

# 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 *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## THE LORD'S SUPPER: ST. MARK OR ST. PAUL?

THE readers of the EXPOSITOR will not have forgotten the papers on "Harnack, Jülicher and Spitta on the Lord's Supper," contributed by Mr. Stewart to the July and August numbers of last year. The papers must have given the impression to many minds that a discussion of singular interest had been opened up, and that more would be heard on the subject. Of Harnack's contention, out of which this discussion sprang, that it was a matter of comparative indifference in the Church of the second century whether the Eucharistic cup was filled with wine and water or with water only, it may be that we shall not hear much more. But the stream then set in motion has flowed in a channel which Harnack may not have contemplated, and has broadened out into an inquiry as to the precise nature and import of the acts and words done and said by the Saviour on that night on which He was betrayed. The different traditions on the subject in the New Testament are being examined afresh, and their relation to each other discussed from every point of view. With some of the scholars engaged in it the inquiry presents a highly complicated appearance. Many must have felt in reading Mr. Stewart's account of the views of Spitta—a condensed but very accurate account, if I may presume to say so—that in that scholar's hands the problem was being overloaded, and assured results of criticism mixed up with speculative theories. The whole German controversy has been fully set forth in a book, which is by no means a small one, *Das Herrnmahl, nach Ursprung und Bedeutung, mit Rück-*

*sicht auf die neuesten Forschungen untersucht* (the Lord's Supper, an inquiry into its origin and meaning, in the light of the most recent investigations), by Rudolf Schäfer (Gütersloh, 1897). In this work many other views are rehearsed besides those reported by Mr. Stewart to the readers of the EXPOSITOR. While it is an excellent repertory of information on the subject, it is not much of a guide, and leaves a sense of bewilderment, approaching to despair, on the reader's mind.

I venture to place before the English reader an attempt at an analysis of two of the leading narratives of the institution in the New Testament, and an estimate of the respective historical significance of each. I am well aware that the elements of the problem here taken up only form part of it, and that a complete discussion must take account of many other matters. But to obtain some clearness as to the narratives in the Gospels and in Paul is the first and the indispensable preliminary to a successful treatment of the whole question.

The New Testament contains four accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper, that of the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians and those of the three Synoptic Gospels. In the fourth Gospel it is well known that no such account finds any place.<sup>1</sup> St. Luke's Gospel also stands in a peculiar position in this respect. In the text of Westcott and Hort, which is represented on the margin of the Revised Version, and which follows in this instance the authority of the Cambridge Codex, with a number of old Latin versions, St. Luke has scarcely any account of the institution. The German scholar, Blass, who is strongly interested in this Codex, in his recent book, *The Philology*

<sup>1</sup> Spitta considers that there was an account of the institution in John xiii., but that it fell out of the book; and that vi. 51-58 is an interpolation intended to supply the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which had thus become an omission of the fourth Gospel. (*Urchristenthum*, 1, 186 sqq., and 216 sqq.)

of the Gospels, declares the account of the institution to be one of St. Luke's omissions. Should criticism decide, against these scholars, as it is on the whole inclined to do, that the latter half of verse 19 and the whole of verse 20 ought to stand, with the great body of the manuscripts in Luke xxii., as they do in the Textus Receptus and in our Authorised Version, then we have four narratives.

It will be convenient to give the various narratives here in a synopsis.

MARK xiv. 22-25.

And as they were eating He took a loaf and said the blessing and broke it and gave it to them and said, Take, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And He said to them, This is My covenant-blood, which is poured out for many. Verily I say to you, I will never drink again of the fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

MATTHEW xxvi. 26-29.

And as they were eating Jesus took a loaf and said the blessing and broke it and gave it to the disciples and said, Take, eat, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, Drink of it all of you : for this is My covenant-blood which is poured out for many, for forgiveness of sins. But I tell you I will not drink henceforward of this fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it with you new in the kingdom of My Father.

PAUL (1 COR. xi. 23-25).

For I received from the Lord, what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was given up, took a loaf, and after giving thanks broke it and said, This is My body which is for you : this do in remembrance of Me. In the same way also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood ; this do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.

LUKE xxii. 17-20.

