

Harvard Theological Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HTR>

Additional services for *Harvard Theological Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Lukan Tradition of the Lord's Supper

Benjamin Wisner Bacon

Harvard Theological Review / Volume 5 / Issue 03 / July 1912, pp 322 - 348

DOI: 10.1017/S0017816000013547, Published online: 03 November 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0017816000013547

How to cite this article:

Benjamin Wisner Bacon (1912). The Lukan Tradition of the Lord's Supper. Harvard Theological Review, 5, pp 322-348 doi:10.1017/S0017816000013547

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE LUKAN TRADITION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

In its effort to determine the historic sense of the New Testament records, and thus to understand them genetically, modern criticism has developed no instrument more effective than the method of comparison. In former days the aim was harmonization, because the interpreter started with the assumption of a mechanical agreement among the witnesses. Today the aim is distinction, because mechanical coincidence is neither assumed nor desired. On the contrary the broader the contrast in point of view, the surer the ultimate inference. Stars so remote that they give no parallax, their rays seeming to come at precisely the same angle no matter from what point of the earth's orbit the observer takes his measurements, afford small hope of determining their real position. There must be difference of angle when the earth has swung round half its orbit, or there is no basis for measurement. Fortunately for the problem of the historical Jesus, the rays which come to us from him do not travel along precisely parallel lines. On the other hand the problem is enormously complicated by the process of mixture; for the testimony of one witness has visibly affected that of another, detracting from its independent value. Paul's conception is indeed distinctive in itself, strongly marked and characteristic. Little as he tells us of the common tradition, his own point of view is definable, and moreover he both expressly differentiates it from certain views which he opposes as reactionary, and also asserts its essential agreement with certain doctrines and traditions which he declares to be preached by all, "whether it were I, or they." The "apostolic" conception, on the other hand (if we may use the word "apostolic," in a Lukan rather than a Pauline sense, to include only the personal associates of Jesus) is hard to differentiate in its purity. The material embodied by Luke, espe-

cially in the early chapters of Acts reporting the speeches of Peter, admittedly shows the widest divergence from Paul's conceptions of the person of Christ and the work and message of redemption. Late as the work of the third evangelist may be,—its date in our judgment is not far from 100, and it is certainly later than Mark's gospel, which it incorporates as its very framework,—its author claims to have proceeded after the manner of a conscientious historian in examining and utilizing the work of his "many" predecessors, and we must to the following extent at least give credence to his claim. He has certainly embodied other sources along with Mark, and that not merely as did Matthew,—an evangelist whose historical interest is quite subordinate to that of teaching men to "observe all things whatsoever [Jesus] had commanded." Luke has not contented himself with Matthew's almost slavish dependence on the narrative of Mark as a framework for the body of precepts. Taking up most of this "logian" material in common with Matthew, though not in great agglutinated blocks of discourse, but with a sincere attempt to rearrange it "in order" as consecutive history, Luke also adds a goodly amount of material, both narrative and "logian," found in neither Matthew nor Mark, yet so clearly interconnected and so distinctive in type as to have won from modern analytical and literary critics the designation the "special source" of Luke. And this "special source" is strong precisely where the collection of precepts so dear to Matthew is weak, namely, in the story of the passion and resurrection. Here more than anywhere else Luke drops even his Ariadne's thread of Mark, and boldly strikes out an independent course. Often, indeed, this departure is in the interest of rhetorical beauty, sentiment, and edification, rather than of history; but instances of real gain in historical verisimilitude are not wanting, as in the account of Jesus' detention and abuse by "the men who held him captive" in the courtyard of "the house of the high-priest" until his taking away by "the whole crowd of them" to the trial before Pilate in the morning. Here the probability is very greatly on the side of the special source, as against Mark's impossible story of a trial before the entire Sanhedrin at midnight of passover night (!) For in Mark the Jewish senate is successively con-

vened and dismissed and reconvened at the high priest's house between cock-crowing and dawn (Mk. 15 1), with no advantage gained by the process, save a publicity and responsibility they are really anxious above all things to avoid, together with an opportunity to indulge (the Sanhedrin!) in personal abuse of the helpless victim. Here the simplified Lukan version extorts at least the verdict, *Sì non è vero, è ben trovato*.

The weakness of the method of literary or source analysis in the gospels is the lack of external criteria by which to check and verify its results. Besides the far more complete digestion and assimilation of source-material in an author such as Luke, as compared with one of the compilers of Hebrew history such as JEP^r or JEP^r, there is the lack of a well-defined relation between historical praxis and literary presupposition. The deuteronomic and priestly codes introduce revolutionary changes in the national cultus, so that we can say with confidence, The period before Josiah cannot possibly have known Deuteronomy; or, The period before the exile is unaffected by religion as understood in P. But it is exceedingly difficult to trace variations of observance in various branches of the apostolic and post-apostolic church. We know something of its two great rites, baptism and the breaking of bread, though little as to their origin and the differences of meaning attached to them at various stages of their development in different quarters. We know something of the later disputes over the observance of days and seasons; but what would we not give to be able to trace to its real beginning the observance of "the Lord's day," or the annual fast and feast of the quartodeciman "true passover of the Lord"!

Of the relation of the widely variant accounts of the resurrection in Paul on the one side and gospel tradition on the other to "primitive observance" we have spoken elsewhere.¹ It remains to be seen whether it may not be possible similarly to correlate research into the origin and significance of the Lord's supper with literary analysis of the gospels, in such wise as to

¹ See *The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance*, Yale University Press, 1911 (reprinted from *American Journal of Theology* for July, 1911), and *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, Yale University Press, 1909, pp. 190-232.

reflect light in both directions. A large amount of able and scholarly criticism has lately been expended upon the historical problem of the origin and significance of the sacraments, the point of departure being practically dictated by the historical references of Paul in 1 Cor. 10 1-11 34, with the Synoptic Gospels as check, and the aim a differentiation of the Pauline surcharge of new and mystical significance leading over to the sacramentarian conceptions of the Fourth Gospel, Ignatius, and the church fathers. We can scarcely hope to define this process of development more clearly than has been done, for example, by Heitmüller in his admirable discussions of the subject²—if indeed we guard ourselves from too much emphasis upon the new elements contributed by Paul. The factors of Paul's personal contribution were twofold: (1) his own religious experience, (2) the influence exerted upon him by Greek ideas indirectly through hellenistic Judaism and directly through his adaptation of his message to the capacity of Greek-speaking, Greek-thinking communities. But we must beware of overestimating the new constituents. A. Schweitzer's³ keen and insistent criticism will serve here as a mentor of sleepless persistence and alacrity.

