

Posted 26<sup>th</sup> February 2011

The following is a section of a chapter for a new Book on the Diachronic Approach to exegeting New Testament problems.

Posted 12 nov. 2011

## Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον What Does This Mean?

In the Lord's Prayer, as found in Mt 6:9-13, the first petition in second person imperative is: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον. Matthew is, as far as we know, the first author to use the word ἐπιούσιος, which implies that there is no earlier evidence to help us make out its exact meaning<sup>1</sup>. This absence of pre-Matthean evidence has opened the way to considerable discussion and speculation. In his Vulgate translation, Jerome had used the Latin 'supersubstantialem' ("necessary to support life"), replacing the Itala reading *panis quottidianus*, though some Latin MSS reverted to 'cottidianum' ('daily'), reflected in the French tr. by L. Segond

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 78, n. 1, tried to cast doubt on Origen's — and in general on the Fathers' statements (by reference to A. C. Trench's discussion of ἀποκάλυψις, etc. in his *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 330 f.)— that ἐπιούσιος was a Biblical creation, citing as evidence "A. Debrunner's discovery of ἐπιούσιος in an ancient housekeeping-book in Fl. Petrie's *Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsinoe*, London, 1889, p. 34 (no. 35) = Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, Strassbourg, 1915, no. 5224 (see also *BDR*, § 123, n. 2, though W. F. Howard, *Accidence and Word-Formation* etc. [being Vol. II of J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*], Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, rp. 1979, p. 313, has no problem in accepting the word as a Biblical creation). However, B. M. Metzger, "How Many Times Does ἐπιούσιος Occur Outside the Lord's Prayer?" *ET* 69 (1957/58), 52-54, showed up the weaknesses of Debrunner 'evidence' and Deissmann's contention. Even more tenuous is Deissmann's note in his *Bible Studies*, rp. Alpha Publications 1979, p. 214, in which he quotes Nestle's communication about three Armenian MSS, *Codices Sergii*, as containing the Armenian equivalent of the form ἐπιουσίους, being unable, however, to answer the important questions (1) "How does this addition (ἐπιουσίους) run in these Armenian MSS?" and (2) "Is this Armenian word identical with the Armenian word for ἐπιούσιος in the Lord's Prayer?"

(1979)<sup>2</sup>: “pain quotidien”; the Italian (1982): “pane cotidiano”, the German (Luther, rev. 1984) and revidierte Elberfelder Bibel (1986): “tägliches Brot”; the Swedish tr. of 1917: “dagliga bröd” and the Dutch tr. of 1951, rev. 1996: “dagelijks brood”. The Syriac Sinaiticus (in Luke) and the Syriac Curetonian translated it with אַמְינָא ‘perpetuum’, while the Syriac Peshitta and the Harklean version used דְּסִינְקִינָן ‘necessarium’<sup>3</sup>. So, too, the Spanish version (1992): “el pan que necesitamos”. Similar is the circumlocutionary phrase of the German Einheitsübersetzung (1996): “das Brot, das wir brauchen”. Finally, of the Neohellenic translations, that by N. Vamvas (1851) in *Katharevousa* uses the original ἐπιούσιος, whereas of the more Demotic New Testament versions of 1964 (low Katharevousa-high Demotic) and 1989<sup>4</sup> (low Demotic), although they could have used ἐπιούσιος (since the word is still in full use in N)<sup>5</sup>, distance themselves tendentiously, with the 1964 version rendering with the strongly vernacular τὸ καθημερινό μας ψωμί (“our daily bread”), while the otherwise quite vernacular version of 1989 rendering with words chosen from a higher register: τὸν ἀπαραίτητο γιὰ τὴ ζωὴ μας ἄρτο (“the necessary bread for our life”).

Perhaps the apparently most peculiar translation into any of the European languages known to me is that of the latest Swedish translation of 2000: “Ge oss idag vårt bröd för dagen som kommer” (“give us today our bread for the day that is coming”). This understanding is not as whimsical

<sup>2</sup> The *La Bible en français courant* (1997) has, instead, rendered it by “pain nécessaire”.

