

of the Labourers in the Vineyard here suggested, it was not intended to teach merely the rather obvious truth that the divine reward is given in accordance with the quality and not in accordance with the quantity of work done, nor that its object was "that of warning Christ's first disciples that others who should become His disciples at a later date would also be partakers of privileges equal to theirs who had first joined Him."¹ Both of these explanations are no doubt implicitly taught in the parable; but its prime purpose was to show that Christ had come to inaugurate a new relationship between God and men, or rather, to declare more fully what that relationship really was and always had been. No man could, by virtue of his works, *claim* a reward from God, for the capability and the will to do them came from God—"What hast thou that thou hast not received?"—the initiative is not man's; no man, therefore, could be justified in the sight of God by his own merit. It is by means of divine grace that the desire to do good works arises, it is by divine grace that power to accomplish those works exists, and it is by divine grace that the reward for them is accorded.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

*ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER: A
CRITICAL NOTE ON THE SECOND SACRAMENT.*

2. INTERNAL CRITICISM.

THE only internal difficulty that I can find stated as to the passage is this. St. Luke speaks, according to the text that possesses "overwhelming external evidence," of our Lord as blessing *two* Cups, and of the blessing of the Bread as having taken place *between* them. Thus we find ourselves face to

¹ Allen, p. 214.

face with alternative difficulties. If we retain the words in question, we must believe that our Lord blessed two cups, and that He used with the *first* one words that occur in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's narratives after the *second*. If we reject the doubtful passage, we must believe that St. Luke reverses the order of the two elements. If we retain the two accounts in St. Luke, we must believe that our Lord said, "I will not drink henceforth, etc.," and yet that He consecrated and (by assumption) drank of a *second* cup. If we reject them, we must suppose that our Lord, from St. Luke's point of view, due (according to Dr. Wright) to local custom, consecrated the wine first, and thereby bring St. Luke into absolute contradiction, not only with his brother Synoptists, but with his friend and master St. Paul. Dr. Plummer, reviewing the evidence in the light of the canon of internal criticism, which declares that *the more difficult reading is to be preferred*, admits that the difficulty presented by the retention of the words is greater than that presented by their omission; i.e., that the "Two Cups" theory would present more difficulty to scribes of the early centuries than the "One Cup" view,—and yet he drops the words simply because he believes it safer to move along the path of least resistance, by getting rid of *all* the difficulties involved in retaining the suspected passage. This is obviously contrary to all canons of criticism. To drop a passage with overwhelming external evidence, simply because of its internal difficulties, is contrary to the canon, "Internal evidence follows external." To abolish a passage that does not contain *in itself* any gross difficulties is mere presumption. To do so because it is easier to understand the meaning without it (if it be easier, in this case, which I greatly doubt) is sheer contradiction of the canon, "The more difficult reading is to be preferred." To do so, when there is *no* rival reading, but simply a very poor case for omitting the

words, is contrary to the rules, alike, of common-sense and criticism.

We may, however, deal better with the passage by a thorough examination of all the objections that can be made to it. And, in doing so, we must remember that "more difficult" has two meanings, too often confused. In one case it means, "more difficult for us"; in the other, "more difficult for the writer in whose text the disputed words occur." We cannot argue at all from the first meaning—the long interval between our Lord's days and our own has cleared out some difficulties, but it has made others still harder to understand. We can argue on sound grounds from the second, because we can often judge how far either general circumstances, or local customs and traditions, or apparent discrepancies between different portions of Scripture, may have made a particular reading difficult to men who were uncritical as to both Scripture and services, and took everything without much inquiry.

Looking then at the objections that may be made against the genuineness of the passage, point by point, and remembering that we must weigh them against an overwhelming mass of external evidence, we may state them as follows:

(*α'*) The passage may have been added because of the difficulty involved in St. Luke's *order*; or

(*β'*) It may have been *omitted* because of the difficulty presented by the idea of *two cups*.

(*γ'*) The fact that the passage is Lucan (or Luco-Hebraic) in vocabulary has, by some strange contortion of Reason, or by the "*difficilior præferetur lectio*" canon, been urged against its authenticity.

(*δ'*) So also has the parallelism between these words and St. Paul's account,—an objection on account of *resemblance*.