Heitmüller's classification of the sources for our knowledge of the institution of the Lord's Supper may be adopted as commanding general assent. We have really but three forms of the tradition in the New Testament; for Mt. 26 26-29 is an almost identical transcript of Mk. 14 22-25, and in the Fourth Gospel the sacrament is not instituted at all. There Jesus gives only a symbol and interpretation of it in the miracle of the loaves and the discourse in Capernaum on the bread from heaven,⁴ as the Baptist in the opening chapter gives a prophecy and symbol

² *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1903, and "Abendmahl" in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, i, pp. 19-51.

³ *Das Abendmahlsproblem auf Grund der wissenschaftlichen Erforschung des 19. Jahrhunderts und der historischen Berichte*, 1901; and *Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung*, 1911, pp. 141-180.

⁴ Jn. 6; cf. Jn. 13. The discourse of Jn. 15 f. develops eucharistic themes, and thus throws an indirect light on the problem.

of baptism (conceived as exclusively a Christian ordinance) which Jesus in the two succeeding chapters interprets.⁵ This leaves as actual reports of the institution only (1) Paul's references in 1 Cor. 10-11; (2) Mark-Matthew; (3) Lk. 22 15 ff. Moreover, to get at strictly independent testimony we have still to subtract from the evangelic records of 70-100 A.D. the element absorbed from the Pauline, which dates in this form from 53-54 A.D., but gives evidence of transition from an earlier to a later mode of observance and interpretation of the rite.

In the case of Lk. 22 15-20 the process of removal of the Pauline element is simplified by the testimony of the textual authorities. So decisive is the evidence of "Western" texts and versions to the absence from the original of verses 19b-20, and so obviously is the latter passage constructed on the basis of 1 Cor. 11 24 f. and interpolated in the context, that Westcott and Hort are driven to the following verdict:

These difficulties, added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Cor. 11 24 f. . . leave no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Luke.

Our Revised Version accordingly inserts the marginal note: "Some ancient authorities omit *which is given for you . . . which is poured out for you.*" The subtraction leaves for the Lukan tradition a strangely different representation of the institution of the "covenant" meal and of the significance of the cup and the broken bread. To this we must return hereafter.

But the higher criticism has also evidence to adduce for Pauline influence upon the tradition represented by Mark-Matthew. The general phenomena of our second gospel not only confirm the tradition of its origin in the great Pauline church at Rome, but show clearly the evangelist's dependence upon distinctive Pauline ideas. This is less apparent in mere matters of language than in the evangelist's general attitude of mind, as when he takes up (especially in 4 11) the doctrine of the hardening of Israel, or when he makes the believer's attainment of eternal life depend on faith in Jesus as the Son of God and loyal self-surrender to him, rather than on obedience to precepts or forms of righteous-

⁵ Jn. 1 19-34; cf. 2 1-11 and 3 1-30.

ness (chap. 10). We should anticipate in a gospel of this type decided evidences of Pauline modification of the proto-apostolic tradition; and such, we believe, can be shown to be the case with Mark's dating and interpretation of the supper. The Markan dating not only conflicts with the Johannine, but is inconsistent with the narrative taken up by himself. According to Mk. 14 1 f. the authorities are urgent to apprehend Jesus *before* the great feast day (Nisan 14) in order to avoid "a tumult of the people." As the chapter continues, the supper is identified with that of the Jewish passover on the night of Nisan 13-14. The motive is transparent. The evangelist wishes to represent the Jewish (annual) feast as having been superseded and abolished by the institution of the Christian (weekly) sacrament. But the result to the narrative is to make it self-contradictory. The description of the meal of leavened bread (*ἄζυρος*) and wine, without the distinctive passover elements and ritual, together with the ensuing disregard of the legal requirements⁶ is perhaps of less moment. But what shall we say of the arrest, trial, and crucifixion, which are now made by Mark to take place on passover night (Nisan 14), the crisis occurring at the very hour which the conspirators are most anxious to avoid! Nothing but the occidental evangelist's antipathy to the oriental practice (reflected in the Fourth Gospel) of an annual commemoration of the crucifixion and resurrection on Nisan 14, the "passover of the Lord," can fully account for the discrepancy. Mark desires to justify the conception of the supper and the mode of its observance current in his own section of Christendom, that is at Rome. Fortunately we have reliable witness of a collision on this point between East and West no later than 154 A.D. We must anticipate, therefore, in the Markan form of the tradition greater or less conformation to the mode of celebration and interpretation prevalent in the church at Rome not long after the time of Paul's letters and residence. For our gospels were not composed to please the critical historian, but to edify and confirm the believer in "the things wherein he had been instructed."

We need pause but a moment for the minute additions of Matthew. The later transcript has "Take, eat," instead of the

⁶ Cf. for instance 14 26 with Ex. 12 22.

mere "Take" of Mark, and changes "And they all drank of it" to "Drink ye all of it." It also further defines the symbolism of the "shed blood" by adding "for the remission of sins." This clause is removed from Mark's characterization of the baptism of John and appended here, much as Jn. 1 29 removes from this pre-christian rite all significance with relation to sin and forgiveness, and makes the Baptist merely point to "the Lamb of God," with his baptism of the Holy Ghost, as real remover of "the sin of the world." Manifestly no basis of independent tradition can be claimed for Matthew's changes. They merely fortify the Markan rubric.

If we would subtract from Mk. 14 22-30 the element due to Pauline influence, and thus come back to the basis of pre-pauline (or at least non-pauline) tradition on which Mark is framed, we must first of all try to discover from Paul's own suggestions what was distinctive in his teaching regarding the supper, as compared with the commonly received doctrinal tradition. Fortunately, Paul himself has defined for us the distinctive element in his message, for instance in his report of his vindication of his doctrine of the abolition of the law against Peter in Antioch (Gal. 2 15-21). It was the assertion that the death of Christ has annulled the legal economy; and this doctrine is very closely related to that of mystic union with Christ "in the Spirit." Both factors are typified according to Paul in the sacraments. Knowing what we do from Paul himself (Rom. 7 7-25, Phil. 3 4-11) of the personal religious experience which made him conscious of a message beyond and above all he might gain by intercourse with "those who were apostles before him," we ought to be able to differentiate his distinctive and individual doctrine in 1 Cor. 11 17-34, where he prescribes the mode of observance of "the Lord's supper" and interprets its significance, from the current and general conception taken for granted in the allusions of 1 Cor. 10 1-11 1.

