

"adopts" any work of human hands. Wherever man has toiled to make visible his thought in wood or stone, nature following after him has done her best to obliterate his monuments. It takes her a long time to effect this in some instances, but she never surrenders the task.'

But again, it does not seem to matter. In a little we shall hear Professor BROWN admitting that nature is not actively antagonistic, that 'for the most part' she is simply indifferent. And all it seems to come to at last is the declaration that, whatever we may say about the flesh and the devil, there is an enemy whom we have to overcome called the world. . . And to that we all agree.

The third feature of EUCKEN's philosophy is its insistence on the New Birth. There is the 'mere man,' or 'the petty human,' the man of flesh and

sense, man 'born of a woman' in the phrase of the Bible; and there is the 'new man,' the 'spiritual man,' the man who has been born again. For EUCKEN is most emphatic that 'in spiritual life we have to do, not with a mere addition to a life already existent, but with an essentially new life.'

Professor BROWN does not claim for EUCKEN that he has discovered and can tell us precisely where the spiritual man comes from. The wind still bloweth where it listeth. But he does claim that EUCKEN has introduced him to 'high circles of academic thought.' In other words, he has got the fact of the New Birth accepted by philosophy. And the distinction between the old man and the new is the very distinction with which we have been elsewhere made familiar. The old man thinks chiefly of his own things; the new man chiefly of the things of others.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D. LL.D. D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

PART I.

THE following paper was planned, and in great part written, early in A.D. 1901. Publication was delayed, because I had found myself driven to take Lk 22^{15, 16} in a sense diametrically opposite to the accepted view; and I shrank from once again challenging the general opinion. It seemed better, therefore, to wait and see if the interpretation which I put on those verses would stand the test of time. Now, since Professor Burkitt, Mr. Brooke, and Mr. Box have all independently declared themselves against the generally accepted view, I am able to follow with more confidence in their wake,¹ even though I may perhaps proceed to draw inferences which none of them would accept or approve.

The article was originally intended as one of a

¹ Mr. Box in *Critical Review*, January 1903, pp. 32-38; Professor Burkitt and Mr. Brooke in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, pp. 569-572; I learn about the first from *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1908, p. 106.

series of comments on 1 Corinthians; but it took a wider scope. The series was published in the *Expositor*, 1900 and 1901, and came to an abrupt conclusion: in the *Expositor*, December 1901, p. 401, the writer mentions the reason: 'The succeeding paper of the series, written eight months ago, he desires to think over for another year before printing.' The single year has grown to nine; but the views expressed have not changed, though the paper is enlarged.

Having thus followed the rule of Horace, and reconsidered until the nine years have fully elapsed, I venture to print the speculative explanation of one of the most serious and enigmatic difficulties in the New Testament, the divergence between John and the Synoptists with regard to the day when the Last Supper took place. In the paper that follows the facts are arranged in a certain succession, corresponding generally to the order of historical development, which is not that of simple time;

and for the sake of clearness the theory of explanation is stated in a rather too dogmatic fashion, but it is only the desire of brevity that gives the appearance of dogmatism. What is stated is a theory about a great and confessed difficulty; and is not put forward as assured truth.

I. The chief difficulties in the accounts of the Last Supper are:—

1. The Supper occurred on the evening of Thursday (as we think, March 18th, 29 A.D.), and the Crucifixion in the afternoon of the following day, Friday. St. John (with whom evidently St. Paul agreed, 1 Co 5th) declares that the Friday was the day when the Passover was slain, and eaten at sunset; but the Synoptists affirm that the Supper on Thursday night was the regular Passover Feast. John and Paul regard Jesus as the Paschal Lamb, slain on the Friday afternoon: the Synoptists consider that the Paschal Lamb was slain on the Thursday to make ready the Supper of which Jesus and the Twelve partook. According to John the Friday of the Crucifixion was 14 Nisan, according to Mark it was 15 Nisan.

That John was right and the Synoptists wrong in this, seems to be proved even by the Synoptic narrative: so much is now generally admitted. It is inconceivable that the Jews should have permitted the Trial of Jesus and the Crucifixion of Him, and of the two criminals to take place after the Passover had been eaten and the Feast had begun. It was the Jews, and not the Romans, who caused the arrest and all its consequences; and John is beyond all question right, even according to the Synoptic testimony, in asserting that the death of Jesus and the two robbers was hurried on in order that the corpses might be disposed of before the Saturday began, *i.e.* before sunset on the Friday, lest the great day should be profaned.