(a) IN CODEX D (*Cantabrigiensis*).

(17) And He took a cup and gave thanks and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves ; (18) for I say to you, I will never drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And He took a loaf and gave thanks and broke it and gave it to them saying, This is My body.

(b) IN CODEX B (*Vaticanus*).

(17) And He took a cup and gave thanks and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. (18) For I say to you, I will never drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And He took a loaf and gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them saying, This is My body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, This cup, the new covenant in My blood, poured out for you.

When these narratives are closely compared, we see that they fall into two groups. St. Matthew and St. Mark agree together as against the other two, and St. Paul and St. Luke (in the *Vaticanus*) have a number of phrases in common which go beyond what we find in the first two. To the words found in Matthew and Mark, "This is My body," Paul and Luke add "which is for you": they add the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me": to the word "covenant" they add the adjective "new," and they add the preposition "in" or "by means of" in the same phrase. The covenant is said to be in or by means of the blood.

To take a step further, it is obvious that St. Luke is indebted to St. Paul, rather than St. Paul to St. Luke, since First Corinthians was written, as every one admits, earlier than any of the Gospels. The possibility that St. Luke drew independently from the same source as was used by St. Paul, is, of course, to be recognised; but if St. Luke was St. Paul's companion and assistant, and if St. Paul was the first to put the tradition in writing, it is difficult to see how the Gospel could be quite independent of the Epistle. St. Luke, it is true, has one phrase, "poured out for you," which St. Paul does not give, and which is similar to the "poured out for many" of the first two Gospels. But the phrase stands very awkwardly in the grammar of St. Luke's sentence, as in the Greek the word "poured out" agrees with the word "cup," not with the word "blood," to which it naturally belongs. The Sinaitic

Syriac omits the phrase, and perhaps it crept in from the other Gospels. In the other group, St. Mark's account may be regarded as the original of St. Matthew's. If the theory of the relation of these two Gospels be a true one, which is now held so generally, that St. Mark's Gospel was written first, and that it was closely followed by St. Matthew writing a few years later, then St. Mark's authority is to be regarded as the older in every case where there is no decisive evidence to the contrary. In this case St. Matthew, following, perhaps, the growing Church practice of his day, makes various slight additions to St. Mark's short and simple narrative.

We may notice here that if and so far as the narrative of Codex D in St. Luke xxii. 17-19 is to be taken as an account of the institution, it agrees with the shorter account of the first two Gospels rather than with the longer of St. Paul and St. Luke. If Westcott and Hort are right in preferring this text to that of Codex B,<sup>1</sup> and in regarding the latter as having been conformed to 1 Corinthians xi., then the three Gospels stand in line together with a shorter narrative, and Paul stands alone with that which is longer and more elaborate.

I shall take St. Mark's narrative as representing the simpler tradition on the subject, and I shall venture to compare it carefully with that of St. Paul. It is true that the Pauline narrative was the first to be written down, but it does not follow that it must therefore be a better witness for the original facts. The Apostle says that he received it "from the Lord," but he does not mean by these words to claim direct revelation for his narrative. He does make that claim for some of his acts and teachings, but he does not make it here. What he does claim is that the regulation he is laying down for the observance of the Lord's Supper has more than his own personal authority behind

<sup>1</sup> The New Testament in Greek. Appendix, p. 83.

it, that this is a matter on which he shares a common tradition with the Christians of the older Churches. The Lord, who is the head of all the Churches, is the ultimate source of the order the Apostle wishes to see observed; through what channel the tradition reached him, which he now goes on to communicate, he does not say. He may have got it from those who were apostles before him, from Peter specially, whom he knew best of their number. But the tradition was current in every part of the Church; he would hear it before he was converted, and learn it at Antioch as well as at Jerusalem.

St. Mark also was connected with Peter, and, according to a tradition which is now meeting with more acceptance than formerly, St. Mark wrote down St. Peter's reminiscences of the Lord's sayings and doings. The presbyter quoted by Papias to this effect takes exception for various reasons to Mark's Gospel, but he immediately connects him with St. Peter. Thus we are in the position that both the principal accounts of the institution may be due to some contact with the same source. If they differ from each other, we cannot at once conclude that Paul's account deserves the preference because it was first written down. The circumstances of the transmission have to be considered in each case, and the character of the works in which the accounts respectively appear. If Mark's Gospel has come by recent movements in criticism to be regarded as the most original of the first three, and as containing a very faithful reproduction of very early sources, its general character must tell in its favour in this instance also.

