

EUCCHARISTIC ORIGINS - A CRITICAL APPRAISAL
OF RECENT RESEARCH

by

HERBERT KIESLER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Montréal

1975

©

HERBERT KIESLER 1976

Herbert Kiesler

Religious Studies

Ph.D.

Eucharistic Origins^c - A Critical Appraisal

Ph.D.

Religious Studies

Herbert Kiesler

Les origines de l'Eucharistie: evaluation
critique des récentes recherches

Durant les cinquante dernières années, de nombreuses études ont traité des origines de l'Eucharistie. On peut alors se poser la question suivante: "Quel progrès a été accompli pendant cette période de recherche?" Pour se répondre à cette question, nous avons voulu présenter un historique et une évaluation critique des travaux les plus importants qui ont été publiés par les spécialistes de Nouveau Testament depuis l'étude classique de Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl, publiée en 1926.

Les exégètes ont tenté d'élucider cette question complexe du point de vue de l'histoire, de la théologie et de la Tradition. Quelques-uns ont soutenu que les écrits sur l'Eucharistie ont leur Sitz im Leben dans la célébration de Pâques.

L'analyse de diverses théories nous a montré que les recherches actuelles sur le Nouveau Testament se penchent surtout sur la communauté chrétienne comme milieu d'inspiration des écrits sur l'Eucharistie. Ici les travaux de Marxsen et Feneberg prennent une importance capitale.

Herbert Kiesler

Eucharistic Origins - A Critical Appraisal
of Recent Research

During the last fifty years much work has been done on eucharistic origins. Thus one may raise the question: "How much progress has been made during this period of research?" In order to answer this question we have attempted to present an historical survey and critical appraisal of the most important contributions made by competent New Testament scholars since Lietzmann's publication of his classical study, Messe und Herrenmahl, in 1926.

Scholars have tried to unravel this complex problem on a historical, theological and on a traditio-historical basis. Some have suggested that the eucharistic accounts have their Sitz im Leben in the Christian Passover celebration.

As a positive result of our examination of the various theories we have discovered that New Testament scholarship is now focussing its attention upon the Christian community as the creative milieu of the eucharistic accounts. Here the studies of Marxsen and Feneberg are of importance.

PREFACE

Since the publication of Lietzmann's classical study, Messe und Herrnmahl in 1926, much work has been done on eucharistic origins. Scholars have attempted to solve this complex problem on a historical, theological and traditio-historical basis.

A survey of recent literature on the subject clearly indicates that scholars have treated almost every single aspect of the problem on hand. At this point the question arises: "How much has been accomplished during the last fifty years of research?" In order to answer this question it was necessary to present an historical survey of the most important contributions made by competent New Testament scholars and to give a critical appraisal of them. We believe that such an account will be a useful contribution to New Testament and liturgical scholarship.

In this study the biblical quotations in Greek have been made from the Greek New Testament, edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger and Allen Wikgren. Quotations from other ancient sources have been taken from standard English translations.

Some persons have placed me in debt for their interest they have taken in the progress of my work at the Faculty of Graduate Studies of McGill University.

My thanks are due Professor George Johnston for his invitation to take up graduate studies at McGill University and for his kind advice and encouragement.

Above all, however, I wish to thank my advisor Professor John C. Kirby, who not only suggested the topic to me, but who has taken a personal interest in the progress of this study. Professor Kirby has always been ready to offer suggestions and constructive criticisms. Without his advice this study would never have materialized.

My appreciation is also extended to the librarians of the University of Chicago and of Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana; and to Miss Norma Johnston and staff of the library of the Faculty of Religious Studies of McGill University, Montréal.

I would also like to thank Mrs. Cheryl Bristow, Mrs. Suzanne Benner, and Mrs. Klara Banki for their help in preparing the manuscript.

Finally, I am especially thankful to my wife, who has not only shown a keen interest in my study, but who has supported me in every way.

ABBREVIATIONS

AThR	Anglican Theological Review
BR	Biblical Research
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
BZNF	Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge
ET	Expository Times
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie
HThR	Harvard Theological Review
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JQRNS	Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JTSNS	Journal of Theological Studies, New Series
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NTS	New Testament Studies
RB	Revue Biblique
RGG	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThQ	Theologische Quartalschrift (Tuebingen)
ThRNF	Theologische Rundschau, Neue Folge
ThWNT	Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
ZNW	Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZThK	Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
Notes	
Chapter	
I HISTORICAL APPROACHES	7
The Last Supper--a Haburah Meal? The Last Supper--a Kiddush Meal? The Last Supper--not a Passover Meal! A Critical Appraisal of Jeremias' Interpretation of the Eucharistic Words The Last Supper--a Qumran Meal? Notes	
II THEOLOGICAL APPROACHES	103
The Development from Spitta to Marxsen 1. Friedrich Spitta 2. Hans Lietzmann 3. Ernst Lohmeyer 4. Oscar Cullmann 5. Eduard Schweizer 6. Robert D. Richardson 7. Willi Marxsen Notes	
III TRADITIO-HISTORICAL APPROACHES	204
The Lucan Text-Problem The Quest for the Oldest Form of the Eucharistic Tradition The Form of the Eucharistic Words Christian Passover and Eucharist Notes	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	330
BIBLIOGRAPHY	337

INTRODUCTION

Since the introduction of the critical historical method of research, the New Testament accounts of the origins of the Eucharist have been subjected to very minute and critical investigations. This has resulted in a great number of traditio-historical, form- and literary-critical analyses of these accounts.¹

In all their efforts, scholars were primarily concerned with a reconstruction of the historical events of the Last Supper and with a recovery of the ipsissima verba of Jesus.² But in their attempt to come as close as possible to the historical situation, they encountered some very basic problems. These problems were primarily posed by the New Testament accounts of the Eucharist, for they are both brief and enigmatic. They could therefore furnish only a very limited amount of information. The problem was rendered more difficult by the meal accounts in Acts. Acts 2:42, 46 refer to meals within a cultic setting, which are characterized by an aspect of overflowing joy (*ἀγαλλίασις*), but they make no reference at all to the words attributed to Jesus in the Gospels and in 1 Corinthians. The other reference in Acts to the "breaking of bread" (20:7) does not refer to them either.

The situation is further complicated by the Lucan text-problem Luke 22:15-20. From a text-critical point of view, the Lucan text has presented the most knotty problem. Scholarship is still sharply divided on the question whether the short or the long text represents the authentic text-form. In 1881 in The New Testament in the Original Greek,

Westcott and Hort had pronounced an unfavourable judgment upon Luke 22:19b-20, and shortly afterwards, Schuerer, a German scholar, became convinced of the authenticity of the short text.³ He was followed by Lietzmann,⁴ Jeremias⁵ and others.

In more recent years, French and German scholars have decided in favour of the long text. British scholars, however, e.g., Caird,⁶ Chadwick⁷ and Leaney⁸ still defend the authenticity of the Lucan short text.

In their work on eucharistic origins, scholars have sought to identify the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples as either a haburah-, a kiddush, or a Passover meal.⁹ With the discovery of the Qumran documents, scholarly interest has particularly focussed on the question of a possible relationship between the Eucharist and the Qumran meals.¹⁰

Scholarly opinion is still divided over the question of the identity of the Last Supper with any one of the above mentioned Jewish meal practices. British scholarship, for instance, has abandoned the Passover theory almost completely, because it thinks that the Johannine dating of the Last Supper and of the crucifixion is the correct one.¹¹

For some time the Passover theory was also unpopular with German scholars,¹² but it gained a new lease on life through the researches of J. Jeremias,¹³ who was here following in the footsteps of Dalman and Billerbeck.

Religionsgeschichtliche research on the Eucharist started with Eichhorn's Abendmahl in Neuen Testament, in 1898.¹⁴ Eichhorn had primarily been concerned with a different evaluation of the texts. In contradistinction from the critical-historical method, which considered the eucharistic accounts as historically reliable reports of the life of

Jesus, the religionsgeschichtliche method looked at these accounts in terms of how they would have been understood by their authors and readers.

Eichhorn's theory was accepted and extended by Heitmüller. It was further developed by Bousset and J. Weiss. The whole religionsgeschichtliche discussion was interrupted by the First World War. But shortly after the war, the Eucharist became once more the subject of further discussions by liturgists and New Testament scholars such as Wetter, Casel, Lietzmann and K. L. Schmidt.¹⁵

Wetter,¹⁶ who may be considered as a forerunner of Lietzmann, strongly reacted against the text-critics. In his opinion, they had given too much emphasis to the rather ambiguous texts of the New Testament, and too little attention to the religious life of the primitive Christian community as reflected in the ancient liturgies.

With Lietzmann,¹⁷ who followed Spitta,¹⁸ the stage was set for a series of discussions which for some time revolved around the subject of the double origin of the Eucharist. The distinction between the two different types of the Eucharist was primarily made on a theological basis. In Lietzmann's opinion, the Jerusalem type of the Eucharist was characterized as an eschatological meal, which was celebrated with great rejoicing. The Pauline type of the Eucharist, however, was held in commemoration of the death of Jesus.¹⁹

Lietzmann's basic thesis was considerably modified by scholars such as Cullmann²⁰ and Lohmeyer.²¹ These discussions took a definite turn after the publication of Schweizer's essay "Das Abendmahl eine Vergegenwärtigung des Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl?"²² and Jeremias' Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu.²³

The more recent essays of Schweizer (1956) and Marxsen (1963) show

the influence of the "new quest," which marks a new era in the "life of Jesus" research by the post-Bultmannian school.²⁴ The study by Marxsen on the Eucharist, "The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem," is of special importance here.

Since the publication of Lietzmann's famous study, Messe und Herrenmahl, in 1926,²⁵ much work has been done on eucharistic origins. We believe that an account and an appraisal of the most important studies which have been made in this area during the last fifty years will be a useful contribution to New Testament and liturgical scholarship.

It is, therefore, the purpose of this study to present a historical survey of the most important attempts to solve the problem of eucharistic origins and to give a critical appraisal of them.

In some cases it was necessary to present the liturgical aspect of an argument. But since the liturgical problems are outside the scope of this study, we have not engaged in a detailed examination of them.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

¹Hermann Patsch, Abendmahl und Historischer Jesus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), p. 59.

²The recovery of the ipsissima verba of Jesus was of special concern to scholars such as Joachim Jeremias and Heinz Schuermann; see, e.g. Professor Jeremias' chapter on "The Oldest Text of the Eucharistic Words of Jesus" (The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. by Norman Perrin [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966]); see also the essay by H. Schuermann, "Jesus' Words in the Light of His Actions at the Last Supper," Vol. 40 of Concilium, ed. by P. Benoit, R. E. Murphy, B. von Iersel (New York: Paulist Press, 1969), pp. 119-31.

³Pierre Benoit, "Le Récit de la Cène dans Lc. XXII, 15-20," RB (Paris), No. 3 (July 1939), pp. 359-93.

⁴Hans Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy, trans. Dorothea H. G. Reeve (Leiden: Brill, 1953-58), p. 175.

⁵Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, pp. 42ff., cited by Willi Marxsen, "Die Einsetzungsberichte zum Abendmahl," (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, University of Kiel, 1951), p. 32.

⁶George B. Caird, The Gospel of Luke (London: Cox and Wyman Ltd., 1963), pp. 237ff; see also Joachim Jeremias, review of The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, by George B. Caird, in ET, 78 (Oct. 1966 - Sept. 1967), p. 58.

⁷Henry Chadwick, "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII, 15-20," HTHR, L (1957), pp. 249-58.

⁸A. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary According to St. Luke (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), pp. 72-75.

⁹A critical evaluation of the various attempts to identify the Last Supper with either one of these Jewish meals is presented by Professor Dugmore; see, e.g. his chapter on "The Study of the Origins of the Eucharist: Retrospect and Revaluation" (Studies in Church History II [London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1965]).

¹⁰A summary of the recent debate about a possible relationship between the Lord's Supper and the Qumran meals is presented by Herbert Braun in Qumran und das Neue Testament, Vol. II, (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, [Paul Siebeck] 1966), pp. 29-54.

¹¹Ernst Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), pp. 194-204.

¹²Ibid., p. 201.

¹³Professor Jeremias defended the theory that the Last Supper was a Passover meal at great length; see Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 15-84. This view was endorsed by scholars such as A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952), pp. 13-23. In note 1 on p. 23, Higgins listed a number of recent supporters of the Passover theory as well as some opponents to it.

¹⁴Hans Lessig, "Die Abendmahlsprobleme im Lichte der neutestamentlichen Forschung seit 1900" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, University of Bonn, 1953), p. 72.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 72.

¹⁶Altchristliche Liturgien I und II, cited by August Arnold, Der Ursprung des Christlichen Abendmahls (Freiburg i.B.: Herder & Co., GMBH, Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937), p. 3.

¹⁷Lietzmann, op. cit.

¹⁸Friedrich Spitta, Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums, I (Goettingen: 1893), pp. 207-66.

¹⁹Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 204-208.

²⁰Oscar Cullmann and F. J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper, trans. by J. G. Davies (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), pp. 5-23.

²¹Lohmeyer, "Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," JBL, LVI (1937), 219-52.

²²Eduard Schweizer, "Das Abendmahl eine Vergegenwaertigung des Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl?," ThZ, 2 (March/April 1946), 81-101.

²³Jeremias, op. cit.

²⁴Professor Reumann takes notice of this in his introduction to Professor Schweizer's essay; see his "Introduction" (The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967], p. XII. See also John Kselman's chapter on "Modern New Testament Criticism" (The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. II [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968]).

²⁵Lietzmann, op. cit.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL APPROACHES

The Last Supper--a Haburah Meal?

We begin with an exposition of the theories of two well-known exponents of the haburah theory, F. L. Cirlot¹ and G. Dix.² Both scholars held that the Last Supper could best be understood in terms of a haburah meal.

1. Felix L. Cirlot

Without presenting a critical evaluation of Lietzmann's hypothesis of the dual origin of the Eucharist in the New Testament, Cirlot made it very clear that there was no basis for the two-type hypothesis in the New Testament.³ He was hopeful, however, that the meals of the haburoth might throw new light upon the complex problem of eucharistic origins.⁴

In his refutation of Lietzmann's hypothesis of the dual origin of the Eucharist, Cirlot was not alone. Dix,⁵ for instance, also found himself in disagreement with Lietzmann. While he used a different approach to the problem, he reached conclusions which were almost identical to those of Cirlot's.⁶

Cirlot held that the Eucharist as a corporate meal had its roots in Jewish meal practice.⁷ In the light of his reconstruction of its Jewish background, Cirlot concluded that the Eucharist best conforms to

the haburah meal, rather than to a Passover meal or to the kiddush.⁸

In the light of the haburah theory, one of the puzzling aspects of this problem, that of the relationship between the agape and the Eucharist, finds its solution. On the basis of his examination of a post-resurrection haburah meal, Cirlot pointed out that it consists of the following parts: (1) a preliminary course, (2) the blessing and breaking of bread at the beginning of the formal part of the meal, (3) the main body of the formal meal, which would always be festive or joyous, and (4) the "cup of blessing" at the end of the meal.⁹

In view of this scheme, Cirlot pointed out that the bread and cup, which opened and closed the formal part of the meal, are identical with "the Eucharist" of a later time.¹⁰ On the assumption that the Jewish meal practice served as the pattern or norm for the meal customs of the early Christian church, certain New Testament passages which are still much debated would seem to be far less problematic.¹¹ The phrase "breaking of bread," for instance, is just a descriptive title for the haburah meal.¹² In the light of this consideration, the phrase "breaking of bread" does not at all mean that the "cup of blessing" was inferior to bread, neither does it prove its total absence as Lietzmann and others maintained.¹³

On the basis of his examination of the eucharistic accounts in the Synoptic Gospels, Acts and Paul, Cirlot was unable to find any support for Lietzmann's view of a considerable gulf between the "breaking of bread" as practiced in the Pauline communities and in the primitive Palestinian church.¹⁴

In connection with 1 Corinthians 11:17ff,¹⁵ Cirlot pointed out that this passage, the next important one outside the Synoptic Gospels,

presents a more complete picture as to how the primitive Eucharist and agape had been conducted. According to Cirlot, the problem in this passage is one of semantics, for it is not clear whether the title "Lord's Supper" applied to the whole meal, the eucharistic bread and cup, or to the common part only.¹⁶ Again, Cirlot is convinced that a knowledge of the Jewish meals, which are the prototype of the Christian Eucharist, will be helpful in solving the problem.¹⁷ In the light of his reconstruction of the evidence in 1 Corinthians 11 against the background of a haburah meal, Cirlot concluded that Paul had introduced the Eucharist in Corinth and other Gentile churches in connection with an ordinary haburah meal, but without the preliminary course, which was customary in Judaism. But some innovators from the Jerusalem church seem to have forced the adoption of the preliminary course on the Corinthian Christians. When confronted by this problem, Paul expressed his disagreement with this innovation and appealed for the restoration of the original custom.¹⁸

Cirlot also examined the following references: Jude 12, 2 Peter 2:13, St. Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian and the Apostolic Traditions of Hippolytus. In the light of the evidence, he postulated the existence of an ordinary community meal in the primitive community and its union with the Eucharist.¹⁹

His examination of the Didache,²⁰ which he dated at 130-150 A.D.,²¹ made him aware of the problem of the inverted form of the eucharistic elements, which in his opinion can be solved by postulating a prior stage of development,²² where the eucharistic cup was at the end after the common meal, having as its consecration prayer the grace-after-meals (Didache 10:2-5 at least). This was the most primitive form of the Christian "breaking of bread," as well as of the pre-Christian

formal haburah banquet. When finally the cup was moved before the bread, the Didache form came into existence.²³

While the exact time for the separation of the Eucharist from the agape cannot be determined, Giriot held that it must have taken place during the second century, because of the lack of evidence prior to the time of St. Ignatius. On the other hand, there seems to be no evidence that they were still united at the time of St. Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria.²⁴

It was believed that the Lord himself has given a new meaning and significance to the customary meal. He also wished that this new meaning and value should be retained.²⁵

When this meal was taken out into a Gentile environment, its basic pattern remained unchanged: Only minor changes took place: (1) The preliminary course was not retained; (2) in Corinthians 11 and the pre-Didache, the "body of Christ" appears at the beginning, followed by a common meal and the "blood of Christ"; (3) in the Didache the cup is already transposed into the higher spiritual key; and (4) after this, a double development would set in. As soon as the agape had been deleted, bread and cup would not simply be given up, but would come into juxtaposition. The double consecration prayer would seem to have lost its *raison d'être*, and would soon merge into one eucharistic prayer, which was pronounced over both elements. Justin Martyr is a witness of this development.²⁶

The haburah theory also helps to explain the variant forms of the eucharistic accounts. Thus, the first cup of the Lucan account, if it is historical, may be considered as the cup drunk during a preliminary course. The covenant-blood-cup, which is placed after the bread,

is probably to be identified with the concluding "cup of blessing" of the customary feast.²⁷

The first eschatological logion in Luke 22:15-16 is in its right place. With regard to the second eschatological logion, the problem is more difficult. The evidence seems to favour the Marcan position.²⁸ If the command to repeat is historical at all, preference should be given to its double form in Paul.²⁹

After these traditio-historical considerations, Cirlot concerns himself with the historicity and meaning of the actions and logia.³⁰ With regard to the words "This is my body" (Luke 22:15-16) he pointed out that they refer to the Lord's imminent death. Jesus interprets it to his disciples on the basis of an acted parable.³¹ He not only interpreted to them the significance of that death, but instituted a memorial of it. The covenant-blood logion is historical, because it is attested by Matthew, Mark, Paul and the longer Lucan text. This saying defies the ingenuity of accidental mishap or even of the cleverest inventor.³² The allusions to Exodus 24:8, Jeremiah 31:31 and Isaiah 53 are introduced in such a way that they reflect the actual situation of Jesus, who had come to the most critical moments of his mission. The covenant-blood logion forms the basis for his teaching of the significance of his death, which effects the forgiveness of sins.³³ As to the command to repeat the rite, Cirlot concluded that there are strong reasons for accepting it as historical.³⁴ On the basis of this premise, he proceeds with the reconstruction of the Last Supper.³⁵

While concerning himself with the historical aspects of the Last Supper, Cirlot also attempted to establish its meaning. For this

purpose he turned to the writings of the early church fathers such as Ignatius,³⁶ Justin,³⁷ Irenaeus,³⁸ and others. He discovers that these fathers are adherents to the doctrine of realism. This doctrine was already attested by John, Paul and the longer Lucan text. The only way one can account for its origin is by tracing it back to the Last Supper and the authority of Christ himself.³⁹

The early Christians consider the Eucharist as a sacrifice,⁴⁰ a fact which finds support on the basis of the sacrificial terminology being applied, such as *θυσία, δῶρα, προσφορά*. To them the Eucharist is not a mental, subjective recalling of the passion. It is rather an objective memorial or representation of the passion, which is effected by the offering of the eucharistic elements, the sacrificed body and blood of Christ.⁴¹

The realistic interpretation is evidenced in John.⁴² Here, the Eucharist claims to be the actual body and blood of Christ. This made it impossible for the Docetists to accept it. On the assumption that Hebrews 13:15 is a eucharistic reference, it may be considered as the first extant text in which the term "sacrifice" is applied to the Eucharist. This passage lends strong support to the conclusions reached in Cirlot's previous chapters about the eucharistic doctrine.⁴³

Paul⁴⁴ also seems to consider the Eucharist in terms of a sacrifice. In 1 Corinthians 11:25-26 the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is emphasized, because these verses clearly indicate that it is a memorial of the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross.

