

gether fair controversy in America, with which we on this side of the Atlantic have no concern. Professor Hilprecht, however, laid himself open to attack by claiming for his text that it was not only an early version, but the earliest at present known. But this cannot be proved, as it is undated, and the forms of the characters are not older than the close of the Khammu-rabi period, while a fragment of a version discovered by Professor Scheil a few years ago is actually dated in the reign of the fourth successor of Khammu-rabi. Moreover, it must be remembered that the well-known version of the story discovered by George Smith goes back, like the epic in which it is embodied, to the Khammu-rabi age, though the edition of it which has come down to us belongs to the time of Assur-bani-pal.

The new text is but a fragment, and the translation of what remains, therefore, is not always very easy. I cannot follow Professor Hilprecht in reading what is left of line 12 (. . . *ku um mi ni*) as *ku mi ni* 'instead of a number,' though I am unable to suggest any alternative rendering. At all events, I do not know what he could be thinking of in proposing to translate the biblical

l'minêhu 'instead of a number'; the Hebrew words could never mean this.

But I am at one with him in holding that the Babylonian story of the Deluge, with its close approximation to the language of Genesis, was known to the Hebrews before the Mosaic age, and I cannot do better than quote some of his concluding words: 'There remains no other period to be considered when the oldest version of the Deluge story could possibly have entered Canaan than the time when Abraham, whom I regard as a truly historical person, left his home on the Euphrates and moved westward; in other words, the period of the first dynasties of Isin and Babylon, of which Khammu-rabi or Amraphel is the central figure. This is the time when the Amorites knocked at the gates of Babylonia, invaded the country, and soon overthrew the old order of things, at the same time getting themselves intimately acquainted with Babylonian literature and civilization, which they finally accepted.' Abraham was an Amorite in the Babylonian acceptance of the name, and, as one of the upper classes, would have been educated in the learning of the Babylonians.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

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

PART IV.

On the theory above stated about Luke's two authorities, we assume that there was some considerable difference between them in word, but not in fact. The contemporary authority (lost, except as Luke preserves it) mentioned words that were not taken into the Church Rite, and there is a noteworthy difference between Mark and Luke as to the words spoken after the Cup, about which I do not venture to make any suggestion. But with regard to the general fact of difference between the two authorities, it is sufficient to prove their absolute independence of one another, but not sufficient to show any inconsistency or contradiction. Rather, it amounts simply to the degree of difference that will always be found between two witnesses reporting without mutual consultation part of the words and acts of a

rather complicated incident. According to our view, the difference would probably have been greater, had it not been for the influence of the Church Rite, which preserved the memory of the central and most important part of the whole series of acts and words.

The variation in form between Lk 22^{16,18}, parallel as they are in most respects, is also highly important: 'I say unto you, I will not eat (this Passover), until,' etc., and, 'I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until,' etc. Jesus, as we know, ate the meal, and did not merely give to the disciples to eat, but He did not eat this Passover. Hence, while eating the meal, He says, 'I will not eat the passover, until.' . . . On the other hand, in respect of the wine, which formed no part of the Passover, He

says, 'I will not after this occasion drink until the kingdom of God shall come' (or, as Mark has it, 'until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God'). The variation between the two sayings in Luke seems certainly original; yet it appears not to have been understood and to have been the cause of some difficulty to the earliest historians.

Some minor divergences in the details may be noted. Luke says, 'divide it amongst yourselves,' while Matthew has 'drink ye all of it.' The difference in the verb is doubtless due to varying translations of the Aramaic word used by the Saviour.¹ Mark, on the other hand, changes the imperative to the indicative, 'and they all drank of it': it seems beyond question that here Luke and Matthew preserve the truer form; but the command was followed by the act: some give the command, Mark mentions the act; but each implies the other, and it was sufficient to mention either alone. The divergence between 'shed for many'² and 'for you,' though slight, is not easy to explain satisfactorily, though one might easily suggest possible theories. The command respecting the Cup, 'Take this: Divide it among yourselves' (or, 'Drink ye all of it'), is doubtless original; but being as a repetition unnecessary, it was shortened by Mark and Matthew, and omitted in the Church ceremony so far as reported by Luke and Paul. It was necessary in the original action, because there was an interval between the two acts, the Bread and the Cup (as the expression of Luke shows 'after supper,' referring to the time when the wine was ordinarily served after the conclusion of the meal). When the two acts follow immediately one on the other, as in the ceremony, it was unnecessary to repeat the command.

