

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

PART III.

V. In studying the text of Luke, the first question at every point must be what relation exists between his narrative and that of Mark, which was employed by him and to a large extent incorporated in his Gospel. Yet Luke rarely contents himself with merely transcribing Mark. Apart from stylistic improvements, which may be disregarded as adding nothing to the meaning, he often works into passages taken from Mark new statements, which are best explained as obtained from a different authority:¹ in such places he took Mark's narrative as his basis, and treated other narratives, oral or written, as subsidiary. In other places he took a different narrative as his basis. No one doubts that he had access to various accounts of the life of Jesus; he himself says that several older written histories were in existence when he began to compose his biography, and that he had access to even better sources of information than any of those earlier historians. There is no reason to doubt that he often was in possession of more than one authoritative account of an incident; and there need be no hesitation in assuming that he worked up one authority by incorporating in it details taken from another. "Can we determine what authorities he used, and how he treated the narrative of Mark in his account of the Last Supper?"

That Luke used Mark as his fundamental authority in describing the preparation of the Feast is certain: 22⁷⁻¹³ corresponds to Mk 14¹²⁻¹⁶ and to Mt 26¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Matthew has shortened Mark, and it would be instructive to observe how the shortening is achieved, e.g. the despatch of two disciples to find and prepare the room is omitted; and if we had no other narrative than Matthew's, it would be natural to understand that all the Twelve went for this purpose; yet it is certain (and accepted by almost all scholars) that Matthew had Mark's narrative before him, and there is no reason

to think that he intended to dissent from his authority in this one point. It is merely his brevity which lends itself to a misunderstanding. Luke, on the other hand, names the two disciples that were sent, Peter and John,² and mentions an order which Jesus gave them, and which elicits from them the question, 'Where wilt thou that we make ready?' Mark and Matthew give this question in a longer form, 'Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the Passover?'³ This question includes in itself the statement which Luke puts in the initial command of Jesus, 'Go and make ready for us the Passover, that we may eat.'

Luke is at this point fuller and more detailed than Mark; and yet he agrees almost verbally with the latter in the rest of the narrative, vv. 7-18. It is therefore evident and certain that Luke used Mark as his fundamental authority here, adding from some other source of information the names of the two disciples, making their action stand out more prominently in the incident, and slightly modifying the initial stage. Whether this modification is preferable need not be discussed: Luke thought so. Probably there is much abbreviation in both accounts.

After this Luke abandons Mark, and follows another authority. V.¹⁴ might indeed be taken as a modified form of Mk 14¹⁷; but the words are quite different, and probably come from a different source; and the indication of the coming betrayal, and the denunciation of the betrayer, which Mark and Matthew place at an early stage in the Feast, are postponed by Luke until a later moment, and are described in terms which differ so much that they must rest on some other authority. According to Luke, Judas Iscariot was present at the solemn ceremony in which the Eucharist was instituted. Mark and Matthew, while they do not actually say

¹ The point is discussed at length in the first paper in *Luke the Physician, and other Studies* (e.g. p. 44). Some scholars assume that in making such additions to the Marcan original Luke had no other authority, and simply added them in all cases for literary reasons, to give breadth and tone to the scene. With this view I cannot agree.

² There seems no reason to doubt that, in making such an addition, Luke had another authority, whether oral or written we need not here ask. The assumption that he stated the names without knowledge is contrary to the whole spirit of his treatment of Mark;

³ Matthew shortens the question a little.

that Judas had left the room before the ceremony; mention the denunciation as preceding the Bread and the Cup, and thus suggest that Judas was no longer present; for John says that Judas went out immediately after the denunciation (which he describes with slightly varying details).

We must follow Luke here. He is quite clear as to the presence of Judas, and Mark is not quite clear or positive as to his absence. Now there was no probability that any narrator would through error introduce the traitor into the most solemn ceremony of the Church; but there was a natural tendency to forget or ignore his presence there, and this tendency has probably affected Mark.

Comparison with the Fourth Gospel makes the sequence of the events clearer. Judas was denounced and went out before the supper was finished; but Luke and Paul are positive that the Cup was drunk after the supper. We must conclude that the two parts of the rite were separated on that occasion by some considerable interval, during which Judas departed from the room. In the Synoptists this interval is slurred over (except that Luke's expression 'the Cup after the supper' implies it). The Church ritual ignored the interval, and made the second part follow immediately after the first. The narrative of Mark and Matthew, and one of the narratives in Luke, were strongly influenced by the familiar ritual, which (as we have seen) exercised great power over all subsequent writers. The two parts of the rite are therefore closely conjoined by all three; and the denunciation of Judas had to be placed either before or after. Mark puts it before, and Luke puts it after the rite. In actual fact it happened between the eating of the Bread and the drinking of the Cup. The meeting at the Table, therefore (as was natural), lasted a long time; and there was abundant opportunity for the discourse which John records. The Synoptists mention only one or two incidents in the long meeting.

