, gives ἄγρον ἀκριβασμῶν μου, "bread of my strict observance;" Symmachus, διαίταν ἰκανήν, "sufficient maintenance;" and the Latin Vulgate, *victui meo necessaria*. The Peshito-Syriac renders by *umro mesti*, "habitation of my sufficiency," *i.e.*, sufficient shelter. When we compare the language of the Lord's Prayer with that of the prayer in the Proverbs, it is true that we do not find the same word used, but the meaning is so near, and the sense in which the passage in Proverbs was understood by the various translators so entirely corresponds, that we may well suppose that our Lord, Who made many tacit references to the Book of Proverbs, had this prayer in His mind. At all events, the similarity in meaning forms a link between the two prayers, and will probably account for the interpretation of ἐπιούσιος in the Peshito version of the Gospels.

We now turn our attention to the word itself. Ἐπιούσιος is an adjective derived either from ἐπι and ἵνασι, and has a future sense, or from ἐπι and ἵνασι (οὐσία), and signifies *for subsistence* or *livelihood*. We have seen that translators in ancient days were divided on this subject. Let us examine the claims of each derivation. For the first the authority of the Curetonian Syriac is specially pleaded; it is, indeed, the sheet-anchor of this interpretation. It is claimed for this document that it is more ancient and reliable than the Peshito as we now have it.

The old Latin is urged on this side, though the interpretation is different; all that can be said is that it refers to *time*, and not to *need*, and the other early Oriental versions seem to favour the Curetonian traditions. But the crowning argument which was advanced by Canini and Grotius, and recently has been enforced with great learning by the Bishop of Durham, is that the first *iota* in the word must be elided if the second derivation is maintained; the word must be *επιούσιος*, and not *επιούσιος*. The Bishop shows by several examples that where *επι* in composition retains the *iota* before a vowel, the word with which it is compounded had originally the *digamma*, and therefore elision could not take place. Hence it must be derived from *επιέναι*, the *iota* belonging to the verb, and not to the preposition. 'Η *επιούσα* is constantly used for the *morrow*, or it may be for the *coming day* viewed from an early hour in the morning; and so our word will be an adjective formed from this phrase, and the prayer will mean, "Give us this day our bread of the morrow," or "of the coming day."

It is at this point, I conceive, that Mr. Wratlslaw's additional evidence and arguments should be noted. It appears that he practically discards the interpretation of the "morrow," and insists on *ἡ ἐπιούσα* signifying always the *on-coming day*—that is, the day which has already commenced. In proof of this he produces a passage from Aristophanes and another from Plato. These instances are of great interest, and it may be conceded that a fair and potent argument may be reared upon them as examples of classical usage. If not fully and finally convincing, they are, we admit, strong. But what concerns our inquiry most is the Hellenistic and Biblical usage. Here, I think, the argument entirely breaks down. The instance advanced by the learned writer is Acts xx. 15. His critical remarks upon it are fresh in the minds of our readers; but let it be remembered that this passage does not stand alone in this book. If the meaning of *ἡ ἐπιούσα* is restricted to the *on-coming day* in this place, it must have the same meaning in other places—at least, this seems to be the argument before us. We will submit this passage first to the test of the Syriac version. We find here all three of the words, *επιούση*, *ετέρα*, and *εχομένη*, rendered by *achrino*—i.e., *another day*. All we plead for is this—that if *επιούση* was the *same day*, it could not be *another day*. What says the Vulgate? The three words in question are rendered respectively, *sequenti*, *aliā*, and again *sequenti*. Let us turn to the other examples. In chapter vii. 26 we have the same phrase, *επιούση ἡμέρα*. Now, this is a quotation, and hence a translation, of Exod. ii. 13. What is the original? בַּיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי, "on the *second day*," and it is translated by the LXX. *επι δευτέρα*, by the Syriac, as

above, by *achrino*, and by the Vulgate *sequenti*. The original Hebrew and the LXX., the Syriac and Latin translations, made direct from the original, make the meaning to be *the morrow*, and surely St. Stephen must have meant the same in his quotation of the passage.

