

* OCT 24 1910
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII

OCTOBER 1910

NUMBER 4

MIRACLES AND HISTORY.

The remark is frequently made that miracles were formerly a means or weapon of apologetics, but have now become an object of defense. Once an aid to faith, miracles are now regarded by many as a burden, and as some would have it a burden too grievous to be borne. As the work of Paul was to throw off the yoke of legalism, and the task of Luther was to break the bands of sacerdotalism, so, it is assumed, the duty of the present age is to complete the work of emancipation, and to free religion from the twofold yoke of miracle and dogma.

Whatever other aspects the question of miracle may have it is primarily an historical question. Back of such considerations as the possibility or credibility of miracles, or their value as an evidence for the truth of Christianity, lies the more important question, Did the miracles recorded in the New Testament really happen? The perennial interest in the discussion is no doubt due to its inseparable connection with central and cherished beliefs in philosophy and religion, but it is this connection which makes the task of the historian peculiarly difficult. Absolute impartiality in investigating the evidence would be the ideal condition for the historian, but the historical student, as a man of like passions with other men, cannot but be influenced, in considering a question with so intimate philosophical and religious bearings, by the dominant thought of his time.

THE TEXT OF LUKE XXII. 17-25.

The canonical accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper in I Cor xi. 23-25, Mk xiv. 22-25 and Mt xxvi. 26-29 present texts which are generally acknowledged to be original and which, therefore, require no discussion from the textual standpoint. The case is very different with the text of Luke xxii. 17-25. The character of the passage is essentially affected by the retention or omission of vv. 19b, 20. If these verses are a part of the original text, Lk gives an account closely allied to the Pauline account, but peculiar in the mention of two cups, that of v. 17 and that of v. 20. If, on the other hand, vv. 19b, 20 are omitted, we have a strikingly unique tradition of the institution, in which the cup precedes the bread, the cup is given without the usual words significant of its sacramental character, and the bread is dismissed as in Mk (Mt) with the bare words, *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*. The arrangement of the text in which vv. 19b, 20 are omitted, but the order vv. 19a-17-18 is established, preserves the usual precedence of the bread but is as singularly poor as the form just discussed in statements of the significance of the cup. The solution of this most complex and difficult problem is important not only for the proper grouping of the canonical sources giving an account of the institution (can we maintain the usual grouping Mk-Mt and Paul-Lk, or must we make three groups, Mk-Mt, Paul, and Lk?) but for the decision of the broader question of the temporal and ideal connection between the Jewish Passover and the Christian sacrament.

Five forms of the text are attested. In the following enumeration they are set down without reference to the supposed affinities between the text-forms, but simply to exhibit the actual varieties of attested texts:

(1) That attested by all the uncials except D, by most minuscules and most versions, containing vv. 17-20 as

they stand in Tischendorf's text, in the conventional order vv. 17-18-19-20. V. 17 recounts the taking and dividing of a cup which has been blessed, but which is without indicated sacramental significance, unless that significance lies in the words *λάβετε* and *διαμερίσατε*. V. 18 is found without essential variation in all texts, and recounts the statement of Jesus that he will not drink of the cup again until the Kingdom come. V. 19a recounts the taking, blessing, breaking¹ and giving of the bread, with the short statement of its sacramental significance, *ἰοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*, as in Mk and Mt. V. 19b continues the statement of v. 19a by adding *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* as in Paul, with the further natural addition of *διδόμενον*, and has a command for the repetition of the sacrament as in Paul, but not in Mk and Mt. V. 20 recounts the similar procedure, *ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι*, with another cup, after supper (so Paul) and the following statement of the sacramental significance of the cup, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου* (so Paul except *ἐστίν* after *διαθήκη* and *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*, for *ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου*), then a difficult addition, *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*, said to belong grammatically to *τὸ ποτήριον* and logically to *τῷ αἵματι*, similar to Mk's *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* where both the grammatical and logical reference is plainly to *τὸ αἷμά μου*. The most striking characteristics of this text are the two cups, and the similarity of vv. 19b, 20 to Paul and Mark.

(2) That attested by D (d) a ff² i l (rhe), which omits vv. 19b, 20, with the consequent order vv. 17-18-19a. This text evidently regards the cup of v. 17 as the sacramental cup, but has the cup before the bread, and is without the usual words indicative of the sacramental signifi-

¹It is difficult to discover on what authority Sir William Ramsay makes the statement that "there is no mention of the Breaking of the Bread" in Mark's account of the institution, *Expository Times*, March, 1910, p. 250. The Greek text of Mk. xiv. 22, which he cites in a footnote (*Ibid.*, p. 252), contains the familiar *ἐκλασεν*. Again in the *Expository Times* for April, 1910, p. 297, he marks with an asterisk the steps of the rite "which Paul mentions and which Mark omits." The first item so marked is "He brake the bread."

cance of the cup. Then follows the usual v. 18, and the institution of the bread in v.19a, ending with *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*.

(3) That attested by b e, which omits vv. 19b, 20 as in (2) but places v. 19a before vv. 17, 18, with the consequent order vv. 19a-17-18. Here we have a poverty of explanatory words for the cup as in (2), the same explanatory words for the bread, with affinities with Mk Mt, not with Paul, but the bread resumes its usual precedence of the cup.

(4) That attested by Syr^{ca} which omits v. 20, but has all of v. 19 except *διδόμενον*, in the order of (3). Here the bread precedes the cup, there are no sacramental words with the latter, but the words in connection with the bread and the command for repetition are similar to those in Paul.

(5) That attested by Syrⁱⁿ which has all of v. 19 and disjointed fragments of v. 20 before and after v. 17 in the following order vv. 19-20a-17-20b-18. The bread stands first, with the full indication of its significance and the command for repetition as in (1), then the Pauline *καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* as in v. 20a, the institution of the cup with the sacramental words of v. 20b, but in the more nearly Marcan form *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη* and the usual v. 18.

Three forms of the text have been advocated as original: (1), (2) and (3); (4) and (5) have such scanty attestation and are so evidently enlargements of a text like (3) that their originality has been out of the question. Spitta², while contending that (1) is original with the author of the third Gospel, holds that the source which lay before him contained only vv. 17-18-19, a form of text at present unattested by any manuscript. At first glance, considerations of method suggest an immediate examination of the evidence for (3), as having the least external attestation. Further reflection, however, reveals the fact that such a dis-

² *Zur Geschichte u. Litteratur des Urchristentums*, Göttingen, 1893, iter Bd., pp. 297f.

cussion, involving matters of essential importance to the determination of the relative originality of (1) and (2), had better be deferred until after an examination of the two forms of text, one or the other of which has commanded the support of most scholars. We turn then to a discussion of the relative priority of the texts attested by \aleph ABCL etc. and D a ff² i l.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE \aleph ABCL etc. AND THE
D a ff² i l TEXTS.

It is immediately apparent that the latter text is supported by purely Western evidence. That evidence is confined to the uncial D and the Old Latin codices a ff² i l, unconfirmed by the testimony of any other early version or any early father. Moreover, the Old Latin codices c f g¹ 2 q, which are frequently found in agreement with D, are here ranged against it. However, the frequent variants within the group show us that we have to do with a text that has a considerable history, that is, with a very early text. The former text is not only attested by all the uncials except D, by the minuscules and most versions, but is also confirmed by the testimony of Marcion and Justin. Justin in his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, Apol. i:66 has *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου* in connection with *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου*, but not in connection with *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου*, which, as R. A. Hoffmann³ remarks, proves that this text of Justin's goes back at least to a tradition such as that represented in our received Lucan text, since neither Mt nor Mk have the words at all and Paul has them in connection with both the bread and the cup.⁴ Tertullian

³ *Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, Königsberg i. Pr., 1896, p. 19.

⁴ It does not seem necessary at this point to go into the broader and much disputed question of the character of Justin's citations from the Gospels. Cf. Bousset, *Die Evangelienzeit Justins des Märtyrers*, Göttingen, 1891, for the view that back of Justin's citations of the words of Jesus lies a text widely different from the present text of our Gospels. Cf. also Schürer, *Theol. Litztg.*, 1891, Sp. 363, Hilgenfeld, *Ztschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol.*, 1893, pp. 250-53, 267; Lippelt and von Soden as cited in Nestle, *Einführung* usw.,³ Göttingen, 1909, p. 160.

makes us aware of the fact that Marcion knew v. 20. *Adversus Marcionem* iv.40⁵ reads "sic (sc. ut in panis mentione) in calicis mentione testamentum constituens sanguine suo obsignatum substantiam corporis confirmavit". Here we have a clear reference to *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*, though the covenant is not expressly specified as a new covenant. There can be no reference here to the Pauline account since Tertullian everywhere in the fourth book from chapter eight to the end cites the Gospel of Luke against Marcion's falsification of it⁶. That is to say, the early character of the longer text is confirmed not only by the testimony of the great mass of codices and versions but by the testimony of Marcion and Justin. We have then to do with two forms of the text, each of which is very early.

Opinion as to the value of the Western text in the Gospels is so unsettled that it is impossible to approach the specific question before us with any confident presumption. We cannot be sure whether the variants presented by D are relatively late redactions or whether they preserve a very early or a Lucan text. The question is most acute in the last three chapters of Luke, xxii-xxiv, where the many omissions and additions attested by the Western text warn us of an early disturbance of the text. We shall perhaps be justified therefore in foregoing an attempt to settle the broad question in regard to the character of the Western text in the Gospels, and in contenting ourselves with an induction from the phenomena which it offers in the three chapters of Luke to which the Western "non-interpolations" are confined. Fr. Schultzen⁷ may guide us in his careful study, (1) of the variants attested by the group D-it-Syr^{cu} and (2) of those with other attestation. The readings of Syr^{sin} were apparently not available at the time when Schultzen con-

⁵ *Tertulliani quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Oehler, tom. ii, pag. 268, cf. also Zahn, *Forschungen* usw., Erlangen u. Leipzig, 1890, 2ter Bd., p. 25, 49¹.