2. Gregory Dix

The publication of Dix's book, The Shape of the Liturgy, in

1945,⁴⁵ represents an important contribution of British scholarship to the study of liturgics in general and the eucharistic problem in particular. In his study, Dix was primarily concerned with the problem of the origin and development of the structure of the liturgy.⁴⁶ He approached the subject as a liturgist, who was, by his own definition, a student of Comparative Religion, and as a Christian, who applies the scientific method to the practical realms of his religion.⁴⁷

Within the broader context of Dix's detailed treatment of liturgical problems, the fourth chapter, dealing specifically with the problems of the origin and meaning of the Eucharist, is our main concern here.⁴⁸

In his discussion of the eucharistic problems, he reacted very strongly against the liberal views.⁴⁹ He was especially ill-disposed towards Lietzmann's theory of the double origin of the Eucharist, stating that his conclusions simply do not agree with the alleged evidence.⁵⁰

In his identification of the Eucharist with the haburah meal, Dix is following the trend of British scholarship, beginning with Oesterley,⁵¹ who in turn is followed by Cirlot,⁵² Otto⁵³ and others.

Dix strongly defends the historicity of the Pauline tradition of the Last Supper. This tradition originated in Jerusalem, being attested to by Peter and all those who were present on that occasion.⁵⁴

In Dix's opinion, the structure or shape of the liturgy, having its basis in the "four-action" scheme, must be considered as a product of history. It has its roots in an historical event, namely in the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples, which conformed to the "seven-action" scheme.⁵⁵ The change from the "seven-" to the "four-action"

scheme probably took place after the writing of 1 Corinthians but before the writing of the first of the four gospels. This change may have been effected at Rome at the time of Clement. But this assumption, Dix pointed out, is a rather speculative one.⁵⁶

With regard to the question of eucharistic origins, Dix followed Oesterley.⁵⁷ He held that the Eucharist cannot be identified with a Passover meal, because of the existing discrepancy between the Synoptic and Johannine datings of the passion.⁵⁸

With Oesterley,⁵⁹ Dix decided in favour of the Johannine chronology. In his opinion, the Eucharist was probably an evening meal, which took place twenty-four hours before the Passover.⁶⁰ It is evident that the Last Supper was a typical Jewish meal, which Dix preferred to identify with the formal supper of a haburah.⁶¹

While critics were unable to establish the historicity of the command to repeat the rite, Dix was quick to point out that there is only one reason for the existence of this command of Jesus; namely, to invest a universal Jewish custom with a new and peculiar meaning for his company of friends. This new meaning, which was attached to the two corporate acts, had a special connection with the atoning death of Jesus, viewed in the light of Isaiah 53.⁶²

According to Dix, the words "Do this for the recalling of me" in 1 Corinthians 11:24 either have a historical basis, or they represent an accidental elaboration in good faith.⁶³ He excludes the latter view. Dix also dismisses the theory of deliberate invention, because it would be absurd to argue that any fabrication would have passed by the critical judgment of Peter and those other ten witnesses.⁶⁴

Dix's criticism of Lietzmann's hypothesis is particularly

directed against the idea that the breaking of bread is to be considered as an essential feature of the Eucharist, while the sacramental use of the cup is but a Pauline creation under Hellenistic influence.⁶⁵ In other words, Dix insisted that there is no scrap of evidence for Lietzmann's hypothesis of the bread and water Eucharists within the New Testament.⁶⁶

The short Lucan text, which Lietzmann holds to be the only authentic account of what had happened at the Last Supper, does not at all present a complete picture of this occasion.⁶⁷

Since the last meal was a haburah meal, it would never have been considered as such without the "cup of blessing," which normally formed the conclusion of that meal.⁶⁸

Lietzmann's theory that the "breaking of bread" in Acts represents a designation for the eucharistic rite in the Jerusalem church, is untenable. In Dix's opinion, Lietzmann's argumentation is absolutely paradoxical, because the identical phrase "breaking of bread," which has been referred to in Acts 2:42, 46, is also being used in Acts 20:11, where, according to an eyewitness report, Paul celebrates the Eucharist. Thus, it would be absurd to assume that the identical phrase, having been used in both instances, would exclude the cup at Jerusalem but include it in the practice of Paul.⁶⁹

Dix admits, however, that our knowledge of the pre-Pauline Eucharists at Jerusalem is limited. The information from Paul, on the other hand, is considerable.⁷⁰

While Lietzmann,⁷¹ who was followed by Cullmann,⁷² had accounted for the Pauline conception of the Eucharist in terms of the vision theory, Dix maintains that such a theory falls short if judged

by the standards of scientific scholarship.⁷³

In his opinion, the first group of the Galilean disciples had been in contact with this tradition. Since Paul had associated with some eyewitnesses, it is only reasonable to assume that he would have assured himself of the veracity of the whole story. Paul's story as told in 1 Corinthians 11 cannot be an invention. In defense of the historicity of the Pauline tradition of the Eucharist, Dix appealed especially to Paul's integrity, and to the opposition party at Corinth. In his opinion, the historical truth of the Pauline tradition rests primarily on Peter and all those who were eyewitnesses of the Last Supper.⁷⁴

As to the meaning⁷⁵ of the Eucharist, Dix pointed out that Jesus ascribed to his person a messianic, redeeming and sacrificial significance. This meaning was fully understood by the church. During the Last Supper, Jesus had focussed his attention on something totally beyond time, but which would some day break into time, namely, the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom, according to Dix's own definition, represents the state of affairs where men will acknowledge the rulership of God. On the other hand, Jesus, who is acquainted with the nature of the kingly rule, has assumed the role of the *παῖς Θεοῦ*. As such, he is concerned to make the disciples his copartners.

As to the development⁷⁶ of the eucharistic rite within the early church, Dix outlined the various stages as follows:

1. In 1 Corinthians 11 the Eucharist was still connected with the agape.
2. In Matthew and Mark, the combination of Eucharist and Supper was considered to be either an account of the past or as of no interest to Christians any longer. In both writings occurs a change of the cup-word

from "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood" to "This is my blood of the New Covenant." This change has been made for stylistic reasons.

3. In Jude 12 and 2 Peter 2:13, the word agape has already become a terminus technicus, in order to describe the Supper apart from the Eucharist.

4. In the following generation, the word is being used in order to describe an observance of the Supper in complete independence of the liturgical Eucharist.

5. At the time of Ignatius (ca. 115 A.D.), the Greek term agape has become an accepted translation of the term haburah. The Eucharistia, on the other hand, is the berakah, independent of the haburah supper.

6. Justin makes reference to the Eucharist, but he remains silent with regard to the agape.

7. At the time of Tertullian, the word agape designated a religious supper in complete independence of the Eucharist.

3. Critical Appraisal

Several scholars, who could not accept the Passover theory as an explanation of the historical circumstances of the Last Supper, were convinced that this occasion could best be understood in terms of the formal supper of a haburah.⁷⁷

Lietzmann,⁷⁸ for instance, followed by F. Cirlot,⁷⁹ G. Dix,⁸⁰ K. G. Goetz⁸¹ and R. Otto,⁸² had pointed to those Jewish meals which were invested with religious solemnity. Lietzmann⁸³ maintained that these meals might be held by a company of friends whenever they felt the need. This assertion, however, can hardly be correct, for there is no evidence for such a practice.⁸⁴

In his description of the haburah customs, Oesterley pointed out that among the Jews of the post-exilic period, it was customary to arrange for Friday afternoon meetings. Friends would meet in someone's home for the purpose of discussing religious matters and to partake of a meal. These weekly gatherings were arranged by societies of friends, which were called haburoth (haburah, sing.). The term is derived from the word chaber, which means a comrade, companion or friend. The social meal began rather early in the afternoon and was extended until the commencement of the Sabbath.⁸⁵

In his study of the Last Supper in The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, R. Otto⁸⁶ argued that the Last Supper belongs to the category of the religious, festive meals of a heber or haburah, with sacramental character and with ritualistic peculiarities. He quotes verbatim the following sentence from A. Geiger:⁸⁷ "All meals which were held in fellowship were meritorious and consecrated by a religious character." In Jeremias' opinion, however, this statement is erroneous because Sanh. 8:2, the passage referred to by Geiger, is not concerned with meals in general, but rather with a haburot miṣwah. On account of this erroneous statement, the consequences which Otto draws from it are also wrong.⁸⁸

In The Early Eucharist, Cirlot had declared rather boldly that the interpretation of the Last Supper in terms of the haburah meal is both easy and obvious.⁸⁹ But, is the identification of the Last Supper with the haburah meal really all that easy and obvious? Cirlot himself has rather uncritically adopted Oesterley's⁹⁰ theory concerning these quasi-religious meals, and has made it the foundation of his own theory. Therefore, when he tries to establish the correct meaning of the term haburah, he relies entirely upon Oesterley's definition of the word.

The latter maintained that the word haburah is to be defined in terms of fellowship and love.⁹¹

Oesterley, however, did not derive this particular meaning from the word haburah.⁹² He rather interpreted it in the light of John 13:34. Prior to this, he had suggested that the circle of friends formed by Christ and the apostles constituted a haburah. After all, in John 15:14 Jesus refers to this in the words, "Ye are my friends, if ye do the things which I command you." Furthermore, Oesterley was almost persuaded that the words of John 13:34, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους can be taken as an allusion to the word haburah, which means fellowship or even love.⁹² Oesterley's theory, however, is unconvincing, because he was unable to present any definite evidence in support of his view that Jesus and his disciples had constituted a haburah. Instead of presenting proof that the Johannine references are to be understood as references to a haburah, he appeals to them in support of his own theory. From a methodological point of view, this appears to be a serious mistake.

In the light of our examination of Oesterley's theory, we have discovered that there is hardly any basis for his thesis that Jesus and his disciples had constituted a haburah. His definition of the term in the sense of love is hardly more than an ad hoc conjecture.

Cirlot, who uncritically followed in the footsteps of his predecessor has also made the mistake of reading into the word haburah a meaning which he has derived from New Testament references, rather than from the Jewish sources. There seems to be no basis for his claim that these haburoth had as their raison d'être acts of piety and love, as indeed is implied by the name haburah.⁹³

Dix was also intrigued by the haburah theory, popularized by

Oesterley. He, too, was convinced that Jesus and his disciples had formed a haburah.⁹⁴ According to Dugmore, a haburah was "a voluntary association of those who pledged themselves to separate their tithes in accordance with the Torah." They were also committed to uphold the laws of clean and unclean laid down in the Torah.⁹⁵

In view of Jesus' attitude to tithing (Matt. 23:23) and the practice of the disciples regarding the washing of hands before eating (Mark 7:2), a basic requirement towards membership of a haburah, it is highly questionable that Jesus and his disciples would ever have been admitted as haberim. For these reasons it is doubtful that the term haburah could be applied to Jesus and his disciples.

The concept of a haburah appears to be evident only in connection with the so-called duty meals.⁹⁶ In other words, on the basis of Sanh. 8:2, Pesach 3:7, b Pesach 101 b (14), b Pesach 113 b it can be shown that these duty meals were held only on special occasions such as betrothals, weddings, circumcisions, funerals and the Passover. Those who are present at any such festive meals, form a haburah.⁹⁷

Strictly speaking, on the basis of the available evidence, the term haburah, in the sense of a table-fellowship, can only be applied to the Passover meal. Only in a broader sense does the word become a terminus technicus for an association.⁹⁸

According to Dugmore, there is no real evidence that these associations followed the custom of holding meals, except on Sabbaths and special feast days.⁹⁹ He pointed out that Dix himself had expressed doubts on the subject.¹⁰⁰ For this reason Dix had invited the disbelieving reader to omit the word from this chapter and to accept the regulations cited as governing any rather formal evening meal in a pious Jewish

household. In Dugmore's opinion, Dix is wrong in regarding the regulations recorded in Berakoth as referring to the formal supper of a haburah. But while Dix was rather doubtful with regard to the haburah theory, he asserted: "That the Last Supper was a haburah meeting seems to arise straight out of the New Testament evidence."¹⁰¹

While there may be points of resemblance between the Last Supper and the meals of Jewish confraternities, we must realize that the parallel cannot be pushed too far.¹⁰² In our opinion, it would be much safer to assume that the Last Supper conformed to a regular Jewish meal.

The Last Supper--a Kiddush Meal?

At the turn of the century, several scholars held the view that the Sabbath-kiddush may have served as a model for the eucharistic rite instituted by Jesus.¹⁰³ This theory was popularized by F. Spitta¹⁰⁴ in Germany. With Foxley¹⁰⁵ and Box,¹⁰⁶ it made its appearance in England where it was widely accepted. But in their attempt to identify the eucharistic rite with a Sabbath-kiddush, they encountered some serious problems, because a Sabbath meal could take place only on Friday night. On the other hand, according to the Synoptics and John, the Last Supper had taken place on a Thursday night.¹⁰⁷

Box¹⁰⁸ obviously had no difficulty in solving this problem. He assumed that the celebration of the kiddush gradually emancipated itself from its formal connection with the weekly Sabbath. Nisan 14th, the preparation day of the Passover was treated as a Passover, and the kiddush ceremony was put back from Friday to Thursday.¹⁰⁹

Burkitt,¹¹⁰ however, found this solution unacceptable. He

pointed out that the kiddush immediately precedes the actual celebration of the day. Thus, a kiddush for the Sabbath is done on Friday night, not twenty-four hours earlier. The Passover kiddush, on the other hand, represents the opening of the Passover meal. It was pronounced over the first of the four Passover cups. In connection with Burkitt's observation, Jeremias raised his voice in protest against the wholly illusory Passover kiddush on the eve of the feast.¹¹¹ Burkitt's warning, however, went unheeded and scholars still found this theory to be quite attractive. R. Otto,¹¹² for instance, was first attracted by the kiddush theory. Then he began to look out for some other similar rites. In Jeremias' opinion, these kiddush-like rites are nothing else but Otto's own invention.¹¹³

The Sabbath-kiddush theory was further refined by Oesterley,¹¹⁴ who had appealed to the Passover kiddush, a ritual sanctification of the feast, which is supposed to have taken place the night before the feast. This view was already advanced by Kennett.¹¹⁵ He pointed out that it was a Jewish custom for friends to gather late in the afternoon on the day before the Sabbath, or on a high feast day. These gatherings were religious and social in nature. When the Passover day began, while the meal was still in process, the president would interrupt the meal, lifting a cup filled with wine. He then pronounced the blessing in order to sanctify the day. The meal would continue until late at night. According to Oesterley,¹¹⁶ the wine blessing may have been followed by a bread blessing. But it appears that the bread blessing was only pronounced in the case where poverty prevented the meal participants of partaking in wine.¹¹⁷ On the basis of these considerations Oesterley concluded that the group of disciples formed a haburah which had gathered for a weekly social meal on Thursday, rather than on Friday.¹¹⁸

The theory of a Passover kiddush was widely accepted in England. Besides Kennett¹¹⁹ and Oesterley,¹²⁰ Macgregor,¹²¹ Maxfield¹²² and Gavin¹²³ became adherents of this hypothesis. In Germany it found acceptance with Huber¹²⁴ and M. Dibelius.¹²⁵ Since these scholars are in favour of the Johannine chronology, they are in the same predicament as those who had adopted the Sabbath-kiddush theory, because they must also account for a time difference of twenty-four hours.¹²⁶ Therefore, they had to postulate the celebration of an opening meal, which Jesus had eaten the night before the Passover. According to Jeremias, however; there is no evidence for such an opening meal. In Jeremias' opinion, the theory of the Passover kiddush is nothing more than pure fantasy.¹²⁷

According to Lohmeyer,¹²⁸ the kiddush theory does contain an important aspect of truth. In his discussion of the Eucharist, Burkitt has pointed this out. He interpreted Luke 22:15f in the sense that Jesus was hoping to eat the Passover with his disciples. But the unfavourable circumstances prevented him from doing this. Therefore, the last meal of Jesus can hardly be considered to be more festive than the meal at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper (Mark 14:3f). If Jesus wanted to honour the last meal by a solemn act he had to rely upon existing table rites. Therefore, his institution of the Eucharist took on the form of a kiddush. This observation is further supported by the fact that a single cup was handed to all the meal participants.¹²⁹

In the light of this consideration, we must seek for a proper definition of the term. From Jeremias' discussion of the kiddush theory, it has become apparent that there was a real confusion among scholars as to the actual meaning of the word "kiddush".¹³⁰ Consequently, on the basis of the kiddush theory one could hardly expect to gain a better under-

standing of the Eucharist. According to Jeremias, the kiddush is to be defined in terms of a simple blessing.¹³¹ Dunbitz¹³² defines it as a ceremony and prayer by which the holiness of the Sabbath or of a festival is proclaimed. In other words, the advent of the Sabbath was marked by a "sanctification" kiddush, which set the day apart from the week-day which preceded it. At table, the head of the house, surrounded by his friends and guests, would take a cup full of wine and pronounce over it the usual blessing: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the world, who createst the fruit of the vine and the blessing of the day." Then, he and after him all other meal participants drank from the "cup of blessing." After the blessing over the wine, followed the blessing over the bread.¹³³ It was customary to place two loaves of bread before the head of the house. These loaves of bread symbolized the double portion of the manna on the Sabbath. After the bread blessing, the meal proceeded.¹³⁴ This pattern of the ritual, connected with the cup of wine and the breaking of the bread, reflects a practice of a later period (200 A.D.), and not that of the time of Jesus.¹³⁵

In view of the definition of the kiddush, in terms of a simple blessing or as a ceremony and prayer whereby the Sabbath was set apart from the preceding work day, we must conclude that the Eucharist cannot be identified with a kiddush. Only the meal practice which was connected with the kiddush may show some resemblance to the Last Supper. These meal customs, however, are independent and are not necessarily confined to the kiddush.

The Last Supper--a Passover Meal?

Thus far New Testament scholarship has been unable to present

convincing arguments in support of the Passover theory. The discrepant datings of the Last Supper found in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Gospel of John, for instance, pose a serious problem. In spite of the lack of any definite evidence, Jeremias has defended the Passover theory at great length. Since he is one of the main representatives of this theory it will be necessary to present an exposition of his thesis.

