

corruption of תרתח. But it is no ordinary lance of which the poet speaks—it is the “lance-star,” *i.e.*, according to Jensen, Antares, the heliacal setting of which heralds the autumnal equinox, but, according to Hommel, Procyon. Thus we get a beautiful supplement to the questions of verses 31 and 32 relative to Orion and other constellations. In the second line I am almost, but not quite, sure that שִׁכְנִי should rather be קֶשֶׁת, “bow,” *i.e.* the *kakkab kashti* = Sirius. Thus the distich becomes:

“Who hath put wisdom into the Lance-star,  
Or given understanding to the Bow-star?”

I have also, as I believe, been able to restore תרתח in two other places in the Old Testament. For these passages I refer the reader to an article on “Textual Criticism,” which has appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for July, where I have also mentioned what I believe to be the discovery of these new star-names in Job.

T. K. CHEYNE.

## HARNACK, JÜLICHER, AND SPITTA ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

### II.

WE come now to Spitta. His contribution to the discussion is contained in his article, “The Early Christian Traditions concerning the Origin and Meaning of the Lord's Supper” (*Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, Bd. i., pp. 205–337, 1893). In a previous work he had reached conclusions which appear to have met with considerable acceptance. The view he had formerly held was this—that Jesus had invested the Jewish Passover with a deeper significance, and transformed it into a Christian celebration; and that in this form the celebration had at first been repeated yearly, until the transplantation of Christianity to Gentile soil

led to the union of the Lord's Supper with the Agape, and in consequence to more frequent celebration, and to a certain change in the meaning of the rite. But further study has led him to change his position, and in the present paper he puts before us the new conclusions he has arrived at.

The first part of his paper is devoted to an inquiry into the TIME and OCCASION of the words of institution. So far as the time is concerned, on one point all the accounts agree, that the Lord's Supper coincides with the last meal Jesus ate with His disciples on the night He was betrayed. But the agreement goes no further. It is now almost universally recognised that the Fourth Gospel dates that last meal on the 13th Nisan, *i.e.* the day before the beginning of the Feast of the Passover, while the Synoptic Gospels more or less clearly identify the Last Supper with the Passover supper, *i.e.* assign the 14th Nisan as the date. Spitta proceeds first of all to establish the fact that according to the Fourth Gospel the Last Supper falls on the 13th Nisan. He does not confine himself to the chronology of the later chapters of the Gospel, but considers further whether in the passage John vi. 26-58, assuming that our Saviour's words here have any bearing on the Lord's Supper, we find any reference to the Passover. A critical examination of the passage leads to the conclusion that the section *vv.* 51-59 is a later addition, and makes it plain that there is not the slightest reference in the words of Jesus to the Passover. So far, then, the position of the Fourth Gospel is clear. The Lord's Supper was celebrated on the 13th Nisan, and there is no connexion between it and the Passover.

But, on the other hand, the Synoptic Gospels seem to decide no less plainly for the 14th Nisan. The Synoptic Gospels—but we must distinguish between the Synoptic Gospels and the Synoptic tradition, and Spitta believes he

can find evidence of a tradition in the Synoptic Gospels which points to the 13th Nisan. It is in Mark that he finds most distinct traces of this tradition. In Mark xiv. 1 we have a date assigned to the resolution come to by the enemies of Jesus to capture Him and put Him to death: ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας. Why, we ask, this precise statement of the date on which this resolution was come to? The answer is given in the next verse: ἔλεγον γάρ μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μήποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ. Was it with regard to the capture or the execution of Jesus that the Sanhedrists resolved μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ? To the execution. They proposed to take Him ἐν δόλω, so that, so far as the capture was concerned, they need not have feared an uproar. It is the execution that, two days before the Passover, they resolve to accomplish μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. And this resolution μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ can only mean "before the feast." For why delay till after? The people would have dispersed, but Jesus also might have left the city. According to Mark, then, it was the plan of the Sanhedrists to capture and execute Jesus before the feast. They make a bargain with Judas, and he seeks to betray him *εὐκαιρῶς* (v. 11), *i.e.* at the right time—the right time, of course, being the time agreed upon by the Sanhedrists, *viz.* before the feast. Thus far, at any rate, the tendency of Mark is to place the capture of Jesus before the Passover.