⁶ Cf. R. A. Hoffman, *op. cit.*, p. 19, Anm., where *Adversus Marcionem* is wrongly quoted, iv. 20.

⁷ *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, Göttingen, 1895, pp. 7 ff.

structed the body of his argument, though he discusses them in a footnote⁸, but their addition does not affect the conclusions of his argument. The variants of the first class are grouped according to their character as additions, alterations, and omissions. The additions and the alterations attested by D-it-Syr^{cu} (the testimony of the Itala codices is not constant) are in no case to be preferred. The situation is somewhat different with regard to the omissions. It may appear inconsequent to attach any importance to the omissions of a text which is under suspicion because of its additions and alterations. In such a text we must always reckon with the possibility not only of intentional omissions but of omissions occasioned by carelessness or haste. But it is possible that an otherwise suspicious text may in some cases preserve the original readings, while the better witnesses, under special influences, present later alterations and additions. This possibility is made more probable by the variants of the second class, where it appears that the text has been freely interpolated. In xxii. 43, xxiii. 17, xxiii. 34a, xxiv. 42, xxiv. 43, all of which are glosses with the exception of xxiii. 34a, the group D-it-Syr^{cu} is never decidedly on the side of the codices which omit. In at least one case where the gloss is apparent, xxiii. 17, it presents the questionable words—which affords another ground for caution. A sure result can be obtained only by turning to the omissions of the first class of variants. Here the following passages come into question: xxii. 62, xxiii. 39, xxiv. 3, 6, 9, 12, 17, 20, 36, 40, 51, 52⁹. Of these variants Westcott and Hort double-bracket xxii. 62, xxiv. 3, 6, 9, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52 on the adverse testimony of the Western witnesses, but retain xxiii. 39 against the omission of D e, l having a compilation from the parallels; xxiv. 7, against D b e ff² l Marcion, a omits more; xxiv. 17, against a b c e ff² l Syr^{cu}; xxiv. 20

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁹ Schultzen also cites the testimony for omissions in xxiii. 54, 55, 56, attested by D alone; for xxiv. 1, a single word, ἀρώματα, attested by D a b c e ff² i l sah Syr^{cu} Syr^{su}; and for xxiv. 25, attested again by D alone.

against a ff² l. Schultzen is doubtful about xxii. 62 but concludes that an addition is more probable. He asserts the probable originality of xxiv. 3 against Westcott and Hort, agrees with Westcott and Hort in considering xxiv. 6, 9, 12, 40, 51, 52 additions, and is doubtful about xxiv. 36. In the cases where Westcott and Hort retain the readings against the Western testimony, as indicated in detail above, Schultzen finds xxiii. 39 of doubtful originality, agrees in asserting the originality of ἀμαρτωλῶν in xxiv. 7; περιπατοῦντες in xxiv. 17; καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν in xxiv. 20. In other words, intrinsic and transcriptional evidence leads Westcott and Hort to assent to the omissions of D-it-Syr^{ca} in nine cases out of thirteen, while in the other four cases the testimony of the group is set aside. Schultzen is inclined to add xxiii. 39 to the cases in which the D-it-Syr^{ca} readings are to be preferred, while he is doubtful about xxiv. 36 which Westcott and Hort double-bracket. It is possible to differ with Schultzen in some details, but not in his general conclusion, which he states somewhat as follows¹⁰. The examination of these passages leads to the conviction that the group D-it-Syr^{ca} has preserved the original text in many cases. On the other hand, in four passages (xxiv. 3, 7, 17, 20), portions of the original text have been omitted. In some cases the decision has been for the former alternative because there was no apparent ground for the omission of the words in question. The possibility of omissions due to oversight or haste is still open. Our investigation has yielded some general points of view but not much positive result. We have at least learned that we must reckon strongly with the possibility of the shorter text being the original.

We may be permitted to remark that the presumption in favor of the shorter text in xxii. 17-25 rests on an induction in which the final determination of the primary or secondary character of the D-it-Syr^{ca} group is made on the basis of the internal evidence afforded by the passages themselves rather

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 15f

than on the authority of the manuscripts. In at least four cases both Westcott and Hort (xxiii. 39, xxiv. 7, 17, 20) and Schultzen (xxiv. 3, 7, 17, 20) set aside the testimony of the Western group under the influence of the internal evidence. The presumption of the originality of the Western text in its omissions is therefore a presumption which must be confirmed or rejected on the internal evidence afforded by xxii. 17-25¹¹.

We turn then to an examination of the intrinsic and transcriptional evidence, with the presumption in favor of the shorter text, but a presumption itself based on internal evidence in the cases of the thirteen variants examined and waiting for confirmation or rejection at the hands of the internal evidence. Both texts are very old, certainly as old as the second century, and their relative priority hangs in the balance until the intrinsic and transcriptional evidence is thrown into the scale.

Both texts present serious intrinsic and transcriptional difficulties. The long text is difficult. The short text is difficult. In fact, they are both so difficult that the examination resolves itself into a determination of which text is the less difficult rather than into a determination of which is the more congruous.

INTRINSIC DIFFICULTIES OF THE \aleph ABCL etc. TEXT.¹²

There are two internal difficulties in the text attested by \aleph ABCL etc.: (1) the presence of two cups, v. 17 and v. 20,

¹¹ Schmiedel's observation must be borne in mind, *Hand-Comm.*, 2ter Bd., Freiburg i. B., 1891, p. 269: "Sehr mit recht aber lehnt Steck, 163, W-H's Meinung ab, Lc. 22: 19f. habe τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδ... ἐκχυνν ursprünglich gefehlt. Nicht nur dass dies nur abendländisch ist (...); es zeigt sich hier vor allem, wohin die einseitige Beachtung textkritischer Umstände führen kann."

¹² A sharp discrimination between intrinsic and transcriptional evidence in the discussion of the internal difficulties of the long text leads to such repetition of matters of detail that it has seemed best not to carry it through. For instance, the conformity of Lk. xxii. 19b, 20 to I Cor xi. 24, 25 and Mk xiv. 24 is properly a transcriptional difficulty, while the alleged infelicities of the text of Lk. xxii. 19b, 20 are intrinsic difficulties; yet the continuity of the argument suffers if the two questions be separated.

and (2) the conformity of vv. 19b and 20 to I Cor xi. 24b, 25a and Mk xiv. 24b, which gives rise to the suspicion that we have here to do with an interpolation. We shall consider the difficulties in order.

(1) The two cups¹³. There are two possibilities open to us. (a) The cup of v. 17 and the cup of v. 20 are the same. The cup of v. 17 is then an anticipatory reference to the cup of v. 20. This supposition is not only without apparent reason beyond the difficulty of the situation but it involves an impossibly awkward insertion of the institution of the bread between two accounts of the cup. We may safely turn to the second possibility. (b) The cup of v. 17 and the cup of v. 20 are different cups. A comparison of the cup of v. 17 and the cup of v. 20 reveals the fact that although the cup of v. 17 has attached to it the words of v. 18, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω . . . ἔλθῃ, which in Mk xiv. 25 and Mt xxvi. 29 stand in connection with the Lord's Supper cup, yet the cup of v. 20 is undoubtedly the Lord's Supper cup by virtue of the words τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινῆ διαθήκης κ.τ.λ. It has been held that the cup of v. 17 is a paschal cup. So, for instance, Resch,¹⁴ who holds that v. 18 stands in the Lucan account in the position which it occupied in the *Urtext* and that Luke, in accordance with his sources, preserves for us an account of the celebration of the Jewish Passover, in its chief moments, by Jesus and His disciples, *before* Jesus instituted the New Testament Supper. He thinks that it is vain to endeavor to specify the cup of the Passover meal which Jesus consecrated, since we do not know how closely He adhered to the Passover ritual then in use. The cup of v. 20, however, belongs no longer to the Jewish Passover: it is, on the contrary, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης. It is very probable that the cup of

¹³ This is the difficulty which has appealed strongly to Dr. Sanday, art. *Jesus Christ*, HDB, ii., p. 636, where he says, ". . . the double mention of the cup raises real difficulties of the kind which suggest interpolation."

¹⁴ *Aussercanonische Paralleltexzte zu den Evangelien, Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Bd. x, Heft 3, 1895, p. 626.

v. 17 is the third cup, the so called כוס הכרבה, for the prayer offered by the Jewish house-father in connection with this cup expressly mentions the wine as the fruit of the vine (citing as authority Bartoloccius, *Bibliotheca magna rabbinica*, Romae 1678, ii, 738). This prayer forms the transition to the saying of v. 18 in which Jesus forever takes leave of the Jewish פרי הגפן = τὸ γένημα τῆς ἀμπέλου. Schmiedel¹⁵ sees no reason for departing from the position taken by Resch, and adds, "Luke does not wish to let the Lord's Supper cup appear as a part of the Jewish Passover, and accomplishes his purpose by first relating the participation of Jesus in the Passover, so that the Lord's Supper stands as something quite new, no longer Jewish." On this interpretation, v. 15 recounts the eating of the Passover, v. 16 gives the statement of Jesus that He eats it for the last time under these conditions, v. 17 recounts the drinking of a paschal cup, perhaps the third cup, and v. 18 gives His statement that He drinks it for the last time under these conditions. Vv. 15, 16 and vv. 17, 18 form parallels, in which the Passover is completed. Vv. 19, 20 pass on to the institution of the Lord's Supper. This view of the cup of v. 17 receives some confirmation from the fact that the cup of v. 17 is without the article—a cup—while the cup of v. 20 has the article—the cup. Plummer¹⁶ says "But τὸ ποτήριον need not mean more than 'the cup just mentioned.' In Mt and Mk ποτήριον has no article: and in all three ἄρτον has no article: so that its absence in ver. 17 and presence in ver. 20 is not of much weight in deciding between the two difficulties." However, we have seen that it is impossible to identify the cup of v. 17 with the cup of v. 20: therefore, it is impossible that τὸ ποτήριον of v. 20 should mean "the cup just mentioned." The fact that ἄρτον nowhere has the article and that ποτήριον is found without it in Mt and Mk rather encourages the conjecture

¹⁵ *Protestantische Kirchenztg.*, 1896, Sp. 105.