1. Jeremias' Passover theory

Jeremias' monograph, Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, must be considered as an epoch-making attempt to unravel the eucharistic problems of the New Testament. For more than two decades this erudite study has dominated the eucharistic discussion in Germany.¹³⁶

Contrary to Bultmann,¹³⁷ who had defined the Eucharist in terms of a cult-legend originating in a Hellenistic milieu, Jeremias was primarily concerned to defend its historicity.¹³⁸ In fact, it is quite characteristic of Jeremias to always reflect upon the historical question throughout his minute investigation.¹³⁹ Therefore, it is hardly surprising when he begins his study of the eucharistic words with the historical question concerning the Passover. The answer to this question does not only serve to solve the chronological question of the life of Jesus. Jeremias is much more concerned with the recovering of the ipsissima verba of Jesus. He also views the Eucharist as a vital link in the scheme of salvation-history.¹⁴⁰

For Jeremias, theological interpretation must have a firm historical basis. Thus, he is convinced that we must find our way back to the historical Jesus and his message:¹⁴¹

We cannot bypass him. Quite apart from all theological con-

siderations, there are two circumstances which compel us to make the attempt to ascertain the character of the gospel as Jesus proclaimed it. First of all, it is the sources which forbid us to confine ourselves to the kerygma of the primitive church and which force us ever and again to raise the question of the historical Jesus and his message. Every verse of the gospels tells us that the origin of Christianity lies not in the kerygma, not in the resurrection experiences of the disciples, not in a "Christ-idea." Every verse tells us, rather, that the origin of Christianity lies in the appearance of the man who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, Jesus of Nazareth, and in his message. . . . Over and over again we come across words which unmistakably imply a situation prior to Easter. Only occasionally do we meet with traces here and there of christological overlay; and even if everything were overlaid with Christology, the study of the historical Jesus would still remain an imperative task, since the absence of primary sources should not constitute a reason for abandoning historical research.¹⁴²

According to Jeremias, the identification of the Last Supper with a Passover meal has profound theological implications, for he holds that our understanding of the eucharistic words depends upon it.¹⁴³ In his attempt to prove that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, Jeremias had to come to grips with a serious chronological problem, namely the discrepant datings of the death of Jesus.¹⁴⁴ The chronological problem may be briefly summarized as follows: All the evangelists agree that Jesus was executed on a Friday.¹⁴⁵ Therefore, the Last Supper was held on Thursday night. To be more specific, the Supper must have taken place during the first hours of Friday, beginning at sunset.¹⁴⁶

In this connection, the question arises: "Was this Friday the first day of the Passover feast?" In other words, did the Last Supper take place at the beginning of Nisan 15 or a day before?¹⁴⁷ On this question the Synoptists and John are divided.¹⁴⁸ According to the former the Last Supper was a Passover meal. All the events from the Last Supper to the burial take place during the night of Nisan 14/15 and Nisan 15.¹⁴⁹ John, on the other hand, who does not report the insti-

tution of the Eucharist, seems to consider Nisan 14 as the day of execution for, according to John 18:28, the Jews do not go to the judgment hall. Consequently, the eating of the Passover meal had not taken place, as yet.¹⁵⁰

In Mark 14:12¹⁵¹ there is a contradiction between the first half and the second half of the time reference. According to the unusual reckoning, the phrase *τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζύμων* points to Nisan 15.¹⁵² But there is evidence that occasionally this phrase referred to the preceding day. The second half of the time reference, *ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουσιν*, definitely refers to Nisan 14.¹⁵³ Therefore, only this day can be intended.

Which possible solution can be found in order to remove the discrepancies? The following attempts must be made in order to solve the complex chronological problem:

1. John has to be explained on the basis of the Synoptists.¹⁵⁴
2. The Synoptists have to be explained on the basis of John.¹⁵⁵
3. The two statements must be harmonized in the sense that the different datings can be explained.¹⁵⁶

Jeremias, who may be considered as the champion of the Synoptic chronology,¹⁵⁷ had accumulated a series of incidental data, which in his opinion would lend definite support to his thesis that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.¹⁵⁸ We will briefly refer to some of the most important incidents mentioned by Jeremias:

1. On the basis of the unanimous testimony of the Synoptics (Mark 14:13 par.; 14:26 par.;;) and of John (18:1), the Last Supper took place in Jerusalem and not in Bethany.¹⁵⁹ While it was impossible for all the pilgrims to stay over night within the precincts of the Holy City,

as it was expressly demanded by Deuteronomy 16:7, the Passover lamb had to be eaten within the gates of the city.¹⁶⁰

2. According to 1 Corinthians 11:23 and John 13:30, the Last Supper was held at night.¹⁶¹ In Jeremias' opinion, this is quite unusual, for nowhere in the gospels do we find any reference that a regular meal was eaten at night. The only exception to this rule is Matthew 14:15 with its reference to the miraculous feeding of the five thousand. Since it was not customary to hold a meal in the evening, the textual references must point to a Passover meal.¹⁶²

3. The Synoptists (Mark 14:18, Matt. 26:20, Luke 22:14) and John (13:12, 23, 25, 28) are in agreement on the point that Jesus and the disciples celebrated the Eucharist while reclining at table.¹⁶³ Only for the celebration of a special meal was it customary to recline at table.¹⁶⁴ The Passover meal, of course, was part of such a special meal celebration.¹⁶⁵ The objection that Exodus 12:11 speaks against the reclining at table during the Passover celebration, is simply dismissed with the remark that this rule was valid only in connection with the actual exodus.¹⁶⁶

4. The drinking of wine at the Last Supper (Mark 14:23, 25 par.) characterizes the meal as a festive occasion, because in everyday life water was drunk.¹⁶⁷ Matthew 11:16-19 and John 2:1-11 are the only other references in the gospels which indicate that Jesus drank wine.¹⁶⁸ The idea that Jesus and his disciples used wine with their daily meals is simply unfounded.¹⁶⁹ In Jeremias' opinion, the drinking of wine at the Last Supper is an indication that this occasion was a Passover feast.¹⁷⁰ According to rabbinic regulations, each participant had to have four cups of wine.¹⁷¹

5. After the Last Supper a hallel was sung.¹⁷² This singing of a hymn is mentioned rather incidentally in Mark 14:26 and in Matthew 26:30. It is a further indication that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.¹⁷³
6. The last argument is the weightiest one in support of the Passover theory. The manner of Jesus' announcement of the passion becomes intelligible only within the setting of a Passover meal.¹⁷⁴ Jesus spoke words of interpretation over bread and wine, which is a fixed part of the Passover ritual.¹⁷⁵ According to Jeremias, they primarily concern the framework and the substance of the narrative. Therefore, they cannot be considered in terms of later embellishments for the purpose of giving a paschal character to the Last Supper.¹⁷⁶

Jeremias' attempt to strengthen his position with regard to the Synoptic tradition on the basis of new materials was very soon met with strong opposition. Kaesemann,¹⁷⁷ who did not believe in the paschal character of the Eucharist, objected to Jeremias' presentation of the new materials. In his opinion, these data are not fully convincing. They simply serve to underline the fact that the Synoptic tradition does speak of a Passover meal.¹⁷⁸

In Schweizer's opinion, the arguments collected by Jeremias in support of the Passover character of the last meal, and those against it, seem to counterbalance one another. As positive evidence, he accepted the following arguments: (1) Jesus eats in the city and not in the suburbs; (2) he eats at night, and not in the late afternoon; (3) his disciples sing a hymn of praise at the end of the meal (Mark 14:26a).

But, he pointed out that the arguments against the Passover theory seem to be more persuasive than those cited in its support. In his opinion, there is a distinct difference between the Passover and the Lord's

Supper. The former was hardly celebrated only once a year in the earliest church. Schweizer holds the view that in Acts 20:6 and the "Epistle of the Apostles 15(26)," and among the Quartodecimans, the Passover had nothing to do with the Lord's Supper. Red wine, for instance, was not only used at a Passover celebration, but was drunk on other festive occasions and special meals also. The argument concerning the reclining position at the table does not prove anything, because it is frequently mentioned in all four gospels. The disciples' lingering within the confines of the city does not stand out as anything unusual in John 18:2, Luke 21:37 and 22:39, while John 13:29 is simply used as a literary device by the evangelist. Hence, it does not point to a special night on which the poor are to be found on the streets. In the light of these arguments, Schweizer seems to imply that a good case could be made out against the Passover theory. Most particularly, the lack of any reference to the Passover in Mark and Paul, which may be considered as the oldest passages, seems to lend support to this view.¹⁷⁹

From a theological point of view, Schweizer argued, this question is unimportant, because a meal held on the eve of the Passover could have taken up the ideas of the impending celebration.¹⁸⁰ But if the question is of no theological significance, we can hardly understand why Schweizer is so anxious to point out that even a meal held in the atmosphere of the Passover would have been influenced by paschal ideas.

With regard to Jeremias' presentation of the new materials in support of the Passover theory, Dugmore¹⁸¹ has particularly objected to Jeremias' argument that it was customary at ordinary meals in Jesus' time to eat sitting, rather than reclining. He pointed out that of the two passages which Jeremias cites "from the Rabbinic literature" (J. Ber.

VII, 11b, 62, 11c, 42 and 48), the first mentions reclining at meals, while the second makes no reference either to reclining or sitting. He also pointed out that neither Ber. VI nor b. Sanh. 38a warrants the statement in his text.¹⁸² Furthermore, the common Greek words for "to sit" καθίζω, καθεζομαι and κάθημαι are constantly used in the gospels: For instance, when Jesus healed the sick of the palsy, "there were certain of the scribes sitting there (Mark 2:6)."¹⁸³ According to Dugmore, whenever the gospels mention a meal at which Jesus was present--including the feeding of the multitude (Mark 6:39; Luke 9:14; John 6:11;) and the meal at Emmaus (Luke 24:30)--they employ words like ἀνακείθαι etc., all of which mean "to fall back, to recline." Thus, Jeremias' argument that because Jesus and his disciples reclined at the Last Supper, it must have been a Passover meal, fails to be convincing. Dugmore passes a similar judgment on other arguments presented by Jeremias in support of the Synoptic chronology.¹⁸⁴ He concludes that Jeremias has made it less impossible to believe that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, but he is far from having proved that it was.¹⁸⁵

Without engaging in a detailed analysis of each single point of the new material, which Jeremias presented in support of the Synoptic chronology, we must agree with Dugmore, Kaesemann and Schweizer that Jeremias has failed to convince us that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.¹⁸⁶

From a discussion of the various points in support of the Passover theory, Jeremias turned to an examination of eleven major objections to the Synoptic assertion that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. In his treatment of these objections, we noticed that Jeremias has simply tried to explain them away. Furthermore, he tends to make exceptions

the rule for his explanation.¹⁸⁷ This can best be illustrated on the basis of his rather inadequate explanation of the Sanhedrin's meeting and condemnation of Jesus on Nisan 15, which was actually forbidden by Jewish law. According to the Mishnah, "none may sit in judgment . . . on a feast day."¹⁸⁸ In the light of this mishnaic statement, the question comes into focus: "Was this law already enforced at the time of Jesus?" In Jeremias' opinion, Blinzler has conclusively demonstrated that the rabbinic-mishnaic criminal law was not yet in force at the time of Jesus.¹⁸⁹

In support of his thesis, Jeremias appealed to a statement by Rabbi Akiba, who died after 135 A.D. According to this statement, a convict was to be brought to Jerusalem and kept in prison until the feast, for it is said: "And all the people shall hear it, so that they may fear it and not act presumptuously again."¹⁹⁰ According to the Torah, the exception on a feast day was ruled out. But by referring to Rabbi Akiba, Jeremias indicated that Jesus' case was a legal exception to the law of no judging on feast days, and concluded that Jesus had to be tried and executed at once. The argument fails to be convincing, since we have no evidence for such a legal exception at the time of Jesus. Furthermore, there is no conclusive proof that it was more than a preliminary inquiry with a view to making recommendations to the Roman procurator, who would pass legal judgment himself.¹⁹¹ The Jews admitted that they were unable to put a man to death (John 18:31). They waited for Pilate to issue an effective sentence.¹⁹²

In Gaugler's¹⁹³ opinion, the Sanhedrin's meeting during the Pass-over night, the trial and execution on the first day of the feast, still pose a serious problem which cannot easily be solved. Preiss,¹⁹⁴ in

basic agreement with Gaugler, also expressed strong doubts about Jeremias' claim that Jesus should have been judged, condemned and crucified in the midst of the feast. That would have been contrary to the prescriptions of the law. It is impossible to understand that the disciples should be armed in Mark 14:47, and why Simon of Cyrene in Mark 15:21 should be returning from the field at noon at the height of the feast. According to Preiss, one can understand very well why Simon should return at noon on the eve of the Passover, for there is evidence that people were allowed to work in the fields until noon of that particular day. In his opinion, this detail of the Marcan tradition strengthens the Johannine data.¹⁹⁵ Thus, the Sanhedrin's meeting, the disciples' bearing of arms, and Simon's return from the fields at noon still represents a considerable problem for the date of Nisan 15.

2. The chronological problem

In the course of his defense of the historicity of the Synoptic chronology, Jeremias had refuted all attempts¹⁹⁶ seeking to harmonize the discrepant chronologies of John and the Synoptics. He also refuted the rather ingenious study by Mlle A. Jaubert.¹⁹⁷ In connection with K. Holl's critical observations,¹⁹⁸ Jeremias argued that the "strange passion week chronology" which occurs in the Didascalia for the first time, represents a secondary development which had its origin in the fasting practice of the church.¹⁹⁹

a) Attempts at harmonization

Since Jaubert's hypothesis was considered by several scholars as a possible solution to the puzzling chronological problem, in the sense that it respects the integrity of both the Synoptic and Johannine

chronology, it will be necessary to briefly discuss it.

Jaubert's book La Date de la Cène²⁰⁰ is divided into three sections. In the first part²⁰¹ the author discusses the solar calendar, which is represented by the Book of Jubilees, the "Astronomical Book" in Ethiopian Enoch and in the Qumran texts (CDC XVI:1-5; III:13-15; CDC VI:18-19f and IQSI:14-15; IQS X:5-7). While there is no need to enter into a discussion of the technicalities concerning this calendar, we must briefly state the following data: (1) The year was a solar year of exactly 364 days. It was divided up into exactly 52 weeks, which means that the days of the week were fixed days. In other words, if the year would begin on a certain day, the next year would begin precisely 52 weeks later on the same day. Furthermore, the year was divided into four parts: Each part consisted of two months of thirty days each, plus one month of thirty-one days. On the basis of some complicated calculations it has been worked out that the year, according to this solar calendar, began on a Wednesday, and that the Passover also fell on that day.

What is the history of this calendar? It can already be found in the Old Testament, namely in the Hexateuch and in Chronicles. This calendar also exerted its influence upon the liturgical practice of the early church. The first indications of liturgical dates appear in the Didache. From this document it appears that the Christians had chosen Sunday, Wednesday and Friday as fast days. Since, in the milieu of Jesus and the disciples, the calendar with fixed days was used, the question arises: "How could Jesus have celebrated the Passover on any other day but Tuesday night?"

In the second part²⁰² of her work, Jaubert concerned herself

with the patristic tradition. The most important texts attesting a Tuesday night Passover can be found in the Didascalia (21) and in Epiphanius.²⁰³ The tradition was, of course, more widespread than our present documentation reveals. Victorinus of Pettau, for instance, who died in 304, accepted the same tradition in his De Fabrica Mundi, without showing any dependence upon the Didascalia. The important thing to notice here is, that this tradition could not have arisen from a reading of the gospel texts. According to the tradition found in the Didascalia Jesus was arrested during the night from Tuesday to Wednesday. He was crucified on Friday.²⁰⁴

In the final part²⁰⁵ of her book, the author connected the primitive church's tradition of the three-day passion with the solar calendar. According to this calendar Jesus had celebrated the Last Supper on Tuesday night and he was crucified on Friday, Nisan 14. This was in harmony with the official Jewish calendar. Therefore, the Johannine dating seems to be justified.

On the assumption that Jesus had celebrated the Passover on Tuesday night, it is highly improbable that the priests would have permitted the killing of lambs in the temple. The official day for the slaughter was Nisan 14. Therefore, the Marcan phrase *καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον*, (Mark 14:12), appears to be a secondary gloss, because the glossator probably no longer understood which Passover celebration he was referring to, the priestly one or the one of the official calendar.

The double calendar has also affected the dating of certain feasts in the early church. The Quartodecimans of Asia Minor, for instance, celebrated Easter according to the official Jewish calendar on

Nisan 14. Rome and the rest of the churches, seem to have followed the priestly calendar, because they have chosen a certain day of the week, namely Sunday, as their date for Easter.

Jaubert's hypothesis seems to offer a far better solution to the puzzling passion chronology than any other one suggested thus far. It was favourably received by a number of scholars such as Allegro, Carmignac, Cross, Walther and others.²⁰⁶ In Johnston's²⁰⁷ opinion, Jaubert's hypothesis does not depend upon any arbitrary alteration of the date of the Pasch by either Jesus or the Jewish authorities. Moreover, it is based upon the evidence of a calendar we know did exist. But in spite of the attractiveness of her theory it has failed to be fully convincing. Therefore, scholars such as Blinzler,²⁰⁸ Burrows, Schubert²⁰⁹ and Jeremias²¹⁰ have found it unacceptable. Johnston, for instance, raised the question whether Jesus ever followed the Qumran calendar.²¹¹ Secondly, the problem of intercalation calls for further investigations. Kuhn,²¹² for instance, pointed out that the Qumran calendar could only have functioned properly for a longer period of time, if authentic proof for an intercalation of the calendar were available. Unfortunately, there is no shred of evidence that the solar calendar has ever been intercalated. According to Kuhn,²¹³ Ethiopian Enoch 80:2-8 is to be considered as an example that the solar calendar did not function at all, because it was not intercalated. In Ethiopian Enoch 74:13-14, for instance, an attempt was made to calculate the days of an eight year period on the basis of a 364 day year, resulting in 2912 days. This example clearly indicates that the necessary intercalation of ten days was not made. In the light of these considerations, Kuhn concluded that Jaubert's thesis of a Tuesday night Passover could be accepted only if

the following two conditions were met: (1) proof would be needed that Jesus himself followed the Essene calendar, and (2) evidence would need to be provided that the solar calendar was actually intercalated for the purpose of adjusting it to the solar year. Such proof, however, is not available.²¹⁴

Blinzler also objected to Jaubert's Tuesday Passover theory, because the following considerations seem to militate against such a view: How could Jesus have celebrated the Passover on a Tuesday night without a Passover lamb, which had to be killed and prepared in the temple with the assistance of the priests and according to their specifications? Since the temple priests, who were the representatives of official Judaism, celebrated the Passover on a Friday night, it is to be assumed that for the slaughter of the lambs, the priests were available only on Friday afternoon, rather than on Tuesday afternoon, which would have been Nisan 11. Therefore, if Jesus ate the lamb on Tuesday night, it cannot strictly be designated as a Passover lamb, because it was not killed and prepared at the appropriate time and place.²¹⁵ Furthermore, on the basis of this consideration, the Last Supper could not be specified in terms of a ritual pesach meal of sacrifice of the Old Covenant.²¹⁶

We can hardly enter into a detailed discussion of Jaubert's book. But while Jaubert's thesis promises to fit the facts in a rather impressive way, it is to be admitted that there are certain problem areas such as the intercalation of the calendar²¹⁷ and the Tuesday Passover theory,²¹⁸ which stand in need of further research. Therefore, her thesis, which has been favourably received by several scholars, is still far from being conclusive.

In this connection, it should be pointed out, that several schol-

ars were not at all persuaded by Jeremias' extraordinary, learned arguments in support of the Synoptic dating. In his essay "Are Both Synoptics and John Correct About the Date of Jesus' Death?" Shepherd²¹⁹ suggested that the problem of the discrepant datings could best be solved on the basis that two different ways of reckoning the Passover may have existed.²²⁰

John, for instance, who was following a Palestinian tradition based upon the Palestinian reckoning of the day of the Passover, recorded the true date.²²¹ The year when Jesus died, the Passover coincided with the Sabbath. Therefore, Jesus died on the eve of the Passover. Mark, on the other hand, who was followed by Matthew and Luke, wrote from the vantage point of one who followed the calendar of Diaspora Judaism, whose tradition recalled that in the year Jesus died, the Passover fell on a Friday.²²²

This hypothesis seems to provide a rather simple solution to a complex problem. It is so convenient as to arouse the suspicion that it may have been invented for the purpose of solving the rather complex problem on hand.

b) Defense of the Johannine chronology

While Jeremias defended the historicity of the Synoptic dating of the Last Supper, some scholars were convinced that the Johannine chronology is the correct one.²²³

According to Branscomb,²²⁴ the evidence strongly supports the Johannine presentation that Jesus was crucified before the Passover feast began. He presented the following reasons for his conclusion:

1. Mark's dating is not consistent. There are indications that

he has combined portions of two different traditions.

