

JEROME'S INTERPRETATION OF THE BREAD IN THE LORD'S PRAYER:
ἐπιούσιος AND *SUPERSUBSTANTIALIS*

Tamiko Isaka*

Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan

Introduction

After arriving in Rome in 382, Jerome (c. 345–420) undertook a revision of the existing Latin translations of the Bible at the request of Pope Damasus (c. 304–84). Starting with the four Gospels he completed his revised edition, dedicated to the pope, in 384. It was not a fresh translation from the Greek original but a revised version of the Old Latin texts. As Jerome stated in his preface, he greatly feared being accused of sacrilegious forgery by conservative people. Therefore, he deliberately retained as many Old Latin texts as possible and made changes only where he deemed them necessary to correct the meaning. He altered inaccurate spellings to exact ones and changed finite verbs to participles where the Greek original contained the latter verb forms. However, the revision overall was clearly conservative, with relatively few changes.¹

* This article is based on the one written in Japanese and published in *Mediterraneus* 40 (2017), pp. 27-47.

1. On the circumstances where he embarked on the translation of the Bible, see Hedley Frederick Davis Sparks, 'Jerome as Biblical Scholar', in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 510-41 (513-14); Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, 'Latin Bible', in James Carleton Paget and Joachim Schaper (eds.), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible from the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 505-26 (517). On the general characteristics of Jerome's revision of the Gospels, see Sparks, 'Jerome', pp. 523-24;

One of Jerome's rare significant changes was his translation of the epithet used in reference to the bread in the Lord's Prayer at Mt. 6.11. Here he replaced the Old Latin version's text, *panem nostrum cottidianum* ('our daily bread'), with *panem nostrum supersubstantialem*. Thus, he translated ἐπιούσιος, the adjective modifying the bread in Greek, as *supersubstantialis*, a word that Jerome appears to have coined.

It is difficult to define ἐπιούσιος with precision, because the term is found nowhere in Greek literature except in reference to the Lord's Prayer. What did Jerome think that it meant, and why did he translate it as *supersubstantialis*? In this paper, I will attempt to answer these questions. First, I will examine how he determined the meaning of the word philologically. Next, I will show how the controversies between the Nicene faction and the Arians concerning the Trinity influenced his translation. I will also demonstrate that the meaning of *supersubstantialis* as 'supersubstantial' or 'above material substance', as modern scholars generally interpret Jerome's term, was not what he intended.

*The Epithet Used for the Bread, ἐπιούσιος, and its Translation,
Supersubstantialis*

Mt. 6.11

- Vulg.: *panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie*²
- The Old Latin texts: *panem nostrum cottidianum da nobis hodie*³ ('Give us today our daily bread')⁴
- The Greek original: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον⁵ ('Give us this day our daily bread')⁶

Lk. 11.3

- Vulg.: *panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis cotidie*

J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), pp. 86-87.

2. The citation is the *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, 5th edn.

3. The citation is from Adolf Jülicher, Walter Matzkow and Kurt Aland (eds.), *Itala das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überferung. I. Matthäus-Evangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2nd edn, 1972).

4. All the translations in this article are mine unless noted.

5. The citation is from the NA²⁸.

6. The translation of the Greek original is from the NRSV.

- The Old Latin texts: *panem nostrum cottidianum da nobis hodie*⁷ ('Give us today our daily bread')
- The Greek original: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ('Give us each day our daily bread')

The Lord's Prayer, which Jesus is believed to have taught his disciples, is recorded in Matthew 6 and Luke 11. The words differ to some extent between the two Gospels, and certain expressions occur only in Matthew; however, the petition for the bread is found in both. Although the petition itself is succinct, contestation over the meaning of ἐπιούσιος has continued ever since ancient times.

In addition to these two appearances in the Gospels, ἐπιούσιος also appears in the version of the Lord's Prayer found in *Did.* 8.2,⁸ which is regarded as having been written in the late first or early second century CE; however, no example of the Greek word has been found prior to these writings. The early church father Origen (c. 185–c. 254) stated that none of the Greek authors had used this word, nor was it in common use among ordinary people, but that the evangelists seemed to have created it (*Or.* 27.7).⁹ Over the years, investigations of the etymology of ἐπιούσιος have yielded three main explanations, presented below. The second alternative is linguistically the most probable and the one most widely accepted; however, the word's meaning is still debated.¹⁰

7. The citation is from Adolf Jülicher, Walter Matzkow and Kurt Aland (eds.), *Itala das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überferung*. III. *Lucas-Evangelium* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2nd edn, 1975).

8. The text of the petition for the bread is the same as that in Matthew.

9. Besides the Gospels and subsequent patristic authors, ἐπιούσιος had long been thought to be attested in P. Yale inv. 19 which was found in Egypt and was assumed as dating from the fifth century CE. The reading, however, turned out to be incorrect and the document was reexamined to date from the first or second century CE according to M. Nijman and K. A. Worp, "'ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ" in a Documentary Papyrus', *NovT* 41 (1999), pp. 231-34 (233-34).

10. See Werner Foerster, 'ἐπιούσιος', *TDNT*, II, pp. 590-99 (590-95); Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7* (trans. James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, rev. edn, 2007), pp. 319-21; François Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27* (trans. Donald S. Deer; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), p. 90; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 289-90.

(1) It derives from the preposition ἐπί and οὐσία ('substance, essence, existence'), which is a derivative of εἶμι ('be'). The interpretation of 'contributing to our substance' or 'necessary for existence or life' is based on this proposed derivation. However, this explanation suffers from the objection that the ι in ἐπί is not elided.

(2) It derives from ἔπειμι ('come on or after'), a combination of ἐπί and εἶμι ('come, go'). The expression ἡ ἐπιούσα [ἡμέρα], which comes from the participle of this verb, means 'the coming day, the next day'. Based on this analogy, ἐπιούσιος is interpreted as 'for the following day, for tomorrow'. Or it can also be interpreted as 'for today', since 'the coming day' would be the equivalent of 'this day' if one were praying the Lord's Prayer at dawn. In the ancient world, each day was considered as beginning with the evening, so that the use of this term in an evening prayer could refer to the new day that would begin shortly. There is no linguistic objection to this derivation.

