

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

It does not seem possible to distinguish any difference of meaning between the three verbs as used of our Lord's knowledge in these four passages. What distinction there is is perhaps one of tense—*εἰδώς* being the present, *γινούς* and *ἐπιγινούς* the aorist: *γινώσκων*, *ἐπιγινώσκων*, are not found in Mark. In other words, when Mark wanted to write a present participle, he used that of *οἶδα*: when he was writing an aorist, he turned to *γινώσκω* or *ἐπιγινώσκω*. Just as with *οἶδατε* and *γνώσεσθε*, so with *εἰδώς* and *γινούς*, we construct the complete paradigm only by the help of the two verbs.

The practical identity of *γινώσκω* and *ἐπιγινώσκω* seems to be borne out by a comparison of vi 33 *καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί* (if we read *ἔγνωσαν* with B D and *fam.* 1) *καὶ πρέσβη . . . συνέδραμον* and vi 54 *εὐθὺς ἐπιγινόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον . . .*

C. H. TURNER.

### ἌΓΑΠΗΤΌΣ

A year ago Prof. Souter published in the JOURNAL (Oct. 1926, xxviii 59) a passage of Plutarch illustrating the sense of *ἀγαπητός* for which I have pleaded in reference to the Gospels. Shortly before the appearance of Prof. Souter's note my friend the late Prof. A. H. Cruickshank, of the University of Durham, had communicated to me another passage from Plutarch where *ἀγαπητός* is conjoined with *μόνος* in the same sense: *de genio Socratis* 27<sup>1</sup> (Charon talking of his son) *οὗτος (εἶπεν) ὃ ἄνδρες ἐμοὶ μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαπητός, ὡς ἴστε.*

C. H. TURNER.

### THE 'SHORTER TEXT' OF ST LUKE XXII 15-20.

IN one of the Additional Notes to *Can we then Believe?* Dr Gore deals with the problem of the 'shorter text' of St Luke's account of the Institution of the Eucharist. In this note the writer, with characteristic candour, records his abandonment of 'a preference for the longer text, as it is found in the A.V. and R.V.', and admits the force of the textual argument against that longer text, as presented by Dr Hort and Dr Sanday. But he still finds the problem of this passage insoluble. The shorter text appears to hold the field, yet 'on the other hand, it is difficult to suppose that St Luke should have been content to give an account of the Institution which ends so abruptly, and leaves it to be supposed that our Lord dealt with the cup before

<sup>1</sup> In the Teubner edition of the *Moralia*, iii 539.

the bread, and should have omitted in connexion with the cup any reference to its sacramental meaning'.

Dr Gore is surely justified, alike in abandoning the 'longer text', and in feeling that the 'shorter text', as commonly presented, is extremely hard to accept and to understand. It is the purpose of this note to give reasons for thinking that a different 'shorter text' can be reconstructed, on the basis of the textual evidence, and that such a text is both likely to be what St Luke actually wrote, and also offers none of the difficulties which are involved in the acceptance of the reading found in *Codex Bezae*.<sup>1</sup>

Before passing on to consider the textual evidence, I would call attention to a question which is more important than some scholars have appeared to realize. The Marcan narrative provided St Luke with the words οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Since Luke was purposing to add at a later point a reference to eating and drinking at the table of the Lord in His kingdom, he wrote down Mark xiv 25 in a shortened form—οὐ μὴ πῖω . . . ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ; but he also deliberately duplicated the whole utterance—ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα φαγεῖν . . . λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. What was the point of this duplication? This will appear more clearly later on; but it is to be noted that the effect of the duplication is to open the story of the Last Supper with a solemn and mysterious reference to (1) eating and (2) drinking. In the *Textus Receptus* this double reference is then repeated, in full liturgical form; whereas in the text of D the reference to drinking is followed only by a curiously abrupt account of the eucharistic breaking of the bread. Thus it is misleading to speak of that text as though it merely inverted the normal liturgical order, and placed the cup before the bread; it does not do so<sup>2</sup>; it merely adds a reference to bread and eating after

<sup>1</sup> The whole passage Luke xxii 14-23 was the subject of a very interesting study by Dr H. E. D. Blakiston which appeared in this JOURNAL in 1903 (vol. iv, pp. 548-555). Dr Blakiston, who was definitely inclined to prefer the 'longer text' to that of W-H, propounded the hypothesis that the whole section was 'not the Synoptic tradition with additional details perhaps affected by St Paul's version, but a deliberate, though intentionally incomplete, conflation of two distinct, independent, and perhaps equally original narratives of the Institution'. The acute arguments by which this hypothesis was supported do not concern me here; but it is interesting to find that the narrative which Dr Blakiston assigned to the Lucan source is exactly identical with the Lucan text towards which, as I believe, the textual evidence really points.