It is needless to say that we must wholly and absolutely reject any theory which assumes that Luke had only Mark as an authority, and that divergences from Mark are to be explained as interpolations made in his text on the authority of Paul's account in First Corinthians. No such theory is sufficient; for it affords no explanation

¹ It is not necessary in a case like this to have recourse to the fashionable theory that Luke misread an Aramaic word. Independent renderings of the same words are quite sufficient to account for the facts.

² Matthew's addition 'for remission of sins' is probably explanatory, and not true to the original.

of the prophecy regarding the Passover which Luke, and Luke alone, records; and in other respects it fails to explain the literary facts.

As there are two accounts which we have found united by Luke, we might perhaps expect that he would put first that which he took as the standard, namely, vv.^{19, 20}, and afterwards append the subsidiary account so far as he retained it. Such was the case in the Old Syriac Version of the Sinaitic Codex (recovered and published by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson). Now the Sinaitic Syriac seems undoubtedly to carry us back to a text of Luke existing in the second century: it reveals to us, therefore, an older form of the text than any other authority exhibits. Can we then infer that it gives us the true, original Lucan order, which has been disturbed in the Greek? This is improbable for two reasons: (1) No explanation can account for the change from Sinaitic order to the Greek, if the Sinaitic was original; but there was great temptation to change the Greek order into the Sinaitic, if the Greek was original. (2) The Sinaitic order is not got merely by a simple transposition; it breaks up the two accounts, and mixes them: in short, it is conflate and secondary, while the Greek, in comparison, is primary.

But the great value of the Sinaitic Text in this passage lies herein. It proves, in the first place, that the whole of the second account, as given in vv.^{19, 20}, was in the Greek text from which the Sinaitic Syriac was translated in the second century; and disproves beyond reasonable question the theory, already utterly improbable on many grounds that the Bezan Text is right in leaving out vv.^{19b, 20}. In the second place, the Sinaitic Syriac Text takes us into the midst of the work and thought which were being applied during the second century in the Churches from Antioch to Ephesus to the study of the New Testament, and to the modernization and adaptation of the language of the historical books to the practical needs of the time. The process is precisely the same as we find to have been carried out in the Bezan Texts of *Acts*³ on a far greater scale.

³ According to the writer's theory (often misstated by its critics) that the Bezan Text of Acts is largely a modernization; but it is founded on a far earlier and in some ways better copy of the book than survives in any MS., and therefore in some cases preserves, or points the way to, a better text than any which we now possess.

The Sinaitic translator (probably working in Antioch) either used a Greek MS. in which already the text had been transposed and remodelled, or he transposed as he translated: the former is the more natural and probable course: the translator merely translated, and we must dismiss as unlikely the other supposition that the translator himself made the transposition. Moreover, the Bezan Revision seems to have been founded on a Text in which the transposition had already been accomplished; and there can hardly be any doubt that the old Text which lies behind that Revision was Greek and of date not later than the second century.

The Bezan editor was also displeased with the account. The double Cup offended him most, and he dropped out the second Cup, leaving the wrong order. Then the process was carried further: the Cup was transposed to follow the Bread, which (owing to the omission) was now possible in a simple way; and this form of text occurs in a very few MSS. The Sinaitic Syriac carries us back to a MS. in which the Bezan omission had not been made.

Our theory, then, as to Luke's authorities at this point, is that he had before him, first, Mark, whose account he regarded as being, not incorrect, but secondary; secondly, the Church Rite, as he had seen it all over the Christian world, everywhere similar;¹ thirdly, a narrative contemporary (as I believe), coming from one of those who were present. But even this last account, though he preserved from it something which was not taken into the Church Rite, was treated by him as subsidiary, and the Rite was the prime authority.

We do not here follow the usual procedure in comparing the Third Gospel with the First and Second. The general procedure is to take everything in the entire Lucan passage that agrees with the accounts of Matthew and Mark as adopted from the common Synoptist source. It then becomes an insoluble puzzle why Luke should put the Cup before the Bread, contrary to the unanimous

¹ His thought is exactly the same in character as that which was expressed about 192 A.D. by Avircius, Presbyter-Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia (St. Abercius), who describes his travels to Rome on the west, to Nisibis beyond Euphrates on the east, and adds, 'Everywhere I found pledged Brethren,' adding a veiled account of the Rite of the sacred meal, the Fish (*i.e.* Christ) and the Wine, the mixed cup according to the ordinary ancient custom of giving mixed, not pure wine.

tradition, and the undoubted order in the rite as actually celebrated.

