

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER

GEORGE GARDNER MONKS

CAMBRIDGE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

SINCE the publication of Dr. Hort's famous note (*New Testament in Greek. Notes on selected readings*, pp. 63f.), on the text of Luke 22 15-20, dealing with the Last Supper, many scholars have been inclined to treat the question as a closed one, believing that the last word had been said. However, the subject has refused to stay decently buried, and the unconvincingness of reasons suggested why it should do so must serve as excuse for this re-examination of the entire subject.

Luke apparently mentions two cups, associating with the first, words which correspond roughly to Mark 14 25, and with the second, those in general similar to Mark 14 22-24. But it is at once noted that Mark connected both sets of words with his single cup, and further combined them in the reverse of the Lucan order. It is obvious that both cannot be authentic reports of what happened. What are the alternatives open to us? Accepting, for the moment, the text as it stands, we can hold either that Luke intended merely a double mention of the same cup, or that the two cups were, in his mind, separate and distinct. (1) Under the first alternative, we must be able to suggest a reason why Luke, with Mark's account before him, should have inverted his order, and further, why he should have divided his words about the cup, placing a portion before the mention of the bread, and the remainder after.

(2) If we lean toward the other horn of the dilemma, then we must ask the further question as to whether it is the first or the second Lucan cups which corresponds to that in Mark.

Once again, both courses lead us into difficulties. (a) If the former identification is favored, we have merely the record that Jesus, presumably after drinking Himself, passed the cup to His disciples adding that He would not again drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God should come. There is no reason why this should not have happened, but we must remember that according to Mark, the cup represents Jesus' "blood of the new testament which was shed for many." This symbolism is reflected in the testimony of Paul, and is intimately connected with the celebration of the Eucharist throughout all Christian history. Now no reflection of this can, by any stretch of the imagination, be read into the Lucan account. And on this theory, it is extraordinary to note that the words we should expect here, we actually do find mentioned in connection with Luke's second cup, which, on hypothesis, was different from the Marcan "cup of the covenant." (b) But if we try to identify the second cup with that of Mark, the difficulties are similar and only slightly less cogent. What was the first cup, and how can we account for Mark's appropriation of the words which Luke connected with it? In Christian tradition, it was taken to be one of the cups of the Passover feast, usually the third cup, the so-called Cup of Blessing, which it is observed that Paul calls (1 Cor. 10 16) "the communion of the blood of Christ." Then Luke's second cup would correspond to the fourth and final one of the Paschal meal. But we have observed that according to Luke's account, it is impossible that his first cup should be called "The communion of the blood of Christ," though the second might aptly be so characterized. Further developing this theory, we might say that the two cups of Luke correspond to the second and third of the Jewish feast, and though this has the advantage of putting the bread in the place it occupied in the Passover meal, yet it places the institution in the very middle and not as an adaptation of the end of the Jewish feast, (which is contrary to all Christian tradition) and does not well jibe with the indication of time given in the expression "After supper." (Lk. 22 20). However, arguments along this line are apt to prove ingenuity wasted, for it is the sense of most scholars that even if the Last Supper may con-

ceivably have been a Passover, yet the rite was so altered that close Paschal analogies cannot be pressed.

This bare outline is sufficient to suggest that there is no simple and direct road out of this maze. When one finds such a great inherent difficulty in the text, one naturally would suspect that the various manuscripts would give some indication of being affected by the difficulty which we feel, and would exhibit efforts to eliminate the trouble. And what we are led, *a priori*, to expect, we find with a vengeance, for there are many well attested, typical, and major variations.

For the sake of clearness, we might indicate, roughly, the various types by the following table, in which the verses (on the basis of *T. R.*) are given in the order in which they occur in various forms.

I. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	<i>T. R. Aleph, B, c, f, q, Vulgate</i>
II. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 a	<i>D, a, ff, i, rhe</i>
III. 15, 16, 19a, 17, 18	<i>b, e</i>
IV. 15, 16, 19, 17, 18	<i>Syr. Cur.</i>
V. 15, 16, 19, 17, 18, 20 b	<i>Syr. Sin.</i>
VI. 15, 16, 19, 20	<i>Peshitta (Some MSS)</i>
VII. 15, 19, 20	<i>Coptic codex aleph</i>

We must now see which of these forms of the Lucan text is probably the original one.

Practically all scholars favor either form I or form II. Zahn (*Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. 3, pp. 39 f.), however, endeavors to make a case in favor of the *b, e* type, in which vv. 19 b-20 are omitted and v. 19 a transposed to precede vv. 17-18 (III). However, there is one objection that seems absolutely conclusive apart from other considerations, and that is the impossibility of accounting for our sundry variations on the basis of this as an original. Leaving to one side the Syriac readings, the Western form would be arrived at, on this hypothesis, by inverting the order of the bread and the cup, thus giving rise to a serious difficulty with no advantage whatever to correspond. Then the longer text must be considered as a further revision of this, for the difficulties are such that the derivation of *T. R.* direct from form III is almost inconceivable. Such a change

as this could not be unintentional, and if intentional, then it should serve to remove a difficulty and not to add many new ones, which would be the case here. Form III is easily explained as a variation from form II, which removes a real difficulty by putting the bread and the wine in their proper order. In any case, the whole theory rests on an hypothesis of successive recensions of the gospel, which meets with no special approval. The various objections, which seem to be absolutely fatal, are well summarized by Goguel (*L'Eucharistie*, pp. 113 f.).

A likely relation of the various forms to one another is clearly summarized by Dr. Sanday (*H. D. B.* vol. 2, p. 636), as follows: "To the textual critic, these phenomena are fairly clear. (1) The omission of vv. 19 b-20 belongs to the oldest form of the Western text (II). (2) The next step (*b, e*) was to transpose the order of vv. 17-18 and 19 a so as to make the sequence of the Bread and Cup correspond to that in the other authorities (III). (3) The next (*Cur.*) was to supplement the words relating to the Bread from 1 Cor. 11 24 (IV). (4) The next (*Sin.*) was to supplement in like manner the part relating to the cup by somewhat free interpolations, partly suggested from Matthew and Mark, but mainly from 1 Cor. (V). In this instance *Syr-Sin* represents a later stage than *Syr-Cur*, though its readings are more often earlier. The omissions of vv. (16), 17, 18 are probably not important. (VI & VII)"—(perhaps due to homoeoteleuton, or, more probably, to an attempt to eliminate the difficulty of the two cups). —"We have then confronting each other the primitive form of the Western text (II), . . . and other authorities which introduce a second cup, or second mention of a cup, and fill out the whole mainly from St. Paul (I). We cannot doubt but that both these types of text existed early in the 2nd century."

Most English scholars since the publication of Westcott and Hort's revised text are inclined to follow Hort in regarding vv. 19 b-20 as "Western non-interpolations," accepting form II, as given in the Bezan codex, as the original. This opinion, which is set forth in the note already referred to, is so important that it must be quoted *in extenso*.

"The only motive that could apparently in any way account

for the omission (vv. 19 b - 20) as a corruption would be a perception of the double reference to the cup. But this explanation involves the extreme improbability that the most familiar form of the words of institution, agreeing with St. Paul's record, should be selected for omission; while the vaguer, less sacred, and less familiar words, in great part peculiar to Luke, were retained. In the case of *D, a, ff, i, rhe* the selection would be improbable likewise as seeming to identify the cup of v. 17, preceding the bread, with the cup of the other records, following the bread. A sense of this discrepancy is presupposed by the transposition in *b, e, Syr. Cur.*; and again their reading adds a second difficulty to the supposed selection by involving a gratuitously double process, omission and transposition.