<sup>2</sup> The view here rejected is maintained by Loisy (*Évangiles Synoptiques* ii 528): 'le récit de Luc a toujours embarrassé les commentateurs, la bénédiction de la coupe précédant celle du pain, sauf à revenir une seconde fois après le souper.' Loisy holds the common view that the Lucan account and order, as given in D &c., is to

the twofold utterance about eating and drinking which is found in *vv.* 15-18. This 'shorter text', then, ought not to be thought of as narrating a complete eucharistic Institution in an abnormal order. Its difficulty is not one of order but of redundancy; for if it be accepted we have to explain why one half of the Institution-narrative is appended to a passage in which the twofold elements of the eucharistic action are already represented, enigmatically indeed, but in their normal sequence.

The textual evidence is reduced by Dr Zahn in his Commentary (pp. 671 ff) to four main types of reading, namely:—

I. an early Syriac-Latin form, in which *vv.* 17-18 are placed after *σῶμά μου*, and take the place of 19<sup>b</sup>-20 as the conclusion of the narrative;

II. the text of the great uncials, &c.;

III. that of the Peshitto, which omits 17-18 altogether, but includes 19-20 as they are found in II;

IV. the reading of D a ff<sup>2</sup> &c., which inserts *καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου* only, after *v.* 18.

This classification is rather a rough one, as a closer glance at the Syriac evidence would shew, but it is adequate, perhaps, for our present purpose. Of the types thus distinguished, III may clearly be disregarded; and in spite of Professor A. C. Clark's rehabilitation of II (*Primitive Text of the Gospels* pp. 77 ff) I will take leave to assume that the weight of evidence is definitely unfavourable to II, and that II is a deliberate and non-Lucan assimilation of a difficult passage to more familiar texts and usages. But it must not be forgotten that the evidence for II, or something very like it, is extremely early. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i 66), harmonistic though his reference to the Eucharist may be, clearly thought of the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου* as Gospel words, and when he wrote *καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως* it is to be presumed that the Lucan *ὡσαύτως* was in his mind. Marcion also—though the evidence for his reading at this point is incomplete—appears to have had in his text the words *διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*. Therefore, if II is the product of a process of assimilation, that process must have begun very early indeed.

This being admitted and borne in mind, we have next to ask whether any of our extant Gospel-texts is so pure as to preserve the

be illustrated from the *Didache*; it reproduces the normal Jewish order of the benedictions, which was not the order in which the distribution took place. The order bread-wine was due, he thinks, to St Paul, 'qui a vu surtout dans l'eucharistie le symbole et la continuation du sacrifice de la croix . . . De ce point de vue théologique, la fraction du pain, symbole de la mort, s'offrait la première à l'esprit, et permettrait de comprendre sans difficulté le symbolisme du vin'.

original text from which the process of assimilation and amplification took its beginning; and since the reading of D & c. has been accepted as the standard type of 'shorter text', we have to ask whether D preserves what St Luke wrote, or whether even this text has undergone any amplification.

In order to answer this question we must look more closely into the texts roughly grouped by Zahn under the heading I. Within this group Syr-sin seems to stand over against Syr-cu and *b e* as representing a more advanced stage of textual evolution, while *b e*, again, are more primitive than Syr-cu. A *conspetus* will make this clear:—

*Syr-sin*

ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθυμήσα  
το πασχα φαγειν μεθ' υμων  
προ του με παθειν  
λεγω γαρ υμιν  
(οτι) ουκετι ου μη φαγω αυτο  
εως οτου πληρωθη  
εν τη βασιλεια του θεου  
και λαβων αρτον