<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew tr. by F. Delitzsch, סַפְרֵי הַבְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה, renders with לֶחֶם הַקֵּינָן “our fair portion of bread” reflecting Prov 30:8: לֶחֶם הַקֵּי; likewise the Trinitarian Bible Society’s Hebrew tr., while the translation of the Bible Society in Israel (1986) has in its Hebrew part לֶחֶם צְרִיכָנו “the bread for our need” and in its Aramaic part: לְחֵמָא דְּסִינְקִינָן “the bread for our need”.

According to Jerome (*Commentary on Matthew, ad loc.* 6:11) “In the so-called *Gospel according to the Hebrews* instead of ‘essential to existence’ I found *māhar*, which means ‘of tomorrow’, so that the sense is: Our bread of tomorrow—that is, of the future—give us this day”. Ph. Vielhauer comments: “If the GN [= the Gospel of the Nazarenes = The Gospel of the Hebrews] actually contained the vocable *māhar* in the petition for bread—and there is no reason to doubt—then the conclusion is inevitable that this reading is ‘merely an erroneous translation, resting on a misunderstanding, of the original epusios’ (Waitz, *Apokrypha* II, 19) ... The rendering of the petition for bread in the GN is the earliest attempt to explain it. The Aramaic GN thus assumes, at least here, the Greek text of Matthew” (E. Hennecke – W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2 Vols, London: SCM Press 1963, Vol. I, pp.142 and 147).

<sup>4</sup> The translation of the whole Bible was published in 1999.

<sup>5</sup> See Μπαμπινιώτη, *Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσας*, 1998, s.v. ἐπιούσιος.

as it may appear. It is based on the idea that ἐπιούσιος is a new creation on the basis of ἐπιούσα, the feminine form of the present active participle ἐπιών (< ἔπειμι, ‘follow’ etc.). Since ἡ ἐπιούσα implies an implicit ἡμέρα, i.e. “the coming/following day”, so, too, ὁ ἐπιούσιος ἄρτος would, in this interpretation, express an elliptical idea, namely, “the bread for the following day”<sup>6</sup>. This understanding was rejected in the XVIIIth century by Salmasius and Suicer, who argued against the formation of the adjective ἐπιούσιος in -ιος instead of -αιος, on the analogy of forms like δευτεραίος, τριταίος, ποσταίος. More seriously, Alford advanced the inherent contradiction with Mt 6:34.<sup>7</sup> However, the Swedish translators, anticipating such objections, interpret the saying as referring to the everlasting bread, the bread of the Kingdom of God, not the physical, material bread of every day<sup>8</sup>. Consequently, the prayer is for God to give us already today the eternal bread that we shall ‘be eating’ in the Kingdom of God.

Such an interpretation is made quite improbable not only by etymology but also by the very structure of the prayer. The grand address “Our Father who art in Heaven” is followed by three petitions, all of which relate to the heavenly sphere: “let Thy Name be sanctified”, “let Thy kingdom come”, and “let Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven”. In the third of these petitions, an explicit transition is made from heaven to earth. In fact, in the original text “the earth” is the very last idea mentioned so far. And now the prayer comes to what has always been the greatest headache of mankind in this life: the acquisition of the daily bread, the basis of life on earth, which is the presupposition for the two petitions relating to forgiveness and temptation—also these being earthly experiences.

Since we have no texts before the time of Matthew that use the term ἐπιούσιος, this becomes a typical example of the importance of applying the diachronic approach to elucidate a NT creation, i.e. by having recourse to the later evidence. Such evidence cannot be brushed aside simply as anachronistic<sup>9</sup>. No one who has a proper insight into the development of

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Herodotos, III. 85: ὡς τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρης ὁ ἀγὼν ἡμῖν ἐστί; Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazousai*, 105: τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν; Xenophon, *Kyrou Paideia*, II. 1. 23: ἐν τῷ ἐπιόντι χρόνῳ; Platon, *Kriton* 46 a: τῆς γὰρ ἐπιούσης νυκτός, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Alford, *The Greek Testament* etc., Vol. I, 61 .