"On the other hand, if the words were originally absent, the order of vv. 17-19 being as in the common text, the two other readings at once explain themselves as two independent attempts to get rid of this apparent inversion of order. In *be (Syr. Cur.)* this is effected by a simple transposition; in most documents by an adaptation of St. Paul's familiar language. When the apostle's account of the cup was being borrowed, it was natural to introduce with it, for the enrichment of the Gospel narrative, the immediately preceding line concerning the bread. The only substantive element not derived from St. Paul, the last clause τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον causes no difficulty: St. Paul's corresponding sentence being implicitly contained in his τοῦτο ποιῆτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, already appropriated, a neater ending was obtained by taking a phrase from Mark (*cf. Matt.*) with the substitution of ὑμῶν for πολλῶν in accordance with St. Paul's ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν of the previous verse. Some trifling variations from his diction are only such as are commonly found to accompany the adoption of additional matter from parallel places. The insertion of τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν . . . ἀνάμνησιν (without διδόμενον) in *Syr. Cur.* was probably independent, and due merely to the desire of making the account more complete."

Hort then goes on to state that both readings, intrinsically, are difficult, though in different degrees. The shorter one involves the change in order of bread and cup, a phenomenon which occurs elsewhere in comparing the third gospel with the

first two (the Temptation, the Trial, etc.). The longer reading he holds to be more difficult because of the appearance of the two cups, dividing between them the words of institution as given in Mark. The conclusion is that "these difficulties . . . and the transcriptional evidence given above, leave no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Luke notwithstanding the purely Western ancestry of the documents that omit them." This statement of the case for the priority of the shorter form can hardly be improved upon.

Dr. Hort recognizes the strong patristic support of the longer form, but hardly gives it full weight; and it behooves us to enter into the patristic evidence a little more thoroughly. There is one Father not quoted by Hort, who probably bears on the case, and that is Justin Martyr (*First Apology*, Chapter 66), who reads: "For the apostles in the memoirs composed by them which are called gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them: that Jesus took bread, and after giving thanks, said 'Do this in my remembrance. This is my body'; and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup, and given thanks, He said: 'This is my blood' and gave to them only."

In the first place, is this a reference to Luke at all (as is assumed in the note *in loco* in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* and also in Migne's edition)? We cannot be certain, but there are indications in that direction. (1) It is likely that the narrative in First Corinthians is excluded as a possible source, as it is doubtful if the term "gospel" would at this time have been used loosely enough to include the epistles of Paul. It is probable that by "memoirs" Justin included three or four gospels (*Ency. Brit.*, art. "Gospels," p. 266 c). In any case we are certain that by the time of Tatian, Justin's disciple, the term included and was limited to the canonical four. But even if the term's meaning will not bear pressing, the verbal similarity to the Lucan account is at least as close as to the Pauline. (2) Luke is the only one of the *gospels* from which the phrase "Do this in my remembrance" could have come. Now if this reference is really from Luke, as seems very likely, it is obvious that Justin possessed the longer text, a) because of the order and b) because of the inclusion of "Do this in my remembrance."

The quotation from Tertullian (*Against Marcion*, Bk. 4, Ch. 40) is as follows: "When He earnestly expressed His desire to eat the Passover He considered it His own feast . . . Then having taken bread and given it to His disciples, He made it His own body by saying 'This is My body' . . . He likewise when mentioning the cup, and making the new testament to be sealed 'in His blood,' affirms the reality of His body." It is obvious that this does not follow with verbal accuracy any text that we possess and we must assume that it merely purports to give the general sense. The quotation is probably based on Luke, for this is the only gospel accepted by Marcion and used by Tertullian in refuting him. Now we cannot be absolutely certain whether this quotation bears evidence to the text of Tertullian or of Marcion, or of both. Doubtless, it at least represents that of Marcion, as the whole point of Tertullian's argument is that he refutes the heretic out of his own mouth, and if he mentioned anything which the latter did not have in his text, it would greatly weaken his own case. Our evidence for the exact text of Marcion, beside this passage, is very limited. Epiphanius (Migne, vol. 41, 316) is explicit in stating that Marcion excised verse 16, which reads: "For I say unto you that I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God." But as it is generally recognized that Epiphanius did not mention everything that Marcion omits, it is supposed that he probably omitted verses 17 and 18 as well, as there is no trace of either in Tertullian, and anything that would be objectionable in the verse which Epiphanius says he did eliminate would apply with equal force to verse 18.

Adamantius (*Dialogues*, V, 870 E) quotes verses 19-20 from Marcion. Harnack (*Marcion*, p. 215), Hahn (*Evangelium Marcionis*, p. 207), and most scholars favor the view that Marcion's text corresponded to type VII (*i. e.*, vv. 15, 19, 20). But whatever doubt there may be as to the exact form of his text, we note (a) that the order given is first the bread and then the wine; and (b) that the "new testament sealed in blood," which is in verse 20, is mentioned. Therefore there seems no doubt as to the presence of verses 19-20, thus bearing conclusive evidence that Marcion did not use the Western reading or

form III. So, notwithstanding his mutilations, we can be fairly sure that the text which Marcion originally possessed was of form I. Probably we cannot be sure of that followed by Tertullian himself; however, we might note in passing that his own witness in favor of the longer form becomes more definite just in so far as we feel bound to agree with certain scholars who suggest that Tertullian was not following Marcion's text closely.

The reference in Origen (*Commentary on St. Matthew*, no. 823 in Migne) is a casual one and is as follows: "As it was written in the gospel, 'The cup of the new testament' etc." Now it is unlikely that this is a direct quotation, but it is doubtless given from memory, for it is a purely incidental reference and does not follow exactly any of our accounts. We have already noted the probability that the term "gospel" for Justin Martyr would exclude the Epistle to the Corinthians, but there is no question that this would be so with Origen. And we cannot fail to note that among the gospels, it is only in Luke that there is the expression "This cup is the new testament," whereas Matthew and Mark have "This is my blood of the testament." Now in Luke's gospel, this expression occurs in verse 20, which would not be present if Origen was using the Western text. While by no means conclusive, it seems more likely than not that Origen's text was of the longer form. This gives a possible indication as to the local text of Caesarea, for the *Commentary on St. Matthew* was not written in Alexandria, but in Caesarea, and Dr. Streeter has shown that for this work Origen used a text belonging to what he calls "Family *theta*," which is distinct from the text of Alexandria. (*The Four Gospels*, chap. 4).

Turning now to the *Canon* of Eusebius, there remains not the slightest doubt as to the text which this Father was following. He places Luke vv. 19-20 in his canon *b*, which comprises those verses which, in their essentials, occur in the three synoptists. Now had Eusebius been following the shorter text, then the verses in question could not have been in this canon but must have been placed in that comprehending verses found only in Matthew and Mark. While the text used by Eusebius

does not invariably represent the ancient *theta* text—though it is based directly on it (Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 91)—yet it should be noted that it differs chiefly from that of *theta* in that it has many readings found only in *D*; but at this point in question, Eusebius takes sides against *D*, and therefore it is very probable that here, at any rate, Eusebius represents the text of *theta*. Thus his testimony, coupled with the evidence of Origen for what it is worth, combine to make it likely that the original text of family *theta* was of the longer variety, and this family Streeter ranks with *B* and *D* as the three primary evidences for the gospel text.