ευχαριστησας εκλασεν  
και εδωκεν αυτοις λεγων  
τουτο εστιν το σωμα μου  
το υπερ υμων διδομενον  
ουτως ποιειτε  
εις την εμην αναμνησιν  
και μετα το δειπνησαι  
λαβων το ποτηριον

ευχαριστησας επ αυτω  
ειπεν λαβετε τουτο

διαμερισατε εις εαυτους  
τουτο εστι το αιμα μου  
η καινη διαθηκη  
λεγω γαρ υμιν  
οτι ου μη πιω απο του νυν  
απο του γεννηματος τουτου

εως οτου η βασιλεια του  
θεου ελθη

*e (Syr-cu, δ)*

concupiscentiam concupi  
hoc pascha manducare uobiscum  
priusquam patiar  
dico enim uobis  
quia iam non manducabo illud  
doneque adimplear (impleatur δ)  
in regno dei  
et accepit panem et (et accepto  
pane δ)  
gratias egit (+ επ' αυτω cu) et fregit  
et dedit eis (illis δ) dicens  
hoc est corpus meum  
(+ το υπερ υμων  
ουτως ποιειτε  
εις την εμην αναμνησιν cu: om *b e*)  
et  
accepit calicem et  
(accepto calice δ)  
gratias egit (+ επ αυτω cu)  
et dixit accipite (+ hoc et δ  
+ τουτο cu)  
uiuete (diuidite δ) inter uos

dico enim uobis  
quod non uiuam (bibam δ) amodo  
de potione uitis (de generatione  
uitis huius δ: απο του γεννηματος  
τουτου της αμπελου cu)  
quoadusque (donec δ) regnum  
dei ueniat.

The Greek text underlying the Sinaitic Syriac, with its additions of τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δίδόμενον ('which I give for you'), οὕτως ποιείτε κτλ., μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, and τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμα μου ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, is clearly later, at this point, than that represented in the Curetonian, while the Curetonian is in its turn later than the Latin authorities grouped with it; and we may conveniently take *e*, therefore, as representing Zahn's group I in its earliest extant form.

What, then, is the difference between the text of I (*e*) and that of IV (D *a ff*<sup>2</sup>, &c.)? Neglecting minor details, it amounts simply to this, that IV has the words καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον . . . τὸ σῶμά μου after the clause ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ, whereas I has the same words appended to the clause ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Dr Sanday (in H. D. B. ii 636 f) regarded the reading of *e* as an attempt to improve upon that found in D. 'The omission of *v*. 19<sup>b</sup>-20 (D *a ff*<sup>2</sup> *i l*) belongs to the oldest form of the Western text. The next step was to transpose the order of *v*. 17-18 and 19<sup>a</sup>, so as to make the sequence of the Bread and Cup correspond to that in the other authorities.' Yet, with all due deference to so high an authority, it is permissible to doubt the correctness of this reconstruction of the textual development, and to suggest an alternative.

Since *k* is not extant at this point, *e* is our only available representative, though by no means a consistent representative, of the African Latin; and it is not impossible that *e* should be regarded here as parallel to D rather than derivative from D. In fact, I would suggest, these two manuscripts represent two extremely early and almost identical attempts to emend a difficult passage, or rather they represent one and the same attempt, marred in one case and not in the other by a mischance.

Is there not a presumption, where a piece of 'over-matter' is found, in two different but kindred authorities, at two different points in a paragraph, that it is in both cases an interpolation? If that is so, the present case is surely one in which that presumption is of exceptional strength. We have here a little section, very strangely placed in D and less strangely in *e*, but occurring in both cases after the words βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Is it not probable, at least, that the clause is a very early interpolation, intended from the first to be inserted where *e* has it, but added by mischance, in an ancestor of D, after the wrong βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ? Professor Turner, to whom I made this suggestion, amplifies and illuminates it thus: 'one might suppose that the first change was that a very early annotator put in the καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου clause between two columns of his papyrus roll, and that *e*'s ancestor copied it into his copy in the left-hand column of the text, D's ancestor into the column to the right, that is, at a later point.'

