

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 Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

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

EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ
EQ

Evangelical Quarterly

**An International Review
of Bible and Theology**
in Defence of the Historic Christian Faith

Vol. LXXXIV No. 2 April 2012

Editors: I Howard Marshall, John-Paul Lotz,
John G F Wilks



A searchlight on daily bread (Matthew 6:11)

J. Duncan M. Derrett

Professor Derrett continues to react to problems in the New Testament. His last article in the Evangelical Quarterly was 'Preaching to the Coast (Mark 4:1)' (EQ 73 [2001], 195 – 205).

Key words: Bread, Epiousios, Lord's Prayer, Word, Isa.55: 1-4, Matt. 6:11, John 6: 27-54.

Introduction

The New Testament has so many problems, and some are thought to be insoluble. A seventeenth century author described the arena in which grammarians and theologians were debating the meaning of *epiousion*¹ in Matt. 6.11, Luke 11:3 and Didache 8:2 as a torture chamber. Alas, research along conventional lines will not supply an answer. But we are not exonerated from a duty to try. If the grammarians seem to have won battles they have not won the campaign. A common defence of the dominant opinion² is charming, but one hesitates. A prejudice in favour of the Gospel of the Hebrews³ which suggested to Jerome that the Aramaic word *mahar* (tomorrow) lay behind *epiousios* is weak in that it could be a retro-translation from the Greek by scholars no better briefed than ourselves. To pray now for the bread of the future is suitable for gluttons and incompatible with Matt. 6:8 which precedes the Lord's Prayer itself. The root of our problem may be that polysemic words can seldom be translated at all.

The word *epiousios* itself, as is well known, is not found in classical Greek outside the Lord's Prayer, so that Origen conjectured⁴ that it was a word made up by the evangelists – and he was right. The ambiguous word is said to mean 'daily', whether implying the current day, the morrow, or an indefinite period.⁵

-
- 1 W. Foerster, *TWNT* 2. 587-93. W. L. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 4th edn. (Chicago: University; Cambridge: University, 1957), 297, no. 3. The latest edition was not available. Matthew Black (see below). F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Cambridge: University; Chicago: University, 1961), 66-7, §123(1).
 - 2 J. D. Douglas, ed. *New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd edn (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1982), 706.
 - 3 Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*. Part 1 (London: SCM, 1971), 199. His solution conflicts with the Jewish idea that one who has bread in his basket and yet prays for more lacks faith (Babylonian Talmud, *Sôtah* 48b).
 - 4 *De oratione* 27.7.
 - 5 Matthew Black, *An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 203-7; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1988), 607-10; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990) 481-3. S. Schulz, *Q* (Zürich: Theologischer, 1972), 90-1 briefly discards *time* and renders *epiousios* as 'which we need' (so Billerbeck, below).

One should not pray for anything beyond the daily ration – so say partisans of the ‘bread that we actually need’ version.⁶ *Epiouios* will then be taken to mean ‘that which is following (viz. tomorrow)’.⁷

Now other petitions in the Prayer are for the future, though hardly postponed to the Last Day, which would render them useless. No doubt they expect a revelation, but they are anchored in time. The hallowing of the Name, the coming of the Kingdom, total obedience to the Will, forgiveness of sin, and protection from temptation – all of these operate prospectively and the petitions are to be repeated as if they were aspirations. So what are we to make of a petition for something *today*?⁸ Imminent benefit is expected. To want one’s bread today, unlike the other, much more comprehensive desires is curious. But only if the ‘bread’ is literal. What if it is metaphorical? The aliment of the soul, however soon it commences, implies a process of some length not unlike a medical remedy. Günther Schwarz’s elimination of the word *epiousion* itself⁹ risks a banal result: ‘Give us our bread!’

Prayer for such feeding savours of Ps. 111:5, and is puerile. Life is more important than food (Matt. 6:25; Luke 12:23). It is an absurdity to pray for food, neglecting instruction *how* to be a denizen of that Kingdom and a candidate for eternal life. Asking for food was tempting God (Ps. 78:18, 29-32). He reacted with the quails and with the manna, which Christ treated symbolically (John 6:32).