Of course, it might well be objected that the reference in Origen gives no reflection of the text of Caesarea, but is a reminiscence of the one to which he was accustomed in Alexandria. This is by no means improbable, but we must not forget that, in any case, the text of Alexandria was surely of the longer type. The reference in the Syriac version of Cyrill's *Commentary on St. Luke* to this passage is explicit testimony in favor of the fuller form. Conclusive evidence is afforded by codices *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus*, coming from Alexandria probably early in the fourth century, and reinforced, if reinforcement is necessary, by the Coptic version, reaching back to a somewhat later date, which survives in both the Sahidic and the Bohairic dialects. There cannot be the slightest ground for doubt but that the textual tradition centering around Alexandria is wholly in favor of the inclusion of the doubtful verses.

But we must turn, before leaving this part of the subject, to a study of the Sinaitic and the Curetonian Syriac. In this, no attempt is made to go behind the facts stated by Dr. Burkitt (*Evangelion da Mepharreshe*), though certain of the conclusions which he draws from the evidence he presents seem contestable.

If the Curetonian and the Sinaitic Syriac texts are placed side by side, one might well feel that the latter was an attempt to harmonize the former with the longer Lucan text. The Sinaitic Syriac presents the following changes, as compared with *Cur.*: (1) Adds "I give" after "my body that . . ." (2) Adds "after they supped" before "he took a cup . . ."

(3) Adds "This is my blood, the new covenant," after "divide it among yourselves." (4) Adds "for" before "I say unto you . . ." (5) Substitutes "fruit" for "produce of the vine."

Now for No. 1, Luke, in the longer form, has *διδόμενον*, but as none of the other accounts of the Last Supper have anything, it is safe to suggest that the author may well have known the *T. R.* reading of Luke, and to this view the change of form is by no means a fatal objection. No. 2 comes directly from Luke's longer text, or Paul. No. 3 does not correspond closely with any of the accounts, but it might well represent an attempt to assimilate the Curetonian text somewhat closer to Luke's account, probably the exact language being influenced by the *Diatessaron*. No. 4 exactly reproduces the form in Luke and differs from that in all the other accounts. No. 5 is probably not of major importance. Burkitt points out that the Syriac word translated "produce" (*Cur.*) is more colorful and appropriate than that corresponding to "fruit" (*Sin.*). He suggests that "of the vine" dropped out when *Sin.* was revised from *Cur.* If one is derived from the other, then the less colorful (*Sin.*) would be more likely to be the original. But as in general it is assumed, in the passage we are considering, that *Cur.* is more primitive, it is not impossible that the two are both independent translations from the same Greek word. Thus of these five changes, we see that two are unimportant, and the remaining three are in the direction of harmonization with the longer Lucan text, for all of them are paralleled in verses 19 b-20, which would be omitted in the Western text of Luke. From this study, it seems to me not unlikely that the longer form of the Lucan text was in circulation and in good standing in the locality where the Sinaitic Syriac arose, and before this was compiled.

But if we see distinct traces of the presence of Luke's longer form in the Sinaitic text, is it not possible that the Curetonian which is, in general, later, may also have known it? Dr. Burkitt (*Evangelion da Mepharreshe*, vol. 2, pp. 300 f.) suggests that the translator of *Cur.* knew the *Diatessaron*, and also, probably, a liturgical text resembling *Aphraates* 221, in addition to the underlying Greek text of the original *Evangelion*.

Now though the text of the *Diatessaron* is doubtful, variations would probably not affect the main course of the argument. The Arabic (xlv, 12—16) of the *Diatessaron* gives as the text Matt. 26 28—29 (his complete account) followed by Luke 22 19 b "and so be doing for my memory."

Aphraates reads "He took bread and blessed and gave to His disciples, and said to them, 'This is My body; take, eat of it, all of you.' And also over the wine thus He blessed and said to them, 'This is My Blood, the new covenant that for many is shed to forgiveness of sins. Thus be ye doing for my memory whenever ye are gathered together.'"

Assuming, as Burkitt does, that the writer was thoroughly familiar with at least the *Diatessaron*, we must ask the question whether it would be easier to account for the existence of our Curetonian text on the basis of a Greek *Evangelion* which corresponded with the Western, or with the longer, or with some other form. Let it be said at once that a type similar to form III would have great advantages over both the more usual forms, but we have no record of the existence of any such text as this outside of the West, and the *Evangelion* was almost certainly of definitely Antiochian ancestry (cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 75).

Burkitt thinks that this task is easier with the Western text, but his conclusion cannot but be influenced by his opinion, following Hort, that the shorter is the original authentic form of the gospel narrative. He argues that "Which is for you" must be dependent on Paul, because Luke connects with it *διδόμενον*. This Pauline element would probably come through the medium of the *Diatessaron*, and the further expression "so be doing for my memory" would be similarly accounted for. Without these expressions, there are then no signs left of Luke 22 19 b—20, and therefore he concludes that the underlying text was similar to the Western, and that the translator, noting the reverse in the order of bread and cup from that of the *Diatessaron* or *Aphraates*, placed vv. 17—18 after v. 19 a, thus, in a simple manner, correcting the error he noted. Finally he suggests that both *Sin.* and *Cur.* may have been independently assimilated to the *Diatessaron*, and that the original text of the *Evangelion* was even closer to that of Westcott and Hort.

Let us now see what is involved on the assumption that the translator had before him the longer form of Lucan text. As he read this, he would note that the cup came first, but as this was contrary to the order he knew, he therefore skipped over verses 17-18 and took verse 19 intact where the bread was described. Except for the omission of the *διδόμενον* above noted, there are no alterations. Then, in describing the cup, he took verses 17-18, which *Cur.* gives with only minor variations from Luke (none of which variations, be it noted, are in the direction of assimilations towards any of our other primary narratives). Then he was through; he had the bread, he had the cup, and his account ended with something roughly similar to the latter part of the *Diatessaron*, and perhaps he did not notice the further description of the cup following the bread, or if he did notice it, deliberately passed it by, and pushed on to new material.

In comparing the two possibilities, it is seen that in neither case are we completely free from difficulties. But we have noted that Dr. Burkitt traces what corresponds to Luke v. 19 b to Paul, and he pushes on further to assign the entire description of the bread to First Corinthians. But it is precarious thus arbitrarily to assign a Pauline element (for which there is no evidence) to the *Diatessaron*, which was a harmony of the gospels. He finds also that while the Curetonian account is based on a combination of Luke and Paul, the Sinaitic calls for the further introduction from Matthew of "This is my blood, the new covenant." Now this hypothesis seems to me complicated and arbitrary, especially when we note, in comparison, that by assuming the longer text of Luke, nothing more must be postulated from Paul or any of the gospels to account for *both* the Curetonian and the Sinaitic forms. Further, we must remember that we have already noted the possible existence of the longer form at the time and place of compilation of the Sinaitic Syriac, which probably preceded the Curetonian. Also, we are studying verses that are part of the gospel of *Luke*, and so we should look to it first of all for our sources and not to a polyglot combination based on the indefinite text of the *Diatessaron*. An inversion of order is called for in each case,

and in each, this is traced to a knowledge of the *Diatessaron*, (or *Aphraates*, or both) and the omission calls for similar explanation under both hypotheses.

