

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

1075 B

VOL. XXII.

JANUARY, 1918.

No. 1.

LUTHERANISM AND PURITANISM.¹⁾

Four hundred years have elapsed since Dr. Martin Luther nailed his Ninety-five Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg. Through this chosen vessel of His the Lord brought about the reformation of His Church. We heartily thank Him, especially during this year of jubilee, for the deliverance He has thus granted us from the slavery of the Bishop of Rome. This is the great theme of innumerable sermons preached, of countless discussions carried on, and of numberless books and pamphlets written within the folds of the Protestant Church during these months of rejoicing. But we Lutherans are just as grateful to our God for having kept us in the faith again restored to His flock by the great Reformer, and for having guarded us against the deceit of the many false prophets that have gone out into the world since the days of Luther.

Among the many pernicious sects which sprang up in the countries blessed of God through the Reformation, the Puritan is one of the most conspicuous. A comparison of Lutheranism with Puritanism would therefore not be out of place nor without value to us at this time.

"Puritans" was the name given to such in England as were opposed to the Established Church of that country during

1) This article and the next one were prepared for a new edition of the commemorative volume of essays on the Reformation, *Four Hundred Years*. Since the new edition will not be forthcoming soon, we publish them here.

HO ARTOS HO EPIOUSIOS.

AN INQUIRY INTO MATT. 6, 11 AND LUKE 11, 3.

One of the most remarkable achievements of Luther was his translation of the Bible into German. The very fact that this statement has been made so frequently as to render it almost commonplace only goes to show how true it is. Luther's translation of the Scriptures was the first modern Bible-version sufficiently adequate in explication and expression to secure for it a worthy and abiding place on the book market of the world, and by careful revision, ceaseless emendation, and painstaking polishing on the part of the great Reformer and his distinguished coworkers, it has become not only the most satisfactory substitute for, but also by far the most serviceable commentary on, the Greek and Hebrew original, and withal an imperishable masterpiece of hermeneutic art and sound Scriptural interpretation. Unlike the English Authorized Version, which had passed through various stages of gradual development until it was cast into its final form by a select draft of representative scholars, Luther's version was wonderfully competent in its very first edition, though accomplished in a relatively brief space of time and under the stress of the most harassing events, while the final editions published under his supervision were as nearly perfect as human intelligence and assiduity could make them. How well Luther had per-

formed his task is evident from the fact that when modern German scholars attempted a revision of his version, they could make but few essential changes and still fewer real improvements, and in the rare cases where they gained in accuracy, they lost in force, elegance, or general intelligibility, so that to this day Luther's German Bible is still *the German Bible*, dear to the learned and the unlearned as the medium that conveys to them the thoughts and oracles of God in the most satisfactory way.

All this has been said before; and we repeat it merely for the sake of introducing a discussion which is to show how well Luther rendered the original even in places in which the exact meaning of the Greek and Hebrew could not be ascertained beyond doubt. Luther had a rare talent for ferreting out the latent meanings of obscure words and tangled phrases, and withal a prodigious capacity for linguistic comprehension, which, though frequently obliging him to cast the thoughts into new and different molds, preserved his renditions wonderfully true to the original.

In Matt. 6, 11 and Luke 11, 3 we have the Fourth Petition of the Lord's Prayer, a prayer which millions of Christians repeat several times each day. Yet, very few realize or remember that this petition contains a *crux* which has defied the skill and ingenuity of interpreters to this day. While the Lord's Prayer is exceedingly clear in its essential parts, being couched in the simplest terms, which even a child can readily understand, it contains one word the meaning of which has ever puzzled the scholars, from the very time when Jerome pored over the sacred text to the present hour, when the world is full of rare scholarship and philological facilities of every kind.

The Fourth Petition reads, according to Matthew: *Ton arton hemon ton epiouision dos hemin semeron*, while St. Luke has it thus: *Ton arton hemon ton epiouision didou hemin to kath' hemeran*. Though differing slightly in reading, the two petitions contain the same thought, which in general offers no difficulties; for having taught His disciples to ask for

spiritual gifts in three distinct petitions, the Savior now shows them how to pray for temporal things.

“Give us this day our . . . bread.” The gift for which the disciples, as well as all followers of Jesus, are to pray, is bread, *ho artos*, which, in its literal meaning, signifies *cibus, e farina cum aqua permixta, compactus et coctus* (Wilke-Grimm). However, in this connection, the expression comprises more than ordinary bread, and not only meat and drink in general, as in 2 Kings 6, 22, but as Luther correctly expounds in his explanation of the petition: “Everything that we need for the support and wants of the body, such as food and drink, clothing and shoes, house and home,” etc. Most interpreters have followed Luther in this conception of the word *artos*, and there seems to be no reasonable doubt that this indeed is the *sensus literalis*, the meaning intended by our Savior.