¹⁶ *Comm. on St. Luke*, Int. Crit. Comm., New York, 1906, p. 496.

that when it is found with the article in the Lucan parallel the addition is significant. If so, it can only mean to suggest a contrast between the cup of v. 17 which is merely "a cup", "a paschal cup", and the cup of v. 20 which is "the cup", "the Lord's Supper cup". If this interpretation of the character of the two cups be accepted, the intrinsic difficulty not only disappears but Luke's narrative possesses a definiteness which is wanting in Mt and Mk. This advantage of the Lucan account in clearness is quite independent of the further question as to whether or not the Lord's Supper had any temporal connection with the Passover. For Luke's narrative in the form in which it has come down to us, even apart from xxii. 17-25, dates the Lord's Supper on the Passover evening.

Some further questions raise themselves : Why is only one paschal cup mentioned? How is the position of λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν . . . ἔλθῃ in connection with the paschal cup and not in connection with the Lord's Supper cup as in Mt and Mk to be accounted for? The express inference from the Lucan account that our Lord did not partake of the Lord's Supper cup, and the fact that according to Luke He did not expressly charge the disciples to partake of the cup of v. 20, though He did charge them to partake of the cup of v. 17, also need explanation. With reference to the fact that only one paschal cup is mentioned, it is perhaps enough to say that none of the Synoptists gives us any clear intimation of the closeness with which he supposes the Passover ritual to have been adhered to at the Last Supper, nor are we informed with precision as to the character of the Passover ritual in current use at the time. Luke is more explicit than either Matthew or Mark in notifying us of the drinking of a paschal cup, and we ought not to complain of his failure to illumine for us all the details of the Last Supper. The λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν . . . ἔλθῃ is at least as natural in its Lucan context as in the context of Matthew and Mark. Indeed, the inference which may be drawn from its Lucan position to the effect that

our Lord did not drink of any subsequent cup, that is to say, not of the Lord's Supper cup, fits the significance of the cup better than the most natural inference from Matthew or Mark, namely that He did drink of the Lord's Supper cup. As Hoffmann¹⁷ says, "These words in Mt and Mk are rightly understood by Haupt to mean that the Lord drank of the Lord's Supper wine which He gave to His disciples as His blood. That is, however, factually impossible and Luke's narrative deserves the preference in this point". V. 18 certainly reports a charge to drink in connection with the paschal cup, *Λάβετε τούτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς* : but in connection with the Lord's Supper the burden of the charge is borne by the *ὡσαύτως* of v. 20, which clearly refers to the *λαβὼν εὐχαριστήσας, ἔδωκεν* of v. 19, so that the command to drink the Lord's Supper cup is sufficiently explicit in Luke. If this interpretation of the cup be maintained, it is not unreasonable to assert that Luke in his report of two cups not only does not present difficulties in contrast to Mt and Mk, but that in relative fullness of detail and in the more natural placing of *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν . . . ἔλθη* he deserves the preference over his fellow Synoptists.

(2) The second difficulty of Lk xxii. 17-20 is found in the supposed interpolation of vv. 19b, 20 from I Cor and Mk. That which Paul and Mark present beyond the short text, ending at v. 19b, corresponds to the additions in the long text, which awakens the suspicion that the long text has been enlarged from the parallels. We are warned against a hasty decision by Hehn's sensible remark.¹⁸ "The textual-critical rule that the shorter text is to be preferred cannot be applied here. For it rests on the observation that the enlarged text generally contains circumlocutions or explanations of the main thought, without adding anything new. But here the situation is different. The assumption of the originality of the shorter text darkens

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

¹⁸ *Die Einsetzung des hl. Abendmahls*, Würzburg, 1900, p. 21.

the sense inexplicably and forms an unconfirmed contradiction to the other accounts”.

The discussion of the question will be aided by the display of the texts to be examined :

Luke.

19b. τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

20. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου,

τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

Paul—Mark.

I Cor xi. 24 Τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

Mk. xiv. 24 τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

I Cor xi. 26 τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡς ἄκεις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

If we suppose that vv. 19b, 20 were interpolated from I Cor and Mark, we must be prepared to admit that the interpolation took place at a very early date, for Marcion knew v. 20 and the corrupted text soon came to be almost universally accepted. We have here, moreover, an unusual if not altogether unique case of the interpolation of a Gospel from an Epistle.¹⁹ Joh. Weiss finds this fact the only striking fact in connection with the interpolation. He says,²⁰ “It is only striking that the interpolator has not drawn his material from Mt Mk but has here inserted the Pauline account”. He then advances a cautious suggestion in explanation of this unusual phenomenon. “It is not impossible that in the codex in which the interpolation was first made, the Gospel of Luke, without Mt and Mk, was bound up with the Pauline Epistles”. We must admit that the explanation is not impossible : it is, however, not probable, and its possibility lacks the confirmation of any

¹⁹ The texts of Syr^{cu} and Syr^{s1n} in this passage may perhaps be regarded as examples.

²⁰ Meyer-Weiss, *Komm. über Lukas*⁸, Göttingen, 1892, p. 616.

sort of evidence. Wright²¹ advances another explanation : "A copy of St. Luke's Gospel must have reached Corinth, or some other Pauline church at an early date. What wonder if the church authorities, finding in it so strange an inversion of their own custom of administering the Eucharist, should have inserted into the margin from their liturgical formula (which was based on I Cor. xi. 25) the words which in the common text distort the whole passage ?" It is easy to object that the Gospel of Mark must have reached the supposed Pauline church at the same time, for τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον is not found in I Cor but in Mk. Surely the church authorities did not do well in inserting into a passage containing "so strange an inversion of their own custom of administering the Eucharist" "words which in the common text distort the whole passage", nor does any known fact lie back of Dr. Wright's conjecture. It may conceivably be easier to call in the known fact of the close association of the third Evangelist with Paul to explain the similarity between the Gospel and the Epistle.

When we carefully compare vv. 19b, 20 with I Cor xi. 24, 25, 26 and Mk xiv. 24, we are at once aware that the texts are not entirely coincident. Mr. Frankland²² has somewhat too mechanically summarized the differences between the passages : "Words added, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, διδόμενον, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον: words displaced μου, ὡσαύτως: words omitted, ἐστίν and the whole phrase, τοῦτο ποιείτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν: words changed, μου for ἐμῶ. Thus in respect of thirty-seven words in the Epistle, the Gospel displays change amounting to twenty words". The ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς lies outside the range of the supposed interpolation. διδόμενον is a natural addition to the abrupt ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν of I Cor xi. 24. This abruptness in I Cor itself has given offense to copyists, and κλωμενον, θρυπτομενον, διδομενον have been added in various manuscripts. The displacement of μου and ὡσαύτως, the

²¹ *Some New Testament Problems*, London, 1898, p. 138.

²² *The Early Eucharist*, London, 1902, p. 118.

omission of *ἐστίν* and the change of *ἐμῶ* into *μου* are minor changes such as are likely to occur in an interpolation. But more serious questions present themselves. Why was not the interpolation made from Paul exclusively? Why, if the interpolation was to be enriched from Mark, is the Marcan text changed? Why is the second *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε . . . ἀνάμνησιν* omitted? Westcott and Hort²³ tell us that the copyist, considering that the first *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε . . . ἀνάμνησιν*, already appropriated from Paul, contained implicitly the second, obtained a "neater ending" by taking a phrase from Mk (Mt), with the substitution of *ὑμῶν* for *πολλῶν* in accordance with St. Paul's *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* in the former verse. We are willing to admit that *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* makes a neat ending, though Zahn, as will appear later, thinks it a very crude one. However, since the copyist was interpolating from Paul and not writing an independent account or depending on an account in which *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε . . . ἀνάμνησιν* occurred only once, as perhaps Justin was, we are surprised that he should turn aside to Mark for a neat ending, when the second Pauline *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε . . . ἀνάμνησιν*, which would preserve a perfect balance between the members of his text, lay at his hand. He was evidently proceeding with some care, for he nicely altered Mark's *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* to *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* to correspond with the former Pauline *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*. The closely reasoned neatness of the copyist is almost suspicious.

Nevertheless two infelicities of the Lucan text, in addition to the similarity of vv. 19b, 20 to I Cor and Mk have been urged in favor of the supposition of an interpolation.

(1) The first infelicity is found in the supposed incorrect reference of the participial clause in v. 20, where it is said that *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* belongs logically to *τῷ αἵματι*, but grammatically to *τὸ ποτήριον*. Zahn²⁴

²³ *The N. T. in the Original Greek*, New York, 1882, ii, Notes on Select Readings, p. 64.

²⁴ *Einleitung in das NT.*,³ 2ter Bd., Leipzig, 1907, p. 365.

states the matter most sharply: "Such a crude and absolutely unnecessary solecism is not to be attributed to a Luke, nor the absurdity that the cup which Jesus gave to His disciples was poured out or shed for them". A closer study reveals some mitigation of the harshness of the construction. The cup of course stands by a metonymy for the wine within it. In Mark's *λαβὼν ποτήριον* this metonymy is implicit but none the less real where *καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας* can only mean that Jesus blessed the wine in the cup. So far the metonymy is maintained in Mark. But the *καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες* unfolds the metonymy. They drank not the cup but the wine. Now that the thought has been led from the cup as a metonymy for the wine to the wine itself, Mark's *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου* is the natural sequence. But in Luke the metonymy is preserved throughout. It is implicit in *καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως*. Then Luke omits *καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, and so does not unfold the figure, making it instead more evident by writing *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον* for Mark's simple *τοῦτο*. Luke has committed himself to the metonymy. He writes *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου* because *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης* would violate the figure, and adds *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*, the natural consequence of his consistent use of the cup for the wine. He alters the *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* of Mark to *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, precisely because it is the cup which is given to them which carries the figure. If he had left *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* unchanged it might perhaps be thought that *τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* belonged logically to *τῷ αἵματι* but grammatically to *τὸ ποτήριον*. Since he maintains the use of cup as a metonymy for wine, it is likely that here *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* belongs both logically and grammatically to *τὸ ποτήριον*.

