The Lord's Prayer.—Two articles have recently appeared dealing with points connected with the Lord's Prayer. The first* discusses the rendering daily bread. In this model of Christian prayer it would be expected that all the petitions would be clearly understood from the beginning. But on the contrary this word "daily" by which the R. V. translated the Greek epioussion is a very uncertain rendering for that mysterious word. In trying to determine the meaning we note (1) the testimony of tradition; (a) The Aramaic vernacular for this word is handed down as mahar, "to-morrow." This is very weighty evidence. (b) The old Latin version had quotidianum, "daily." But as one Latin father pointed out, this word was never intended to represent the original but rather a confession of ignorance as to the meaning of the original. (c) The Syriac has a word meaning "of our need," "needful." This is important from its antiquity, and its relation to the original Aramaic. (d) Jerome's Latin version uses for this word supersubstantialem, "super-substantial." The fathers are divided between these various interpretations but their comments and discussions center about two points, first, that we are not to be anxious about bodily food or for the temporal morrow and may therefore only ask for one day's food and that the one very present and not the coming day, and, second, that Christ himself is the bread of God's children. (2) Note the evidence of etymology. This immediately discounts beyond all recovery the rendering of Jerome. The word epioussion means etymologically "coming on." Can this mean "daily?" (3) Consider the setting of the phrase in the Lord's prayer. There is (a) the title or address, (b) three petitions for the greater glory of the Father, each beginning with a verb and followed by the noun, (c) three petitions, for certain mercies for the children on earth, of which the latter two begin with verbs but the first, the one we are considering, begins with the noun. Must not some reason exist for this emphatic position given to "daily bread?" Can it be that we are thus emphatically bidden to pray each day for the morrow's perishing bread? Are we not rather introduced to a mystery, in other words, are we not praying here for the "spiritual bread" which is emphatically "our" bread as God's children? The conclusion is that tradition, etymology and the setting establish beyond all reasonable doubt (a) that the original word used by our Lord was mahar "to-morrow," applied in its spiritual sense of the "coming age," (b) that the Greek rendering of this word, coined especially for it by the evangelists, cannot be connected with any meaning of "substance," (c) that the significance of this word, from Aramaic, Greek, tradition, and emphatic position in context, is of the morrow, i. e., of the "future age," in reference to "spiritual life," "the life which is to come." "Daily" can have no such meaning and is hence wrong. With the deep spiritual meaning of "to-day" as "the present life," and of "to-morrow" as the "life to come," we are to pray, Give us to-day our morrow's bread.

*By the Rev. Principal J. B. McClellan, M. A., in the Expository Times, May 1891, pp. 184-188.
The second article considers the question, "Does the Lord's Prayer make mention of the Devil?" Many were surprised at the R. V. rendering, *Deliver us from the evil one.* Is it correct? (1) Indecisive considerations are (a) the use of the definite article *the* evil (one) i.e., *ho poneros*; (b) the connection of thought in the prayer. The word "deliver" suggests rescue from a person but is also used of deliverance from death, etc. (2 Cor. 1:10; Col. 1:13; 2 Tim. 4:18). (c) The use of concrete and abstract terms in the New Testament as a whole is indecisive. In Romans 12:9 we read *the evil* (thing), when were it not for the neuter form of the article we would certainly think that persons were meant. (2) A more decisive point is found in the answer to the question—Was *ho poneros*, "the evil" (one), the usual term to designate the Devil? (a) It evidently was not the usual word in the New Testament. There are only six clear and distinct cases to be found in it and only one in the Four Gospels. Now while it is possible for this rare usage to be incorporated into such a formula as that of the Lord's Prayer, it is extremely improbable. (b) Old Testament usage is against it. The word *poneros* is used by the Septuagint with or without the article to denote "evil" in general. Of course the doctrine of Satan is largely a post Old Testament doctrine. But in the Old Testament the disciples were trained and unless the language employed by our Lord was decisively limited to an evil *person*, they would inevitably understand it of evil itself. (c) The Talmud seems to favor the "person" view or at least either rendering. It cannot be regarded as decisive evidence. We do not know enough about it. Our conclusion is that the old rendering is preferable. The weight of evidence and probability is in favor of it.

*By Professor L. S. Potwin, in Bibliotheca Sacra, April 1891.*

These two articles show much learning and carefulness in weighing evidence. It is interesting to compare their canons of judgment. It is the mysteriousness about the *epioudion* that appeals to Principal McClellan while it is the simplicity and naturalness of the rendering *evil* that attracts Professor Potwin. Incidentally it may be mentioned that both the views urged by these writers were opposed by Bishop Lightfoot who, in behalf of the Revisers made an exhaustive investigation of the two questions. Prin. McClellan's view is unsatisfactory because it depends too much upon the Fathers who found mysterious and spiritual meanings wherever they could thrust them into the plain words of Scripture. While the evidence seems irresistible for the rendering *to-morrow*, the argument for its spiritual sense is quite inconclusive.