The substantive *ho artos* is modified by the pronoun *hemon*. Hence we are to pray for *our* bread, that is to say, the bread which *we* need for the support of *our* lives, and which in His infinite kindness God allots and vouchsafes to us.

That bread *God* the Father should *give* us. No matter how hard we have worked for it, the fact remains that we nevertheless owe it to the goodness of a kind Providence. Unless God deigns to grant it to us, we shall never have it, notwithstanding our greatest efforts to secure it.

Hence God must also give us our bread *daily*, and so we are to pray for it, according to the instruction of the Savior. *Semeron* and *to kath' hemeran* mean essentially the same thing: this day, *heute, quotidie*. The meaning thus far is clear. The prayer which Christians are to waft to the throne of God is: Give us this day our bread!

The difficulty lies with the expression by which the noun *ton arton* is further qualified: *ton epiousion*. We should pray not only for our bread, but for our bread which is *epiousios*. And, *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!* What is the meaning and force of that adjective? What further thought does it convey? Why did the Savior add it so emphatically? Again, did Luther

render it correctly when he translated it with *taeglich*, so that we really ask God for that kind of bread which the Savior intended us to solicit of Him?

Nor should we regard these questions as of little significance. We know that *pasa graphe theopneustos kai ophelimos pros didaskalian* (2 Tim. 3, 16), and that *ou dynatai lythenai he graphe* (John 10, 35); and if it is true that *eukopoteron esti ton ouranon kai ten gen parelthein e tou nomou mian keraian pesein* (Luke 16, 17), then each word of the Scriptures must be of the greatest importance, and it is our sacred duty, as interpreters and teachers of God's holy Word, to ascertain what He wishes to teach us by even seemingly unimportant terms. Now if that holds good with reference to the sentence: *Theoi este*, applied to those *pros hous ho logos tou Theou egeneto* (John 10, 35), then it must apply also to the expression *epiousios*, especially in so terse and concise a locution as the Lord's Prayer. *Epiouios* in this connection must have a definite meaning, and one distinguished both from that of the limiting modifier *hemon* and that of the adverbial modifier *to kath' hemeran* or *semeron*; and it must add to *artos* a particular force, different from that of *hemon* and *semeron*. The first is so clear as to require no further proof, and that *epiousios* is, in its literal meaning, not synonymous with *semeron* or an equivalent adjective becomes obvious when we take into consideration that, whenever the *koine* wishes to express something that is in itself, or is done, daily, it does so by using that word which properly means daily (cf. *te(i) diakonia(i) te(i) kathemerine(i)*, Acts 6, 1; *to kath' hemeran anakrinontes tas graphas*, Acts 17, 11), and neither in the *koine* nor in the classical literature of Greece does *epiousios* ever occur in the literal meaning of "daily." *Epiouios*, which is found only in the Fourth Petition, must therefore add to it some particular qualification not contained in the other adjective or adverbial modifiers.

The great question is, What *does epiouios* mean? In determining its meaning, we have hardly any hermeneutical

facilities to direct us, no elucidating context, either *antecedens* or *consequens*, no parallel reading, no *usus loquendi*, in fact, there is scarcely anything definite to shed light upon the term. Even the etymology of the word, in absence of the other helps, is reduced to mere conjecture. Nevertheless, the case is not hopeless, and we hope to be able to show that Luther was right in correcting Jerome's suggestion and restoring the word "täglich" to its place in Matthew, which in its Latin form it there occupied in the *Itala*, before the great western scholar substituted his fanciful, but impossible innovation.

As regards the etymology of *epiousios*, grammarians and lexicographers are divided into two classes, each upholding its own favorite derivation of the word. Grimm, in his *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, puts it thus: "*Epiusios*, *on*, vox solis locis Mt. 6, 11, Luc. 11, 3, in phrasi *artos epiousios* (. . . *Itala* = panis quotidianus) obvia, quam Origenes ne in vulgi quidem sermone usurpari ideoque ab evangelistis ipsis effictam videri docet. Origene, Hieronymo (solo Matthaei loco *barbare panem substantialem vertente*), Theophylacto, Euthymio, Zigabeno praeceuntibus multi, velut Beza, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Ewald, Bleek, Keim, Cremer [addimus: Pfeiffer, Stolberg, Korthold] explicant panem *sustentandae vitae inservientem*, vocem ab *ousia* deducentes e similitudine vocum *exousios*, *enousios*. Sed *ousia* perraro nec nisi in philosophico sermone idem est ac *hyparxis*. . . . Alia exempla praebet Bonitz, Index aristotel., p. 544; plerumque denotat aut *naturam*, *essentiam* (Substanz) aut *opes*, *facultates*, rem familiarem. Quam ob causam Leo Meyer . . . , Kamphausen . . . , quibus Weiss . . . , Keim . . . , Delitzsch . . . assentiuntur vocem ab *epeinai* et proxime quidem a ptcp. *epon*, *epousios*, . . . *epontios*, v. infra), *adesse*, repetere atque panem, *qui* — *praesto sit s. suppetat*, intelligere malunt, ut Christum chaldaice *lachma d'chuckkanah* (cf. *lechেম chukki, portio panis*, Prov. 30, 8) vel similiter dixisse conjiciendum sit." And to quote another authority, we read: "Et de originatione huius vocis, et de eo, quid per *arton epiousion* significetur, ampla est doctorum disceptatio. Stolberg, J. P. Pfeiffer, Kort-

