

## The Prayers of Jesus: J. Jeramias

### The Lord's Prayer in the Light of Recent Research

About AD 75, therefore, the Lord's Prayer was a fixed element in instructions on prayer in all Christendom, in the Jewish-Christian as well as in the Gentile-Christian church. Both churches, different as their situations were, were at one on this point: that a Christian learned, from the Lord's Prayer how to pray.

For our question then of how it is-to be explained that in Matthew and Luke we have two forms of the Lord's Prayer which vary from each other, the conclusion is that the variations can in no case be traced back to the caprice of the evangelists-no author, would have dared to make such alteration in the Prayer on his own - but rather that the variations are to be seen within a broader context: we have before us the wording for the Prayer from two churches, that is, different liturgical wordings of the Lord's prayer. Each of the evangelists transmits to us the wording of the Lord's Prayer as it was prayed in his church at that time.

#### The original form

Now we can deal with the second question: which of the two forms is to be regarded as the original? If we compare the two texts carefully, the most striking divergence is the difference in length. The Lucan form is shorter than that of Matthew at three places. First, the invocation is shorter. Luke says only 'Father', or properly 'dear Father', in Greek  $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$ , in Aramaic *abba*, whereas Matthew says, according to the pious and reverent form of Palestinian invocation, 'Our Father who art in heaven'. Second, whereas Matthew and Luke agree in the first two petitions-the 'Thou - petitions' ('Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come') - there follows in Matthew a third 'Thou-petition': 'Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven'. Third, in Matthew the last of the following 'We-petitions' as an antithesis. Luke has only: 'And let us not fall into temptation', but Matthew adds: 'but deliver us from evil'. Now, if we ask which form is the original-the longer form of Matthew or the shorter form of Luke-the decisive observation which has not yet been mentioned, is the following: the shorter form of Luke is completely contained in the longer form of Matthew. This makes it very probable that the Matthean form is an expanded one, for according to all that we know about the tendency of liturgical texts to conform to certain laws of their transmission in a case where the shorter version is contained in the longer one, the shorter text is to be regarded as original. No one would have dared to shorten a sacred text like the Lord's Prayer and to leave out two petitions if they had formed part of the original tradition. On the contrary, the reverse is amply attested, that in the early period, before wordings were fixed, liturgical texts were elaborated, expanded, and enriched. This conclusion, that the Matthean version represents an expansion, is confirmed by three supplementary observations. First, the three expansions which we find in Matthew, as compared with Luke, are always found toward the end of a section of the prayer-the first at the end of the address, the second at the end of the 'Thou-petitions', the third at the end of the 'We-petitions'. This again is exactly in accordance with what we had elsewhere in the growth of liturgical texts; they show a proclivity for sonorous expansions at the end.

Second, it is of further significance that in Matthew the stylistic structure is more consistently carried through. Three 'Thou-petitions' in Matthew correspond to the three 'We-petitions' (the sixth and seventh petitions in Matthew were regarded as one petition). The third 'We-petition', which in Luke seems abrupt because of its brevity, is in Matthew assimilated to the first two 'We-petitions'. To spell this out, the first two 'We-petitions' show a parallelism:

Our bread for tomorrow / give us today.

Do Thou forgive us / as we forgive.

In Luke, however, the third 'We-petition' is shorter, apparently intentionally:

And lead us not into temptation.

But Matthew offers a parallelism here too:

And lead us not into temptation, / but deliver us from evil.

This endeavor to produce parallelism in lines is a characteristic of liturgical tradition. One can see the point especially well if one compares the various versions of the words of institution at the Lord's Supper.

Third, a final point in favour of the originality of the Lucan version is the reappearance of the brief form of address 'dear Father' (*Abba*) in the prayers of the earliest Christians, as we see from Rom. 8:15 and Gal. 4:6. Matthew has a sonorous address, 'Our Father who art in heaven', such as corresponded to pious Jewish-Palestinian custom. We shall see that the simple *abba* was a unique note in Jesus' own prayers. Thus we must conclude that this plain *abba* was the original address.