(*ε'*) So has the fact that the passage is not parallel to the other accounts, an objection on account of *difference*.

(5') So has the idea that, if we accept a belief in two cups, and attach our Lord's words, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine," to the first, our Lord cannot have drunk of the Eucharistic chalice.

(5) Against the "two cup" objections that the inversion in St. Luke's account, of the order of Consecration is unaccountable, a theory is advanced in S G that the Evangelist probably followed "a local custom."

Taking these points in succession, and remembering (1) that, if we suppose either the addition or the omission to have been made, as it were, half-accidentally, there is exactly the same chance of accident in each case; (2) that if the codex which was the parent—near or remote—of B and N were within the reach of the people, the addition of words to a well-known formula would have caused even more scandal than their suppression in a minor group headed by D; (3) that the scribe of E—the supposed parent codex of B and N—cannot well have done his work later than the third century; and (4) that (as has already been pointed out) there is no probability (and most obviously no certainty) of a text constructed on the system followed in WH being final: we have a perfectly sound basis for internal criticism. The case then stands as follows.

(1) α' and β' can be treated together; they simply call on us to decide between the strength of two motives, or of two opportunities. Looking at the case objectively, it is plain that the temptation to remove the words must have been slighter than the other, since they are retained by all the best MSS., etc., and omitted by only a very few MSS. of a very poor school. Subjectively, there would be every temptation to remove an aberrant passage, on the ground that it seemed an unauthorised addition; but the addition, in the third century, of extra words to the New Testament Eucharistic formulæ would have seemed a blasphemy.

The scribe of Ξ , whenever it was written, kept the aberrant passage—the account of the first cup; it is therefore highly improbable that he added the disputed words as to the second cup.

(2) The canon, “*Difficilior præferetur lectio*,” obviously rests on a principle behind it, the principle that deliberate or semi-deliberate tampering with an important text is generally due to a conscious or half-conscious desire to remove difficulties: and this canon prevails only when stronger evidences are equal, or nearly equal. We have already seen that, in this particular case, the external evidence for the “two-cups” theory is overwhelmingly superior; but, even if it were not, the difficulty presented to the scribe of Ξ by retaining the disputed passage would be much greater than that caused by its removal. In the latter case, there would be only the difficulty caused by the divergence of St. Luke’s *order* from that of the other three accounts, a comparatively trifling¹ matter. In the former, there would be the enormous difficulty of the use of *two* cups, a thing nowhere else mentioned in Scripture. So the *subjective difficulty* of (β') would have been far greater than that of (α'); and, so far forth, the canon, “*Difficilior præferetur, etc.*,” confirms the external testimony.

(3) Under γ' we can clearly see that a difficulty evident on the surface would have been far greater, to an early scribe, than one that could be reached only by careful internal criticism. For us, the case is reversed. He could not, except by a *Kritik* that was difficult, and probably beyond his powers, find any objection to the passage on the ground of its parallelism in vocabulary to *Hebrews*. On the other hand, the “two cups” difficulty would have been at once obvious to him. But we, especially those of us who accept

¹ No difficulty at all, if Dr. Wright’s theory as to local differences in custom could be accepted.

the Lucan authorship of *Hebrews*, cannot fail to notice that the three words *ποιεῖτε*, *ἀνάμνησις*, and *διαθήκη* are not merely present in the vocabulary of the Epistle, but are used in technical senses which, at least, help to illustrate their use here. *ποιεῖν* is familiar enough: "By faith he *kept*" (or "*sacrificed*") "the Passover" (Heb. xi. 28). The word *διαθήκη* (Covenant) is not only a keyword in the Epistle, but almost *the* keyword. And *ἀνάμνησις*, which Farrar, with his peculiar carelessness, declares to be absent from all New Testament Scripture except in this passage and the parallel passage in I Corinthians,¹ occurs in a very remarkable passage in *Hebrews*, the only verse in the New Testament that helps to throw any light on the words here. The passage possesses the peculiar alliterativeness that is common to St. Luke's other writings and the Epistle, and the use of the word is obviously based on its technical sense in the LXX. "ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἶμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας." "But in these there is a *Remembrance*" (or "*Memorial*") of sins made yearly, for it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins" (Heb. x. 3). Thus the character of the vocabulary would have formed—to an early scribe—no objection to the passage, while, to us, it is a strong argument for its retention.