Israel, says Paul in 1 Cor. 10, were baptized in water and the Spirit when they passed through the Red Sea, and were covered by the cloud. So, too, they ate and drank of spiritual food and drink, which is Christ, when they received the manna and the

water from the rock.⁷ Their idolatry and fornication at Beth-peor, that brought on them the wrath of God, offer an example of what it should mean for a Christian to go from "the table of the Lord" to "the table of demons" as guest at an idolatrous feast. To become in this way "partners with demons" will "provoke the Lord to jealousy," because, while the idol is nothing, the demonic being represented by it is real, and a repast partaken of in honor of a demon produces fellowship with demons. The admitted proposition that "the cup of blessing which we bless is a fellowship of the blood of Christ," and "the loaf which we break is a fellowship of the body of Christ," carries with it the necessary inference, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons."

Here is the basic starting-point. The sacrament is a fellowship (*κοινωνία*) which unites the believer to Christ; making him a member of Christ's body. It is a "table-covenant," separating the Christian from all alien relationships. It is apparent that the rite of the "communion" (*κοινωνία*) is practised and understood universally in this sense. Hence the interrogative form, "Is it not?"

The noteworthy thing is that in all the allusions of this chapter to the symbolism of the rite as commonly understood there is no single clear reference to the death of Jesus. It is a "communion" of his "body" and "blood"; but one can be united in "blood-covenant" with a living man, so as to be "of his body and blood" or "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh" without any thoughts of his death. In fact the act of "guest-fellowship" or "table-fellowship" is commonly held to effect a union of life rightly thus expressed. An equally important difference between 1 Cor. 10 and 1 Cor. 11 might be that of *order*, if we could be sure that the change from 11 3 f. ("eat . . . drink") to the reverse order in verses 16 and 21 ("cup . . . bread," "cup . . . table") was a conformation to the customary praxis, wherein the ritual of the cup preceded. But no certain conclusion of the kind can be drawn.

⁷ Ex. 16 and 17. The order of events in the narrative makes here the order "ate . . . drank" inevitable.

A paragraph answering the Corinthians' question regarding the costume of women in the assembly (11 2-16) intervenes before Paul continues the subject of the "communion" service. Then in 11 17-22 he rebukes the local disorders, and in 11 23-24 gives specific regulations for the future. These are partly based upon his own interpretation of the significance of the rite, partly are aimed to remove the too convivial and festive character (to give it no worse name) which the Corinthians had been giving to the "Lord's supper," and invest it with the solemnity of a sacrament commemorating "the Lord's death." The emphasis is placed throughout on this relation to "the Lord's death," as the thing needing to be apprehended. With this object the explanation is added, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye are proclaiming the Lord's death."⁸ If, as many hold, the opening statement, "I have received of (παρέλαβον ἀπὸ) the Lord," is to be understood not of tradition (παράδοσις) but of mystical revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), it can of course refer only to this special aspect of the rite as a commemoration of Jesus' death, perhaps to the words twice uttered (vss. 24, 25), "This do in remembrance of me," words central for Paul's thought, but singularly (if not inexplicably) wanting from the Synoptic record. If Paul is here communicating "revelation," we must understand it of this feature only; for the Apostle can hardly have spoken of the generally current tradition of the rite as a special revelation to himself. If he is speaking of a form of the tradition reaching back to Jesus, we must account for the absence of the command, "This do," from Synoptic story as the rules of criticism require; and it is far less likely to have been dropped by transcribers, who sought in every way to enhance the solemnity of the ritual, than added in process of its transmission.

We are justified, then, in tracing (provisionally at least) a distinction between the general significance and mode of observance

⁸ The expression τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, as Rev. G. H. Box points out in his admirable article, "Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist" (Journal of Theological Studies, April, 1902, p. 364), corresponds to the *haggada* (from *higgid*, "to tell a tale"), the *ἱερὸς λόγος*, of the passover, "which consists mainly of the telling of the story of the Exodus." Cf. Deut. 26 1-11.

of the communion of the Lord's supper, as presupposed in 1 Cor. 10, and the special connection with the doctrine of the cross (Paul's own distinctive doctrine) which he is laboring to give it in 1 Cor. 11. The former interprets the "cup of blessing" as a covenant-cup, not necessarily referring in any way to the Lord's death, but simply cementing, by a rite of almost world-wide observance and of immemorial antiquity, an eternal and indissoluble bond of brotherhood. The latter interprets it as "the new covenant in my blood." Chapter 10 interprets the broken bread simply of "table-fellowship" with the Lord, a "fellowship of the body of Christ, seeing that we who are many are one loaf, one body, for we all partake of the one loaf." It might go back to the "breaking of bread" in Galilee, when Jesus acted as house-father to the little company for whose sake he had sundered the ties of earthly home and kin, as well as to "the night in which he was betrayed." Chapter 11 interprets it as the body "given [some texts read "broken"] for your advantage," introducing a reference to the cross as a vicarious sacrifice.

But let us limit ourselves to the first of these differences, expressed in the words "the new covenant in my blood." The reference is unmistakable to Paul's individually distinctive doctrine of the "new covenant," "not of the letter but of the spirit," developed at length in contradistinction to "the old covenant" in 2 Cor. 3 6-4 6. Jesus is depicted as comparing the blood of his cross to the blood sprinkled by Moses on the altar when he pledged Israel at Sinai to obedience to "all the words of this covenant" (Ex. 24 8). Paul's disciple, the author of Hebrews, takes up the antithesis of 2 Cor. 3 3 and 11, between the tables of stone and of the heart, between "that which passeth away" and "that which remaineth." He further develops it on the basis of Jeremiah's great chapter on the "new covenant" written on the heart. Here, then, in Heb. 8 1-10 25 comes the full elaboration of Paul's conception of "the blood of the new covenant," reaching its loftiest expression in the closing benediction: "The God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep with *the blood of the eternal covenant*, make you perfect."

Are we to see in this reference to the superseding of the Mosaic dispensation by a new one the real, historic sense of the rite? Did Jesus intend to institute a commemoration of his death as an atoning sacrifice, abolishing the legal and instituting the filial relationship of men to God? Or is this a part of the special revelation of Paul? We must apply such standards as we now possess to Synoptic tradition before we can properly answer this question, endeavoring here also to differentiate Pauline from pre-pauline, or at least non-pauline, conceptions.

Mark 14 22-25 undoubtedly corresponds to the conception and mode of observance of the Lord's supper prevalent in Rome in 70-80 A.D., and forms part of a narrative clearly derived from pre-pauline sources. Yet if we place the story of 1 Cor. 11 24 f. side by side with it, we shall inevitably be struck with the close similarity, and this impression will surely be heightened if subsequently we observe the contrast of this Pauline-Markan-Matthaean account with the Lukan (in the true text) and its kindred. To bring out more distinctly the real nature of such differences as exist we print in *Italics* the additions in Paul which seem to be of an explanatory character, and in black type those of Mark which imply an independent source.

