

Essay

On Paternoster: No Longer "Lead Us Not into Temptation" But "Do Not Abandon Us to Temptation"

Massimo Cocchi^{*1, 2} & Fabio Gabrielli³

¹Research Institute for Quantitative and Quantum Dynamics of
Living Organisms Center for Medicine, Mathematics & Philosophy Studies

²Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences

³Theological Faculty of Northern Italy

Abstract

Paternoster, the prayer that Jesus taught to Christians (Luke 11, 1-4, Matthew 6, 9-13), is about to be modified, as Pope Francis wants, in a fundamental passage: "do not lead us into temptation", changed to "do not abandon for temptation". The Aramaic expression was *VIH-AL TIVI-AYNU LI-YDAY NISA-YON* (and do not lead us into temptation) *KEE IM HAL-TZAYNU MIN HARAH* (but deliver us from evil).

Keywords: Paternoster, God, Jesus, Pope Francis, temptation, revolution, consciousness.

The original Greek text, in turn, said: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, translated into Latin with: *et ne nos inducas in tentationem*.

On the exquisitely linguistic level, the verb εἰσενέγκῃς" (*eisenekes*) is the imperative aorist of *eispherein*, composed of the particle *eis*, "in, towards", that is, a movement of direction towards something, and *pherein*, "lead towards", "carry within". Not only that, in the Greek text we find another *eis*, used as a proposition, referred to the term *peirasmón*, "prove, temptation".

Thus, the Greek text seems to emphasize the concept of movement towards temptation. The same Latin term *inducere*, used by Girolamo in the 4th century in the *Vulgata*, the Latin translation of the *Bibbia* from Hebrew and from Greek, composed of *in e ducere*, translates in a paradigmatic way the term *eispherein*, followed by *tentationem*, in analogy with the greek construct.

In short, from the linguistic point of view, the translation "do not lead us into temptation" would seem the most appropriate.

The change in the translation in "not abandoning ourselves to temptation", rather than on the level of linguistic-literal adherence, could be dictated by the ambiguity underlying "not induce us

*Correspondence: Prof. Massimo Cocchi, Research Institute for Quantitative and Quantum Dynamics of Living Organisms Center for Medicine, Mathematics & Philosophy Studies. Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences. E-mail: massimo.cocchi@uniibo.it

into temptation", as if God were the creator of evil (the Italian meaning of "induce" it has more constrictive value, while the Latin *inducere* and the Greek *eispherein* they have more concessive value, a sort of "let in").

In practice, the faithful asks God not only not to abandon him to temptation, but to stand by his side, as inescapable help, even when it is already within temptation.

It seems curious that from the "Sermon on the Mount" up today, no one has attempted to modify that phrase which has the value of an extraordinarily important concept because it concerns the free will: ***"do not abandon us to temptation", these words bring back to the man the responsibility of his own action, so is the man who reaffirms his determination in the face of the choices and actions to be performed.***

In other words, man asks God not to abandon him in his free choices which, being choices interwoven with human frailty, are always exposed to error. Pope Benedict XVI in the "Jesus of Nazareth" interprets the first version of the Paternoster as follows: " With it we say to God: "I know that I need proves for my nature to be cleansed.

If you decide to undergo these proves, if - as in the case of Giobbe - you give a little 'free hand to the Evil, then think, please, to the limited extent of my strength. Do not believe me too capable.

Do not make ample boundaries within which I can be tempted, and be close to me with your protective hand when the test becomes too difficult for me. "

It does not seem that in the face of an ambiguous translation, the enlightened mind of Pope Benedict XVI engages in justifying explanations of the action of man recognizing that God "leaves" to the Devil a free hand, it seems, instead that we need to reaffirm that concept of "free will" that the church considers central to the salvation.

Does all this talk fit with the problem of suicide?

In fact, as reported in the essay published in this journal [1], the concept of free will takes on a critical dimension in the case of suicide:

With the creation, God has designed the future time, he gave dimension to it and only God is awareness keeper. Only if it was possible for humans to give dimension to the future, then one could discuss the deity. "If man acts based on the memory of time (e.g., in the case of suicide), then we can assume that there is free will. If suicide is an event in the dimension of the future, then there is no free will but predestination.

This brief consideration opens a critical prerequisite to the critical understanding of the concept of free will, considering the origin of the concept, the many interpretations that

have been given and the scientific knowledge of the human body, in particular, of the brain.

The best example and expression of the concept of free will certainly refers to "suicide." In fact, suicide is the negation of life through the apparent freedom of thought and ideational capacity. The subject of suicide put into question the divine will of leaving to man the freedom to express his fate, whatever that is.

...In social terms, the theme of suicide is faced with ambiguity. For example, suicide attempt in prison is punished, not because it denies life, but because it represents an element of institutional disruption.

This modality of intervention affirms the concept of punishment but ignore to consider the will of those who attempt suicide - the most dramatic act that man can commit, the negation of life.

While the Church has revised its criteria of judgment with respect to suicide, restoring obsequies and burial in consecrated ground, revisiting, in this way, the concept of free will and reinterpreting it as a man's decision-making ability in a very bad situation.

Therefore, a Church that no longer punishes demonstrates the capacity for self-criticism" ...

Evidently, the Church, facing with the most terrible manifestation of "free will", the suicide, this terrible act against life, has reconsidered the concept of mercy and to the forgiveness of those who make mistakes, leaving the man to his responsibilities: you have wrong but I forgive you.

This fact and the realization that in the founding prayer of reference for Christianity, remained the possibility of an erroneous interpretation on the responsibility of an error from the man, the Church intervenes by reaffirming the original concept expressed in the prayer of the "Sermon on the Mount".

De facto, we come back to the origin that leaves no space to that compromise that has held up for centuries and centuries by deluding man that God could have had some responsibility in human actions, that is, that "induced and did not abandon".

An astonishing revolution of consciousness demonstrating the immense value of the "word", which rises to mathematical perfection.

Reference

1. Cocchi, M. & Capezzani, L., Time & Free Will: Concepts & Considerations. Scientific GOD Journal, 8(2): pp. 164-166.