NOTES AND STUDIES

THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In the course of the Rev. J. C. Lambert's comments in a late number[1] of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES on the Rev. G. H. Box's interesting theory as to the 'Jewish antecedents of the Eucharist,' he discusses the well-known discrepancy between the Lucan account of the Institution and that which is common to the other Synoptists in a manner that shows how unlikely it is that critics will be content for long that 'the whole passage should be treated as at least doubtful.' The longest and most detailed account of an occurrence can never be simply neglected, unless it is proved to be of entirely secondary authority; and in this case acquiescence in failure would be so serious as to throw doubt on the possibility of any satisfactory solution of the Synoptic problem. I need not apologize then for offering even on so well-discussed a question a theory which has not, so far as I can ascertain, been considered as to the relation of the constituent parts of the Lucan account to one another and to the other narratives of the Institution: in so complicated a question even a slight alteration of a previously attempted solution may at least suggest possibilities.

It is unnecessary to do more than indicate briefly the difficulties of St. Luke xxii 17–20, since they have been stated so fully by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Plummer in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. If we adopt with Westcott and Hort the 'Western' reading of this passage, we not only reduce the special parallelism with 1 Cor. xi 23–5 to a single word, but are left still with the inexplicable variation in the order of the Bread and the Cup, which discredits either St. Luke's version or that of St. Paul and the Synoptists. Nor is it clear that the shorter version is to be preferred on the *a priori* ground that the temptation is usually rather to expand than to contract a narrative; for the expansion in this case only introduces fresh confusion. If the longer reading of the Textus Receptus is retained we have to explain *either* the erroneous connexion of certain phrases with the Tradition of the first cup *or else* the double mention of the same cup; in either case it is possible that the impression, to say the least of it, that Eucharistic language is used of the first cup, may have

[1] *J. T. S.* vol. iv pp. 184 ff.

led to the 'Western' omission of the second. But in my opinion the presence in St. Luke's account of additional details so striking as the words recorded in xxii 15, 16 and 21 calls even more urgently for a complete explanation, since it is difficult to think that mere details arose simply from an independent source similar to those used by St. Luke for his independent sections, unless that source was something quite distinct from the tradition common to the Synoptists, while the details in question certainly have not the character of literary additions or inventions by the author of the Gospel himself[1].

I venture then to propound my hypothesis that the whole section, Luke xxii 14–23, is not the Synoptic tradition with additional details perhaps affected by St. Paul's version, but a deliberate, though intentionally incomplete, conflation of two distinct, independent, and perhaps equally original narratives of the Institution. Postponing for the moment the question of the remarkable differences between the evidently allied versions of St. Paul and the Synoptists, I shall set out at length the verses which I suppose to belong to the specially Lucan narrative, which may be called L, and then those belonging to the common narrative which I will call S, distinguishing the two forms which it assumes as S^P (for St. Paul and St. Luke) and S^M (for St. Mark and St. Matthew). I use the Revisers' Greek Testament, as Westcott and Hort are committed to one side on an important point in the case.

To L I should attribute St. Luke xxii 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21.

καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. πλὴν ἰδού, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

With St. Mark xiv 25.

ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκέτι μὴ πίω ἐκ τυῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

And St. Matthew xxvi 29.

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου.

To S would remain the points which are more or less common to St. Paul and the Synoptists, which may be subdivided as follows:—

[1] Mr. Frankland (*The Early Eucharist*, pp. 46–7 and App. A) has recently applied the 'two autograph' theory of St. Luke's Gospel to the latter part of this narrative; but his reconstruction by inclusion of all the details of his 'six accounts' seems to me highly uncritical.

S[P]

St. Luke xxii 19, 20.

καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

1 Cor. xi 24, 25.

ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ εἶπε, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

and S[M]

St. Mark xiv 22, 23, 24.

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, Λάβετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

St. Matthew xxvi 26, 27, 28.

ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπε, Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

The next step is to attempt a restoration, necessarily very rough and conjectural, of the two independent narratives L and S, premising that, if St. Luke's account is really a conflation, the author would omit phrases which were identical or very similar, even if he thereby to some extent confused the two versions, though he did not intend to render them altogether indistinguishable.

The first narrative, which I call L, would be something like this :—

καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ [λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας] εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν [ἐκ] τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. πλὴν ἰδού, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

In this reconstruction I have preferred the briefer form of the words which follow the Tradition of the Cup because St. Luke would hardly have cut down the striking phrase, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω [μεθ' ὑμῶν] καινόν, unless he had some authority for so doing, while St. Mark and St. Matthew do not agree as to the exact wording of what I suppose to be an attempt to expand the meaning of ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου in a mystical sense; on the other hand I have preferred their ἐκ to

St. Luke's *ἀπό* because the latter may have come from the preceding *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*.

The second narrative is more difficult to reconstruct, owing to the differences between S^P and S^M; but may have run originally somewhat as follows:—

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

As this may seem merely an arbitrary conflation of the two parallel versions, I will explain that it proceeds on the idea that St. Paul's, though the earliest account in point of time, is freer in point of statement, especially in the phrases *ὡσαύτως, ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε*, and *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι*, and that in these points he has *directly* affected St. Luke, though the latter by retaining *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* and *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον* shows that he was not entirely dependent on St. Paul. I have followed S^P on the other hand rather than S^M in the important difference *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*, because that phrase could hardly be considered a legitimate development from *τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης*, while the latter may have been produced from the former, partly by the influence of the Old Testament, partly by assimilation to *τὸ σῶμά μου*, and partly by an unconscious desire to find a more accurate construction for *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*. This implies that S^M is a later version than S^P of S, and has been perhaps affected by liturgical formulae in *Λάβετε* or *Λάβετε, φάγετε*, and *Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*. The differences between St. Mark and St. Matthew are normal, and the phrase *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* can hardly be anything but a gloss due to the latter author. The differences between St. Paul and St. Luke are not greater than would be expected between a writer who is quoting from memory in the course of an argument and one who has both the original document and his friend's quotation before him or within his recollection.

The parallel verses Mark xiv 25 and Matthew xxvi 29 raise a more difficult question; but the phrases they contain seem so much more coherent with the rest of L than with the end of S, that I incline to regard them as an accretion from the one account on to the other in the latest stage of the development of the Synoptic narrative before it took literary form at all.

On these lines it would not be very difficult to answer the next question that arises, namely, in what manner the four extant accounts are derived from the original narratives L and S. No doubt this problem would be simplified if one adopted the 'Western' text in St. Luke; but on the

whole I think it more likely that the 'Western' text itself is due to the desire to simplify. Subject then to what has been said about the difficulty of reconstructing S out of S^P and S^M, and about the fragment of L which is appended to S^M, we may characterize the four accounts as follows:—

(1) St. Paul's version is the oldest in its present form and also the simplest. It appears to be a slightly condensed form of S, as quoted from memory; and S may have been in St. Paul's time not a document at all but an oral narrative incorporated in an inchoate liturgy.

(2) St. Mark gives S from a document, after it has absorbed a fragment of L probably from oral tradition, and after it has been affected by the liturgical formulae of the Eucharist.

(3) St. Matthew, as usual in plain narrative, uses St. Mark or his documentary authority with considerable freedom.

(4) St. Luke must have been acquainted with both L and S. It is probable that he used both St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Gospel of St. Mark. But, unless he simply invented, he must also in the course of his researches have come across the other narrative which I have called L, and considered it of such importance that he conflated it and the current version with a minimum of alteration, viz. the omission of words actually common to both and the retention in its proper place only of the sentence about the fruit of the vine which had strayed (in disguise) from L into S. He preserved both the phrases about the Tradition of the Cup because they were different; he omitted the phrase about the Breaking of the Bread because it was the same, though it is difficult to see why he made the omission in the first rather than in the second part of his compound narrative.