But the verses which follow (Mark xiv. 12-16) are in glaring contradiction with what we have found to be the tendency of the preceding narrative. Without any reference to the agreement come to between the Sanhedrists and Judas, the Evangelist proceeds to describe the arrangements made by Jesus for the celebration of the Passover. The plan, then, to capture Him before the feast had fallen through. Why do we hear nothing more about it? If this plan is important enough to receive the careful mention it does, why does Mark not tell us how it was that

it was given up and another substituted? The verses 12-16 are so entirely out of connexion with what has gone before that we must regard them as an interpolation. This view is confirmed by the fact that *v.* 17 does not harmonize with what immediately precedes it in the suspected passage. In the interpolated verses we read of Jesus sending two of His disciples to prepare the Passover, while in the seventeenth verse we find Him coming *with the twelve*. Spitta has no hesitation in concluding that Mark xiv. 12-16 completely lacks organic connexion with the rest of the narrative. Omit these verses, and the tendency of the rest of the account is to confirm the opinion that Mark is basing on a tradition which assigned the 13th and not the 14th Nisan as the date of the Last Supper and capture of Jesus.

The further course of the narrative in Mark is all in favour of this conclusion. In the account of the capture, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus there is not one word to suggest that all this took place on a Sabbath-like feast. The whole conduct of the Sanhedrim would have been illegal on this assumption. Minor points in the narrative—Simon coming from the fields, Joseph buying the linen, the release of a prisoner, of which the most natural explanation is that it was to enable him to celebrate the feast—strongly support the view that the date of the crucifixion must have been the 14th Nisan. Nor can we understand the conduct of the high-priests on the generally accepted chronology of Mark. They had resolved not to capture and execute Jesus during the feast, and yet directly in the teeth of this resolution they not only take Him then, but, instead of keeping Him safe in prison, for no reason that we can see, proceed to try Him and put Him to death, running straight into the danger they had resolved to avoid. It is evident, then, that the account of the preparation of the Passover is irreconcilable with the rest of

the narrative. We have but to omit it, and there remains a clear and consistent narrative pointing to the 14th Nisan as the date of the crucifixion.

This conclusion is borne out by the evidence as to the character of the meal which Jesus ate with His disciples on the night of His betrayal. Was it or was it not the Passover? We have four accounts, which arrange themselves into two groups—Mark and Matthew, Paul and Luke. On comparing them, we observe the following main points of difference:

(1) Paul and Luke represent the Lord's Supper as an ordinance, the institution of which at the Passover supper had been premeditated by Jesus. Luke is emphatic, *ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν* (xxii. 15). The *εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* of Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25) is to the same effect, and points unmistakably to the Passover (Exod. xii. 14). In Mark and Matthew, on the other hand, there is no evidence of premeditation. The so-called words of institution give us the impression of being spoken on the impulse of the moment, and there is no mention of a repetition of the celebration.

(2) Luke makes the meal begin with wine, evidently thinking of the first cup of the Passover, and from the very beginning we feel that it is a sacred feast that is being celebrated. Mark and Matthew describe an ordinary meal, *καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων*; and where Luke puts the first cup, they introduce the Judas episode. Now there would be no place for such a speech as that of Jesus regarding the traitor in the liturgy of the Passover, and it is probably this feeling that makes Luke reserve the Judas episode to the end.

Mark and Matthew, then, know nothing of a Passover supper, while Paul and Luke distinctly point to it. But even in these latter we note some points which seem to conflict with the view they present. For instance, if it

was the Passover supper, it is strange that Jesus should have chosen the bread, and not rather the lamb, to represent His body. And again, the point at which the blessing occurs is suspicious. At all ordinary meals the blessing came before the breaking of the bread, but in the Passover supper after. And yet, even in the accounts which represent the supper Jesus is eating as the Passover, we find the *εὐλογεῖν* coming before the breaking of the bread. These and one or two other minor points in the accounts of Paul and Luke stand as a protest against the view which these accounts are designed to present, that the last meal of Jesus with His disciples was the Passover supper.

Briefly, then, to sum up the results of the enquiry into the Synoptic tradition regarding the Lord's Supper :

(1) There is clear evidence of a tradition in Mark which assigns the 13th Nisan as the date of the celebration. In the present form of the Mark Gospel this tradition is obscured by the interpolation of Mark xiv. 12-16; much more so in Matthew, where, however, we see many traces of it. Luke, on the other hand, distinctly assigns the 14th Nisan as the date. Spitta further finds evidence in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter and the *Didaskalia* in favour of the Mark tradition.