Luke therefore followed at this stage an authority whom he counted better than Mark. Now, in vv. 15, 16, he quotes words of Jesus which seem appropriate to the beginning of the Supper, and which have nothing exactly corresponding to them in the Mark or Matthew: 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you that I will not eat it, until it be completed in the kingdom of God.' What is the meaning of these enigmatic words?

It is usual among commentators to understand, 'I will not eat it *after the present occasion*.' While I would not say that this meaning is impossible, I much prefer the simple interpretation advocated by Professor Burkitt in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, p. 569.¹ 'I will not eat this passover,' a plain intimation that the present meal was not the Passover proper. These words dropped out of the memory and the record as the erroneous idea affected Mark that the present meal was the Jewish Passover. Luke has repeated some of Mark's erroneous expressions on this point; but he also preserves clear evidence of the truth, as it appears from John, that this meal took place twenty-four hours before the Passover meal proper.

What, then, is the force of the conjunction 'for'? On the interpretation of the commentators I see no explanation of it. According to our theory there is an ellipse of the kind common before a statement introduced by 'for' (γὰρ): 'I eagerly desired² to eat this passover with you before I suffer [but this cannot be], for I will not eat it, until the act be completed in the kingdom of heaven.'

The following two verses (17, 18) belong to the same narrative and authority as 15, 16. They clearly describe the same act as Mk 14²⁷⁻²⁹, but are taken from some other Source, as a comparison shows:

MARK 14²³⁻²⁵.

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank of it.¹ And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many. 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.

LUKE 22^{17, 18}.

And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves: for

I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

The parallel and the differences are patent. Luke has not the words of consecration (Mk 14²⁸). Must

¹ In the first draft of this paper, written in 1900, I took this view; and it was largely the hesitation to differ from so many high authorities that led me to postpone publication until I had thought over the matter longer. Professor Harnack, in *Theolog. Litztg.* 1908, also approves of this interpretation (as Professor A. Souter informs me).

² Aorist, not perfect tense: the force of the aorist is not easily caught in English. At some moments one feels that the perfect gives it best, at other moments one sees it best in our past tense, and so on. Yet some too modern scholars think that the tenses were being confused with one another.

we conclude that the Source which he here uses omitted those words? I think not: Luke found them in the Source, but himself omitted them, because they were to come in what seemed to him a more appropriate place in verse.

There follows in vv.^{19, 20} a formal narrative of the institution of the Eucharist as a regular ceremony of the Christian society. The narrative corresponds to Mk 14²²⁻²⁵, Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁹ (Mark being the Source, Matthew the reproduction). It is usually assumed by the modern scholars that Luke here followed Mark, and that either he completed his primary authority from some other Source,¹ or his narrative has been supplemented by a later hand, and was originally much shorter than Mark. A comparison of the two accounts, indicating by italics slight differences, due to the character and style of each narrative, and by capitals important differences:

MARK 14²²⁻²⁵.

And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had BLESSED, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body.

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood OF the covenant, which is shed for MANY, etc. (as above.

Westcott and Hort, followed by some other recent scholars, regard the words of Luke in v.¹⁹ after 'This is my body,' and the whole of v.²⁰, as an early interpolation. These words are omitted in the Bezan Codex and a few related manuscripts or versions—*i.e.* the so-called Western text of Luke does not contain them. It is argued that addition is more probable than omission, but this seems a feeble argument, involving a modern point of view, and inharmonious with the ancient way of thinking. Later readers of the history, and modern scholars, have felt eager to gather every item of information about the life of the Saviour; but the ancient view

LUKE 22^{19, 20}.

And he took bread, and when he had GIVEN THANKS, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body WHICH IS GIVEN FOR YOU: THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.

And the cup *in like manner after supper*,² saying, This cup is the NEW covenant IN my blood, even that which is poured out for YOU.

in religious matters rather preferred to avoid anything wrong or inharmonious than to treasure up everything that could be gathered together. Hence the tendency during the earliest period in the transmission of the text was rather towards omission than towards addition.³ The great crime was unjustifiable addition: silence was safe in religious ritual.