Many will agree that it is intolerable that in a prayer intended for frequent use by persons of any race and level of education a word should be prescribed requiring special exegesis. A scholar once suggested that *artos* (‘bread’) could be both alimentary and spiritual. This showed that the common opinion was lame. True, attempts have been made¹⁰ to evade the conflict between Matt. 6:11 and 6:25, ‘Do not be preoccupied with what you shall eat or what you shall wear...’, and with the precept not to be concerned for the morrow, since it will have problems of its own (Matt. 6:31-34; Prov. 27:1), a platitude. But neither is confined to *artos* (‘bread’) and *epiousios* remains obscure.

Paul Billerbeck reported early Jewish learning in the supposed area.¹¹ The community should pray for food for individual needs (Babylonian Talmud, *Ber.*

6 J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 387; H. J. Schonfield, *The Authentic New Testament* (London: Dobson, 1962), 49. S. Schulz (see n. 5 above)

7 Arndt-Gingrich (see n. 1 above).

8 Geza Vermes, *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 2004), 226. Vermes was the premier historian of Jesus within his period.

9 G. Schwarz ‘*Und Jesus sprach*’, (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer), 1976), 214, 217-18.

10 By Hugo Grotius amongst many others.

11 H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. 1, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Munich: Beck, 1926, repr. 1961), 420-1. On lack of faith see C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1963), 338, no. 886. Isaiah is at §§437(Canticles Rabbah 1§2,3), 442, 1348-9 (Babylonian Talmud, *Ta’an. 7a*).

29b) relating to the current day, not for the indefinite future. Lachs¹² approved this, now a commonplace. These experts in Jewish literature have in fact followed the common understanding of Matt. 6:11. They are not conclusive.

Let us allow ourselves a moment's digression, and see Gen. 28:13-22. God patronised Jacob. The latter could choose his patron deity from amongst many. He set out his terms. Jacob's vow was valuable: he will owe 10% of his income. God was to be 'with' him and keep him in the way he should go morally (so the Palestinian Targum) and feed and clothe him (cf. Eccles 29:21; 1 Tim. 6:8), and so provide that he should return to his paternal home in 'peace'. These conditions relate to the everyday oven, basket, loom and footwear. It is a bargain in keeping with the Old Testament. The Lord's Prayer does not suggest any such stipulations by the believer.

Altogether our grammarians have concentrated on the mysterious word *episios* instead of on *artos*, whence they could profitably have begun.

The meanings of the word *artos*¹³

Artos primarily means 'bread', whether leavened or unleavened. It is an aliment; as a synecdoche it means 'food'.¹⁴ It illustrates 'needs' (Matt. 6:8). At least as important is *artos*' metaphorical meaning, Law, the Torah (see below). This latter in Christians' eyes is superseded by Jesus's Word (John 1:1, 6:45, 17:6, 14, 17; Acts 4:29). *Artos* appears frequently in the sense 'Word'. At Job 23:12b God's words (Deut. 8:3) are treasured more than daily bread. One can eat them,¹⁵ and in spite of some tart contents they are sweet to taste (Ps. 34:8).¹⁶ Philo, contemporary of the Apostles, shows how the manna itself, invariably tasty, was the divine Word (the Logos).¹⁷ The angels' bread (cf. Ps. 77:25 LXX) was not material, since they have no alimentary canal. According to Philo 'heavenly food' was an allegory for words and teachings.¹⁸ To the rabbis also manna itself signified the

12 Samuel T. Lachs, *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament. The Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1987), 119-121, 124, n.40.

13 *New Bible Dictionary* (n. 2 above), 147-8.

14 Literally: Matt. 4:3, 16:5; Luke 11:8, 14:15(?); John 21:9. Synecdoche: Hos. 9:4; Dan. 1:5,8; Tob. 1:11; Matt. 15:2, 26; Mark 3:20, 6:8; Luke 14:15(?), 15:17; 2 Thes. 3:8, 12. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, s.v. *lehem*, meaning 3.

