

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

infected, so that those who partook of it would be literally and inevitably drawn under the power of the evil spirits, to the certain peril and the probable ruin of their souls. Their 'weakness' consisted in their inadequate appreciation of, and defective confidence in, the power of Christ.

The 'weak' within the Roman Church Dr. Rauer believes to have been men who had been Gentile Gnostics before they became Christians, and who in their adopted religion continued to practise the vegetarianism which had been obligatory in the religion which they had abandoned—practised it all the more earnestly, as Christianity was felt to be a call to perfection, and with this they not unnaturally associated asceticism. It is also possible that their conduct was determined in part by an eschatological motive, according to which the latter days were to reproduce the ideal primal time, when animal food was believed to form no part of the diet of man. As against this conception, Paul desires to bring home to those who held it that the kingdom of God has nothing to do with meat or drink. Dr. Rauer rightly comments on the fine pastoral tact which Paul displays in both discussions. This suggestive and illuminating study helps us to appreciate the difficulties which the great apostle had to encounter through the retention in the minds of his converts of ideas which

had been engrained in them or become precious to them through their former way of living.

A strange fascination attaches to the reputed words of Jesus which are found in extra-canonical sources. Curiosity will be abundantly satisfied by the very extensive and beautifully printed collection¹ gathered together by M. Besson from many sources—apocryphal gospels, apocryphal Acts, the Talmud, the Fathers—and supplemented by two interesting appendices on Christ in the Talmud and in Muhammadan Tradition. The French translations of the Sayings are accompanied by brief notes. In spite of the writer's disclaimer that his work has no scientific pretensions, the collection cannot fail to be welcome to ordinary readers who are eager to gather up such fragments as ancient tradition, whether reliable or unreliable, has left us of the words of Jesus. But when we have read them all, we can only endorse the author's own statement when he says that 'the striking thing is that, after all the studies devoted to Christian literature, so small a number of words has been discovered which can with any certainty be attributed to Christ.'

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

¹ *Les Logia Agrapha*, par Emile Besson (Bibliothèque des Amitiés Spirituelles, à Bihorel-lez-Rouen, 2, rue du Point-du-Jour, chez A. L. Legrand; 7 fr.).

The Institution of the Eucharist.

BY THE REVEREND G. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., HOVE, SUSSEX.

THE main purpose of this paper is to defend the genuineness of Lk 22^{19b-20} against the prevalent opinion to the contrary. But by way of clearing the ground for this important task, it is necessary first of all to consider the difference as to the date of the Crucifixion, and inferentially the Institution of the Eucharist, between St. John and the Synoptics, as well as the variations between the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark on the one hand and that of St. Luke on the other.

A.

The contradiction regarding the date of the Crucifixion and the time of the Eucharist between

St. John's account and that of the first three Gospels is, indeed, as pronounced as it possibly could be. According to St. John, the Crucifixion took place in the afternoon of the 14th of Nīsān (see particularly 18²⁸ and 19¹⁴), whilst the three other Evangelists place the date of the Crucifixion on the 15th of Nīsān, that is the first day of the Passover-feast itself, the Paschal lamb having been slain and eaten in the evening of the 14th of Nīsān, which according to Jewish ideas counted as the beginning of the 15th day of the month (see Mt 26¹⁷, Mk 14¹², Lk 12⁷).

Now if the Synoptic statement had, like that of St. John's Gospel, been consistent in itself, it

would have been critically more difficult to decide on which side to take our stand. But, as it happens, the chronological position of the Synoptics is anything but consistent. There is, first of all, the fact that the Hebrew phrase answering to ἡ πρώτη τῶν ἄζύμων can, as Dr. Chwolson pointed out long ago (*Das letzte Abendmahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes*, p. 3 f.), only mean 'the first day of unleavened bread,' that is the 13th, and not the 14th of Nisān, 'so that,' to use the phrase of Professor Sanday, 'it would be a contradiction in terms to say, with Mk 14¹², "on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover," that sacrifice having been accomplished on the day before.' Then there is, besides, the significant fact that the Synoptists themselves make the Sanhedrin say that they would not arrest Jesus on the feast day, and there are in addition several other difficulties which the reader might usefully look up in Dr. Sanday's 'Jesus Christ' in *H.D.B.* p. 634, col. 2.

St. John's account is, on the other hand, perfectly consistent. The Crucifixion took place on the 14th Nisān, and consequently the Last Supper on the evening of the 13th; and criticism can entertain no doubt as to which statement to accept on chronological grounds.