Moreover, there was a strong reason suggesting that omission was needed here. In Luke, vv.¹⁷⁻¹⁸ describe the giving of the cup, and v.¹⁹ the giving of the bread. The giving of the cup a second time in v.²⁰ seemed wrong; and when it was omitted, there resulted a description of the ceremony in its two stages, in which the cup was first and the bread last. It is certain that this false opinion about the order gained ground in some places, for that is the order mentioned in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a document probably of the second century.⁴ The reason why this false opinion spread probably is that it was based on the false interpretation of Luke.

There was also probably a tendency to assimilate the text of the three Evangelists about this ceremony. There was little comparative critical faculty in the ancient Church; and generally in the Gospels there is little trace of attempted assimilation or harmonizing of the narratives; but in the account of this impressive and frequently repeated ceremony there probably did grow up some feeling of the inconsistency between Luke and the other two Gospels.

Through these two causes there came about the omission of v.²⁰ and the last words of v.¹⁹ (which Mark does not admit). We confidently accept the fuller narrative of Luke, as it is given in all the most important manuscripts, in the overwhelming majority of authorities, and in the received text.

We have, then, in Luke's text two distinct accounts of the Supper, the first incomplete, the second complete. The first was probably cut by Luke, because the second was the most detailed and corresponded best to the actual ceremony as it was celebrated in the churches which he knew. He felt that he must give the second account entire, but from the first he was free to cut out the words which were repeated in the second.

³ The one marked exception is the Bezan Text of Acts.

⁴ As has been pointed out, this order was not thought of or known to Paul, though some have falsely inferred from I Co 10 that it was practised by him.

¹ The two stages 7 and 8 are both given; Paul omits 8.

² Luke's brief word, 'in like manner,' sums up all the stages, as previously stated, and as given more fully by Mark.

Why, then, did Luke not combine the two accounts, instead of leaving them side by side in his text? The answer is that he did not feel free to work them into one, because he felt bound to leave the second unchanged in its simplicity, corresponding to the ceremony as he knew it; and because he wished to leave each of two revered authorities as it was, without additions.

If the second account was confirmed by the usage of the Church, and Luke felt himself not at liberty to change it in any way, why did he give the first at all? Why not omit it? His reason evidently was that he had this account from an authority which he believed to be absolutely trustworthy, and which he could not disregard, even though it did not agree entirely with the settled form of the Church ceremony. Such high authority could not belong to any one except an eye-witness: either orally or in writing, Luke knew the account given by one of those who had been present 'even as they delivered' it to him, 'which from the beginning were ministers and eye-witnesses of the Word.' If the account was given orally, we should not be able to get any further; but if he found it in a written source, we might proceed to inquire whether this was Q, the lost common Source of Matthew and Luke, which (as I have tried¹ to show) was a narrative contemporary with the events.

The latter supposition seems to me, on the whole, perhaps more probable. There is naturally much reason to suppose that Q would contain the events of this night; the whole burden of proof lies with him who would maintain the negative. One who from day to day set down in writing what he had seen of the life of Christ, and what he had heard from His lips, could hardly be conceived as omitting this incident.

This supposition, then, would require us also to suppose that Q also contained the events of the following day, the Trial and Crucifixion; and I have elsewhere maintained that Q was written before the Death of Christ; but the two positions are not inconsistent. Q was a sort of diary, written from time to time, as the events occurred, and had therefore no thought of the Death of Christ as the culmination and explanation of His life; and yet it concluded with a narrative of the events of that last day. Luke, with Q before him, would be unlikely to omit this part of the document.

¹ In a paper on 'The Oldest Written Gospel' in *Luke the Physician, and other Studies*.

Now these verses suit the character of Q well. They are largely sayings. Narrative plays a very small part in them. The Church ceremony, as it established itself, tended to prevent any fuller narrative being written. As we have seen, Luke did not feel free to add anything to the settled form of words, but sets down that form by itself, and places beside it, but not in it, the additional information which he possessed. Yet that form of words was, undoubtedly, abbreviated from the longer incident as it really occurred. A contemporary writer noted down the fuller words, including both those that were taken into the Church ceremony and others that were omitted in the ceremony. From John we know that far more was said at the Supper than appears in any or all of the other authorities.

