

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

be the original, and either of them the emendation. If the shaking was corrected into stretching out, it was perhaps daily experience which suggested the alteration, in the opposite case Hebrew knowledge and a desire for accuracy may have been the motives. It is not so probable that the whole of the textual problem should be a curious and rare coincidence between actual facts<sup>1</sup> and a scribe's blunder in omitting the last two letters of a word.

That shaking out the lap is a sort of *course* even nowadays—however much its importance may have diminished in the course of time—appears from the fact that the person against whom it is directed is sometimes seen to cross himself instantly, once or several times.

J. DE ZWAAN.

*ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER: A  
CRITICAL NOTE ON THE SECOND SACRAMENT.*

[In the following note I have tried to deal absolutely fairly with a somewhat difficult question. Writing as an Anglican clergyman, I have avoided, as far as possible, any "denominational" questions. Indeed, I believe there is nothing in this paper on which Lutherans, Calvinists, Romans, or Anglicans need differ. As an Anglican priest, I have naturally referred, when necessary, to the English Prayer Book. But this was unavoidable, if only because every Minister of the Living God must know best the forms with which he is most familiar: and the *Via Media* certainly

<sup>1</sup> Another possible parallel which may be important, if one wishes to investigate this matter more thoroughly, was suggested to me] by Dr. Hesseling, Professor of Mediæval and Modern Greek in the University of Leiden. It is the story of the Roman Ambassadors in Livy xxi. 18, § 13, who told the Carthaginian Magistrates that they brought either peace or war. As the Roman ultimatum was rejected, they also shook out their mantles.

ought to lead, at least, to sympathetic dealing with, and an absence of offence towards, all. As a more or less conservative critic, my paper may be somewhat "apologetic"; but here again I can plead that I have spared neither thought nor reading in an effort to appreciate fully, and deal honestly and courteously with, the opinions and proofs of those more "advanced" than myself.

I have written, as much as possible, in English, since, in spite of the general learning of those to whom the EXPOSITOR most appeals, my conclusions may prove interesting to some who, like Shakspeare, have "small Latin and less Greek": and the Veil of the Presence is often transparent enough to those who, in questions of criticism, have to rely mainly on the learning of others.

The abbreviations here used are, as a rule, generally understood. The codices are marked with their usual symbols, "N" for the Sinaitic MS., "B" for the great Vatican codex, "A" for the untrustworthy "Alexandrian," "C" for the palimpsest named after Ephrem the Syrian, "D" for Beza's codex. I have to thank Dr. Arthur Wright (whose *Synopsis of the Gospels* is quoted as "S G") for the following abbreviations: "l" and "ll" signify MSS. (one or more) of the ancient Latin versions; "s" and "ss" of the Syriac; "s<sup>8</sup>" is an interesting Syriac document, the "Lewis-Gibson Syriac Palimpsest." The text I have chiefly used is "WH," Westcott and Hort's admirable critical text, and the grounds of the text have been checked by "S G." In the particular passage here discussed I differ from "WH" and "S G," and the paper is an attempt to give good reasons for this difference.]

There are certain axioms with which a critic must start, unless he wants to write a whole book in order to prove what is either self-evident or has been proved already.

The New Testament itself gives us four accounts of the

Institution of Holy Communion. Of the four, that given by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians may (from the relative dates of the Epistle and—to a high probability—of the Gospels) be taken as the earliest *written* account. The others may rest on an older account, written or oral, but we have no ground to suppose that the Synoptists held materials that were inaccessible to St. Paul, and St. Paul himself seems to claim that he received his account by revelation. There is a strong resemblance between the account in the Third Gospel and in 1 Corinthians, a resemblance that seems only natural to those who accept Luke the Physician as the author of that Gospel.<sup>1</sup> In any case, there is no ground for supposing that St. Luke, whether he derived his account of the Last Supper from St. Paul or not, was in any way less well equipped than the authors of the first two Gospels for giving an accurate account of the Last Supper. The first two Synoptists evidently derive their accounts from the same source, oral or written, St. Matthew's being an expansion of St. Mark's, or St. Mark's a compression of St. Matthew's.<sup>2</sup> Certain parts of the narrative are absolutely alike in all the accounts, notably the description of the manual acts, the words of Consecration of the Bread, "THIS IS MY BODY," and part of the corresponding words as to the cup, "THIS" (or "THIS CUP") "IS MY BLOOD,"—St. Matthew and St. Mark reading "My Blood of the Covenant," St. Luke and St. Paul "The new Covenant in my Blood." So, too, all accounts agree in *not* stating certain things. None of them says that our Lord Himself partook of either the Bread or

<sup>1</sup> Personally, I think this needs no special proof. But, in addition to the evidence of tradition, etc., it is worth observing the prevalence of medical terms, the fact that "The Gospel of the Infancy," which probably came from the Blessed Virgin herself, contains details that she probably would not have given to any one but a medical man, etc.