If this theory is sound, some interesting conclusions follow. We have already noted that the Sinaitic Syriac showed evidence of being assimilated toward the longer Lucan text and, at the time, we assumed that it was assimilated from the Curetonian. But this is rather unlikely, for generally the former is the earlier and more original, so that, at this point, the theory above suggested would be open to criticism. But why should not we consider the two Syriac forms as independent attempts to deal with the problem that the longer Lucan text afforded, for the Sinaitic form is similarly and quite as easily explained on this basis as on the one we suggested? Then both authors would be familiar with the *Diatessaron*, perhaps *Aphraates*, and something close to the *T. R.* of Luke. The Sinaitic would here as elsewhere prove itself the more original, solving the difficulty by keeping close to his text of Luke, while the Curetonian takes greater liberties. Thus we have a perfectly good explanation to offer why the Sinaitic, generally the more primitive and reliable, appears to be later in this case, even though probably it is not so. Therefore it is by no means impossible that the *Evangelion*, representing the ancient Lucan text of Antioch, followed the longer form, agreeing with that of Alexandria and Caesarea.

We have already noted that the text of the *Diatessaron* is very uncertain, but there is one further bold speculation which might be offered on this score, which can only be judged as a leap in the dark. If we turn to the *Diatessaron*, (Hill's edition 44:41—43 and 45:12—16), we note that Luke 22 15—16 comes at the beginning of the Passover meal, more than a page removed from the institution of the Eucharist, and that in this page is described the departure of Judas: this is contrary to the order of events given in Luke. Having preferred this order, it was natural to prefer Mark and Matthew for the contents of the institution. It is only in the very end that we have an indication of Luke in a phrase peculiar to his gospel: "and so do for my remembrance." It is, of course, possible that this phrase may have come from the account in I Corinthians, but

this conjecture is by no means required, and the *a priori* probability is in favor of Luke, just because the *Diatessaron* was a harmony of the *gospels*. It is true that there are similar words in *Aphraates* which indicate a possible dependence on Paul's account; but even though this dependence should be proved, yet Burkitt points out that *Aphraates* is not directly based on the *Diatessaron*, and so it is not required to trace the origin of these words to this source. But the reader will at once recognize that the words in question are not only peculiar to Luke among the *gospels*, but further, that they occur in a portion that the Western form would not have. We have already observed that Justin, Tatian's master, probably possessed the longer form of text. Is it impossible that these two indications taken together permit us to add Tatian as a further possible witness in support of this form?

Let us now summarize our findings. We can tell with certainty that the longer text was the ancient form centering in Alexandria, with almost certainty that it was that of Caesarea, and with what seems to be a distinct possibility that it was that of Antioch as well; even if this last point seems going ahead of the evidence, none the less, it is absolutely futile to call on the Syriac texts as a support for the Western form. Turning to the West, we find indications of the longer text almost certainly in Marcion (140 A. D.) and Justin (150 A. D.), representing the tradition of Rome, and also possibly Tertullian (207 A. D.) from North Africa, probably dependent on Rome. Further there are the Latins *c*, *f*, and *q*, and the Vulgate. In favor of the Western form are *D* and *a*, *ff*, *i*, *rhe*, all Old Latins, *b*, probably from Gaul, and *e*, from Carthage. We will leave the question now for the moment, noting only the definite and universal support of the longer form in the East, and its strong and early support in the West as well.

Turning now from the patristic evidence to the intrinsic probability of the two types, we will do well to heed the advice of Canon Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 142), who warns us of the fallacy of assuming that Hort's Western non-interpolations must stand or fall together. He says "No manuscript or group of manuscripts is even approximately infallible; all have suffered

from some accidental omissions. It is more probable that in some cases *B* is correct in retaining the words, even if, in the majority, *D* is right in omitting them. The real case against the genuineness of these readings rests, I must repeat, not on their omission in one line of the manuscript tradition, but in the fact that they look like attempts at harmonization." Each case must be judged on its own merits.

We have, therefore, reached the point of comparing these two primitive types on their intrinsic merits, determining which account is inherently the more likely. The case for the primacy of the shorter form as given by Hort, has already been quoted, and cannot well be improved upon; but certain serious difficulties with this view must be elaborated.

First of all, let us consider critically the words of verses 19 b - 20 which, it is supposed, came from Paul's account. Taking First Corinthians as the basis we find that the Lucan variations are as follows: (1) *διδόμενον* is added. (2) *ώσαύτως* is in a different position. (3) *έστιν* is omitted. (4) *μου* is substituted for *έμφ.* (5) *τό ύπερ ύμων έκχυνόμενον* is added. (6) *τούτο ποιείτε . . . έμην ανάμνησιν* is omitted. None of these variations are of major importance. No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 need no comment. No. 1 corresponds with the addition of *έδωκεν* in verse 19 a. No. 5 is somewhat stranger. It might be explained as added to fill out the parallelism with *τό ύπερ ύμων διδόμενον* in verse 19 b. However, the coincidence of *έκχυνόμενον* with the Marcan account is probably not accidental and suggests the likelihood of some connection, even though the Marcan account has *πολλων* instead of *ύμων*. At any rate, this addition presents an obstacle to the derivation of these verses from the Corinthian account *exclusively*. No. 6 also presents some problems. It is extremely unlikely that No. 5 should have been substituted for it, as some suggest, or again that repetition of its thought was unnecessary because already contained in verse 19 b; there would appear to be no very satisfactory reason for its omission, if the Lucan section came from Paul at all directly. In summary, there are altogether 32 words in this section, or an average of about one variation to five words, though of the six variations, three at least are insignificant.

Now let us compare the words of the first half of verse 19 in the same way. There are thirteen words, with the following Lucan variations from Paul: (1) λαβών instead of ἔλαβεν. (2) ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς is added. (3) λέγων is substituted for εἶπεν. (4) μου occurs in a different position. Of these, No. 4 is trifling, No. 1 and No. 3 are due to the grammatical structure of the sentence, and No. 2 alone is of any significance; here Luke may be following Mark, who has the same expression, or merely be making more explicit what was the obvious sense of Paul. In other words, verse 19 a is quite as close to Paul as are verses 19 b - 20.

There is one further point which calls for study, and that is the relative closeness of verse 19 a to Mark and to Paul. Most of the variations are unimportant, on the whole, the more interesting ones being as follows: (1) Luke follows Paul in having εὐχαριστήσας whereas Mark has εὐλογήσας. (2) Luke follows Mark in having ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς for which Paul has nothing to correspond. (3) Luke follows Paul, in not having Mark's λάβετε. (4) Luke, in the Western text, follows Mark in stopping with τὸ σῶμά μου whereas Paul adds τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν etc., though in the longer text he agrees with Paul against Mark. The most significant of these is No. 4; it is indeed interesting that the Western text of Luke should stop just at the point where Mark stops. However, if the theory which is here suggested, namely that vv. 19-20 are to be kept as a unit, derived chiefly from Paul, can be sustained, then this fact is by no means to be ignored, but becomes of considerable significance in attempting to explain how, granted the longer text was original, the Western text ever came into existence; and also how, if it is a shortened form, it came to end at just the place it did. But at this point, we cannot appeal to No. 4 one way or the other, for it begs the question at the very point at which we are concerned: namely, what the original Lucan text was. So we see that verse 19 a is rather closer to the Pauline account than to the Marcan. Of course it is possible that verse 19 a is part of an independent version and there are theories such as that of Dr. Rashdall (*Idea of Atonement*, pp. 41-44) which argue that the shorter form of the Lucan text is a direct and very reliable witness of tradition, independent of and earlier than both Mark and Paul.