But it is, of course, certain that in all accounts from every source there would be much agreement. Therefore we must not assume that everything in Luke's account which agrees with Matthew and Mark is derived from a common source. Rather we hold that in both Luke's authorities the order was, first Bread, then Cup; and that excision from the first authority produces the appearance that he gives the reverse order. A too eager desire to be careful, and not to lose any important detail, or to alter any transmitted word,² has introduced some confusion into his account.

VI. At this point it will be useful to mention the account given by Justin Martyr of the sacrament as it was celebrated in his time. His conversion to Christianity occurred somewhere under Hadrian's reign, *i.e.* between 117 and 138 A.D.; and therefore his knowledge of the form in which the Rite was celebrated goes back to that time, since it is evident that he was unconscious of any change having taken place in the ceremonial during his own time, and that he confidently regarded the forms as having come down unchanged from the time of the Apostles, *i.e.* from the original institution by the Lord. His evidence is valuable, because he gives both a brief account of the ceremonial as it actually was performed in the Church during his experience and a rough quotation of the record of the Apostles: *οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἀ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλλαι αὐτοῖς: τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν: 'τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου.' καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν: 'τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου.'* He regarded this Apostolic record as corresponding in every essential to the ceremony as he knew it in the Church.

In the first place, as to what Justin meant by the Gospels, I think that after much discussion it has now come to be generally accepted that the four canonical Gospels were in existence in his time; and they were therefore meant by him here. It does not follow that he thought all four were written by Apostles; but he took them all as being record of Apostolic authority, and two at least as being

² To omit part of an authority was not the same as altering it. Omission was freely practised, and was often regarded as right.

actually the work of Apostles. In this case he has in mind the Synoptists. His quotation is only from memory; and it gives in a shortened form the substance of the three accounts which we have. Evidently he thinks of Luke especially. He uses, like Luke, the word 'thank,' not 'bless' (as Mark and Matthew do): he mentions the order to 'do this in remembrance of me,' which Luke alone records; and he uses the phrase 'in like manner,' when he mentions the Cup, implying a repetition of acts and words, as Luke does (but not the other two); though *ὁμοίως* occurs to his memory in place of the synonym *ὡσαύτως*, which is Luke's word. He therefore was acquainted with the longer form of Luke's narrative, and not the shorter Western texts, for it seems quite unreasonable to suppose that he followed Paul in preference to the Gospels, summing up loosely an Epistle of Paul among the *ἀπομνημόνεύματα* called *εὐαγγέλια*.

In the next place, he regarded the varying accounts given by the Synoptists as in essential agreement with one another. He quotes Luke as approaching most closely to the actual Church Rite; but, with the Rite in his memory as a guide, he saw no practical difference between the various accounts. Such is the real fact. The three accounts, when understood in connexion with the Rite, are in perfect agreement; they do not choose the same details for record, but they all imply the same series of acts and words, for the details which they mention require inexorably that the other details, which they omit, must take place. Even the command, 'do this in memory of me,' is, as we saw, presupposed in the narrative of Matthew and Mark and taken for granted as familiar to all. What they record loses almost all its importance, unless it were intended (as Paul says it was) to be the institution of a Rite for future repetition. Hence Justin says that, according to the Apostolic tradition in the Gospels, the command was issued (to do as the Church habitually did): he considers that this command is implied in all the accounts, though he expresses his informal quotation on the lines of Luke, as giving the clearest statement. The account of Matthew and Mark becomes intelligible only through its historic character as the expression of the reason for, and as hinting at the truth embodied in, an established custom of the early Church.

In the third place, Justin clearly distinguishes between the Rite and the Apostolic narratives.

He describes the Rite in chap. 65 of his first Apology, and in the following chapter he quotes the narratives as the justification and explanation of the Rite. The narratives are accounts of the historical facts, out of which the Rite originated. They were written by authors who were familiar with the Rite, and who wrote for readers that were familiar with it; and those authors had always an eye to the ceremonial of the Rite, but still they were not describing the Rite: they were describing its historical origin in certain actions of the Lord. This is extremely important in its bearing on their value as historical authorities.