hold, Marekius, qui ab *ousia* deducunt, vertunt *supersubstantialem*, quam vocem Hieronymus pro voce *quotidianum* Versioni Italicae inseruit, hodieque ea in Vulgata legitur, et occasionem praebuit interpretandi hunc panem de pane spirituali, ipso Christo et gratia Dei. Cui sententiae post plures doctores antiquos etiam favit aliquando Lutherus. . . . *Verum Lutherus mutavit hanc suam sententiam in Catechismis.*"

In these citations we have the view of the first class of very able and distinguished grammarians. They derive *epiousios* from the preposition *epi*, *ad*, and either *ousia* or *epeinai*. Both derivations are grammatically possible, though the first is improbable, and in both cases the meaning would be the same: *panis, qui praesto sit s. suppetat*, hence, *panis necessitatis nostrae, i. e., panis nobis necessarius*, as the ancient Syriac version has it; or "*panis, welches epi ten ousian, das ist, zum Bestehen und zur notduerftigen Erhaltung unsers Lebens, erforderlich ist.*" (Dietrich, *Institutiones Catecheticae*, translated by Dr. Notz.) This view induced Delitzsch, in his Hebrew translation of the New Testament, to render *ton arton ton epiouision* with *eth-lechem chukkeni*, while all modern versions, so far as we were able to verify, have followed Luther's rendition, offering their equivalent for the Latin term "*quotidianum.*"

Now, while this derivation is possible and its meaning in accord with the *analogia fidei*, having in its favor even a kind of parallel reading (*sc.*, Prov. 30, 8), it is nevertheless open to criticism and another class of equally reliable grammarians has violently assailed it, offering vital objections. We again refer the reader to Grimm's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, where we find them stated thus: "*Sed huic sententiae pariter atque antea memoratae, ut alia taceamus, id maxime obstat, quod, etsi littera i in epi in quibusdam vocibus (ut epiorkos, epiorkeo, epiossomai al.) ante vocalem retinetur, semper tamen in epeinai ab eoque deductis epousia, epousiothes, eliditur*"; while the authority whom we quoted above says: "*Et indoli Graecae linguae conformior est derivatio a participio verbi*

epeimi, venio, accedo, epion, epiousa, epion, sicut *ethelousios* ex *ethelon* est, et ipsae illae voces *periousios, homoiousios* etc. a participiis rectius deducuntur, quam ab *ousia*, quia *a-purum, non in -ios, sed in -odes vel -aios sua derivata format*, et *epi* suum *iota* tunc solet amittere." Hence, the objections to this derivation are purely grammatical, being based on the usual elision of the *i* in words compounded with *epi* and *ousia* or *epinai*, and on the difference of the termination which according to the regular formation should be *odes* or *aios*. Besides this, the derivation of *epiousios* from *epinai* seems the more natural and logical, a fact which is emphasized by Winer, who says: "Unter den Adjektiven, welche von andern Adjektiven (Partizipien) gebildet sind, finden sich einige bemerkenswerte, naemlich *periousios* und *epiousios*, wie *ekousios, ethelousios*, welche aus *ekon* und *ethelon* in der Weise fortschreitend sich herausgebildet haben wie die Feminina *hekousa, ethelousa; epiousios* aber steht wohl in bestimmter Beziehung auf das Femininum (*he*) *epiousa*, sc. *hemera*, und *artos epiousios* heisst demnach das fuer den folgenden Tag gehoerige Brot." With regard to the derivation of the word from *epeinai* he remarks: "Die grammatisch moeglich waere; vgl. *enousios*." Benseler, in his *Woerterbuch*, defines *epiousios* as "the bread fuer den folgenden Tag bestimmt, 'taeglich,' hinreichend." Stock (*Clavis Ling. S. Novi Testamenti*), after giving the definition: "*panis ad sustentandam substantiam pertinens*," adds the words: "*adveniens, adventitius, accessorius, superveniens*," and supra *eimi* from *ienai*, where he again refers to *epiousios*, he explains the expression in the following way: "*Artos epiousios est panis adventitius, accessorius, superveniens, futurus, qui . . . spirituali nostrae necessitati velut adjicitur atque supervenit. . . . Nam panis, et quicquid nobis alendis sustentandisque necessarium, non est primarium illud, quod petere debemus, sed adventitium quid. Redditur in Vulgata quotidianus. Nec inepte, ut putatur. Nam epeimi significat etiam sequi, succedere. Jam quod quotidianum est, perpetuam habet successionem, ita, ut hesterno hodiernum succedat. Sequenti*