The question still remains whether there might be a way of explaining how the wrong chronology has crept into the account given by the first three Evangelists; and it is in this connexion unfortunate for the English student that our best commentaries and reference books were published before Dr. Chwolson published the second edition (in 1908) of *Das letzte Abendmahl Christi*, etc. A concise indication of the solution of the difficulty can, however, now be found in Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1911, p. 544). Dr. Chwolson suggests that the phrase τῆ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἄζύμων is to be regarded as a misinterpretation of ביום קמי דפסחא that stood in the Aramaic original of Mt 26¹⁷, which is capable of being rendered in three different ways: (1) 'the day before the Paschal day,' i.e. Nisān 13, which would agree with St. John's account; (2) 'the day before the Paschal feast,' i.e. Nisān 14; (3) 'the first day of the Paschal feast,' i.e. Nisān 15 (see further in Moffatt, p. 545). This proposed solution does not, indeed, meet the entire difficulty, as the various other discrepancies alluded to above still remain; but the supposition would

be that the initial error, through a misrepresentation, having once crept into the Synoptics, an attempt was made to produce a text conformable to it, though without sufficient success, self-contradictions not having been avoided; whilst the Johannine account, giving from the first the true chronology, remained consistent throughout, and bears on the face of it the marks of genuineness which criticism has clear-sightedly discerned in it.

B.

Assuming, then, that some such process as has just been described lies actually at the base of the Synoptic account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, it remains for us to consider the difference between St. Luke's record and that of the two other Synoptists. How are we to account for the presence of two cups in the Third Gospel, considering that the two First Evangelists, as well as St. Paul (1 Co 11) speak of one cup only?

As has been stated at the beginning of this paper, this is really the ultimate theme of the present contribution to this great subject. But in order to clear our minds of, may be, long-cherished misconceptions of our Lord's attitude towards the Jewish ordinances of His day, it is necessary to lay stress on some important facts which do not seem to have carried sufficient weight in the minds of our commentators when dealing with the question before us.

(a) Theological writers generally appear to be anxious to establish a complete conformity between our Lord's manner of keeping the Last Supper with His disciples and the requirements of the Jewish customs obligatory at the time. But is it not an undeniable fact that Christ allowed Himself a full amount of freedom in matters of this kind? He, indeed, considered it right to take part in these ordinances and was desirous of always keeping *en rapport* with the prevalent institutions. But He did it all in His own way; and, as we know very well from His treatment of, e.g., the Sabbath, not always to the satisfaction of His critics among the Pharisees and other sections of the community. Is it not necessary to note carefully His declaration, 'but I say unto you' in the Sermon on the Mount, in order to obtain a clear idea of His position in matters not only of later Jewish rule, but also of the more ancient traditions? He was the Lord of everything; He followed the spirit, not the letter. He was Spirit, He was Life.

(b) Applying, then, what has just been said about our Lord's general attitude towards Jewish customs of His day to the narratives of the Institution of the Eucharist as set down in the Gospels and 1 Co 11, we must be prepared to find ourselves in an atmosphere of complete spiritual independence. The legal ordinances of the Passover celebration were to be observed in the highest spirit of the Divine freedom with which our Lord was endowed throughout His life on earth. The Passover lambs of the community generally were sacrificed in the afternoon of the 14th of Nisān, and eaten on the evening of the same day. But in our Lord's case, not only was there no Passover lamb—for, wonderful thought!—He was Himself bodily and spiritually present as the Lamb that accomplished infinitely more than the Jewish Passover lamb could possibly accomplish; but the time chosen for the Last Supper was also not the legal one either. Instead of sitting down with His disciples to the Paschal meal on the night of the 14th of Nisān, His chosen time was the night of the 13th, that is, twenty-four hours before the sanctioned date. Do we not, as in all others of His actions on that memorable night, observe His perfectly untrammelled mode of carrying out the traditional observances of His nation, of which He was not in any sense the Rabbinic exponent of the time, but the Lord and Master? And is this not in full accord with what has been said above of His general attitude towards the traditions of the elders, the Sabbath, and the entire system of the ancient Law of His people?

C.

But there is another question to be considered before we can finally proceed to deal with St. Luke's account of the Institution of the Eucharist; and, as this question concerns no less a matter than the critical acceptance or rejection of Lk 22^{19b-20}, in which mention is made of the second cup, it is clear that all possible attention must be given to the textual problem before dealing with the fact which it embodies.