(2) The second infelicity of the text is found in the abruptness of v. 21 after v. 20. Axel Andersen²⁵ says, "The thought of v. 21, 'But (*πλήν*), behold the hand of my

²⁵ *Das Abendmahl* usw.² Giessen, 1906, p. 37.

betrayer is with me on the table', forms no contrast to v. 20. But it forms an excellent contrast to vv. 15-18, which express again the loving fellowship of Jesus with His disciples in the last hour". Spitta²⁶ also remarks, "It must not remain unobserved that if v. 20 belongs to a later form of the tradition, the word concerning the betrayer, v. 21, stood in the original immediately after that concerning the bread. And so there arises a noteworthy parallel to John xiii.18 where the words of Psalm xl.10 are applied to the betrayer: ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπήρην ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ." Πλήν, the adversative conjunction,²⁷ is one of Luke's favorite words, being used by him fifteen times (vi.24, 35; x. 11, 14, 20; xi. 41; xii. 31; xiii. 33; xvii. 1; xviii. 8; xix. 27; xxii. 21, 22, 42; xxiii. 28). Matthew has it five times (xi. 22, 24; xviii. 7; xxvi. 29, 64). Mark does not use it. It is found elsewhere in the New Testament six times (I Cor xi. 11; Eph v. 33; Phil i. 18; iii. 16; iv. 14; Rev ii. 25). An induction of the passages in which Luke uses it, though there is a difference of opinion among commentators, confirms Blass's classification of it as an adversative.²⁸ It is possibly expansive and progressive only in xi. 41. We have then to consider whether the πλήν . . . τραπέζης of v. 21 forms a better contrast to v. 19a than to v. 20. We must also keep in mind the fact that πλήν appears again as a strong adversative in v. 22. On the supposition that vv. 19b, 20 are an interpolation, the original text reads as follows: 19a καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 21 πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ'

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 298, Ann. 1, where the reference is cited, evidently from Tischendorf, as Psa. xl. 9; properly either LXX, xl. 10 or Heb. xli. 10.

²⁷ Blass-Thackeray, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, London and New York, 1905, p. 268.

²⁸ In spite of the opinion of B. Weiss in Meyer *Komm.*,⁹ 1901, p. 635, speaking of the adversative interpretation of πλήν in v. 21, "für welche Bedeutung die Ausleger in der verschiedensten, aber gleich künstlichen Weise eine Anknüpfung an die vorigen (unächtigen) Worte suchen."

ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης. 22 ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται. The first πλὴν may then be taken with Andersen as expressing a contrast between the "loving fellowship" of Jesus and His disciples and the disposition of Judas. No doubt the contrast is a strong one, though the first member of it is somewhat obscurely indicated in the bare *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*. The contrast is more explicit if vv. 19b, 20 be retained. The immediate context then reads: 20b *Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. 21 πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ κ.τ.λ.* It is not necessary to suppose that the πλὴν furnishes a restriction of *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* (Hofmann) or that it contrasts the dispositions of Jesus and Judas (Baljon), but that it institutes a contrast between the whole clause *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον . . . ἐκχυννόμενον* and the *ἡ χεὶρ . . . τραπέζης*. "Though my blood is shed for you, yet the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. For the Son of Man indeed goeth as it hath been determined (by God)—though God has determined that the Son of Man is to go—yet woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed." Here the contrast is explicit and progressive. Indeed it is not impossible to suppose that Luke has altered Mark's *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* to *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* (*ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* changed to *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, and the order changed) for the sake of the added sharpness which the new form lends to the following contrast. So far from agreeing with Andersen in his contention that v. 21 is more suitable after v. 19a than after v. 20, we seem forced to exactly the opposite conclusion. The parallel which Spitta suggests would be instituted with John xiii. 18 in case v. 21 followed v. 19a is fully contained in v. 21 itself, *πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης*.

Grass²⁹ argues for the originality of the short text on the basis of external and transcriptional evidence, but he feels

²⁹ *Das Verhalten zu Jesus nach den Forderungen der "Herrnworte" der drei ersten Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 110, Anm. 2.

the difficulty of supposing that the long text has arisen by interpolation from Paul. "It can hardly be supposed that the words are taken from the Pauline account in I Cor xi, for in that case they would be inserted here in closer agreement with the original, while as a matter of fact not unessential differences appear between Luke xxii. 19b, 20 and I Cor xi. 24, 25, which cannot be explained on that hypothesis. The supposition lies closer at hand that the interpolation is taken from the common oral tradition, in which case it is easy to account for minor variations". If under pressure of external and transcriptional evidence we feel compelled to regard vv. 19b, 20 as an interpolation from some source, Grass's suggestion, or Haupt's³⁰ that the interpolation was made from memory, would be well worth our attention. But for the present question it is beside the mark. We are considering the necessity of regarding vv. 19b, 20 as an interpolation on the ground of their similarity to I Cor and Mark, and of the infelicities of the text which these verses present. Grass does not feel the infelicities of the text, and he agrees that the interpolation has not been made from I Cor. We have as yet, therefore, no need for his hypothesis of an interpolation from oral tradition. We are not sure that there has been any interpolation at all. The external evidence raises a presumption for an interpolation, but a presumption which must stand or fall with the internal evidence. Grass agrees, on the basis of the internal evidence, that the interpolation has not been made from Paul. We may turn again to his suggestion, if the transcriptional evidence makes it probable that an interpolation from some source has taken place.

There remains to be considered the positive evidence for the unity of the passage vv. 17-20. Haupt³¹ calls attention to the parallelism between vv. 15, 16 and vv. 17, 18. V. 16 is an undeniable parallel to v. 18: in the former verse

³⁰ *Ueber die ursprüngliche Form u. Bedeutung der Abendmahlsworte*, Universitätsprogramm, Halle, 1894, p. 10.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

Jesus says that He will no more eat of the Passover until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God; in the latter, He says that He will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come. Vv. 15 and 17 afford respectively the ground and introduction for vv. 16 and 18. If v. 19b and v. 20 come from Luke, v. 19 and v. 20 afford another set of parallels. V. 19 reports the institution of the bread, which is neatly paralleled by v. 20 which reports the institution of the wine. We have then three sets of smoothly running parallels, vv. 15, 16; 17, 18; 19, 20, and as Schultzen³² says, "Then vv. 15-20 contain an excellently arranged group of ideas". It may perhaps be added that the parallelism is nicely rounded off by the *πλήν* clause of v. 21, followed by the similar *πλήν* clause of v. 22, and the final v. 23. The argument from this parallelism **cannot** be pressed too far, but the passage displaying it is much more likely to have been written by a narrator who was carefully feeling his way through his material, arranging it in suitable form, than by an interpolator who roughly inserted material which he conceived to be necessary to the sense of the scanty text before him.

It is moreover worth noticing that in the course of our examination of the supposed infelicities of the text of vv. 19b, 20, the reference of the participial clause *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*, and the contrast of v. 21, *πλήν ἰδοὺ . . . τραπέζης*, that the passage which is suspected of being an interpolation from I Cor and Mark seems necessary to the continuity of the thought of the whole. We found that the *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* of Mark had been altered to *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* in order that the metonymy contained in *τὸ ποτήριον* might be consistently carried out. It is precisely the cup which is given to those around the table which carries the figure. An examination of the contrast instituted by the *πλήν* of v. 21 has also revealed the fact that the clause, supposed to be interpolated from Mark, is more intelligible as the first member of the contrast than the

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου of v. 19a. It is precisely the fact that "my blood is shed for you" which sharpens the fact that "the hand of the betrayer is with me on the table". The ποτήριον of v. 17 without the article, and the τὸ ποτήριον of v. 20 with the article, also suggest a text in which even the articles are selected with a careful regard to the meaning intended. These considerations, not of much weight in themselves, taken together with the apparent continuity of vv. 17-20, revealed in the parallelism of verses, constitute an argument of some value in support of the supposition that we have to attribute the passage to a single writer. Add to this presumption the fact that although the suspicion of an interpolation of vv. 19b, 20 was first aroused by their similarity to I Cor. and Mark, a further examination has revealed the difficulties in the way of confirming that suspicion, for not only are the differences considerable and hard to explain, but the infelicities of the text to which final appeal was made have been found capable of explanation, and it may be concluded that the internal difficulty of the long text drawn from the appearance of an interpolation from the parallels is no more insurmountable than that drawn from the presence of two cups.

INTRINSIC DIFFICULTIES OF THE D a ff² i l TEXT.

We have now to consider the intrinsic difficulties of the short text. We need only spread the text attested by D a ff² i l out before us to feel the difficulties which caused b e to invert vv. 17, 18, and Syr^{cu} Syr^{sin} variously to enrich the text. The institution of the cup is narrated before the institution of the bread, an inversion of the traditional order in narration and church praxis. There is an entire lack of the words which in the other accounts of the institution indicate the sacramental significance of the cup. V. 17 merely informs us that "He received a cup, and when He had given thanks, He said, take this and divide it among yourselves". V. 18 immediately follows with the

saying that He will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come. There is no hint of any relationship between the wine in the cup and His blood. So far as this account is concerned the cup has no indicated sacramental significance.