2. Some episodes of the Passover narrative seem very unlikely on the night of the Passover and the first day of unleavened bread.

3. The evidence of Paul supports the Johannine dating: 1 Corinthians shows a strong influence of paschal ideas (1 Cor. 5:6-8). This statement becomes very pointed if Paul believed that the crucifixion coincided with the slaughter of the paschal lambs, as John affirms. Secondly, if Paul had understood that the meal had taken place on a Passover night one would expect to find a reference to it in the description of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff.

4. The Quartodecimans were convinced that the crucifixion was on Nisan 14th.²²⁵

In Branscomb's opinion, only two features suggest that the Last Supper was a Passover meal: The Passover meal had to be eaten within the city limits and the singing of a hymn is mentioned at the conclusion of the meal.²²⁶

In his essay "Der Termin des Todes Jesu," Strobel²²⁷ also insisted that preference should be given to the Johannine chronology. In his opinion, B. Lohse, who had attempted to interpret the Quartodeciman practice in terms of a direct continuation of the last Passover of Jesus on Nisan 14th, had made a mistake. Since Lohse was primarily concerned with establishing the age of the celebration, he had failed to notice that the special content of this celebration was responsible for the discrepancy of twenty-four hours, as compared with the historical date of the Last Supper.

According to Strobel, the Quartodeciman-apostolic celebration was characterized by a strong emphasis upon the eschatological expecta-

tion. This particular aspect of the celebration had connected itself with the midnight hour of the Passover.²²⁸ In the light of this consideration, it is highly probable that the Synoptic presentation of the last meal reflects the common practice of the primitive Christian community.²²⁹ Therefore, the Johannine chronology, with Nisan 13 as the date for the Last Supper and Nisan 14 as the day of Jesus' crucifixion, is to be preferred.²³⁰

Strobel found further support for his thesis on the basis of a source-critical analysis of the chronological framework of the Marcan account. The time reference of Mark 14:1 is to be interpreted in the sense that Jesus' Last Supper was not understood as a Passover meal. On the basis of this reference, it appears that Jesus was already arrested during the night from Nisan 13th to Nisan 14th. He was crucified before the feast, during the afternoon of the day of preparation. Therefore, these developments coincide with the Johannine chronology.²³¹

His basic assumption, that the meal account could be considered as a factor which has introduced disorder into the Synoptic chronology of the passion, can also be supported on the basis of Mark 15:42, where the day of crucifixion is designated as paraskeue, but with the additional phrase "that is the day of preparation for the Sabbath."²³² While we must admit that these are weighty arguments in favour of the Johannine chronology, Strobel's attempt to explain the cause of the discrepancy is unconvincing.

Recently, P. Benoit²³³ stated his view concerning the Johannine problem as follows: "The issue is not settled as yet. For our theme it is of no decisive importance. Jesus' farewell meal may have taken place on the eve before the Passover, or even earlier. At any rate, it

was submerged in the atmosphere of the Jewish feast."

In another article,²³⁴ Benoit, observing the various attempts to solve the chronological problem, made a recommendation. In his opinion, it would be most reasonable to assume that Jesus was fully aware of the fact that at the moment of the slaughter of the Passover lamb, he himself would die. Therefore, he antedated the Passover celebration by one day. At the celebration of his last meal, Jesus had clearly recalled the Passover ritual, so that he was able to build his own rite, which was to be the Passover rite of the New Testament, upon this very foundation. According to Benoit, this solution certainly respects the Johannine as well as the Synoptic datings.²³⁵

Benoit was fully aware of the fact that there is no easy solution to the complex chronological problem. Since he was unable to establish the historicity of either the Johannine or of the Synoptic datings, he decided to make a compromise. In other words, for Benoit the question of the historicity of either dating seems to be no longer of any fundamental importance as long as one can be certain that the Last Supper took place in the atmosphere of the Passover.²³⁶ In this way he can find at least some basis for his theological interpretation. Benoit's solution, however, can hardly satisfy.

According to Preiss,²³⁷ the chronological discrepancy was created by the mistaken Marcan chronology. He argued that Mark 14:1-2 "Now after two days was the feast of the Passover and of unleavened bread . . . not during the feast," presupposes the Johannine chronology.²³⁸

Preiss was particularly concerned to find a solution to the rather complex problem whether Jesus' last meal was a Passover meal or not. In his opinion, the last meal of Jesus with the disciples was not an antici-

pation of the paschal meal, but rather an anticipation of paschal motifs.²³⁹ The eschatological prospect, for instance, may be considered as proof that the Last Supper was an anticipation of the Kingdom.²⁴⁰ On the basis of his examination of the Johannine and the Pauline traditions, Preiss concluded that only from a theological, rather than from a chronological point of view, does the Last Supper appear as a Passover meal.²⁴¹

The rise and spread of the mistaken Marcan chronology, which was also adopted by Matthew and Luke, seems to be the result of a theological development which was responsible for the transformation of a simple meal with a Passover theme into a paschal meal.²⁴² In the course of this development, only the editorial framework of the Marcan narrative was affected, while its substance remained uninfluenced by this trend.²⁴³

c) Attempts of Jewish scholarship

In this connection, it should be pointed out that some Jewish scholars have also been sharply divided over the question concerning the correct chronology of the Last Supper and the crucifixion of Jesus. Torrey,²⁴⁴ for instance, had attempted to dispose of the discrepancy by interpreting the word *παράσκευή* in the Fourth Gospel as a reference not to the eve of the Passover, but rather to the Friday of the Passover week. In Torrey's opinion, the word *παράσκευή* in John 19:14 is not the colourless Greek word preparation, but a Jewish technical term.²⁴⁵

- In disagreement with Torrey, Zeitlin²⁴⁶ pointed out that the word *παράσκευή* is not a Jewish technical term equivalent to the eve

of the Sabbath.

Heawood²⁴⁷ also attempted to reconcile the contradiction between the Synoptic and non-Synoptic Gospels. He maintained that in biblical times the Passover was distinct from the Festival of Unleavened Bread. The Passover lamb was sacrificed on the 14th day of Nisan, while the Festival of Unleavened Bread began on the 15th. In later days, the word Passover was used to cover the whole of the seven days of the festival.

In Zeitlin's²⁴⁸ opinion, Heawood's facts are correct, but his conclusions are incorrect. On the basis of a careful examination of the chronological data, Zeitlin concluded with certainty that there is a discrepancy between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel. This existing discrepancy, however, is in regard to the date of the month, not the day of the week. As far as Zeitlin is concerned, the gospels are irreconcilable.²⁴⁹ The contradiction between the Synoptics and non-Synoptic Gospels is not a historical, but rather an ideological problem, "Does Jesus personify the Paschal Lamb or the Passover?"²⁵⁰

This disagreement among Jewish scholars may serve as a further illustration that there is no simple solution to the chronological problem. As we have already pointed out there is no justification for Jeremias' insistence upon the historicity of the Synoptic chronology. In our opinion, there are some weighty arguments in favour of the Johannine chronology. But thus far, it is to be admitted that we have no conclusive evidence in support of either the Johannine or the Synoptic datings.

The Last Supper--not a Passover Meal!

Apart from any chronological considerations, Bornkamm,²⁵¹ Hahn,²⁵²

Preiss²⁵³ and others have pointed out that there are other basic considerations which hardly permit us to identify the Last Supper with a Passover meal.

1. Objections to the Passover theory

Contrary to Jeremias, Hahn²⁵⁴ contended that the question whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not could not be decided on a historical basis. From a methodical point of view Hahn saw the following two possibilities: (1) since the Lord's Supper was celebrated regularly, the Passover motifs were omitted; (2) the reference to the Passover is to be explained as an addition which was theologically motivated.²⁵⁵

In Hahn's opinion, on the basis of historical and tradition-historical considerations, it is very unlikely that Jesus' Last Supper was a Passover meal.²⁵⁶ Referring to Mark 14:25, Hahn indicated that in this text, we cannot recognize any connections with a Passover meal. He was quick to point out, however, that there is a definite link between the death of Jesus, his farewell meal and the Passover celebration. This, in turn, gave rise to interpretations such as 1 Corinthians 5:7 and John 19:36.²⁵⁷

In Bornkamm's opinion, Jeremias' presentation that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, fails to be convincing. At the most, Jeremias has presented proof that the Synoptics have placed the Last Supper within the framework of a Passover meal. The accounts of institution have very little, or no connection at all, with the Passover.²⁵⁸

Bornkamm, who was even more critical than Hahn, pointed to a number of factors which in his opinion speak decidedly against any connections between the Last Supper and a Passover meal: (1) The consti-

tutive elements of the Passover meal, such as the Passover roast, the matzoth and bitter herbs, are not mentioned at all. (2) In no way can the words of interpretation be considered in terms of a Passover Haggadah. (3) Against Jeremias, Bornkamm argued that the constitutive words and actions of the Lord's Supper can hardly be fitted into the framework of a Passover liturgy. (4) In the accounts of the Lord's Supper, there are no interpretative words for the lamb, the matzoth and bitter herbs. (5) The bread- and cup-words are also without any analogy to the Jewish celebration of the Passover.²⁵⁹

With regard to the Pauline account of the Last Supper Bornkamm pointed out that the absence of any reference to the Passover from the words of interpretation is rather striking, because Paul does show familiarity with concepts such as Christ is our Passover Lamb. On the basis of his examination of pertinent New Testament passages, Bornkamm concluded that there was no justification for the assumption of a possible relationship between the Last Supper and the Passover.²⁶⁰ On this point, Bornkamm is in disagreement with Hahn,²⁶¹ who maintained that there was a connection between the Last Supper and the Passover meal. In Bornkamm's opinion, the textual situation is such that wherever reference is made to the Lord's Supper, there is no indication of a Passover lamb. On the other hand, wherever the lamb is referred to, no mention is made of the Lord's Supper.²⁶²

In the light of these considerations, Bornkamm concluded that the theses of G. Walther²⁶³ and J. Jeremias²⁶⁴ were untenable. Thus, Bornkamm could not find any basis in the texts for their conception that Jesus, as the Passover Lamb of the New Covenant, should be the central idea of the Lord's Supper.²⁶⁵

Kuermel was also unable to find a textual basis for the paschal interpretation of the Last Supper. He pointed out that according to Mark 14:12, the Last Supper was a Passover meal.²⁶⁶ Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, have simply adopted the Marcan dating. The Marcan and Pauline accounts of the Last Supper do not make reference to anything which is peculiar to the Passover. The lack of any reference to a lamb is especially striking.²⁶⁷

According to Lohmeyer, there can be no doubt that Mark has inserted his account of the Last Supper into the ritual of a Passover meal. Consequently, he wants to have it understood as a Passover meal. While there are numerous possibilities in understanding the Last Supper on the basis of the ritual of a Passover meal, one cannot overlook the fact that the account of the Last Supper itself does not allude to a Passover meal at all. Therefore, in Lohmeyer's opinion, it is necessary to explain it without any reference to the Passover meal.²⁶⁸

Exegetes have obviously been puzzled by these conflicting traditions. This in turn has given rise to numerous hypotheses. Oulton,²⁶⁹ for instance, thought it possible that the Lord had intended to hold a farewell meal instead of a Passover meal.

In his opinion, it would be easy to suppose that, later on in the minds of the Christian disciples, the farewell meal would be regarded as having taken place on the actual day of the feast.²⁷⁰

We have already stated Preiss' basic thesis and discovered that for him the question whether Jesus' last meal was a Passover meal or not has no bearing upon the issues involved. In his opinion, we are to realize that the various traditions of the Last Supper have been shaped by the theological interest of the primitive Christian community.²⁷¹

From a chronological point of view, with the exception of the mistaken Marcan chronology, the Last Supper was not a Passover meal.²⁷² Theologically speaking, however, the last meal was a Passover meal.²⁷³ It was so as the result of the death of Jesus. In the Jewish economy, the Passover was the central point of all the events of the Exodus. Now, the Passover serves as an enormous symbol, which is realized in Christ. On the assumption that Preiss' basic presuppositions are correct, all attempts which seek to prove that the Last Supper was a Passover meal become superfluous. The important point to remember is that Jesus instituted the Last Supper by the whole of his life and especially by his death and resurrection. This meal will be fully accomplished at the time of the parousia in the great communion of the Kingdom.²⁷⁴

In Branscomb's opinion, the question why the early Christians wished to identify the last meal, at which the Eucharist was instituted with the Jewish Passover, can easily be answered.²⁷⁵ The first Christians were mostly Jews, or they were Gentiles who had Jewish leaders. Thus, it is to be assumed that the Jewish Passover was still considered to be one of the dominant events of the annual calendar.²⁷⁶ The Passover, of course, was characterized by two primary ideas: on one hand, it was a memorial of Israel's deliverance in the past; on the other hand, it pointed forward to a future deliverance. These ideas also characterize the Eucharist, which, as a result of the death of Jesus, serves as a memorial of the deliverance of God's people. It is also a promise of a future salvation. Thus, it is only natural that the Christian eucharistic meal came to be thought of as a Christian substitute for the Jewish Passover.²⁷⁷ This substitution resulted from an opposition to Judaism and its rites. Such an idea would find support by the general

Christian knowledge that the institution of the Eucharist and the death of Christ occurred at the Passover season.²⁷⁸

Branscomb's contention that the Eucharist was a substitute for the Jewish Passover is to be questioned on the grounds that, at the beginning of the Christian movement, both rites may have been observed by the Christians.²⁷⁹

In the light of the above considerations, we conclude that Jeremias' insistence upon the historicity of the Synoptic dating, and the identification of the Last Supper with a Passover meal, is unfounded. While the chronological problem is still far from being solved, it is to be admitted that a strong case could be made out in support of the Johannine chronology of the Last Supper and the crucifixion of Jesus.

Furthermore, the eucharistic accounts themselves contain no features peculiar to a Passover meal. For these basic reasons, the exegete will not be able to interpret them in terms of a Passover meal. On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that the early Christians did associate the Eucharist with a Passover meal. This identification was theologically motivated. The Passover, as the central aspect of the events of the Exodus, provided a suitable background for an understanding of the Christ event. It did not only provide a backward look to the redemptive death of Jesus, but also the prospect of a future deliverance in the Kingdom of God.

A Critical Appraisal of Jeremias'
Interpretation of the
Eucharistic Words

For Jeremias, the identification of the Last Supper with a Passover meal has profound theological implications. Since his exegetical construction is firmly based upon the assumption that Jesus' Last Supper was a Passover meal, it will be necessary to briefly examine the main aspects of his presentation: (1) Jesus' avowal of abstinence; (2) Jesus, the Passover Lamb; (3) the anamnesis command, and (4) Jesus died as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.

1. Jesus' avowal of abstinence

In this section Jeremias develops the thesis that Jesus assumed the role of an intercessor for his deluded people.²⁸⁰ In order to impress his disciples with a spirit of complete self-surrender, he engages in a fast for his persecutors (Did. 1:3).²⁸¹ In other words, Jesus begins the last Passover meal as the Servant of God, who according to Isaiah 53:12, makes intercession for the transgressors.²⁸² At this point the question arises, "What is Jeremias' basis for this rather impressive construction?"

In the light of Luke 22:15, Jeremias, in agreement with F. C. Burkitt and A. E. Brooke,²⁸³ argued that the text should be translated: "I would very gladly have eaten this Passover lamb with you before my death." The reason why for Jesus this wish was not fulfilled is given in verse 16: "for I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God."²⁸⁴ In Jeremias' opinion, the eschatological prospect of verses 16 and 18 cannot be interpreted as a

prediction of death, but rather in the sense of a careful declaration of intent, almost in terms of an oath.²⁸⁵

Further support for the hypothesis that Jesus abstained completely from food and drink can be found in the words of interpretation, because it would be hard to imagine that Jesus would have partaken of bread and wine, which he described in terms of his body and blood.²⁸⁶

Jeremias also appealed to the Quartodeciman practice in support of his thesis. These Christians of Asia Minor, who were living towards the end of the first century, celebrated the Passover at the same time the Jews did. Instead of eating the ceremonial meal like the Jews, these Christians would engage in a fast for the Jews, which culminated in the celebration of the Eucharist at the time of the cock-crow.²⁸⁷

A survey of source material from late Judaism indicates that renunciations played an important part in its life.²⁸⁸ In most cases they were an expression of an irrevocable resolution, of dedication of oneself to God and the mortification of the flesh in order to strengthen persistence in prayer.²⁸⁹ In Jeremias' opinion, these considerations are helpful towards a better understanding of Jesus' attitude in abstaining from food and drink.²⁹⁰

Jeremias' exegetical construction may be very impressive. But it causes us to raise the question whether it has a sound textual basis. In other words, does Luke 22:15-18 warrant Jeremias' portrayal of Jesus' intervention on behalf of his deluded people of Israel? Can we possibly understand these verses in the sense that Jesus, in an attempt to impress the urgency of his intercession upon his disciples, underscores this with a renunciation of the festival celebration and of the wine? Is there any textual basis for Jeremias' contention that at the Last Supper Jesus

engaged in a fast?

With this question in mind, we must briefly examine the Marcan-Matthaeian tradition of the Last Supper, in order to find out whether there is any indication of Jesus' renunciation with regard to the meal. In the light of Mark 14:18-20, it appears that Jesus and his disciples were eating. Furthermore, the phrase αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 14:25); πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Matt. 26:29) seems to lend support to the idea that Jesus had partaken of the cup, since he will drink it anew in the Kingdom of God. On the basis of these considerations we must conclude that the idea of Jesus' fasting cannot be derived from either Mark or Matthew. This means that we must focus our attention solely upon Luke 22:15-18.

With regard to the interpretation of verse 15, it should be pointed out that there is no unanimity among exegetes. Some have interpreted it in the sense that Jesus' desire was actually fulfilled. They hold that Jesus did not only express his desire to eat the Passover meal with his disciples, but he indeed ate it.²⁹¹

Jeremias, on the other hand, argued that verse 15 is to be understood in terms of an unfulfilled wish.²⁹² In this connection, he pointed out that the use of ἐπιθυμεῖν "to desire," with an infinitive, is a favourite construction in Luke's special source. In Luke 17:22 it clearly expresses an unfulfilled desire.²⁹³

In criticism of Jeremias' position, du Toit²⁹⁴ has pointed out that there seems to be a contradiction between verses 15 and 16. On the basis of Luke 22:15-18 one would have to assume that on one hand Jesus was longing to eat the Passover meal with his disciples. On the other

hand, Jesus seems to have voluntarily withdrawn from the meal celebration. One could only account for this contradiction on the basis of some special reason which compelled Jesus to give up his desire to eat the Passover meal.²⁹⁵ Jeremias suggested that Jesus' intention to abstain from any food was motivated by his great concern for his deluded people.²⁹⁶ This argument, as impressive as it may be, fails to be convincing, because there is no textual basis for it.²⁹⁷ In order to give some added strength to his argumentation, Jeremias appealed to the Quartodeciman practice, which in his opinion can be traced back to the earliest community and ultimately to the practice of Jesus himself.²⁹⁸ But even this attempt to project a second century practice back to the practice of Jesus must be considered with great caution.²⁹⁹ According to du Toit,³⁰⁰ Jeremias' argument could easily be reversed. He thinks it would be possible to argue that a redactor of Luke 22:15ff wanted to project the practice known to him, back into the last meal. In connection with this last observation, it should be pointed out that in his description of the events at the Last Supper, Jeremias has treated Luke 22:15-18 as sound evidence. In other words, he has failed to take into consideration that this text has passed through several stages of development which may have left their traces upon it. The Semitism of verse 15, *ἐπιθυμία ἐτεθύμησα*, for instance, may be an indication of Lucan redaction.³⁰¹ If so, Jeremias' argument that verse 15 expresses an unfulfilled wish becomes untenable.

