

theologia crucis and (still later) development among Lutherans of a legalism of their own. Is he then to be allowed to excuse Luther from being the originator of *détours* while I may not have a similar privilege regarding Calvin? In fact, however, I do not wish to claim it. In my opinion, some followers of Calvin have done badly by his theology, but at the same time there are weaknesses even in the great teacher himself.

6. Where Dr. Leupold accuses me of arguing by general inferences I am rather sketching out a general position. I should like to think that his claim is true: "All students of the New Testament today agree that the connection between baptism and justification must be taken very seriously." I am glad that he agrees with me upon the importance of the Lord's Supper in the believer's incorporation into Christ. I should regard baptism as fulfilling the same function because it is (among other things) identification with Christ's dying and rising humanity.

7. I am at a loss to know what Dr. Leupold may be imputing to me by his use of the adverb *conveniently*. Certainly I agree that the rank and file of believers experience the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*. My concern was simply to assert the ancient doctrine of the Church that her teachers exercise their authority by virtue of this Spirit.

8. As Dr. Leupold seems to realize, my article was written from within the Reformed tradition. I made no claim to include Lutheran attitudes. At one point in my original address I did in fact make a bow to a more wholesome attitude among Lutherans (as I believe) than among Reformed, on the relationship of justification to baptism, but this remark was omitted in the printed version. A reader of the article can see from my frequent references to Reformed (that is Calvinistic) theology, to Geneva (never to Wittenberg), and to those of us who are "on the Genevan side" that I wrote from a Reformed rather than from a general Protestant point of view. It is hardly necessary for me, therefore, to take up the matters that Dr. Leupold draws in from the Lutheran side, but I must disavow the intention he seems to want to lay upon me of attempting "to shrug off the healthy impetus that has come from the Reformers."

DAVID W. HAY

*Knox College,
University of Toronto*

THE EUCHARIST IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

IN HIS ARTICLE "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel"¹ the late G. H. C. MacGregor adduces four answers to the question: "Why is there no specific reference to the institution of the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel?" These may be summarized as follows:

1. G. H. C. MacGregor, "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies*, 9 (1962-63), 111-19.

CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, VOL. XII (1966), No. 3

(i) The mystery whereby the word became flesh, rather than the cross, is the central fact of redemption for John. Eucharistic teaching must be *en rapport* with this.

(ii) The attainment of eternal life is determined, not by any redemptive transaction, but by the communication of the divine life through Christ and its appropriation by the believer. Hence the wine symbolism is transferred from the covenant cup, symbolical of atonement through death, to the figure of the Vine, and the bread symbolism is divorced from the Last Supper and associated with the feeding of the five thousand.

(iii) Jewish attacks on Christianity centred on the Eucharist; John emphasizes the necessity of this sacrament by saying, "Unless you eat the flesh . . . you have no life in you."

(iv) Pagans regarded sacraments as having some sort of magical influence on participants, and probably the recently converted brought these notions into the Church. There also existed materialistic ideas on grace, according to which a mysterious efficacy attached to the mere performance of the rite, quite apart from the state of heart of the participant. The Fourth Gospel is trying to provide an antidote to these aberrations.

I believe that Dr. MacGregor has underemphasized the importance John attaches to the passion of Christ; admittedly this gospel is the first to state a doctrine of incarnation, but this development took place as a result of the weakening of the eschatological hope and the consequent need to reinterpret the Christian message. Thus incarnation and death become integral parts of the one redemptive act; it is not true to say that one is more important than the other in the thought of our writer. "God so loved . . . that he gave. . . . Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 3:16; 15:13). There is no antithesis between Bethlehem and Calvary. They are complementary.

Moreover, although it may be said that eternal life is communicated through Christ and appropriated by the believers, equally it may be said that eternal life is gained by incorporation into the Son of Man, and the Son of Man is the one who descended and also ascended or returned to his divine glory through the cross (cf. John 3:13-15). As the Son of Man is glorified, so are we, who are incorporate in him.

If the assertion of (iii) above is correct, it seems extraordinary that John should produce a Gospel in which some scholars seriously deny the presence of any sacramental teaching at all. It is surely the case that one has to read between the lines to see any reference to sacraments. I believe that this reading between the lines is legitimate, but it can hardly be said that the necessity of the sacraments is emphasized.

Finally, John's words about eating the flesh and drinking the blood seem ill-chosen to counteract the tendencies mentioned in (iv) above.

There appears to be a much simpler reason why John omits specific reference to the Lord's Supper and its institution. He is at pains to avoid the eschatological associations which the Last Supper had in primitive

Christianity. John, as I see it, was attempting to wean Christianity from the eschatology in which it was cradled, in view of its non-fulfilment, and part of his task was the rehabilitation of the sacraments for the continuing life of the Church.

The synoptists had portrayed the Last Supper as a Passover meal (cf. Mark 14:12, 14, 16). Luke includes the saying of Jesus, "With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer" (Luke 22:15). Matthew similarly portrays the Last Supper as a Passover meal (cf. Matt. 26:17, 18, 19).