But the first and most important thing to do in order to an understanding of the varying traditions on the subject, is to examine each of the two accounts in its own connection, and to make out its exact purport.

To understand the story in Mark we require to go back some way, and to examine the teaching of Jesus already

reported in the second Gospel, of which this is the sequel and the keystone, on the subject of His death. For some time past, in this Gospel, Jesus has had that subject before His mind, and it is even possible to trace some development of thought in His utterances about it. The notion that the Messiah should die was one to which it was unspeakably hard for the Jewish mind in that age to adjust itself; and it was Jesus Himself who first wrestled with this dark problem, and made His way, not without pain and anguish, to a firm conclusion as to the meaning and the purpose of the death of the Messiah. I shall enumerate what appear from Mark's narrative to have been the principal stages of His thought on this subject.

1. There is the simple announcement that He sees death impending over Him, without as yet any attempt to determine what the event can mean, or what use it is to serve. (viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 33.) I believe that Jesus really uttered these intimations, and that they were not put into His mouth, as many have held, *post eventum*. He tells His disciples repeatedly that He sees death in His path, and He always says at the same time that His death will not be the end of His person or His cause, but that, after a brief obscurity, He will return.

2. He spoke of His death as a divine ordinance, and, which is the same thing, as being foretold in Scripture. If God wills it, and if it is spoken of in Scripture, the Messiah must die. God's will must be accomplished and not man's, and the Son cannot think of refusing what the Heavenly Father has ordained for Him. This view scarcely differs from the first, and appears in the very earliest intimation (viii. 31) in connection with it. To our logic it is one thing to say that the event was foreseen as certainly impending, and another thing to say that it was divinely ordained; but to one convinced unwaveringly of his own Messiahship, the two views are one.

3. But what purpose was the death of the Messiah to serve? One answer Jesus found to this question was that the death of the Messiah would bring about a crisis in the affairs of the Jewish State. In the parable of the vineyard (xii. 1-9), when the heir is killed by the tenants, the owner comes at once to destroy those tenants, and give the vineyard to others. His death is to be the turning-point; very soon after it He will drink wine at the great banquet in the Kingdom of God.

4. But the death of the Messiah is also to serve a specific purpose in the inauguration of the Kingdom. He gives "His life a ransom for many" (x. 45). These words probably presented to the disciples at first, and ought to suggest to us also, a parable rather than a doctrine. They must, at any rate, imply that many would be in the Kingdom and enjoy its blessings, who, if the Messiah did not stoop to death, must remain outside. He died for others, to save them, to free them, to secure to them the Kingdom. How His death acts to bring about this result is not explained. At all events the terrible occurrence He foresees so plainly has received in His eyes this glorifying hue, to His taste this sweetening savour, that it is for others. He dies to bring to many a benefit they would not otherwise have had, and when He thinks of them, the death of the Messiah, unnatural and dreadful as it is, has a redeeming quality, and is not all horror.

And now we come to the words connected with the bread and the cup. Every one agrees that Christ spoke them with reference to His death. They were spoken just after He had been speaking of what was to happen to His body after His death (xiv. 8), and He has accordingly quite made up His mind that death is just about to overtake Him. But His views about His death need not have changed, though it approached so near. And we naturally expect that in what is said now, the former

teaching, that which we have been considering, will be confirmed, and perhaps carried a step further. Let us examine then what we find here.

In the first place Jesus takes up a loaf—a round scone or cake (bread is made in that form in the East, and a loaf was about enough for the meal of one person)—and He does something with it, and draws the attention of all the company to it and says something about it. Well, that is the way in which Jesus generally taught His lessons. He chose some common object, put a child before the company, or called for a piece of money, or fixed His hearers' attention on some familiar figure, a sower or a fisher, or on a seed, or on a house, and then He spoke of it in a way to make the hearers think of some matter He wished them to understand. "Look at that," He said, "and find out something from it." "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Now, suppose that on the occasion now before us Jesus was employing that method of teaching which He generally followed. In that case the words He uses will have to be taken not as doctrine, not as explicit statement of what was to be apprehended, but as suggestion. What He actually meant to convey was not stated, the hearers were to discover it, and we also have to see if we can discover it.