How could the error of the Synoptists, *i.e.* the error of Mark,¹ have been caused? This is an unsolved problem. Professor B. W. Bacon has advanced a theory, which has one element of right in it; he recognizes that the error must have been produced by some wider cause, and that it could

¹ It may now safely be assumed that the common tradition of the first three Gospels is simply the narrative of Mark, followed by the other two. In the original form of this paper it did not appear safe to assume this without giving reasons. That it can now be taken as generally admitted is a proof of the progress that New Testament study has made.

not be a mere slip regarding the single detail; but beyond this his theory is unacceptable, for it does not even explain the error; there seems to be no connexion between his cause and the effect.

2. St. John describes the Last Supper without mentioning the incident of the Bread and Wine: he places similar teaching as to the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ at a much earlier stage in the Saviour's career (6^{81st}). St. Paul and the Synoptists describe the incident of the Bread and Wine as occurring at the Last Supper, and as being the origin of the Eucharistic ceremony in the observance of the Church. St. John seems to imply that the Saviour's teaching at an earlier time was a sufficient cause and origin of the ceremony.

This omission in the Fourth Gospel is remarkable and beyond all question intentional. Our theory is that the error of the Synoptists and the omission by John are connected. John said nothing about the rite of the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper, because an erroneous interpretation of the meaning and importance of that incident had gained currency, and had led to the error made by Mark, and reproduced after him by Matthew and Luke.

There are other differences between the leading accounts of the incident; but they are all slight and purely verbal. The most important are the following:—

3. Paul and Luke describe Jesus as explicitly ordering the repetition of the ceremony: 'This do in remembrance of me.' Justin Martyr also mentions these words, and they were taken into the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. Matthew and Mark do not report that Christ ordered the ceremony to be repeated.

4. It is sometimes said that Luke places the Cup before the Bread: this, however, depends on a false theory of his text, as we shall see. All authorities, except the *Didache*, are agreed that the order was first the Bread, then the Wine²; and there can be no doubt that this order was observed always in the Church ritual. Hence the whole rite is regularly called 'the Breaking of the Bread,' according to the action which came first.

5. The variation between the different accounts of the words spoken by Jesus in dividing the Bread and Wine is puzzling, and deserves to be carefully studied.

² It has sometimes been thought that Paul puts the Cup first, in 1 Co 10^{16, 21}. This is a mistake, as we shall see.

II. The leading authorities are:—

1. The actual rite as performed in the early Church.

2. Mk 14²²⁻²⁵, repeated by Mt 26²⁰⁻²⁹ with extremely little change.

3. Lk (1) 22^{17, 18}.

4. Lk (2) 22^{19, 20}.

5. Paul in I Co 11²³⁻²⁶.

6. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65.

7. Tatian in the *Diatessaron* is a secondary authority, not a primary one; but his choice was guided by a knowledge of the first authority, which was important in the estimation of all the others. The *Didache* gives rather a comment on, than an account of, the rite.

Disregarding minor variations, we may divide the words spoken into the following parts:—

A. The Consecration: i. 'This is my body,' etc.; ii. 'This is my blood,' etc.

B. The Invitation: i. 'Take, eat'; ii. 'Drink,' etc.

C. The Institution: i. and ii. 'This do in remembrance of me.'

D. The Prophecy: i. 'I will not eat,' etc.; ii. 'I will no more drink,' etc.

The following table shows how many of these parts are mentioned in each of the written accounts, and also gives the order of the parts.

	i. The Bread.	ii. The Cup.
Matthew . . .	B A	B A D
Mark . . .	B A	A D
Luke (1) . . .	D	B D
Luke (2) . . .	A C	A
Paul . . .	A C	A C
Justin . . .	C A	A
Tatian . . .	D B A	B A D C ¹

In these accounts we observe several striking features.