(2) As to the character of the meal, Paul and Luke represent it as the Passover supper, Mark and Matthew as an ordinary meal.

(3) Even in Paul and Luke, however, there are certain points which are hardly compatible with the theory of a Passover supper.

We come now to consider the MEANING of the words of institution. Spitta starts from Mark's account, which has proved the most reliable on the question of date and occasion. Mark represents Jesus as distributing to His disciples bread and wine. Evidently it is a meal that is

here in progress. But what kind of a meal? Not the Passover. Many things are against this—the date, as we have seen, the distribution and invitation to partake, which would be out of place at the Passover supper, where all help themselves without invitation, the fact that the bread should be chosen to represent the body of Christ instead of the Paschal lamb. But if not the Passover, what then? Spitta finds a hint to the answer in the words, τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. The reference to the Mosaic covenant of Exodus xxiv. 8 is unmistakable. But just as there is a difference of detail in the two cases, in the one blood being used, in the other wine, in the one the blood being sprinkled, in the other the wine poured out and drunk, so the covenant of which Jesus is speaking is opposed to the Mosaic. What covenant, then, can Jesus be thinking of when He lets the cup go round among His disciples, and describes it as the blood of the covenant? The answer is clear to Spitta. It must be the Davidic-Messianic, so often opposed to the Mosaic. One of the most common figures under which this covenant is represented is that of a meal; cf. Isaiah xxv. 6-8, lv. 3; Psalm cxxxii. 15, etc. In the Gospels we find Jesus making frequent use of this figure. Spitta instances the beatitudes, Matthew v. 6, Luke vi. 21; the parable of the ten virgins, where the Parousia is represented as a wedding feast; the parable of the great supper. Bread and wine are frequently mentioned as features of the banquet. In Luke xiv. 15 it is described as eating bread, in Mark xiv. 25 as drinking wine. Spitta brings forward a long list of quotations from Rabbinical literature to prove the familiarity of this idea. No figure is more common to describe the spiritual blessings of the Messianic age than that of eating and drinking. The Messiah is represented sometimes as the Giver of the manna, sometimes as the manna itself. Philo repeatedly describes the

manna as the Logos, and 1 Corinthians x. 3 *seq.* shows that such a conception is not unfamiliar to Paul, who, after speaking of the manna and the water together, says with regard to the latter that the Israelites drank *ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός*. We have the same thought in John vi. 48-50, where Jesus calls Himself the Bread which cometh down from heaven. In the Jewish apocalyptic writings the Messiah is described further as the Vine of the fruit of which the righteous shall drink. In view of these expectations, Spitta thinks that it is no mere accident that Jesus, according to John, describes Himself as the true Vine.

It was expected, then, that when the Davidic-Messianic covenant was established the righteous would be nourished with some wonderful food and drink. This bread, wine, water, or whatever it was described as being, is nothing less than the Messiah Himself; so that one can actually speak of "eating the Messiah," or drinking Him in His blood, the juice of the grape. And as the blessings to be obtained are essentially the blessings of the Messianic covenant, this Messiah's blood of which one drinks may be fitly designated the blood of the covenant.

Are there any references to this Messianic meal in the records of the institution of the Lord's Supper? Without a doubt. Mark and Matthew have the saying about drinking new in the Kingdom of God, which Luke introduces at the beginning of the celebration. At the conclusion Luke has the significant saying, *καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς δέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνετε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου* (xxii. 29 *seq.*), while Paul strikes the eschatological note in his *ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ* (1 Cor. xi. 26), and John has the speech about the true Vine. The invitation to partake in Mark and Matthew (*λάβετε, φάγετε, πίνετε*) points in the same direction. It recalls the invitation of Isaiah lv. 1-3, and

suggests such parallels in the Gospels as Luke xiv. 17, "Come, for all things are now ready"; and Matthew xi. 29, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." It is doubtless this thought of the Messianic banquet that has suggested the πάντες in Christ's invitation to His disciples to partake.