If we try to interpret the act and speech of Jesus in this way, we must notice that it is not the Passover or any part of it that He sets up to be considered. It is just a loaf, such as would be on the table at any meal, anywhere, and on every day of the week. The cup, too, said by St. Paul to have been taken after supper was over, is an ordinary feature of any meal where there was any pretence of good cheer. The synoptists give no details of the meal, and tell us nothing about the lamb or the bitter herbs, or the successive cups which formed part of

the Passover meal.<sup>1</sup> We do not hear what was on the table, except that there was a loaf and a cup, things by no means peculiar to the Passover.

The loaf and the cup, then, are, on this view, symbols freely chosen to convey a certain lesson. But they draw all their significance from the way in which the Lord treats them and speaks of them. For the last time Jesus acts as host of His little body of intimates. He was sitting in the place of host already, as He had often done, but now He begins to act again as if it were the beginning of a meal, and as if the company had just sat down. As on the occasion when the multitude was fed at the lakeside, so now again, He bears Himself as one who has something to give for which all are looking. He takes up a loaf as if those present were hungry and He proposed to satisfy their appetite ; He says the blessing, as the father commonly did in a Jewish household. The action, which, as it occurs here, is no part of the Passover ritual, is a very deliberate one, done with all due form and circumstance, so as to convey its full meaning and make the deepest impression. Then He breaks the bread, each is to have part of it, and He hands it to them.

What is the meaning of this act? The disciples were not hungry like the multitude at the Sea of Galilee ; their supper was over, or drawing to a close, and they had eaten more than bread. The point of the action could scarcely appear to them to lie in the nourishment they were to derive from the piece of bread handed to them ;

<sup>1</sup> In Mark and Matthew there is nothing to show that the meal was the Passover, except the story of the preparation (Mark xiv. 12-16), which Spitta proposes to get rid of as an interpolation. If Jesus suffered, as Spitta, following the Johannine tradition, maintains, on the day of the Passover, He cannot have eaten that meal with His disciples. But the narrative of the preparation is, when rightly understood, very simple and natural ; and Luke xxii. 15 can scarcely mean, as Spitta takes it, that Jesus was so anxious to eat the Passover with His disciples, that He had arranged to do so on the day before the right date.

the act must have seemed to be prompted, not by their needs, but by their Master's feeling and by His desire to express Himself. And the words accompanying the act confirm this impression. "Take: this is My body"—that is all that St. Mark gives. What are they to gather from this? Surely that as He gives the bread to them, so He gives His body to them. In respect of the bread the act is being repeated which He had often done with them before; He is head of the party, father of the family; at meals He is in the position of giver, they are receivers. So with His body; He is just about to give it up; He has already thought of what will be done to it after He dies. With respect to His body also, He would have them think that He is giver, they receivers. That is the view He has come to take of His death, and which He wishes them to take also. Till now, when He spoke of His death they did not believe Him; but the hour is near when they will have to believe Him, and when that dark hour comes He would have them interpret His death in the right way. They are to think that it did not overwhelm Him unprepared, nor bring His purpose to naught; but that He was a voluntary agent in His death, and willingly gave up His life for the good to be secured thereby to them and others, by opening to them the doors of the Kingdom. The bread is His body, not in point of the breaking—that is only a necessary incident in the action; the bread has to be broken that they may all partake of it; and He could not expect that His body would be broken, as in fact it was not—but in point of the giving.