ΜΚ. 14 22-25.

²² And as they were eating he took a loaf and blessed (εὐλογήσας) and gave to them and said: **Take**, this is my body.

²³ And he took a cup and gave thanks (εὐχαριστήσας) and gave to them, and they all drank from it,²⁴ and he said unto them, This is my blood of the [new] covenant which is shed on behalf of many.

²⁵ Verily I say unto you, henceforth I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

1 COR. 11 24 f.

^{23 b} In the night in which he was betrayed Jesus took a loaf ²⁴ and gave thanks (εὐχαριστήσας) and brake it and said: This is my body, *which is (given) on your behalf. Do this in remembrance of me.*

²⁵ Likewise also the cup after supper, saying: This cup is the *new covenant* in my blood. *This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

²⁶ *For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye are proclaiming the Lord's death until he come.*

We note, first of all, a coincidence of order which may prove highly significant. In agreement with the apparent meaning of Paul in the phrase, "the cup after supper" (1 Cor. 11 25), and at all events in accordance with the Corinthian practice of first satisfying hunger in the common repast, Mark (followed by Matthew) states that Jesus took one of the loaves "as they were eating," and instituted *first* the ordinance of bread, *afterwards* that of the cup. Since the record of Luke and primitive Syrian practice as recorded in the liturgy of the Didache⁹ reverses this order, the point is worth noting.

Secondly, we note that while Mark neglects Paul's repeated commandment of the Lord, "This do in remembrance of me," as well as the addition of Paul, "given on your behalf" after the bread, he shows decided sympathy with the symbolism Paul is developing. For he inserts after the cup the words "shed for many," and so amplifies from the same Isaian passage which had previously affected his phraseology in 10 45 ("to give his life a ransom for many, cf. Isa. 53 11). As we have seen, Matthew carries the process further by adding "for remission of sins." Thus far there is, on the surface, nothing to indicate Mark's dependence on a source other than Paul's, unless we count as such the omission of the command, "Do this in remembrance of me." The word "Take" in vs. 22 and the clause, "and they all drank from it," in vs. 23 are so easily accounted for as mere editorial enlargement that only independent evidence would lead us to regard them as supplied by a source. This evidence, however, is in fact available, and will appear when Mk. 14 22-25 is placed alongside of Lk. 22 16-18.¹⁰ But this does not affect the general impression of the record. The interpretation put upon the rite as a covenant of *atonement blood* is distinctly and unmistakably Pauline. Only the awkwardness of the double genitive ("my blood of the covenant") suggests amplification of an original shorter form, to make it correspond with 1 Cor. 11 25 ("the new covenant in my blood"). This impression would be

⁹ See the passage quoted below, p. 024.

¹⁰ See below, p. 014. Mark borrows Lk. 22 18 in 14 25; the preceding clause (17b) is the source for his additions, "take" and "and they all drank of it," in 14 23 f.

irresistible if we could admit the very early interpolation "new" in the reading "blood of the *new* covenant," but this we unhesitatingly reject. If we proceed further to reject the second genitive ("of the covenant") as well, the formula of Mk. 14 24 will correspond exactly with its predecessor: "This is my body . . . this is my blood," and we shall obtain a formula free from Pauline admixture. But we have no manuscript authority for omitting "of the covenant." The addition (if such it be) must be attributed to the evangelist himself.

Thirdly, we meet an element in Mk. 14 25 which is certainly not of Pauline derivation, though a faint echo of the sentiment is perhaps to be found in the closing words of Paul's final comment (1 Cor. 11 26). With vs. 25 a wholly new aspect of the symbolism is all at once opened up; and the phraseology ("fruit of the vine") is as new as the thought. It is not Paul who has suggested this interpretation of the supper as a symbol of the messianic feast in the kingdom of God. To Paul "the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." There is no occurrence in his epistles of the figure so common in the Synoptic Gospels and the Revelation of the marriage supper of the Lamb, the redemption banquet, in which the elect from east and west and north and south enter into the joy of their Lord and feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. At all events, in this closing verse of Mark's record of the supper we are compelled to look to other sources than Paul's for the distinctive thought and phraseology.

And we have not far to look. Turning, lastly, to that element of Luke's record which remains after subtraction of the interpolation from 1 Cor. 11 24 f., we may first of all put in one column the Lukan source, subtracting only the few verses (22-28) demonstrably drawn from Mark, and side by side with it Paul's references to "the Lord's supper" in all the naïveté of its unreformed observance in 1 Cor. 10 1-11 1, together with the passage just noted in Mark.

LK. 22 15-30 (authentic text).

¹⁵ And he said unto them: With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer. ¹⁶ For I say unto you that henceforth I shall by no means eat it until it be fulfilled in the (redemption feast of the) kingdom of God. ¹⁷ And he took a cup and spoke the blessing (εὐχαριστήσας) and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; ¹⁸ for I say unto you that henceforth (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) I shall by no means drink of the fruit of the vine (ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου) until the kingdom of God come.

¹⁹ And he took a loaf (of leavened bread) and spoke the blessing (εὐχαριστήσας) and gave it to them and said: This is my body. . . . ²⁸ Ye are they that have continued (διαμεμενηκότες) with me in my trials.

²⁹ And I for my part make covenant appointment (διατιθεμαι) to you, even as my father hath covenanted (διέθετο) to me a kingdom, ³⁰ that ye shall eat (ἐσθητε) and drink at my table in my kingdom (cf. 2 Sam. 9 7), and shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Ps. 122 5).

(The Covenant of David—as the promise Mt. 19 28=Lk. 22 30 might be called—is employed by Matthew to supplement what he regards as an inadequate statement of the reward promised to Peter and the rest who had “left all and followed” in Mk. 10 28-30.

PARALLELS IN PAUL AND MARK.

(1 Cor. 5 7. “Ye are unleavened. For Christ our passover hath been sacrificed for us.” Mk. takes “this passover,” i.e. the annual festival “sanctified” in this rite, to mean the repast actually on the table. The declaration, “I shall no more eat of it,” implies to his mind abolition of the Jewish institution.) (Mk. 14 25: “*new in the kingdom of God.*”)

(Mk. 14 23, εὐχαριστήσας).

(Mk. 14 22 ff.: “*Take*” . . . “*And they all drank of it.* . . . ²⁵ *Verily I say unto you that henceforth (οὐκέτι) I shall by no means drink of the fruit of the vine (ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου) until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.*”)

(1 Cor. 11 20, εὐχαριστήσας).

(1 Cor. 10 16: “The bread which we break, is it not a communion (κοινωνία) of the body of Christ?”)