<sup>2</sup> This applies to this special section only, without prejudice to the origin or relation of these Gospels as a whole.

the cup. None states what the cup contained, though the three Gospel accounts all use the words "This fruit of the vine,"—St. Matthew and St. Mark *after* the account of the Institution, St. Luke (in the commonly received text) *before*. Again, all call the bread "ἄρτον," i.e. "a loaf," and all refer to it, in the words of consecration, as τοῦτο, i.e. "this thing."

Among differences we may note the following, the use or not of the word ποτήριον, i.e. "cup," in the Consecration of the second Element, the peculiar phrase, "Drink ye all of it," in St. Matthew, balanced in St. Mark by the words "And they all drank of it,"—a slight difference as to the use of εὐλογίας (blessing) and εὐχαριστήσας (giving thanks) between St. Luke and the other Evangelists, etc. These are either trifles, or points which can be used for the elucidation of the greatest difficulty, which is this: St. Luke (i.) adds a very important passage after the blessing of the Bread, in which he is partly supported by St. Paul; (ii.) adds another similar passage, again supported by St. Paul, after the blessing of the cup; and (iii.) describes very closely the blessing of a cup *before* the blessing of the bread.

Round these three points the real controversy turns. Are St. Luke's additions genuine? Is the *first* cup the real "Cup of Blessing"? Is the description of the blessing of the *second* cup due to an abortive attempt to harmonise the older with the newer tradition? A theory has been built upon the supposition that—from local custom or some such reason—St. Luke deliberately placed the blessing of the Eucharistic cup before that of the Bread, and that his copyists introduced the whole passage (including the account of the blessing of the *second* cup and the formula then used), deliberately or accidentally, to bring the *order* of the Third Gospel into harmony with that of the first two and of St. Paul. This "One Cup theory" now largely holds the field, but it is obviously desirable to see what light is thrown

on the whole story of the Eucharist by collating and summarising, from the point of view of the "Two Cups theory," the story told by the four narratives as they appear. This will naturally be followed by an examination of the evidence for the genuineness of the disputed passage in St. Luke.

In order to summarise the narrative, I may call attention to certain points. (i.) While the stories of the first two Synoptists place the words, "I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine," *after* the consecration of the Cup, St. Luke, taking the usually received text, places it at the very beginning of the feast. Thus the Synoptists agree in making these words no part of the *actual* Institution of the Sacrament. (ii.) St. Paul, describing the Institution, omits these words altogether,—negative evidence, but practically an implication that he regarded the words as not belonging to the Sacramental formulae. (iii.) Thus, in St. Matthew and St. Mark, no connexion is shown between the words "This fruit of the vine" and any wine at the time in use. (iv.) In St. Luke, the words are certainly associated with the blessing of a cup at the beginning of the Feast. So I believe I am justified in supposing that the accounts of the first two Synoptists are "out of order" on this point, and that they really should be placed at the *beginning* of the story. I shall show afterwards that there is independent evidence as to the use of such a cup, and in such a way, as a part of the "Memorial-Passover," as it is observed now and was in all human probability celebrated in the time of our Lord.

The account, summarised, runs as follows; and I claim that, waiving for the present the question as to the genuineness of the disputed passage in St. Luke, it is absolutely consistent. It is not, to be sure, consistent with a theory of verbal Inspiration: but theories of verbal Inspiration are, quite apart from this question, as dead as any nails that were ever driven into any door: and there is no possible method of

harmonising the accounts that can make them verbally identical.

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the same night in which He was betrayed, said to His Apostles, “With desire I have desired to eat this as the Passover <sup>1</sup> with you before I suffer : for I say unto you, that I will no more eat of it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of (*a.* God) (*β.* my Father). And having received a cup and given thanks, He said : Take this (cup), and (*a.* divide it among you), (*β.* <sup>2</sup> drink ye all of it) : for I say unto you, I will henceforth drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God come.”

“And taking a loaf, He (*a.* gave thanks and gave it to them), (*β.* blessed it) saying, THIS THING IS MY BODY, which (*a.* is) (*β.* is given) for you. Do this as my Memorial. So likewise (taking and blessing) a Cup after supper, He said, (*a.* This cup is the New Covenant in my Blood) (*β.* This is my Blood of the Covenant) shed (*a.* on your behalf) (*β.* for many). Do this, as often as ye drink it, as my Memorial.”