At this point the lesson is complete, but, as often occurs in the teaching of Jesus, it is doubled. Prof. Jülicher, writer of an admirable book on the parables, who has also written one of the best papers on the Lord's Supper in the present discussion, and regards the acts as parables, refers here to the twin parables of the leaven and of the mustard-

seed, of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money, of the patched coat and of the new wine in the old skins. Other pairs also may occur to us. The second parable usually repeats the first, but adds to it some fresh suggestions. And this is the case here. The subject is the same. The cup, like the loaf, is a very common object, which is at hand, but it is invested with a profoundly solemn meaning. Again Jesus acts as the Head of the family, again He causes all present to look to Him for something He is to give them. He takes a cup with wine in it, says the blessing as before; each of them is to take it as from Him, and to find a meaning in the act. The explanation goes somewhat further than the former one did. The wine, like the bread, stands for His person, His life, which He is giving up; but more is said about the meaning of the death. The cup, He says, is His covenant-blood, poured out for many. This phrase has been thought by some scholars to be Pauline. Paul, no doubt, speaks of the old and the new covenant, and of the great change the new one brought, in a way of his own. But perhaps the word covenant, used, not as expressing a definite doctrine of a changed relation, but allusively, to indicate a view that could be thought of, does not go beyond what was natural in the mouth of Jesus Himself. Covenant-blood is the blood of a sacrifice which is offered up at the opening of a new relation. (See Exod. xxiv. 8.) And Jesus has in His mind that His death makes a crisis in the fortunes of the Jewish state, at least. The vineyard is to pass into new hands, the Kingdom is just about to appear, and, as in the use of other treaties and conventions, there is a sacrifice at the inauguration of it. If we ask what kind of a treaty or covenant Jesus may have thought of, the great passage in Jeremiah xxxi. 31 occurs to us, where the new covenant God is to bring, which is no covenant at all, but a life of God with man in full communion and confidence, is contrasted with the old cove-

nant, so often broken in spite of the efforts made by the prophets to keep the people faithful to it. Jesus may well have had that passage before His mind. But a tragical act is to be accomplished before that covenant which is no covenant comes into operation. Does the idea of a sacrifice suggest itself at the inauguration of the Kingdom, and may the blood which is to flow be conceived as being that of the Messiah Himself? Is the covenant-blood that of the Founder of the Kingdom? And if this is the case, does Jesus shrink from the hard fate which is coming upon Him? Does He desire that the Kingdom could have been brought without this sad accompaniment? He would not have His disciples think so. He was not living in any fanatical exaltation, and had not overcome the repugnance of human nature against violence and outrage. Within an hour or two that would appear. But at the board with His disciples He teaches them in a form never to be forgotten that He is a free agent in His death. If a sacrifice was wanted, as it might be thought, He was prepared to be that sacrifice. As freely and gladly as He pours out wine for His dear friends, who look to Him as their head, so freely and unreservedly does He give His life for them. In view of the blessing it was to bring to others, death lost its terrors for Him; He welcomed it as the supreme opportunity of doing a service to those He loved, and for whom He had gone through all His labours and conflicts.

The words of the institution, "Do this in remembrance of Me," are absent from St. Mark's narrative, and are not, even in the view of those who adopt the parabolic interpretation, necessarily to be supplied to it. St. Mark's story, taken by itself, is not an account of the foundation of a rite, but of a pathetic and solemn self-revelation on the part of Jesus, and probably also of the teaching of a lesson He wished the disciples to learn. Indeed, in this Gospel, words are placed in the mouth of Christ which make us

doubt whether St. Mark could contemplate in this passage the foundation of any institution for the Church, since they represent Him as looking forward to a reunion with His disciples after the very briefest interval. My interpretation of the acts and accompanying words differs in some details from those proposed by Jülicher and Spitta; but I am at one with them and with Weiszäcker in considering that St. Mark's narrative, taken by itself, does not record the institution of a rite, but a piece of symbolic teaching.

It will at once be seen that this view has formidable difficulties to encounter. Let us see what attempts may be made to overcome these. One great difficulty is that the Lord's Supper was undoubtedly observed in the Church from the very earliest days. True, the rite occurs in early times under different forms. In Acts we read of the "breaking of bread" only. In the *Didaché* the cup precedes the bread, as in the more archaic narrative in Luke. Still there is everywhere a rite, which Christians observe regularly, as if the Lord had told them to do so. Now, if St. Mark's narrative is correctly interpreted when treated as above, and if the Lord accordingly did not institute a rite to be repeated, how did that rite come into existence? And how are we to account for the narrative of the Apostle Paul, earliest written of all the accounts, in which the Lord is represented as directing the disciples to repeat His acts?