All these observations lead us, then, in the same direction. The common substance of both texts, which is identical with its Lucan form, is the oldest text. The Gentile-Christian church has handed down the Lord's Prayer without change, whereas the Jewish-Christian church, which lived in a world of rich liturgical tradition and used a variety of prayer forms, has enriched the Lord's Prayer liturgically.<sup>1</sup> Because the form transmitted by Matthew was the more richly elaborated one, it soon permeated the whole church; we saw above that the *Didache* presents this form too.

Of course, we must be cautious with our conclusions. The possibility remains that Jesus himself spoke the 'Our Father' on different occasions in a slightly differing form, a shorter one and a longer one. But perhaps it would be safer to say that the shorter Lucan form is in all probability the oldest one, whereas Matthew gives us the earliest evidence that the Lord's Prayer was used liturgically in worship. In any case, the chief thing is that both texts agree in the decisive elements.

Nonetheless the question about the original form of the Lord's prayer is still not completely answered. We have thus far directed our attention only to the varying lengths of the two versions. But in the lines where they share a common wording these versions so exhibit certain -- admittedly, not very significant -- variations, specifically in the second part, the 'We-petitions'. To these differences we now turn briefly. The first 'We-petition, for daily bread, reads in Matthew,

'Give us this day our bread for the morrow'.

As we shall see later, the contrast - this day- for the morrow', sets the whole tone for the verse. In Luke, on the other hand, it reads,

'give us each day our bread for the morrow'.

Here the term 'this day' is expanded into 'each day'; the petition is thereby broadened into a generalized saying, with the consequence that the antithesis 'this day-for the morrow' drops out. Moreover, in Luke the Greek word for give now had to be expressed with the present imperative ( *didou*, literally 'keep on giving!'), whereas elsewhere throughout the Prayer the aorist imperative is used, which denotes a single action. Matthew also has the aorist imperative in this petition: □□ □, 'give' I From all this it may be concluded that the Matthaean form of the petition for daily bread is the older one.

---

<sup>1</sup>This was done gradually, as can be gathered from the fact that in Matthew the word 'heaven' is in the plural in the address (Semitic usage), whereas it is in the singular in the third petition (Greek usage).

In the second 'we-petition' for forgiveness, Matthew has 'Forgive us our debts', while Luke has 'Forgive us our sins'. Now it was a peculiarity of Jesus' mother tongue, Aramaic, that the word *hobha* was used for 'sin', though it properly means a debt, 'money owed'. Matthew translates the word quite literally with 'debts', □□□□□□□□ a word which is not usual in Greek for 'sin'; this enables one to see that the Lord's Prayer goes back to an Aramaic wording. In the Lucan version, the word 'debts' is represented by the usual Greek word for 'sins', □□□□□□□□; but the wording in the next clause ('for we ourselves forgive everyone who is indebted to us') makes it evident that in the initial clause 'debts' had originally appeared. In this case, too, Matthew therefore has the older wording

The same picture results when one focuses attention on yet a final variation in wording. We read in Matthew (literally translated), 'as we also have forgiven (□□□□□□□□) our debtors', while in Luke we read, 'for we also ourselves forgive (□□□□□□□□) everyone who is indebted to us'. When we ask which formulation is the older, the past tense in Matthew or the present tense form in Luke, it is readily seen that Matthew has the more difficult form, and in such cases the more difficult form is to be regarded as the more original. Matthew's is the more difficult form, because his wording ('as we have forgiven') could lead to the mistaken impression that not only must our forgiving precede forgiveness on God's part, but that it also provides the standard for God's forgiving us: 'forgive us thus, as we have forgiven'. In actuality, however, there lies behind Matthew's past tense form what is called in Semitic grammar a 'present perfect', which refers to an action occurring here and now. The correct translation of the Matthaean form would therefore run, 'as we also herewith forgive our debtors'. By its choice of the present form, Luke's version was intended to exclude a misunderstanding among Greek-speaking Christians, since it says (and this catches the sense): 'for we also ourselves forgive everyone who is indebted to us'. Moreover, in the Lucan form, the petition on forgiveness is broadened by the addition of the word 'everyone', which represents a sharpening of the meaning, in that it permits no exceptions in our forgiving.