In this summary I have omitted St. Matthew's phrase “for the remission of sins,” as it is entirely unsupported by any other narrator ; nevertheless, it *may* represent a true tradition, though the lack of support by St. Mark is on the whole against it. For the same reason I have omitted St. Matthew's word “eat,” after “take.” Neither of these points is of any importance, and I fail to see any practical difference in the variations marked between brackets. Taking the account as a whole, it possesses several internal evidences of veracity. It clearly distinguishes between the merely Paschal and the Eucharistic portions of the story ; it shows an absolute symmetry between the former and the latter ; it clearly separates the beginning and the end of the

<sup>1</sup> τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα. The importance of this translation will be shown later on.

<sup>2</sup> St. Mark has instead, “And they all drank of it.”

feast. The only difficulty disclosed by this arrangement—apart from those arising from the critical examination of the (supposed) doubtful words in St. Luke's account—is that it leaves a long empty gap between the beginning of the Supper and the Institution of the Sacrament. But, unless we reject the whole Johannine account, we must allow a long time for the teaching and transactions recorded in the Fourth Gospel: and, in any case, there is no special reason for believing that the whole story of the Supper formed part of the Synoptic or any other traditions.

The really important difficulty is to be found in two passages recorded in the Third Gospel, which are rejected by many critics; indeed, the *whole* passage in which they occur is placed between double brackets in the WH text, and the whole passage is also rejected in S G. The doubtful words are as follows:—and it is worth observing that, *a priori*, there is just as much reason for supposing them to have been rejected in favour of the “One Cup theory,” or omitted in the interests of the “Two Cup” belief. Thus the question of their genuineness depends entirely on the actual evidence, external and internal, given by MSS. and versions, or supplied by examination of the passages themselves. In WH we find after “This is my Body”:

[[τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινῆ ΔΙΑΘΗΚῆ ἐν τῷ Αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.]] In other words, WH omits the following English words from the text of St. Luke:

“Which is given on your behalf: do this as my Memorial. So likewise <sup>1</sup> the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new Covenant in my Blood, which is shed” (or ‘poured out’) on your behalf.”

The R.V. admits the whole of this passage into the text,

<sup>1</sup> Or “a”—the *τό* is certainly doubtful.



but has, as a marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit *which is given for you . . . which is poured out for you.*" Thus the Revisers' text admits the genuineness of the passage, though it also admits that "some ancient authorities" omit a small part of it. The American Revisers have recorded no protest. Thus we see that the whole passage has commended itself to the highest scholarship of the United Kingdom and the United States: and, in particular, that their readings involve the absolute acceptance of the "Two Cup" theory.

We may also remark, in passing, that the disputed passage is strongly Luco-Hebraic. *Ποιεῖτε* ("do" in whatever sense the word may be used), *ἀνάμνησις* ("Memorial"), and *διαθήκη* ("Covenant") are all used in special and technical senses in *Hebrews*. It is equally worth observing that the presence of these words, close together, is an argument in favour of the genuineness of the passage, for those who believe in the Lucan authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews,<sup>1</sup> and that a scribe, writing before the time of the common origin of *N* and *B*, both of which have the passage, could not well have taken the theory of the Lucan authorship of *Hebrews* as a basis for a forgery. The theory prevalent in the third century was not Lucan: so the writer of the common original *n'aurait pas de quoi*.

But, since the time of the R.V., a strong feeling has grown up among scholars against the genuineness of the passage. We may take WH as the basis of this opinion: S G gives the text, with the doubtful part cleared out, and adds the omitted words in the margin, with the authorities for their preservation. The Reverend Dr. Plummer (p. 496 in the volume on "St. Luke" in the *International Critical Commentary*) rejects the words on what seem to me weak internal grounds, and adds the authorities for their omission.

<sup>1</sup> See my article in the *EXPOSITOR*, July and August, 1904.

These are all good and scholarly exponents of the "One Cup" theory, and most certainly cannot be accused of prejudice in favour of its rival. So, with a passing protest against the assumption that a text based on codices and versions can be regarded as final, until it has been carefully checked by the mass of quotations contained in the early liturgies and Fathers, a task too herculean for accomplishment within the life-time of any man, I pass on to the external and internal criticism of the passage.