In what sense, then, are we to understand Jesus's words at the table? From Mark xiv. 25 and Luke xxii. 30 we see that He is thinking of the completion of His work. His words to the traitor seem to point to the failure of that work, but His faith never wavers. In the very hour that He is preparing for death He speaks as one who has overcome the world. He looks forward with confidence to the triumphant establishment of the Kingdom He has come to found, and with the eye of faith sees that hour as if it were already come. Already, in imagination, He is sitting at table with His disciples in the Kingdom of God, and dispensing to them those blessings which only He, the Messiah, can supply. It is in this spirit that He distributes the bread and wine to His disciples with the words, "Take, eat, this is My body," "Drink ye all of it; this is My blood of the testament, which is shed for many." Death has no terrors for Him; no sense of failure embitters the prospect of the abandonment of His work. With unfaltering confidence He looks forward to the future, and already seems to see the glorious work completed, already seems to be drinking of the fruit of the vine with His disciples in His Father's Kingdom. Already that hour seems to have come to which He looks forward in the intercessory prayer, "Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me."

It is only from this eschatological point of view, the point of view expressly suggested by all accounts of the

celebration, that we can understand Christ's words at the table. To start with the symbolical meaning of the bread and wine, and endeavour to decide what is meant by eating Christ's body and drinking His blood, is to open the door to all manner of subjective interpretations, none of which can be accepted with certainty, and most of which give the impression that the words of Christ must have been unintelligible to His disciples. Equally inadmissible is the attempt to explain Christ's words as referring to His death. True, we find this interpretation already current in apostolic times, but that does not diminish its improbability. Nay, in the situation this meaning is impossible. Can we believe that Jesus, when He gave His disciples the bread and the wine, meant them to be regarded as symbols of His violent death? Would they have been appropriate for the purpose? The red wine, the blood of the grape, might certainly suggest human blood. But it is not with the wine but the bread that Jesus begins. And what resemblance is there between bread—even though it be broken—and a dead body? The bread is broken simply that it may be eaten. And the eating and drinking put all thought of reference to the death of Jesus out of the question. The very suggestion of eating a dead body and drinking human blood is revolting. And, further, if Jesus had been referring to His death, is it likely that the disciples would have understood Him? He was in the midst of them, in the full enjoyment of life. How were they to realize that the bread represented the crucified body and the wine the shed blood of the Master whose words they were listening to? We must remember that the thoughts so familiar to ourselves regarding the significance of the death of Christ were foreign to the disciples, whereas, on the other hand, those apocalyptic expectations regarding the Messianic banquet, which are so strange to us, were familiar to

them. It is only by endeavouring to put ourselves into the historical situation that we can hope to understand the meaning of the words that fell from Christ's lips. And once we do so, once we appreciate the sublime enthusiasm of the moment which called forth those words from the Saviour, we shall cease to imagine that He had any other end in view than simply this—to invite the disciples to receive Him to themselves. All thought of intention to found a rite for the observance of the Church is out of the question. Such an object is incompatible with the spirit in which the words were spoken, which betrays no premeditation, but rather the spontaneous outpouring of a heart profoundly moved, and inconsistent with the character of the Saviour, who throughout His life had displayed a lofty indifference as to the forms which were to govern the life of the Church.

It is true the meal was repeated in the early Church, but nothing indicates that this was done in obedience to a supposed command of Christ or with reference to His death. On the contrary, so far from the latter being the case, we read in Acts ii. 46 that the Agapes were celebrated *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει*, and we have to regard them as religious meals which the Christians celebrated together, at which it was natural that they should recall the words which the Saviour had spoken at that last meal with His disciples. As they partook of the food placed before them, they would remember what He had said of Himself as the true nourishment of the soul, and look forward with joyful anticipation to the time when they should sit at meat with Him in the Kingdom of God. Nor is it likely that these thoughts would be associated only with those elements He had used at the Last Supper. Along with bread and wine, water was frequently employed to describe the blessings of the Messianic age. Wine may not always have been

drunk at the Agapes, and we can well imagine that in the early Christian celebrations water may have been drunk in remembrance of Him who had spoken of Himself as the living water.