But his extremely arbitrary treatment of the various accounts seems most unconvincing. And, as a matter of fact, most scholars who favor the Western form consider that, as it stands, it is not an independent witness, but is mainly secondary to Mark. The conclusion of such a position is perhaps well represented by Dr. Plummer (*HDB*. Vol. III, p. 146); he inclines toward the reading of Hort, but says "in the accounts of the institution, the whole passage should be treated as at least doubtful."

Thus we have found on the one hand that verse 19^a is at least as close to Paul as are verses 19^b-20, and, on the other, that it is distinctly closer to Paul than it is to Mark. There is no *a priori* reason why vv. 19^b-20 should not be derived from the same source as v. 19^a, and *vice versa*. No serious obstacle forbids our considering the whole as derived from First Corinthians, or, more probably, from Pauline practices for which First Corinthians is itself our sole surviving direct witness. Of course, we must note that under all hypotheses, Luke had Mark before him as he wrote, and this would in itself be quite sufficient to account for the minor agreements with Mark and against Paul, which we have already noted, and none of which are of major importance.

Again, the position taken by Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 179 f.) is interesting in part because it is put forward on purely stylistic grounds, and apart from any theory of interpretation. He argues that verse 19^a should be omitted as well as verses 19^b-20, frankly recognizing that this leaves no account of the institution at all in Luke. With great acumen, he suggests that it is possible that Luke intended either to have no account, or to have a full account, but it is impossible to imagine that he intended to give a mutilated account, which is what the Western reading really gives us. Taking this hypothetical text as a basis, he says "Later readers did not understand his (Luke's) intention, and either inserted both bread and cup from St. Paul (verses 19-20), or, wrongly imagining that the cup was already there (in verses 17 f.), they inserted the bread from Mark." Such a theory, he holds, gives us an original text which was at once irrefragable from the author's

point of view, and which also provides adequate explanation of the variations which we find in existence. The chief objection is that the theory is utterly devoid of the support of any manuscripts, but if the alterations are pushed back early enough, this is not quite insurmountable.

As a matter of fact, no one can read the Lucan account without noticing the marked break that appears to come after the Last Supper. In the longer text, this is not so obvious, for there does seem to be a genuine connection between "My blood which is shed for you," and "the hand of him that betrayeth Me." The thought passes from Jesus giving His life voluntarily for others to the traitor who is responsible for the shedding of innocent blood. The change in thought is not so great as to make it unlikely that a person writing a running narrative should have left the text as we have it.

However, when we turn to the Western text, the break is far more evident. It would read, "This is My Body. But the hand of him that betrayeth Me," etc. The connection is much more difficult to trace. Even if the transition itself were not so abrupt, it would be hard to think of the first phrase as itself a satisfactory conclusion of a description of the institution of the Eucharist.

Now one of the points in favor of the text of Blass that we have mentioned is that the transition from the Eucharist to the Betrayal is far more natural and easy than with either the Western or the longer form. It runs: "For ($\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$) I say unto you I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come. But, ($\kappa\lambda\eta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$), behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." This is simple and straightforward. We can well imagine the surprise to which Jesus' first statement gave rise in the minds of His disciples, for throughout the gospel story, they were never able to bring themselves to believe that He must die. In consequence of their questioning glances, Jesus went on to show how His apparently extreme statement was literally true, for the betrayer was close at hand. Blass notes in support of his contention two other cases in Luke where the same general transition in thought occurs: in 18 *et.*, " $(\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho)$ I tell you that..."

Nevertheless (πλήν) when the Son of Man," etc.; and again in 19 26 f., "For (γάρ) I say unto you that . . . But (πλήν) those my enemies," etc.

Now there is one further observation that is not without its significance. In all the accounts which we have of the Last Supper, there is a fairly close parallelism between the two parts of the rite. For instance, Mark reads "He took bread and when He had blessed, He brake it, and gave to them and said, 'Take ye; this is My body.' And He took a cup and when He had given thanks, He gave to them; and they all drank from it. And He said unto them, 'This is My blood,'" etc. Matthew is roughly similar. With Paul, the similarity is not so obvious, but it is implied in the very use of the word *ὡσαύτως*—"In like manner"—in connection with the cup. Also he adds in the case of the bread, "Do this in My remembrance;" and of the wine, "Do this, as often as ye shall drink it, in My remembrance." Therefore on *a priori* grounds we might well expect to find a similar parallelism in Luke.

As a matter of fact, we do find verse 16, "For I say unto you I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God," closely parallel to verse 18, "For I say unto you I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come." Thus there would be at least one strong point in favor of any theory that attached these two expressions to the two parts of the rite. And in the latter verses of Luke's account, following more or less that of Paul, there is a rough correspondence between verse 19 and verse 20, which deal with the bread and the cup respectively. But if we take the Western reading, there is no possible parallelism between verses 17 and 18 which deal with the cup, and verse 19 which tells of the bread. This arrangement gives the impression of putting together what does not belong together, and keeping apart verses which seem to be intimately connected with one another. So we find from this totally different line a further support for the theory that verses 19-20 should be kept intact; and it further suggests that in some way these two verses should be separated from what goes before, for if vv. 19-20 are

omitted the parallelism between verses 15-16 and verses 17-18 stands out very clearly.

Let us consider, finally, the question of the order of the bread and the wine. On the one hand, we have the universal custom of Church practice, present and past, and this is supplemented by all the accounts in the New Testament (leaving, for a moment, the Lucan text out of consideration). On the other hand, we have the testimony of St. Paul (1 Cor. 10 16) where the "Cup of Blessing that we bless" precedes the "bread that we break," and that of the *Didache* (chap. 9).

The Pauline reference does not seem upon closer examination to bear much weight. If, as is sometimes contended, the order here given is that which Paul followed and taught in his churches, we would have expected to find some reflection of it in contemporary record or in later custom, but of this, there is none. Furthermore, we must not forget that in this same chapter there is no doubt that Paul is referring to the Eucharist where he speaks of partaking of spiritual meat before he mentions spiritual drink (1 Cor. 10 3 f.). Finally, there is an express statement (1 Cor. 11 23 f.) where the apostle describes the record which he received from the Lord of the institution of the rite, and in this the bread comes first. And it would seem preposterous to argue that the Pauline practice was contrary to his own express teaching on the Last Supper, especially as no indication of any such practice beyond this casual reference can be pointed out.

What are we to do, then, with the passage in question? It seems to me that if we read it in connection with its context there is no great difficulty. We must remember that this epistle was not a carefully transcribed and accurately corrected thesis, but a more or less hasty letter. At this point, Paul is using the Eucharist as an analogy in his argument about the heathen feasts; and in them, the cup was given the prior place; so naturally, Paul would adapt his illustration to the thing illustrated (10 21). To have had the order different in the two cases, or to reverse that of the heathen feasts, would only weaken the force of his argument, and serve to "drag a red herring across the trail."