In the light of these considerations we must conclude that Jeremias' interpretation of Luke 22:15-18 fails to be convincing.

2. Jesus, the Passover Lamb

According to Jeremias, Jesus understood himself in terms of the eschatological Passover Lamb.³⁰² Therefore, he represents the fulfillment of all that of which the Egyptian paschal lamb and all the subsequent sacrificial lambs were the prototype.³⁰³ He presents the following arguments in support of his thesis:

The words of interpretation were spoken within the context of a Passover meal.³⁰⁴ During the Passover devotions, Jesus had already given an interpretation of the unleavened bread and probably also of the wine.³⁰⁵ But to the great amazement of the disciples, he added further words after the two graces.³⁰⁶ Because this was contrary to the prevailing custom, Jesus' action must have been as unexpected by the disciples as his avowal of abstinence at the beginning.³⁰⁷ Jesus' words of interpretation, however, did not concern the actions of breaking the bread or pouring out the wine, but rather the elements themselves.³⁰⁸ This argument can be supported on the following basis: (1) the interpretation of the special elements in the Jewish Passover rite is not concerned with any actions, but with the components of the meal themselves, and (2) the early church understood the *τοῦτο* as referring to the bread and wine.³⁰⁹

The terminology used for the interpretation of the elements consists of the double concept bāsar wadam or bišra udeṃa.³¹⁰ The meaning of this concept is twofold.³¹¹ The second one deserves special consideration in connection with Jesus' reference to "his flesh and blood."³¹² Jesus is applying to himself terms from the language of sacrifice. Just as the participle *ἐκχυνόμενον* conveys a sacrificial aspect, so do the two nouns *σάρξ* and *αἷμα*.³¹³ On the basis of these considerations, Jeremias concluded that Jesus had referred to himself in terms of a sacrifice.³¹⁴

References to Jesus as a Passover Lamb can be found in the pre-Pauline Passover Haggadah, which is preserved in 1 Corinthians 5:7, in early Christian literature as well as in extra-biblical sources.³¹⁵ The very great age of this comparison of Jesus with a sacrificial lamb is evidenced by the pre-Pauline phrase "his blood."³¹⁶ Since the crucifixion was a bloodless form of execution, the phrase must come from the language of sacrifice.³¹⁷

With the words den bisri, "this is my flesh," and den idim, "this is my blood," Jesus probably designated himself as the eschatological paschal Lamb.³¹⁸ The tertium comparationis in the case of the bread is the fact that it was broken, and in the case of the wine, the red colour.³¹⁹ According to Jeremias, bread and wine represent a double simile. The broken bread is a simile of the fate of Jesus' body, while the blood of the grapes is to be considered as a simile of his outpoured blood.³²⁰ Therefore, Jesus is saying, "I go to death as the true Passover sacrifice."³²¹ Jesus did speak of the nature of his death, but he gave no details of its manner. In view of the simile and the participle ἐκχυνόμενον, one can be certain that Jesus must have expected a violent death.³²² In Mark 14:25, the indication is given that Jesus was convinced that God would vindicate his death.³²³

Jesus, who compared himself with the eschatological paschal Lamb, designated his death as a saving death.³²⁴ For Jeremias, the parallel between the Egyptian paschal lamb is obvious.³²⁵ The blood of the lambs which were killed at the time of the Exodus from Egypt had redemptive power. When the blood was applied to the doorposts, God displayed his mercy towards Israel for he did not execute the death sentence. Similarly, the vicarious death of Jesus brings about the final deliverance of

God's people.³²⁶

Jeremias also saw a very close connection between the phrase $\tauὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν$ and the passage relating to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53:12.³²⁷ The word $\piολλοί$ marks it as an Isaianic concept, for it almost functions like a Leitmotiv in the Servant Song, Isaiah 52:13 - 53:12.³²⁸ The "for many" is a Semitic manner of speaking in an inclusive sense.³²⁹ Therefore, the full meaning of the phrase $\tauὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν$, should be translated: "which will be shed for the peoples of the world."³³⁰ The eucharistic words of Jesus are more than parable and instruction.³³¹ Their primary purpose was to make clear to the disciples that by partaking of the elements, they would receive a share in the redemptive work of Jesus, their Saviour.³³² Thus they would be the recipients of Jesus' best and greatest gift, the forgiveness of sins, and become the representatives of the new people of God, the redeemed community.³³³

Jeremias' contention that the words attributed to Jesus can best be understood from the perspective of the Passover theology, appears to be totally unfounded. The fact that we have found no evidence in support of his view that the Last Supper was a Passover meal appears to be a good reason for refuting his thesis that Jesus considered himself as the eschatological Passover Lamb. In addition to this, there seems to be no evidence at all that Jesus considered himself in these terms, and that he ascribed to his death as a Passover Lamb a saving function.

On close examination of the eucharistic texts in the New Testament, we must conclude that the words attributed to Jesus cannot be interpreted in the light of the Passover theology.

If we must assume that these words are to be understood in the sense that the body and blood represent the body and blood of the new Passover Lamb, then it is puzzling why this is not explicitly stated in the texts. The total absence of any reference to Jesus as the Passover Lamb of the New Covenant is difficult to understand, especially in view of the fact that the primitive Christian community must have been quite familiar with such concepts as "Christ, our Passover Lamb" (1 Cor. 5:7; John 1:29; 1 Peter 1:19).³³⁴

With regard to the blood of the Passover lambs, it should be pointed out that a different role was ascribed to it, as compared with the eucharistic wine, which was interpreted in terms of blood. Originally, the blood of the Passover lambs was applied to the doorposts, but it was not drunk.³³⁵

In the light of Jeremias' argument that Jesus considered himself as the eschatological Passover Lamb, it is extremely difficult to understand how Jesus, in the presence of the roasted lamb which was cut up into pieces and ready to be eaten, could have seen in it an analogy to his approaching fate.³³⁶

Furthermore, it is also inconceivable that the two elements of bread and wine should have pointed to Jesus as the sacrificial lamb.³³⁷

Finally, we must also object to Jeremias' combination of the Passover with the Servant theology, which are two essentially different theological aspects.³³⁸

3. The anamnesis command

In Palestinian usage the construction *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* designates a presentation before God intended to induce God to act.³³⁹

The historicity of the command to repeat the rite could be challenged on the basis of its close affinity with the formulae used for the foundation of ancient ceremonies in commemoration of the dead.³⁴⁰

H. Leclercq,³⁴¹ for instance, considered the early Christian meal celebration in terms of "un véritable banquet funébre."³⁴²

This idea was perpetuated by H. Lietzmann, who stated the final result of his investigation in 1931.³⁴³ At that time he had suggested that the formula "in remembrance of me" had experienced a complete transformation under Hellenistic influences. The daily table-fellowship with Jesus had turned into a festival which was held in commemoration of the dead. The Pauline Supper was the result of this process.³⁴⁴ Lietzmann's position was criticized by Jeremias on the following basis:³⁴⁵

While the *μνήμη*-motif plays an important role in antiquity, it is important to notice that the construction *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* is completely absent.³⁴⁶ Furthermore, in none of the instances of an endowment *εἰς μνήμην* or *μνήμης χάριν* is there any indication of a memorial meal.³⁴⁷

The commemorative meals of cultic fellowships were not held daily or even weekly as the early Christian Eucharist was. They were, rather, held annually as birthday celebrations in honour of the dead.³⁴⁸

The increasing worldliness of the memorial feasts makes it hard to understand that the command for repetition should be considered as having any connection with these meals for the dead.³⁴⁹

The formula *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* and its variants were used in Judaism at the time of Jesus as follows: (1) *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* is said for the

most part in reference to God, and (2) it then designates without any exception, a presentation before God intended to induce God to act.³⁵⁰

According to Jeremias, the command to repeat the rite may be understood in the sense: "This do, that God may remember me." God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia.³⁵¹ This interpretation is based upon Jeremias' exegetical consideration of the two phrases: *ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ* and *ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ*.³⁵²

In the light of several Old Testament references, the phrase *ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ* appears to be an established expression for the repetition of the rite.³⁵³ This usage also lives on in the Qumran texts.³⁵⁴ It specifically refers to the rite of grace at table.³⁵⁵ Furthermore, the expression "to break bread" as a technical term is probably due to the command for repetition.³⁵⁶

The expression *ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ* is rather ambiguous.³⁵⁷ According to Jeremias, the *ΕΜΗΝ* represents an objective genitive.³⁵⁸ Thus, the phrase should be translated: "that I be remembered." But who should remember Jesus? Was Jesus afraid that the disciples would forget him?³⁵⁹

According to Jeremias, this is not the most obvious interpretation. Therefore, he referred to the parallel construction *ΕΙΣ ΜΗΜΟΣΥΝΟΝ* which is found in Mark 14:9 (par. Matt. 26:13) and Acts 10:4, "as a memorial before God."³⁶⁰ In Acts 10:4, God is referred to as the subject of the remembering, and Mark 14:9 seems to relate to the merciful remembrance of God: "that God may (mercifully) remember her at the last judgment."³⁶¹

While the command *ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ* is

linguistically clear, and as a command has a clear-cut meaning,³⁶² Jeremias concluded that *ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ* in 1 Corinthians 11:24ff and Luke 22:19 is to be understood in the sense that God is being besought to "remember his Messiah."³⁶³

According to Richardson,³⁶⁴ Jeremias' interpretation of *ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ* is doubtless correct as far as it goes.³⁶⁵ He pointed out that the anamnesis is primarily a divine remembering. But its meaning is not at all exhausted here.³⁶⁶ He criticized Jones, who in his opinion does not entertain the possibility that a phrase such as *ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ* may contain not merely one meaning but several meanings.³⁶⁷

Jones,³⁶⁸ however, was more critical of Jeremias' position than Richardson. He held that if one is to assume with Jeremias that the Passover context is indeed as dominating as Jeremias argues, one would expect that every association would conspire to make the remembrance which Jesus commanded comparable to the remembrance inherent in the Passover rite, and not the contrast of it, as Jeremias' thesis requires. In the Passover, the worshipper looked back and remembered. The same holds true as regards the Eucharist.³⁶⁹

According to Kosmala,³⁷⁰ if Jeremias is right and the sentence should be understood in the sense of "do this, that God may remember me," this could have ~~been~~ expressed in an appropriate manner. It could be done, for example, with a final clause where God is the subject, or with the help of an adverbial phrase.³⁷¹

He also pointed out that the "remembrance of Jesus" in the primitive Christian community never finds expression in terms of "God's remembrance of the Messiah."³⁷² Thus, it is more than probable that the

participants at the Last Supper did not understand it this way.

Ligier³⁷³ was also puzzled by Jeremias' interpretation of the command. He was unable to see how in the Christian economy the Father is able to remember the passion for the sole benefit of his Christ. Has he not already brought him to life again and glorified him? In his opinion, however, it cannot be ruled out that he is still able to remember him and his sufferings for the good of mankind and of the church.³⁷⁴

While Ligier and Richardson were able to accept at least one aspect of Jeremias' interpretation of the command to repeat the rite, in the light of Jones' and Kosmala's examination of the command, this interpretation must be questioned.

4. Jesus, the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53

In connection with his interpretation of the words attributed to Jesus, Jeremias attempted to show that Jesus had considered himself in terms of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh in the light of Isaiah 53. As a Servant, Jesus was willing to give his life, his blood, for the many, the nations.³⁷⁵

This unique theological statement may be very impressive. It also seems to blend in very well with Jeremias' basic conception of Heilsgeschichte. But will this statement stand the test of a critical examination? In the context of this study we can hardly unfold the numerous problems which are connected with it. Thus, we will focus our attention on the question: "Did Jesus consider himself in terms of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53?"

For the present purpose, it will be necessary (1) to briefly

summarize the arguments presented by some exponents of the traditional view such as V. Taylor,³⁷⁶ R. Otto³⁷⁷ and H. W. Wolff,³⁷⁸ and (2) to compare these views with some of the recent attempts to solve this complex problem.

In his book Jesus and His Sacrifice³⁷⁹ Taylor concerned himself with the problem of the influence of the Servant concept upon the passion-sayings. He was convinced that the Marcan references, such as Mark 9:12b; 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34 and Mark 10:45 as well as 14:24; had been influenced by Isaiah 53.³⁸⁰

With regard to Luke 22:37, Taylor was convinced that this passage is an express citation from Isaiah 53.³⁸¹ Its presence in the Lucan tradition confirms the view that Jesus had deeply pondered the description of the Suffering Servant, and saw it as a foreshadowing of his own experience of suffering and death.³⁸² In Taylor's opinion, it would be incredible that Jesus should have considered his own suffering in the light of this sublime poem, while ignoring the representative and vicarious aspects of the Servant's sufferings.³⁸³

Rudolf Otto,³⁸⁴ in the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, argued that Mark 9:12 represents a definite proof that Jesus considered himself in terms of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.³⁸⁵ Referring to Mark 10:45, he stated: "Here again we have a clear synthesis of the Son of Man and Isaiah's Servant of God."³⁸⁶ On the basis of this identification, Otto interpreted the meaning of the death of Jesus.

H. W. Wolff³⁸⁷ had also made a careful study of the Servant-Song and its influence upon sayings such as Luke 22:37; Mark 10:45; 14:24 and 9:12b.³⁸⁸ He held that the answer to the question, whether Isaiah 53 appears in the word of Jesus is not necessarily an answer to the second

question, whether Isaiah 53 played an important role in the consciousness of Jesus.³⁸⁹ Wolff defended the traditional view on the basis of the following two observations: (1) Jesus made frequent reference to Isaiah 53, and (2) Jesus occupied himself with the fate of John and the martyrdom of the prophets.³⁹⁰ Thus, he concluded, it is highly improbable that Jesus should have ignored this important chapter.³⁹¹

On the basis of his examination of Luke 22:37, Wolff pointed out that Luke knew Jesus as one who referred to his own death as follows: "And he was reckoned with transgressors."³⁹² Wolff held that Mark 10:45 must be considered as an important witness to the relationship of Jesus to Isaiah 53.³⁹³ Here, as well as in Mark 14:24, the significance of the death of Jesus is expressed in the light of the Old Testament chapter.³⁹⁴ The authenticity of Mark 9:12b may be doubted.³⁹⁵ In Bultmann's opinion, this text represents a secondary, redactional gloss.³⁹⁶ Wolff argued, however, that the imprecision of the citation is an indication of Jesus' manner of speaking. In agreement with Otto, he defended the view that these words can hardly be a theological construction of the primitive Christian community.³⁹⁷ In the light of these considerations, he concluded that Isaiah 53 exerted an influence upon the thought of Jesus with regard to his death.³⁹⁸

While these scholars were convinced of the definite influence of Isaiah 53 upon the passion sayings, Jeremias admitted that many of these passages are wholly or in part the work of the community.³⁹⁹ He was convinced, however, that not all references of Jesus to the ebed are inauthentic.⁴⁰⁰ If Jesus had weighed the possibility of a violent death, and there are definite indications that he did so, then in view of the

extraordinary importance of the concept of the atoning power in late Judaism, it must be assumed that Jesus had given thought to the meaning and purpose of his death.⁴⁰¹ In support of his supposition,

Jeremias⁴⁰² pointed to the following considerations:

1. We are dealing with a pre-Hellenistic tradition, for none of the passages, with the exception of Luke 22:37, shows influence of the LXX.⁴⁰³ Such an influence is completely out of the question for passages such as Mark 9:12; 10:45; 14:8, 24, Luke 23:34 and John 10:11; 15:17.⁴⁰⁴ Some of these references presuppose either a Hebrew or an Aramaic background.⁴⁰⁵
 2. Since several of the intimations of the passion are so general, they cannot be considered as an invention ex eventu.⁴⁰⁶ In Jeremias' opinion, the core of the predictions of the passion and of the glorification are part of the pre-Easter tradition, which still shows no influence of the course of events.⁴⁰⁷
 3. Jeremias pointed to certain sayings which are firmly rooted in their context. They form an essential part of the pericope.⁴⁰⁸
 4. The use of the passive form *παράδιδωται* in Mark 9:31 is firmly rooted in the tradition, and recurs in other passages such as Mark 10:33; 14:21 and Matthew 26.⁴⁰⁹ In connection with God's action, it points to an antique Jewish mode of speaking, but it is very frequently employed in the words of Jesus.⁴¹⁰ In Jeremias' opinion, this is a clear indication of Jesus' personal style.⁴¹¹
 5. The *ὅτι* phrase in Mark 14:24, the oldest and soundest tradition, represents a definite reference to Isaiah 53.⁴¹² This view can be substantiated on the basis of traditio-historical considerations.⁴¹³
- Jeremias held that Paul had received his version of the Eucharist pos-

sibly after 40 A.D. in the city of Antioch. Since he is convinced that the Synoptic versions are older because of their Semitic features, they could have arisen in the thirties.⁴¹⁴ In the light of these considerations Jeremias concluded that "here we have the bedrock of the tradition."⁴¹⁵

He admitted, however, that there are only a few passages where Jesus applies sayings from Isaiah 53 to himself.⁴¹⁶ There are none at all in the material peculiar to Matthew and Luke.⁴¹⁷ This scarcity of references to the Old Testament chapter on the part of Jesus can best be explained on the basis that Jesus never declared himself in public as the Servant of God.⁴¹⁸ Only to his disciples did he disclose the mystery of his sacrificial death on behalf of the many, the nations.⁴¹⁹

In his book The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, R. H. Fuller⁴²⁰ still held the position that the Servant concept can be traced back to Jesus himself. He had analyzed the Marcan passion predictions (Mark 8:31, 9:12, 9:31, 10:33ff and 10:45) with the purpose of separating the different strata of the tradition.⁴²¹ Thus, he distinguished between an original substratum in which Jesus speaks of his sufferings in the light of Isaiah 53, and the residue as a series of vaticinia ex eventu.⁴²²

In the meantime, H. E. Toedt has analyzed a number of alleged derivations from Isaiah 53.⁴²³ He concluded that these references must stem from other sources, with the exception of Mark 10:45b and 14:24. In these two texts Toedt has found allusions to Isaiah 53:11 (MT).⁴²⁴

In Fuller's⁴²⁵ opinion, the researches of Toedt and Miss Hooker have completely demolished the thesis defended by the exponents of the traditional view, according to which Jesus thought of himself in terms of the Servant of the Lord. Far less did he understand himself as the

suffering, atoning Servant of Isaiah 53.⁴²⁶ Since Hooker's⁴²⁷ thesis is of real importance, it will be necessary to briefly summarize her basic arguments:

She distinguishes between two different groups of texts in the Synoptic gospels, which are considered as proof for the influence of the Servant concept upon the mind of Jesus:⁴²⁸ (1) those texts which have some linguistic affinity to one of the Servant Songs,⁴²⁹ and (2) those which express the necessity for Jesus to undergo suffering.⁴³⁰ Some of the passages may be assigned to both groups.⁴³¹ With regard to the first group of passages, Hooker had established two basic criteria of judgment:⁴³²

1. Proof that the reference was exclusively to Deutero-Isaiah.
2. The application of the Servant's sufferings to Jesus.

On the basis of a minute examination of these passages, Hooker concluded that a considerable number of texts fulfilled the first of the two conditions. Only Luke 22:37 fulfilled both requirements.⁴³³

For the remaining passages of the first group, which speaks of suffering, it was impossible to find any proof of their dependence upon the Servant Songs.⁴³⁴ Furthermore, in those passages which belong to the passion narratives, there was no indication of an alteration by the authors, in order to establish the identity of Jesus with the Servant.⁴³⁵

In all passages, which belong to the second group, there is no indication that the ideas concerning Jesus' approaching suffering and death could only be derived from the relevant passages in Deutero-Isaiah.⁴³⁶ In the light of her analysis of the pertinent passages, Hooker concluded that in none of them does Jesus make a specific reference to Deutero-Isaiah.⁴³⁷ He rather speaks in a general way of the fact that his death

was foretold in the prophets.⁴³⁸ Thus, it will be difficult to uphold the view that Jesus identified his mission with that of the Servant of the Songs.⁴³⁹ Hooker indicated that the search must be continued in the rest of the New Testament, in the hope of finding some evidence to show that it was in the primitive Christian community where the identification of Jesus with the Servant was first made.⁴⁴⁰ An examination of the remaining, relevant New Testament passages led to the following conclusions: In Acts 8, the fourth Servant Song is associated with the sufferings of Christ. This reference, therefore, must be considered as definite proof that at an early date, the passion of Jesus was seen in connection with the fourth Servant Song.⁴⁴¹ This connection, however, was not expounded. There is no indication that Philip made this passage the basis of his sermon about Jesus' sufferings and the forgiveness of sin.⁴⁴² While to Paul, John and the author of Hebrews the identification of Jesus with the Servant seemed to be of minor importance, the situation is different in 1 Peter, where the significance of the application of the fourth Song to Jesus is expounded.⁴⁴³

The second chapter of 1 Peter must be seen as the earliest, definite evidence for the identification of Jesus with the Servant.⁴⁴⁴ In the light of these considerations, Hooker concluded that the Synoptic gospels do not offer any definite evidence that Jesus considered himself in terms of the Servant.⁴⁴⁵ This concept was not even of any significance to the early church. Those who defend the traditional view must therefore be able to give an explanation for the lack of evidence that Jesus interpreted his death in terms of the vicariously Suffering Servant.⁴⁴⁶ They must also give an account as to the church's apparent failure to attribute any significance to those passages which Jesus considered as the

key to his passion.⁴⁴⁷

While Hooker has thus exposed the weaknesses of the traditional position, she did not exclude the possibility that Jesus saw in the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah a forecast of Israel's sufferings, of which his own were but a part.⁴⁴⁸

In his criticism of Hooker's thesis, Hahn⁴⁴⁹ pointed out that she is right in refuting a recognizable after-effect of Isaiah 53 and a messianic understanding of this chapter in late Judaism.⁴⁵⁰ On the other hand, she has completely misjudged the significance of the motif of atonement within the conception of suffering of late Judaism and of primitive Christianity.⁴⁵¹ Furthermore, she has overlooked the important book by E. Lohse, Maertyrer und Gottesknecht.⁴⁵² With regard to her treatment of the Synoptic texts, Hahn pointed out that Hooker has not considered the individual logia from a traditio-historical point of view.⁴⁵³ His criticism, however, hardly affected the final results of her research, for he himself concluded that there is indeed very little in the Synoptics to support the traditional view that Jesus identified his mission with that of the Servant of the Songs.⁴⁵⁴ In agreement with Fuller,⁴⁵⁵ and opposing Barrett⁴⁵⁶ and Hooker,⁴⁵⁷ Hahn maintained that an influence of Isaiah 53 upon Mark 10:45 and 14:24 can hardly be disputed.⁴⁵⁸

These two texts, Mark 10:45 and 14:24 are the only two texts in the tradition according to which Jesus attributed an atoning significance to his death.⁴⁵⁹ Their authenticity is still disputed.