Again, in chapter xvi. 11 we read, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ εἰς Νεάπολιν κ. τ. λ. Here the Syriac and Vulgate present the same renderings as before. Once more, in chapter xxi. 18 the word is found where there can be no doubt that the morrow is intended, and here the Syriac and Latin use the same equivalents. There is only one passage in the Acts that furnishes a shadow of support—chapter xxiii. 11., τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτί, which, viewed from the day then present, occasions no difficulty. Ἡ ἐπιούσα may mean, possibly, in some places the *on-coming* day, and does mean the *after-coming* day; but certainly not the former only, to the exclusion of the latter. Moreover, it is a long step to take in the argument, that because ἡ ἐπιούσα may mean the *on-coming* day, that therefore the adjective ἐπιούσιος must be *derived* from this word and have this meaning, and that, too, in the face of other words which we shall produce. This derivation, at all events, must remain as yet unproven. Before closing this part of the subject it may be well to refer to the two places in the LXX. where this participle is found. In Deut. xxxii. 29 εἰς τὸν ἐπίοντα χρόνον is the translation of the Hebrew לְאַחֲרֵיתָם, “their latter end” (A.V. and R.V.); and 1 Chron. xx. 1, τῷ ἐπίοντι ἔτει, which is the translation לְעַת תְּשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה, “after the year was expired” (A.V.); “at the time of the return of the year” (R.V.). The latter is the literal rendering; it must mean the beginning of the next year, the spring-time. Neither of these places lends any support to the theory advocated by Mr. Wratistlaw.

We may now resort to the other arguments which have been advanced in favour of the derivation from *ἵνα*. It has been the fashion of late with some of our most learned critics at home and abroad to assume a recasting of the Greek text of the New Testament in the fourth century. They throw aside or undervalue the traditional text of Antioch, and set up that of Alexandria as supreme. The documentary evidence, however, of the former line has a connected history, and the latter has none. Its authority is based upon a theory derived from internal and comparative evidence. If such a revision took place, it must have been mentioned by some of the writers of the period, among whom were some of the greatest lights of the Church; and even if it were granted that such a revision did take place, the noted scholars of that day, who had before them all the testimony to be advanced for both, elected that text which finds so small favour in our times.

But the Peshito-Syriac belongs to this family, and so to account for this perplexing agreement the theorists proceed to assert that a contemporaneous revision took place also in the Syriac text. Of this, again, there is not an atom of historical evidence; and is it likely, we may ask, that two distinct branches of the Church, influenced hitherto by independent traditions, would not only revise the text in unison, but leave out passages and alter most important words without much debate and disagreement? Could such a revolution occur in days of controversy and mutual jealousies, and no trace of the struggle be recorded for after ages? Such a proceeding is in itself morally impossible, and the contemporaneous silence is inexplicable. The revision of the Latin text has transmitted its record of strife, why have not the Greek and the Syriac? Moreover, we have no proof that the Peshito gives a text posterior to the Curetonian. The two texts, as we have observed, are independent witnesses; the Peshito could not be derived from, or be a revision of, the Curetonian. Words and phrases embodying the same teaching are quite different, and there could be no purpose in wilfully changing the one for the other. They occupy the same position relatively to each other that the *textus receptus* of the Gospels does to the Manuscript of Beza. Further, it has been all but conclusively shown by Mr. Gwilliam, in his essay in the Oxford "Studia Biblica," that the Peshito text is the earlier one. No reliance can therefore be placed on the supposed superiority of the Curetonian fragments. To the Latin testimony we shall refer hereafter. But by far the most important feature in this inquiry is the presence of the *iota*. We may grant at once the force of the argument that words beginning with the *digamma* would retain, and words not so beginning would elide, the preceding vowel in ancient and classical Greek; but this rule may be considered capable of modification, if we remember that the word *ἰσθλας* was coined for this very place. It is a word without a preceding history. Who were the inventors of it? Were they learned grammarians? Could they be esteemed as philologists? St. Matthew, in whose Gospel the word originated, was a Jew and a tax-gatherer, and his companions, who with him used the prayer, were Galilean fishermen. What would they know about the *digamma*? Little is really known about it now, what should they have known about it then? What so natural that illiterate men, familiar with Syriac as their vernacular tongue, and having some acquaintance with Greek from their admixture with the Gentiles round them, should compose a word in the simplest form they could frame to embody the meaning they desired to convey? *ἰσθλα* is properly "being," a word which is in common

use among ourselves for the means of life and the necessities of life. Οὐσία appears in the Gospel of St. Luke (xv. 12, 13) in this sense, though it may be observed that in both Syriac versions it is represented by a different word altogether from those under discussion here, but it will serve to show that the word was known and so used in Apostolic times. But on the other hand, let us suppose that the word which our Lord employed was quite lost to memory, and that the Greek one only survived, then it will follow that the framers of a Syriac version would do their best to represent ἐπιούσιος in their language. They must have known what sense was attributed to the word traditionally among Christians; and the Peshito rendering has, as we have seen, quite as good, if not a better, claim than its rival, and we hold it to be most improbable that the Curetonian reading should be changed in both Gospels into that which now stands in the Peshito.