The Jewish Passover was a festival commemorating the great deliverance from Egypt, and at the same time it was an anticipation of a greater deliverance yet to come, which would be wrought by the Messiah. There was consequently an eschatological flavour about the Passover meal. A. J. B. Higgins² quotes rabbinic sources which expected the future deliverance to occur on Passover night, as had that from Egypt. The Messiah was expected in the month of Nisan, in which the Passover fell, and some expected the arrival of Elijah, the forerunner of the Messiah, on Passover day. It was customary to set a place for Elijah at the Passover meal. Certainly in this meal there was an element of expectant joy.

Similarly the Last Supper commemorated the deliverance from Egypt, and also anticipated the future deliverance; but that deliverance was felt to be very near, rather than some event in the far distant future; it was so near, in fact, that those who shared the meal with Jesus were having a foretaste of the Messianic Kingdom itself; they were virtually sitting at meat with the Son of Man in his glory. So the book Enoch describes the future of the blessed: "And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of Man shall they eat, and lie down and rise up for ever and ever" (62:14). The parallel with the Last Supper is striking.

Albert Schweitzer³ shows that the idea of a Messianic Feast at the End was part of the Jewish expectation. He believes that the germ of the idea is to be seen in Isaiah 65:13f.: "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed." The idea is taken up again in the post-exilic prophecy of Isaiah 25:6: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all peoples a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wine on the lees well refined." Ezekiel sees the inhabitants of the New Jerusalem feeding on fruit from trees by the stream that flows out of the Temple; these trees bear fruit every month, and the stream also gives abundant fish (47:7-12). According to II Baruch this great feast begins with the appearance of the Messiah:

2. Cf. A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (Chicago: Regnery, 1952), pp. 47f.

3. Cf. A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: A. & C. Black, 1931), p. 237.

. . . The Messiah shall then begin to be revealed . . . and then shall they [Behemoth and Leviathan] be for food for all that are left. The earth also shall yield its fruit one thousand fold, and on each vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster shall produce a thousand grapes, and each grape shall produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered shall rejoice. . . . And it shall come to pass at the selfsame time that the treasury of manna shall again descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time (29:3-8).

This idea of a Messianic Banquet also held a prominent place in the thought of Jesus; he pictures the future as a sitting at meat with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of God; in the parables the Kingdom is likened to a supper or wedding feast (Matt. 22:2f; Luke 14:15f.). At the Last Supper itself, Jesus speaks of a future banquet in words that suggest that the meal in the upper room was a foretaste of it: "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" (Mark 14:25).

The eschatological content of the Last Supper is reflected in our other primitive accounts of the Eucharist, namely I Corinthians 11 and Didache 9 and 10. Paul's account of the institution concludes, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (I Cor. 11:26). This verse seems to indicate that there was an eschatological flavour about the eucharist as celebrated in the Pauline churches.

The Didache account of the Lord's Supper looks forward even more explicitly to the consummation; thus Professor Richardson says: "The Eucharistic prayers, so clearly modelled on the Jewish forms for grace before and after meals, betray a period when the Lord's Supper was still a real supper, and when the joyful and expectant note of the Messianic Banquet had not yet been obscured by the more solemn emphasis on the Lord's passion."⁴ The prayers referred to are:

As this piece (of bread) was scattered over the hills and then was brought together and made one, so let your Church be brought together from the ends of the earth into your Kingdom (Did. 9:4).

Remember, Lord, your Church, to save it from all evil and to make it perfect by your love. Make it holy and gather it together from the four winds into your Kingdom which you have made ready for it. For yours is the power and the glory for ever. Let Grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any is holy, let him come. If not, let him repent. Our Lord, come! Amen (Did. 10:5-6).

The eschatological content in these prayers is strong; and the Aramaic phrase "Maranatha" has probably been correctly translated as a prayer for the coming of the Lord, i.e. the coming of Christ in his Kingdom.

We see then that in the earliest church, whose traditions are represented

4. C. C. Richardson (ed.), *Early Christian Fathers*, Library of Christian Classics, Vol. I (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), pp. 165f.

by the Synoptics, I Corinthians, and the Didache, the Lord's Supper is celebrated with a note of expectant joy; the final consummation is imminent; and the Supper itself is a foretaste of the Banquet that believers are soon to share with their Master.

As I said above, in view of the non-fulfilment of those hopes, John, in his rehabilitation of the sacrament, avoids all such associations. He prefers therefore to treat of the Eucharist under the symbols of Bread of Life and True Vine. To avoid the association of the Eucharist with the Passover and the Messianic Banquet and to make specific mention of the institution would have involved a direct clash with the Synoptists—not a wise thing in view of their general acceptance by the church and the widely established use of the words of institution.

C. L. J. PROUDMAN

*Queen's College,
St. John's, Newfoundland*