Westcott and Hort³³ pass over this second difficulty, but suggest an explanation of the first: "The difficulty of the shorter reading consists exclusively in the change of order as to the Bread and the Cup, which is illustrated by many phenomena of the relation between the narratives of the third and of the first two Gospels, and which finds an exact parallel in the change of order in St. Luke's account of the Temptation (iv. 5-8; 9-12) corrected in like manner in accordance with Mt in some Old Latin MSS. and in Amb." Grass³⁴ draws in for comparison another passage, Lk xi. 30-32 *cf.* Mt xii. 40-42. Appeal has also been made to the order of the prayers in Didache ix. 2, 3, where οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου precedes περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος,³⁵ and to I Cor x. 16. R. A. Hoffmann³⁶ remarks that the Lucan change of the Matthaean order in the temptation narrative relieves the Lucan change to the cup-bread order of its singularity, but does not explain it. It may also be said that it is a very different thing to change the order in an account of two historical events which have given rise to a sacramental practice almost universally in the order bread-cup (if for the moment the cup-bread order in the Didache be accepted) and to change the order of events in a narrative with no liturgical or sacramental significance. A merely literary motive, or a change of order in the temptation-source at Luke's disposal—a change which might easily have taken place since no particular significance attaches itself to the order of the temptations—is sufficient to account for the situation in Lk iv. 5-8, 9-12.

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

³⁵ *Cf.* Brandt, *Die evangelische Geschichte u. der Ursprung des Christentums*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 301, Anm. 4.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

Some larger motive must have been operative to have caused Luke to depart not only from the Marcan tradition, which was certainly known to him, but also from the almost universal church praxis (admitting again that the Didache is an exception). This larger motive is not suggested by Westcott and Hort. Nor is the additional passage which Grass draws in any more helpful. For even though it be admitted that Luke is no improvement on Matthew, the same considerations urged in the case of the temptation narrative are of even greater weight here.

Whatever may be thought of Zahn's contention³⁷ that the prayers of Didache ix are not intended for the Lord's Supper in the narrower sense but for the preceding Agape, it has not escaped notice that the Didache knows the order bread-cup, ix. 5 *μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω*; x. 3 *τροφὴν τε καὶ ποτόν*. It is most likely that unconscious habit, established by current usage, emerges here in these incidental references. In respect to the order of I Cor x. 16, it may be said that it is occasioned by the context, and is sufficiently controlled by the formal account of the institution in I Cor xi. 24ff. where the order bread-cup is followed. It is not possible to suppose that Paul has contradicted himself within the limits of the short passage from x. 16 to xi. 24.³⁸

It cannot be maintained that these attempts to explain the unusual order of the elements in the short text have been successful, and yet what Hoffmann³⁹ justly calls "the chief difficulty, the failure of a symbolical reference in the wine" has been left without any explanation. Schmiedel⁴⁰ is finally decided in his rejection of the short text as Lucan by the impossibility "that the Evangelist himself should have furnished us with an account of the Lord's Supper

³⁷ *Forschungen* usw., Erlangen, 1884, iii. p. 293, also *Einleitung*,³ 2ter Bd., p. 364 and Drews in Hennecke, *Neutestamentl. Apokryphen*, Tübingen u. Leipzig, 1904, p. 187.

³⁸ *Cf.* Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

³⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁴⁰ *Protestantische Kirchenztg.*, 1896, Sp. 104.

that contains no words of Jesus indicative of the significance of the elements except, 'This is my body', without any explanation of the cup. If it were possible to assert that the account of Luke was the most primitive, then there would be at least a little sense in attributing so singular a form to it. But all the defenders of the shorter text admit that the third Evangelist used the second, if not the first, Gospel, and knew besides the Pauline account". How did it happen that Luke, certainly familiar with the Marcan tradition and the church praxis, wrote an account of the Lord's Supper in which there is nothing to indicate the sacramental significance of the wine? This phenomenon, together with the placing of the cup before the bread, has given rise to many hypotheses on the part of the defenders of the short text.

(a) There is the explanation offered by Grass⁴¹: "So far as the brevity is concerned, the Evangelist did not need to report in detail the words which in any case were among the best known of our Lord's sayings. The words in explanation of the bread indicate sufficiently what is here narrated." It is hardly conceivable that Luke who prefaces his Gospel as he does, should have omitted "words which in any case were among the best known of our Lord's sayings" because he did not need to quote them in order to aid his readers in identifying vv. 17, 18 as an intended account of the Lord's Supper. They might conjecture his purpose from the *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου* in connection with the bread. The character of Luke's Gospel is a sufficient refutation of Grass's hypothesis.

(b) Haupt⁴² suggests that the short text originated through a misunderstanding on the part of the author of the third Gospel. "It can, moreover, be proved that Luke was not led to place the cup before the bread by any tradition to that effect which lay before him, but by a misun-

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 10f. Cf. Rogaar, *Het Avondmaal en zijne oorspronkelijke Beteekenis*, Groningen, 1897, pp. 31f.

derstanding of the source which he used. Luke found the sayings, vv. 15, 16 and vv. 17, 18, which belong together, in the source peculiar to him in their correct position, as an introduction to the Last Supper. A confusion of the first half of the words of Jesus with the Lord's Supper was impossible, for they speak of the eating of the paschal lamb, while bread is eaten in the Supper. But Luke could well confuse the saying of v. 17, according to which Jesus gave the cup to His disciples with the Lord's Supper cup, and therefore omit it in its proper place, thinking that he had already given an account of it." Both Schmiedel⁴³ and Hehn⁴⁴ have been quick to remark that if Luke mistook the first cup of his source for the Lord's Supper cup, his source must have been one in which two cups were mentioned, first a paschal cup, then a Lord's Supper cup, that is to say, a source like our present longer Lucan text. The longer text is then older than the shorter, and the mistake which the defenders of the short text hesitate to attribute to a copyist, namely the mistaking of the cup of v. 17 for the Lord's Supper cup and the omission of vv. 19a, 20 under the impression that the Lord's Supper cup had already been reported and from which the *Daffil* text originated, is attributed to Luke himself. The suggestion advanced by Haupt, if it be accepted, is a direct confirmation of the greater antiquity of the longer text.

(c) It is also possible that the shorter text of Luke preserves a more accurate account of the institution of the Lord's Supper than Matthew, Mark or Paul. This view has been strongly urged by W. Brandt.⁴⁵ Brandt denies any original temporal or ideal connection between the Passover and the Lord's Supper. The Last Supper was the ordinary evening meal which Jesus was accustomed to eat with His disciples (p. 294). At that meal, He broke the bread and divided it among them that by their sharing it

⁴³ *Prot. Kztg.*, 1896, Sp. 105.

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 283ff., Cf. Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 15f., Schmiedel, *Prot. Kztg.*, 1896, Sp. 105f.

they might signify the fact that they belonged to one family (p. 295). Not so with the cup. The whole idea of the significant relationship between the cup and the blood of the covenant, as it appears in the present Marcan text, is a later addition under the influence of Pauline theology (pp. 289, 290). The same may be said of the announcement of Jesus that He will not drink of the fruit of the vine until He drinks it in the Kingdom of God (p. 292). Since the words which make the cup significant do not go back of Paul, it is easy to conjecture that the cup was not regarded as important either in the *Urgemeinde* or at the Last Supper itself (p. 292). This conjecture is strengthened by the fact that the Lord's Supper is called *ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* (Lk xxiv. 35, Acts ii. 42) in the best accounts of its celebration (p. 292). The uncertainty proven by Ad. Harnack with reference to the proper contents of the cup, whether water or mixed wine, that continued until the middle of the second century, is best explained if the mother church had furnished no tradition with reference to the cup (p. 293). Paul is responsible for making the Lord's Supper into a memorial of the death of Jesus (p. 295): the connection with the Passover is first found in Mk (p. 297). It is only after the destruction of Jerusalem, when, because it was impossible to secure lambs for the Passover meal, bread and the cups became the chief ingredients of the Passover, that the similarity between the Lord's Supper and the Passover was apparent enough to allow the conjecture of their original coincidence. The Evangelists represent Jesus as celebrating the Passover as is customary in their day, not in His (p. 297). This representation of the Lord's Supper as a Passover had two consequences. (1) Wine which was probably not from the first part of the Supper, became, under the influence of the Passover cups, one of the essential ingredients (p. 297). (2) The order of cup-bread, represented by the shorter text of Luke, which Brandt accepts (*cf.* p. 301, Anm. 4) is an adaptation of the Lord's Supper to the Passover ritual,

in which the meal was introduced by a cup (one of four) which was the "cup of blessing" in the most significant sense (p. 302). Neither Matthew nor Mark ventured on this further approximation of the Lord's Supper to the Passover. The Lucan short text makes the venture.

It is clear that Brandt has an interest in maintaining the originality of the short text. The failure of any indication of a connection between the cup and sacrificial blood makes the cup an incidental rather than an integral part of the Supper. The words concerning the bread stop short of the Pauline *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, and may be interpreted in accordance with I Cor x. 16, 17. Moreover, the order cup-bread is made to support Brandt's contention of a later adaptation of the Lord's Supper to the Passover. Luke's short text preserves, on Brandt's theory, a truer account of the Lord's Supper in the first two respects, the incidental character of the cup, and the interpretation of the bread as a symbol of community among its partakers. In the cup-bread order, however, it represents the last stage in a process in which Mark, Matthew and Paul are intermediate.

Brandt cites *Pesachim* x : 2 as evidence that the first cup of the Jewish Passover was "the cup of blessing" *κατ' ἕξοχήν*. There, however, the first cup is called merely *כוס ראשון* and there is no indication that the first cup is called the "cup of blessing". With whatever cup of the Passover ritual the cup of v. 17 be identified,⁴⁶ it seems certain that the third cup was the "cup of blessing", by eminence.⁴⁷ In the present state of our knowledge of the Passover ritual of the time, and of the closeness with which Jesus' adherence to it is represented by the Synop- tists, it seems impossible to affirm with Brandt that Luke in the short text ventures upon a closer approximation of the Lord's Supper to the Passover than do Matthew and Mark.

⁴⁶ Cf. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, 1878, p. 485, for the view that it was the first cup, and Resch as cited above for the view that it was the third cup.