<sup>8</sup> Even this idea is not new; Alford long ago contemplated it but understood it only as a secondary meaning “provided we keep in the foreground its primary physical meaning” (Alford, *The Greek Testament*, Vol. I, 62).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J. v.d. Watt and C. C. Caragounis, “A Grammatical Analysis of John 1:1”, *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 41 (2008), pp. 91-138, esp. 93-94.

the Hellenic language can ever entertain such a thought. The later evidence indicates the linguistic parameters within which the word should be interpreted, how early Christian authors understood it, while their understanding of it ought to reasonably divulge the traditional understanding of the Gospel of Matthew by the early Church, which, in turn, very likely reflects the meaning that Matthew himself had put into this word. Thus, the probability of getting to Matthew's intention in this way approaches near certainty. The term ἐπιούσιος has been understood in the following ways:

1. Ἐπιούσιος has sometimes being derived directly from the verb ἐπιέναι (i.e. ἐπί + εἶμι) 'to follow', on the analogy of the use of the articular neuter participle τὸ ἐπιόν = 'the future'. In the history of exegesis there have been many particular applications of this meaning (see conveniently *BDAG*<sup>10</sup>, s.v. ἐπιούσιος, 4, esp. 4.e), in particular the application to the everlasting bread of the coming Kingdom of God.<sup>11</sup> This is the meaning followed by the new Swedish version, which rendering has been generally criticized in Sweden. Linguistically, the derivation faces similar difficulties as the derivation under 2.

2. The word ἐπιούσιος could *a priori* derive from the feminine form of the participle ἐπιών, ἐπιούσα, ἐπιόν (< ἔπειμι, i.e. ἐπί + εἶμι = 'to come after', 'to follow'). In Attic Greek the indicative of the verb εἶμι functions as the future of ἔρχομαι, while the optative, infinitive, and participle variously as present or future of ἔρχομαι. Thus, infinitive ἰέναι as well as participle ἰών, ἰούσα, ἰόν complete ἔρχομαι in the present tense. The feminine ptc. of the compound verb, ἐπιούσα, with ἡμέρα understood (viz. τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν) signified 'the following day'. The meaning here is similar to that under 1, above, although the theological interpretation may not be to the Kingdom of God but to the daily bread for the coming day, that is, depending on whether the prayer is uttered in the morning, in which case it would refer to the current day; or in the evening, in which case it would refer to the following day. Linguistically, the transition from

---

<sup>10</sup> *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, etc. revised and edited by F. W. Danker, based on W. Bauer's *Griechisch-deutsch Wörterbuch*, etc., Chicago: UCP 2000.

<sup>11</sup> This view is also adopted by *i.a.* E. Lohmeyer, *The Lord's Prayer*, London 1965, 134-59; J. Jeremias, *Abba*, 165-67. See I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC), Paternoster 1978, pp. 459-60.

ἐπιούσια to ἐπιούσιος is difficult, if not impossible<sup>12</sup>. There is no other term formed analogically from ἐπιούσια, i.e., turning the syllable –σα to –σιος plus an appropriate ending.

3. A third solution has been proposed, taking ἐπιούσιος as a substantivization of ἐπὶ τὴν οὐρανὴν (sc. ἡμέραν) “for the current day”, i.e. “for today”. Quite apart from the difficulty of deriving ἐπιούσιος from ἐπὶ τὴν οὐρανὴν (ἡμέραν), this arbitrary derivation also makes nonsense of σήμερον, which thus becomes an inelegant tautology: “Give us today our bread *for today* (or *for the current day*, i.e. *our daily bread*)”!<sup>13</sup>