(3) It derives from ἐπὶ τὴν οὔσαν [ἡμέραν] and can be interpreted as 'for today'. However, although ἡ οὔσα ἡμέρα means 'the present day, today', ἡ οὔσα is not attested without ἡμέρα. Moreover, this derivation is vulnerable to the same linguistic objection as choice (1).

What did Christian writers think about ἐπιούσιος prior to the time of Jerome's revision of the Latin Gospels? Origen was the first one to consider the term. He regarded it as coming from ἐπί and οὐσία, and as meaning 'contributing to our substance' (*Or.* 27.7).¹¹ At the same time, he also pointed out the possibility that the word derived from ἔπειμι and meant 'suitable for the coming age' (literally, 'for tomorrow'), although he affirmed that the former interpretation was preferable (*Or.* 27.13).

Origen's opinion that ἐπιούσιος was derived from οὐσία must have influenced the Christian writers who followed him. Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315–87) interpreted the term as meaning 'appointed for the substance of the soul', agreeing with Origen that it derived from ἐπί and οὐσία (*Catech. Myst.* 5.15).¹² Gregory of Nyssa (c. 330–c. 395) did not discuss the term itself; however, he seems to have associated ἐπιούσιος with οὐσία, regarding the bread as 'what is sufficient for preserving the bodily existence' (τῆς σωματικῆς οὐσίας)

11. He understood the bread only as spiritual, not material (*Or.* 27.1).

12. In the subsequent sentence he accepted that the bread was also material and useful not only for the soul but for the body.

(*Or. dom.* 4).¹³ John Chrysostom (c. 347–407) defined the word as ‘for the day, daily’ (ἐφήμερος) (*Hom. Matt.* 19.5).¹⁴

On the other hand, Tertullian (c. 160–c. 225), author of the oldest extant Greek or Latin commentary on the Lord’s Prayer, did not address the meaning of ἐπιούσιος directly,¹⁵ nor did Cyprian (d. 258).¹⁶ The first Latin writer to discuss it, to the best of my knowledge, was Marius Victorinus in the fourth century, and he derived it from οὐσία, which he regarded as meaning ‘the substance of God’ (*Ar.* 1.30; 1b.59; 2.8).¹⁷ Later in the same century, Ambrose (c. 339–97) published a similar discussion (*Fid. Grat.* 3.15.127).¹⁸

In the Old Latin texts, ἐπιούσιος was translated as *cottidianus* (‘for every day, daily’) in both Matthew and Luke.¹⁹ In his revised version, whereas Jerome replaced *cottidianum* with *supersubstantialem* in Matthew, he left *cottidianum* (the older spelling of *cotidianum*) untouched in Luke and replaced *hodie* with *cotidie* (‘everyday, daily’) as the exact translation of καθ’ ἡμέραν. He seems to have coined *supersubstantialis*, because the word is not attested before the Vulgate. How did he understand the meaning of ἐπιούσιος so as to translate it as *supersubstantialis* in Matthew?

Although *supersubstantialis* has often been listed with a brief explanation as one of the ancient translations of ἐπιούσιος in commentaries on Matthew or Luke, in theological dictionaries or lexicons and in articles on the interpretive history of the Greek term, very few modern scholars have discussed the Latin term in detail. Among the existing explanations, Hennig has provided the longest one, pointing out that Jerome defended his translation at *Comm. Matt.* 1.6.11. Citing Jerome’s discussion on ἐπιούσιος in English and translating

13. He understood the bread as material.

14. This definition would fall under the second etymology above. He thought the bread to be material.

15. Though he accepted that the bread was food necessary for life, he attached much higher value to its spiritual sense (*Or.* 6.1–2).

16. He gave equal weight to both the spiritual bread and the material one (*Dom. or.* 18–21).

17. See the next section of this article for details.

18. See the next section of this article for details.

19. Ambrose explained the translation *cottidianus*, saying, ‘therefore it [the bread] is called ἐπιούσιος in Greek. But the Latin text calls this bread *cottidianum*, because the Greeks call the coming day (*advenientem diem*) τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν’ (*Sacr.* 5.4.24).

supersubstantialis as ‘supersubstantial’, Hennig wrote, ‘The translation *supersubstantialem* obviously aims at a more literal version of the Greek text than the older translation *quotidianum*’.²⁰ However, he did not examine his argument at all. Since Jerome’s discussion is very important in the evaluation of his translation, it would have been useful for Hennig to provide an English translation of that part of his commentary; however, the argument is not so self-evident that simply translating it would suffice to justify Hennig’s conclusion.

Bauer, in the first part of his entry on ἐπιούσιος, explained it as derived from ἐπί and οὐσία and as meaning ‘necessary for existence’, mentioning Origen, Chrysostom and Jerome.²¹ He listed *supersubstantialis* as one of the word’s ancient translations without translating it and referred readers to Hennig.²² Blaise defined *supersubstantialis* as ‘necessary for subsistence’ and added a note on Jerome’s *Comm. Matt.* 1.6.11: ‘He interprets it either as “excellent, above all the substances” or as “concerning the present food and not tomorrow’s”’.²³ Luz, Cullmann, Nolland, France and Harvey gave ‘supersubstantial’ or something similar as the meaning of *supersubstantialis*, indicating explicitly or implicitly that Jerome derived ἐπιούσιος from οὐσία (understood as ‘substance’) and ἐπί (understood as ‘above’).²⁴

20. Anthony Hennig, ‘Our Daily Bread’, *TS* 4 (1943), pp. 445-54 (445-46).

21. W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97), I, p. 607, give Bauer’s explanation as one of the four most important interpretations of the Greek term.

22. BAGD, p. 376.

23. Albert Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens: Revu spécialement pour le vocabulaire théologique* (Strasbourg: Le latin chrétien, 1954), p. 799.

24. Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, p. 319, states ἐπιούσιος means ‘surpasses all the substances’; Oscar Cullmann, *Das Gebet im Neuen Testament: Zugleich Versuch einer vom Neuen Testament aus zu erteilenden Antwort auf heutige Fragen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2nd edn, 1997), p. 71, glosses the term as ‘übernatürlich’; Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, p. 279, renders it ‘supersubstantial’; R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), p. 248, states, ‘[supersubstantialis] probably meant “supernatural”’; and Anthony Harvey, ‘Daily Bread’, *JTS* 69 (2018), pp. 25-38, says, ‘[to Jerome] ἐπιούσιος could mean “over-and-above substance” (p. 26) and “extra-real” from ἐπι- (“in addition to”) and οὐσία (“being”, “reality”)’ (p. 30).