15 Jer. 15:16; Ezek. 2:8-3:2; John 6:51; Rev. 10:9-10.

16 Job 12:11; Ps. 19:10; 119:103; 141:6; Heb. 6:4-5; Rev. 10:9; Cf. Ps. 63:5; Prov. 16:21; 24:13-14; Eccles. 24:19, 20-23; Philo, *leg. alleg.* 3.173; *de fuga* 138; *quod deterius* 117 (Wisdom). Cf. *Odes of Solomon* 30:14, trans. J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2 (London: DLT, 1985), 762.

17 Philo, *quis heres* 79, 191; *de fuga* 137 ('nourishment of the soul'); *quod deterius* 18; *leg. alleg.* 2.86. Bernard, *John* (1928), vol. 1, 196; Behm, *TWNT* 1.476, para. 3, lines 24-25. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 17th edn. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 169 n. 5.

18 *De opificio mundi*, 157, 158.

Law.¹⁹ 'Water' and 'bread' (two necessities) refer to the Torah.²⁰ The words of the Law were to be drunk with thirst: so the Mishnah.²¹

Mark already expects his audience to know the equation between bread and teaching. Notice Mark 6:34-42; 7:2,5 (*artous, arton*) – 13 (Word); Mark 7:27 (the children's bread is Christ's doctrine). Crumbs and remnants (8:8) hint at seeds (cf. 4:14) of wisdom. Pagan leaven makes pagan teaching (8:15-21 want of understanding).

When John provided (as it seems) a commentary on Matt. 6:11 or Luke 11:3 in his sixth chapter he claimed that that bread was universally needed: 'Lord, evermore give us this bread (6: 34).' In sum, the bread we are concerned with is not literal but metaphorical. It seems a simile has moved over, in prehistoric times, into a metaphor. Yet there is more.

Deuteronomy 8:3 and its implications

The root of our study is Deut. 8:3, and, since in the time of Christ two versions existed, we need to handle it warily. The Masoretic text, about which there is no doubt, can be translated as follows: 'For not by bread alone does man live, since by all that issues from the mouth of God does man live.' The KJV prints 'but by every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth...' The translators did not consider '*words*' for there was no reason to do so, and, as they show by their italics 'word' itself does not exist there. They followed the Septuagint, the Vulgate and more especially Matt. 4:4, where that word (singular) is supplied. The verb is rendered by some 'issues', by others 'proceeds' while Young rendered it by a noun, 'produce'. The passage is alluded to at Isa. 38: 15-16 where that produce becomes the creative word. The Hebrew of Eccles. 39:17d is content with 'produce'. Recent Jewish translators write 'decrees', but this constricts the vagueness of the Masoretic text.

It may be urged that these are distinctions without a difference. Many mod-

19 Prov 9:5 cited at Exodus Rabbah 25 (Billerbeck 2.483(c)).

20 Water as teaching: Targum of Isaiah 12:3 (the wells of salvation: cf. John 4:10) and new instruction (C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University, 1968), 83; Bultmann (above, n. 17), 133, n.5, *Ergänzungsheft* (1957), 25. Bar. 3:12, Sifre (on) Deut. §§ 48, 206, trans. R. Hammer, *Sifre* (New Haven and London: Yale University, 1986), 103, 303; Mekilta de R. Ishmael, *Wayassa* I.75, trans. J. Z. Lauterbach (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Soc., 1976), vol. 2, 90. Billerbeck (n. 11 above), vol.1, 193, 543, 561; vol. 2, 294, 357, 435, 483, 752; see also *ibid.*, vol. 2, 454. *Bread* as Torah: Exodus Rabbah 25, Billerbeck, vol. 2, 480 (Prov 9:5), 482-4 (note c), 8:10; Eccl. 15:3; John 6:35. Dodd (where cited (Genesis Rabbah 70.8) For Isa. 55:1 see Billerbeck, vol. 1, 843; vol. 2, 294 (Babylonian Talmud), *B.Q.* 82a); vol. 4, 155, 563-4. Pesiqta (Buber) 80b; Pesiqta Rabbati 51, trans. W. G. Braude, *Pesikta Rabbati* (New Haven and London: Yale University, 1968) vol. 2, 854.