As is well known, Westcott and Hort relegate the part of the text named to the number of rejected passages, leaving it, however, in its place within double brackets. To make a stand in its favour against such high authorities seems a bold enough step. But there is, to begin with, the crucial fact to be considered that on this particular

point Westcott and Hort's decision is not in conformity with their general principles of N.T. textual criticism, but in decisive antagonism to these principles. According to their own fully considered position, the different forms of the Western text are the least reliable authorities to be guided by, and yet here they actually reject vv.^{19b-20} on the strength of exclusively Western readings arrayed against forms of text which they regard as most authoritative in fixing the most acceptable wording of the New Testament Scriptures.

Nor can it be said that some of the finest critical investigators, who subsequently dealt with the subject, assent to Westcott and Hort's position in this matter in more than a half-hearted and, at any rate, inconclusive sort of way. Thus Dr. Sanday (*loc. cit.*, vol. ii. p. 636), after fully summing up the entire textual evidence, declares: 'We cannot doubt that both these types of text existed early in the second century. Either may be original,' though he adds: 'And this is just one of those cases where internal evidence is strongly in favour of the text which we call Western. The temptation to expand was much stronger than to contract; and the double number of the cup raises real difficulties of the kind which suggest interpolation.'

Now as to the greater temptation to expand, this can evidently not be regarded as decisive, as the temptation to contract on the part of the other Synoptics and St. Paul may have happened to have very strongly operated in the present case. The great difficulty in Dr. Sanday's view lay, therefore, in the mention of a second cup, which, he considered, suggested interpolation. But what if the two cups should actually prove, not a difficulty in the received text of St. Luke, but a great support in its favour? And what if not only Westcott and Hort, but also other great textual critics, have been led to reject vv.^{19b-20} simply because they had not the opportunity of reading St. Luke in the light of the Jewish family observance of the Passover night? And it is just this crucial point that is to be dealt with in the following section of this paper. For the moment we must content ourselves with the mention of one other rather weak assent on the part of a discerning critic, namely, Dr. Plummer, and wind up this section with a reference to a lifelong opponent of Westcott and Hort's entire position, namely, the late Mr. Gwilliam, who not only unceremoniously,

but even indignantly, rejects the prevalent view regarding Lk 22¹⁹⁻²⁰ (in his article 'Last Supper' in Hastings' *D.C.G.*). With the general question of the textual values of the New Testament we have not, of course, to deal here; but on this particular point it is really impossible not to agree with Gwilliam's opinion.

D.

Now starting from the position that St. Luke's two cups are authentic, how are we to explain his record? The answer is assuredly to be found in the observances of Jewish domestic Passover-night Service. At that festive family gathering there were, and at the present day are, at intervals four cups: (1) the cup of the *Qiddūsh* (or sanctification of the feast); (2) what may be called the cup of redemption, following as it does on a benediction voicing the expectation of national independence in the Holy Land; (3) the cup immediately preceding the benediction after meals; (4) the final cup, preceding certain additional pieces at the end of this interesting domestic festal Service, which may, perhaps, be not improperly styled the Jewish Passover Agapē.

Now it ought to be carefully noted that at the mention of the first cup in Lk 22¹⁷⁻¹⁸, no words of Eucharistic institution are used by our Lord. He merely said: 'Take this and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.' In v.¹⁸, on the other hand, the blessing over the bread is accompanied by the words of Institution: 'This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me,' and v.²⁰ records with equal definiteness the Institution of the Eucharistic cup: 'And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This is the new covenant in my blood, *even* that which is poured out for you.'

The reason why the other two cups of the Passover liturgical feast are not mentioned by St. Luke is that they lay outside the purpose of his record. He mentions the first cup on account of its importance as the *Qiddūsh* and of our Lord's significant remark in connexion with it; and the cup of Eucharistic Institution (apparently the third cup 'after having supped') was, of course, of the most paramount importance on this great occasion. But the remaining two cups he had no special reason

to bring into his narrative; or, possibly, this is another instance of our Lord's freedom of action in all matters of this kind, as He may, in fact, only have used two cups on this occasion: namely, (1) the cup of the *Qiddūsh*; and (2) the Eucharistic cup; or, again, there may possibly only have been two cups normally in the service as used in the time of Christ. In any case, St. Luke's record, as it stands in the received text, seems to remain perfectly authentic on the available evidence before us drawn from the domestic Passover-night liturgical meal.

But the question may, and should rightly be asked, What evidence there was to justify us in assuming that the domestic Service referred to was in use as early as the time of our Lord? Fortunately the extant evidence is perfectly sufficient to show that in its main features it was used in His day.