But there is another possible explanation that might be suggested. There is no sentence supplementary to that about the "Cup of Blessing," but to that about the bread is added "seeing that there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread" (R. V. *margin*). Now if Paul desired to add a comment to one part, it is most natural that the part to which the comment was to be added should come last, so that the general flow and sense of the passage should not be interfered with. On the whole, it is likely that either of these suggestions is quite sufficient to account for something which is, at most, but casual witness to the order of the two elements.

Let us turn now to the *Didache*. It reads "And as regards the eucharist, give thanks in this manner. First for the Cup . . . And for the broken bread . . ." It seems evident at first sight that this refers to the Eucharist. The name *εὐχαριστίας* would seem conclusive. It is further to be noted that if not at this place, then nowhere in the treatise would this sacrament receive the full consideration which one might naturally expect, especially in view of the ample treatment of baptism. But on the other hand, MacLean believes (*The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 24f.) that this whole account more probably refers to the *agape* than to the Eucharist. He points out: (1) The order of elements is unusual for the Eucharist. It is to be noted that in verse 5 we have "let none eat nor drink of your eucharist . . ." Of course that cannot be used as an argument for our main point, which is simply the value of this testimony to the order. (2) The word *κλάσμα*—"the breaking"—is distinctly unusual as a word for "the bread," and without any parallel in patristic usage, though, of course, "the breaking of bread," "to break bread," are common as titles of the Eucharist. (3) If this is not an account of the *agape*, then there is none given, though the existence of the rite is recognized (11 9). (4) The meal described is one of which it may be said that those who partake of it are "filled" (10 1). That such a word is inappropriate for the Eucharist is evidenced by the author of *Apostolic Constitutions* (7 26), who, in adapting this prayer for communicants, alters it to read "after the partaking."

(5) We are given, in chapter 10, a grace to be said after "being filled," which is much more suitable after an *agape* than at the conclusion of a Eucharist. Especially is this so of the closing verse: "But suffer the prophets to give thanks as they will." (6) There is no reference in any of the prayers to the Last Supper, to our Lord's death, or any of the eucharistic associations.

How, then, could we explain the use of the word "eucharist"? It is suggested that just as for Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 8) the word *agape* includes both rites, so here "thanksgiving" serves the same purpose. (*Dict. of R. and E.*, art. "Agape," gives a resume of the whole matter.)

Dr. Robinson (*Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache*, p. 92) follows a completely different line, holding that the Eucharist is really being referred to in this passage, but as to the order, he believes that the author is merely following Paul's allusion in First Corinthians which we have already examined. He says: "We have seen enough of our author to be ready to believe that this is a piece of literary perversity on his part, and does not represent the practice of any Christian community." At the moment it is unnecessary for us to go further than to note that, whichever line is followed, the result for us is the same, namely that the value of the *Didache* as an authority for the existence of other than the usual order is practically nil.

Now we must turn to the Lucan text. According to the reading preferred by Westcott and Hort, the order is the cup followed by the bread, and the cases we have just examined are pointed out as supporting evidence. However, we have found that this evidence will bear no weight, and if the Western text be the correct reading, we must realize that it is the *sole* reliable witness in literature or tradition to the order which it gives. Now if we assume that this unusual order is correct, how can we account for the wide-spread error? Is such a universal transformation of record and practice as this theory requires conceivable? There really can be no two answers to this question. To answer in the affirmative would involve the destruction of every atom of historical reliability of all our sources. Therefore it seems to me we are forced to admit

that, granted the Western text is the true one, it must be bearing a false witness; and this conclusion is such as to cause us to question the reliability of the account itself. It is comparatively pointless to call attention to the various cases, especially in connection with the Passion, where Luke inverts Mark's order. In most cases, Luke's order seems to be preferable, and to be due to a separate source (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 202). Can we postulate that this generally reliable source presents us with an order for which there is absolutely no other evidence in its favor, and much against it? It is strange procedure to call a special source to our rescue and condemn it when we get it. Is it not much more reasonable to suppose that the longer text gives us the correct reading, and that Luke falls into line with all the rest of our testimony? I see no escape from this dilemma; either the Western text is a false reading, or it bears false witness.

Now the objections which we have found to the Western text are as follows: (1) It divides verse 19 in a way that is unconvincing, for we have seen, from a critical comparison with the parallel accounts in Mark and Paul, that there is good reason for treating the verse as a unit. (2) It takes no account of such contentions as those of Blass, who points out indications in favor of a still shorter text. (3) It completely destroys the expected parallelism between the two halves of the rite. (4) It requires an inversion of the order of the elements which is without the slightest support.

No mention has been made before of attempts that have been made, granted the priority of the Western text, to arrive at the longer version, because I have felt them to be singularly unconvincing. It is all well enough to say that it was a filling out with the familiar Pauline form, but if this is so, why was such a bad job done, and why were the two mentions of the cup left as they are? It would be easier to explain these difficulties on the supposition that the text had been left strictly alone, but if it is once admitted that it was altered, then we have a right to ask why the alteration was not at least reasonably well done? It is striking that *all* the variants from the *T. R.* agree in but one point, namely the elimination of the

double mention of the cup. This would seem to indicate that this point was the crux of the trouble. Texts of form III (b, e) which, as we have seen, are dependent on the Western text, in themselves bear evidence that the latter is not entirely to their satisfaction. It is probable that the advocate of the Western text would note the difficulties as we do, and would explain the longer reading as itself an attempt to remove the trouble. But is it not an extraordinarily inadequate and unsatisfactory attempt? Goguel (*L'Eucharistie*, pp. 108 f.) has outlined in considerable detail the possibility of accounting for the various forms (he follows the usual view as to *Syr. Sin.* and *Syr. Cur.*) on the basis of one or another as the original, and arrives at the definite conclusion that the Alexandrian text is the most primitive form.

In summary, it seems evident that, inherently, the longer form is much preferable, indeed that the Western form is practically impossible, and, in addition, there is the extremely strong support which the patristic evidence affords. The longer form seems certainly prior to the Western. Even if it is not possible to meet all the objections which may be raised against it, yet the difficulties on the other side are far more cogent, and practically insurmountable. But there are two important questions which any one proposing to support this hypothesis must stand ready to answer. (1) What are we to say of the double mention of the cup? (2) Why and how did the alternative versions, and especially the Western text come about? In so far as any answer is convincing, just so much more likely will it render our conclusion.

Canon Streeter's theories (*The Four Gospels*) as to the origin and development of the third gospel supplement admirably the conclusion which we were reaching on our topic, along wholly different lines. He holds that back of our gospel was a document also written by Luke, the author of the gospel, which he calls *proto-Luke*, and which later was combined with Mark to give us our canonical gospel. Now this *proto-Luke* was itself formed from *Q*, and probably from notes or a document denoted by *L*, which, he suggests, Luke secured during the imprisonment of Paul at Caesarea (a "we" section of Acts

starts at 27¹, indicating that Luke left Caesarea with Paul). He quotes with approval the work of Perry (*The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*), who finds a special passion source which would correspond with part of Dr. Streeter's *L*.