21 Mishnah, *Avôt* 1, 4.

ern translations of Deut. 8:3 introduce that word 'word'.²² But there is a much-damaged Qumran scroll justifying the reading: 'Moses spoke... Today God, our God, has caused these words to issue from his mouth, all his precepts and... (here the fragment breaks off)'²³ The virtue of the plural, 'words', is this: a scholar like Philo²⁴ may identify the Decalogue as that 'issue', but others²⁵ require the plural to embrace not merely the Decalogue but also rabbinical *midrashim* (commentaries) thereupon, the 'oral law' (*tōrah she be 'al peh*) and legends (cf. Exod. 24:3,18; 33:11; Deut. 4:36; John 9:28). Moses notoriously was instructed in all! The importance of all this is the implication that God has promised the bread of life by a variety of utterances. This brings us to the famous word *mēmra*'.

The Aramaic versions of Deut. 8:3 uniformly make the *mēmra*' the author of the words of life. *Mēmra*' has two meanings:²⁶ normally it means 'Word'; but it is constantly found as a euphemism for God himself. The Word and God, therefore tend to be confused. We shall return to this. Meanwhile Deut. 8:3 plainly promises life other than that Satan envisaged at Matt. 4:44; Luke 4:4. It is the same promise we find at Isa. 55:3.²⁷

Isaiah 55:1-4 and the disciples' function.²⁸

Christians regarded Isa. 55:1-4 as messianic (Acts 13:34). Considering various models one may translate it as follows:

Ho, all that are thirsty (cf. John 4:13), come for water, even if you have no money; come buy food and eat; buy wine and milk (Cant. 5:1) without money. Why do you spend money for *what is not bread*, your earnings²⁹

22 The NIV, NEB, NJB, NRSB. But the *Bibbia Concordata* (1971) has (in Italian) rightly 'everything that issues from the mouth'. Similarly the *Biblia Sagrada* (1984). We need not go into the variant readings of Luke 4:4.

23 1QWords of Moses (1Q22, formerly 1QDM), col. 2, trans. F. G. Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 2nd edn. Leiden: Brill, 1994), 276.

24 *Legum allegoria* 3.173, 174, 176. Every part of the Word is important. Flavius Josephus is content with the Words, meaning the Decalogue (*Antiquities* 3. 101).

25 The authoritative *midrash*, *Sifre on Deuteronomy* (n. 20 above) §48, trans. Hammer, 104. Moses learnt a great deal more than the Decalogue - he had plenty of time. Angelo S. Rappoport, *Myth and Legend of Ancient Israel* (London: Gresham, 1928), vol. 2, 298, 305, 306-13, 316.

26 M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumium, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature* (New York: Pardes, 1950), vol. 2, 775, col. 2.

27 John 4:10,14; 6:33,35,39,40,47-48.

28 The thorough study by Georg Richter, 'Die alttestamentlichen Zitate in der Rede vom Himmelsbrot Joh 6,26-31a' appeared as an article in 1971 and is reprinted in his *Studien zur Johannesevangelium* (BU 13; Regensburg: Pustet, 1977). He makes careful use of rabbinic material but I see no reference to Isa. 55:1.

29 Cf. Eccl. 1:3; John 6:27.

for what does not satisfy?³⁰ Give heed to me, and you shall eat choice food and enjoy the richest meals (cf. Ps. 63:5). Incline your ear and come³¹ to me (says Yahweh); hearken and you shall be revived.³² And I will make with you an everlasting covenant, the enduring relationship promised to David.³³

The relevance of Isa. 55:2-3 to John 6 was observed by Hugo Grotius at the latest.³⁴ True, when he discusses Matt. 6:11 his comments are chiefly conventional. One should not pray for superfluities. But when he comes to John that *artos* has become entirely symbolic³⁵ as it may well be if Jesus' recommendations are a revelation.³⁶ On John 6:35 Grotius reminds us that metaphors cannot be avoided, and therefore the metaphors 'I am the bread of life' and 'He who comes to me' are to be unwound. There can hardly be an excuse for ignoring Grotius, whose comment is copied verbatim by our own Matthew Poole.³⁷ Unless one declines to see John 6:34, 'Lord, evermore give us this bread', as an illustration of Matt. 6:11 Grotius's aid is invaluable. His words may be paraphrased: 'Similes and metaphors are often mixed. The idea put simply is this: he who has eaten me will never hunger and whoever has drunk me will never thirst (cf. 4:4). 'Eating and drinking' means believing. Coming and believing are alternative expressions. For it is the same thing to come to Christ as to devote oneself to him and believe, as verse 44 shows. *All these ideas look back to Isaiah 55:1-2 (my emphasis).*'

