

THE HOUSE IN WHICH THE LAST SUPPER WAS HELD.

MAY I make a humble remonstrance against Professor Burkitt's hypothesis that it was in the house of Mary the mother of Mark that the Last Supper was held; and that Barnabas was not only the *οικοδεσπότης*, but also the 'man bearing a pitcher of water'? When Mary and her house are mentioned in Acts xii 12, it is evident that she was a widow, the house being called hers; whereas in Mark xiv 14, we hear of the 'goodman of the house' (*οικοδεσπότης*), and that usually means the husband of its mistress, not her wealthy brother from abroad. Possibly, of course, Mary's husband may have died in the interval between the two events. Houses are even with us Westerns called by the name of a wife only in the most colloquial way, and not in important narratives. For this reason I think Martha of Bethany must also have been a widow, else why did her house not belong to Lazarus? There were many houses open to the Disciples before Peter's imprisonment, as we see from the expression *κατ' οίκον* in Acts v 42, and *κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους* in Acts viii 3; so there was no reason why Peter should be confined in his choice of a haven to the house already consecrated by having been the scene of the Last Supper.

It is extremely improbable that a man in the position of Barnabas would condescend to carry a pitcher of water. Professor Burkitt knows well that this is woman's work in all Semitic lands. Not even the meanest of the traveller's servants will put a hand to it. Your dragoman has always to give a *para* to some woman for the purpose. No doubt Barnabas, after the Resurrection, would have been ready to demean himself in any way for the sake of the Risen Lord; but it is very doubtful if he could have so early reached such a height of Christian perfection as the performance of this act implies. Is it not more likely that it was done by some Gibeonite?

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

THE PRAYER FOR THE CONSECRATION OF A BISHOP IN THE CHURCH ORDER OF HIPPOLYTUS.

IN the JOURNAL for July 1915 (Vol. xvi pp. 542 ff), Mr C. H. Turner restores the Greek prayer for the consecration of a bishop in the Church Order of Hippolytus, and would, with Dr Frere (April 1915) consider that this prayer really comes from Hippolytus himself.

Dr Vernon Bartlet, however (April 1916), argues that the original prayer did not contain the clauses which refer to 'the function of high-priesthood and propitiation of God, and authority to forgive sins in the high-priestly spirit, to distribute offices, and to loose every bond according to the authority given to the Apostles'. This is part of a wider argument in which Dr Bartlet is concerned with the ordering of presbyters also, and any proper discussion must be directed to the argument as a whole. Yet I wish to offer, very tentatively, a reason for thinking that (if there was a separate prayer for bishops) these clauses might have been part of its primitive form as it came from Hippolytus.

It might, indeed, be supposed that the last two words in the recorded title of the treatise which Hippolytus is known to have written—*περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποστολικῆ παράδοσις*—go far to guarantee some of the clauses in question. However that may be the 'high-priestly' phraseology seems to bear the same relation to the Epistle to the Hebrews as do the like allusions in Clement. As in Clement's epistle, so here, the words are associated with less obvious reminiscences of Hebrews; are co-ordinated with phrases from other schools of apostolic writing; and shew no sign of the writer's having appreciated the full significance of the sacrificial conception. The bishop's high-priesthood is like Christ's as the ruler of the Church, not as the offerer of his own Blood. Even where that idea is approached, in the verb *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, the addition of the accusative, *τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ*, lowers mystery to analogy; there is no awful merging of episcopal function in the ineffable act of Christ.

It is, I suppose, certain that Clement did not, any more than Hippolytus, read Hebrews as Pauline, or what we should now call canonical; though in some places there can be no doubt he quotes from it. But are all the coincidences quotations? The fancy, too rigidly elaborated by Mr J. E. Field, will recur to me, viz. that some may be due to the influence of (Roman) worship on both Clement and the author to the Hebrews. If so, the Rite, however freely varied in those early times, would seem to have enshrined a deeper intention than Clement's *ἐπιείκεια* could interpret. That speculation need not be pursued here. Yet it may possibly suggest something which bears on the matter in hand. This high-priestly language in 'the earliest Ordinal known to us' may be no later addition of developed ecclesiasticism, but an already faded echo of still grander thought in primordial Christian devotion: *ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου*.