Jerome indeed connected ἐπιούσιος with ἐπί and οὐσία; however, it is doubtful that he interpreted the term as ‘necessary for subsistence’. Moreover, a meaning akin to ‘supernatural’ is not what Jerome himself intended. On the other hand, Blaise rightly listed ‘excellent’ among Jerome’s explanations; however, his comment that Jerome also considered ‘concerning the present food’ an interpretive possibility is wrong.

Jerome’s Interpretation of ἐπιούσιος and its Relation to περιούσιος

After completing his revised translation of the four Gospels, Jerome wrote his *Commentary on Titus* in 387 or 388. In this work, he explained ἐπιούσιος and discussed the bread in the Lord’s Prayer. Later, he revisited the topic in greater detail in his *Commentary on Matthew*, written in 398. In addition, his other writings contain some relevant observations about the bread. I will examine these passages to consider more closely Jerome’s interpretation of ἐπιούσιος.

In *Comm. Tit.* 2.12–14, Jerome translated the Greek term and gave an interpretation of the bread:

Unde et illud quod in Euangelio secundum Latinos interpretes scriptum est: Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie, melius in Graeco habetur panem nostrum ἐπιούσιον, id est ‘praecipuum’, ‘egregium’, ‘peculiarem’, eum uidelicet qui de caelo descendens ait: Ego sum panis qui de caelo descendi. Absit quippe ut nos qui in crastinum cogitare prohibemur, de pane isto qui post paululum concoquendus et abiciendus est in secessum in prece dominica rogare iubeamur. Nec multum differt inter ἐπιούσιον et περιούσιον: praepositio enim tantummodo est mutata, non uerbum. Quidam ἐπιούσιον aestimant in oratione dominica panem dictum quod super omnes οὐσίας sit, hoc est super universas substantias. Quod si accipitur, non multum ab eo sensu differt quem exposuimus: quidquid enim egregium est et praecipuum, extra omnia est et super omnia (Comm. Tit. 2.12–14, CCSL 77C, 54–55).

Hence what is written according to the Latin translators in the Gospel, ‘Give us today our daily bread’ [Mt. 6.11], is also expressed better in

Greek, ‘our ἐπιούσιον bread’, that is, ‘exceptional’, ‘outstanding’, ‘special’; of course, him who when coming down from heaven says: ‘I am the bread that came down from heaven’ [Jn 6.51]. For it should not happen that we, who are forbidden to think about tomorrow, are ordered to ask in the Lord’s Prayer for the bread that is soon to be digested and thrown away in a toilet. And there is not much difference between ἐπιούσιον and περιούσιον because only the prefix is changed, not the word itself. Some think that the bread in the Lord’s Prayer is called ἐπιούσιον because it is above all οὐσίας, that is, above all substances. But if this interpretation is accepted, it is not very different from the sense that we have explained. For whatever is outstanding and exceptional is outside all things and above all things (*Comm. Tit.* 2.12–14).

Thus, after translating ἐπιούσιος as *praecipuus*, *egregius* or *peculiaris* and describing the bread as spiritual, Jerome affirmed that ἐπιούσιος and περιούσιος were virtually synonyms. Just before this passage, he discussed the meaning of περιούσιον in Tit. 2.14 and then, in this context, turned to dealing with Mt. 6.11 as quoted above. Before considering the passage on Mt. 6.11 more closely, let us consider what he said about περιούσιον, as this is also important to our discussion.

At the beginning, after quoting Tit. 2.14 in Latin—in which λαὸν περιούσιον was translated as *populum egregium* (‘outstanding people’)—Jerome observed that περιούσιος was a translation of the Hebrew *sgolla* (his transliteration; *s^egullāh* in a modern transliteration), meaning ‘valued property, peculiar treasure (which Yahweh has chosen and taken to himself)’.²⁵ Jerome judged that Paul, who he believed was the author of Titus, had taken the term περιούσιος from the Old Testament, consistent with his background as a Hebrew and Pharisee, and used it in the epistle. Therefore, he searched for instances of περιούσιος in the LXX and found that the Greek term was a translation of *sgolla*. Moreover, he also discovered that Symmachus had translated *sgolla* as ἐξάίρετος, which Jerome then expressed as *egregius* or *praecipuus*. He added that Symmachus used a different Greek word for *sgolla* in another place, which Jerome translated as *peculiaris* without telling us the Greek word itself.

Thus, after explaining the meaning of περιούσιος, Jerome shifted to a discussion of Mt. 6.11, because the term ἐπιούσιος, which he regarded as a synonym of περιούσιος (as is apparent from the passage quoted above), is used

25. BDB, p. 688.

there. Most likely, he came to view the two words as synonyms because he assumed that the First Gospel had originally been composed in Hebrew and was translated afterwards into Greek.²⁶ While considering the meaning of ἐπιούσιος, the meaning of which was uncertain by that time but which he believed to have been translated from Hebrew, he could have begun to think that it was connected with περιούσιος, which was also translated from Hebrew.

At first glance, it seems strange that Jerome would call two words synonymous while describing them as different only in their prefixes (both prepositions). However, he seemingly regarded ἐπί and περί as prefixes with similar meanings. In fact, περιούσιος is derived from the noun περιουσία ('that which is over and above, surplus, abundance; superiority'), which in turn comes from the verb περίειμι ('be over and above, remain; be superior to, surpass, excel'). In this case, περί means 'before, above, beyond'.²⁷

On the other hand, ἐπί means 'upon, over (a place); over, beyond (boundaries); (superiority felt) over; (authority) over'.²⁸ Thus, these prefixes do not have exactly the same meaning, though they overlap to some extent. Therefore, Jerome seems to have judged that ἐπιούσιος and περιούσιος were synonyms, first because they had -ούσιος in common and their prefixes had similar meanings, and second because the definition of περιούσιος ('outstanding' in his judgment) fit the theme of the bread in the Lord's Prayer. Accordingly, in the above citation he represented the ἐπιούσιος bread as the *praecipuus*, *egregius* or *peculiaris* bread, drawing on the possible translations of περιούσιος.