(Lk. 22 28 is a transition verse in which the evangelist returns to this source from the material in vv. 24-27 drawn from Mk. 10 42-44. The language has perhaps received some editorial modification.)

(Mk. 10 39, 40: *Ye shall indeed drink the cup that I drink . . . but to sit on my right hand or on my left is not mine to give.*)

Literary relationship between the (fragmentary) material of Mark which we have already found to be independent of his

Pauline tradition, and that which now appears to form the *complete* Lukan tradition of the covenant-meal, is here undeniable. So close approximation in language as that between Mk. 14 25 and Lk. 22 18 is inexplicable on any other theory than that of direct literary dependence. If appeal is made to the unknown possibilities of oral tradition, the answer is that oral tradition carried to this degree of stereotyped uniformity is equivalent to a document. The issue is then reduced to a mere quibble over the word "literary."

At first thought it is natural, in view of the known employment of our second gospel by the writer of our third, to think of this literary dependence as on the side of Luke. But to this there are at least three insuperable objections: (1) The unity of the Lukan record, inseparably connected as it is with a saying of Jesus not found in Mark, but independently attested by Matthew (Q); (2) the pre-pauline form and interpretation of the rite as compared with Mark's adaptation to his own context and connected argument; (3) peculiarities of style and language. Let us take these considerations in order.

(1) It is important to observe that the Lukan tradition of the covenant-supper is not a mere agglutination of unrelated fragments, but a closely connected whole, having its own very marked and distinctive character, and not even mutilated by serious gaps when subtraction has been made both of the textually unauthentic material from 1 Cor. 11 24 f. and of the Markan material inserted by the compiler of the gospel. The general theme is stated at the beginning in vss. 15 f. The approaching feast of passover—commemorative of Israel's redemption from Egypt—had long been the goal of Jesus' hope. He had wished to celebrate it with the twelve; but his wish is not to be granted. The plots against his life will frustrate the outward observance. Therefore, let the mind be set on the greater redemption feast of which it is the type. "It shall be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

The ritual observance to which Jesus now proceeds is not that of the passover, but the far simpler one of the *kiddush*, a ritual common to every pious Jewish household, prescribed for the *eve* of every Sabbath and of every feast-day, and deriving its name

(*kiddush*, "sanctification") from the fact that the day (which began at sunset according to Jewish usage) was thus made "holy."¹¹ The elements employed in this "sanctification" are simply a cup of wine and a loaf of *leavened* bread. The ministrant is the head of the household. The ritual is (1) a blessing of the cup, in the form, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, king of the universe, creator of the *fruit of the vine*. . . . Blessed art thou, O Lord, who sanctifiest the Sabbath." After participation in the cup there follows (2) washing of hands (for which, as Edersheim points out,¹² Jn. 13 1-11 substitutes foot-washing to emphasize Lk. 22 27). This is followed (not preceded) by (3) a similar blessing, breaking, and distribution of the loaf. After this the evening meal proceeds.

Jesus, according to the Lukan record, employs this ritual of "sanctification." But since the ensuing day was not the Sabbath but Friday, we can only understand it as "sanctification of pass-over," making Luke's chronology coincide with that of the Fourth Gospel, in spite of the fact that the first of the four cups of the passover ritual is reckoned (according to G. H. Box¹³) as the cup of "sanctification of passover."

In the Lukan ritual, at all events, the main point is the institution by Jesus with the twelve of an eternal covenant looking forward to the great messianic redemption feast in the kingdom of God" (cf. Lk. 14 15). It is a blood-covenant like that between David and Jonathan (1 Sam. 20 13-17, 23) wherein David pledged himself, when he should have attained the kingdom, to remember for good the house of Jonathan. As David fulfils this "covenant" in 2 Sam. 9 7, by "appointing" that Mephibosheth, the crippled survivor of the house of Jonathan, "shall eat bread at my table continually," so Jesus makes "covenant appointment" (*διατίθεμαι*) with those that have endured (*διαμεμενηκότες*) with him that they shall "eat at his table in his kingdom." He adds a further promise as distinctly Davidic as the blood-covenant with Jonathan. It is based on one of the "songs of ascents; of David," Ps. 122 2-5.

¹¹ The rabbis interpret the command: "Remember the Sabbath day to *hallow* it" as inculcating the use of the *kiddush*.

¹² Life of Christ, vol. ii, p. 497.

¹³ Op. cit.

Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem;
 Jerusalem that art builded as a city compact together:
 Whither the tribes go up, even the tribes of the Lord,
 An ordinance for Israel to give thanks unto the name of the Lord.
For there are set thrones of judgment,
The thrones of the house of David.

Modern commentators, so far as known to the present writer, have as completely failed to recognize this transparent Old Testament basis for the promise of Lk. 22 30b (=) Mt. 19 28, as they have to recognize the relation of vs. 30a to the blood-covenant of David with Jonathan. Only Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia, principally known to us as having employed Papias's "Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord" for his own commentary on Revelation, points out in commenting on Rev. 20 4¹⁴ that such is the unmistakable basis of the promise.

We think it more probable that this development of Ps. 122 25, the song of "thanksgiving" for the "thrones of judgment for the house of David" in the new Jerusalem, should have been added to Jesus' original "blood-covenant" with those who had "endured in his trials" with him, than that Jesus himself should have uttered a promise so at variance with the declaration of Mk. 10 35-40, where he explicitly disclaims authority to appoint to thrones in his kingdom, even for those who have endured his martyrdom with him. But as to the antiquity of the tradition there can be no question. It not only forms part of the Q-element derived by Matthew and Luke from a common source independent of Mark, but is attested over and over again in the earliest documents back to the great epistles of Paul themselves. We have found Andreas of Caesarea justly connecting Rev. 20 4 with the basis of it, perhaps in dependence on Papias. At about the same period (c. 93) 2 Tim. 2 12 quotes it as a "faithful saying":

If we died with him, we shall also live with him;
 If we endure (*ὑπομένομεν*), we shall also reign with him;
 If we shall deny him, he also will deny us;
 If we are faithless, he abideth faithful;
 For he cannot deny himself.