But here a question of a totally different nature is suggested. What is the meaning of *amino*, the Curetonian equivalent of ἐπιούσιος? Let us remember that the utmost that can be asserted is that it means *continual*, in *constant succession*. There is nothing about "to-morrow" or "the coming day," as such apart from the general idea of futurity. We may pass over the difficulty of praying for to-morrow's food on the previous day, and confine ourselves to the lesser difficulty of interpreting the word as referring to the day on which the petitioner has entered. The request for food for the coming day could only be made in an early morning prayer, but in the Gospels the form is prefaced by *ὅταν*, *Whenever thou prayest* (St. Matt. vi. 6), and *Whenever ye pray* (Luke xi. 2), which seems to forbid such a limitation. We are led on thus to examine whether there exists a real and substantial difference between the words found in the Peshito and the Curetonian in their respective meanings. It is true that the adjective found in the other passages where we meet with it in the New Testament bears the sense of "continual" and "constant" (see Rom. xii. 12; Phil. i. 3; 1 Tim. v. 23; and Acts xii. 5; 1 Tim. v. 5); but this meaning is mostly associated with *perseverance*, and both rest on the fundamental meaning of *trustworthy* and *reliable*. If we compare the Hebrew root, we shall find that **בָּנָה** signifies to make fast, or strong, to build, to maintain, foster, and bring up, and in the passive to be supported and made firm, and hence to be true and trustworthy. And the cognate adjective signifies sure, true, and firm. The Syriac verb, from which our adjective is derived, means to persevere and be *constant*, and in *Aphel* to trust and believe, and thus it will appear that the primary sense of our word is *certainty*, and that *continuance* is a secondary and

derived meaning. The Curetonian rendering therefore may imply nothing more than "Give us to-day bread on which we may rely." Thus the idea of *time*, as such, will vanish, and that of *certainly* of a supply of our wants take its place. Thus interpreted, the two witnesses will be found not to be at great variance with each other, and the Curetonian adjective will fail to supply a foundation for the superstructure that has been reared upon it. It may be, indeed, that from this double meaning of the Syriac word the confusion originally arose.

Another class of facts now calls for consideration. How was *ἐπιούσιος* understood by the Greek Fathers? Origen mentions both derivations, but prefers that from *οὐσία*, and interprets it mystically of spiritual food. It has been advanced that Origen invented this derivation from *οὐσία*, and that it obtained favour afterwards through his great authority; but the Peshito rendering existed long before Origen. Moreover, Origen's *mystical* interpretation severs him from the writers of the line of Antioch, who interpreted the word of our *bodily* wants. Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and other Greek writers, favour the same derivation. The chief point to be observed here is this; that it cannot be supposed that men of such attainments as these Fathers were, who were well versed in Greek as their vernacular tongue, and some of whom lived in the city which was so famed for its Greek grammarians, could have derived a word in an illegitimate manner. If the composition of the word from *ἐπι* and *οὐσία* had been so flagrantly wrong and untenable, they must have known it, and could not have built up their teaching on a patent error. The adjective *περιούσιος* appears to have been brought into use, perhaps coined, by the LXX., though the cognate noun was in classical use, and *ἐτερούσιος*, *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὁμοιούσιος* and *συνούσιος* (the corresponding noun of the last-named was in use, but in a different sense) were invented and introduced by the Church. These are all clearly derived from *οὐσία*; why should not the Evangelists, who chronologically stood midway between the two, have also introduced a like compound of *ἐπι* and *οὐσία*?