Justin, unfortunately, does not describe so fully as we should wish, the ceremonial of the Rite, nor the words uttered by the celebrant ('him who was the leader among the Brethren,' τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν); but it is interesting to observe two things: (1) The celebrant used words which explain the divergence between Luke on the one hand, and Mark with Matthew on the other hand, as to the opening words. Luke speaks of 'giving thanks,' Mark and Matthew of 'blessing.' Justin says that the celebrant first 'sends up praise and glory to the Father,' etc., and then 'makes a thanksgiving' (εὐχαριστίαν . . . ποιῆται); the first stage corresponds better to the Marcan term 'bless,' the second to the Lucan term 'give thanks'; and it is clear that (as was stated in an earlier paragraph) both terms are correct descriptions of the words used by Jesus on the historic occasion, and repeated in every celebration of the Rite.

(2) Justin also makes it quite clear that the celebrant spoke at some considerable length. We cannot doubt that much which he said was traditional, being the stereotyped and prescribed repetition of the original words. The proof seems complete that (as we have assumed above) Jesus spoke at far greater length than the Synoptists record. They give only a very brief statement of what they considered the most important details; and no two persons will ever agree exactly in giving a short résumé of the most important points of a series of acts and words. Matthew, though at this point repeating Mark, modifies him in certain points; and we must hold (as above stated) that he did so with the intention of improving him and making his narrative correspond more closely with the Rite.

After all is said, the ceremony as performed in

the early Church stands out more and more prominently as the best and the chief and the sufficient authority for the original facts. Such must be the historian's judgment.

We notice that Justin uses the same word as Paul about the transmission of the record: the Apostles *παρέδωκαν*, 'handed on the record that an order was given to them.' Similarly, Paul says *παρέδωκα ὑμῖν*, 'I have handed on the record to you Corinthians.' The trustworthiness of the tradition originating from historical facts and from the words and actions of the Lord is assumed by both writers as the fundamental truth in this matter.

It should not be left out of notice that Justin knew the Rite to be celebrated with the mixed Cup, water and wine (just as Avircius Marcellus in his epitaph, about thirty years later than Justin's death, mentions the *κέρασμα μετ' ἄρτου*). We cannot, on the principles which guide this investigation, doubt that such was the original form and the fact of the Last Supper; but this is probably to be attributed not to any mystic or hieratic intention, but to the regular and usual custom of the time. The Last Supper was an ordinary meal, which became epoch-making in its consequences and accompaniments; it was served in the customary fashion, with wine after the food had been eaten: this wine was mixed with water, because that was the invariable usage (except among persons who intended to become excited and intoxicated).

Now, according to the fashion which we see acting so effectively in the records, namely, that a series of associated acts might be briefly summed

up by mentioning any one of them (as, for example, the Sacrament might be called either the Breaking of the Bread, which is usual, or, for some special reason on a special occasion, the Cup), it was evidently quite possible and natural that the mixed cup of the Rite might be called either the Wine or the Water, or the mixture. Justin exemplifies all these ways of speaking: he calls it first *ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος*, where the water is most prominently mentioned, and the wine is implied (but not expressly mentioned) in *κράματος*: later he speaks of it as *οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος*, where the wine is most prominent: later he calls it in quotation simply *ποτήριον*: finally, where he asserts that the Rite has been imitated in the Mithraic religion, he speaks of *ποτήριον ὕδατος* alone, because the Mithraic rite was celebrated with water only, and yet Justin regarded this as mimicry of the Christian Rite.

It is necessary, therefore, to avoid laying any stress on occasions where water alone is mentioned, or wine alone, as if the early Rite was celebrated with either liquid singly. Doubtless there would have been no difficulty felt in celebrating the Rite with one alone, if the other were not easily procurable: the early Church laid no stress on such petty details, it was the spirit and the general effect, not the material, that was important. But the proper and original form was the mixed Cup; and it is wrong to attempt to press and force testimony into conformity with any theory as to the superior importance of one element in the Cup. This consideration would modify some modern theories on the subject.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament.

1. *Précis de Linguistique Sémitique*. This is a translation into French of Professor Brockelmann's *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, which was published in 1906. The translation has been made by W. MARÇAIS, Directeur de la Médersa d'Alger, et M. COHEN, Agrégé de l'Université de Paris (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1910).

2. *Verbesserungen zu Mandelkerns Grosser Konkordanz*. Mandelkern's Hebrew Concordance is

a great book. But every concordance contains mistakes, and it is known that Mandelkern's has its share of them. Here is a supplementary volume to lie beside it. Professor Dr. Sven Herner has corrected more than four thousand mistakes (Lund: Hjalmar Möller).

3. *Les Livres de Samuel*. It is surely interesting to learn that a Commentary on the Books of Samuel has been written in Jerusalem. The author, Père Paul Dhorme, is a professor in the École biblique de Saint-Étienne in Jerusalem.