(4) The same argument, more or less, applies to δ' and to ε'. Both objections imply that a difficulty found by research would have been stronger than one on the face of the Lucan story,—the use of the two cups. We take it that the copying of codices was not so much the occupation of Fathers and students of "comparative" New Testament theology as of godly men who wrote fair uncial characters and copied with general accuracy. Again, is there any sufficient reason why men of this kind should try to harmonise by

¹ *Cambridge Greek Testament, S. Luke*, p. 371.

creating a greater difficulty? It is obvious, too, that it is hardly consistent to contend that a resemblance to one account and a difference from another should be alike reckoned difficulties: but we, who more thoroughly realise that St. Luke was St. Paul's physician and close friend, and that each of these great men acted on and was influenced by the style of the other, can see a good reason why St. Luke's record should be like St. Paul's, and more or less unlike those of the first two Synoptists. Here, as in (3), the objection itself helps us to an argument in favour of the genuineness of the disputed passage, an argument possessing all the extra weight belonging to a *confirmation* that could not have been worked out at the time when the original codices, *Æ* and the unknown parent of *D*, were written, but can be thoroughly worked out by the critical apparatus at the disposal of us children of a later age.

(5) Against the fuller Lucan account and its correspondence with that of St. Paul, the only real objection urged is that St. Paul, though he retains the order of the first two Synoptists, (or, to use a modern phrase, "the Marcan tradition"), yet speaks of the Elements in the opposite order in another passage. "The cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not a partaking of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not a partaking of the Body of Christ?" We might retort on the exponents of the single canon "*Difficilior præferetur lectio*," that, in this case, there would be a strong reason for supposing that St. Paul had, in the passage just quoted, reversed the true order. But it is not necessary to go so far. We may say (i.) that a deliberate history is more likely to follow its author's ideas as to details than a casual remark, especially as the question of order does not seem to be of any importance for the purpose of reference. (ii.) St. Paul, however, seems to have had a plain reason for the adoption of the reverse order in this passage. It is

followed by the words (translating them correctly), "Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one Body, because we are partakers of the one loaf." I hope to show, later on, that there is a peculiar importance attaching to this latter passage. At present it is enough to say that St. Paul—a master in both style and thought—followed both the natural logic of thought and a sound principle of style in speaking last of the "loaf," as he was about to write further concerning the loaf. (iii.) St. Paul, in his historical account (which he seems to claim as "received" by him in some special way, if not as directly inspired), by his explicit use of the phrase "the cup *after supper*," not only makes it impossible to reconcile his statement with the abbreviated Lucan account, but also seems to confirm, strongly or weakly, the possibility of the use of two cups.

(6) We cannot neglect the fact that, in the universally acknowledged account of what I believe to have been the *first* cup, St. Luke says "δεξάμενος ποτήριον," "having received a cup." In the disputed part, he, like St. Paul, uses no verb. St. Paul allows the missing verb λαβών (*taking*) to be inferred from his description of the consecration of the loaf; St. Luke may very well have done the same. The other Synoptists use "taking" for both the loaf and the cup. If there were a variant reading, the use of a strange verb would be a strong motive to early scribes to change it to the usual verb,—to us, the fact would be rather a reason for retaining δεξάμενος. But there is no variant reading. (i.) The obvious inference is that the early scribes accepted δεξάμενος because λαβών was already present, by implication, in another part of St. Luke's narrative. (ii.) This is quite consistent with the fact that λαβών and δεξάμενος have really different meanings. The absolutely uniform use of λαβών in connexion with the Eucharistic loaf and cup seems to imply that Christ *took* both from the Table Himself;

δεξιμένος, that He *received* the cup from the hands of some one else. The two accounts are not consistent with the "one cup" theory, but they are quite consistent with the "two cup" view. For we know (among other things) that, both at present and for a period that probably included the time of our Lord's ministrations, there are and were several different cups used at the "Memorial Passover," which, by the way, Jews have always carefully distinguished, both in meaning and in ritual, from the actual original Passover kept at the Exodus.

(7) Up to this I have, perhaps, seemed to assume—without giving my reasons—that there is an antecedent historical authority in favour of the use of two cups. A young Oxonian friend summed up the contrary opinion by telling me that "nobody believed there were two cups" at the original Institution of the second Sacrament. So, perhaps, it may be as well to state the plain facts.