But in course of time a change took place. This simple repetition of the original meal disappeared before the celebration of the Lord's Supper as a Christian Passover in commemoration of the death of Christ. We can trace the beginnings of the change in the earliest times. Spitta offers the following sketch of the probable development: If Jesus died on the 14th Nisan, then the meal which He ate with His disciples on the 13th was not the Passover. The disciples then could not have eaten the Passover at this time, for it is out of the question to imagine that they would do so in the melancholy circumstances. But the law commanded, "If any man of you or of your posterity shall be unclean by reason of a dead body, or be in a journey afar off, yet he shall keep the passover unto the Lord. The fourteenth day of the second month at even they shall keep it" (Num. ix. 10 *seq.*). The disciples, in obedience to this command, would return to Jerusalem to celebrate the second Passover on the 14th Ijjar. This is the simplest explanation of the fact that we find them again in Jerusalem, although they had been commanded to seek the risen Saviour in Galilee. We can hardly over-estimate the importance of this, the first Christian Passover. A month before, when they had thought to eat the Passover with Jesus, His blood had been shed on the cross. In consequence of their Easter experiences they now see the death of their Master in a new light. The parallel between Jesus and the Paschal lamb, which was slain at the same hour, must at once have forced itself upon them. Here is the germ of Paul's *τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός*. Do we wonder that this Passover meal, invested with this new significance, assumed the character

of a new institution? If, as is by no means improbable, on this occasion Jesus appeared to the disciples, that would enhance the importance of it. We are almost tempted to identify this meal with that of which we read in the spurious conclusion of the Mark Gospel, and which is referred to in Acts i. 4 (though dated later), at which Jesus appeared for the last time to His disciples before He was received up into heaven. An interesting parallel suggests itself between this last meal of Jesus with His disciples before His ascension, and the last meal before His death. On both occasions He went out with the disciples to the Mount of Olives; on both occasions He was taken away from the disciples—the first time by His enemies, the second by the darkness of a cloud into which He was received, never to appear again. This last meal was really a Passover.

But be that as it may, there can be no doubt that the celebration of the Christian Passover reaches back to the earliest times, and that it exercised considerable influence on the original celebration of the Lord's Supper. That the disciples themselves should have misunderstood the meaning of our Lord's words is hardly possible. But we can easily understand how, after Christ was long dead, others, hearing the words *σῶμα* and *αἷμα Χριστοῦ*, would naturally think of the death of Christ. To those who did not know the historical situation in which the words were spoken the analogy of the Passover most readily suggested itself as an explanation of their meaning. In this light the Lord's Supper was regarded. Such an interpretation was bound to react upon the accounts of the origin of the Lord's Supper. The theory of a Christian Passover pointed to the 14th Nisan as the date of the original celebration, and the analogy of Exodus xii. 14 to a direct institution by Christ.

Spitta proceeds now to test this conjecture as to the

probable course of things by an examination of the accounts of the Lord's Supper. He begins with Luke, whose narrative he would curtail by the omission of xxii. 20, which evidently is the result of an attempt to combine Paul and Mark—the first half of the verse pointing to 1 Corinthians xi. 25, while the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον is taken from Mark xiv. 24, and introduced so awkwardly that what is there said of the αἶμα is here applied to the ποτήριον. In Luke's account we already see a vast change. The cup comes first, and the distribution of the bread is the climax of the celebration. No symbolical meaning is attached to the cup, as the wine in the Passover had none. The words which are spoken as the bread is distributed correspond to the "hoc est pascha" of the Paschal liturgy. Evidently it is a Christian Passover that is here described: so early had the practice of the Church begun to influence the traditions regarding the original celebration. When we find such changes introduced into the narrative of the last supper, do we marvel at the discrepancy in the chronology of the Passion? It is no more difficult to understand than this variation in the form of the celebration, and springs from the same source—the identification of the Lord's Supper with the Passover.

The original tradition regarding the Lord's Supper is preserved in purer form by Mark and Matthew, though somewhat obscured by the introduction of the passage describing the preparation for the Passover. But we have no difficulty, as we have seen, in finding in Mark and Matthew clear evidence against the 14th Nisan as the date of the original celebration.