One may interject that, granted we may make a connection between Matt. 6:11; John 4:14, and John 6:33,51 those who 'come' and 'believe', receiving this bread are themselves competent to pass on the gift without money to those who honour God and his son (John 5:23, 36d; 6:29 and 8:49).

The hint as to Isaiah was taken up in the *Assembly's Annotations* (1657).

30 Job 27:14; 105:40, 145:16; John 6:27. Note the manna itself did not satisfy: Num. 11:4-8, 21:5 (light, miserable bread). Jewish scholarship of the earlier Middle Ages tended towards seeing Isa. 55 as promising satisfying food (meaning wisdom of the Torah). Moses Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed* I, 50, trans. Shlomo Pines (Chicago & London: University of Chicago, 1963, 1974), vol.1, 63-4. Bahya b. Joseph Ibn Paquda employs Isa. 55:2-4 to prove that the law provides benefits in this world and the world to come: *The Book of Direction to the Duties of the Heart*, trans. Menahem Mansoor (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), 159, 302. Bahya is clear that the pious pray for nothing beyond instant needs, never ahead of time (265, 267-8: Babylonian Talmud, Sanh. 100b).

31 Cf. John 4:16; 6:37,44,65; 7:37.

32 Literally, 'Your soul shall live.'

33 2 Sam. 7:8-16; Ps. 89:98; Isa. 9:6(7). *Hesed* is the effect of a reciprocal relationship. The renderings 'compassion', 'mercy', 'kindness' obscure this.

34 H. Grotius, *Annotationes in libros evangeliorum* (Amsterdam, 1641).

35 See below.

36 Bultmann's views appear where cited at 132 n. 4, 168 n. 4.

37 Matthaeus Polus, *Synopsis criticorum* (London, 1669), vol. 4.

Isa. 55:2 is connected with Matt. 6:11 by J. H. Michaelis (1720), an outstanding scholar of the Hebrew Bible. Matthew Henry's *Exposition* (1708-11) cites Isa. 55:2 against John 6:27: food for the soul is needed. Schnackenburg³⁸ has fruitfully relied on Isa. 55:1-3 in connection with John 4:14; 6:32-3 and 48-50. Isa. 55:1 is cited by Dodd and Bultmann.³⁹

Ousia ('Essence')

It is with some distaste that we take up once again the question what *epiousios* means in Matt. 6:11. We must not expect too much of any answer: it is the word *artos* that matters; *epiousion* is, after all, only an adjective, showing an accident of the principal idea. Behind *epiousios* must lie *ousia*, essence, substance, reality. Even 'stable being'. Consistent with this is truth (John 6:55), that on which one may rely. We already know that the Word is permanent.⁴⁰ To convey all this in one word would be a feat. *Epiusios* is an invented adjective, itself seemingly formed from another adjective. The bread is serviceable or even necessary for the support of spiritual life, which is everlasting. Isa. 55:3a and John 6:54-58 agree: 'and your souls shall live'.

The original author of *epiousios* was not required to translate with one word what the Aramaic original may have conveyed by several, nor was he constrained by rules of grammar familiar to the nineteenth century West. To fail to elide the iota of *epi* would offend the latter but a first century Greek could write *epiergus* for *epergus*, and who minded? At any rate he must avoid *epousios* which means 'non-essential', 'adventitious'. To Aramaic possibilities we must return.