It is absolutely certain that the Jews now use *five* cups at different periods of the festal supper, beginning with a cup before eating, and ending with another cup after the meal is over. Dr. Farrar (who, on this point, is really an authority) states this definitely, and gives good reason for believing that it was so in the time of our Lord. To be sure, we do not know the actual details of the Paschal feast as then observed, but we do know that the wine was an unauthorised, though perfectly appropriate, addition to the bare rules of the law; and, knowing this, it is easier to believe that more cups than one were used in our Lord's time than that a single cup has multiplied into five since then. To use a phrase of St. Paul's, "Nature herself" would tell us that the eating of a roast lamb with unleavened bread would be impossible without some liquid refreshment during the feast, as well as after it: and there is no suggestion of and no conformity with Eastern custom in

the use of any other kind of refreshment besides wine. Besides this, several passages in *Ecclesiasticus*—a book which our Lord certainly knew and often referred to—show us that the Jews had, before our Lord's time, begun to speak habitually of a feast as “a banquet of wine.” This does not imply excess, as the wines used by the Jews (as well as those drunk by the Romans) were low in alcoholic strength, and were never used without mixing with water: though, in view of another question, we may say that both the Apocrypha and the New Testament imply that men could get drunk on them. A parallel case is the German *Helles Bier*, on which a student cannot get drunk until he has passed the stage of getting sick after his fifteenth glass; but he faces the situation bravely, and gets drunk somewhere between the fifteenth and the thirtieth. There is therefore no historical difficulty in the fact that two cups are mentioned by St. Luke. On the contrary, the real difficulty is that no one else mentions them. But all imply them, either in the reference to “this fruit of the vine,” or (as St. Paul) by the differentiation of the last cup as “the cup after supper.” We have already seen that the transference of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's *final* words, which follow the direct history of the actual Institution, to the beginning, where St. Luke unites them with the “receiving” and blessing of the first cup, gives them a definite meaning and enables us to harmonise the whole narrative. We may now take a further step. Farrar, though he gives no reason, identifies the former cup with the *third* cup of the Passover: St. Luke, if we follow the longer text, joins this cup and its blessing with our Lord's words concerning the feast in general, spoken at the *beginning* of the feast. This arrangement, too, is absolutely symmetrical: “I will no more eat thereof, etc.”; “I will not drink henceforth, etc.” Perhaps some critics may con-

sider the fact that the reception of the fuller account makes a double symmetry between the words and actions at the beginning and those at the end of the feast an evidence of want of authenticity : I confess that, to me, the accidental bringing out of a symmetry so beautiful and significant seems to point the other way, especially as it coincides with a remarkable set of facts, whose meaning we could not understand without the witness of Jewish ceremonial. It is one of these facts that obliges me to differ from Farrar as to the former cup. The blessing (or thanksgiving—for all Jewish “blessings” are blessings of God, not of things) belonging to the *first* cup still runs, “Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, Who hast created *this fruit of the vine.*” This seems to identify, absolutely, the first cup of St. Luke with the first Paschal cup ; it helps to strengthen the case for the transference of St. Matthew’s and St. Mark’s references to “this fruit of the vine” to the beginning of the feast ; and it makes the whole story, in St. Luke’s longer account, absolutely consistent. So, too, the Jews still call the *last* cup of the Passover “the Cup of Blessing,” doubtless because of its association with the final “grace” or “benediction” of the feast. St. Paul, as we have seen, speaks also of “the Cup of Blessing,” even where he speaks of the cup first. It is entirely unnecessary to do more than mention the wisdom of that greatest disciple of Gamaliel in all matters of Jewish customs, and the close accuracy of that greatest follower of the good side of Pharisaism—Pharisees were simply Jewish Stoics, and even the Stoics had a great deal of good mixed up with their fatalism, the parent of Pharisaic predestinarianism—in everything that pertained to the rites and ceremonies belonging to the Church of Israel, which he left for better things, but loved to the end.