etiam sufficiens tempori est, et ad sequentes etiam pertinet dies, ut panis quotidianus eodem dicatur sensu, quo dici solet: *Er hat seinen taeglichen Unterhalt*, ubi sane non de uno, sed de sequentibus etiam diebus intelligitur. In eadem sententia est Barnesius, nam scribit . . . ita: *ho kath' hemeran bios* idem, qui in litteris nostris, oratione nempe dominica, *epiousios artos* dicitur." To this, however, Stock objects by adding: "Ego vero existimo, interpretationi huic adversari *particulam semeron, quae tum manifeste redundaret,*" and in great despair, apparently, he bids farewell to the puzzling proposition by a suggestion which brings him far away from the etymological meaning of *epiousios*: "Igitur malim *arton epiousion* intelligere de *pane proprio*, ut sententia verborum haec sit: Gib uns heute unser eigenes Brot, von dem wir sagen koennen, dass wir es erworben haben, nicht anderer Leute Brot." Matthew Henry defines *ton arton ton epiousion* as "*the bread for the day approaching, for all the remainder of our lives, bread for the time to come, or . . . bread for our being and subsistence.*" Dieterich discusses the question at length, in his *Inst. Cat.*, and as his discussion sheds some light on the difficult question, we shall quote him in full: "Welches die urspruengliche Bedeutung des Wortes *epiousios* sei, darueber sind die Vaeter geteilter Ansicht. Um die Schwierigkeit zu heben, hat Hieronymus . . . das hebraeische Evangelium Matthaei, welches bei den Nazaracern zu Berrhoea aufbewahrt wurde, nachgeschlagen und darin das Wort *machar* gefunden, welches *morgen* bedeutet, und mit dem Artikel *dimachar*: *das Morgende*. Dann waere der eigentliche Sinn dieser Bitte: *Unser morgendes Brot gib uns heute*. Diese Ansicht zieht Angelus Caninius allen andern vor und sucht sie mit den Worten Christi zu beweisen, mit welchen dieser den Frommen verboten hat, fuer den morgenden Tag zu sorgen. Um uns dieses aengstlichen Sorgens gaenzlich zu entheben, gebiete Christus, man solle den Vater bitten, dass er unserer Schwachheit sich annehme *und uns tags zuvor schon geben wolle, was wir am folgenden Tag beduerfen*. Er fuegt noch hinzu, dass bei keinem griechischen Schrift-

steller *epiousios* bedeute: *taeglich*; auch koenne man es nicht erklaren im Sinne von: zum Bestehen notwendig oder vielmehr von: mehr als zum Bestehen notwendig (supersubstantialis); denn dann muesste es lauten *hyperousion* oder *ousiode* oder wenigstens *epousion*. . . . Das ist richtig. Denn das Wort kommt her nicht von *on* und *eimi* (ich bin), sondern von *ion*, dem Partizipium des Zeitworts *eimi* (ich gehe), wovon *epeimi* gebildet ist. Auch findet sich das Wort *epiousios* in der Apostelgeschichte mehrmals in demselben Sinne gebraucht, naemlich 7, 26; 16, 11; 20, 15; 21, 18; 23, 11, wo es heisst *te(i) epiouse(i) hemera(i)*, das heisst: *am folgenden Tag.*” But also Dietrich closes his remarks with an admission of defeat by saying: “Doch wir ueberlassen dies den Gelehrten zur genaueren Untersuchung.” Grimm summarizes the whole question thus: “Quapropter multo rectius Grotius, Scaliger, Westenius, Fischer, . . . Valekernarius, Fritzschius, . . . Winer, . . . Bretschneider, Wahl, Meyer al. comparatis vocibus *hekousios, ethelousios, gerousios* (ab *hekon, ethelon, geron* pro *hekontios, ethelontios, gerontios, . . .*) adjectivum *epiousios* effictum esse conjiunt ex *epion, epiousa*, ut respiciatur ad notissimum illud *he epiousa . . . et artos epiousios* sit idem ac *artos tes epiouses hemeras, victus ad crastinum diem spectans, i. e., necessarius aut sufficiens*. Optime ita sibi respondent *epousion* et *semeron* atque ille animi sensus significatur, qui *victu ab uno ad alterum diem sufficiente* pie contentus in petendis a Deo alimentis extremam proxime futuri temporis necessitatem non egreditur. Quae explicatio etiam eo commendatur, quod teste Hieronymo in evangelio secundum Hebraeos vocis *epiousios* locum explevit aram. *mahar*, quod dicitur *crastinus*, unde Christus ipse chaldaice *lah'man di l'mahar* dixisse videtur. Neque precatio ita intellecta menti Christi Matth. 6, 34 expressae adversatur, sed apprime ei congruit; nam summum numen rogare jubentur auditores, ut *ipsis cura diei insequentis adimatur.*”