To ascertain Jerome's understanding of ἐπιούσιος further, let us now turn to the relevant passage in *Comm. Matt.* 1.6.11. Here he explained how he came to understand the meaning of the Greek term as *praecipuus*:

Panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie. Quod nos supersubstantialem expressimus, in graeco habetur ἐπιούσιον, quod uerbum LXX interpretes περιούσιον frequentissime transtulerunt. Considerauimus ergo in hebreo, et ubicumque illi περιούσιον expresserant, nos inuenimus sogolla quod Symmachus ἐξάρητον, id est praecipuum uel egregium, transtulit, licet in quodam loco peculiare

26. He mentioned this belief several times (e.g., *Vir. ill.* 3; *Praef. in Evangelio* [*Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, p. 1515]; *Epist.* 20.5; *Comm. Isa.* 3. 6. 9). Cf. Kelly, *Jerome*, 65.

27. LSJ, s.v. περί, A III, F III.

28. LSJ, s.v. ἐπί, G I, III.

interpretatus sit. Quando ergo petimus ut peculiarem uel praecipuum nobis Deus tribuat, panem illum petimus qui dicit: Ego sum panis qui de caelo descendi. In euangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos pro supersubstantiali pane maar repperi, quod dicitur crastinum, ut sit sensus: Panem nostrum crastinum, id est futurum, da nobis hodie. Possumus supersubstantialem panem et aliter intellegere qui super omnes substantias sit et uniuersas superet creaturas. Alii simpliciter putant secundum apostoli sermonem dicentis: Habentes uictum et uestitum his contenti sumus, de praesenti tantum cibo sanctos curam gerere, unde et in posterioribus sit praeceptum: Nolite cogitare de crastino (Comm. Matt. 1.6.11, CCSL 77, 37).

‘Give us today our *supersubstantialem* bread’ [Mt. 6.11]. What we have expressed by *supersubstantialem* is rendered in Greek by ἐπιούσιον. The LXX interpreters very frequently translated [the original Hebrew word for] this word by περιούσιον. Therefore, we have examined the Hebrew and have found the Hebrew word *sogolla* wherever they had rendered περιούσιον. Symmachus translated this word as ἐξάριετον, that is, ‘exceptional’ or ‘outstanding’, although in one passage he translated it as ‘special’. Therefore, when we ask God to give us special or exceptional bread, we are asking for him who says, ‘I am the bread that came down from heaven’ [Jn 6.51]. In the Gospel that is called as ‘according to the Hebrews’, I have found, instead of *supersubstantiali* bread, *maar*, which means ‘tomorrow’s’. So the sense is ‘give us today our tomorrow’s, that is, future, ‘bread’. We can understand *supersubstantialem* bread in another way as well: the bread that is above all substances and surpasses all creatures. Others think simply, in accordance with the apostle’s words when he says, ‘Having food and clothes, we are content with these’ [1 Tim. 6.8], that saints should care only about the present day’s food, for which reason it is commanded also in what follows, ‘Do not think about tomorrow’ [Mt. 6.34] (*Comm. Matt.* 1.6.11).

About ten years after the composition of *Comm. Tit.*, Jerome’s opinion on ἐπιούσιος and περιούσιος had not changed. In both commentaries, based on his belief that the First Gospel had originally been composed in Hebrew, he linguistically pursued the meaning of ἐπιούσιος. He was convinced that the term was a synonym of περιούσιος, which had been used to translate the Hebrew *sogolla* (*sgolla* in *Comm. Tit.*), and thus he interpreted ἐπιούσιος as *praecipuus*, *egregius* or *peculiaris*.

Why Jerome Translated ἐπιούσιος as *supersubstantialis*

But why, then, did Jerome translate ἐπιούσιος as *supersubstantialis*? Why did he not use *praecipuus*, *egregius* or *peculiaris* in his translation? In fact, he expressed *s^egullāh*, which was translated as περιούσιος in the LXX, as *peculiaris* or *peculium* in his translation from the Hebrew Bible.²⁹ On the other hand, it would be difficult to understand *supersubstantialis* as ‘exceptional, outstanding, special’ without reading Jerome’s commentaries. Therefore, it might seem inevitable that others would interpret the word’s meaning as ‘being above material substance’. In this section we will consider that question.

In *Or.* 27.7, Origen discussed the meaning of ἐπιούσιος:

ἰσομοία τῇ ἐπιούσιον προσηγορία ἐστὶ παρὰ Μωϋσεῖ γεγραμμένη, ὑπὸ θεοῦ εἰρημένη· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος. καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ἑκατέρω λέξις παρὰ τὴν οὐσίαν πεποιῆσθαι, ἢ μὲν τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν συμβαλλόμενον ἄρτον δηλοῦσα, ἢ δὲ τὸν περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καταγιγόμενον λαὸν καὶ κοινωνοῦντα αὐτῇ σημαίνουσα (*Or.* 27.7).

A word similar to ἐπιούσιον is found in the writings of Moses, spoken by God: ‘And you shall be for me a περιούσιος people’ [Exod. 19.5]. And either word seems to me to be derived from οὐσία, the one indicating the bread contributing to the substance, the other signifying the people abiding around the substance and partaking of it (*Or.* 27.7).

Origen’s indication that περιούσιος in Exod. 19.5 was similar to ἐπιούσιος might have led Jerome to connect the two words. Whereas Origen understood the meaning of περιούσιος only through his knowledge of Greek, Jerome, aided by the *Hexapla*, derived it from Hebrew and fixed its meaning. Moreover, just as Origen had quoted Jn 6.51 concerning the bread at *Or.* 27.3, Jerome likewise quoted the verse in the passages from both *Comm. Tit.* and *Comm. Matt.* cited above. Thus, he likewise regarded the bread not as material but as spiritual.