(8) We may now pass on to the next objection. It is

said (5') that, if we accept the theory of two cups, we must also accept the implication that our Lord did not Himself drink of the Eucharistic chalice. Is this necessarily true? And is it necessary to believe that He Himself either ate the Eucharistic loaf or drank from the Eucharistic cup? (i.) We cannot fail to notice that, as the story is told by St. Luke, our Lord made a precisely similar statement as to the Passover—or Paschal meal—which His Apostles were about to eat with Him. Both *may* mean “from this moment,” and both *may* mean “after this feast.” But it is absolutely impossible to take the two statements in different senses. If we accept the first meaning, we must believe that our Lord neither ate nor drank anything at the “Last Supper”—which is possible. If we accept the second, He certainly may have eaten and drunk at the feast, and there is no reason why He should not have drunk from the last cup as well as from the former ones. (ii.) But there is no possible proof, either in or outside the disputed words, that Christ either ate the Eucharistic loaf or drank from the Eucharistic cup. Scripture is strangely reticent on the point. It is true that in both the Anglican and the Roman Use, and, so far as I know, in every Use that has ever existed in Christendom, the Celebrant *must* communicate, whosoever else may fail to do so. This might be taken as evidence that our Lord also communicated. But there is one immense difference between that First Eucharist and every one of its successors. Whatsoever “grace” may be given or meant in the Eucharist, the Celebrant needs it as much as any one else. He, in a manner, represents Christ; he speaks the words Christ spoke, and performs the actions Christ performed; he gives God’s message of peace and goodwill and Eucharistic blessings (whatsoever these may be) to the people. In the Church of England service the Confession is ordered to be

said by "one of the Ministers," i.e., clergy assisting at the Celebration, if there be any, so that the Celebrant cannot say the Confession unless he is celebrating alone. The rubric (which orders the *Minister* saying the Confession, and the people, to kneel) seems to preclude him even from kneeling if he does not say the Confession. The Roman Rite is somewhat different, but only because the Confession and the Absolution that follow are not "Sacramental," the actual Confession and Absolution having been made and given beforehand. In the Constantinopolitan Rite the Confession is whispered, very briefly, in the priest's ear, and an equally brief Absolution given at one of the doors leading into the sanctuary. But amid all varieties of Use, all Christians of every Church know that the Celebrant is as much in need of the Sacrament as any of his flock. From the Pope to the youngest curate of an Anglican Church, all need grace, because all are sinners. But Christ committed no sin, and was pure in Thought, Word and Deed, the very Wisdom, the very Strength, the very Beauty of God—the very God Himself in human form. True Man, He prayed, thanked the Father, did in all good things as His brethren did and do; and He received from the Father, as we all receive, power and knowledge: He tells us so Himself. But He did not need grace; He did not need any further spiritual blessings, seeing that the Father gave Him the Spirit "without measure," and that He was, as He is now, the very Fount of Grace. Therefore He *need* not have received the Eucharist He gave, though, as a matter of fact, we do not know whether He actually did so or not. (iii.) If (as I believe, and there are many strong authorities to support me) the Last Supper was celebrated *before* the time when the Paschal lambs were killed, there was no lamb on the Table. This helps us to understand the meaning of Holy Communion. *He made Himself the*

true Paschal Lamb. This being so, there was every reason why He should *give* "His Body" and "His Blood" (to quote simply His own words) to others; but it entails a strong improbability against His eating the mystic feast itself. So, to sum up the answer to this objection, we may say that the words commented on do not necessarily bear the interpretation put on them; that we do not know, from any source, whether our Lord Himself ate of the Holy Loaf and drank the Cup of Blessing, and that there are several grounds on which it may be reasonably believed that He ate and drank neither. The weight of evidence is, therefore, on this point, against those who urge the objection.

(9) As to the possibility of St. Luke's having followed a "local custom" in the *order* of his description, there are two separate difficulties to be met. Did such a local custom ever exist? If so, for how long a time did it prevail? Under the first question we must ask another, Why does St. Luke himself show no sign of any such custom elsewhere? We are fully justified in identifying the writer of the Third Gospel with the author of—at least—the prologue and the latter part of the Acts: and I at least believe that the hand of the same writer shows, broad and deep, on every page of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have already seen that St. Luke was with St. Paul at the time of the writing of 1 Corinthians. Now, in *all* of these works there is strong evidence that the author put the loaf, in his thoughts, before the cup. We need not go further into the aberrant passage in 1 Corinthians. But we may safely say that in the latter part of the Acts (and in the earlier, for that matter) the "breaking of the loaf" is so strongly marked as to throw the second element into the shadow,—that neither St. Paul nor his secretary seems, at the time when 1 Corinthians was written, to have even