Paul agrees with Luke in regarding the Lord's Supper as a memorial of the death of Christ. But we note certain variations from Luke. He does not follow the order adopted by Luke, and in the words over the cup he keeps more closely to the apostolical tradition. The points on

which he differs from Mark and Matthew are significant. He has *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡς ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, which has its parallel in Luke in the words spoken at the end of the celebration, specially with reference to the bread. Further, instead of *τῆς διαθήκης* he has *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*, and, most important of all, the simple *τὸ αἶμά μου* of Mark and Matthew has been replaced by *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*. Clearly this is a transformation of the original words, and an awkward one enough, as the New Testament cannot be drunk; and the reason of the change is the same as has led Luke altogether to omit the word over the cup, so that even where Paul appears more closely to approach Mark and Matthew, he is really nearer to Luke. Spitta finds in Paul's version of the words *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἶμά μου* a proof that these words are genuine, and that they did not originally refer to the death of Christ. It is interesting further to contrast the reference to the *διαθήκη* in the words of Jesus with Paul's version. Jesus speaks of *eating and drinking* in which the promise of the Davidic-Messianic covenant will be *fulfilled*; Paul points to a *sacrifice* by which a new covenant is instituted, which *sets aside* the old forms of the Jewish religion. The close connexion between the body and blood of Christ and eating and drinking, which is emphasized in Mark and Matthew, is not preserved by Paul, who has no *λάβετε, φάγετε, πίετε*. Bread and the cup are to him symbols fraught with a certain meaning. Of appropriation of Christ and the blessings of the new covenant by eating and drinking there is no thought.

It is evident that so far in Paul's version we have the two traditions, the apostolical and the ecclesiastical of Luke, crossing one another. That the latter preponderates is due to the fact that Paul was not an eye-witness, but himself belonged to the circle for whom Luke's account was designed. At the same time we can trace the influ-

ence of Paul's account on the later versions of the apostolical tradition, notably in Matthew's addition *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* to the *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* of Mark.

But we have a different view of the Lord's Supper presented in 1 Corinthians x. (cf. xii. 13). Here there is no reference to the death of Christ; it is the eating and drinking that is prominent. Bread and wine are regarded as the media whereby the participant is brought into communion with the pneumatic Christ. We cannot fail to find here a reminiscence of the apostolical tradition, even while we note how great is the difference between the earlier view, which regards the bread and wine as *symbols* of pneumatic blessings, and Paul's view, which accepts them as *media* of the same. That we should have these two different views of the Lord's Supper in Paul, that even when he approaches to the earlier tradition he should yet depart so far from the simplicity of it—these things are a proof to Spitta that Paul no longer stands at the source of the tradition regarding the Lord's Supper, but at a point where that tradition has already become divided and obscured.

In concluding his paper, Spitta deals briefly with the practical consequences of the position he has sought to establish. That the view he has presented differs from that set forth in all creeds and confessions is evident. On the negative side, in so far *i.e.* as he denies the institution by Jesus of a rite in commemoration of His death, he is aware that he is opposed to the universal doctrine of the Church. But, on the other hand, on the positive side, in so far *i.e.* as he emphasizes participation in the spiritual blessings which the Messiah bestows, he contends that the view of the Lord's Supper he has set forth has many points of contact with the evangelical piety of the Church, as it finds expression in its hymns. Certainly those hymns have been written from a different standpoint; but in

spite of this the fact remains—and Spitta quotes many instances to prove it—that among the hymns dealing with the Lord's Supper, the meaning which he has assigned to the rite is that which is most frequently and most effectively adopted in giving expression to the devotion of the believer.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

### THE EASY YOKE.

WHEN Jesus said, "My yoke is easy," He probably had in His view a contrast between His teaching and that of the scribes. Be that as it may, it is certain that His "yoke," compared with theirs, was easy. Therefore we may fitly adopt "the Easy Yoke" as a title for this paper, in which it is proposed to consider some of the sayings uttered by our Lord in connection with His various encounters with the religious teachers of Israel. This study will form a suitable sequel to the preceding one on the *Disciple-Logia*. The latter, curiously enough, exhibit Christ as a Master in a light which might readily suggest that His yoke was the reverse of easy, though no instructed disciple would ascribe to it such a character; for such an one understands that severity and gentleness are not incompatible. But the fact remains that to see clearly with what justice Jesus claims to be a genial, reasonable Master we must study the words in which His moral and religious ideas are set in sharp antagonism to the doctrine of the scribes.

These words are many, as we learn from Matthew's Gospel, which contains the fullest account of our Lord's anti-scribal polemic. To consider them all, even in the most cursory manner, is impossible within our limits. It is also quite unnecessary for our purpose. It will suffice to weigh the import of those words that have been preserved in the Gospel of Mark, which, meagre as its report of our