Meanwhile that *epiousios* derived from *ousia* as asserted above is happily confirmed by Theodoret. He says in his commentary on Ps. 101.6 LXX, 'Just as attribute-less bread nourishes the body, so the Logos from heaven nourishes the *ousia* (essence) of the soul.' The argument was a cliché (by his time (fifth century). Origen (third century) on Ps. 77:30-37 and especially Cyril of Jerusalem in his *catecheses mystagogicae* 23:15 anticipated him. Cyril worked in the fourth century. Our *epiousios* was no stumbling-block for any of them: they had no need to hunt for an Aramaic original.

Conclusion

Translations based on the idea that *artos* was literal and tangible are wrong. 'Allotted portion' will not do, for if the allowance is allotted no need for prayer arises. *Artos* to the Jewish preacher means the Torah. Jesus's teaching (*tôrah*: Ps.

38 R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St John*, vol. 1 (London: Burns and Oates, 1980), 430.

39 Dodd (cited at n. 19 above), 83; Bultmann (n. 17 above), 40.

40 Ps. 117:2; Isa. 40:8; Matt. 24:35; 1 Pet. 1:25.

3:1, etc.) is as flexible as Moses's. Problems arise constantly.⁴¹ Principles must often be brought to mind. Scrupulous avoidance of sin favours membership of the Kingdom and conformity to the Will. To early Christians the Bread was pneumatic (1 Cor. 10:3); it was wisdom (Ecclus. 15:3 Syr.) and understanding (15:3 LXX). Literal bread ends in the sewer or the drain (Matt. 15:17; Ecclus. 14:9 LXX). The aliment of the soul satisfies, tending to life here and hereafter.

Of what help is Aramaic to us? The total vocabulary is unknown. No answer will serve us that is not in harmony with Deut. 8:3 and Isa. 55:1-4. Some words suggest themselves: *mamas*, 'real', and *qûsh̄ta*, the truth. Yet the Word is more than that. Portmanteau expressions are not unusual in this literature. *Epiousios* is certainly opposed to *periousios* ('superfluous'), but that is hardly helpful. The prefix *epi* can be merely an intensive, as it often is. If 'substantial' is a right use of *epiousios* by patristic writers⁴² it is conceivable that what we are looking for is a paraphrase for *artos* in its guise as Word, a paraphrase impossible to convey conveniently to a non-Jewish church. There is a candidate.

What about *mêmra'*? We know it means both Word and the Author of that Word, God himself. If the Word can be tasted (so above), so can the deity (Ps. 34:8; 1 Pet. 2:2-3). The Logos was already flesh (John 1:14).

The *mêmra'* has a respectable pedigree (see Dan. 4:14; Ezra 6:9). Aramaic versions of the Law, the Prophet, and the Writings (e.g. Ps. 119:48) use *mêmra'* for God or Wisdom. So *lihmana de-mêmrach* may serve.

The prayer for forgiveness is appropriately placed (see Ps. 119:58) since without the Word in all its richness one can hardly be sincere in the other petitions.

Abstract

Translations of Matt. 6:11 presuppose, erroneously, that the prayer was for material bread. The distinction between literal and metaphorical bread prevents this petition from being banal, out of keeping with the remainder of the prayer. Biblical texts which restore the true meaning include Deut. 8:3 and Isa. 55:1-4.

Current Jewish imagery identified *lehem/artos* as (1) the Law and so (2) a fine comestible. John 6:32-54 relies on this. The basic idea having been recovered, the problem of *epiousios* remains. Aramaic idiom lies behind it, unintelligible to non-Jews. One thinks of *mêmra'* which means both the Word and its Author. A paraphrase, not a translation is called for. Metaphorical 'bread' would ensure life, membership of the Kingdom and obedience to the Will. Could a Greek neologism manage this? *Epiousios* could have meant 'essential'.

41 Exod. 5:22, 17:4, 18:15-16; Num. 12:13-14, 16:4-5; Judg. 20:17; Ezek. 20:27; Zeph. 1:12, 3:4, I. J. D. M. Derrett, 'Morality not to be codified,' *Bibbia e oriente* 229, 48/3 (2006), 181-90.

42 G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), s.vv. *epiousios* 2a and *ousia* IB1 'essence'; D 'special character'. Thus a word made up out of *ousia* would be sufficiently vague and also sufficiently suggestive, without attempting a literal translation of any Aramaic word or phrase.