4. In his *Περὶ εὐχῆς* (*De Oratione*), 27.7, Origen writes:

τί δὲ καὶ τὸ ‘ἐπιούσιον,’ ἤδη κατανοητέον. πρῶτον δὲ τοῦτο ἰστέον, ὅτι ἡ λέξις ἢ ‘ἐπιούσιον’ παρ’ οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε τῶν σοφῶν ὀνόμασται οὔτε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συνηθείᾳ τέτριπται, ἀλλ’ ἔοικε πεπλάσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν.<sup>14</sup>

(What this ἐπιούσιον, too, means must be already understood. First, it must be clear that the word ἐπιούσιον never occurs in any Greek; neither is it mentioned by any learned author nor is it common in the speech of the uneducated, but seems to have been created by the evangelists)

Subsequent research has so far confirmed Origen’s judgement. He then opines that in creating this word, Matthew and Luke have done exactly what the LXX translators did, for, he asks:

τίς γάρ ποτε Ἑλλήνων ἐχρήσατο τῇ ἐνωτίζου προσηγορίᾳ ἢ τῇ ἀκουτίσθητι ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα δέξαι καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ποίει σ[ε]; ἰσομοία τῇ ἐπιούσιον προσηγορίᾳ ἐστὶ παρὰ Μωϋσεὶ γεγραμμένη, ὑπὸ θεοῦ εἰρημένη· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος. καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ἑκατέρω λέξι παρὰ τὴν οὐσίαν πεποιησθαι, ἢ μὲν τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν συμβαλλόμενον ἄρτον δηλοῦσα, ἢ δὲ τὸν περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καταγιόμενον λαὸν καὶ κοινωνοῦντα αὐτῇ σημαίνουσα.

(For, which of the Greek authors ever used the address ἐνωτίζου or ἀκουτίσθητι instead of εἰς τὰ ὦτα δέξαι and ἀκοῦσαι ποίει σ<ε>? Equivalent to the address ἐπιούσιον is the one written in Moses and uttered by God: “you are to be to me a λαὸς περιούσιος”. And it seems to me that each word is created

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Hj. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 Vols., Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1973, Vol. I, pp. 539 f.: “muß sie als sachlich höchst unwahrscheinlich betrachtet werden”.

<sup>13</sup> Spick, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3 Vols, rp. Hendrickson, 1994, Vol. II, p. 56 rightly refers to E. Delebecque, *Etudes grecques*, pp. 169: “This Hellenist rightly sees a tautology in ‘give each day our daily bread’ and a platitude in ‘give us today our bread for today’.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam* (in catensis), 178.1.

around the element of οὐσίαν, the one word indicating the bread that contributes to subsistence, the other word designating the people that is occupied with substance (life) and partakes of it)

Thus, then, Origen derived the word from οὐσία ‘substance’.<sup>15</sup> He understood it as ‘necessary for life’ and explained its derivation from οὐσία (< ἐπί + οὐσία) by analogy to the similarly formed word περιούσιος (< περί + οὐσία). Origen understood the ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον both as material bread for the nourishment of the body and as spiritual bread for the nourishment of the soul, on account of its congenitality with the relevant substance, and hence it was regarded as “necessary” for its nourishment/subsistence: ἀναγκαῖον συγγενῆ τῷ ἄρτῳ τὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι νοεῖν· (“it is necessary to understand that substance is congenital to bread”)<sup>16</sup>.

Although he did not etymologize, Ioannes Chrysostomos understood it similarly as ‘necessary’. He explained it as ἐφήμερος ‘lasting for one day’, thus opposing the interpretation ‘for the coming day’ as well as spoke of δεῖται γὰρ τροφῆς τῆς ἀναγκαίας (“for it is in need of the necessary food”).<sup>17</sup> Here we may also add Jerome’s understanding as *panem supersubstantialem*<sup>18</sup>. This understanding is accepted by Basilios, Gregorios of Nyssa<sup>19</sup>, Apollinaris<sup>20</sup>, Theophylaktos, *Σοῦδα Λεξικόν*<sup>21</sup>,

<sup>15</sup> Cf. 28.8: οὐσία ἐστὶν ἢ πρώτη τῶν ὄντων ὕλη, καὶ ἐξ ἧς τὰ ὄντα, ἢ τῶν σωμάτων ὕλη, καὶ ἐξ ἧς τὰ σώματα (“οὐσία is the primeval matter of beings, from which being are made, or the matter of bodies from which bodies are made”).