We have quoted the above authorities in order to show not only how difficult the solution of the problem seems to be, but,

above all, to make it clear how much misunderstanding, confusion, and downright ignorance exists on this one expression which daily passes over the lips of millions of Christians. And if that is the case, then the term is certainly worthy of examination and study, in order to find a way in which to make its meaning clear beyond a reasonable doubt if that be possible. Nor are the difficulties insurmountable, if approached in a rational way. The great thing for us to do is, not to increase the height of the mountain by piling others on top of it, a thing that occurs only too frequently in cases of this kind. In order to gain a start, and arrive at a satisfactory meaning of the word, it might be well to ascertain what *epiousios* cannot mean, or at least, is likely not to mean in this connection. Now, in the first place, it is clear that *epiousios* does not mean *transubstantialis*, for that suggestion is an outrage against every rule of sound grammatical interpretation. In the second place, it does not mean *panem necessitatis nostrae*, at least not literally. Prov. 30, 8, though similar in content and form, is *not* a parallel reading to Matt. 6, 11 or Luke 11, 3; hence we have no right to force the expression *lechem chukki* on *epiousios*, tempted though we may be, and *epiousios*, though we admit the combination of *epi* with *ousia* to be possible, does not mean *panis nobis necessarius*; that thought the *koine* would have expressed in a different and clearer manner. (Cf. Acts 2, 45; 4, 35; Heb. 10, 36; Luke 10, 42; John 13, 29.) In the third place, the derivation of *epiousios* from *epi* and *ousia* is, to say the least, rather improbable, as it is contrary to the usual way adjectives are formed, and involves a twofold deviation from the rules governing such cases, rules which were so deeply rooted in the spirit and nature of the Greek idiom that we can hardly believe that they were transgressed in order to form the new term *epiousios*. If the word would read *epousios* or *epousiodes*, the case would be reversed, and the burden of proof would rest with those denying the derivation. Apart from this difficulty, there is another one of a different kind. Why should we pray so emphatically for *arton epi ten ousian*?

Or is there any bread which is not *epi ten ousian*? We at least know of none. So far as we know all bread is *panis sustentandae vitae inserviens*. But this is evidently not the meaning which these grammarians wish to have expressed by *epi ten ousian*. Hence Dietrich says: "Zweitens: Brot, welches *epi ten ousian*, das ist, zum Bestehen und zur notduerftigen Erhaltung unsers Lebens erforderlich ist." So *artos ho epiousios* is to convey the idea that we should not pray for *much* bread, or for riches of bread, but only for so much as we need for our *subsistence*. Now, this beautiful thought, so often inculcated upon us in the Scriptures (Prov. 30, 8; Matt. 6, 32, 33; Col. 3, 2; 1 John 2, 15), is already implied in the very term bread; for by teaching us to pray for bread only, which was the staff of life also in ancient times, the Savior obviously intended to show that we are to ask only for *necessary temporal gifts*. Moreover, that thought is contained also in the modifier *hemon*; for *our* bread is evidently the bread which is necessary for our maintenance and support. Even the adverb *semeron* emphasizes that idea; for by petitioning for *daily* bread only, it is clear that we are to ask for only such things as we need to *kath' hemeran*, that is, every day, and that again means that we should not ask to be laden with the thick clay of superfluous earthly goods. These objections obtain also with regard to the derivation of *epiousios* from *epi* and *einai*, in the sense of *adesse*, or *panis, qui praesto sit seu suppetat*. Instead of proving in its favor, the whole petition, with its well-chosen and pregnant expressions, argues against such a derivation.

Now, if *epiousios* cannot be derived from *epi* and *einai* or *ousia*, there is but one other alternative, namely, to derive it from *epi* and *ion*, a derivation which is not only quite possible, but also very plausible and highly probable. In fact, after all has been said, and every *pro* and *con* carefully weighed and considered, this seems to be the only sound etymology for *epiousios*. It impresses itself at once upon the unbiased mind as true, and leaves the impression of truth and credibility, even though reliable authorities incline to the former view. As soon

as we hear the word *epiousios*, we think of a similar expression which we frequently meet with in the New Testament, namely, the term *he epiousa*, either standing alone, or followed by the noun *hemera*. (Cf. Acts 7, 26; 16, 11; 20, 15; 21, 18; 23, 11.) No doubt, Winer is right when he says: "*Epiousios* steht wohl in bestimmter Beziehung auf das Femininum (*he*) *epiousa*, sc., *hemera*." So likewise Grimm with his definition: "*Artos epiousios* est idem ac *artos tes epiouses hemeras, victus ad crastinum diem spectans*"; or Dietrich: "Denn das Wort kommt her nicht von *on* und *eimi* (ich bin), sondern von *ion*, dem Partizipium des Zeitworts *eimi* (ich gehe), wovon *epeimi* gebildet ist."