heard of such a local custom,—and that such testimony as is afforded by the Epistle to the Hebrews is against the idea of such a custom existing. The account in 1 Corinthians (as we have seen) strongly resembles St. Luke: if the relative dates allowed us, we could find no objection to its being an excerpt from the Lucan account. It is, at least, an excerpt from the knowledge common to St. Paul and St. Luke: and it follows the same order as St. Luke, if we believe that the first cup mentioned by the Evangelist was *not* Eucharistic. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, again, the allusions to the Eucharist are few, but they are somewhat striking. The writer dwells upon the thought of the Christian Altar as one from which “those who serve the Tabernacle” could not *eat*: I can remember no passage in which he speaks of drinking from the cup; and, most curiously, when he has occasion to speak of the Incarnation, He seems to reverse the order of “flesh” and “blood” deliberately. The reading is certain; he says, “Inasmuch as the children were *partakers of blood and flesh*, etc.” There seems to be only one possible explanation of this. (*a*) The phrase “My flesh and blood” (found in St. John) was already familiar in connexion with the Eucharist; (*β*) the word “*partakers*” suggested the act of communion. St. Luke, therefore, avoided any possible confusion between the “partaking” in the Eucharist and the “partaking” in the Incarnation, by simply reversing the order of the *words*. Is it, then, probable that he (or St. Paul) knew of any “local” custom which would justify him in inverting the order of the acts of Consecration? St. Paul’s nescience as to any such custom goes further. In 2 Corinthians he places the order of the elements as all Christendom knows them now, “And so let him eat of that loaf and drink of that cup.” So, too, in describing the disorder of the *Agapê* at Corinth, when the “hungry navvies” (to use a phrase for which I

must thank Dr. Wright) ate and drank with indecent and profane haste the consecrated Elements and the "Love-feast" together, St. Paul deems it a sufficient description of their sin to say that they ate, "not *separating out*" (*διακρίνων*, A.V., "discerning") "the Lord's body." If he knew of any "local custom" to the contrary, he surely would not have allowed his readers merely to *infer* the presence of and the offence against the second Element. St. John's mystic sayings, again, are against the theory of a "local custom." He indeed gives our Lord's descriptions of Himself as the "Bread of Life" and as the "True Vine" separately; but, when both Elements are alluded to, the "Bread" comes first. "My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed." "Whoso eateth not my flesh nor drinketh my blood, etc."¹

Again, there is no trace of any such local custom in Church history before, during, or after, the age of the great Codices. We may say, then, and say with safety, that there is no evidence of a custom, local or otherwise, of an inversion in the *order* of Consecration having ever existed, anywhere or at any time, except at the present day in Dr. Wright's fertile imagination. But there is, as we have seen, abundant evidence of the use of several cups at the Paschal feast, and we have already seen that there is, at the least, a very high probability of St. Luke's *first* cup corresponding to the first of these, and of his having put the *first* cup and the *last* each in its proper place. To me it is harder to explain why the two earlier Synoptists should have left the first cup unmentioned than why St.

¹ Dr. Wright is perfectly certain that these and other words in St. John apply to the Eucharist, and bases on them a theory that Christ instituted a special method of "breaking bread" near the beginning of His ministry. He ought to have observed that, on this theory, the sacramental use of the cup must have been also an early institution of Christ's, and that the order, as fixed by St. John's quotations, must have been constant from the beginning.