⁴⁷ Cf. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on Mt xxvi. 27; Schmiedel, *Hand-Comm.* on I Cor x. 16; Spitta, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

Brandt's argument that the cup was originally of merely incidental significance in the celebration of the Lord's Supper rests on Harnack's contention in his *Brot und Wasser: die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin (Texte u. Untersuchungen*, vii, 1891, pp. 117ff.), and on the designation of the Lord's Supper as ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου in Lk xxiv. 35; Acts ii. 42 (to which may be added with equal pertinency Acts ii. 46; xx. 11). It may be affirmed with confidence that Luke xxiv. 35 does not relate a celebration of the Lord's Supper. In the other passages, if it be admitted that the Lord's Supper is referred to, it is probable that the whole sacrament is conveniently described by naming a part of it, "the breaking of the bread". Harnack's contention rests upon an extremely doubtful interpretation of passages in Justin and Cyprian. It has been entirely deprived of any evidential value by the thorough examination and refutation to which it has been subjected by Jülicher, Zahn and Funk.⁴⁸

There remains only the interpretation of the bread as a symbol of community. It is a possible interpretation for τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, but by no means the only possible interpretation and merely serves to relate the short text of Luke more closely to Mark and Matthew than to Paul. Apart from general considerations which could be urged against Brandt's whole construction of the Gospel history, it appears that his theory that the short text of Luke presents an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper more closely in accord with the primitive facts than the other Synoptists or Paul breaks down on examination.

Schultzen⁴⁹ proposes two explanations in case the short-

⁴⁸ Jülicher, *Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsfeier in der ältesten Kirche*, *Theol. Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker . . . gewidmet*, 1892, pp. 215-250; Zahn, *Brot u. Wein im Abendmahl der alten Kirche*, *Neue kirchliche Zeitung*, III Jahrgang, 1892, pp. 261-262, also printed separately, 1892; Funk, *Die Abendmahlselemente bei Justin*, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 74 Jahrgang, 1892, pp. 643-659; cf. Harnack in *Theol. Lititzg.*, 1892, Sp. 374-378, *Dogmengesch.*,³ iter Bd., pp. 64f.

⁴⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 110f.

er text is held to be original. The author of the Gospel may have misunderstood his sources, and so omitted a second cup reported by them : a view which has already been discussed. Or he may preserve a truer tradition than either Mark or Matthew. Originally the cup had no more meaning for the Lord's Supper than it had for the Passover. The eating of the broken bread was the essential thing in the whole celebration. As long as the celebration was held daily, it consisted solely in the breaking of bread. As the celebration became more ceremonial, the wine was added—perhaps also in remembrance of the fact that Jesus drank wine at the Last Supper—until the use of wine became an integral part of the sacrament. Or the use of wine was a part of the sacrament from the first, but it was originally unaccompanied by any words explanatory of its significance. But the fact that the bread and wine appeared side by side in the sacrament, and the bread was accompanied by a *τοῦτό ἐστιν* led to the enrichment of the account by the addition of a *τοῦτό ἐστιν* for the wine. Either the mother church or Paul is responsible for the specification of the blood as "the blood of the covenant". If Jesus spoke accompanying words only in connection with the bread—and in the shorter text there is no specific reference to the actual eating of the bread or to a repetition of the sacrament—it is possible that we have to do with a purely symbolical act designed by Jesus to make the disciples understand the significance of His death. The account is much more indefinite and gives room for the liveliest play of fancy.

Schultzen's suggestion, made in a less reconstructive spirit than Brandt's, fails not only in not accounting for the presence of the cup before the bread in the Lucan narrative, but, what is much more serious, fails to account for the presence of the cup, ranged alongside the bread on terms of sacramental equality in Matthew, Mark and Paul. The tradition in Mark (Matthew) is at least as old as that in Luke. Paul's tradition goes back of his first visit to Corinth

on the second missionary journey.⁵⁰ That is to say, at the time the third Gospel was written, there was widely current a tradition in which the bread preceded the cup, and both were equally accompanied with words indicative of their sacramental significance—a tradition, moreover, at least in the latter respect (the *Didache* adding its testimony), followed by the church praxis. If Jesus divided a cup at the Last Supper, in conformity to common usage, but left it without sacramental designation, we must suppose that very early the mother church or Paul arbitrarily added the specification of the wine as the blood of the new covenant, and totally altered the character of the Lord's Supper by elevating their own institution of the cup to an equality with our Lord's institution of the bread. This *tour de force* was unquestioned except by Luke's negative attitude and was universally accepted in the church praxis. If the wine itself was added, as the celebration of the sacrament became more ceremonial, the difficulty of understanding the motive for the alteration of the character of the Supper is not only intrinsically enhanced, but the shorter Lucan account is itself at variance with the primitive usage (*δεξάμενος ποτήριον*). The early and unanimous testimony of Mark (Matthew) and Paul makes it almost certain that from the first the cup was of equal sacramental importance with the bread, and that our Lord indicated its sacramental significance Himself, in which case it is not possible to hold that the shorter Lucan text preserves a truer tradition than Mark (Matthew) or Paul.

(d) We must also reckon with the possibility that the short account of the Lord's Supper was set down by Luke in obedience to some religio-dogmatic tendency. This explanation in its simplest form is suggested by Schultzen.⁵¹ "There remains only one way out, that Luke, in contrast to Mark and Paul, intends to relate significant words of

⁵⁰ I Cor xi. 23, Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.

⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

Jesus only in connection with the bread. It is improbable that he himself took offense at the drinking of blood: he must be following here a Jewish-Christian source, in which the words concerning the cup were lacking—the idea which they express might afford difficulties for Jewish Christians. If Matthew were under discussion, that might be possible. But it is impossible to see why Luke, who is so well acquainted with Pauline ideas, and who so intentionally emphasizes the equality of Jews and Gentiles, should have given the preference exactly here to a Jewish-Christian source over the accounts of Paul and Mark, which he knew." In other words, this suggestion, first presupposes the Jewish Christian offense at the drinking of the wine as symbolical of the blood, holding that their offense took objective shape in an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and then discovers itself unable to demonstrate how Luke, who shows such an opposite disposition in his Gospel, came to yield to the representations of his Jewish-Christian source in the face of the unanimous testimony of the tradition known to him. Moreover, it is perhaps unnecessary to remark that this view does not account for the order cup-bread.

Johannes Weiss⁵² supposes that in many passages Luke has used a Jewish-Christian source, *e. g.* in xxii. 25-30, where he omits the Pauline *λύτρον* of Mk x. 45, and above all in the Lord's Supper account of the short text. The characteristic of this Jewish-Christian source in Luke, and of the similar Petrine speeches in Acts, and of the Epistle of James is the suppression of the sacrificial significance of the death of Christ. "In this account (Lk xxii. 17, 18, 19a) as it came from the old Jewish-Christian church at Jerusalem, there is lacking any indication of the significance

⁵² Meyer-Weiss, *Marcus u. Lucas*,⁸ 1892, pp. 617ff., and *Die Predigt Jesu, vom Reiche Gottes*,² Göttingen, 1900, pp. 102ff., *cf.* Schaeffer, Spitta, *op. cit.*, pp. 299ff., Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 15; Schmiedel, *Prot. Kstg.*, 1896, Sp. 104.

of the death of Christ for the salvation of the disciples⁵³." The short account in Luke is without the Pauline indications of the significance of Jesus' death: "the body given for you", the cup as "the covenant on the ground of my blood which is poured out for you", and the command for the repetition of the sacrament. The Lord's Supper is a farewell meal, in which the cup is drunk and bread eaten as a symbol of the personal communion of Jesus with His disciples—a communion that was to continue after His death.

It is doubtful whether the phenomena to which Weiss has called attention are sufficiently weighty to necessitate the hypothesis of a Jewish-Christian source departing so widely from the common tradition of the *Urgemeinde*. Moreover, Spitta⁵⁴ has remarked the fact that a reference to the sacrificial character of the death of Jesus is present in the short text, for the body of Christ is there thought of as parallel to the body of the Passover lamb. Even if it be denied that any reference to the sacrificial death of Christ is to be found in the *ἔκλασεν*—the reference is certainly not impossible—yet the fact that the words concerning the bread are the same in the Lucan short text as in Mark and Matthew's account of the Lord's Supper where the express connection between the wine and blood precludes the Jewish-Christian tendency, still further militates against Weiss's hypothesis. Moreover, as Hoffmann⁵⁵ points out, if the author of the source had desired to eliminate any reference to the meaning of the death of Christ for salvation, he would have done it by omitting the addition to *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου*, not the words themselves. And why did he change the order? Surely that

⁵³ *Komm.* p. 619. Weiss does not mean to deny that Jesus regarded His death as having significance for salvation. It was unnecessary for the salvation of the disciples, as they were already partakers of it, but was essential for the yet unrepentant people, *cf. Predigt*, pp. 102ff. He, however, sometimes fails to make the limitation, *cf. Predigt*, p. 198.

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 299.

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

procedure was not necessary to accomplish the suppression he desired. In view of the result of our examination of the suggested tendencies, we are safe in saying that the short text of Luke was not written under the influence of a religio-dogmatic tendency.

In fact, Schmiedel seems to be right in saying that the shorter Lucan text is "simply inexplicable".⁵⁶ It is not sufficient to suppose that the author intended merely to indicate the general background, and not to work in the details of the Supper. If Luke wrote the short text under a misunderstanding of his sources, the two-cup source must be older than the shorter Lucan text. The short text does not present a more accurate picture of the institution than the other Synoptists or Paul. It was not written under the influence of any assignable religio-dogmatic tendency. On intrinsic grounds, we must reject its originality. The longer text has internal difficulties, indeed, but difficulties capable of alleviation, and in no way comparable to the intrinsic difficulties of the short text. Our examination of the intrinsic evidence has more than reversed the presumption raised in favor of the short text by the examination of the external evidence, a presumption itself raised on the basis of internal evidence. There yet remains to be examined the transcriptional evidence.