(1) There is a strong tendency to abbreviate. Even the longest account is, indubitably, far shorter than the actual incident. The desire of the earlier writers was to take only the rigorously necessary words, to concentrate attention on them, and to leave out everything that could be regarded as of secondary importance, or as involved or implied in what was selected for record. In some cases a writer even abbreviates his written author-

¹ C is evidently intended by Tatian as a sequel to both, being taken either from Luke (who gives it only in i.) or from Paul, who gives it in both i. and ii.

ity. Many illustrative examples might be given of the way in which the writers of the New Testament shortened their narrative, omitting words and incidents about which they knew perfectly well, if they thought that these either were not indispensable, or were sufficiently suggested in the context, or were familiar to the readers who were addressed, and might therefore be assumed.

(2) It is therefore supremely unmethodical to argue that because certain words or details are omitted in any Source, therefore the original authority from whom that Source was derived was ignorant of them. In the case of such omissions the proper question to ask first is whether there is any obvious reason why it might seem unnecessary to lengthen the narrative by including them. A good example of this is the following paragraph (3):—

(3) There is a marked tendency in the writers to omit either B, the Invitation, or C, the Institution. Some give only B, others only C. Tatian's work is avowedly a union of everything that was found in any Gospel. Luke also has both; but, as will be shown, Luke places side by side two Sources, one of which mentions B and one C. It would be false method to infer from this that some knew only about B, others only about C, but no one knew about both. Should we not rather gather that B, the Invitation to eat and drink, was considered by some to carry with it the Institution for all time—inasmuch as the first occasion and invitation extended to all Christians and included all subsequent occasions—while others, who mentioned the words of Institution, thought that these rendered it unnecessary to quote the Invitation to do on this occasion what was being instituted as a recurring and permanent ceremony?

In short, bearing in mind that the ceremony was familiar to all readers as the chief mystery of the Church ritual, we see that some understood the command, 'Take eat,' as the first of an eternal series of repetitions; while others understood the Institution, 'This do in remembrance of me,' as implying the command to repeat the whole ceremony with the Invitation (which is tacitly assumed as indispensable).

(4) The accounts do not all come from one Source. There are at least three, perhaps even more, independent Sources. It does not, of course, follow that all those independent Sources originated in the formal narratives of persons

present at the Supper. Some of them were of that kind; but an authority of a totally different kind was used, one that had not the form of mere narrative, but consisted in the ritual reproduction of the acts and words of the Saviour as a ceremony practised in the early Church from the beginning. That the ceremony was repeated from the earliest time in the assemblies of the faithful is almost universally admitted; the theory that it was instituted by Paul has been stated, only to be rejected. This ritual repetition was familiar to all writers, and inevitably exercised much influence on their narratives.

For example, the account of the Eucharist given by Justin Martyr is said by him to be handed down by the Apostles in the Gospels. But, apparently, he quoted their accounts from memory, and his memory was much influenced by the form of words used in the Church ritual as he knew it. Again, the account given by Paul is professedly a statement of the ritual as it was regularly performed in the Church. This knowledge of the rite lay in the mind of every writer whom we possess, and was a strong force acting on them all (with the probable exception of one Source).

It will be best briefly to review the written accounts, one by one, and try to determine their origin and the degree of their dependence on the rite as celebrated in the early Church; but first a word is needed about the rite.

III. The extreme antiquity of the Church rite is almost universally admitted. It began from (or before) the time of the Last Supper. Little need be said on this point, and the little will be most appropriately stated in reference to Luke's and John's testimony.

The names that are most commonly applied to it are in themselves important as evidence. That it was called 'the Breaking of the Bread' proves that this action, as being first, was recognized as the specially characteristic fact in the rite. That it was called the Eucharist (*εὐχαριστία* in Justin, i. 66) proves that the giving of thanks was the most characteristic feature in the traditional words. All accounts agree that the acts and words were handed down from the Lord, and not changed or modified by any of the Apostles; but there is some disagreement whether Eucharistia or Eulogia was most typical among the words used by the Lord in the Breaking of the Bread.

It cannot be assumed that exactly the same

words were used in every celebration of the rite from the beginning onward. Some slight variation is always possible in the oral transmission of a ceremony in which there was a considerable amount of speaking; but there was at least one cause which militated against the admission of any change, namely, the fixed belief among the ancients that the efficacy of religious formulæ depended on the literal correctness with which the words were repeated.