This may be the fitting place to suggest, as subsidiary to our argument, some probable references in Scripture. St. Paul seems to have in mind a kindred line of thought to this petition, and, if so, to support the meaning we are advocating, when in 1 Tim. vi. 8 he speaks of *εὐσέβεια μετὰ ἀνταρξίας*, and connects this *ἀνταρξία*, *sufficiency* or *contentment*, with *διατροφῆς καὶ σκεπάσματα*. And some further light may be gained from the high authority of St. James (ii. 15, 16), when he interprets *τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς* by *τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος*. The reference is unmistakable to the Lord's Prayer. There is some ground

for believing that St. James wrote his Epistle in Syriac, and the last phrase in the Peshito version of this Epistle is identical with the word in the Lord's Prayer, the difference being only one of gender. The Latin renderings are of secondary importance. There may be some difficulty in accounting for the old Latin *quotidianum*; at the best it must be a loose rendering. If the translator had understood ἐπιούσιος, as St. Jerome tells us the Hebrew Gospel did, as referring to the "morrow," why did he not render it by *panem crastinum*? Or if as referring to the "on-coming day," why not by *hodiernum*? *Quotidianum* is "daily" in the sense of as often as one day succeeds another, and if this simple continuance were only intended, why did not *futurum* serve his purpose? *Quotidianum* is certainly not a strictly literal translation of ἐπιούσιος, or of either of the Syriac words. With regard to *supersubstantialem*, which St. Jerome introduced in St. Matthew's Gospel, perhaps it has not been borne in mind that his intercourse with his first teacher in Hebrew, a Jewish convert, may have influenced him in this interpretation, as well as the opinion of Origen and others on the subject. It savours of an Oriental mode of thought, and may be compared with the "true bread," a meaning which borders close upon the Curetonian epithet, and the spiritual signification of the manna given "day by day" might contribute to this interpretation; as an exact translation it has but small claims.

It is worthy of notice that modern scholars of the highest rank have found no difficulty in deriving the word from οὐσία, though some have called attention to the objection presented by the *digamma*. Among these may be reckoned such names as Olshausen, Tholuck, Stier, Godet, Wordsworth, Alford, etc. Delitzsch, in his note on Prov. xxx. 8, maintains this derivation, and in his Hebrew New Testament renders ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον

of the Evangelists by לֶחֶם הַקֶּנוֹ ("bread of our allowance"), evidently connecting it with the prayer of Agur. The translators of the Prayer-Book of the English Church into Hebrew for the use of Jewish Christians present the same rendering. Strange to say, Dr. Lightfoot, the author of the "Horæ Hebraicæ," adopts the derivation from ἕναι, but quotes a passage from the Talmud which evidently favours the other view: "The necessities of Thy people Israel are many, and their knowledge small, so that they know not how to disclose their necessities; let it be Thy good pleasure to give to every man כְּדִי פִּרְנָסָתוֹ, what sufficeth for food, etc."¹

Lastly, is not internal evidence against the derivation from ἕναι, and in favour of that from οὐσία? Whatever may be said

¹ See Gandell's edition, vol. ii., p. 151.

to the contrary, is it not clear that the morrow is to take care of the things of itself? And can we believe that the petition should be read, "Give us this day the bread of the morrow"? or, as has been said above, could we restrict this prayer to early morning use only, "Give us this day bread for the coming day"? Or, if we could bring our minds to admit such a limitation, would it not be a tautology in so brief a sentence to have "this day" "for the coming day" thus crowded together? Again, "daily bread" can only mean the bread given us each day, as it comes, and is not the same tautology evident?

But derive the word from *opsis*, and all falls into order and good sense: *Give us this day bread for our being or support; supply our necessities.* The internal evidence counterbalances the external difficulties, which have been magnified. Before such an interpretation the question of a digamma on the lips of Galilean peasants surely vanishes.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

DULVERTON VICARAGE,
July, 1888.



ART. III.—"CLERGY AND THE MASSES."—THE CURATE QUESTION.

PART II.

WHATEVER may be said to the contrary, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the best interests of the Church of England, and of religion in general, are clearly associated with all questions touching the present and future supply of candidates for holy orders, and the position and prospects of the present assistant curates. We already number 7,000 licensed curates, and it is estimated, by those well qualified to form an opinion on the subject, that we ought to have almost double that number, in order that all parishes may be fairly supplied; but it has been pointed out, and it will be readily seen, that as the numbers of curates are increased in the Church, so are diminished the hopes of preferment of those who are now in the profession, because the increase in the number of benefices is not proportionate to the number of men ordained each year.

It may be said that, as a rule, if a man does his work fairly and honestly, if he is a man of fair average ability and shows an aptitude for parochial work, if he is a decent preacher, and if he is worth anything at all, he is sure to get preferment in no great length of time. This statement can be easily disproved. The time at which, upon an average, an un-