TRANSCRIPTIONAL EVIDENCE OF THE D a ff² i l TEXT.

On the hypothesis that the short text is original, our problem is to determine how a copyist having before him the short text might come to alter it into the long form. As already pointed out the short text would contain two causes of offense to a copyist, (1) the order cup-bread, (2) the lack of any sacramental words in connection with the cup. Under these two influences, we are to suppose that a copyist having before him an exemplar in which vv. 17, 18, 19a constituted an account of the Lord's Supper, enlarged it to the form vv. 17, 18, 19, 20. Some questions

⁵⁶ "einfach unerhört", *Hand-Comm.* p. 269.

emerge with reference to the offense lying in the order cup-bread. If the copyist regarded the cup of v. 17 as the Lord's Supper cup, why did he not simply invert the order of verses as b e have done, giving us the order vv. 19a, 17, 18? Perhaps it is sufficient to say that his account would still be without sacramental words in connection with the cup. However, it is worth noticing that the simple inversion satisfied the copyists of b e. If the copyist did not regard the cup of v. 17 as the Lord's Supper cup, why did he let it stand? It is hardly probable that he left it in order nicely to indicate the relationship between the Lord's Supper and the Passover. Perhaps it is sufficient to appeal with Zahn, in another connection, to the reluctance of the church to part with any early tradition; though it may reasonably be objected that the Western text and not the Neutral is chiefly notable for its preservation of more or less incongruous bits of tradition. It may also be regarded as possible that so long as the copyist was enriching his account by the introduction of the familiar Lord's Supper cup in the Pauline form, he found it natural to introduce *διδόμενον* in v. 19b and to add the *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* of v. 20 from Mark. Or he may have interpolated from oral tradition or from memory, which is much more likely. The internal difficulties attaching to this supposition have already been pointed out. It must moreover be admitted that the history of the text, that is to say, of the forms presented by b e and Syr^{cu} and Syr^{sin} are capable of explanation only on the hypothesis that the text-form D a ff² i l lay before the copyists. Graefe's⁵⁷ attempt to explain Syr^{cu}, Syr^{sin}, b e directly from \aleph ABCL etc. is not impressive. D a ff² i l must be regarded as the parent of b e, Syr^{cu}, Syr^{sin}. In b e the traditional order bread-cup has been restored by a simple inversion of v. 19a, giving us a text in the order, vv. 19a, 17, 18. No attempt has been made at enrichment of the account in respect of sacramental words with the cup. Syr^{cu} and

⁵⁷ *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1896, pp. 250-256.

Syr¹¹ⁿ have felt this serious deficiency of the text and have variously supplied it from the Pauline account. It is unnecessary to determine whether Syr^{cu} and Syr¹¹ⁿ have made the inversion of v. 19a independently of b e or whether they depend on b e for it. Syr¹¹ⁿ with its vv. 19, 20a, 17, 20b, 18 has carried the process of enrichment further than Syr^{cu} with its vv. 19, 17, 18. That the Syriac texts have been much worked over in this section is proven by the fact that the Peschitta, the Sinaitic and the Curetonian Syriac each translate the *γενήματος τοῦ* of v. 18 by a different word. We must conclude that, looked at from the point of view of transcriptional evidence, it is possible that **Ⲛ** ABCL etc. has been derived from D a ff² i 1, though the supposition is not without its difficulties.

TRANSCRIPTIONAL EVIDENCE OF THE **Ⲛ**ABCL etc. TEXT.

We must now examine the transcriptional evidence on the hypothesis that the long text is original. Here the problem is to determine how a copyist having before him the long form of the text might come to alter it to the short form. As Westcott and Hort indicate, the perception of the fact that the long form contained two cups is the only apparent reason for the omission of vv. 19b, 20. The copyist saw two cups in the exemplar: he omitted the latter one. He must have regarded the cup of v. 17 as the Lord's Supper cup.

Holtzheuer⁵⁸ is unwilling to attribute the thoughtlessness which would regard the cup of v. 17 as the Lord's Supper cup either to Luke or to a copyist. He asserts that there are two possibilities: either the Evangelist meant only to give a rapid sketch, without pretending to fill in the details, a view already discussed; or some physical accident has caused a hole in the manuscript from which the witnesses of the short text are descended. He is quite justly unwilling to let the latter suggestion stand alone: it rests on no more satisfactory basis than the former. Berning⁵⁹

⁵⁸ *Das Abendmahl u. die neuere Kritik*, Berlin, 1896, pp. 26f.

⁵⁹ *Die Einsetzung der hl. Eucharistie*, Münster i. W., 1901, p. 42.

is probably right when he dismisses the hypothesis of a hole in the manuscript, "for no one will seriously agree with the view of Holtzheuer".⁶⁰

Joh. Weiss⁶¹ holds that "an omission of these highly important words on the part of a copyist is simply unthinkable". But the fact remains that we must attribute their omission either to a copyist or to Luke. The former seems the better alternative in view of the intrinsic difficulties of the short text. Spitta⁶² replies to Weiss: "We do not owe the manifold additions of the Codex D to a mere copyist. We cannot decide merely on the basis of our own feelings whether the conservation of the words of v. 20 or the harmonizing of Luke with the other two Synoptists by the omission of the one cup, appeared more important to the person in question."

Two difficulties have been raised in the way of the hypothesis that the copyist omitted vv. 19b, 20 in order to harmonize his account with that of the other Synoptists in respect of the number of cups it reports.

(1) Westcott and Hort⁶³ ask why he did not choose for omission the less familiar words of v. 17.

(2) Why did he omit v. 19b, which has no connection with either of the cups?

In regard to the first question, Schmiedel⁶⁴ remarks, "Westcott and Hort silently admit that the shorter text of the Lord's Supper is simply inexplicable when they find it impossible to understand why the copyists of D etc. chose for omission the familiar Lord's Supper words instead of xxii. 17." Is it more difficult to suppose that a copyist omitted the familiar words of v. 20 or that Luke failed to report them? Spitta⁶⁵ has called attention to the fact that

⁶⁰ Resch's view that the short text is due to the activity of a Jewish-Christian redactor, working over the original text, is sufficiently answered by Berning, *op. cit.*, pp. 30ff.

⁶¹ Meyer-Weiss, *Marcus u. Lucas*, as cited, p. 616.

⁶² *Op. cit.*, p. 296.

⁶³ *Op. cit.*, p. 63.

⁶⁴ *Hand-Comm.*, p. 269.

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 296.

v. 17 has a number of points of agreement with the Synoptic narrative, which are lacking in v. 20 : the taking of the cup, the blessing of it, the command to take it, and to drink it together. These similarities of v. 17 to the Synoptic narrative, though no doubt somewhat superficial, might have influenced a copyist to select v. 17 for preservation instead of v. 20, if we may conceive that before he had written v. 17 he was aware of the second cup in v. 20. However, as will immediately appear, he probably did not notice the cup of v. 20 until he had already transcribed the cup of v. 17.

The second question (why the copyist omitted v. 19b, which is not connected with either cup) has given rise to a lively discussion concerning the amount of cleverness to be attributed to the copyist under consideration. Schmiedel⁶⁶ opened the matter by asserting : "On the other hand, it is possible that a copyist and only a copyist, remarking in the midst of his writing the disconcerting appearance of a second cup, might have remedied his difficulty by a simple omission of that which he had not yet written, and in doing so, allowed the quite innocent closing words of xxii. 19 to fall out with them." Brandt⁶⁷ replied : "A copyist who saw beyond the closing words of xxii. 19 could see far enough to realize that these words had nothing to do with the second cup. A really stupid copyist, on the other hand, would not have been bewildered until he actually reached v. 20." The dilemma was not without its effect on Schmiedel⁶⁸ who answered : "What a copyist would or would not do, according to the degree of his cleverness, will doubtless always be a disputable question. For that very reason I have not advanced my suggestion on this point as decisive, as my expression 'might have' shows, but I advanced it only as a proof that my view, which rests on other grounds, could be carried through in this point also. What I regarded as decisive was the impossibility of conceiving that

⁶⁶ *Hand-Comm.*, p. 269.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 584.

⁶⁸ *Prot. Kztg.*, 1896, Sp. 103.

the Evangelist himself should have furnished us with an account of the Lord's Supper that contains no words of Jesus indicative of the significance of the elements except 'This is my body' without any explanation of the cup."

Fortunately it is not necessary to determine the mental dullness of the copyist with any great precision, nor is it necessary to fall in with the somewhat naive suggestion of Schultzen⁶⁹ that toward the end of the book the copyist worked with particular haste "perhaps because times of persecution made haste necessary. This conjecture explains most simply why precisely these chapters are so rich in additions: the copyist had a scanty text and enlarged it more than was necessary or good". It is manifestly improbable that a copyist would enrich a text because he was afraid of imminent interruption by the inquisition.

Hoffmann's⁷⁰ suggestion is less interesting but more valuable. The copyist omits the cup of v. 20 because the Synoptic tradition with which he was familiar records only one cup. He omits v. 19b, leaving *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου* without the *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον* because Mark (Matthew) reports the words of Jesus concerning the significance of the bread in that simple fashion.

A survey of the transcriptional evidence thus brings us to no definite conclusion. We must rely upon the external and the intrinsic evidence for our final decision.

We have now completed our examination of the evidence for the texts attested by \aleph ABCL etc. and D a ff² i 1. The external evidence raises a presumption in favor of the shorter text, but a presumption itself based on internal evidence, and requiring the support of the internal evidence for its confirmation in any particular case. Westcott and Hort rest their argument for the short text largely on intrinsic and transcriptional evidence. Our examination of the transcriptional evidence has yielded no positive result. The intrinsic evidence, however, is strongly against

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

the originality of the shorter text—so strongly indeed that we feel justified in agreeing with Schultzen⁷¹ when he says: “The internal difficulties noticed above make it as good as certain that the Lucan text originally included vv. 15-20.”

THE TEXT OF b e (SYR^{cu} SYR^{sin}).