Another source seems to have strongly influenced Jerome’s decision to use *supersubstantialis*. There are three relevant passages from Marius Victorinus’s *Adversum Arium*, which is thought to have been written between

29. *Peculium* for Exod. 19.5. *Peculiaris* for Deut. 7.6; 14.2; 26.18.

the end of 358 and the beginning of 360,³⁰ or some twenty years before Jerome's revised translation of the Gospels:

nomen quidem substantiae forte non est, denominata autem a substantia sunt. unde enim deductum ἐπιούσιον, quam a substantia? da panem nobis ἐπιούσιον, hodiernum, quoniam Iesus vita est et corpus ipsius vita est, corpus autem panis, sicuti dictum est: dabo vobis panem de caelo, significat ergo ἐπιούσιον ex ipsa aut in ipsa substantia, hoc est vitae panem (Ar. 1.30).

[I]n fact, the term *substantia* [substance] is perhaps not in the holy Scriptures, but derivatives from *substantia* are found there. For whence is ἐπιούσιον derived other than from *substantia*? 'Give us today the ἐπιούσιον bread' [Mt. 6.11]. Since Jesus is life and his body is life but the body is bread, as it was said, 'I shall give you bread from heaven' [cf. Jn 6.51], therefore ἐπιούσιον signifies 'from or in that *substantia* itself', that is, the bread of life (Ar. 1.30).

et item consubstantialiam populum dixit ... et evangelium secundum Matthaeum: panem nostrum consubstantialiam da nobis hodie (Ar. 1b.59).

And in addition he [i.e. Paulus] said, 'the people along with *substantia*' [cf. Tit. 2.14] ... And the Gospel according to Matthew: 'Give us today our bread from the same *substantia*' [cf. Mt. 6.11] (Ar. 1b.59).

hanc vitam et Christi et dei, id est aeternam, quo nomine ipse dicit? ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, ex eadem οὐσία panem, id est de vita dei consubstantialiam vitam ... δὸς ἡμῖν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, id est vitam ex eadem substantia... Graecum igitur evangelium habet ἐπιούσιον, quod denominatum est a substantia, et utique dei substantia. hoc Latini vel non intellegentes vel non valentes exprimere non potuerunt dicere, et tantummodo cotidianum posuerunt, non et ἐπιούσιον. est ergo et nomen lectum, et in deo substantia et dici potest Graece. quod etiamsi Latine non exprimitur, dicitur tamen Graece, quia intellegitur (Ar. 2.8).

By what name does he [i.e. Christus] call this life both of Christ and of God, that is, eternal life? Ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, bread from the same οὐσία

30. Cf. Caius Marius Victorinus, *Traité théologique sur la Trinité* (ed. Paul Henry; trans. Pierre Hadot; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960), pp. 35-51.

(substance), that is, life from the same *substantia* from the life of God... δὸς ἡμῖν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον [cf. Mt. 6.11], that is, the life from the same *substantia* ... Therefore, the Greek Gospel has ἐπιούσιον, which is derived from *substantia*, and that without doubt from the *substantia* of God. Either because they had not understood it or because they had not been able to translate it, the Latins could not express it and used only *cotidianum* ['daily'], not ἐπιούσιον also. Therefore, the term [i.e. *substantia*] is also read [in Scripture], and *substantia* is used in reference to God. The term can be stated in Greek. Even if it is not expressed in Latin, it is nevertheless said in Greek because it is understood (*Ar.* 2.8).

In the first passage, Victorinus, objecting to the Arian argument that the term *substantia* (οὐσία) was not found in Scripture, argued that its compounds occurred there and that ἐπιούσιος was one of them. In the second passage, he took Tit. 2.14 and Mt. 6.11, where *consubstantialis* was found, as examples to show that *substantia* was used as one of the Son's names. Finally, in the third passage, understanding ἐπιούσιος as meaning 'from the same substance' and, therefore, as a synonym of ὁμοούσιος, Victorinus disapproved of *cotidianum*, the translation in the Old Latin texts.

The key word in these passages is *substantia* (οὐσία). The Nicene Creed, adopted at the Nicene Council in 325, has the term ὁμοούσιος ('of the same substance'), or *consubstantialis* in Latin. In *Ar.* 1.30, when defending the choice of this term, Victorinus tried to rebut the Arians' argument that the term οὐσία did not exist in Scripture. He cited the verses as evidence once in Greek and at another time in Latin, where the compounds of οὐσία/*substantia* containing the adjective form -ούσιος/*substantialis* occurred. He even cited the verses where *substantia* itself seemed to be used. Among these verses, he quoted Mt. 6.11, deriving ἐπιούσιος from *substantia*. He believed that -ούσιος in ἐπιούσιος had the same meaning as -ούσιος in ὁμοούσιος, that is, 'of the substance [of God]'.

In *Ar.* 1b.59, after confirming that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were of the same substance, Victorinus maintained that many names were used for the Son in Scripture. He regarded *substantia* as one of them and quoted Tit. 2.14 and Mt. 6.11, each of which contains the word *consubstantialis*, as

similar instances. The term *consubstantialis* is here used to translate both *περιούσιος* and *ἐπιούσιος*.³¹

Finally, in *Ar.* 2.8, when dealing with the origin of *ὁμοούσιος*, Victorinus quoted Mt. 6.11. He interpreted *ἐπιούσιος* as ‘from the same substance’ three consecutive times (*ex eadem οὐσία, de vita dei consubstantialis* and *ex eadem substantia*). In other words, he regarded *ἐπιούσιος* as a synonym of *ὁμοούσιος*.³² Clearly, for the same reason he used *consubstantialis* to translate *ἐπιούσιος* in *Ar.* 1b.59, a totally different translation from *cotidianus* in the Old Latin texts. Presumably Victorinus himself made this translation.