Still, while this derivation seems plausible, the meaning of *epiousios*, as defined by these grammarians, is not so. This Winer gives as: "*das fuer den folgenden Tag gehoerige Brot*." Now, it is clear that this cannot be the meaning of *epiousios*; for it is inconsistent with the adverbial modifier *semeron*. The question is: Why should God give us the bread of to-morrow to-day? The very expression *to kath' hemeran* or *semeron* implies that we should be satisfied with asking for the bread which we need to-day. Nor is Dietrich's explanation satisfactory: "Um uns dieses aengstlichen Sorgens gaenzlich zu entheben, gebiete Christus, man solle den Vater bitten, dass er unserer Schwachheit sich annehme und uns tags zuvor schon geben wolle, was wir am folgenden Tag beduerfen." By our praying for the bread of to-morrow we do the very thing against which Christ has warned us in Matt. 6, 34: "*Me oun merimneste eis ten aurion; he gar aurion merimnesei heautes. Arketon te(i) hemera(i) he kakia autes*." Nor does the explanation of Stock convince sufficiently: "*Artos epiousios* est panis adventitius, succedens, accessorius, superveniens, futurus, qui . . . spirituali nostrae necessitati velut adjicitur atque supervenit." That is true enough, still the thought is so foreign to the context, as well as the word *epiousios* itself, that it impresses itself upon the mind as being far-fetched and strained. Again, if we accept Grimm's definition: "*victus ab uno ad alterum diem sufficiens* —

taeglicher Unterhalt," then Stock's objection obtains: "Ego vero existimo interpretationi huic adversari particulam *semeron*, quae tum manifeste redundaret." Hence when *epiousios* is brought into connection with *epiousa*, the following day, a meaning results which in some way invariably proves objectionable, and therefore, when Grimm defines *arton epiousion* as "*victum ad crastinum diem spectantem*," he immediately adds: "*i. e., necessarium aut sufficientem*," thus suggesting the same meaning given by those scholars who derive the word from *epi* and *ousia*, and we are as far from a definite etymological meaning as ever.

However, there is one alternative which the above authorities seem to have overlooked, though they were very near it. In order to ascertain this meaning, let us leave the Greek text and try to ascertain the original text of the Fourth Petition. Grimm says: "*Epiousios*, vox, . . . quam Origenes ne in vulgi quidem sermone usurpari ideoque ab evangelistis ipsis *effictam* videri docet." According to Origen, *epiousios* is a word which was not found in the Greek idiom before, but was especially coined, in order to express an idea heretofore clothed in words of another tongue. Now, that language was either Hebrew or Aramaic, presumably the latter; for, no doubt, in His conversation with uneducated Galilean fishermen, whom He had called to be His disciples, the Savior employed that language which they properly claimed as their *langue maternelle*. And that was Aramaic; for although Hebrew was still known to the scribes and doctors of the Law, it was practically unintelligible to the lower strata of the Jewish population at Christ's time. (Cf. the relation of Sanscrit to the popular dialects of India to-day.) Again, when the apostles after Pentecost preached the Gospel of salvation to the Jews in Palestine, and especially in Jerusalem, they used the same language which was dear to the common people, and they reproduced the Fourth Petition—to name a particular instance on which our attention is now concentrated—in *ipsissimis verbis* of the Savior. Hence, thus far Matthew had no difficulties in teaching this petition,

for he used the words of Christ, and these were readily understood by the Jews.

The great difficulty arose when Matthew was to recast his original Hebrew thoughts in a language altogether different from his mother tongue. He had to express thoughts for which there were *no synonyms in Greek*, and had to render words for which he could find no equivalents. The difficulty was all the greater as the original was Semitic, while the new idiom was Aryan. Hence it is clear that the expression *epiousios*, which was unknown in classical Greek, is indeed *vox ab evangelista ipso efficta*.

However, the question now is: Which was the original expression used by Matthew in either Hebrew or Aramaic, and before this, by the Savior? Dietrich says: "Um diese Schwierigkeit zu heben, hat Hieronymus das hebraeische Evangelium Matthaei, welches bei den Nazaraeern zu Berrhoea aufbewahrt wurde, nachgeschlagen und darin das Wort *machar* gefunden, welches *morgen* bedeutet und mit dem Artikel *di machar: das morgende*." This sheds sufficient light upon the original expression to enable us to reconstruct it quite correctly.