Now if, in *L*, verses 19-20 were not present, and the narrative ran as suggested by Blass, full weight would be given to all his observations, and an explanation offered for the weakness of his theory: namely, that no documentary support survives. It gives a consistent, coherent narrative, with a description of *some* rite in which the two parts are in close parallel.

It is true that Perry includes verse 19^a in his reconstruction of the special source (*op. cit.*, p. 118), but we must note that when the author discusses the problem briefly (p. 39), though he rather inclines to the view that verse 19^a should be omitted also, he considers it outside the province of his work to go behind the text of Westcott and Hort. He suggests that verses 19-20 are probably drawn from the oral tradition, or from some ritual rather than from any document, and were inserted, by some later hand, or by Luke himself. The possibility that this latter offers the true explanation is also suggested by Lagrange, who says (*Evangile Selon Saint Luc*, p. 547): "It seems, taken all in all, that the words in question are taken from Paul. But why should this not have been done by Luke himself?"

Returning to Dr. Streeter's outline, verses 19-20 might well have been added by Luke, probably in the course of the compilation by him of *proto-Luke*, thus actually giving what I believe to be two partial, but independent accounts of the same event, put side by side. Luke, who was not an eye-witness, and who was probably unfamiliar with details of the Jewish Passover, may well have thought that the Last Supper had been such a feast, possibly in consequence of a misunderstanding of 22¹⁵ ("With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer"). The suggestion of Drs. Burkitt and Brooke (*J. T. S.*, vol. 9, pp. 568 f.) that this is a genuine *logion* of Jesus, and implies an unfulfilled desire, has met with wide approval). But from his journeys with Paul, Luke must

have become familiar with the formula used in the churches, which was traced back to the lips of Jesus at the Last Supper. So, feeling that his account was seriously deficient without these important words of Jesus, possibly in editing our gospel, but more probably in preparing *proto-Luke*, (which was itself a complete narrative), the evangelist added, at the point at which it would naturally come, namely at the end of the "Passover" meal, an account of the institution of the Eucharist by Jesus, based on Pauline practices. The two cups caused no difficulty for him, for he may well have assumed that both of them belonged to the Passover, to which feast, indeed, the account in our gospel taken as a whole, does bear a certain superficial resemblance. But in any case, we must bear in mind that it was the custom of Luke to avoid conflation of his sources (Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 275). Then if it is felt that there are traces in *T. R.* which call for a dependence on Mark, this opportunity is easily supplied in the course of the process of combination with Mark which resulted in our gospel. Dr. Streeter (p. 216) has shown Luke's preference for his own source over Mark, and if *proto-Luke* had an account much as it stands in our gospel, there is nothing in Mark that would call for a major alteration. Thus we have a development every stage of which is reasonable and consistent and which fits well into an outline of the literary history of the gospel.

But we must face the second question, as to how the Western variant ever came into being. Of course, this is a question which, in its very nature, can probably never be conclusively settled, and especially is this impossible at the present, in view of our ignorance of the genesis of Western readings in general. But let us consider the Christian world during the second century and ask ourselves where there would be likely to be the least knowledge of Jewish customs and traditions. There were large Jewish colonies in Egypt, in the vicinity of Palestine, and more or less all over the East; but in the West it would probably be only in the large cities, especially Rome, where there was a considerable Jewish group. Now it has been suggested above that to Luke the longer text caused no difficulty, for he very probably connected the first mention of the cup with the Passover,

and this connection might also be made by those who knew about the Jews and their rites. However, the difficulty would be most acutely felt where the knowledge of the Jewish ceremony was least, and therefore it would be in such places that we might expect to find attempts to change the text. Now we cannot but note that our Western readings all come, so far as we can know, from places where this knowledge would be likely to be meagre. In Italy, there is good evidence of both the longer and the shorter forms, the latter of which attempted to remove what seemed to be a mistake of some sort, by omitting the second cup. Now this Western reading itself was rightly considered to be unsatisfactory, and especially where the original difficulty was not felt, we might well expect attempts to improve on it. And it is interesting that two manuscripts from two sections of the West far removed from Rome, namely, *b*, from Gaul on the one hand, and *e*, from Carthage, on the other, represent apparently independent attempts, by inverting the order, to improve on the Western reading which they had received. The correction from the Bezan form is such an obvious one that there is no trouble at all in considering the two independent.

We may consider that the excision of verses 19 *b*—20 was either accidental or deliberate. The former of these possibilities has been so strained in much recent critical study, and so much responsibility for things that could not otherwise be explained has been foisted onto the shoulders of a "careless scribe," that it seems hardly worth while to dwell long on this alternative. Of course, the omission may perfectly well have happened by accident; anything may have happened by accident, but unless we can suggest some definite and positive support for this hypothesis, it is much safer frankly to admit our ignorance.

But if it was by deliberate intention, why should it have been? It has been pointed out that the double mention of the cup caused no difficulty to Luke because he believed that one, at least, was connected with the Passover, but in later years, especially in localities where knowledge of and regard for Jewish customs would be very slight, the difficulty which the presence of the two cups occasioned would be a very grave one, and the simplest solution would be to suppress one.

Dr. Salmon (*Some Criticisms of the Text of the New Testament*, p. 100) suggests the possibility that scrolls were of a definite maximum length, and that as copyists feared they would be pressed for space to complete their works, they were imbued with a mind predisposed in favor of compressions. He notes in support of such a possibility the large number of omissions in the Western text toward the end of Luke. Though admittedly made out of whole cloth, it is not impossible that something of this sort actually did happen. Especially is it easier to assume some such origin as this for a reading when we remember that the Western text originated very early indeed, at a time when there would be little tendency to check up texts with one another, and when, we can well imagine, literal verbal accuracy was not expected, and minor variations would cause no comment. It was only with the further development of the Church and the necessity of extensive use of the scriptures in the rebuttal of heretics that we would expect to find any very thoroughgoing attempt to prevent further errors in copying (much less to correct texts which were already old) and so bring about a uniform book for the entire Christian world.

But even so, why should it not have been the first, rather than the second mention of the cup that was omitted, for with the latter were connected words that were almost certain to be the more familiar? Though we probably must admit that, on the whole, it would seem to us better to have done so, yet this does not constitute an insuperable obstacle. The coincidence that the Western text ends with "This is My Body," just as does the first half of Mark, has already been noted. Now let us imagine a scribe copying the text of Luke who was very familiar with that of Mark. He would copy on till he had written v. 19^a and, with the memory of Mark fresh in his mind, this would seem a likely stopping place. He glances at the manuscript he is copying and, seeing the mention of the other cup, realizes that he has already written about a cup and passes on to new material.

We have now completed our survey of the problem of the Lucan text as such. We have examined carefully the patristic and other external evidence as to the most primitive form of

the text; we have compared the intrinsic probability of the readings; we have suggested possible answers to objections that might be raised and endeavored to link up our hypothesis with a critical scheme for the origin of Luke's gospel, which, at least in its main points, commands the general assent of scholars. There may be places where the argument is unsound, and some "lacunae" which, with the material at present available, cannot be filled, but, none the less, the priority of the traditional form of the Lucan text seems to have been conclusively established.