Just after the above citation from *Ar.* 2.8, Victorinus quoted Tit. 2.14 in Greek with his explanation of *λαὸς περιούσιος* and then referred to a prayer of oblation in Greek that had been borrowed from Tit. 2.14. ‘Hence’, he wrote, ‘the prayer of oblation, understood in the same way, is offered to God: “save the people around the substance who are zealous for good works”’ (*hinc oratio oblationis intellectu eodem precatur deum: σῶσον περιούσιον λαὸν, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων*). Thus, it follows that both *ἐπιούσιος* in the Lord’s Prayer and *περιούσιος* in the oblation prayer were used in the Eucharist.³³

31. In the sentence following the above citation from *Ar.* 1.30, Victorinus explained ‘*populum περιούσιον*’ (Tit. 2.14) as ‘the people around the substance, that is, the people remaining around life’ (*circa substantiam, hoc est circa vitam consistentem populum*). In addition, just after the above citation from *Ar.* 2.8 he said, ‘when we follow him and are with him and around him, we are around eternal life and we are called *λαὸς περιούσιος*’ (*cum ipsum sequimur et cum eo et circa ipsum sumus, circa vitam aeternam sumus et appellamur λαὸς περιούσιος*). I have translated *consubstantialem populum* in *Ar.* 1b.59 as ‘the people along with substantia’, taking these explanations and the meaning of ‘con-’ into consideration. Origen seemingly influenced Victorinus’s interpretation of *περιούσιος* (cf. Origen, *Or.* 27.7 cited above).

32. Cf. Hadot, in Victorinus, *Traité théologique sur la Trinité*, p. 915, on 8.19.

33. The use of the Lord’s Prayer in the Eucharistic rite is first witnessed in Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Catech. myst.* 5.11-18. Cf. ‘Lord’s Prayer’ in F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn rev., 2005), pp. 1001-1002. Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, p. 319, has pointed out that its use before Communion aided the interpretation of the bread in terms of the Eucharist or Christologically in the sense of John 6 by the Christian writers. On the other hand, whether the oblation prayer quoted by Victorinus was used at the time of his writing or he quoted the prayer, which had already fallen out of use by his time, to reinforce his argument is not clear. Since Ambrose did not quote it in the argument against Arianism in *Fid. Grat.* cited below, the prayer seems not

Translating these two words as *consubstantialis* in *Ar.* 1b.59, as though they were synonyms, Victorinus directly connected ὁμοούσιος to the Eucharistic liturgy.³⁴

Furthermore, Ambrose produced a similar passage in the third book of *De Fide ad Gratianum* when arguing against the Arians. This book is believed to have been written for the Emperor Gratian between autumn 378 and the end of 380.³⁵ Ambrose wrote:

An negare possunt usian lectam, cum et panem epiusion dominus dixerit et Moyses scripserit: Ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος? Aut quid est οὐσία vel unde dicta, nisi ἀεὶ οὐσα, quod semper maneat? Qui enim est et est semper, deus est, et ideo manens semper οὐσία dicitur divina substantia. Et propterea epiusios panis, quod ex verbi substantia substantiam virtutis manentis cordi et animae subministret; scriptum est enim: Et panis confirmat cor hominis (Fid. Grat. 3.15.127, CSEL 78, 125).

Can they deny that οὐσία is read [in Scripture], when the Lord spoke of the ἐπιούσιον bread [Mt. 6.11] and Moses wrote, Ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος [‘You shall be for me a περιούσιος people’] [Exod. 19.5]? What is οὐσία, or whence is it derived unless from ἀεὶ οὐσα, that which endures forever? For the one who is and is forever is God, and therefore the divine substance, enduring forever, is called οὐσία. And the bread is ἐπιούσιος because, taking the substance of enduring power from the substance of the Word, it supplies this to the heart and soul. For it is written: ‘And bread strengthens the human heart’ [Vulg. Ps. 103.15 (104.15)] (Fid. Grat. 3.15.127).

Although Ambrose did not associate περιούσιος with Tit. 2.14 as Victorinus did, but with Exod. 19.5 as Origen (*Or.* 27.7), he regarded -ούσιος in ἐπιούσιος and περιούσιος as coming from the οὐσία/*substantia* of God along with Victorinus.

to have been in use in his time. Cf. Uwe Michael Lang, *The Voice of the Church at Prayer: Reflections on Liturgy and Language* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), p. 57.

34. See Hadot, in Victorinus, *Traité théologique sur la Trinité*, p. 914, on 8.1-41.

35. D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene–Arian Conflicts* (O ECS, 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 129, 161.

Victorinus and Ambrose's arguments seem to be in close connection with *substantialis*, the latter part of Jerome's translation *supersubstantialis*. When Jerome was revising the Gospel translations, the Arian movement still posed a threat to Homoousianism, although orthodoxy had vanquished Arianism at the Council of Constantinople in 381. Based on the arguments by Victorinus and Ambrose, Jerome as a member of the Nicene faction seemingly believed that it was imperative to use *substantialis* (-ούσιος), the adjective form of *substantia* (οὐσία) of God, to translate ἐπιούσιος.

At the same time, Jerome seems to have been impressed by Victorinus's translation of ἐπιούσιος and περιούσιος as *consubstantialis*, as if they were synonyms. By examining the LXX and the Hebrew Bible, he concluded that ἐπιούσιος had indeed the same meaning as περιούσιος, as we saw in the previous section. Therefore, he expressed ἐπιούσιος as *egregius*, *praecipuus*, or *peculiaris* in *Comm. Tit.* and *Comm. Matt.* In his opinion, these were linguistically the exact translations of the Greek term. However, since his translation for Mt. 6.11 had to include the constituent of *substantialis*, he needed a word that would mean 'outstanding' while also including the constituent.

As we saw earlier, περιούσιος is an adjective derived from περίειμι. It is reasonable to take περίειμι as an equivalent of *supersum* ('have ascendancy, be superior; be superfluous, remain as a residue').³⁶ Accordingly, Jerome seems to have thought that the prefixes περί in περιούσιος and ἐπί in ἐπιούσιος (a synonym of περιούσιος according to his understanding) were equivalents of the prefix *super*, and that -ούσιος would be equivalent to a present participle form of *sum*, which does not exist. Therefore, he seems to have taken *super* from *supersum* and put the prefix before *substantialis*, thus coining *supersubstantialis*. Presumably, he intended to express 'outstanding' with *super* and 'of the substance of God' with *substantialis*; therefore, in his mind, *supersubstantialis* originally meant 'of the outstanding substance [of God]'.