<sup>16</sup> See also Origen, *Περὶ Εὐχῆς*, 27.9: ἐπιούσιος τοίνυν ἄρτος ὁ τῆ φύσει τῆ λογικῆ καταλληλότητος καὶ τῆ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῆ συγγενῆς (“ἐπιούσιος ἄρτος is, of course, the bread that is most appropriate for the nature of reason and congenital to substance itself”).

<sup>17</sup> Chrysostomos, *Commentary on Matthew*, ad loc. (in *Ἰωάννου Χρυσοστόμου Ἄπαντα τὰ Ἔργα* in *Ἑλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978, Vol. IX, pp. 674-76).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Burgoin, “Ἐπιούσιος expliqué par la notion de préfixe vide”, *Biblica* 1979, 91-96, “denounces the translations ‘of tomorrow’ and ‘of today’ and especially the detestable *supersubstantialis*, which links the two contradictory prefixes *super* and *sub*” (Spicq, *Theological Lexicon*, Vol. II, p. 57).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Gregorios Nysseus, *Πρὸς Εὐάγριον περὶ Θεότητος*, (E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, Vol IX), 335. 23.

<sup>20</sup> Apollinaris, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum* (in catensis) (ed. J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentar aus der griechischen Kirche* [TU], 1957), 134.6

<sup>21</sup> *Suda Lexicon* (ed. A. Adler), E 2501: ὁ ἐπὶ τῆ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν ἀρμόζων (“the bread that is fitting for our subsistence”).

*Μέγα Ἐτυμολογικόν*<sup>22</sup>, Tholuck, Alford<sup>23</sup>, Sophocles<sup>24</sup>, and many moderns (see also *BDAG*, s.v. 1).<sup>25</sup>

We thus see that the Greek tradition generally has connected the term ἐπιούσιος with οὐσία and taken it to mean “necessary for our subsistence”<sup>26</sup>. In this derivation, the reference to ‘day’, i.e. ‘daily bread’, by means of deriving the word from ἐπιούσα [ἡμέρα], disappears here altogether—this idea being expressed by σήμερον—and the thought concentrates entirely on the *need* for subsistence, an idea that has not only been mankind’s greatest concern throughout its history, but has, in addition, rich adumbrations and associations in the Old Testament, where God is also presented as taking care of His creatures’ needs. Thus, for example, Ex 16:16f. speaks of the sufficiency of manna collected each day

---

<sup>22</sup> This work also known as *Etymologicum Magnum*, offers the same understanding as the *Suda Lexicon*: ‘Ο ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν ἀρμόζων, as does also *Lexica Segueriana* (ed. L. Bachmann), Epsilon 231. Similarly Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon* (XIII A.D.), Epsilon 794: ὁ τῇ ἐκάστη οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν ἀρμόζων, ἢ ὁ καθημερινός (“the bread fitting our subsistence each day, or daily”).

<sup>23</sup> Alford, *The Greek Testament*, etc. Vol. I, 61 f.

<sup>24</sup> AE. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, rp. Hildesheim: G. Olms Verlag, 1992, p. 506.

<sup>25</sup> Johannes Damaskenos (VII-VIII A.D.), *Expositio fidei* (ed. B. Kotter), 86. 156 contemplates both a bread for this life as well as for the life to come: τὸ γὰρ [ἐπιούσιον] δηλοῖ ἢ τὸν μέλλοντα, τουτέστιν τὸν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἢ τὸν πρὸς συντήρησιν τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν λαμβανόμενον (“the word ἐπιούσιος indicates either the future, that is, the bread of the future age or the bread that is being received for our subsistence”).