In Bultmann's opinion, for instance, Jesus has not spoken of his death and resurrection and of their significance for salvation.⁴⁶⁰ In the gospels, such words were put into his mouth, but they have their

Sitz im Leben in the faith of the Christian community.⁴⁶¹ Bultmann, however, does not attribute them to the primitive Christian community, but rather to Hellenistic Christianity.⁴⁶²

We can hardly be certain of the authenticity of these words. The main reason for this uncertainty is the fact that in the whole tradition, there are only two such references.⁴⁶³ Thus, one may tend to agree with Bultmann and others who hold that Mark 10:45 and 14:24 belong to the kerygma of the primitive Christian community. If so, it appears that Hooker has successfully demonstrated that there is no evidence ~~for~~ the traditional view that Jesus thought of himself in terms of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.

Jeremias' exegetical sections, which are primarily based on the assumption that the Last Supper was a Passover meal appear to be weak. There is hardly any basis for his claim that Jesus considered himself in terms of the Passover Lamb and as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53. Thus, we conclude that Jeremias' attempt to solve the eucharistic problems on a historical and theological basis fails to be convincing.

The Last Supper--a Qumran Meal?

With the discovery of the Qumran documents, the historical problems of the date and the identity of the Last Supper became once more the focal points of a widespread scholarly debate.⁴⁶⁴ Thus, scholarship was particularly concerned to determine the relationship between the Eucharist and the Qumran meals.⁴⁶⁵ Furthermore, some scholars were convinced that the date of the Last Supper could be established with the help of the Qumran calendar.⁴⁶⁶ This aspect of the debate was

closely associated with the name of Mlle A. Jaubert.⁴⁶⁷ Since we have already referred to Jaubert's hypothesis, it will not be necessary to deal with it again in the present context.⁴⁶⁸ We must focus our attention, however, on the question of a possible relationship between the Qumran meals and the Christian Eucharist.

While we can hardly deal with the individual arguments of the debate, it should be pointed out that scholarship is still sharply divided on the question of the meaning of the Qumran meals.⁴⁶⁹ Is it possible to consider them as common meals, which are accompanied by prayer and where the special emphasis is placed upon ritual purity?⁴⁷⁰ Some scholars have argued that the Qumran meals are to be considered in terms of the "sacramental focus" of the Essene worship service.⁴⁷¹ Cullmann⁴⁷² has particularly underlined the sacral character of these meals, while Daniélou⁴⁷³ has sought to emphasize the religious, rather than the cultic meaning of the Qumran meals. In his opinion, there was a close relationship between these community meals and the Christian Eucharist. Other scholars, such as Betz,⁴⁷⁴ have argued that these meals are to be understood as sacrificial meals. Kosmala,⁴⁷⁵ on the other hand, was greatly disturbed by the fact that some have seen a close parallel between the Qumran meals and the Christian Eucharist. He was convinced that the Eucharist could only be understood within the context of a Passover meal.

Without attempting to present a critical appraisal of each individual theory about the meaning of the Qumran meals, it will be necessary to consider the texts themselves. Besides the two pertinent passages in the Qumran documents, where we find a description of the sacred meal, IQS VI:1-6 and IQSaII:11-22,⁴⁷⁶ we also find a rather detailed

account of the Essene meals in Josephus:

Before the sun is up they utter no word on mundane matters, but offer to him certain prayers, which have been handed down from their forefathers, as though entreating him to rise. They are then dismissed by their superiors to the various crafts in which they are severally proficient and are strenuously employed until the fifth hour, when they again assemble in one place and after girding their loins with linen clothes, bathe their bodies in cold water. After this purification, they assemble in a private apartment, which none of the uninitiated is permitted to enter; pure now themselves, they repair to the refectory, as to some sacred shrine. When they have taken their seats in silence, the baker serves out the loaves to them in order, and the cook sets before each one plate with a single course. Before meat the priest says a grace; and none may partake until after the prayer. When breakfast is ended he pronounces a further grace; thus at the beginning and at the close they do homage to God as the bountiful giver of life. Then they lay aside their raiment, as holy vestments, they again betake themselves to their labours until evening. On their return they sup in like manner, and any guests who may have arrived sit down with them.⁴⁷⁷

In the light of this rather brief description by Josephus, we are still able to discern certain features which seem to indicate that the Essene meal was more than merely a meal of satiation. Josephus' meal account opens with a remark about the religious practices of the Essenes. Before sunrise they engage in prayer. In this way they seem to entreat the sun to rise. After this period of devotion, they pursue their daily work until the fifth hour. At that time they assemble themselves the second time for the common meal, which is preceded by special preparations. Here, the emphasis is particularly placed upon the ritual purity of each meal participant. It is possible to see some connections between the ritual washings of the temple priests and the washings of the Essenes.⁴⁷⁸ While the temple priests of Jerusalem were required to wash only their hands and their feet before serving at the altar, the Essenes bathed their whole body. According to Deuteronomy 23:12f this was a requirement in preparation for the Holy War.⁴⁷⁹

The aspect of the community's devotional life, its emphasis upon ritual purity as well as the pronouncement of the blessings before and after the meal, seem to underline the religious nature of the Essene meal. On the other hand, the blessings before and after the meal were typical of every Jewish meal. It should be pointed out that every Jewish meal was a religious meal.⁴⁸⁰

In IQS VI:2-8 we also discover several regulations governing a community meal:

They shall eat together, and worship [lit. bless] together, and take counsel together. In every place where there are ten men of the council of the community, there shall not fail from among them a priest. Each according to his appointed rank, shall sit before him and in that order they shall be asked for their counsel with regard to every matter. Whenever the table is set out for eating, or the wine for drinking, the priest shall first stretch out his hand, to bless the choice portion of the bread and the wine.⁴⁸¹

The information to be gained from this account is rather limited. All we may safely deduce from it is the fact that a minimum of ten men was required, in order to constitute a meal fellowship. The meal itself consisted of bread and $\psi\eta\eta$.⁴⁸² Scholarship, however, is still divided on the question, whether wine or grape-juice is intended here.⁴⁸³

According to the text, the priest pronounced the blessing over bread and wine as an introduction to the whole meal. This is obviously a deviation from the existing Jewish custom, where the blessing over the bread precedes the meal, while the blessing over the wine follows after the meal.⁴⁸⁴ Furthermore, the text also indicates that the blessing is to be pronounced over the $\eta\psi\chi\eta$, the choice portion.⁴⁸⁵ This concept obviously belongs to the sacrificial language and seems to point to the relationship between the meals of the Essenes and the meals of

the temple priests.⁴⁸⁶ Bread and $\psi 17'n$ come into focus as a priestly meal. But there is no indication that this meal mediates salvation.

As we compare the meal account IQSa 2:17-22 with IQS VI:2-4, we discover some basic agreements. The meal referred to in IQSa 2:17-22, however, is characterized by the presence of the Messiah of Israel, and a high priest taking precedence over the Messiah of Israel.⁴⁸⁷ This high priest seems to represent the eschatological high priest, the Messiah Aaron.⁴⁸⁸ While we can hardly pursue the messianic problem any further, we must raise the question concerning the meaning of the messianic meal. Black, for instance, pointed out that the second account resembles the messianic Banquet of the Apocalypses.⁴⁸⁹ In view of this, some scholars have ascribed an eschatological significance to the sacred meal. Thus, it is interpreted as an anticipation of the messianic Banquet or as a meal which is eaten in expectation of this consummation. According to Black, this assumption is merely a conjecture.⁴⁹⁰ On account of the strong agreements of the messianic meal referred to in IQSa II:11-22, with the meal of IQS VI:2-8, it appears that both references point to one and the same meal. But the meal referred to in IQSa II:11-22 is characterized by the presence of the Messiah of Israel, and a priest, who is functioning before him.⁴⁹¹

At this point the question regarding the meaning of the messianic meal comes into focus. Gnilka has raised the question regarding the relationship of the meal account to the closing remark. On the basis of this remark men in groups of ten are requested to perform a rite in accordance with the meal account.⁴⁹² In the light of the few references in Josephus and IQS VI, we have discovered that the community meal of Qumran was not merely a meal of satiation. It also tran-

scended the basic religious nature of every other Jewish meal, because its main purpose was to substitute for the sacrificial service of the temple during the time of its desecration.⁴⁹³

It should be pointed out that a number of authors once held that there is an analogy between the Qumran meals and the Christian Eucharist.⁴⁹⁴ The situation has been changing. According to Braun, in the course of time, scholars have become very cautious in pronouncing judgments with regard to this relationship.⁴⁹⁵ While it is to be admitted that there are striking similarities between the Qumran meals and the Eucharist, there are also some basic differences between these two meal types, which cannot simply be ignored.⁴⁹⁶

Scholars have particularly pointed to the importance of Jesus as regards the Eucharist. Without any reference to him, the Lord's Supper would be unthinkable.⁴⁹⁷

Some have argued that the words attributed to Jesus are unknown to the Qumran texts.⁴⁹⁸ On the other hand, these words are also missing in the short text of Luke, in Acts and in the Didache.

Of the many scholars who have concerned themselves with determining the relationship between the Qumran meals and the Eucharist, K. G. Kuhn is known as one who has engaged in the most thorough investigation of the problem.⁴⁹⁹ According to Braun, Kuhn is to be considered as the initiator of the whole debate.⁵⁰⁰ Therefore, we will briefly present the basic results of his research.

On the basis of his comparison of the Essene meal as described by Josephus with the information found in IQS 6:1-6, Kuhn was led to the conclusion that there is a general agreement between Josephus and IQS VI in the sense that the meals of the Order were held in common and

that they also had a cultic character.⁵⁰¹

In his further discussion, Kuhn also brings IQSa 2:17-22 and the New Testament texts into focus. But neither of the two Qumran passages furnishes any information about the religious significance of the meal. Such an understanding of the significance of a Jewish meal, however, is found in the Egyptian-Jewish legend Joseph and Asenath.⁵⁰² Kuhn was quick to suggest that the sacramental understanding of the meal in Joseph and Asenath should not be transferred to the community meal of the Essenes, since the Qumran texts themselves do not make reference to anything of this sort.⁵⁰³

In the light of the new comparative material, Kuhn also pointed out that there is a basic difference between the cult-meal of Judaism and the Eucharist of the Christian community.⁵⁰⁴ The difference cannot be ignored in spite of the striking parallels one may discover. From the very beginning, the Eucharist is the meal of the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus, it is a decidedly Christian meal, which is clearly to be distinguished from the cult-meals of sectarian Judaism.⁵⁰⁵

With regard to the Marcan cult-formula, Mark 14:22-24, Kuhn is in basic agreement with Jeremias. He too is convinced that the great number of Semitisms point to its Palestinian provenance.⁵⁰⁶ He is also convinced that the Marcan formula originated with Jesus himself.⁵⁰⁷ On the other hand, Kuhn parted company with Jeremias when he argued that the Marcan text does not presuppose a Passover setting.⁵⁰⁸ According to Kuhn, it seems to be futile to appeal to the Passover theory, because it leaves several features in the Marcan formula unexplained.⁵⁰⁹ On the basis of the Essene meal practice, however, these difficulties can be explained. From the Qumran texts, for instance, we learn that only men

were allowed to participate in the meal celebration. The one presiding over the meal is not to be identified with the paterfamilias. He rather assumes the role of the properly appointed leader of the community.⁵¹⁰ While Kuhn had appealed to the cult-meal of the Essenes in order to find an explanation for certain features in the Marcan account, he did not go so far as to postulate a direct dependence of the Last Supper upon the Qumran meal.⁵¹¹ He only attempted to show that the form and praxis of the Lord's Supper is analogous to that of the Essene cult-meal.⁵¹²

Kuhn also saw in the new material an aid towards a better understanding of the daily meals of the Palestinian community (Acts 2:42, 46).⁵¹³

Towards the conclusion of his investigation, Kuhn presents once more a portrayal of the two primitive Christian meal-types. The daily meals of the Palestinian community are simply a continuation of the meal fellowship with the historical Jesus.⁵¹⁴ These meals are characterized by an eschatological expectation of the parousia.⁵¹⁵

The Marcan formula, Mark 14:22-24, on the other hand, represents an account about the Last Supper of Jesus.⁵¹⁶ But in this account, one cannot find any indication that it was continued in the Palestinian church. Only on Hellenistic soil did this type turn into a cult-meal with words of institution.⁵¹⁷

Having made a clear distinction between the various meal traditions in the New Testament, Kuhn pointed out that the reference to the person of Jesus as well as the non-esoteric and non-priestly elements of his ministry represent the major differences between the meal practices of the Qumran community and the Christian Eucharist.⁵¹⁸

As the result of our attempt to follow the basic course of the debate concerning the relationship between the Qumran meals and the

Christian Eucharist, the following considerations have come into focus: While the Essene meal practice may be considered as an important criterion for a differentiation between the various strands of the eucharistic tradition, Kuhn was unable to discover any dependence of the Eucharist upon the meal practice of the Essenes.⁵¹⁹ Marxsen,⁵²⁰ however, has argued that the Qumran meal may have exerted an influence upon the literary meal description of the eucharistic accounts in the New Testament, a view which H. Braun⁵²¹ found unacceptable. In Braun's opinion, the omission of the command to repeat the rite, as found in the Pauline formula, can hardly be attributed to Qumran influence, for the community meals at Qumran were a daily affair. In spite of the striking similarities between the meals at Qumran and the Christian Eucharist, there is hardly any evidence of a direct influence of the Essene meal practice upon Jesus or the Eucharist. Therefore, we must conclude that with regard to the Eucharist the Qumran documents present us with valuable information which can be utilized for the purpose of comparison. This, in turn, may allow us to view the eucharistic traditions in the New Testament in their proper perspective. On the other hand, this new material has no immediate bearing upon the problem of eucharistic origins.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

¹Felix L. Cirlot, The Early Eucharist (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1939).

²Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Glasgow: The University Press, 1947).

³Cirlot held that there was no basis for the view that the breaking of bread was totally disconnected from the Last Supper. The fact that in Acts 2:42, 46 no specific reference to the chalice is made lends no support to the theory that the breaking of bread and the Lord's Supper are to be considered as two unrelated rites. See Cirlot, op. cit., pp. 17-49; esp. p. 23.

⁴Ibid., p. 1.

⁵Dix, op. cit., n. 1, p. 58.

⁶Ibid., n. 2, p. 58.

⁷Cirlot, op. cit., p. 1.

⁸Ibid., p. 16.

⁹Ibid., pp. 17-18.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 18-19.

¹¹Ibid., p. 19.

¹²Ibid., pp. 19-20.

¹³Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 20-24.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁶In Cirlot's opinion, the term Lord's Supper probably applies to the whole meal, for it is doubtful that at this stage of development a special term was given to the supernatural, sacramental elements. See Cirlot, op. cit., n. 1, p. 24.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 24-28.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 28-30.

²⁰Ibid., p. 30.

²¹Ibid., p. 32.

²²Ibid., p. 33.

²³Ibid., p. 33.

²⁴Ibid., p. 44.

²⁵Ibid., p. 44.

²⁶Ibid., p. 46.

²⁷Ibid., p. 146.

²⁸Ibid., p. 148.

²⁹Ibid., p. 149.

³⁰Ibid., p. 149.

³¹A summary of the most important attempts to understand the eucharistic words in terms of a parable, is presented by Patsch, op. cit., pp. 47-50.

³²Cirlot, op. cit., pp. 152-53.

³³Ibid., p. 153.

³⁴In his defense of the historicity of the command to repeat the rite, Cirlot pointed out that Jesus had intended that his haburah should continue. The meal, which Jesus shared with his disciples should be his memorial, Cirlot, op. cit., p. 156. On the other hand, Barrett has presented the view that the relation formed by common eating and drinking, included a sharing of blood; see, e.g., his chapter on "Christ Crucified" (Jesus and the Gospel Tradition [London: SPCK, 1967]), p. 50. Therefore, if during the Last Supper the disciples had indicated their willingness to die with Jesus, then the command to repeat the rite would have been superfluous. For a further discussion of this aspect see also The Golden Bough, p. 266, and The Religion of the Semites, pp. 312-20, 479-81, cited by C. K. Barrett, loc. cit., p. 50.

³⁵Cirlot, op. cit., p. 164.

³⁶Ibid., p. 40.

³⁷I. Apol., 66, cited by Cirlot, op. cit., p. 80.

³⁸Cirlot, op. cit., p. 84.

³⁹Ibid., p. 90.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 101.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 115.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 122-30.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 130-34.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 134-44.

⁴⁵Dix, op. cit.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. XII.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. XII-XIII.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 48-102.

⁴⁹In Dix's opinion, it is especially disconcerting that on every point of importance liberal scholarship attributed more creative activity to the primitive church than to Jesus himself; Dix, Shape, p. 70.

⁵⁰While Dix's criticism of Lietzmann's two-type hypothesis is justified, he contradicts himself when on the one hand he claims to have used Lietzmann's study with admiration and profit for thirteen years, and on the other hand, he points out that Lietzmann has reached conclusions, which are staggering in their arbitrariness; Ibid., n. 1, p. 63.

⁵¹W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925).