Immediately after interpreting ἐπιούσιος as *egregius*, *praecipuus* or *peculiaris* in *Comm. Tit.* and *Comm. Matt.*, Jerome showed his understanding that the bread was spiritual in nature by citing Jn 6.51. In his opinion, the adjectives like *egregius* were not enough by themselves, but the verse, which revealed that Christ was a spiritual form of bread, was necessary to convey the meaning of ἐπιούσιος. The original Greek term ἐπιούσιος meant, as Jerome

36. P.G.W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 2012), s.v.

understood it, not only ‘outstanding’ but at the same time ‘of the substance of God’, because it included *-ούσιος*, derived from *οὐσία*, as a constituent of the word. To express these two meanings in one Latin word, Jerome seems to have created *supersubstantialis*.

Supersubstantialis as ‘Supersubstantial’

In *Comm. Tit.* and *Comm. Matt.*, Jerome first explained the meaning of *ἐπιούσιος*. In the last part of the passage from *Comm. Tit.* cited above, he said that some people interpreted *ἐπιούσιος* as ‘being above all substances’. However, since this interpretation seems not to have arisen before Jerome’s revised translation of the Gospels, his use of *supersubstantialis* may have brought it about. Although *substantia* means ‘substance, essence, material’, *οὐσία* does not have the meaning of ‘material (of which a thing is made)’. Contemporaries who interpreted *supersubstantialis* as ‘being above all substances’ derived the term from *super* (‘above’) and *substantia* (‘material’). Jerome’s innovative translation would not have been understood without annotation. Though their interpretation of ‘material’ seems to be in contrast with ‘substance, essence [of God]’, he did not reject this interpretation based on the misunderstanding but tolerated it as within his own interpretation. Moreover, about ten years later, in *Comm. Matt.*, he rather approved it. In *Comm. Tit.*, he had said that ‘some’ interpreted the word in that way and added the condition ‘if this interpretation is accepted’, but in *Comm. Matt.* he said that ‘we can understand’ it in that way ‘as well’. He would have accepted the interpretation that was a by-product of his own translation, probably because he judged that it fit his theme of the spiritual bread. This judgment seems very different from his philological effort to define *ἐπιούσιος*; however, he would not have any justification for rejecting the interpretation, because, after all, his end was to make his revision of the Gospel translations helpful to Christians.

Ambrose, who died in 397, used *cotidianum* from the Old Latin texts when, writing in his later years, he cited Matthew’s version of the Lord’s Prayer several times in *De sacramentis*.³⁷ Augustine, who frequently cited

37. Ambrose, *Sacr.* 5.4.18, 23, 24, 26; 6.1.24. In 5.4.24 he rephrased *ἐπιούσιον* as *substantialem* (*Panem quidem dixit, sed ἐπιούσιον dixit, hoc est substantialem. Non iste panis est, qui vadit in corpus, sed ille panis vitae aeternae, qui animae nostrae*

the Lord's Prayer, always used *cotidianum* too. After Jerome himself, John Cassian was the first to use *supersubstantialis*. He stated the following in *Collationes*, written after 415:

Deinde panem nostrum ἐπιούσιον, id est supersubstantialem da nobis hodie. Quod alius euangelista cotidianum dixit. Illud nobilitatis ac substantiae eius significat qualitatem, qua scilicet super omnes substantias sit atque omnes creaturas sublimitas magnificentiae eius ac sanctificationis excedat, hoc uero proprietatem usus ipsius atque utilitatis expressit. Nam cum dicit cotidianum, ostendit quod sine ipso nullo die spiritalem uitam capere ualeamus (Coll. 9.21).

Next, 'Give us today our ἐπιούσιον, that is, *supersubstantialem* bread' [Mt. 6.11]. Another Evangelist called it *cotidianum*. The former [*supersubstantialem*] signifies the quality of its nobility and substance, by which it is of course above all substances and by which the sublimity of its magnificence and sanctity exceeds all creatures. The latter [*cotidianum*], on the other hand, expresses the property of its use and utility. For when it says *cotidianum*, it shows that without the bread we cannot live a spiritual life for a single day (Coll. 9.21).

Cassian's explanation of *supersubstantialis* with emphasis on the bread's 'being above material substance' is impressive. Hereafter in patristic exegesis the *supersubstantialis* bread came to be understood almost exclusively as the 'supersubstantial' Eucharistic bread.³⁸

Interpretation of ἐπιούσιος as 'of future' and 'of substance [of God]'

Jerome chose to translate ἐπιούσιος in Matthew as *supersubstantialis*, but he admitted that the Greek term had another meaning that *supersubstantialis* could not convey. Before considering this, we must review the interpretations that he rejected in his passage from *Comm. Matt.* discussed earlier in this article. There he indicated four possible interpretations of ἐπιούσιος: (1) its Latin translation is *supersubstantialis*. The Greek term is equivalent to περιούσιος in the LXX and to *s^egullāh* in Hebrew, meaning *praecipuus*, *egregius* or

substantiam fulcit). He seems to associate *substantialem* with 'the substance of our soul' here.

38. Cf. Hennig, 'Bread', p. 448; Cullmann, *Gebet im Neuen Testament*, p. 72.

peculiaris. In addition to these meanings, Jn 6.51 is needed to fully understand ἐπιούσιος; (2) It is equivalent to *maar* in ‘the Gospel that is called “according to the Hebrews”’, meaning ‘of the future’ (literally ‘tomorrow’s’); (3) It means ‘supersubstantial’ or ‘being above material substance’; (4) It means ‘pertaining to every day, daily’. The daily bread is a material bread used to maintain one’s bodily existence.

We have already examined alternatives (1) and (3) concerning *supersubstantialis*. Jerome rejected explanation (4), as the citation from *Comm. Tit.* quoted above also reveals. Cyprian (*Dom. or.* 19), Gregory of Nyssa (*Or. dom.* 4) and John Chrysostom (*Hom. Matt.* 19.5) interpreted the term in this way, though Cyprian, as *Dom. or.* 18 shows, also viewed the bread as spiritual in nature.³⁹

Another meaning of ἐπιούσιος that Jerome admitted as possible is (2); however, this definition has no linguistic relation to *supersubstantialis*. He reported that the equivalent to ἐπιούσιος in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which is identified as the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, was *maar*—that is, *māhār* (‘tomorrow’s’).⁴⁰ This reference of his is important to contemporary research on ἐπιούσιος and has become a testimony to the second etymology described earlier in this article. Jerome valued the Hebrew Gospel so highly that it would have been natural for him to recognize *māhār* as another meaning of the Greek term.⁴¹ Since he interpreted it not as ‘of tomorrow’ literally but as ‘of the future’, the bread of the future is not the bread that we will eat in our upcoming days in this world, but the one that Christians will eat in the kingdom of God in the world to come.⁴² To Jerome, the petition for the bread was probably asking the one who was in heaven to enable us to taste it beforehand on earth through the Eucharist. Though *Comm. Matt.* does not elucidate how much importance he placed on this meaning of ἐπιούσιος, the following

39. Cf. the discussion above on what various early Christian writers thought about ἐπιούσιος.

40. On the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, see James R. Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), pp. 118-24.