This supposition leaves one very serious difficulty: how can it be supposed that Matthew here deserted Q completely and preserved no trace of it? I fully acknowledge the difficulty, and cannot answer it or propose any solution. Many will probably consider that Luke's authority in vv.^{15, 16} is not Q, but the account, probably oral, of some other witness; and there is much to be said for that view. I would only urge that there is in men a certain element of individual freedom in choice, and that we cannot always understand why another person will choose just so many things out of a larger number, and leave some which others, and we personally, would value equally or even more. There always remains this incalculable element in the use of historical or literary Sources; and modern investigators do not always allow sufficiently for it, and are resolutely bent on framing a theory which will account for everything without taking this element into the reckoning. Moreover, we must remember that Q differed here from Mark and from the established form of the rite, containing words which were not taken into the Church rite, abbreviated as the rite was. Mark certainly felt it best to be guided greatly by the rite as it was celebrated in his time. Might not Matthew also feel the same? Fortunately, John had no such feeling, and stated very fully his impression of the whole scene and the teaching which was then given, untrammelled by the limitations of the Church rite; and Luke also preferred to mention what he found in a thoroughly good authority.

We must, for the present, leave it quite an open question whether the other authority used by Luke at this point was Q, or a third written Source, or

an oral narrative. My own inclination is towards either the first or the third of these alternatives. His fundamental account in vv.^{19, 20} we take to be simply an account of the Church Rite, as it was known to him. We never escape from the overmastering influence of this Rite: it affects every writer in one way or another.

Luke's second account is evidently the one which he regarded as fundamental. The other account was intended as subsidiary, and was mutilated to avoid repeating anything that was given in the fundamental account; and yet it was authoritative to Luke in the highest degree.

We have seen why it was so authoritative to him that he could not pass it by; but there rises another question. If it was so authoritative, why did he make it subsidiary, and mutilate it? and if it was subsidiary, why did he place the subsidiary and incomplete account first, and the fundamental account second? To do that was to obscure the

sequence and to invite misapprehension. Such was the result that followed. Luke's narrative has been misunderstood, tampered with, and mutilated repeatedly in subsequent times, because his method was misunderstood. When we place ourselves at the proper point of view, everything becomes quite simple; and we see that the subsidiary account had to come first, because its opening words are introductory to the incident as a whole; they could not possibly be placed after vv.^{19, 20}. Mark and Matthew require an introductory phrase to place their narrative of the ceremony in the context, 'And as they were eating, he took bread.' Luke, in his fundamental account, simply says, 'And he took bread,' because the preceding words stated the situation sufficiently. After the ceremony proper Matthew and Mark add a verse, which Luke keeps in the subsidiary account, because it was closely parallel to a sentence in it, which had not been taken into the Church order of the ceremony.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

THE HEAVENLY CITY.

ITS OUTCASTS AND ITS INHABITANTS.

REVELATION XXI. 27.

'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.'—R.V.

THE ideal city which St. John depicts is not heaven, except in so far as heaven is already latent in the earth and shall finally be realized in it. The indications of the path of interpretation are clear. The ideal city is the Holy Jerusalem, and stands in contrast to the great city Babylon. Whether we take them separately, or oppose them to one another, their meaning is obvious. It is certainly not heaven and hell that they represent, but rather the forces and dominions upon earth of good and evil. Jerusalem represents here, as it does in ancient prophecy—upon which the pictures of this book are almost entirely based—the people of God upon earth, in their holy character and their organized force. If there were any doubt of

this, the added picture of 'the Bride, the Lamb's wife,' would remove all uncertainty. For, whether we turn to the Old Testament or the New, the metaphor is consistently applied to the covenant people of God. The ideal city, therefore, represents the Church of Christ in its ideal meaning and its ideal attainment. It is not a 'jeweller's shop,' as some have called it in supercilious and ignorant scorn. It is a symbolic picture of the spiritual power and grandeur which God has destined for the earth.¹

It is the glorified Church that is here spoken of, and hence the text may be said to refer to heaven, for at the present moment the nucleus of the glorified Church is in heaven, and from heaven every defiled thing must be shut out. Hence, too, it may refer to the kingdom of the millennial age, when the saints will reign with Christ upon the earth for a thousand years, when even upon this battlefield our conquering Leader shall be crowned with victory, and where His blood was shed His throne shall be set up, for among the sons of men shall He triumph, even among those that spat in His face. The text may also be read as including the eternal world of future bliss, for of that glorious, endless, undefiled inheritance the

¹ J. Thomas, *The Ideal City*, 4.