⁵²Cirlot, op. cit.

⁵³Rudolf Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1943).

⁵⁴Dix, Shape, p. 64.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 48-50.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 101.

⁵⁷The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, pp. 158-92, esp. pp. 183ff., cited by Dix, op. cit., n. 1, p. 50.

⁵⁸Dix, op. cit., p. 50.

⁵⁹Jewish Background, pp. 158ff., cited by Dix, op. cit., n. 1, p. 50.

⁶⁰In his criticism of Jeremias' defense of the Synoptic dating of the Last Supper, V. Taylor pointed out that most British scholars are justified in holding that the Last Supper and the crucifixion preceded the celebration

of the Passover; see V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1952), p. 666.

⁶¹Dix, op. cit., p. 50.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 57, 75.

⁶³Ibid., p. 69

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 69.

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 60-61

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 61.

⁶⁷Dix's textual judgments with regard to the short Lucan text are not based upon text-critical considerations, but rather on sheer intuition. In his opinion, a corruption must have taken place very early. For a discussion of the Lucan text-problem see Dix, Shape, pp. 61ff.

⁶⁸Dix, op. cit., p. 62.

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 62-63.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 63.

⁷¹Lietzmann, Mass, pp. 207ff.

⁷²O. Cullmann and F. J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p. 17.

⁷³Dix, Shape, p. 64.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 63-64.

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 74-75.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 96-102.

⁷⁷Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 29.

⁷⁸Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 170f., 185.

⁷⁹Cirlot, op. cit.

⁸⁰Dix, Shape.

⁸¹Der Ursprung des kirchlichen Abendmahls: blosse Mahlgemeinschaft von Jesus und seinem Juengern oder eine besondere Handlung und Worte von Jesus? p. 27, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 29.

⁸²Otto, Kingdom, p. 278.

- ⁸³Lietzmann, Mass, p. 171.
- ⁸⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 30.
- ⁸⁵Oesterley, Background, p. 167.
- ⁸⁶Otto, op. cit., p. 278.
- ⁸⁷Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, p. 123, cited by Otto, Kingdom, p. 278.
- ⁸⁸Jeremias, op. cit., p. 30.
- ⁸⁹Cirlot, op. cit., p. 15.
- ⁹⁰Oesterley, op. cit., p. 167f.
- ⁹¹Ibid., p. 204.
- ⁹²Ibid., pp. 172, 204.
- ⁹³Cirlot, op. cit., pp. 14-15.
- ⁹⁴Dix, Shape, p. 50.
- ⁹⁵Gregory Dix, review of The Shape of the Liturgy, by C. W. Dugmore, JTS, 47 (1946), p. 109.
- ⁹⁶Jeremias, op. cit., p. 30; K. G. Kuhn "Die Abendmahlsworte," ThLZ, 7 (1950), p. 401.
- ⁹⁷Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," pp. 104ff.
- ⁹⁸Ibid., p. 105.
- ⁹⁹Dix, review of Shape, by Dugmore, op. cit., pp. 107ff.
- ¹⁰⁰Dix, Shape, n. 2, p. 50.
- ¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 232. (cf. Dix, review of Shape, by Dugmore, op. cit., pp. 107ff.
- ¹⁰²J. Delorme, "The Last Supper and the Pasch in the NT," in The Eucharist and the New Testament: A Symposium trans. by E. M. Stewart (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964), p. 24f.
- ¹⁰³Jeremias, op. cit., p. 26.
- ¹⁰⁴Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums, I, cited by Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 198.
- ¹⁰⁵Contemporary Review, cited by Lohmeyer, loc. cit., p. 198.

- ¹⁰⁶ The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist, cited by Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 198.
- ¹⁰⁷ Cf. Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 148f.
- ¹⁰⁸ Antecedents, cited by Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 198.
- ¹⁰⁹ Dugmore, "Study of Origins," op. cit., p. 8.
- ¹¹⁰ F. C. Burkitt, "The Last Supper and the Paschal Meal," JTS, 17 (1915-16), p. 294.
- ¹¹¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 29.
- ¹¹² Die Christliche Welt, 31 col. 246, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., n. 6, p. 28; see also Otto, Kingdom, p. 283f.
- ¹¹³ Jeremias, op. cit., n. 6, p. 28.
- ¹¹⁴ Background, p. 169f., cited by Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 198.
- ¹¹⁵ The Last Supper: its Significance in the Upper Room, cited by Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 198.
- ¹¹⁶ Oesterley, op. cit., p. 167.
- ¹¹⁷ Encyclopedia Jud. IX, p. 1201, cited by Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 199.
- ¹¹⁸ Oesterley, op. cit., p. 175.
- ¹¹⁹ Last Supper, cited by Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 198, 168.
- ¹²⁰ Oesterley, op. cit., pp. 167-79, esp. p. 175.
- ¹²¹ G. H. C. McGregor, Eucharistic Origins (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1928), pp. 22ff.
- ¹²² The Words of Institution, pp. 22ff., cited by Jeremias, op. cit., n. 5, p. 29.
- ¹²³ The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments, p. 65f., cited by Jeremias, n. 4, p. 29.
- ¹²⁴ Das Herrenmahl im Neuen Testament, pp. 21, 70, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 29.
- ¹²⁵ Martin Dibelius, Jesus, trans. by Charles B. Hedrick and Frederick C. Grant (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949), p. 132.
- ¹²⁶ Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 148f.
- ¹²⁷ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 29.

- ¹²⁸Lohmeyer, op. cit., ThRNF, 9 (1937), pp. 119-200.
- ¹²⁹Ibid., pp. 199-200.
- ¹³⁰Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 26-29.
- ¹³¹Ibid., p. 27.
- ¹³²Lewis N. Dunbitt, "Kiddush," The Jewish Encyclopedia VII, 1904, pp. 483-84.
- ¹³³George F. Moore, Judaism, II (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), p. 36.
- ¹³⁴Ibid., p. 36.
- ¹³⁵Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 26-29.
- ¹³⁶A number of important monographs show a strong dependence upon the researches of Jeremias; see, e.g. Higgins, op. cit. and Patsch, Abendmahl p. 39.
- ¹³⁷Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 265, 277. See also his chapter on "The Sacraments" (Theology of the New Testament [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957]), pp. 144-52; cf. E. J. Kilmartin, The Eucharist in the Primitive Church (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1964), p. 24.
- ¹³⁸Jeremias' historical concern comes into focus in connection with his attempt to recover the ipsissima verba of Jesus.
- ¹³⁹See Rupert Feneberg, Christliche Passafeier und Abendmahl (Muenchen: Koesel Verlag, 1971), p. 35.
- ¹⁴⁰"Offenbarung Gottes im hl. Abendmahl," Luthertum 48; (1937), pp. 340-46, 353-72, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 16, Das Abendmahl, Passamahl, Bundesmahl und Messiasmahl, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 16.
- ¹⁴¹Jeremias, The Problem of the Historical Jesus, Facet Books (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 12-13; cf. Feneberg, op. cit., pp. 35ff.
- ¹⁴²Jeremias, loc. cit., pp. 12-13.
- ¹⁴³Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 16.
- ¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 16.
- ¹⁴⁵Mark 15:42; Matt. 27:62; Luke 23:54; John 19:31, 42; Ibid., p. 15.
- ¹⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 15-16.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 19-20.

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁵²No scholarly consensus has been reached on this point. In Jeremias' opinion, the time reference "on the first day of Unleavened Bread" is probably due to a translation error. Bywm kmy dptyry can have two meanings. Obviously, the first one πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν ἁζύμων, i.e., Nisan 14 was intended in Mk. 14:12; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 18. In basic agreement with Jeremias, Hirsch pointed out that Mk. 14:12 refers to Nisan 14, the day of the paschal sacrifice. The expression probably was inserted by someone who was unfamiliar with the Jewish custom of the festival. It is possible that this time reference was introduced by a Christian, who considered Jesus as the true Passover Lamb, sacrificed on the cross. To this person it was very significant to mark Nisan 14 as the day of the slaying of the Passover lamb. Thus, this day was understood as a feast day; Emanuel Hirsch, Fruehgeschichte des Evangeliums, I (Tuebingen: J. C. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1951), p. 149. Against those who hold that the statement is essentially incorrect, Branscomb argued that the Passover actually preceded the first day of unleavened bread. This distinction is still preserved in Jewish writings. See B. H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937), p. 249. E. Mally, on the other hand, thinks that this date, which should mean Nisan 15, is immediately corrected by the following clause, "when the Passover lamb was slaughtered" (Nisan 14). Edward J. Mally, "The Gospel According to Mark" (The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. II, p. 21.)

¹⁵³The phrase ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον determines more exactly the time reference καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζύμων. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 18.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵⁷Scott McCormick, The Lord's Supper (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 115-19.

¹⁵⁸The names of recent supporters of the view that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, as well as the names of some opponents to this theory are presented by A. J. B. Higgins, op. cit., n. 1, p. 23; see also Higgins, "The Origin of the Eucharist," NTS, I (1954), pp. 200ff.

¹⁵⁹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 42.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., n. 6, p. 43.

¹⁶¹This observation was made by A. Oepke, "Ursprung und ursprünglicher Sinn des Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," III, col. 58, cited by Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, n. 2, p. 44.

¹⁶²Jeremias, op. cit., p. 44-46.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 48.

¹⁶⁴Jeremias allowed for the possibility that the various expressions ἀνακεῖσθαι, συνάκεῖσθαι etc. may have lost their original force (like the post-biblical Heb. heseb), and had come to mean simply 'to have a meal': Jeremias, op. cit., n. 5, p. 48.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 49.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., n. 2, p. 49, (cf. Feneberg, op. cit., n. 8, p. 17.)

¹⁶⁷b. Pesach, 109a (Bar.), cited by Jeremias, op. cit., n. 7, p. 50.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁶⁹Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁷¹According to Pes. 10:1, it was the duty of every participant to take at least four cups of wine, 'even if it is from the pauper's dish' [i.e. from charity]. Jeremias, op. cit., n. 4, p. 52.

¹⁷²Ibid., pp. 54-55.

¹⁷³The hallel at the conclusion of an ordinary meal cannot be described in the sense of 'to sing a hymn.' The reference can only be to the second half of the Passover hallel. Jeremias, op. cit., n. 1, p. 55.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 55-56.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 56-61.

¹⁷⁷The new material presented by Jeremias can hardly be considered as conclusive evidence in support of the theory that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. Kaesemann, e.g. who does not believe in the paschal character of the Lord's Supper, objects to Jeremias' presentation of the new material. In his opinion, the material is not at all convincing. It simply underlines the fact that the Synoptic tradition reports of a Passover meal. See Ernst Kaesemann, Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament, pp. 60ff. cited by Willi Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 11f.

¹⁷⁸Schweizer, Lord's Supper, p. 30.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁸⁰This is in disagreement with Preiss, who attributes the paschal association of the Eucharist to the theological interest of the primitive Christian community. See Theo Preiss, "Was the Last Supper a Passover Meal?" in Life in Christ, trans. by Harold Knight, (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957), pp. 81-99. Kilmartin also emphasized the theological interest of the primitive Christian community. In his opinion, the Eucharist is the fulfillment of the Old Pasch. As such, it has a meaning analogous to that of the paschal feast in the old dispensation. While the paschal feast included a cultic meal, which recalled the crucial redemptive intervention of Yahweh at the time of the Exodus, the Eucharist or the New Pasch was the occasion for the re-presentation, the re-actualization of the redemptive work of Jesus for the benefit of the participants of the Lord's Supper, Kilmartin, Eucharist, p. 52.

¹⁸¹Dugmore, "Study of Origins," op. cit., p. 6.

¹⁸²Ibid., n. 3, p. 6.

¹⁸³Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8.

¹⁸⁶With regard to Jeremias' presentation of the new material, Marxsen has pointed out that certain aspects of the problem may be insoluble. On the other hand, Jeremias has shown how many arguments can be cited in support of the Passover theory, and herein lies the great importance of his investigation; Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 13.

¹⁸⁷Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 197.

¹⁸⁸Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, n. 2, p. 78.

¹⁸⁹Jeremias, loc. cit., n. 2, p. 78; Blinzler points to John 8:5 as a remarkable piece of evidence in support of his thesis. See Joseph Blinzler, "Die Strafe fuer Ehebruch in Bibel und Halacha: Zur Auslegung von Joh. VIII:5." NTS, 4 (1957-58), pp. 32-47.

¹⁹⁰Jeremias, op. cit., n. 1, p. 69.

¹⁹¹McCormick, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

¹⁹²Ibid., p. 117.

¹⁹³Gaugler pointed out that even the consideration of G. Dalman (Jesus-Jeshua, pp. 86-98.) and Billerbeck (in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash II, pp. 815-34.) to which Jeremias appeals in support of his thesis are hardly more than a possibility; see E. Gaugler, Das Abend-

mahl im Neuen Testament ("Gegenwartsfragen biblischer Theologie," Basel: 1941), pp. 24-25. In Kaesemann's opinion, Jeremias has not succeeded in refuting the most decisive objection against the Passover character of the Last Supper, namely, that the meeting of the Sanhedrin and the execution could not have taken place on such a high feast day; see E. Kaesemann, Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament, pp. 60ff. cited by W. Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," pp. 11-12.

¹⁹⁴Preiss, Life, pp. 81-82.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 81-82.

¹⁹⁶Chwolson, who was followed by Lichtenstein, Strack and Billerbeck attempted to explain the discrepancy between the Johannine and Synoptic dating of the Last Supper on the basis that in the year of Jesus' death, the Sadducees and Pharisees dated differently the beginning of the month of Nisan. The Synoptics followed the Pharisaic reckoning and John the Sadducaic. In Jeremias' opinion, its weakness is that it is wholly conjectural; see Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 21-23. Gaugler, agreeing with Jeremias, pointed out that in John we can discover some indications that the account, which forms the basis of the Johannine narration, shows paschal associations. On the other hand, the evangelist himself probably understood the chronological situation as follows: The meal took place on Nisan 13th, the meeting of the Sanhedrin and the execution of Jesus on Nisan 14th. In Gaugler's opinion, it is highly probable that the Johannine dating is theologically motivated. John seems to have adopted the Synoptic dating rather harmlessly. But he put a new accent upon it. He let Jesus die the day the Passover lamb was slain. Consequently, he is in line with the interpretation of the death of Jesus found in 1 Cor. 5:7 and 1. Pet. 1:19; see Gaugler, Abendmahl, pp. 25-27; see also Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 25.

¹⁹⁷Annie Jaubert, La Date de la Cène (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1957).

¹⁹⁸"Ein Bruchstueck aus einem bisher unbekannten Brief des Epiphanius," cited by Jeremias, op. cit., n. 5, p. 24.

¹⁹⁹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 25.

²⁰⁰Jaubert, op. cit.

²⁰¹Ibid., pp. 13-60.

²⁰²Ibid., pp. 79-92.

²⁰³Herbert Braun, Qumran II, p. 44. Jaubert, op. cit., pp. 80ff; see also L. Johnston, "The Date of the Last Supper," Scripture, IX (1957), pp. 108-15.

²⁰⁴Johnston, loc. cit., p. 113ff.

²⁰⁵Jaubert, op. cit., p. 105-34; see also Braun, op. cit., pp. 44-46.

- ²⁰⁶Braun, op. cit., p. 45.
- ²⁰⁷Johnston, op. cit., pp. 108-15.
- ²⁰⁸For a critical appraisal of Jaubert's thesis and a presentation of recent scholarly discussions relating to the chronological problems of the death of Jesus; see Joseph Blinzler, Der Prozess Jesu (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1967), pp. 109-26.
- ²⁰⁹Braun, op. cit., p. 43.
- ²¹⁰Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 24-26.
- ²¹¹Johnston, op. cit., 114.
- ²¹²Karl G. Kuhn, "Zum essenischen Kalender," ZNW, 52, (1961), p. 67.
- ²¹³Ibid., p. 67.
- ²¹⁴Ibid., p. 69.
- ²¹⁵Blinzler, Prozess, p. 117.
- ²¹⁶Ibid., p. 117.
- ²¹⁷Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 65-73.
- ²¹⁸Blinzler, op. cit., p. 117.
- ²¹⁹Massey H. Shepherd, "Are Both the Synoptics and John Correct About the Date of Jesus' Death?" JBL, LXXX (1961), pp. 123ff.
- ²²⁰Ibid., p. 123f.
- ²²¹Ibid., p. 123f.
- ²²²Ibid., p. 123f.
- ²²³B. H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937, p. 250f.
- ²²⁴Ibid., p. 250.
- ²²⁵Ibid., pp. 250-52.
- ²²⁶Ibid., p. 253.
- ²²⁷August Strobel, "Der Termin des Todes Jesu," ZNW, 51 (1960), p. 74.
- ²²⁸Ibid., pp. 71-72.
- ²²⁹On this point Strobel is in agreement with Ghilarouff. See Strobel, op. cit., n. 11, p. 72.

²³⁰Strobel, "Termin," p. 72.

²³¹Ibid., p. 73.

²³²This phrase can hardly be considered as an explanatory addition by the evangelist. Originally, it probably referred to the day of preparation for the feast. Therefore, it was his task to enter the chronology, which was disarranged by the Passover meal account; Strobel, "Termin," p. 73.

²³³"Die eucharistischen Einsetzungsberichte und ihre Bedeutung," in Exegese und Theologie, p. 88, cited by Feneberg, Passafeier, p. 22.

²³⁴"Eucharistie," in: Woerterbuch zur biblischen Botschaft, p. 157, cited by Feneberg, Passafeier, p. 23.

²³⁵Ibid., p. 157

²³⁶Benoit, Einsetzungsberichte, p. 89, cited by Feneberg, Passafeier, p. 22.

²³⁷Preiss, Life, p. 94.

²³⁸Ibid., p. 82.

²³⁹Ibid., p. 83.

²⁴⁰Ibid., p. 85.

²⁴¹Ibid., p. 85.

²⁴²Ibid., pp. 94-95.

²⁴³Ibid., p. 96.

²⁴⁴Charles C. Torrey, "In the Fourth Gospel the Last Supper was the Paschal Meal," JQR, XLII (1951-52), pp. 237-50.

²⁴⁵Ibid., p. 237f.

²⁴⁶Solomon Zeitlin, "The Time of the Passover Meal," JQR, XLII (1951-52), pp. 45-56.

²⁴⁷Percy J. Heawood, "The Time of the Last Supper," JQR, XLII (1951-52), pp. 37-44.

²⁴⁸Solomon Zeitlin, "The Last Supper As An Ordinary Meal of the Fourth Gospel," JQR, XLII (1951-52), p. 260.

²⁴⁹Ibid., p. 260f.

²⁵⁰Ibid., p. 260f.

²⁵¹Guenther Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," ZThK, 53 (1956), pp. 323-24.

²⁵²Ferdinand Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung," EvTh, 27 (1967), pp. 337-74.

²⁵³Preiss, Life, pp. 83ff.

²⁵⁴Hahn, "Motive," p. 343.

²⁵⁵Ibid., p. 343.

²⁵⁶Ibid., p. 343.

²⁵⁷Ibid., p. 343.

²⁵⁸Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl," p. 323.

²⁵⁹Ibid., p. 323.

²⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 323-24.

²⁶¹Contrary to Bornkamm, who could see no relationship between the accounts of the Last Supper and the Passover meal, Hahn held that the death of Jesus and his farewell meal were connected with the Passover feast. This in turn gave rise to interpretations such as 1. Cor. 5:7; John 19:36 as well as to the Synoptic chronology, whereby the Passover and the Lord's Supper were closely connected; see Hahn, "Motive," n. 27, p. 343.

²⁶²Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl," p. 324.

²⁶³Jesus das Passahlamm des neues Bundes: der Zentralgedanke des Herrenmahles, cited by Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 324.

²⁶⁴ThLZ (1951), col. 547, cited by Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 324.

²⁶⁵Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 324.

²⁶⁶Werner G. Kuenmel, Die Theologie des Neues Testamentes nach seinen Hauptzeugen Jesus, Paulus, Johannes (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), pp. 82-83.

²⁶⁷Ibid., p. 82.