¹⁴ "And I saw thrones and they [those who had endured the great trial] sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them, . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

Here the liturgical form and the reference to Christ's faithfulness in martyrdom alike suggest derivation from the covenant-ritual. Even the greater Pauline epistles already exhibit allusions to the pledge of "thrones of judgment." In 1 Cor. 4 8 Paul reproaches his converts with proceeding already to the enjoyment of their "reign," while their apostles are still "enduring." In 6 2 they are reminded that "the saints shall judge the world," whereas they have lowered themselves appearing as litigants before heathen judges. In Acts 14 22 the apostles "confirm the souls of the disciples" with the promise, given in direct discourse as a quotation, "Through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God." In Jas. 1 12 the man who "endureth trial" is assured of "the crown of life" which the Lord "promised to those that were lovers of him," and the reference is repeated in 2 5, where those who had been chosen by God as "poor in this world" (cf. Lk. 6 20) are declared to have been "promised a kingdom," as "those who loved him." It is apparent that we are dealing here with elements that go back to the very foundations. From a time indefinitely antecedent even to 1 Corinthians the covenant-meal was celebrated as a pledge that those who endured with Christ should also reign with him. The cup of blessing is a token of living and reigning in union with Christ in the new Jerusalem. The thought is expressed in the ancient Syrian ritual: "We give thee thanks, O our Father, for the holy vine of thy servant David [Ps. 80], which thou madest known unto us through thy servant Jesus." John 14 1 ff. expresses it in the parable spoken at the supper: "I am the true vine. . . . Except ye abide in me, ye cannot bear fruit. . . . If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you. . . . A little while and your sorrow shall be turned to joy."

The Lukan form of the tradition of the supper is therefore a unit. Reference to the covenant-blood sprinkled by Moses on the altar is as completely absent as reference to the blood of the passover lamb. True, the passover is referred to as pointing to something higher, and regret is expressed that its celebration is prevented. But the *kiddush* is not meant to supersede it. It is expected to continue in annual observance as the *kiddush* continues as a weekly rite (so Acts 20 7 ?). There is no reason why

the *kiddush* might not be employed daily (so Acts 2 46, 6 1). There is no connecting of the ceremony with Jesus' death. The whole tone of the ordinance is joyous, the burden is: The feast we now "sanctify" is to be soon "fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Can it be supposed that the compiler of our Luke derived all this from the isolated verse Mk. 14 25, remaining all the time quite unaffected by the predominant Pauline animus of his source? For surely the main significance Mark attaches to the rite is quite other than this, and much more in line with 1 Cor. 11 24 f. Can it be maintained that the relevance of the Q-saying, "I on my part make covenant appointment to you, even as my Father hath appointed to me a kingdom," to the "eating and drinking" of the bread and wine, is a mere happy co-ordination by Luke of logion with Markan material? Or must we not rather admit that the whole Lukan context belongs together; that it is the logion concerning the glories of the kingdom which draws into this singularly inappropriate situation the Markan anecdote of the quarrel as to who should be greatest (Mk. 10 42-44 = Lk. 22 24-27); and, finally, that Mark has taken over in the single verse 14 25 the (unexplained) phraseology and (unconnected) idea reiterated throughout the Lukan source (vs. 16, vs. 18, vs. 29), and not that Luke has effected so extraordinary a development of Mk. 14 25?

(2) We have already indicated by a group of references that the promise of the covenant in Lk. 22 29 f. = Mt. 19 28 belongs to the most primitive factors of Synoptic tradition, and is presupposed in the most varied elements of New Testament literature, including documents as early as the greater Pauline epistles themselves. It remains to show that the entire conception and mode of observance of the covenant-rite as represented in Luke's record, inclusive of the promise, agrees with what we know of pre-pauline conception and practice; whereas the peculiarities of Mark tend in the direction of the changes introduced by Paul, or indicate still later developments. It will be convenient for this purpose to place again before our eyes the real contrast between Luke and Mark, continuing the account of the institution of the covenant a little further for the sake of clearer definition of Mark's point of view.

INSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNION.

LK. 22 15 ff.

¹⁵ And he said unto them: With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you [before I suffer]. ¹⁶ For I say unto you that henceforth I shall by no means eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

¹⁷ And he took a cup and spoke the blessing and said: Take this, and divide it among yourselves; ¹⁸ for I say unto you that henceforth I shall by no means drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God come.

¹⁹ And he took a loaf, and spoke the blessing and gave it to them and said, This is my body.

(Prediction of betrayal, and quarrel as to "Who is greater?" from Mk. 14 18-21 and 10 42-44 Vss. 21-27.)

²⁸ [But] ye are they that have endured with me in my trials; ²⁹ and I on my part make covenant appointment unto you, even as my Father hath appointed unto me a kingdom, ³⁰ that ye shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

MK. 14 22-29 (order transposed).

(Prediction of betrayal "as they reclined and were eating," vss. 17-21.)

²³ And he took a cup and spoke the blessing and gave to them, and they all drank of it. ²⁴ And he said unto them: *This is my blood of the [new] covenant which is shed for many.* ²⁵ Verily I say unto you I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

(Singing of the Hymn—the *Hallel?*—vs. 26.)

²² And as they were eating he took a loaf and spoke the blessing, and gave it to them and said, Take ye, this is my body.

(Quarrel as to "Who is greater?" Mk. 10 42-44 ensuing on the request of James and John to sit with Jesus "in his glory." Jesus answers:

³⁹ Ye shall drink the cup that I drink [The clause "and be baptized with the baptism wherewith I am baptized" is wanting in Mt.]; ⁴⁰ but to sit upon my right hand or my left is not mine to grant, but belongeth to those for whom it hath been prepared.)

PREDICTION OF STUMBLING.

³¹ Simon, Simon, Behold, Satan hath obtained leave to sift you as wheat. ³² But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, when thou art turned again, establish (σθῆρις) thy brethren. ³³ But he said to him, Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and death.

²⁷ And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be stumbled, for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad [²⁸ Howbeit, after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee]. ²⁹ But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be stumbled, yet will not I.

The principal variations in Mark are as follows: (a) The change of order (note the place of vs. 22) in the institution, involving the representation that the passover feast is in progress (note the "hymn" in vs. 26), the bread broken "while they were eating," and the cup consecrated "after supper." (b) Additions in vs. 24 to relate the observance to the covenant of Sinai and to bring out the correspondence between the atoning blood of Jesus and the vicarious sufferings of the "Lamb" of Isa. 53.¹⁵ (c) Removal of the Davidic covenant (*διαθήκη*) of Lk. 22 28-30 to another context wherein sitting with Jesus in his glory is sought from Jesus by two of the twelve as a reward for endurance with him of his trials, but denied on the ground that he has no authority to grant such rewards, even to those who have "drunk his cup" of suffering. (d) Addition to the prediction of stumbling of a prediction of betrayal (vss. 18-21). Evidence that these verses constitute a later addition appears in the resumption of their opening clause ("as they were eating") in vs. 22, "as they were eating." That is, the announcement has no psychological effect. The twelve continue the meal as unconcerned as though the overwhelming announcement had not been made. Our Luke has inserted this Markan addition along with the other (strife as to who is greater) in the single paragraph, vs. 21-27, but this only injures the sequence of the story. (e) Addition of vs. 28 to prepare for the (missing) account of resurrection appearances in Galilee.¹⁶ With Lk. 22 23=Mk. 14 29 the two records begin again to flow in a common channel.