### I. EXTERNAL CRITICISM.

The first requisite to a fair criticism is, undoubtedly, a thorough realisation of the bearing of the most important codices and versions on the subject. For this purpose it would be desirable to inquire into the exact value of every MS.: but it is sufficient for our present need to remember a very few facts. (1) WH take, as the primary principle of their text, the proposition that a group of codices headed by  $\aleph$  and B is, except under very exceptional circumstances, of higher value than a group headed by any other combination of uncials. (2) A is a MS. of another school, whose general "type" of text is inaccurate; and, as a matter of fact, the readings of A are now hardly ever quoted by any competent critic. (3) C, when its readings can be clearly brought to light under the comparatively modern writing that covers it (a task greatly helped recently by photography), is a very good palimpsest; but it is, at the earliest, an early fifth century document, i.e.,—it is younger than B by, say, almost a century, and than  $\aleph$  by anything from fifty years to a hundred. (4) D, "Beza's Codex," has always been noted for the eccentricity of its readings. By a recent revision, its value has been enhanced through the removal of some of these peculiarities: but its exact age is doubtful;

it cannot be, at the earliest, less than fifty years younger than C, and no careful student dares to assume anything with certainty as to its precise age. Putting all the facts together, a group headed by D is, from the point of view of external criticism, of very small value indeed.

Now, Dr. Wright (in S G) accepts the reading of WH, deciding *against* the doubtful passage. But he gives the formula of external authority in its favour thus :

“**ℵBCllss** + τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς (**B** omits εἰς) τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. (v. 20) **ℵBlls<sup>s</sup>** + καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λεγῶν (**s<sup>s</sup>** + λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς) **ℵBlls<sup>s</sup>** + τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου **ℵBll** + τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.” That is to say, **ℵ B C ll ss** (see note at beginning) read, “That is given for you ; do this as my Memorial.” (Verse 20) The same MSS., except C, with the **ll** and **s<sup>s</sup>** read, “And the cup likewise after supper, saying” (**s<sup>s</sup>** adds here, “Take this, divide it among yourselves”) “This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.” And the same MSS., except **s<sup>s</sup>**, read “That is shed for you.”

It is easy then to see how Dr. Plummer, though he rejects the passage, speaks of “the overwhelming external evidence of almost all MSS. and versions in favour of the words in question.” And, as Dr. Plummer acknowledges that the only first-class MS. which omits the words is D, we see that he has not overstated the external evidence, As it stands, it gives us the full support of **ℵ, B, C**, and a group of Latin and of Syriac MSS., for the whole of the words concerning the bread, and almost as strong a group for the rest of the passage. One Syriac MS. omits the words “That is shed for you,” and adds “Take this, and divide it among yourselves”: but this omission is as trifling as the authority on which it rests, and can be filled up from St. Paul’s account; and the addition, which is not of much importance either,

is simply a different form of the later tradition "Take this," "drink ye all of it."

Yet Dr. Wright, WH., Dr. Plummer, and many other authorities omit, and omit with emphasis, these words. Surely there must be a very strong internal case against a passage so forcibly supported by the earliest documentary evidence. Let us see.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

(*To be continued.*)

### LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.<sup>1</sup>

#### VI.

*ἀλόγως*.—PFi 58 (iii/A.D.) *ἀλόγως ἐπελθόντες δίχα παντὸς νόμου*, a "brutal" assault. (Add to *Notes v.*)

*ἀναβολή*.—The meaning "bag" is given by the edd. on TbP 413<sup>10</sup> (ii/iii A.D.). (Ditto.)

*ἀναγκαῖος*.—P Par 46 (ii/B.C.) *ἐν τ. ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς*. The subst.= "calamity" occurs in *Syll.* 255<sup>23</sup> (iii/B.C.) *ἐν ἀνάγκαις καὶ κακοπαθίαις γένηται*. Cf. the relative in BM I. p. 30 (=Witk. 40, ii/B.C.) *εἴπερ μὴ ἀναγκαιότερόν σ[ε] περισπᾶι* "unless urgent business detains you." PFi 61<sup>15</sup> (i/A.D.) *ἐντυγχάνει σοι τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ἀναγκαιότατον*.

*ἀνάγνωσις*.—The verb is of course extremely common (examples in *Thess.* 81). For the noun cf. TbP 61 (*b*<sup>4</sup>) (ii/B.C.) *ἐπὶ τῆς ἀ. τῆς κατὰ φύλλον γεωμετρίας* "at the revision of the survey of the crops" (G. and H.), and several instances from iii/A.D. in the normal sense "reading": cf. *Syll.* 552<sup>81</sup> (ii/B.C.). The fact that it was usually reading *aloud* needs keeping in mind: to the *exx.* for simple "reading" add the early formula *ὡς ἂν οὖν ἀναγνώις τὴν ἐπιστολήν*, EP 9<sup>3</sup> (222 B.C.), and cf. 13<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For abbreviations see the February EXPOSITOR, p. 170. EP = Elephantine Papyri—see footnote below.