<sup>26</sup> J. H. Moulton’s (see Moulton-Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, etc. rp. Hodder & Stoughton, 1972, p. 242 f.) and Howard’s contention (*Accidence*, p. 313) that the word ἐπιούσιος in the papyri has only the meaning of “property or estate” only shows the erratic approach of these authors to the Hellenic language by means of the exaggerated importance which they attached to the papyri, as though they were determinative of the meaning of the New Testament vocabulary, in other words, their failure to perceive the importance of the diachronic approach to the Hellenic language as the only correct approach to solve linguistic problems that relate to words with no pre-NT history as well as such words as underwent a development of meaning during their history. The Greek tradition for the meaning of ἐπιούσιος as “necessary for subsistence” is borne out also by Neohellenic lexicography: cf. Δ. Δημητράκου, *Μέγα Λεξικὸν ὅλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης*, 9 Vols, rp. Ἀθήναι 1964, Vol. IV, p. 2823: ὁ ἐπαρκῆς διὰ τὴν ἡμέραν (ἄρτος), ἀναγκαῖος, καθημερινός. Similarly defined in Πάπυρος’s *Λεξικὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσας: Ἀρχαίας – Μεσαιωνικῆς – Νέας*, 13 Vols., Ἀθήνα 2007, Vol. III, p. 517, and Γ. Μπαμπινιώτη, *Λεξικὸ τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσας*, Ἀθήνα 1998, s.v. ἐπιούσιος: αὐτὸς ποὺ εἶναι ἀναγκαῖος γιὰ τὴν καθημερινή μας συντήρηση “[the bread] which is necessary for our everyday sustenance”.

for the needs of everyone in each family, irrespective of whether one had gathered too much or too little: the manna in the vessel was the allotted portion for each individual's needs of the day: אִישׁ לְפִי אָכְלוּ לְקִטּוֹ "each one had gathered as much as he needed"<sup>27</sup>; Job 23:12 speaks of treasuring "the words of His mouth more than *my daily bread*" (NIV) צָפַנְתִּי אִמְרֵי בְּיֹו (בְּחֻקֵּי), and Prov 30:8: says: "Give me neither poverty nor riches, but give me only *my daily bread*" (NIV) (רֵאשׁ וְעֹשֶׂר אֶל תִּתֶּן לִי הַטְּרִיבֵנִי לְהֵם חֻקֵּי). In both of the last two texts the word translated 'my daily [bread]' is חֻקֵּי. The meaning of this word is '[appropriate/allotted] portion', 'something prescribed', 'due', and then 'law', 'statute', etc.<sup>28</sup>, in other words, in this context, it signifies the necessary portion or amount. It is obvious, then, that the translation "daily bread" here is tendentious, having been influenced by the wrong interpretation of ἐπιούσιος in Mt 6:11 (Lk 11:3). Without any doubt the correct translation in both texts should have been "my necessary bread".

The most recent Neohellenic translation (in Demotic) has captured well the meaning of the phrase by rendering with τὸν ἀπαραίτητο γιὰ τὴ ζωὴ μας ἄρτο ("the bread that is indispensable [i.e. necessary] for our life")<sup>29</sup>. This I hold to be the most natural rendering of the meaning of ἐπιούσιος.

---

<sup>27</sup> So correctly, expressing a pluperfect idea. The NIV's mistaken simple past is probably influenced by the KJV. The *Jerusalem Bible* and the Neohellenic *Ἡ Ἀγία Γραφή* (1999) have interpreted it properly as pluperfect.

<sup>28</sup> See Kohler-Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 5 Vols., Leiden: Brill 1994-2000, Vol. I, p. 346.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. also Spicq, *Theological Lexicon*, Vol. II, pp. 56-f.: "Hence, in *epiousios*, the prefix *epi*, expressing the idea of contact, can be rendered 'touching' or 'concerning'; the adjective amounts to the same thing as *ousios*, that which concerns the essence, is essential. Once the prefix is empty, the meaning is clear: 'give us our essential bread today' (Matt), 'each day' (Luke)."