If the interpretation I have given of St. Mark's narrative is sound, then it follows apparently that the disciples came very early to misunderstand their Master, and to represent Him as ordering the repetition of these acts when He had not done so. To this it may be answered that Mark and Matthew at least did not misunderstand Him, but furnish a narrative in which the original meaning of the words still shines through. But more, it is perhaps not very difficult to represent to ourselves a very natural process by which the acts done by Jesus in bidding His disciples farewell,

acts in which so much was expressed, and in which memory and reverence for the Lord saw an ever-increasing wealth of meaning and a greater depth of pathos, how these acts came almost immediately to be regarded as the deliberate institution of a rite for the Church. At first the believers hardly needed any rites; they expected their Master to return so soon that everything was in suspense, and they could only wait for the new set of institutions He would give them when He came. At their meetings meanwhile they spoke of the strange fact of His death, so darkly contrary to all they had expected; and when they met together in the evening and broke bread with one another, they remembered how He had presided over their party, and how He did so the last night of His life, and made the bread and wine on the table convey to them His last thoughts about His death. Thus they showed forth His death till He should come, and explained it to themselves by repeating the explanation He Himself had given them in the common substances of bread and wine. Here were all the elements of a rite of religion—a common meal in which the absent Head was felt to be near, and His tragic fortunes represented in the simplest acts of eating and drinking—a meal, therefore, which, each time it took place, bound each believer afresh to the absent yet present Lord and bound them all together. Surely then the Lord meant these acts to be repeated, surely it was by His foresight and arrangement that believers enjoyed all the comforts and blessings they found in repeating them. He meant us to do this, they said; this practice we have formed was just what He had in view that night when He was so calm and full of courage, and His friends were so bewildered and forsook Him. If not the Master on earth, yet the Lord in heaven could be heard enjoining the repetition. And thus the words of the institution came to be added to the narrative: “Do this in remembrance of Me.”

This brings us to the Apostle Paul and to his account of the institution. That account is given for a certain purpose. It is intended to correct the disorders which attended the observance of the Lord's Supper at Corinth. The Christians there did not keep their religious rite distinct enough from their ordinary supper, which, like Greek clubs and guilds, they took together in the evening. They did not distinguish the Lord's body sufficiently, nor show forth the Lord's death in a proper fashion. They simply ate their evening meal in the same room; sitting in company at their food indeed, but in an irregular and even an unbrotherly way, each devouring the private supplies he had brought with him, the rich brother having too much, the poor too little. In these circumstances the Lord's Supper properly so called was lost sight of; the meal should have been, or should have contained as a distinct feature, the observance of the Lord's Supper, but this had almost ceased to be the case. St. Paul, therefore, wishes a fixed order introduced at these meetings, so that they may be more brotherly in their character, and also more markedly religious. They are not to be as formerly, a mere feast which could be attended to as well at home, but a ceremony, a rite. And that this may be done, he gives a narrative of the first institution. He had given them this before, when the Church of Corinth was founded, but he repeats what he had said, as they have lost sight of it. If they attend to the account of the institution which he gives them, it will be impossible for them to fall into such confusion about the Lord's Supper again. The account he gives them, therefore, is intended as a type for Church practice. He means to insist on the acts perhaps rather than on the words, and especially on the due order and sequence of the acts. These acts are not to be entered on till all the brothers have arrived, and they are to be done deliberately, solemnly, with clear intention and perception

of their meaning. As for the words, the Apostle does not prescribe that the very words he rehearses to the Corinthians are to be repeated at every observance; all he distinctly insists on is that the meaning of the acts is what these words indicate, and that when the acts are done that meaning is to be clearly remembered and dwelt upon. If the acts are done with clear emphasis, and if the meaning of them, as set forth in these words of Christ, is properly realised, then the observance will be, as it ought always to be, a showing forth of Christ's death; the Lord's body will be distinguished and kept in a place by itself, instead of being mixed up with the promiscuous viands of the common meal. No offence will be committed against the bread and the cup (the cup, it is clearly indicated, is to be after supper), which possess such sacred associations. Other points connected with the ordinance are left for adjustment when the Apostle comes to Corinth; in the meantime he gives them this narrative.