But before doing so, we might say a few words about the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, concerning which there are so many legendary reports. The usual claim is that Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, translating it, at some later period, into Greek for the benefit of the Jews living in the Diaspora, and unacquainted with either Hebrew or Aramaic. However, a careful study of the Greek Gospel goes far to convince one that the Gospel of St. Matthew is no translation, but, rather, an original work, conceived and executed in Greek. At the same time Matthew must either have written a Hebrew Gospel Himself, or had it written by some scribe, or it may be that some scribe of his own accord wrote down the Gospel preached by Matthew, giving it the title: Matthew's Gospel. This claim he could rightly put forth, for the Gospel was indeed that of Matthew, as, no doubt, the evangelist narrated the miracles

and works of Christ according to a certain form and outline. As our reason for this conjecture we may state that the legends concerning the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew are too well substantiated as to permit them to be rejected as altogether mythical and spurious.

But to proceed. Jerome then saw a copy of this Hebrew Gospel, and found in it the expression *machar*, or *di machar*, in the place where the Greek text has *epiousios*. The little particle *di* proves that this Hebrew Gospel was really an Aramaic one, and therefore Grimm says: "Quae explicatio etiam eo commendatur, quod teste Hieronymo in evangelio secundum Hebraeos vocis *epiousios* locum explevit aram. *machar*, quod dicitur *crastinus*, unde Christus ipse chaldaice *lahman di l'mahar* dixisse videtur." Grimm's reconstructed Aramaic phrase is no doubt correct, as we shall see anon; but we shall for the present omit the particle *le*. For the report is that Jerome found *machar* only,—at least so much we know definitely,—with possibly the particle indicating the relation of the genitive, *di*. Hence we have *lahman di mahar*, the equivalent for the Hebrew *lechem hammachar*. This, however, is the common Semitic combination of *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum*, which ordinarily expresses the same relation which in the Aryan languages is expressed by the use of the genitive. The question is: What special relation does the *nomen rectum* here have to the *nomen regens*? Many, we know, are possible in cases of this kind. Gesenius-Kautsch says: "Das Nomen rectum stellt dar: a) einen sogenannten gen. subj.; b) einen sogenannten gen. obj.; c) einen sogenannten gen. partitivus; d) einen sogenannten gen. explicativus oder epeexegeticus," etc. Now, as we have seen before, the expression cannot mean: *bread of to-morrow*, or *to-morrow's bread*; neither can it reasonably mean: *bread intended for to-morrow*, or: *bread used on the morrow*, for both conflict with Matt. 6, 34 and with the very adverb *semeron* used in the petition. Hence the relation of the *nomen rectum* to the *nomen regens* cannot be that of the

gen. subj. or obj.; but neither that of the gen. partitivus or gen. epexegeticus, as lies on the surface.

There is but one relation left which properly belongs neither to the relation of gen. obj. nor gen. epexegeticus, but examples for which Gesenius has grouped either under the one or the other. We refer to expressions like these: *derech ez hachajjim*, Gen. 3, 24, the way to the tree of life; *derech hajjam*, Is. 8, 23, the way to the sea; *shebuath J'hovah*, 1 Kings 2, 43, the oath directed to Jehovah; *sibchei Elohim*, Ps. 51, 19, sacrifices pleasing to God; *bammajim mei aphasajim*, Ezek. 47, 3—5, water extending to the ankles, to the loins, etc. (Gesenius-Kautsch, Hebr. Gramm., p. 422.) Cf. also Prov. 7, 27; Job 38, 20. Of very special interest is also the expression *lachaz: lechem lachaz umajim* = *Drangsalsbrot, Drangsalswasser*, 1 Kings 22, 27; 2 Chron. 18, 26, cf. Is. 30, 20: *lechem zar* (Gesenius, Woerterbuch, sub. *lachaz*).

Now, in all these cases we have *nomina recta*, which describe something *extending to a certain terminus ad quem* (*Ziel*). And that seems to be the relation expressed by the expression *lechem hammachar*—*the bread of the morrow*. (Cf. *lechem lachaz* or *lechem zar*.) The meaning would then be: *the bread which extends to the morrow, not from day to day*, as some would have it, but to quote Grimm with a little modification: *panis ad crastinum sufficiens, bread sufficient till to-morrow*—*das bis zum Morgen hinreichende Brot*.