But beside Luke's account of the Last Supper, there are three others: Matthew, Mark, and Paul, in First Corinthians. These all purport to describe the same event, and though there are many important similarities, yet a critical examination reveals certain marked divergencies. These demand explanation. Each account must be seriously treated, and not lightly dismissed as an irresponsible aberration. The plan that is hereinafter outlined aims to suggest how all the various accounts took their rise, and insofar as it is held to be satisfactory, it will be just one final argument in favor of Luke's longer text, for it is a curious fact, generally overlooked, that most critics who favor the Western form either do not try to fit it in with the other accounts at all, or else adopt the unjustifiable expedient of summarily condemning one or more of the narratives as unhistorical.

A cursory glance at a synopsis is sufficient to show that Matthew, in his account, shows no signs of having access to any first-hand information other than Mark, and therefore in a reconstruction of the scene, his minor variations are without historical significance. Similarly, Luke's second account (vv. 19-20) is probably most safely to be considered as derived from Paul or Pauline practices, and therefore not a primary authority.

Thus we are left with Paul, Mark, and Luke's first account (vv. 15-18) for our primary evidence. These three narratives are by no means similar, but all of them have an excellent ancestry. Paul's account was written only about twenty years after the event occurred; the testimony of Mark is generally of the very best; and Luke, incorporating as he probably does a genuine *logion* of Jesus, reaches far back in history; in fact, Perry suggests as the author of the Passion Source, a man

writing from Jerusalem about 45 A. D. (*op. cit.*, p. 98), and not impossibly one of the Twelve (p. 91). Thus it would be most uncritical to rule out as impossible or even as unlikely anything in any of the accounts without the strongest evidence to support such a step.

We note that there is in Mark a fragment, (verse 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," which corresponds closely with Luke (verse 18), "For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come." It is possible that Luke is dependent on Mark, though unlikely, for the verse is an integral part of Luke's account, which, as a whole, is clearly independent of Mark. More probably, this Marcan verse is a small section detached from a tradition which is represented more fully in Luke. If Mark wished to incorporate this saying in his account at all, the place which he has chosen is the natural, almost the inevitable one.

It is a further significant point that, with this verse detached, Mark is a good deal closer than before to Paul, and it is evident that the two give an essentially similar account of the same event, and this, for convenience, we shall call the "memorial account," in contrast to the "eschatological account" of Luke. It is almost certain that Mark is not at all directly derived from Paul, nor Paul from Mark, for in some cases, one seems the more primitive, and in some, the other; much more likely is it that they are divergent lines from a common source. But what would be a likely common source behind Mark and Paul? One instinctively thinks of Peter, for we know from Papias that Mark "having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered," etc.

Paul's testimony is that he received his account "from the Lord" (I Cor. 11 23). Without entering for the moment into the intricate question of just what Paul meant by the phrase, it is obvious that he was intending to give the highest possible authority to his words. In his Epistle to the Galatians, where he is in the heat of controversy and at a time when anything he said would be certain to be used against him, Paul says (1 11)

that the gospel he preaches is not after man, "for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." But a few verses later, he says that he did not confer with flesh and blood, but came into Arabia, and then after three years he went to Jerusalem and conferred only with Peter, after which he began the active work of his ministry. Therefore, it seems that Paul must have accepted the possibility of a divine revelation through a human medium, and this is probably what he meant when he said of the account of the Eucharist that he received it "from the Lord" (see Guy, *Was the Holy Communion instituted by Jesus?*, pp. 98 f.). Barring a direct revelation, he might have gotten his information from the disciples at Damascus after his conversion (Acts 9 19). But it is much more probable, both historically and psychologically, that he would get his information at the period when he would begin to need it, and from the most reliable source that was available, namely Peter, who had first-hand knowledge, and with whom, as we have already noted, Paul actually did confer at an early date. Thus it is not impossible that our two great strands of tradition, the Marco-Pauline, and the Lucan both reach back to eye-witnesses of the Last Supper. And therefore, though there will be details of which we are uncertain and always must be, yet of the main points, we can be as certain as of any fact in the whole gospel history.

There is thus not the slightest justification for accepting one strand as true and rejecting the other as false. It is, of course, conceivable that the two accounts are of two different events, one of which was at another time than the Last Supper; but this seems extremely unlikely, for each account would lose most of its meaning apart from this occasion. For in Luke, Jesus says that he has taken food and drink for the last time; in Mark, he mentions His blood being shed on the disciples' behalf; and in Paul, He further tells them to perform this rite in memory of Him, all of which suggest His death as immediately imminent.

While it is true that in Luke, there is no mention of the bread, yet there are certain things we must notice. (1) The parallelism between verse 16 and verse 18 suggests a similar

parallelism between what has just been eaten and the wine that has been consumed. (2) It is not impossible that Luke, feeling that the description was of a Passover, edited out a more definite reference to the bread which may have been in the tradition as he received it. (3) The term *πάσχα* (we would expect *ἀπρον*) included not only the lamb, but the entire meal, and might loosely be applied to any part of it. (4) If we are forced to put both accounts during the Last Supper, it is almost inconceivable that there should have been two separate and distinct rites with words attached to both looking forward to Jesus' approaching death, in both of which a cup was blessed and distributed, and in both of which this was preceded by the first half of the rite in which something was eaten. One can start on no other hypothesis than that the two strands are independent, and thoroughly trustworthy accounts of the same event. (On this whole problem, see Blakiston, *J. T. S.*, IV, pp. 548 f.)

There seem to be insurmountable difficulties in the way of holding that the two strands which we have distinguished come from a single account of which we have no traces; it would be difficult to imagine how the various bits of what was once a consecutive description could ever get so twisted about and combined in strange ways as we find them in our accounts; and much the most likely theory is that the common origin of the two streams is none other than the actual words and actions of Jesus Himself at the Supper.

There are various ways in which the strands can be combined. The eschatological portion might come, with both the bread and the wine, before the memorial portion, as Blakiston suggests. But it seems to me more likely that in each case, it came after. Perhaps after Jesus had blessed and distributed the bread as described in the "memorial account", He added by way of further explanation, possibly in answer to some questioning glances of the disciples, who failed fully to comprehend why He should be giving His body for them, words corresponding to the first part of the "eschatological account", which make explicit the immediate imminence of His death. Then with the wine, the two parts would be joined similarly. The framework

as to what was *done* is roughly similar in both strands, and we might speculate that in the "memorial account", those words were inserted into this framework which especially impressed themselves on the mind of Peter, while in the "eschatological account", we find those that were particularly striking to the disciple who is the immediate or ultimate source of the strand we see in Luke.

Thus all five of our narratives are easily explained. Matthew, following Mark, represents the first tradition, with a remnant of the second attached to the cup only. Paul has preserved the first, probably having received it from Peter, and adds what is perhaps a faint reflection of the spirit of the second in "Ye do show forth the Lord's death until He come", which gives an eschatological turn to the thought. It is interesting to note that apparently these words are not included in those which Paul received "from the Lord", but represent his own conclusion which has not for him the same weight. Probably we will do best to assume that Paul found a certain eschatological connection attached to the rite in the early Church; and thus bears an indirect testimony to the widespread influence of a tradition corresponding to the Lucan strand which we possess. Luke set the two accounts side by side, probably with certain minor alterations which could easily have come about in the course of successive editings by the evangelist.

Proceeding from some such critical analysis, one can reconstruct with some degree of assurance the words and actions of Jesus, and thus lay a sound basis for the important, study of the significance of this rite for Him, and so for us.