

that overweening estimate of ourselves and our own powers to which we are all prone, and which leads us indirectly to criticise, if not to censure, the Providence in which we profess to trust. And the one true remedy for it is to measure ourselves, not by ourselves, but by the standard of Christ; and to compare ourselves, not with one another, but with Him who was so great and yet so humble, so rich and yet so poor in spirit, so wise and yet so meek, who did so much for God and man and was yet so lowly of heart.

ALMONI PELONI.

---

*ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF  
THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

In the article by Dr. Sanday, on the Revised New Testament (Vol. II. pp. 401 *et seq.*), he adverts to the four parallel accounts of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and notices a difficulty in the longer reading of St. Luke's account "arising from the apparent division of the Institution of the Cup into two parts, separated from each other by the Institution of the Bread." Dr. Sanday appears to hesitate as to whether the latter clause of the passage is to be accepted as genuine or not.

It appears to me that a comparison of St. Luke's account with the ceremonies observed by the Jews at the Passover supper in our Saviour's time presents at once a natural and reasonable explanation of the difficulty. I take the account of the Passover supper from Lightfoot's Temple service. There were four cups of wine drank at the supper, but only two of these were preceded by a blessing or thanksgiving: viz. the first and the third. Thus, according to the Talmudical schoolmen, "He gave thanks most especially over the first cup and over the cup of blessing, over the first cup and over the third."

Now let us compare the account of the Passover supper there given with St. Luke's account of this Institution of the Lord's Supper.

(1) The first cup was brought to the master of the family, who gave thanks over the wine, and then they drank it off. Now St. Luke does not say, as he does of the Bread, that our Saviour took the cup, but "He received a cup." He does not say to the disciples, "Drink ye all of it," but "Divide it among yourselves"; and He gives as the reason for this command, not, "For this is the new covenant in my blood," but "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine," etc. This was evidently not the Sacramental Cup, but the first cup, which our Saviour Himself did not drink for the reason there given.

(2) After the first cup the Jews supped upon the food placed on the table, the master of the household explained to the children the origin and meaning of the supper, the first part of the Hallel was sung, and the second cup, over which no thanksgiving had been pronounced, was drunk. This part of the supper is expressed by the first two Evangelists by the words, "And as they were eating."

(3) The master of the household then took two cakes of unleavened bread, broke one of them in two, and, laying the broken cake upon the whole, he gave thanks to God. One half of the broken cake was given to one in the company, and the rest he retained to be reserved till they had eaten the Paschal lamb, when the reserved bread was eaten: after which "they tasted nothing at all," that is, the eating of the bread terminated the supper. This is exactly followed by St. Luke: "And He took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body," etc.

(4) Then the master of the household took the third cup, and gave thanks over it, and this cup was called "the cup of blessing."

St. Luke says, "And the cup in like manner"—that is, taking it and giving thanks—"after supper, saying, This is the new covenant in my blood," etc.

(5) Then they sang the rest of the Hallel, that is, from the 115th to the 118th Psalm, and drank the fourth cup, which was called the Cup of the Hallel. This is alluded to by the first two Evangelists: "And when they had sung a hymn, they went out," etc. The fourth cup was optional, and was not drunk by them.

This comparison shews, I think, the contrast between the two cups mentioned by St. Luke. The first was received, not taken; it was given to the disciples to be divided among themselves,

because our Saviour would not drink of the fruit of the vine any more on earth: and they were not told to drink all of it as representing his blood. What were instituted and consecrated, as the memorials of his passion and the symbols of his body and blood, were the cake of unleavened bread which terminated the supper, and the third or cup of blessing, which immediately followed it.

If this view is correct, the first cup mentioned by St. Luke was the first cup of the Passover supper; and it follows that St. Luke could not have copied St. Paul's report in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, but that they are independent reports.

I am inclined to account for the identity of many of the expressions in this way. In the Passover supper the master of the household gave an account of its institution before partaking of the Bread which closed the supper, and of the cup of blessing. When the disciples met together to break bread, they probably repeated the account of the Institution. By the words of which, repeated over the Bread and Wine, they consecrated them as the Body and Blood of our Lord. The account given by St. Paul was probably that which was repeated at the celebration of the Sacrament; and the expression "which also I delivered to you" refers to its having been delivered to them when partaking of the Lord's Supper.

WILLIAM F. SKENE.

---