

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 *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

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

the patriarchs. If Cain was a tribe, it is at any rate odd that we should have recorded of him a punishment for murder, which under the various names *sacratio capitis*, *Friedloslegung*, outlawry, &c., is familiar to all students of early law. And the doubt so raised is increased by every fresh instance. It would be easy to go through the legal passages of Genesis one by one, examining them from this point of view; but as I have recently drawn attention to some of the more important of these elsewhere, I need not now linger on them. But such investigations make it very difficult to believe that the instance of rape and the resulting private war chronicled in Gen. xxxiv are in fact symbolical. If they were, it is improbable that they would find parallels from all over the world.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

ST LUKE XXII 15, 16.

I AM glad to see that Professor Burkitt's authority is now enlisted on the side of the non-paschal implications of St Luke xxii 15, 16. Both Professor Burkitt and Mr Brooke are, apparently, unaware that I proposed this interpretation of the passage more than five years ago in a review of Berning's *Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie in ihrer ursprünglichen Form, nach den Berichten des neuen Testaments kritisch untersucht* (see the *Critical Review*, Jan. 1903, pp. 32-38).

Perhaps I may be allowed to recall the passage from the review in question which contains the suggestion. It runs as follows:

'It is also remarkable how slight (apart from the introductory narrative-setting) are the indications of the alleged paschal character of the meal described in the Synoptists, while they are altogether absent from the parallel narrative in John (xiii). It is especially significant that none of the accounts contains any mention of the paschal lamb, unless Luke xxii 15 be an exception, which is hardly probable. It must be admitted that the latter passage at first sight seems to demonstrate the paschal character of the meal; but on examination this becomes less certain. In Westcott and Hort's text the verse runs as follows: ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τούτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. The saying—which bears the stamp of genuineness—is peculiar to Luke. It is noteworthy that the state-

position of certain narratives appears clearly from Gen. x 19, where a border is fixed by reference to places that were destroyed in the age of Abraham, and that are spoken of in this passage as being still in existence.

ment οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό is, as regards the speaker's present, perfectly unqualified: *I will not eat it*, viz. τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα. The difficulty was evidently felt by the early readers and copyists, who added οὐκέτι before οὐ μὴ φάγω and changed αὐτό into ἐξ αὐτοῦ—'I will not *again* eat of it'. But it is at least conceivable that the original saying should be interpreted: *I have greatly desired to eat this (coming) Passover with you before I suffer (but it is not to be); for I say unto you I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God.*

['Sometimes כִּי (= *for*) in a poetical or rhetorical style gives the reason for a thought not expressed but implied' (Driver in *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* s. v. כִּי col. 474 *a* where instances are given). The same remark applies to the usage of the Aramaic כִּי, which was probably the original of γάρ here.]

When I proposed the above explanation in January 1903, I believe I was in a minority of one. It is gratifying to know that the minority has now been increased to three at least.

G. H. Box.

THE APOSTOLIC GROUPS.

THE lists found respectively in the first, second, and third Gospels and in the Acts appear to represent four corresponding stages in the evolution of the apostolic college. Various features in this evolution will be set forth in the course of the following article, but it may be pointed out at once that a division into three groups of four soon came to be more fundamental than the original division into pairs. The latter is found in St Matthew's list, and marks it off as the most primitive. The pairs probably represent the companies in which the Apostles were wont to preach.¹ In the Acts, St Luke harks back to this arrangement; yet there not merely does he name the first four Apostles without such pairing, but the last three also, because of the absence of the traitor, and he makes an interchange in the two pairs which he does give.

On the other hand there is abundant evidence for the development of the groups at the expense of the pairs. The Acts list shews itself the latest by explicitly marking the beginning of a new group by the omission of καί: in the case of the last group it perhaps has the support of the other Lucan list, but the reading is doubtful. Further, the leader of each group is always the same; he alone keeps his place in all the lists, but the groups are never crossed. Lastly, the different

¹ Cf. Mk. vi 7: for similar examples see Lk. x 1, with Plummer's note.