On examining St. Paul's account of the institution, we find that it differs from that of St. Mark, just as the different situations and motives of the two writers would lead us to expect. St. Mark is a historian, who deals in carefully treasured reminiscence. He does not compose freely, but reproduces materials furnished to him in various ways, adding to them, no doubt, in many passages, some arrangement and colour of his own, but in the passage before us giving surely the exact words of his source. St. Paul, on the other hand, comes before us here as a Church statesman, who has practical ends to serve in the Churches he has founded, and who holds very strongly a doctrine which he regards as the one and only gospel. With all his merits he is not a historian, interested in facts for their own sake; and in particular the facts of the earthly life of Christ are of subordinate importance to him. That is a noticeable feature of his writings, and there is a reason for it, since it

is after the spirit, not after the flesh, that he is determined to know Christ. Now, the account of the institution had not attained liturgical fixity when Paul came to deal with it, but was subject to modification at his hands, and at the hands of others, such as the first and the third Evangelist, and in particular the words spoken by the Saviour were liable to alteration. They were not, perhaps, regarded by others, any more than by Paul himself, as ritually fixed and as necessarily to be repeated at each observance, but were valued as fixing the sense in which the acts were to be understood to which they were attached.

St. Paul's account, therefore, presents various changes on the old Jerusalem tradition as given by St. Mark. These changes might be almost imperceptible at first, in a matter which had as yet so little fixity, but to us they are noticeable enough. On the one hand the living Church rite reflects itself on the narrative of the institution; and on the other the specific Pauline doctrine is at work; the rite, according to this account, shows forth Christ's death according to the meaning and effect that death possesses in the Pauline system.

Of smaller changes, we may notice that St. Paul does not state to whom the bread and the cup were given by the Lord. He has the words "took, blessed, broke," but omits the word "gave." Perhaps this makes the narrative more general, more fitted for a Church rite. The Corinthians are not required to think of those Galilean disciples to whom the bread was originally given, but only of the Head of the Church doing the acts for all His followers in every land, which they now repeat. That might be represented as a small point, but it is an additional alteration in the same direction that, instead of speaking as St. Mark does of "a" cup which Jesus took, the Apostle speaks of "the" cup. It is the cup familiar to Christians that is spoken of; the Church celebration is carried back by the unconscious

phrase to that first evening. And the cup is placed after supper, a point St. Mark and St. Matthew do not mention; it has a place of its own; it is not a mere drinking during the common meal that is to be thought of, but a marked observance, a rite separated by its position from vulgar things.

For St. Mark's words accompanying the bread, "Take, this is My body," St. Paul gives, "This is My body for you." There is a difference. "Take, this is My body" is the natural dramatic speech of the original scene, expressing the Saviour's act and feeling as at first conceived. "This is My body for you" is a difficult phrase, as may be seen from the various participles added to it in the variants, the "broken" (*κλάμενον*) of the Authorised Version, discarded by the Revisers, the "broken" (*θρυπτόμενον*) in another Greek word, found in some copies, and the "given" (*διδόμενον*) of St. Luke. The brief phrase now standing in the text, however, is less dramatic, more doctrinal than St. Mark's; it has less in it of the original situation, more, perhaps, of what the body of Christ given up to death has come to be to believers afterwards, as the standing permanent symbol of the supreme devotion in which Christ gave Himself for them, for their atonement and justification.

Of the words, "This do in remembrance of Me," we have already spoken. They constitute what is no doubt the principal difference between the two narratives. The Lord's Supper must have assumed, even with the Jerusalem apostles—by whom, as well as by others, Paul may have been informed—something of the character of the Passover (in connection with which it was thought by some to have been instituted), as a memorial observance (Exod. xii. 14); it fills up the gap between the Lord's removal and His coming again; Christians declare at each observance of it the sense in which they regard His death, and they believe that He Himself bade them do this.