There yet remains for discussion the third form of text, the originality of which has been advocated by Dean Blakesley⁷² and Th. Zahn.⁷³ Scrivener⁷⁴ thought that the argument of Dean Blakesley in favor of this text had not received the attention it deserved, though he himself argues against it. The same text has, however, been more recently advocated by Th. Zahn, who asserts that its originality seems to him certain. The attestation of this text falls into three groups, b e, and its interpolated forms Syr^{cu} and Syr^{sin}. Its originality is supported first by comparison with the group D a ff² i l, and finally by a further comparison with the group \aleph ABCL etc. Very serious difficulties are encountered in the progress of the argument. The difficulties emerge first in the attempted demonstration of the originality of the group b e Syr^{cu} Syr^{sin} as against the group D a ff² i l, which Zahn maintains on the basis of two considerations.

(1) The ancient character of the Latin witnesses b e, with which Syr^{cu} and Syr^{sin} are in essential agreement, in comparison with a ff² i l, proves that the former is a more original Latin form from which the latter is derived. The texts attested by these two groups of witnesses are similar in every respect except the order of verses. They are both without the second cup, both destitute of any indication of the sacramental significance of the cup, and both have the short Synoptic “hoc est corpus meum”. But b e preserves the traditional order, the bread then the cup, vv. 19a-17-18, while a ff² i l has the order, otherwise attested

⁷¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁷² *Praelectio in Scholis Cantab.*, Feb. 14, 1850.

⁷³ *Einleitung*,³ 2ter Bd., pp. 363ff.

⁷⁴ *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.*,³ 1874, pp. 519ff., unchanged in the 3rd and 4th ed., Miller.

only by D, cup-bread, vv. 17-18-19a. How did it happen that a copyist with the usual order before him changed it, instituting a new and unattested order, while he preserved the exact wording of his exemplar to the smallest detail? Zahn answers: Under the influence of the text represented by \aleph ABCL etc., which gradually came to be the dominating text even in the West. The order of the \aleph ABCL etc. text was all the more readily appropriated because of the apparently passable *parallelismus membrorum* which it establishes between vv. 15, 16 and vv. 17, 18. On closer examination the answer seems insufficient. It is impossible to see why, if the parallelism between vv. 15, 16 and vv. 17, 18 was sufficiently striking to cause the copyist to change the order of verses in his exemplar so as to present the entirely new order cup-bread, contrary to all tradition, it was not strong enough to cause him to add vv. 19b, 20 to his scanty v. 19a, which standing alone would mar the symmetry of his account, but which with the addition of vv. 19b, 20 would complete the parallelism vv. 15, 16; vv. 17, 18; vv. 19, 20. Or, if it be objected that he would not add v. 20 because of the difficulty of the second cup, it may be answered, that if he felt that difficulty, he must have considered the cup of v. 17 to be the Lord's Super cup. The failure of any indication of a relationship between the cup and the blood must have given offense to him, as Zahn remarks at another point in his argument. "On the other hand, every one must have taken offense at the fact that Luke did not correlate the cup with the blood and that he in no way indicated its sacramental significance". It is perhaps possible to see how a copyist, having no account before him in which the relationship of the cup to the blood was indicated, might be content to pass the difficulty over in silence, but it is hard to see how a copyist who so far stood under the influence of a text containing a full indication of the sacramental significance of the cup as to invert the order of his exemplar and establish an order cup-bread, merely for the sake of a somewhat uncertain symmetry, and

in contradiction to known tradition, could have failed to remedy a condition which must have given offense to every one, when the material lay so richly at his hand. It is much simpler to suppose that the copyist, being fully aware of the liturgical order bread-cup, did what he could to conform his account to tradition by simply inverting the order of his exemplar, and establishing the order 19a-17-18.

(2) The text of D a ff² i l cannot be original because in it the only cup which D a ff² i l or b e have is placed before the bread. This order contradicts all tradition both of the New Testament, Marcion and Tatian, as well as the liturgical praxis. I Cor cannot be appealed to because it is impossible that Paul would contradict himself in the short passage x. 16-xi. 23. The Didache knows the order food-drink, and the prayers in chap. ix. do not belong to the Lord's Supper in the narrower sense but to the introductory Agape. This argument, if its validity be admitted and the interpretation of I Cor x. 16 and the Didache be allowed to stand, proves indeed that D a ff² i l cannot be original, but it requires the demonstration of the relationship between b e and D a ff² i l asserted in (1) to constitute a proof of the originality of b e. As we have seen, it is impossible to maintain that relationship, and the legitimate result of the argument is to cast suspicion on the originality of both b e and D a ff² i l.

The real burden of Zahn's proof must, however, be borne by the comparison of b e and \aleph ABCL etc. He concludes that b e preserves the original text on the following grounds.

(1) The age of attestation. But it is not so apparent that the text attested by b e has the advantage in age over the text attested by \aleph ABCL etc.

(2) The history of the text. The origin of b e from \aleph ABCL etc. is just as inexplicable as the origin of \aleph ABCL etc. from b e is explicable. No Christian of an earlier or later date could take offense at the well known words of vv. 19b, 20, taken partly from Mark and partly from Paul. How then explain their omission by b e if \aleph ABCL etc. is

original? "On the other hand, every one must have taken offense at the fact that Luke did not correlate the cup with the blood and that he has in no way indicated its sacramental significance". But since in early times the Gospel of Luke was considered the Gospel of Paul there was nothing more natural than an enlargement of his scanty text from I Cor. But in accordance with an effective canon of the old textual criticism which hesitated to lose any old tradition that was in accordance with ecclesiastical taste, the cup of v. 17, forced from its position by the interpolation of the cup of v. 20, was simply placed before the institution of the sacrament. Both the negative and the positive aspects of this argument contain difficulties. It is perhaps true that no early Christian would take offense at the words of vv. 19a, 20. There is no difficulty in the words themselves, but there is a difficulty in the fact that they furnish an account of a second cup. Suppose the \aleph ABCL etc. text original, a copyist having written down the account of the first cup, might easily be surprised by the emergence of another cup and have remedied the situation by simply omitting v. 20 and with it v. 19a. As Berning⁷⁵ suggests, the difficulty is measurably lightened when D a ff² i l is considered a middle member between \aleph ABCL etc. and b e (Syrⁱⁿ Syr^{cu}). If D a ff² i l is a correction of \aleph ABCL etc. caused by the two cups, b e is a correction of D a ff² i l caused by the unusual cup-bread order, and Syr^{cu} and Syrⁱⁿ are interpolations of b e in the endeavor to enrich the cup-words. The reason Zahn suggests for the enlargement of b e into \aleph ABCL etc. is the failure of any sacramental significance attached to the cup, that significance being supplied in \aleph ABCL etc. from Mark and Paul. If the failure of these sacramentally significant words was so offensive to every reader of the Gospel, how did the author of the Gospel, with Mark before him, and with a knowledge of the liturgical praxis, if not indeed of the Pauline tradition, come to write so inexplicably poor an account of the Supper? On the supposi-

⁷⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

tion that the *b e* text is original we have a strange and unmotivated procedure on the part of the author of the Gospel; on the supposition that *ΣABCL* etc. is original, a motive for the omission of vv. 19b, 20 is supplied in the difficulty relative to the two cups. The latter supposition seems the easier.

(3) Zahn advances as a third argument the infelicity of v. 20, which we have already discussed. He concludes that vv. 19b, 20 cannot be attributed to Luke but must be the work of a copyist.

A review of Zahn's argument for the originality of *b e* in comparison with *ΣABCL* etc. reveals the fact that both the external and internal evidence are against his contention. The intrinsic evidence advanced by him, even if it be allowed its full weight, makes as strongly for the originality of *D a ff² i l* as it does for *b e*. We have found that the originality of *b e* in comparison with *D a ff² i l* cannot be maintained.

It is perhaps worth while to call attention to Zahn's explanation of the character of the text which he holds to be original. How did Luke come to write an account of the Lord's Supper in which the sacramental significance of the wine was not indicated? Zahn⁷⁶ answers somewhat as follows: The striking poverty of the account of the institution in the shorter Lucan text is to be accounted for by supposing that it was written for non-Christian readers. Gentile calumnies, attaching themselves to the Christian sacrament of the Supper, were early circulated. Though they cannot be proven to have been current at the time the third Gospel was written, yet we may conjecture their currency from this passage. Luke did not wish to unveil this most sacred *mysterium* of the Christian faith to the uninitiated. The word concerning the bread might be interpreted merely as a highly significant parabolic saying (*tiefsinnige Bildrede*), but he provides against a crass misunderstanding of the eating of the body and drinking of the

⁷⁶ *Einleitung*,³ 2ter Bd., p. 382.

blood by omitting the mention of these features of the sacrament. That is to say, Luke suppresses the significance of the cup, not because the Jewish-Christians would take offense at the drinking of the wine, symbolical of blood, but because the Gentile non-Christians might take offense at it. He will not reveal the sacramental mystery of Christianity lest it be misinterpreted and traduced. He guards against misinterpretation by so obscuring the significance of the cup that the freest play is left for the imagination in discovering its meaning. The bread, representative of the body, is placed in significant relationship to the body of the Pass-over lamb, and is not merely a "*Bildrede*"—so far the uninitiated may see clearly into the Christian mystery, but they must construct the meaning of the cup out of the current calumnies, if they be presupposed. It cannot be said that Zahn's attempt to explain the intrinsic difficulty of the text of b e is any more successful than his endeavor to maintain its originality on external and transcriptional grounds.

The text attested by b e is certainly not the original text of Lk xxii. 17-20. Intrinsic difficulties make it impossible to suppose the originality of the text attested by D a ff² i 1. The text of \aleph ABCL etc., with its impressive external evidence and its illuminating addition to our knowledge of the Last Supper, at which the Christian sacrament was first instituted, is the original text of Luke's Gospel in this passage.

HAROLD MCA. ROBINSON

Princeton.