But however closely this working hypothesis might account for the phenomena of the four existing versions, it would be useless and worthless if the two narratives, supposed to be the original constituents of them, were not in themselves plausible. It is therefore necessary to consider carefully the various possibilities as to the origin and relation of L and S.

(1) That they should be different halves of the same original account of the same stage in the Last Supper is in the highest degree improbable, since, though it is no doubt possible to fit them into one another in various ways[1], of which perhaps the best would be to place the words in L accompanying the Bread and the Cup in either case before the words of tradition in S, the various versions as they stand would almost inevitably show distinct traces of having been formed by separation. And it would be even more difficult to account for St. Luke's transpositions than for the Synoptists' omissions, if there was an original

[1] For instance, as in the Prayer of Consecration.

narrative containing all the points. But they may be (2) different accounts of the same stage of the Last Supper, or (3) accounts of different stages of it, or (4) traditions of unequal value, at any rate as to the words which accompanied our Lord's acts in the Institution of the Eucharist.

(2) The simplest hypothesis as to two different versions of the same events is that one of them, probably S as apparently more generally current, contains St. Peter's recollections of our Lord's language, while the other (L) represents those of another disciple, possibly St. John, especially if the phrases about the kingdom of God and the fruit of the vine can be taken as the speaker's thoughts uttered out loud, rather than as His explicit directions to the whole table. It may be remarked that the phrases of L, if they really refer, as I am supposing, to the Institution itself, resemble St. John's Eucharistic discourses in being indirect and inferential; it is perhaps accidental that a Hebraism similar to that of Luke xxii 15 occurs in John iii 29, and in close connexion with the word *πεπλήρωται*. There is no inherent improbability in supposing that even at so solemn a moment witnesses might differ as to their memory of the actual phrases; and that the attention of one disciple might be arrested by the mysterious promises or prophecies, while the more practical mind might be observing the symbolical actions and the words more distinctly referring to them.

(3) But it is probably more natural to interpret the two narratives as referring to different, though perhaps not widely separated, stages of the same incident, which may or may not have been originally included in the same narrative. In the accounts of the Last Supper, even in St. John's Gospel, we read in a few minutes all that is recorded of the proceedings which occupied some hours, and we cannot suppose that we have every word and act recorded and correctly spaced. It is possible that the vaguer phrases of L represent the *εὐλογία* and *εὐχαριστία* by which the acts of Institution were prefaced. It is perhaps more tempting to conjecture that as the bread and the cup, delivered with this antithetic and almost poetical language circulated among the Twelve, some questioning word or glance elicited an explanation of the acted and spoken symbolism in terms which did not differ materially from the phrases of S. These, as more distinctly impressive and more easily remembered, would inevitably tend to supplant the original sentences, especially if at an early period they were seen to be available for liturgical purposes. If then S could be regarded as an authentic and immediate exposition of L in the words in which they differ, this would explain not only its superior prevalence but the manner in which it is treated by St. Luke, when he brings it into juxtaposition with L, without actually obliterating the distinction between the two. I do not say that

there is any evidence for such a supposition; but it is at least in our Lord's manner to explain without much delay His acted as well as His spoken parables or allegories.

(4) If, however, the supposition which I consider the most plausible, viz. that L and S are independent traditions of different stages of the same scene, were held to be too complex, it would no doubt be necessary to pronounce one account superior in authenticity and antiquity to the other. In that case I should not hesitate to assign priority to L over S. It may sound paradoxical to prefer the later to the earlier writer; but this is not unfrequently done where there is reason to believe that one author is intentionally, even if tacitly, correcting a predecessor, as is apparently the case in many of the differences between St. John and the Synoptic tradition. If we bear in mind how rarely we are able to consider any historical utterances as actually *verbatim* reports of the language used, we might even regard both narratives as attempts to recall the same acts and words. But I think we should consider that the phraseology of L, with its Hebraisms, its parallelism, and its indirectnesses, is the more likely to be correct in substance. If the disciples bore in mind, I will not say the language of the longer Eucharistic discourses about the True Bread, the Bread from Heaven, the Bread of Life, but merely the phrases which their Master had just used of Himself as the True Vine, they would surely have paraphrased the words of L in some such form as S; but on the other hand we can see nothing in S which could naturally suggest so intangible an interpretation of its language as L. Even if S were not original, then, it might be what I may call a justifiable gloss upon L. The command to take the bread and all drink of the cup are not more expressive than the acts of delivery; or at any rate St. Mark did not think so. The explanation of the elements as the body given and the blood shed on behalf of the disciples for the initial step in the establishment of a new and Christian Covenant, is implicit in the ideas of eating this last and first passover and of drinking the fruit of the vine next in the completed kingdom of God. There may have been liturgical formulae which influenced the earliest stages of that account which we know primarily from St. Paul; but the extent to which St. Paul himself would have been prepared to infer it as a practical restatement of the words of Institution as supposed to be given in L may be estimated from his own comment on the meaning of the rite itself—*ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ* Κυρίου *καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ* (1 Cor. xi 26).