Comparison of the wording of the two forms of the Lord's Prayer therefore shows that, over against Matthew, the Lucan form has been assimilated at several points to Greek linguistic usage. Viewed as a whole, our results may be summarized thus:

The Lucan version has preserved the oldest form with respect to length, but the Matthaean text is more original with regard to *wording*.

In our consideration of the petition for forgiveness, we have just observed that the Matthaean phrase 'our debts' enables one to see that the Lord's Prayer, which is of course preserved for us only in Greek, goes back to an original Aramaic version. This observation is confirmed by the fact that the two 'thou-petitions' relate to an Aramaic prayer, the *Kaddish*. When one attempts to put the Lord's Prayer back into Aramaic, Jesus' mother tongue, the conclusion begins to emerge that, like the Psalter, it is couched in liturgical language. Even the person who brings no knowledge of the Semitic languages to his reading of the following attempt at retranslation can easily spot the characteristic features of this solemn language. We should note three features especially: parallelism, the two-beat rhythm, and the rhyme in two and four, which is scarcely accidental. The Lord's Prayer in Jesus' tongue sounded something like this (the accents designate the two-beat rhythm):<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>On the problem of the original Aramaic form and attempts at retranslation of the Lord's Prayer into Aramaic, cf. C. C. Torrey, 'The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels', in: *Studies in the History of Religions* presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends, New York, 1912, pp. 309-17.

## THE MEANING OF THE LORD' S PRAYER

Having considered what can be said about the original wording, we are prepared to face the main question. What was, as far as we can judge, the original meaning? Luke reports that Jesus gave the Lord's Prayer to his disciples on a quite specific occasion.

"He was praying in a certain place, and when he ceased, one of his disciples said to him, 'Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples.'" (Luke 11:1)

That the unnamed disciple appealed to the example of John the Baptist is important for our understanding of the Lord's Prayer, since we know that at the time of Jesus individual religious groups were marked by their own prayer customs and forms. This was true of the Pharisees, the Essenes, and, as we perceive from Luke 11:1, the disciples of John as well. A particular custom in prayer expressed the particular relationship with God which bound the individuals together. The request at Luke 11:1 therefore shows that Jesus' disciples recognized themselves as a community, or more exactly as the community of the age of salvation, and that they requested of Jesus a prayer which would bind them together and identify them, in that it would bring to expression their chief concern. As a matter of fact, the Lord's Prayer is the clearest and, in spite of its terseness, the richest summary of Jesus' proclamation which we possess. When the Lord's Prayer was given to the disciples, prayer in Jesus' name began (John :14:13ff; 15 :16; 16:23).

The structure of the Lord's Prayer is simple and transparent. We present once again what is presumably the oldest wording (following the short form according to Luke, but where there are minor variations of wording that of Matthew):

Dear Father,  
Hallowed be thy name.  
Thy kingdom come.  
Our bread for tomorrow / give us today.  
And forgive us our debts / as we also herewith forgive our debtors.  
And let us not be tested / or succumb to temptation.

The structure of the Lord's Prayer then consists of: (1) the address; (2) two 'Thou-petitions' in parallel (in Matthew, three); (3) two 'We-petitions' in parallel, both forming, as we shall see, an antithesis; (4) the concluding request. We also observe what seems to be an apparently insignificant point: while the two 'Thou-petitions' stand side-by-side without any 'and', the two parallel We-petitions are connected by an 'and'.

### The address 'Dear Father' (*Abba*)

When we trace back to its earliest beginnings the history of the invocation of God as father, we have the feeling of descending into a mine in which new and unexpected treasures are disclosed one after another. It is surprising to see that already in the ancient Orient, as early as the third and second millennia B.C., we find the deity; addressed as father. We find this title for the first time in Sumerian prayers, long before the time of Moses and the prophets, and there already the word 'father' does not merely refer to the deity as procreator and ancestor of the king and of the people and powerful lord, but it also has quite another significance: it is d for the 'merciful, gracious father, in whose hand the life of whole land lies' (a hymn from Ur to the moon god Sin).

Oriental, the word 'father', as applied to God, thus encompasses from earliest times, something of what the word 'mother' signifies among us.