The "covenant-blood" of St. Mark is with St. Paul the "new covenant in, or by means of, 'My Blood.'" The allusion or suggestion has passed into a doctrine. The covenant which with Jesus Himself simply denotes the institution of the Kingdom in which God and man were to dwell together in an intimacy never reached before, is with Paul the new covenant, his views of which are well known to us. With him the death of Christ brings to an end the old covenant made through Moses; the law has come to an end, the power of the flesh is broken, the spirit rules instead of the letter, and liberty prevails instead of coercion and servitude (2 Cor. iii. and *passim*). So immense a change was wrought according to the Apostle by the death of Christ in man's relation with God, and the words used in the Lord's Supper proclaim that change distinctly.

The rite speaks in 1 Corinthians the language of Pauline theology, of that doctrine of Christ crucified and set forth in His blood by God as a propitiation through which believers should be justified. It was Paul who developed this doctrine; it is to his writings that we turn when we wish to expound or to insist upon that doctrine. And as this account of the rite is from Paul's pen, it seems not unnatural to suppose that it was he who made it speak this language. He saw clearly the immense importance of the rite for Christianity. It is he who first declares that the bread and the cup are to Christianity what sacrifice is to the Jewish and to Gentile religion. This bread, this cup, are the distinctive symbol, he declares, of the new religion, and identify the Christian with Christ, as the Gentile sacrifice identified the Greek with Dionysus or with Artemis. When he was called, as we see that he was, to mould the rite in Corinth in a more fixed form than it had previously possessed there, we cannot wonder if he made it express more fully than before that doctrine of the Cross which it

---

had been the work of his life to develop, and which was to him of such immeasurable importance.

The interpretations I have offered of the narrative of the earliest Evangelist, and of that of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, would form some contribution, should they be accepted, to the early history of the rite of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament. There is, no doubt, much in them that can only be regarded as hypothetical. It must be recognised that the materials for coming to a judgment are very scanty. The narrative of St. Mark is brief and enigmatical. The meaning given to it above is that which appears to me to be most in accordance with the line of thought running through the second Gospel as a whole, and with the manner of statement which prevails in it. But the brief narrative admits perhaps of more than one interpretation. St. Mark was, of course, familiar with the Church rite of the Lord's Supper, and he may have meant his narrative as an account of the institution of that rite. He does not say that this is what he means by it; he does not say that he does not mean this. For each interpretation of the passage strong arguments may be brought forward. Again, with regard to the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," there is a great difficulty on either side. If Jesus did not say these words, we have to account both for the repetition of His acts in the Church from the very earliest times, and for the placing of the words in His mouth. I have shown how these difficulties may be met, but the hypotheses by means of which this is done are much debated, and can never have the character of certainty. On the other hand, if Jesus used these words, how are we to account for St. Mark's narrative, for that of St. Matthew, written a few years later, and for that of St. Luke in Westcott and Hort's text—in all of which the words do not appear? If Jesus did intend to found a rite, and actually expressed Himself to

that effect in the presence of Peter and the other disciples, then why do St. Mark and St. Matthew not say so? The difficulties are great on every side.

I venture to conclude with two remarks of a practical tendency. The first is that this controversy will never have any influence on the celebration of the Lord's Supper in our Churches. Whether the Lord founded the ordinance consciously or unconsciously, whether the words "Do this in remembrance of Me" proceeded first from Jesus on earth or from Christ in heaven, He is the Founder of the ordinance, and we shall use these words. The fact will not be changed that the Lord's Supper brings us very near to the Saviour at that hour at which, knowing that His death was at hand, He triumphed over death by the love He bore to men, and willingly gave Himself up to die for them. We shall be no less disposed to set forth our celebration of the dying love of the Saviour with all the dignity and solemnity which the centuries have gathered round it.

And my second practical remark is, that the New Testament lays down no strict ritual of the Lord's Supper, but regards it in a rich variety of aspects. Those Christians, therefore, who appeal to the New Testament as the standard of their religion, are free themselves, and must allow liberty to others, to connect with the acts done in the ordinance, so long as due regard is paid to reverence and order and charity, such views and doctrines as appear to them most true and most in accordance with the spirit of their Master.

ALLAN MENZIES.