It will be observed that this theory, if accepted, would fall in with the view, which I believe to be the only one consistent with the statements of the Gospels taken as a whole, that the Last Supper was an anticipated Passover, and that the Lord's Supper is a dematerialized perpetuation

of the Paschal 'sacrament.' I propound it, however, simply as a solution of the notorious difficulties of the Lucan narrative, and on the chance that the consideration of it by more learned critics may suggest some corroboration from the stores of textual and patristic evidence which are now applied so successfully to the elucidation of our documents.

HERBERT E. D. BLAKISTON.

ON THE EARLY TEXTS OF THE ROMAN CANON.

IT is proposed in this paper[1] to examine the various readings of the early texts of the Roman Canon as contained in the mass-books from the seventh to the ninth century, with a view to ascertain how they may fall into classes or families; and to indicate briefly some of the questions which the results of the comparison raise.

The texts to be considered are those in the following books: (1) the Bobbio Missal, Paris B. N. lat. 13,246, Delisle *Mémoire*, No. vi (cited as *Bo*). (2) The Stowe Missal, now in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy (*St*)[2]. (3) The Missale Francorum, MS Vat. Regin. 257, Delisle No. iv (*Fr*). (4) The *Gelasianum*, MS Vat. Regin. 316, Delisle No. ii (*GV*). (5) Rheinau MS 30 at Zurich, Wilson's R, Delisle No. ix (*R*). (6) St. Gall MS 348, Wilson's S, Delisle No. x (*S*). (7) The Angoulême Sacramentary, Paris B. N. lat. 816, Delisle No. xv (*Ang*). (8) The Gellone Sacramentary, Paris B. N. lat. 12,048, Delisle No. vii (*Gell*). (9) Paris B. N. lat. 2296, a MS which, though of late date and widely departing from its congeners, must be classed with the MSS of the eighth-century revision of *Gelas*; Delisle No. xliv (2296). (10) Cambrai MS 164, see *supra*, pp. 413–6 (*Ca*). (11) MS Vat. Regin. 337 (*Reg*). (12) MS Vat. Ottobon. 313, Delisle No. xxxv (*Ott*).

Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 have been examined by me. Thanks to the extreme kindness of M. Omont, Conservateur of the Department of MSS at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and of M. de la Roncière, Conservateur adjoint, a friend was able to take for me at once photographs of 1 and 8. The readings of 4, 5, 6 are taken from Wilson's edition of the *Gelasianum*, iii 16 and appended notes. For 2 I follow the edition of Dr. McCarthy (*Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, Literature and Antiquities*, xxvii 208–19, 220), which among other advantages has that of distinguishing by difference of type the original text from that of the interpolator Moelcaich; Dr. McCarthy has also recovered a not

[1] The following addition should be made in the previous article at p. 418 l. 2: In like manner, to the third Sunday of Lent is added (c. 39, note *u*) a 'super populum' which in both MSS is that of the Thursday following. Also: p. 417, l. 22, for '240' read '241.'

[2] Unfortunately in his account of the Fulda MS (see *Book of Cerne*, pp. 235–6) Witzel gives only those portions of the Canon that were strange to him.