

therefore be seriously questioned whether the theory that the Last Supper was the Paschal Meal had any existence before St Mark wrote his Gospel.

But to discuss this would go beyond the object of this Note, which is to express my conviction that it is hazardous to interpret St Luke's special source for the Passion Story in the light of the Marcan theory, and also to suggest that the saying of Jesus at the Supper which expresses His earnest desire to have kept the Passover Feast with His faithful followers does not imply that the Supper was a Paschal Meal, but rather that it was not a Paschal Meal.

F. C. BURKITT.

PROF. BURKITT suggested to me, when he discovered that I had independently arrived at the same conclusion which he has reached about the interpretation of Luke xxii 15, 16, that we should both write notes to the *J. T. S.* to call attention to what seems to both of us the natural meaning of the verses; especially as it would seem that we are in a minority of two on the subject. He has been kind enough to shew me his note, and I fear that I have little to add to what he has stated so clearly, except to express my complete agreement with his main conclusion, which had suggested itself to me three or four years ago. The history of the text of these and other cognate verses reflects the difficulty which was felt in interpreting such words in accordance with the so-called 'Synoptic' presentation of the Last Meal. It may be worth while to recall the evidence. In Luke xxii 16 the true text οὐ μὴ φάγω is found in \aleph A B C*vi H L al¹ sah cop. (I quote from Tischendorf. The Bohairic $\pi\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\iota$ is quite clear, and Horner quotes no variants in Bohairic MSS.) The reading of D (οὐκέτι μὴ φάγομαι, omitting the preceding $\delta\tau\iota$) perhaps recalls the Latin of the opposite page, 'iam non manducabo'. At any rate the evidence suggests Western modification of a probably harmonizing character. In ver. 18 οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου κ.τ.λ. is the better attested text, but the words ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν are not found in A C X Γ Δ A Π unc⁵ al pler it^{pler} vg syr^{sch}. Turning to Mark xiv 25 (οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος κ.τ.λ.) the evidence quoted for the omission of οὐκέτι is not inconsiderable (\aleph C D L b^{scr}* a c f k em gat cop aeth). In St Matthew alone the corresponding phrase ἀπ' ἄρτι is undisputed.

It may also be worth pointing out that the earliest form of the Syriac, in which the Lucan account has been rearranged, leaves ver. 15 in its position at the beginning of the narrative, before there has been any mention of eating, or of distributing the bread.

Thus the saying which Luke alone records, if we consider its

position and its original form, would seem to point unmistakably to the view that the wish, to which expression had been given just before, was felt by the speaker to be one which could not be fulfilled. In the light of later views about the meal at which it was spoken it was felt to need modification. And the textual evidence for the similar saying with regard to the fruit of the vine, which is recorded in all three Synoptists, suggests that here also the need for modification was felt, though very likely for different reasons.

May we not add Luke xxv 15, 16 to the indications, considerable in number, that the so-called Synoptic view of the Last Supper is not the view which lies behind, or is presupposed by, the earliest forms of the tradition which they embody? It may be incorrect to speak of the Fourth Gospel as 'correcting' a Synoptic mistake. It has at any rate preserved more clearly the truer tradition.

A. E. BROOKE.

ON APHRAATES *HOM.* I § 19.

IN the January number of this volume of the JOURNAL (pp. 267 ff) Mr H. L. Pass has set forth a new and interesting theory in explanation of the well-known passage in the first Homily of Aphraates¹ which by several eminent scholars has been pronounced to be an early Syriac Creed.

Mr Pass opens his case with a reference to an article of mine on 'The Early Syriac Creed',² in which I maintained that the passage just referred to has no claim to be regarded as Aphraates' Creed, inasmuch as there are evident traces of a much less abnormal formula in others of his Homilies. Mr Pass, whilst accepting my main conclusion, justly criticizes me on a point of detail. I had failed to take account of the evident connexion, mediate or immediate, between the passage in *Hom.* i § 19 and a similar passage in the Letter written to Aphraates by a friend and now prefixed to his Homilies. Mr Pass rightly lays stress upon the resemblance between these two passages. Throughout *Hom.* i Aphraates follows closely a line of treatment laid down for him by his friend. The latter has asked him to set down for him some thoughts on the subject of Faith—what it is, what its basis and the substructure upon which it is to be reared, what is the best means of developing it and bringing it to perfection, and, finally, what are the

¹ In Parisot's ed. cols. 44, 45.

² In the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, July 1906.