41. On his high estimation of the Hebrew Gospel, see Edwards, *Hebrew Gospel*, pp. 36-37. In the same volume on *maar*, Edwards points out that ‘*mahar* is Hebrew’, probably not Aramaic (pp. 83-84).

42. On eating and drinking in the kingdom of God, see Mt. 8.11; Mk 14.25; Lk. 14.15; 22.30.

passages from *Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos*, written after 400, and *Commentaria in Ezechielem*, completed in 414,⁴³ will make it clear:

Panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie hoc est, qui est de tua substantia. In hebraico euangelio secundum Matthaeum ita habet: Panem nostrum crastinum da nobis hodie hoc est, panem quem daturus es nobis in regno tuo, da nobis hodie (Tract. Ps. 135.25, CCSL 78, 295).

‘Give us today our *supersubstantialis* bread’, that is, the one which is from your substance. In the Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew, it is thus written: ‘Give us today our bread for tomorrow’, that is, give us today the bread that you are going to give us in your kingdom (*Tract. Ps. 135.25*).

Ego sum panis, qui de caelo descendi; et quem in oratione nobis tribui deprecamur: Panem nostrum substantium (siue superuenturum) da nobis, ut quem postea semper accepturi sumus, in praesenti saeculo cotidie mereamur accipere (Comm. Ezech. 6.18.5/9, CCSL 75, 239).

‘I am the bread who came down from heaven’ [Jn 6.51]. And we beg that he should be given to us in the prayer: ‘Give us our substantial (or future) bread’ [Mt. 6.11], so that we may have the right to receive daily in the present world the bread that afterwards we will always receive (*Comm. Ezech. 6.18.5/9*).

The ‘Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew’ in *Tract. Ps.* must be the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, which was referred to as ‘the Gospel that is called “according to the Hebrews”’ in *Comm. Matt.* The bread was explained in two different ways in *Tract. Ps.* and in *Comm. Ezech.*, and the second explanation was the bread ‘of the future’ (*superuenturum* in the latter literally means ‘which is to come after’). Clearly, Jerome thought that *supersubstantialis* was not enough to express ἐπιούσιος, and that the Greek term had to be interpreted further as meaning ‘of the future’.

Incidentally, the first explanation was the bread ‘from your substance’ and ‘substantial bread’. Thus, Jerome did not use *egregius*, *praecipuus* or *peculiaris*, the words that he had chosen in *Comm. Tit.* and in *Comm. Matt.* to define ἐπιούσιος. Did he abandon this interpretation? Considering the

43. On the date see Kelly, *Jerome*, pp. 136, 306.

contexts, one concludes that he did not necessarily throw it away. In those commentaries, he dealt with the original Greek term ἐπιούσιος and presented *egregius* etc. as its definition, tracing it back to the Hebrew word that he believed to be its source word. On the other hand, since he did not take up ἐπιούσιος in *Tract. Ps.* or in *Comm. Ezech.*, he would have avoided mentioning the definition based on the philological discussion. Anyway, the facts that he rephrased *supersubstantialem* as ‘from your substance’ in *Tract. Ps.* and translated ἐπιούσιος as ‘substantial’ in *Comm. Ezech.* seem to show that ‘from the substance of God’ was for him the most important of the interpretations of this adjective. In addition, it is noteworthy that he did not give ‘being above material substance’ as his interpretation in these writings either.

Conclusion

This article has considered what Jerome thought about the meaning of ἐπιούσιος and how he arrived at the inventive translation *supersubstantialis*. One background factor influencing his thinking was the use of ἐπιούσιος from the Lord’s Prayer in the Eucharist. Another relevant influence was the dispute between the Orthodox and Arians. Victorinus derived ἐπιούσιος from οὐσία (*substantia*) in the sense of ‘the substance of God’ so as to defend the use of ὁμοούσιος (*consubstantialis*) in the Nicene Creed. In addition, he not only regarded ἐπιούσιος as a synonym of ὁμοούσιος, but he also translated both ἐπιούσιος and περιούσιος in Tit. 2.14, from which an oblation prayer was borrowed, as *consubstantialis*.

Probably affected strongly by Victorinus’s argument, Jerome, for his part, philologically pursued the meaning of ἐπιούσιος. Inferring that Paul, whom he considered the author of Titus, had taken περιούσιος from the Hebrew Bible, he derived περιούσιος from the Hebrew *s^ggullāh*. Furthermore, believing that the First Gospel had originally been written in Hebrew, he assumed that ἐπιούσιος was a synonym of περιούσιος, which he defined as ‘exceptional, outstanding, special’.

However, modern research has shown that the original language of Matthew’s Gospel was Greek. In addition, no scholar today regards ἐπιούσιος as a synonym for περιούσιος. Although Jerome’s definition of ἐπιούσιος was therefore erroneous, he, based on this supposition, appears to have taken *super* from the verb *supersum* (= περιλειμι) and made it the first part of *supersubstantialis*. On the other hand, the discussions by Victorinus and Ambrose,

who defended the use of *ὁμοούσιος* in a fashion similar to Victorinus, seemingly led Jerome to express the latter part of *ἐπιούσιος* as *substantialis*, the adjectival form of *substantia*. Thus, he combined the result of his linguistic examination and the orthodox camp's understanding of the Trinity in a single term, *supersubstantialis* ('the outstanding substance [of God]'). Since his early years, Jerome had been living in a world characterized by an intense struggle between the Nicene party and the Arian movement. In his translation of *ἐπιούσιος* in Matthew, we can see the influence that this situation had on him.