When we turn to the Old Testament, we find that God is only seldom spoken of as father-in fact only on fourteen occasions, all these are important. God is Israel's father, but now not theologically as procreator or ancestor, but as the one who elected, delivered, and saved his people, Israel, by mighty deeds in history. This designation of God as father in the Old Testament comes to full fruition, however, in the message of the prophets. God is Israel's father. But the

prophets must make constant accusation against God's people that Israel has not given God the honor which a son should give to his father.

A son honours his father, and a servant his master.

If then I am a father, where is my honour?

And if I am a master, where is my fear? says the Lord of hosts.

(Mal. 1.6; cf. Deut. 32:5f.; Jer. 3:19f.)

And Israel's answer to this rebuke is a confession of sin and the ever-reiterated cry, *Abhiu atta*, 'Thou art our father' (Isa 63: 15 ff, 64:7ff.; Jer. 3-4). And God's reply to this cry is mercy beyond all understanding:

Is Ephraim my dear son?

Is he my darling child? . . .

Therefore my heart yearns for him;

I must have mercy on him,

Says the Lord. (Jer. 31:20)

Can there be any deeper dimension to the term 'father' than this compulsive, forgiving mercy which is beyond comprehension?

When we turn to Jesus' preaching, the answer must be: Yes here there is something quite new, absolutely new-the word *abba*. From the prayer in Gethsemane, Mark 14:36, we learn that Jesus addressed God with this word, and this point is confirmed not only by Rom. 8: 15 and Gal. 4: 6, but also by the striking oscillation of the forms for the vocative 'O father' in the Greek text of the gospels, an oscillation which is to be explained only through the fact that the Aramaic term *abba* lies behind all such passages. With the help of my assistants I have examined the prayer literature of ancient Judaism - a large, rich literature, all too little explored. The result of this examination was that in no place in this immense literature is this invocation of God as *abba* to be found. How is this to be explained? The church fathers Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyrus who originated from Antioch (where the populace spoke the West Syrian dialect of Aramaic) and who probably had Aramaic speaking nurses, testify unanimously that *abba* was the address of the small child to his father. And the Talmud confirms this when it says: 'When a child experiences the taste of wheat [i.e. when it is weaned], it learns to say *abba* and *imma* ['dear father' and 'dear mother'. *Abba* and *imma* are thus originally the first sounds which the child stammers. In Jesus' days they were no longer restricted to children's talk; they were also used by grown-up sons and daughters to address their parents. Yet their humble origin was not forgotten. *Abba* was an everyday word, a homely family word. No Jew would have dared to address God in this manner. Jesus did it always, in all his prayers which are handed down to us, with one single exception, the cry from the cross: God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mark 15:34; Matt. 27:46); here the term of address for God was prescribed by fact that Jesus was quoting Ps. 22.1. Jesus thus spoke with God as a child speaks with his father, simply, intimately, securely.

But his invocation of God as *abba* is not to be understood merely psychologically, as a step toward growing apprehension of God. Rather we learn from Matt. 11: 27 that Jesus himself viewed this form of address for God as the heart of that revelation which had granted him by the Father. In this term *abba* the ultimate mystery of his mission and his authority is expressed. He to whom Father had granted full knowledge of God, has the messianic prerogative of addressing him with the familiar address of a son. The term *abba* is an *ipssima vox*<sup>3</sup> of Jesus and contains in nuce his message and his claim to have been sent from the Father.

---

<sup>3</sup>*Ipssima vox* of Jesus = Jesus' own original way of speaking (cf. below, pp. 108-115).

The final point, and the most astonishing of all, however, has yet to be mentioned: in the Lord's Prayer Jesus authorizes his disciples to repeat the word *abba* after him. He gives them a share in his sonship and empowers them, as his disciples, to speak with their heavenly Father in just such a familiar, trusting way as a child would with his father. Yes, he goes so far as to say that it is this new relationship which first opens the doors to God's reign: Amen I say to you, unless you become like children again, you not find entrance into the kingdom of God' (Matt. 18.3). Children can say 'abba' ! Only he who, through Jesus, lets himself be given the childlike trust which resides in the word *abba* finds his way into the kingdom of God. This the apostle Paul also understood, he says twice that there is no surer sign or guarantee of the possession of the Holy Spirit and of the gift of sonship than this, a man makes bold to repeat this one word, '*Abba*, dear Father' (Rom 8:15; Gal. 4:6). Perhaps at this point we get some inkling why the use of the Lord's Prayer was not a commonplace in the early church and why it was spoken with such reverence and awe: 'Make us worthy, O Lord, that we joyously and without presumption may make bold to invoke Thee, the heavenly God, as Father, and to say, Our Father.'