The first clear reference to a distinctive part of the ritual in question is made by Rabbi Gamaliel (Mishna, *Pesāḥim*, x. 5). Many scholars hold that this Gamaliel is the first of the name. Professor Gotthard Deutsch thinks (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, vi. p. 141, col. 2) that Gamaliel II. arranged the Passover ritual, just as he arranged the ritual for the daily Services; but even he considers it likely that in one form or another such a ritual existed before the time of the second Tanna of that name. The proper length of the Hallel in the family Service that has come down to us is, moreover, already a subject of discussion between the schools of Hillel and Shammai; and there seems to be no doubt that the hymn sung by Christ and His disciples (Mt 26³⁰, Mk 14²⁶) at the close of the Last Supper was part of the Hallel.

On these grounds it may, therefore, be accepted as an established fact that a domestic ritual meal of some kind was actually in use in the time of Christ; and there thus remains no difficulty on historical grounds in the way of our acceptance of St. Luke's account of the two cups, always remembering that the second cup named by him was that of the Eucharistic Institution, the first having been the cup of the *Qiddūsh*.

Nor should it be thought that the two other Synoptics and St. Paul in 1 Co 11 are in any sense in disagreement with St. Luke's account. They had not made it their task to write a record of the Last Supper in the fuller sense, but merely fastened on what was essential to their purpose. They,

therefore, only speak of the Eucharistic cup, the cup of the *Qiddūsh* lying outside the actual Institution of the Eucharist.

E.

It now remains to refer to Professor Box's theory regarding the relationship of the Eucharist to the *Qiddūsh*. A full discussion of his article on the 'Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist' in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April 1902, in the light of what has been said in the present paper, would require a separate article of some length. So only a few remarks on this part of the subject will be offered here. If the facts stated and the reason-

ing advanced above should be found to carry conviction, Dr. Box's position must clearly be regarded as no longer tenable. He has either, with the majority of scholars, held vv.^{19b-20} in St. Luke to be an interpolation, or has not given weight to the fact that the words of Institution were not spoken by our Lord in connexion with the first cup, but the second. It is to be hoped, therefore, that he will now find it necessary to reconsider his view on this important matter, and that he will finally come to the conclusion that all that can be said with regard to the *Qiddūsh* is that it was a preliminary to the cup of the Institution, and not in any sense identical with it.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Deep Sea Voyage.¹

'The way of a ship in the midst of the sea.'—Pr 30¹⁹.

HAVE you ever seen what's called a shooting star, a meteor flashing through the sky? And do you know that this old world of ours that seems so stodgy and solid is dashing along all the time at just about that pace? We'll have to get up fairly early, you and I, and sprint hard all day long, if we are not going to be left behind, out of things and old-fashioned, for always the earth is rushing into something new and exciting. A while ago it was wireless, but already that's beginning to get stale. You have had your set for months, and that's a long time nowadays. We must have something new again. Well, there is something new, a wonderful thing, the Gyro Compass. Have you heard of that? It's like this. When a ship goes out to sea it must have all kinds of people on board, if it is to have a chance of reaching port upon the other side. There must be a captain, a mate, engineer, stokers, and heaps more. But one man must never be forgotten, and that is the man to steer, to set the course and keep the ship steady to it. It's difficult to steer: it takes brains and skill and experience: and even the best man should not be kept at it too long. For it's so

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

tiring. If you or I tried it, we would make the sorriest mess of things: we would lose knots and knots and hours and hours. It needs a first-rate man. And yet now they have found an instrument to do it for them, which can set and keep the course just splendidly. When the waves try to slap the ship out of its track, it won't let them: when the winds want to drive it from its course this compass brings it round again. And it does it far, far better than any man can do. It has been tried right across the Atlantic; and the captain says that, though he has had the cleverest seamen to steer for him, none of them could do it anything like as well as the Gyro Compass does.

Well, there's something for you and me to think about, and I'll tell you why. How long ago is it since a certain dainty ship was launched? How old are you? That will tell us. Seven. Well, seven years ago a bonnie little boat was launched. It took the water splendidly; and every one was pleased, and then of course they named it. What was your boat called? They did a very cruel thing to mine, poor thing. For they went and named it the 'Arthur.' And it's dreadfully hard not to be a bit milksoppy if you've got a name like that. If you are another Arthur, well, we'll have to stick in and work hard, you and I, to make any kind of show at all. But probably you have a decent name, like Tom or Mary or Jack. Anyhow