None of the written accounts agrees exactly and entirely with any other in respect of the words uttered. This was not due to deficient respect for the rite or to any idea that the exact words were immaterial. It was due to the fact that none of the writers who are mentioned above aspired to become the norm or law of the ceremony. Each felt and knew that the ceremony was there independent of him and superior to his authority. Each gave an account of the rite from some special point of view: some desired to record the circumstances in which it originated, some to show that a certain character (on which they were anxious to lay stress) was dominant in it. None thought of writing a book of ritual, still less of altering the words or the character of the Eucharist. That rite was the fixed and eternal and divine fact: they were the evanescent and human recorders of circumstances connected with it.

We must therefore regard the Church rite as being, not only the oldest, but also the most authoritative record, though only an oral record, of the words and acts: it was authoritative and final for the writers whose words we read: they all presuppose and assume its existence and familiarity. This is the only true point of view for us; and thus regarded, the varying accounts present no real difficulty.

IV. Among the written accounts we shall find that it is best to begin, not with the earliest, but with the apparently simplest account of the actions of the Saviour at the most memorable point of the Supper; namely, with the account given by Mark, and repeated from him with only the slightest variation by Matthew. The details are thus stated¹:—

1. He took bread (*i.e.* a loaf, a single whole unit).²

¹ The Greek is given in p. 252, note¹.

² Paul alone makes the nature of this act quite clear.

2. He spoke a blessing, which is practically the same as He expressed thanks to God.

3. He gave to the Twelve (assuming that they then each ate a piece of the one loaf, as Paul (1 Co 10¹⁷) says).

4. He said, 'Take, this is my body.'

5. He took a cup.

6. He gave thanks.

7. He gave to the Twelve.

8. They all drank.

9. He said, 'This is my blood of the covenant poured out for you.'

10. He made a prediction as to not again drinking.

We observe that this narrative is evidently much abbreviated. There is no mention of the Breaking of the Bread, although that part of the rite was afterwards regarded as the typical one, which often gave its name to the whole ceremony; and the act of breaking or dividing the single piece among many was obviously a necessity of the situation. Mark's record leaves it doubtful whether Jesus broke the bread and handed it in pieces separately to the Twelve, or left it to the participants to break it for themselves, each taking a piece off as the single loaf was passed round the table.

Why does Mark leave this matter doubtful? It cannot be that he attached no importance to it, for other accounts and allusions show that from the beginning it was reckoned highly important. It is simply that he took much for granted as familiar to his readers. The Church ceremony was known to all. Mark assumes this knowledge: he assumes that behind his narrative is the background of Church custom, and on this background he paints with a few outlines his picture. His words implied a great deal more than their bare literal content: they were rich with the fulness of his readers' knowledge. He was not writing a history for the ignorant: he was writing a summary for the instructed (intended, perhaps, to be accompanied and supplemented by further oral instruction).

The words, 'Take, this is my body,' can hardly have been unaccompanied by further explanation. If they were not further explained by additional words, they would arouse inevitably questions and thus elicit teaching. If they were uttered alone, they could only be taken as a parable: 'Without a parable spake he not to them.' Some one of the disciples was always ready to ask some elucidation

of a dark saying.¹ The evident meaning, as Jesus held the Bread and said the words, was 'This bread represents the breaking of my body in the punishment of death on your behalf,' and the words of the Church rite (as quoted by Paul) show that the ritual repetition of the scene made this meaning explicit. Paul adds the further symbolic principle that 'We who are many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread.' It seems quite possible, or even probable, that between this first action and the giving of the Cup, there elapsed a certain interval,² which was occupied with instruction in the meaning of the symbolism.

Matthew gives the opening words as 'Take, eat, this is my body.' Mark omits the word 'eat.' Luke and Paul omit both words 'Take, eat,' but add subsequent words. There is no real discrepancy here. All abbreviate, more or less; but all give enough to recall to the reader the familiar ceremony. What is omitted could readily be supplied by all whom these writers had in mind.

The choice of a different word, 'he gave thanks,' over the Cup, suggests that, while the general character and bearing of the words was the same in each case, Mark understood that there was some difference in form. The *Didache* uses the verb 'give thanks' in both cases, but makes the words, which the celebrants use in the performance of the rite, different in other respects. Paul and Luke, by the expression 'the cup in like manner,' imply that in each case Jesus 'gave thanks,' but not necessarily that the words of thanksgiving were exactly the same. We may safely infer that the words of thanks and blessing differed in the two cases.