### The two 'Thou-petitions'

The first words which the child says to his heavenly Father are 'Hallowed be thy name Thy kingdom come.' These two petitions are not only parallel in structure, but they also correspond to one another in content. They recall the Kaddish ('Holy'), an ancient Aramaic prayer which formed the conclusion of the service in the synagogue and with which Jesus was no doubt familiar from childhood. What is probably the oldest form of this prayer (later expanded) runs:

Exalted and hallowed be his great name  
in the world which he created according to his will.  
May he let his kingdom rule  
in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime  
of the whole house of Israel, speedily and soon.  
And to this, say: amen.

It is from this connection with the Kaddish that we can explain the way in which the two 'Thou-petitions' (in contrast with the two parallel 'We-petitions') stand alongside each other without any connecting word; for in the earliest texts of the Kaddish the two petitions about the hallowing of the name and the coming of the kingdom appear not to be connected by an 'and'.

Comparison with the Kaddish also shows that the two petitions are eschatological. They make entreaty for the revelation of God's eschatological kingdom. Every accession to power by an earthly ruler is accompanied by homage in words and gestures. So it will be when God enters upon his rule. Then men will do homage to him, hallowing his name: 'Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come' Rev. 4.8); then they will all prostrate themselves at the feet of the King of kings, 'We give thanks to thee, Lord God Almighty, who art and who wast, that thou hast taken thy great power and begun to reign' (Rev 11.17). The two 'Thou-petitions', to which in Matthew there is added yet a third one of like meaning (Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven'), thus make entreaty for the final consummation. Their contents strike the same note as the prayer of the early church, Maranatha (I Cor. 16. 22), 'Come, Lord Jesus' (Rev. 22.20). They seek the hour in which God's profaned and misused name will be glorified and his reign revealed, in accordance with the promise, 'I will vindicate the holiness of my great name, which has been profaned among the nations, and which you have profaned among them; and the nations will know that I am the Lord, says the Lord God, when through you I vindicate my holiness before their eyes' (Ezek. 36.23).

These petitions are a cry out of the depths of distress. Out of a world which is enslaved under the rule of evil and in which Christ and Antichrist are locked in conflict, Jesus' disciples, seemingly a prey of evil and death and Satan, lift their eyes to the Father and cry out for the

revelation of God's glory. But at the same time these petitions are an expression of absolute certainty. He who prays thus, takes seriously God's promise, in spite of all the demonic powers, and puts himself completely in God's hands, with imperturbable trust: 'Thou wilt complete Thy glorious work, Abba, Father. These are the same words which the Jewish community prays in the synagogue at the end of the service in the Kaddish; yet the two 'Thou-petitions' are not the same as the Kaddish, in spite of the similar wording. There is a great difference. In the Kaddish the prayer is by a congregation which stands in the darkness of the present age and asks for the consummation. In the Lord's Prayer, though similar words are used, a congregation is praying which knows that the turning point has already come, because God has already begun his saving work. This congregation now makes supplication for full revelation of what has already been granted.

### The two 'We-petitions'

The two 'We-petitions', for daily bread and for forgiveness, hang together as closely as the two 'Thou-petitions'. This connection of the two 'We-petitions' with one another is seen immediately in the structure through the fact that both of them, in contrast to the 'Thou-petitions', consist of two half-lines each:

Our bread for tomorrow / give us today.  
 And forgive us our debts / as we also  
 herewith forgive our debtors.

If it is correct that the two 'Thou-petitions' recall the Kaddish, then we must conclude that in the Lord's Prayer the accent lies completely on the new material which Jesus added, that is, on the two 'We-petitions'. They form the real heart of the Lord's Prayer, to which the two 'Thou-petitions' lead up.