If now we turn from the Markan form with its transpositions of order, additions, and changes (for it is possible in each case to account for the difference as an adaptation by Mark to later and occidental ideas, but not conversely), to the consistent record of Luke, we shall find it to differ to an extraordinary degree from

¹⁵ Italics have been used in vss. 22 and 24 to indicate the changes which bring the record into conformity with 1 Cor. 11 17 ff. and the Pauline point of view. The clauses, "And they all drank of it," in vs. 23, and "Take ye" in vs. 22, which at first might seem to be mere editorial additions, are found on comparison with Lk. 22 17 to have warrant in the older source.

¹⁶ On the significance of this editorial insertion, breaking the connection of vss. 27-29, and its relation to the missing conclusion of Mark, see my *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*

the Pauline interpretation of the supper and directions as to its observance; but to correspond in no less striking degree with pre-pauline, or at least non-pauline, interpretation and observance. The latter are known to us partly from Paul's own references, but mainly from ancient sources not affected by Pauline influence.

It is apparent from Paul's rebuke of the Corinthian abuses that "the Lord's supper," as it had been practised, had a character quite too convivial to meet Paul's sense of propriety. The prevailing note was one of festivity and joyousness. The name given it, from which we may safely infer what it chiefly betokened, was "communion" (*κοινωνία*). Participants entered into "fellowship" with the Lord. Paul would have them remember that it was a fellowship of the Lord's *death*, and lays stress upon this as the real meaning of the symbolism. Clearly this has not previously been prominent in the minds of observers of the rite.

Whether Paul's directions as to the order, involving a postponement of the ritual act until hunger had been satisfied in the common repast, and his declaration that the cup of the covenant was taken by Jesus *after* the supper, which would naturally lead to placing the ceremony of the bread before it, constitute an intentional change from the mode of observance which had prevailed at Corinth or elsewhere, we cannot say with certainty. It is certain, however, that in Syria, even down to a much later period, the ritual of the cup preceded that of the bread, and that the *agape*, or fellowship-repast, followed both, a concluding prayer of thanksgiving being prescribed for its close, "after ye are satisfied."¹⁷

We encounter a ritual and an interpretation of the observance quite independent of Paul, and much more like that of the Didache, when we interpret the Lukan record for itself, with minds uncolored by the ideas of Paul and Mark. We have indeed a covenant meal, but the institution itself is completely devoid of any reference to Jesus' death,¹⁸ and the covenant in question is not

¹⁷ Didache 9, 10.

¹⁸ The preamble (vs. 15 f.) contains a clause ("before I suffer") which we have enclosed in brackets as perhaps an addition of the evangelist; for the references of Jesus to his "suffering" are so distinctively characteristic of Luke (cf. 24 26, 46; Acts 1 3; 3 18; 17 3; 26 23) that this partial exception must be reckoned of the kind which "proves the rule."

related to that of Moses at Sinai, but to that of David with Jonathan. It is a "blood-covenant"; and Jesus employs the bread as a token of his body, but not as symbolizing its fate. The breaking and distribution of the bread are simply preliminary to sharing in the common loaf, whereby, according to the immemorial laws of guest-friendship, the participant comes to share in the life of his host. The guest becomes for the period of time during which the food is supposed to remain in his body a blood-brother of the host, and is entitled to his protection, as being, in a manner, "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh," a true member of his body. The cup has no other meaning apart from the fellowship thus established and has nothing to do with Jesus' sacrificial death.

The words which introduce the ritual, on the other hand, do refer to the passover and to Jesus' fate as liable to frustrate his wish to celebrate the feast with the twelve. But, so far from indicating that the table before them is that of passover, it goes to show on the contrary that it is the *kiddush* or "sanctification" (of passover?), the ceremony for the eve of the feast.

As regards the correspondence of this Lukan tradition of the institution of the covenant-meal with ancient observances, as it can be made out from the earliest Syrian and Palestinian sources, we cannot do better than to transcribe from Heitmüller. The following six considerations are to him convincing evidence that

this [Lukan] form of the Lord's supper, which is moreover traceable to Jewish-Christian, Palestinian soil, comes nearer to the original celebration instituted by Jesus himself, and reflects it more clearly than that known from Paul and from Mark-Matthew,—in short that at the original Lord's supper, as here, the cup and the words of institution of the cup were wanting.

For it is one of the striking features of the Lukan form that the cup not only precedes, but is separate from, the covenant of fellowship in the Lord's body. The cup is simply the "cup of blessing" for the "sanctification" of the coming holy-day. After it, in breaking and distributing the (leavened) bread, Jesus bids the twelve make this a covenant-meal by using the shared loaf as a token of union in his body. It should hardly require to be pointed out that the symbol of a draught of human blood, which the later tradition makes to follow upon that of the loaf and to

repeat its meaning, would be, if possible, still more abhorrent to Jews than to ourselves. The covenant of brotherhood by eating from the same loaf, on the other hand, was sanctioned by immemorial usage, and accounts for the dominance in all ancient tradition of the thought of union, unification, concentration, as the central meaning of the rite.

But to return to Heitmüller. The following are the six considerations which lead him to assign priority to the Lukan form, as against that represented by 1 Cor. 11 17-34 and Mark-Matthew:

(1) We unfortunately possess no direct reports of the communion observances of the earliest Palestinian communities. In Acts 2 46, however, we have the note: "And breaking bread from house to house they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart." If this remark affords a true picture, the Lord's supper of the most primitive community of believers did not bear the character of a commemoration of the death of Jesus (Paul and Mk.-Mt.); on the contrary, the key-note was one of gladness and rejoicing,—just as in the Lukan form of observance the reference to death was wanting, and the mood of joyous hope (Lk. 22 18) predominated. (2) The Lord's supper in Acts is systematically designated the breaking of bread—Acts 2 41, 46; 20 7, 11,—*presumably* an indication that there was no more than the partaking of bread, or that the wine, at all events, was by no means essential. (3) We have an indirect testimony to the Lord's supper of the primitive church in a narrative from the life of Jesus. The feeding of the five thousand (or four thousand) is indubitably intended as a type, a representation of the Communion. (Note in the narratives the same description of Jesus' procedure as at the supper. He took bread, blessed, and brake it, and gave to the disciples, Mk. 6 41, 8 6 and parallels.) In this representation of the Lord's supper there is no mention whatever of the cup. (4) Later (Jewish-Christian) sects inhabiting the region of the Jordan celebrated the Lord's supper without use of wine till long after this period. (5) The peculiar, otherwise unexplained,¹⁹ remark, Mk. 14 23: "They all drank of it," is best explained as a polemic observation aimed at a supposable depreciation of the cup in other circles (cf. 1 Jn. 5 6, Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 6). (6) Finally, it is a suspicious circumstance that the formula of the cup, whether in the rubric of Paul or that of Mark and Matthew, bears a distinctly theological stamp. It interprets the death of Jesus as a covenant-sacrifice, and betrays itself thus as a product of primitive Christian, perhaps of Pauline, dogma.