This suggestion readily explains the forming of so unusual an expression as *epiousios*; in fact, there was hardly any other alternative, unless by way of paraphrase. The evangelist found two Greek words, well known and both having definite *usus loquendi*, namely, the verb *epeimi* and the Greek word for the morrow, *he epiousa*, and from this he constructed a new adjective to express the original idea of *bread reaching unto the morrow*. That Grimm so understood the *nomen rectum* is clear from the fact that he added to it the prefix *le*, making the expression read *lahman di l'mahar*; cf. the Hebrew *lechem l'machar* =

bread till the following day. This prefix, however, expresses the *terminus ad quem*, or to use the words of Gesenius: "Es wird gebraucht als das Exponent des Akkusativs (*Zielakkusativ*).” We may add a few German expressions which remind us strongly of the Hebrew combination of *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum*, and express the same relation as the Hebrew expressions. A *Knierock* is a coat extending to the knees; a *Wolkenturm*, a tower extending to the clouds; the *Heimweg* is the way leading to one's home, etc.

But now a new question arises. Why should the Savior teach His disciples to pray for bread *lasting till the next day*, or *bread sufficient to reach as long as the day*? This thought may not have seemed as superfluous to the population of the ancient world as it does to us, but there may be a time, especially if the present prices for foodstuffs should continue to soar in the same ratio as in the recent past, when even American mothers and fathers will learn to pray with ardor and fervency: Give us this day bread enough to feed our little ones till the next day. We Americans are thoroughly spoiled in every way. God has bestowed upon us the riches of His inestimable goodness in so lavish a way that the thought never occurs to us that our bread might not last as long as the day. Our cellars and larders are stored with provisions and supplies of every kind, far in advance of the necessity of using them. Winter approaching, mother puts down immense quantities of preserves, jellies, sweets, and so forth, of every description, while father gets busy buying potatoes and vegetables and flour, etc. And we are not only a rich, but also a very *cautious* and *provident* nation. As a nation we believe in preparedness, if not for war, at least for the satisfaction of the wants of the stomach. Our miserably cold and inclement climate has made us such; for unless we would do this, at least half of the present population of the United States living in the extreme northern States would starve. Now, conditions in Palestine at Christ's time were quite different. The country of the Jews was no

longer rich and productive, but, largely in consequence of economic conditions, it had become wretchedly poor, much as it is to-day, and so were the inhabitants, especially the common people, who later on largely constituted the Christian churches. The evangelists give us a few, but very interesting glimpses into these conditions, and we are deeply moved whenever we read John 21, 3—5: "Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a-fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing. But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? (Kinder, habt ihr nichts zu essen?) They answered him, No." And this "no" explains the reason why Peter went fishing, and why his fellow-disciples were so eager to go with him. As a matter of fact their provisions were exhausted, and though the evening was come, they had nothing to eat. For people so wretchedly poor, and living so frugally, it meant very much *to have this day sufficient bread to reach till the following one*. Again, the people of Palestine were not only poor, but also very improvident, somewhat, if not very, similar to our Southern fellow-citizens of color. They made no provision for the wants of the following day, even for those of the coming night, just as many negroes and poorer whites do down South. Hence, when the angel of the Lord appeared to Abraham with his two companions, we are told that he hurried to the tent of Sarah, bidding her to make ready three measures of fine meal, and to make cakes upon the hearth, while he himself hastened to the herd to order the shepherd to slay and prepare a calf for the late and unexpected supper of the guests. The fact is that Abraham, though being a wealthy man, had not a morsel of bread in the whole caravansary, and it was well for him to have at least the "makings" of *artos epiousios*. People poorer than he were in a sorer plight whenever unexpected guests arrived. Of this the Savior has drawn a lesson

in Luke 11, 5. 6: "And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him." Such cases may have occurred very often, as the ancient world, especially in the East, was unacquainted with that extremely modern and convenient institution of traveler's delight, the modern hotel, and to this day it is regarded in the East as an unpardonable outrage to refuse a stranger the benefit of bed and board. Hence it must have meant very much to the primitive people of olden times to have *artos epiousios*, *bread sufficient for the day*, and lasting till the next morning, with its new cares and worries and opportunities to work, arrived; and if God should visit our country with times only a little harder than they are now, we may learn to appreciate this thought somewhat better than we do now. However, that meaning impresses itself upon ourselves still more forcibly when we take into consideration the many things that we need for the support and wants of the body, and which are implied in the term *artos*, such as clothing and shoes, house and home, fields and cattle, money and goods, a pious spouse, pious children, pious and faithful rulers, good government, peace, health, discipline, good weather, honor, good friends, faithful neighbors, and the like. Verily, we have every reason to ask God not to deny us these while the day lasts, for we surely have need of them before the next day dawns.

Now, if our suggestion obtains and *epiousios* means *ad crastinum diem sufficiens*, then Luther could find no better word with which to render this thought into modern parlance than the word which he put in substitution for Jerome's translation *transubstantialis*, and "daily bread" is not a vague and indefinite version, but the most accurate and adequate rendering, perfectly expressing the thought which the Savior wished to express by *ho artos ho epiousios*.

Ottawa, Ill.

J. T. MUELLER.