Mark says, 'They all drank'; Matthew substitutes for this the command, 'Drink ye all of it.' This deliberate alteration of his authority was made by the composer of the First Gospel in order to bring Mark's account into closer accord with the actual words and actions of the original scene (as we shall find in studying Luke's account). Mark tended to make his narrative full of actions, with few and short speeches.

¹ There is a possibility that no one asked the meaning of the parable, because it had been fully stated by Jesus at an earlier time (as John says), and was familiar to all; and because they knew the custom as characteristic of Jesus.

² The expression of Paul and Luke, 'the cup after supper,' suggests that some interval separated the two acts.

Mark and Matthew represent the Saviour as giving a formal explanation of the purpose of the Cup, namely, that this wine is (*i.e.* symbolizes) the blood shed by Him in His death on behalf of mankind in ratification of the Covenant and Promise of God to men. Luke and Paul express the same truth in slightly different form, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood,' and Luke adds 'which is poured out on your behalf.' Probably the difference of form, 'the covenant in my blood' and 'my blood of the covenant,' arises only from variety in the Greek translation of the original Aramaic words spoken by Jesus. The addition of the word 'new' is probably explanatory. Jesus in His teaching, on other occasions and probably also then, spoke of the new Promise and Pledge which God was giving in His death. Mark and Matthew understood that the Covenant was sufficiently defined by the circumstances as 'new': Luke and Paul thought it best to state explicitly that it was new.

Matthew adds an explanatory clause 'for the remission of sins.' This is peculiar to himself, and doubtless is intended, though without written authority, to make clear the meaning which the composer of the Fourth Gospel understood to lie in the words and the situation.

Mark and Matthew add a statement as to the future, which Luke places earlier in the Supper. Our view is that Luke is more strictly correct, and that the change of order made by Mark (or by his oral authority) was due to the desire for brevity. This will become clearer in studying Luke's account.

The most important inference with regard to Mark's narrative is that it presupposes so much knowledge in the reader. Behind it lies the existent Church, with its teaching and ritual. The Eucharistic ceremony is understood to be familiar to all, and is therefore implied to be an old and established rite in the Christian society. The simplicity of his narrative is therefore only apparent. He attains much brevity and simplicity by assuming so much.

Further, he assumes the recurring ritual. He does not even mention the Institution of the Church ceremony. It did not lie in his purpose to mention what every reader knew. His intention was, in his own brief style, to record the dramatic symbolism which was embodied in the ceremony. The first performance was an acted and spoken parable (accompanied probably by

much more explanation than is recorded in any Gospel). To infer, however, from his omission of the words of Institution that he did not know about the Church ceremony, or that he thought it unimportant, is to misconceive profoundly his purpose and point of view.

Yet it is hardly possible to read Mark's account (repeated by Matthew) without inferring that he regarded the Institution of the Eucharist as a Christian accompaniment and sequel to the Passover. The meal is described by him as the Passover¹ (though nothing he tells, except the preparations (14¹²⁻¹⁶), indicates that it was that feast).² For some unknown reason, the idea had taken possession of his mind, that the Supper was the Passover, although (as has been pointed out by others) some of the things which he elsewhere records are inconsistent with this idea. What was the cause of this misapprehension? It must be associated with an idea that the Passover was in some way connected with the Eucharist, so that the latter Christianized the former. To John the slaying of the Passover was translated into Christianized form as the slaying of Christ; and the two events coincided in time. To Mark the slaying of the Passover was the preparation for the Last Supper, because the ceremony of the Bread and the Cup was an anticipation and prophecy and interpretation of the Death.

If the existing ritual was known to Mark, and assumed by him as the background of his picture and well known to all his readers, the question arises whether the rite was his authority, or whether he had some source of information independent of the Church ceremony. The answer will probably not be doubted. He possessed another authority, probably an oral authority; but in using this source, he had regard to the information with which his readers were familiar in the Church ritual. His narrative has not the appearance of being simply

¹ Spitta in his *Urchristenthum* regards this part of the Synoptic narrative as an interpolation, while he thinks that an account of the rite was originally given in the Fourth Gospel (chap. 13), but dropped out. All such theories we regard as due to thorough misconception.