This interpolation, if we may now venture to call it so, is not based on 1 Corinthians nor on Matthew but on Mark; *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς* appears in Matthew as *δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς* and is absent from the Pauline text. Moreover, with its omission of *λάβετε* it is closer to the text of *k* in Mark than to that of the critical editions, although it does not go so far with *k* as to include 'et manducauerunt ex illo omnes', which Professor Turner (*Inaugural Lecture* ed. 2 p. 71) believes to be the authentic Marcan text. Both D and *e*, however, with *εὐχαριστήσας* and *gratias egit* shew a slight assimilation to the Pauline text, or to that of Luke xxii 17, whereas the Marcan reading is undoubtedly *εὐλογήσας* (*benedixit k*).

It may be asked whether after all it is not possible that the *e* text as it stands is original. The answer seems to be that in its present form it cannot be the parent of the text of D, nor does it in any way serve to explain the reading of the great uncials. On the other hand, it is, as I believe, the most primitive text that we possess; but in order to explain the other and later forms we seem forced to go back behind all extant MS authority, and to discern behind *e* a text in which there was no explicit eucharistic reference at all. Such a text must have seemed from the first to cry out for amplification<sup>1</sup>; and such a text alone would afford a simple and adequate explanation of all the subsequent variants. That it explains the present reading of *e* is obvious; while Zahn's text-form II may either have been an independent amplification, or, conceivably, may have originated on the basis of the error now perpetuated in D and its congeners. In any case, there is a direct road from the shortest of all the possible 'short forms' to any of the longer ones.

A word must now be said about the resultant text: *καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· λάβετε, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος [τούτου] τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἔλθῃ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντός με κτλ.* All this is deliberately substituted for the explicit eucharistic reference of Mark. The motive for the duplication *οὐ μὴ φάγω . . . οὐ μὴ πῖω*, which replaces Mark's *οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω*, at once becomes plain. The words are *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν*; the double reference to eating and drinking, coupled with the promise uttered later of a *διαθήκη*, wherein the faithful, and they only, would eat and drink at the Lord's table in His

<sup>1</sup> The amplifying process is presumably older than Marcion, but the form in which his text appears to have presented it would have commended itself to him on the ground of its Pauline character.

kingdom, would be understood to veil from all but the initiated the intimacies of a familiar rite. But even so veiled a reference must touch, though allusively, upon food as well as upon drink: and the duplication of the Marcan utterance serves to clothe the allusion in a perfectly appropriate form.

I do not infer, as some recent German scholarship is inclined to do, that the story of the Last Supper was not, in St Luke's mind, linked closely with liturgical usage, that it was not *kultisch gedacht*. Contrariwise, I am tempted to think that we have here such a genuine trace of a *disciplina arcani* as reappears in the Fourth Gospel. One can quite readily conceive that St Luke's narrative was published under circumstances which made it inadvisable to disclose the inner meaning of Christian worship. Dr Blakiston, in the paper alluded to above, called attention to some of the contacts between the Third Gospel and the Fourth at this point. A recent study by von Harnack, dealing with Marcionite readings and their influence upon Catholic texts, has suggested others. Here, perhaps, we have one more; and the significance of these contacts offers a problem for which no one yet, so far as I know, has provided an adequate solution.<sup>1</sup>

H. N. BATE.

## THE THEOPHANIES OF GIDEON AND MANOAH.

IN the course of the criticism of the Old Testament it is often necessary to conclude that a particular narrative or element of a narrative is unhistorical, on the ground that it is contradicted by other evidence which appears to be more trustworthy. But the task still remains of considering the details, for in the effort to understand them we may often throw light upon beliefs and ideas of great value for the study of history in its widest sense. For example, if the opening chapters of Genesis are not regarded as an authentic account of the beginning of the world, we find in its stead a quantity of evidence which illumines the ideas and beliefs of the Hebrews, and what we seem to lose in 'objective' history we gain in a deeper knowledge of Hebrew life and thought. In the long run we acquire material which

<sup>1</sup> This note was written, and had left my hands, before the publication of Professor Burkitt's note on the same passage in the January number of this JOURNAL (pp. 178 ff.). Professor Burkitt holds that the 'shorter text' preserves the true Lucan reading, while the 'longer text' dates from the formation of the Church's official Canon of Four Gospels. I should prefer to say that the 'shorter' and the 'longer' texts both date from successive stages in that process, and that the earlier of these stages cannot be placed later than the first decades of the second century.