Luke should have mentioned a thing so obviously belonging to the feast : but, in all probability, the omission is due to the fact that they did not find it necessary to speak of what every one knew, more especially because there must have been *some* risk of a confusion between the first cup and the real chalice.¹

(10) Finally, we may put together several facts corroborative of the belief that the suspected passage in St. Luke must be genuine. The question as to the possibility of scandal from omission or addition works both ways : it gives us no grounds for forming an opinion, and simply throws us back on external evidence. We have already seen that *no* existent New Testament text can claim to be final. The disputed words certainly existed in the fourth century codices, and, if they were inserted, they must have been inserted long before that period. On the other hand, their omission cannot well have taken place until at least the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, (since D's omission of the words is corroborated by no earlier codex), so that belief in their authenticity has at least antiquity in its favour. We cannot, of course,—until a thorough exploration of all the early Fathers and Liturgies has been made—urge “General Acceptance” in favour of the disputed passage ; but the great Codices are the

¹ In some countries, after the Roman Catholic Church had ceased to give the chalice to the laity, a draught of *unconsecrated* wine was administered to the sick, to facilitate the deglutition of the Host. That custom *might* lead, under certain circumstances, to a confusion between this draught and the consecrated wine. So, too, in the purely Missionary days of Christianity, the mention of the *first* Cup might lead to a confusion between it and the true “Cup of Blessing.” This seems to me a sufficient reason for both the omission of the first cup in the Matthew-Marcan accounts, and for the transference of the blessing of the first cup to the end of the narrative. If the later accounts were maimed, either in the papyri or on parchment, between their first appearance and the time of the exemplars of the great Codices, the well-known (and, in itself, justifiable) tendency to de-paschalise the surroundings of the Eucharist would give a strong *subjective* motive for the omission in the first two Synoptists.

nearest approach we can get to the general acceptance, at their date, of words that have certainly been almost universally accepted ever since.

Joining these latter points with the examination of internal probability that precedes them, and adding to all this the further fact that the external evidence in favour of the disputed words is overwhelmingly convincing, no reasonable and unprejudiced thinker could fail to accept as final—so far as any evidence of the kind can be final—the *dicta* of documentary evidence and the plain probabilities of common-sense and internal criticism. These can hardly lie to us; but a system of guess-work that is, from its very nature, capable of being so fashioned as to fit either side in an argument, is, at the least, absolutely unnecessary until the state of the text and the necessity of meeting difficulties that cannot be otherwise explained call us by stern necessity to what is at the best a somewhat hopeless and misleading task.

We may, then, summarise our results. (1) The disputed passage in St. Luke shows every mark, external and internal, of authenticity. (2) Its admission makes it necessary to believe that St. Luke speaks of the Consecration of *two* cups at the Last Supper. (3) St. Luke joins the declaration and the words of blessing of the *first* cup with a similar declaration of our Lord's as to the whole feast. (4) There is no doubt whatsoever as to the *order* in which our Lord consecrated the loaf and the Eucharistic cup. (5) The *first* cup preceded the feast, and was *not* Eucharistic. (6) St. Paul's account *implies* the use of a cup before the Eucharistic chalice; his omission of any reference to that cup is absolutely intelligible. (7) So, too, the omission of any similar *direct* reference in St. Matthew and St. Mark is intelligible, but both have an *indirect* reference, though misplaced. (8) By replacing their reference in its proper order,

the whole account, derived from its four sources, is intelligible and self-consistent, and reveals the Scriptural truth of the tradition that is embodied in the order of Consecration and administration now used through all Christendom.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

A PLEA FOR THE RECOGNITION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS AN HISTORICAL AUTHORITY.

IN four articles published under the general title "The Scribes of the Nazarenes"¹ I have endeavoured to show by examples that the trustees of the Christian Tradition were Jews after all. They have brought upon me the criticism that it is misleading to over-emphasize the Rabbi in Jesus. To this I take leave to reply that some of the contemporaries of our Lord regarded Him and revered Him as a Rabbi. Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians propounded to Him their problems not always nor only with malicious intentions.

That He was more than a Rabbi His followers realized, but He was not less. The title, like that of Scribe, has fallen on evil days and tongues since those early days when the Gentiles were as yet outside the Christian Church. But such popular misconceptions do not constitute a valid objection to the truth of this aspect of our Lord which is put before us in the Gospels. As St. Paul affirmed, *Christ became a minister of the circumcision, that He might make good the promises given to the fathers.*² He came to His own home-folk as Prophet and Rabbi. In His earthly ministry He was one of the order of God's messengers, which He described as including *Prophets, Sages and Scribes*. In His teaching He employed the Scripture as other Scribes. And the records show—for all the generations of Gentiles who have handled them—that He did not disdain to use

¹ EXPOSITOR, March, 1906, July, 1906, January, 1907, March, 1907.

² Romans xv. 8.