² (1)¹² 'On the first day of unleavened bread, when they were sacrificing the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and (2) make ready, that thou mayest eat the passover? . . . (3)¹⁴ guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? . . . (4)¹⁶ they made ready the passover.' Similarly in Matthew and in Luke (who also depends on Mark up to this point, where the preparations are complete).

an account of the rite. His differences from the ritual are not reasonably explicable except on the supposition that he possessed another authority, to which he attached a value at least equal to that of the ritual as he knew it, so that he does not hesitate to make slight variations and to describe surrounding circumstances which throw light on the ritual. The preceding part of his narrative leads up to this incident: the sequel presupposes it: therefore the incident must be an integral part of the narrative, and cannot merely be taken from the Church ceremony.

IV. Paul mentions the Eucharistic rite twice in his first letter to the Corinthians (1 Co 10¹⁶⁻²² 11¹⁸⁻³⁴). From the first passage, which is allusive rather than descriptive, it might readily be inferred (1) that the Cup came before the Bread (as in the *Didache*, and in some manuscript forms of the Lucan account): this might very well seem to follow from the agreement of vv. 16. 21; ¹ (2) that the word 'bless,' and not 'give thanks,' was believed by Paul to be the Saviour's words as He gave the Bread (v. 16); the word 'bless' is used also by Mark (and Matthew), whereas Luke says, 'He gave thanks.'

If Paul had mentioned the Eucharist only once in this letter, these two inferences would probably have been generally accepted. Fortunately, he has also given a formal description of the rite, and we see that they are both wrong. In his experience the Bread was before the Cup, and Jesus 'gave thanks' over the Bread.² This is a typical and instructive example of the necessity of exercising the greatest care in drawing inferences from allusions. Paul had some reason in 1 Co 10¹⁶ for alluding to the Cup before the Bread. The reason apparently was that he is here contrasting two superficially analogous ceremonies, pagan and Christian, and showing their absolutely opposite nature and opposite effect; and he names the Cup before the Bread, partly because the more important part of the pagan ceremony lay in the

drinking of the wine, and partly because the common food in the pagan ceremony was not bread, but something eaten out of a dish. The emphasis laid on the breaking by the leader and the eating by all in common of one loaf was probably due to the Founder of the Christian rite, whereas the common meal of the pagan religious societies and brotherhoods probably followed the usual practice of simple Oriental meals, in which each guest has his own loaf, though all eat from a common dish.³ Paul was not thinking of the order of the Christian ceremony in 1 Co 10; he was emphasizing the contrast between it and the pagan ceremony, and mere temporal order is of no consequence. Hence also, probably, he uses the words 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' instead of 'give thanks': the former expression seemed to him to bring out into more marked prominence the distinctive feature of the Christian rite and its strongest difference from the pagan. His whole mind is occupied with the intention of emphasizing differences, not of picturing the details of the Christian ceremony exactly in their sequence.

In order to understand and to draw correct inferences from Paul (or from any other ancient writer), we must put ourselves at his point of view, and sympathize with his intention at the moment; then we shall see the subject in the same perspective in which he saw it, with the same details standing out prominently. The difference between 'bless' and 'give thanks' was to Paul a mere trifle. The two words are analogous in formation and closely akin in meaning. 'To bless' is really 'to say good words,' in Arab phrase 'to name the name of God,'⁴ *i.e.* to give thanks to God. It is quite probable that Paul knew that, in telling the story of that Supper, some used the word 'bless,' and some used the word 'give thanks': the difference is one merely of Greek words, the meaning is practically much the same whichever word is used.

³ This was pointed out in my article on the 'Religion of Greece and Asia Minor' in Hastings' *D.B.*, v. pp. 127A, 129B, 132B.

⁴ I am quoting from a saying of Robertson Smith, who in conversation (perhaps some one will be able to quote it from one of his books), declared 'There are three rules of Mohammedan etiquette at table: (1) Name the name of God, *i.e.* say grace; (2) Eat only with the right hand; (3) Eat of that part of the dish that is next to you.' For the benefit of Western readers it is perhaps well to remind them that the rules apply to a meal eaten with the fingers, without knives or forks, out of a single common dish.

¹ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον δὲ κλῶμεν οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; (1 Co 10¹⁶). οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων· οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων (21). Compare Mark, καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (14²³⁻²⁴).

² 1 Co 11²³.