¹⁹ See, however, above, note 15.

It is certainly inadmissible in view of these considerations—omitting others—to regard that form of interpretation and observance of the supper which we find inculcated by Paul, and which in Mark-Matthew is superimposed upon an underlying narrative of different type—the form which contrasts the “new covenant” in the blood of Christ with the “old covenant” of Moses at Sinai, as the earlier; and to consider that which uses the symbolism of the covenant of David (2 Sam. 9 7; Ps. 122 5), corresponding as it does in order, in phraseology, and in signification with the liturgy of the Didache²⁰, to be later and derived. The Lukan form and the Didache are alike in containing no reference in the symbolism to the death of Jesus, and this peculiarity is absolutely unaccountable unless referred to sources as yet unaffected by Paul’s interpretation and prescription.

In one respect, however, we must withhold complete assent from Heitmüller’s observations. It may be admitted that early references and practice show that to the primitive church the essential feature of the observance was the “breaking of the bread” together, and that the cup was not considered an inseparable factor, if we limit the inference to a disproof of the originality of the reference developed by Paul, Mark-Matthew to Jesus’ shed blood. The ritual of Luke and the Didache stand in very close interrelation, mutually interpreting one another, and here it is undeniable that the cup plays an important, and even leading, part, though its symbolism is preliminary to, and independent of, that of the covenant-meal, and has, of course, no relation to the shed blood of Jesus. The unity of Lk. 22 15–19a, 28–32, becomes doubly apparent when we observe how the interpretation of the symbolism of the cup (vs. 18) merely repeats the refrain

²⁰ Didache, 9, “As touching the eucharistic thanksgiving give ye thanks thus. First as regards the cup: We give thee thanks, Our Father, for the holy vine of thy servant David, which thou madest known unto us through thy servant Jesus. (*Response*:) Thine is the glory for ever and ever.

“Then as regards the broken bread: We give thee thanks, Our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou didst make known unto us through thy servant Jesus. (*Response*:) Thine is the glory forever and ever. As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom. (*Response*:) For thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever and ever.”

of the preamble (vs. 16), and that of the loaf (vs. 30a) is closely parallel. Comparison of the ritual of the *Didache* reveals at once the twofold unifying thought: an antithesis of trial and triumph symbolized in the cup, an antithesis of "scattering" and "gathering" symbolized in the loaf.

For in Luke the attachment here of the prediction of stumbling (scattering) which runs on into the offer of Peter to go with Jesus "unto prison and death" is not without relation on the one side to the ground of the Davidic covenant, "Ye are they that have endured with me in my trials" (vs. 28), nor can we fail to see on the other its connection with Mk. 10 42-44 as well as Mk. 14 27-29. These are all variations on the theme, "the gathering together of the elect," as symbolized in the loaf eaten as the body of Christ. As the "cup of blessing" represents the antithesis of present trial ("Are ye able to drink my cup?") and future triumph (the redemption feast "in the kingdom of God"), so the bread, "once scattered on the mountains, but now gathered together into one loaf," represents in general the "gathering together of the elect," but more especially the sifting as wheat which the twelve are about to undergo, and the rallying again under the leadership of Simon. So Luke; but the Roman gospel has a far different attitude toward the apostolic leaders. Just as the right to sit upon the thrones in Christ's glory is denied to James and John in spite of their having "drunk the cup" of suffering with the Lord, so it is not by "Simon" that the "scattered" flock are to be "gathered" in Galilee. The Shepherd himself—at least in our form of Mark—will intervene to rally them. But here we are entering another and a difficult field, the problem of the ending of Mark. Let us be content with having shown that the earlier and consistent form of the tradition is that of Luke, as interpreted by *Didache*.

(3) It remains to point to a single peculiarity of style, which may serve to connect the Q-logion in which our Lukan record of the institution of the covenant-repast culminates, with certain other Q-material in regard to which the present writer has pointed out heretofore that we are dealing not with *precepts*, where the interest is ethical, but with *narrative*, where the interest centres in the person of Jesus and the significance of his message and min-

istry. The form of the verb in the passage: "Ye shall eat . . . in my kingdom" is not the usual $\epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\omega}$ employed elsewhere in the New Testament, but a form which occurs but in four other passages, and is classified in the lexicons as "rare," "poetic," "obsolete," or the like, the form $\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$. Three of the other occurrences are in Q-sections of Luke, two of them in the discourse wherein Jesus vindicates his joyous ministry of forgiveness and healing against those who "were stumbled in him" after the departure of the messengers of John: "For John the Baptist is come *eating* no bread. . . . The Son of man is come *eating* and drinking" (Lk. 7 33 f. = Mt. 11 18 f.). The other Lukan occurrence is in Lk. 10 7, another Q-passages. Elsewhere in the New Testament the form occurs nowhere but in Mk. 1 6, in a passage (vss. 2-6) which shows unmistakable literary dependence on the Q-passages regarding John the Baptist.²¹

Limitations of space will not permit us to dwell upon the relations of Luke's source for his tradition of the supper to other elements of Q. That which has already been adduced should suffice to indicate that here, as in other parts of the Lukan passion story, we are dealing with a source which is at least pre-markan, and in its point of view reflects conceptions and data wholly independent of Pauline influence. To trace this source in the single narrative of the institution of the (Davidic) covenant-meal is a matter of no small importance in determining Jesus' own conception of his mission. To find him here, for example, pointing his disciples forward, not as in Matthew to a "throne of glory" whereon he sits as "Son of man" to judge all nations, but to a new Jerusalem, where he will sit rather as Son of David, surrounded by those who "endured" with him, and who now "eat and drink with him at his table in his kingdom," brings us face to face with a christology which may not be the earliest or most authentic, but whose value to the historical student can only be measured by the breadth of its divergence from long-current and accepted forms. And this is only a beginning. The question of the part played by this source in the development of gospel composition is a problem for treatment on some future occasion.

²¹ For a discussion of the relation, with demonstration of Mark's dependence on this element of Q (Q^{lk}), see my *Beginnings of Gospel Story*.