(a) The first of the two 'We-petitions' asks for daily bread (The Greek word  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . The Greek word,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , which Luther rendered as 'taglich' ('daily') and Tyndale in 1525 and the Authorized Version as 'daily', has been the object of lengthy discussion which is not yet finally settled. In my opinion, the decisive fact is that the church father Jerome (c. AD 342-420) tells us that in the lost Aramaic Gospel of the Nazarenes the term *mahar* appears, meaning 'tomorrow', that here therefore the reference was to bread 'for tomorrow'. Now it is true that this Gospel of the Nazarenes is not older than our first three gospels; rather it rests on our Gospel of Matthew. Nonetheless the Aramaic wording of the Lord's Prayer in the Gospel of the Nazarenes ('bread for tomorrow') must be older than the Gospel of the Nazarenes and older even than our gospels. For in first-century Palestine the Lord's Prayer was prayed in uninterrupted usage in Aramaic, and a person translating the Gospel of Matthew into Aramaic naturally did not translate the Lord's Prayer as he did the rest of the text. Instead, when the translator came to Matt. 6. 9-13, he of course stopped translating; he simply wrote down the holy words in the form in which he prayed them day by day. In other words, the Aramaic-speaking Jewish-Christians, among whom the Lord's Prayer lived on in its original Aramaic wording in unbroken usage since the days of Jesus, prayed, 'Our bread for tomorrow give us today.'

Jerome tells us even more. He adds a remark telling how the phrase, 'bread for tomorrow' was understood. He says: 'In the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews [i.e. the Nazarenes] · · · I found *mahar*, which means 'for tomorrow' so that the sense is, Our bread for tomorrow, that is, our future bread, give us today, ' As a matter of fact, in ancient Judaism *mahar*, 'tomorrow', meant not only the next day but also the great Tomorrow, the final consummation. Accordingly, Jerome is saying, the 'bread for tomorrow' was not meant as earthly bread but as the bread of life. Further, we know from the ancient translations of the Lord's Prayer both in the East and in the West, that in the early church this eschatological understanding-- 'bread of the age of salvation', 'bread of life', 'heavenly manna'- was the familiar, if not the predominant interpretation of the

phrase 'bread for tomorrow'. Since primeval times, the bread of life and the water of life have been symbols of paradise, an epitome of the fullness of all God's material and spiritual gifts. It is this bread-symbol, image, and fulfillment of the age of salvation -to which Jesus is referring when he says that in the consummation he will eat and drink with his disciples (Luke 22.30) and that he will gird himself and serve them at table (Luke 12.37) with the bread which has been broken and the cup which has been blessed (cf. Matt. 26.29). The eschatological thrust of all the other petitions in the Lord's Prayer speaks for the fact that the petition for bread has an eschatological sense too, i.e., that it entreats God for the bread of life.

This interpretation may perhaps be a surprise or even a disappointment for us. For so many people it is important that at least one petition in the Lord's Prayer should lead into everyday life, the petition for daily bread. Is that to be taken away from us? Is that not an impoverishment? No, in reality, application of the petition about bread to the bread of life is a great enrichment. It would be a gross misunderstanding if one were to suppose that here there is a 'spiritualizing', after the manner of Greek philosophy, and that there is a distinction made between 'earthly' and heavenly bread. For Jesus, earthly bread and the bread of life are not antithetical. In the realm of God's kingship he viewed all earthly things as hallowed. His disciples belong to God's new age; they are snatched away from the age of death (Matt. 8.22). This fact manifests itself in their life down to the last details. It expresses itself in their words (Matt. 5.21ff., 33-37), in their looks (5.28), in the way they greet men on the street (5.47); it expresses itself also in their eating and drinking. For the disciples of Jesus there are no longer 'clean' or 'unclean' foods. 'Nothing that a man eats can make him "unclean" ' (Mark 7.15); all that God provides is blessed. This 'hallowing of life' is most clearly illustrated by the picture of Jesus at table for a meal. The bread which he proffered when he sat at table with publicans and sinners was everyday bread, and yet it was more: it was the bread of life. The bread which he broke for his disciples at the Last Supper was earthly bread,