²⁶⁸While Lohmeyer has correctly observed that the account of the Last Supper does not allude to a Passover meal, he has made no attempt to give an explanation why Mark was concerned to have the Last Supper understood in terms of a Passover meal. See Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), pp. 302-303.

²⁶⁹J. E. L. Oulton, Holy Communion and Holy Spirit (London: SPCK, 1951), pp. 9ff.

270 Ibid., p. 10. This explanation, however, fails to be convincing.

271 Preiss, Life, p. 95.

272 Ibid., p. 94.

273 Ibid., p. 94.

274 Ibid., pp. 90-91.

275 Branscomb, Mark, p. 253.

276 Ibid., pp. 253-54.

277 Ibid., p. 254.

278 Ibid., p. 254.

279 This view was presented by Preiss, (Life, p. 95) in dependence upon Lietzmann (Messe und Herrenmahl, pp. 211-12). Lohse, on the other hand, argued that since 31 A.D. the primitive Christians celebrated the Christian Passover. In his opinion, this consideration would be more reasonable than the idea that at first, the Christians continued to celebrate the Jewish Passover, which, after some years, they transformed completely. See B. Lohse, Das Passafest des Quartadecimaner (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1958), p. 112.

280 Professor Jeremias pointed out that he prefers the less technical expression "avowal of abstinence" to the term "vow of abstinence." See Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 207-8.

281 Ibid., p. 218.

282 Ibid., p. 218.

283 "St. Luke XXII:15. 16: What is the General Meaning?" JTS, 9, pp. 569, cited by Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 208.

284 Ibid., p. 208.

285 Ibid., p. 209.

286 Ibid., p. 212.

287 See Epistula Apostolorum 15 (26), cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 212.

288 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 212ff.

289 Ibid., pp. 214-16.

290 Ibid., p. 216.

²⁹¹ Professor Manson, for instance, held that the words "I have longed eagerly (lit. with desire I have desired), express thankfulness that his wish to partake of the Passover with his disciples has been granted. See W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), pp. 241ff. In his commentary on Luke Professor Schmid stated: "Man darf den Satz nicht so verstehen als wuerde Jesus darin sein Bedauern darueber aussprechen, dass er mit seinen Juengern das Pascha in diesem Aeon nicht feiern koenne," Joseph Schmid, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960), p. 321f. Wellhausen also held that Jesus had eaten the Passover with his disciples, for he stated: "Dass Jesus nicht bloss sein Verlangen nach dem Pascha ausspricht, sondern er auch wirklich mit seinen Juengern isst, unterlaesst er zu sagen, weil es sich von selbst versteht." Evangelium Lucae, p. 121, cited by F. C. Burkitt, "St. Luke XXII," op. cit., p. 569.

²⁹² In agreement with Burkitt, Jeremias argues that Jesus' desire to eat the Passover remained unfulfilled. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 208.

²⁹³ Ibid., p. 208.

²⁹⁴ du Toit, Aspekt, pp. 92-93.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 92-93.

²⁹⁶ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 218.

²⁹⁷ du Toit, Aspekt, p. 93.

²⁹⁸ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 212.

²⁹⁹ In his criticism of Lohse's hypothesis, Professor Schuermann was sceptical of Lohse's equation of a second-century practice with a primitive Christian Passover celebration, which is to be postulated. Schuermann, "Vorgang und Sinngehalt der urchristlichen Osterfeier," in Ursprung und Gestalt, p. 207; see du Toit, Aspekt, p. 93.

³⁰⁰ du Toit, op. cit., p. 93.

³⁰¹ In agreement with Lohmeyer, Schuermann pointed out that the phrase ἐν θυμῷ ἐρεθίσθη may go back to Luke himself. He does allow, however, for the possibility of a pre-Lucan redaction. Schuermann, Der Paschamahlobericht: Lk. 22, (7-14), 15-18. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 19/5 [Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956]), p. 7. See also Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9, p. 181.

³⁰² Jeremias, op. cit., p. 223.

³⁰³ Ibid., p. 223.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 219.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 221.

306 Ibid., pp. 219, 224.

307 Ibid., p. 219.

308 Ibid., p. 221.

309 Ibid., p. 221.

310 Ibid., p. 221.

311 Ibid., p. 221.

312 Ibid., pp. 221-22.

313 Ibid., p. 222.

314 Ibid., p. 222.

315 Ibid., pp. 222-23.

316 Ibid., pp. 222-23.

317 Ibid., p. 223.

318 The view that Jesus considered himself as the paschal lamb was vigorously presented by G. Walther, Jesus, das Passalam des Neuen Bundes, cited by Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 223.

319 The analogy is very weak. See Jeremias, op. cit., p. 223.

320 Ibid., p. 224.

321 Ibid., p. 224.

322 Ibid., p. 225.

323 Ibid., p. 225.

324 Ibid., p. 225.

325 Ibid., p. 223.

326 Ibid., p. 225-26.

327 Ibid., p. 226.

328 Ibid., p. 227.

329 Ibid., p. 229.

330 Ibid., p. 229.

331 Ibid., p. 231.

332 Ibid., p. 236ff.

333 Ibid., pp. 236-37.

334 This was pointed out by Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 222.

335 Further arguments against Jeremias' attempt to interpret the words of interpretation on the basis of the Passover lamb conception are presented by Lessig, op. cit., pp. 322ff.

336 This observation was made by Patsch, op. cit., p. 222.

337 If the bread was intended to represent the flesh of the sacrificial animal, it should have been designated as σάρξ from the very beginning. Furthermore, it is hardly conceivable that at the Last Supper Jesus would have passed out bread and wine as the substances of this sacrifice; see Lessig, op. cit., p. 323.

338 For a discussion of this point see Karl G. Kuhn, "Die Abendmahls-worte," ThLZ, 75 (1950), cols. 399-408.

339 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 249.

340 Ibid., p. 238.

341 "Agape," Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie, I, col. 786, cited by Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 238.

342 Ibid., p. 238.

343 Ibid., p. 239.

344 Ibid., p. 239.

345 Ibid., p. 239f.

346 Ibid., pp. 239-43.

347 Ibid., pp. 239-43.

348 Ibid., p. 243.

349 Ibid., p. 243.

350 Ibid., p. 249.

351 Ibid., p. 252.

352 Ibid., p. 249.

353 Ibid., p. 249.

- 354 Ibid., p. 250.
- 355 Ibid., p. 250.
- 356 Ibid., p. 251.
- 357 Ibid., p. 251.
- 358 Ibid., p. 251.
- 359 Ibid., p. 251.
- 360 Ibid., p. 251.
- 361 Ibid., p. 251.
- 362 Hans Kosmala, "Das tut zu meinem Gedächtnis," NovT, IV (1960), p. 81.
- 363 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 252-55.
- 364 Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958), pp. 364ff.
- 365 Ibid., p. 368.
- 366 Ibid., p. 368.
- 367 Ibid., p. 368.
- 368 Douglas Jones, "Anamnesis in the LXX," JTSNS, Vol. VI (October 1955), pp. 183-191.
- 369 Ibid., p. 190f.
- 370 Kosmala, "Gedächtnis," p. 82.
- 371 Ibid., p. 82.
- 372 Ibid., p. 92.
- 373 Louis Ligier, "De la Cène de Jesus a l'Anaphore de l'Eglise," La Maison Dieu, (Paris), No. 87 (1966), p. 424.
- 374 Ibid., p. 24.
- 375 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 225-31.
- 376 V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan Co., 1937), p. 97.
- 377 Otto, Kingdom of God, pp. 249-55.

³⁷⁸Hans W. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), pp. 55-71.

³⁷⁹Taylor, op. cit., pp. 97, 101, 126-27.

³⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 101, 126-27.

³⁸¹Ibid., p. 193.

³⁸²Ibid., pp. 193-94.

³⁸³Ibid., p. 281.

³⁸⁴Otto, Kingdom, pp. 249ff.

³⁸⁵Ibid., p. 250.

³⁸⁶Ibid., p. 252.

³⁸⁷Wolff, op. cit., pp. 55-71.

³⁸⁸Ibid., p. 55.

³⁸⁹Ibid., pp. 55-56.

³⁹⁰Ibid., p. 56.

³⁹¹Ibid., p. 58.

³⁹²Ibid., p. 60.

³⁹³Ibid., p. 60.

³⁹⁴Ibid., p. 60f.

³⁹⁵In this connection, Wolff stated: "Wir halten als bedeutsames Ergebnis fest, dass eine klare Entscheidung ueber die Herkunft des Zitates nicht zu treffen ist." Ibid., p. 68.

³⁹⁶"Reich Gottes und Menschensohn," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 29, cited by Wolff, op. cit., p. 66..

³⁹⁷Wolff, loc. cit., p. 67.

³⁹⁸Ibid., pp. 68-69.

³⁹⁹Jeremias, Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 210.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 210-11.

⁴⁰¹Ibid., p. 213.

- 402 Ibid., p. 213.
- 403 Ibid., p. 213.
- 404 Ibid., p. 213.
- 405 Ibid., p. 213.
- 406 Ibid., p. 213.
- 407 Ibid., p. 214.
- 408 Ibid., p. 214.
- 409 Ibid., p. 215.
- 410 Ibid., p. 215.
- 411 Ibid., p. 215.
- 412 Ibid., p. 215.
- 413 Ibid., p. 215.
- 414 Ibid., p. 215.
- 415 Ibid., p. 215.
- 416 Ibid., p. 215.
- 417 Ibid., pp. 215-16.
- 418 Ibid., p. 216.
- 419 Ibid., p. 216.
- 420 Reginald H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 85ff.
- 421 Ibid., pp. 86-95.
- 422 Ibid., pp. 86-95.
- 423 Heinz E. Toedt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition (London: SCM Press, 1965), pp. 202ff.
- 424 Ibid., p. 202ff.
- 425 Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, The Fontana Library (London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1972), p. 115.
- 426 Ibid., pp. 118-19.

427 Morna D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament (London: S.P.C.K., 1959)

428 Ibid., p. 62.

429 Ibid., p. 62.

430 Ibid., p. 62.

431 Ibid., p. 62.

432 Ibid., p. 101.

433 Ibid., p. 101.

434 Ibid., p. 101.

435 Ibid., p. 101.

436 Ibid., pp. 101-102.

437 Ibid., pp. 101-102.

438 Ibid., p. 102.

439 Ibid., p. 102.

440 Ibid., p. 102.

441 Ibid., p. 127.

442 Ibid., p. 127.

443 Ibid., p. 127.

444 Ibid., p. 127.

445 Ibid., p. 128.

446 Ibid., p. 128.

447 Ibid., p. 128.

448 Ibid., p. 162.

449 Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel: ihre Geschichte im fruehen Christentum (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), n. 2, p. 66.

450 Ibid., p. 66.

451 Ibid., p. 66.

- ⁴⁵²Ibid., p. 66.
- ⁴⁵³Ibid., p. 66.
- ⁴⁵⁴Ibid., p. 66.
- ⁴⁵⁵In agreement with Toedt, Fuller held that Mark 10:45b alludes to Isa-
53. He also seems to agree with Toedt that the ὑπὲρ πολλῶν is an allusion
to Isa. 53:11. Fuller, Christology, p. 115f.
- ⁴⁵⁶See Fuller, loc. cit., p. 118.
- ⁴⁵⁷Hooker, Servant, pp. 74ff., 80-83.
- ⁴⁵⁸Hahn, Hoheitstitel, p. 66.
- ⁴⁵⁹Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 183.
- ⁴⁶⁰Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, trans. by Louise P. Smith and Erminie
Huntress (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson), p. 213.
- ⁴⁶¹Ibid., p. 213f.
- ⁴⁶²Ibid., p. 213f.
- ⁴⁶³Patsch, op. cit., p. 183.
- ⁴⁶⁴Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament, p. 29.
- ⁴⁶⁵Ibid., p. 29.
- ⁴⁶⁶Ibid., p. 29.
- ⁴⁶⁷Jaubert, op. cit.
- ⁴⁶⁸For a presentation of Jaubert's hypothesis; see p. 33f.
- ⁴⁶⁹Joachim Gnilka, "Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener," BZNF, 5 (July
1961) p. 39.
- ⁴⁷⁰This view was presented by J. van der Ploeg; see Gnilka, op. cit.,
n. 1, p. 39.
- ⁴⁷¹The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 114f., cited by Gnilka, op. cit., p. 29.
(cf. Braun, op. cit. p. 31.)
- ⁴⁷²In Cullmann's opinion, the meal of the Qumran community shows much
similarity to the eucharistic feast of the first Christians. But the
differences outweigh the similarities. Cullmann emphasized the purely
sacral character of the Qumran meals. See his article "The Significance
of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity,"
JBL, 74 (1955), pp. 213-26; esp. p. 215. (cf. Gnilka, "Gemeinschafts-
mahl," p. 29.)

⁴⁷³La Communauté de Qumran et l'Organisation de l'Eglise ancienne, p. 107, cited by Gnilka, op. cit., p. 29.

⁴⁷⁴Otto Betz, "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im NT," RQ, 1, (1958-59), pp. 213-34; esp. p. 214.

⁴⁷⁵Hans Kosmala, Hebraeer-Essener-Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der fruehchristlichen Verkueundigung (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), pp. 393-95. Similarly J. Pryke, "The Sacrament of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion in the Light of the Ritual Worship and Sacred Meals at Qumran," RQ, 20 (July, 1966), pp. 548ff.

⁴⁷⁶A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. by G. Vermes (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973) pp. 84f., 108f.

⁴⁷⁷Josephus, The Jewish War, II, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1927), pars. 128-32, p. 373.

⁴⁷⁸Dam. 10:10f., Fest. Levi 9:11; Jub. 21:16; cited by Gnilka, op. cit. p. 43.

⁴⁷⁹Ibid., p. 43.

⁴⁸⁰Karl G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meals at Qumran," in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 72. With regard to the blessings before and after the meal; see Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus, 3d ed. (Muenchen: C. H. Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), pp. 685ff.

⁴⁸¹Black, Scrolls, p. 102.

⁴⁸²Ibid., p. 104, (cf. Kosmala, Hebraeer, p. 394) Differently Gnilka, "Gemeinschaftsmahl," p. 48.

⁴⁸³In Kosmala's opinion, it is doubtful that the Essenes drank wine with their common meals. Kosmala, op. cit., p. 394

⁴⁸⁴According to Kuhn, it is one of the most significant agreements between Josephus and the Qumran texts that a priest has to preside over a meal and thus, as the one highest in rank, gives the blessing at the beginning of the meal. But nothing is said about the closing prayer in the passage cited from IQS. One is tempted to ask whether the priests' benedictions over the bread and the wine, which in IQS VI are placed immediately beside each other, were not divided into the prayer before and after the meal. This was the common practice at all other Jewish meals. Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

⁴⁸⁵Gnilka, op. cit., p. 48.

⁴⁸⁶Ibid., p. 48; see also Black, Scrolls, p. 104.

487 Black, loc. cit., p. 105.

488 Gnika, op. cit., p. 52.

489 Black, op. cit., p. 105

490 Ibid., p. 54.

491 In Gnika's opinion, the development is not to be understood in the sense that the present meal receives its meaning from the future. In other words, it does not claim to be an anticipation of the messianic banquet. On the contrary, the common table will experience its crowning act when both Messiahs will be seated at that table which has become sacred on account of prayer and worship. Gnika, "Gemeinschaftsmahl," pp. 52-55.

492 Ibid., p. 54.

493 Ibid., p. 54.

494 Braun, Qumran, p. 31.

495 Ibid., p. 31.

496 Ibid., p. 33.

497 According to Braun, this view was presented by scholars such as Graystone, Brownlee, Cross and Schubert. Braun, op. cit., p. 33.

498 Ibid., p. 30.

499 Braun, op. cit., p. 30.

500 For a critical evaluation of Kuhn's study, see Braun, op. cit., pp. 35ff.; see also R. D. Richardson, "Essay," in Mass and Lord's Supper, fasc. 6, p. 355; cf. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 31-36.

501 Kuhn, op. cit., p. 70.

502 Ibid., p. 74.

503 Ibid., p. 76.

504 Ibid., p. 77.

505 Ibid., p. 77.

506 Ibid., p. 80.

507 Ibid., p. 89.

508 Ibid., p. 84f.

⁵⁰⁹Ibid., p. 85f.

⁵¹⁰Ibid., p. 84.

⁵¹¹Ibid., p. 84f.

⁵¹²Ibid., p. 84.

⁵¹³Ibid., p. 86.

⁵¹⁴Ibid., p. 86f.

⁵¹⁵Ibid., p. 86.

⁵¹⁶Ibid., p. 86f.

⁵¹⁷Ibid., p. 87f.

⁵¹⁸Ibid., p. 84f.

⁵¹⁹Ibid., p. 85.

⁵²⁰Marxsen, "Ursprung," cited by Braun, op. cit., p. 43.

⁵²¹Braun, op. cit., p. 43.

CHAPTER II

THEOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Lietzmann's monograph Messe und Herrenmahl, which was published in 1926, represents the first scientific approach to the problem of eucharistic origins.¹ While he appears to be the best-known representative of the two-type hypothesis, it should be pointed out that Friedrich Spitta² was the first exponent of the theory of the double origin of the Eucharist. An exposition of this theory appeared in his book Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums, which was published in 1893. Thus we will begin our examination of the various theological approaches with an exposition of Spitta's theory.

The Development from Spitta to Marxsen

1. Friedrich Spitta

At first, Spitta held that the Synoptic accounts of the Eucharist, which were supplemented by information from the Pauline writings, could be considered as a reliable starting point for his investigation.³ In the light of this information Spitta concluded that Jesus had transformed a Passover meal into a cultic act designed for the primitive Christian community. This act was to be repeated once every year. As soon as Christianity moved into a Gentile region, the connection of the Lord's Supper with the agape experienced a change. It was now repeated

more frequently and to the action "was given a new meaning."⁴ But, on the basis of a critical evaluation of the given data, Spitta changed his position. With regard to the date of the Last Supper, he noticed that scholars such as Schuerer⁵ were very cautious in accepting the Synoptic dating of the Last Supper. Therefore, he took sides with Holtzmann,⁶ who strongly defended the Johannine chronology. In connection with his acceptance of the Johannine dating, according to which the Last Supper coincided with Nisan 13, the day before the Passover feast, Spitta now argues that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal.⁷ He finds support for this view on the basis of an examination of John 13:17.⁸ Spitta concluded that in the elaborate speeches of Jesus, found in these chapters, there is no allusion to a Passover meal.⁹ On the basis of John 19:36, however, it may be inferred that the idea of the fate of Jesus and his work in connection with the Passover feast, was not foreign to the author of the gospel.¹⁰ The situation may be different with regard to Jesus' speech at Capernaum, John 6:26-58. But even in this passage, only verses 51-59 seem to allude to a Passover feast. This passage, however, is obviously a recension of a speech of Jesus given at Capernaum, in which the original thought was transformed by the church's practice of the Eucharist.¹¹

There are other considerations which also speak against the Passover theory:¹²

1. The Synoptic accounts concerning the preparation for the Passover meal, such as Mark 14:12-16; Matthew 26:17-19; Luke 22:7-13 are units, which were inserted at a later stage of development.¹³
2. On the basis of his examination of the accounts of the Last Supper,

Spitta concluded that in the Marcan-Matthaeian tradition one cannot find any characteristics of a Passover meal.¹⁴ These accounts rather give the impression that the Last Supper was a regular meal. On this occasion, Jesus spoke important words in connection with bread and wine. The Pauline-Lucan tradition, on the other hand, speaks of an institution by Jesus, which took place within the context of a Jewish Passover meal.¹⁵ In these two traditions, however, one can discover certain features which are absolutely foreign to any Passover situation.¹⁶

With regard to the early Christian liturgy of the Eucharist, Spitta pointed out that it would be a fatal error if one should subscribe to the view that the liturgy for the celebration of the Eucharist was essentially determined by the historical development of the situation, during which Jesus spoke those meaningful words.¹⁷ It would also be a methodological mistake, if one simply read the features of the liturgy back into this historical event.¹⁸ If, before one engaged in any investigation, it could be established that during the last night before his death, Jesus' action resulted in an institution which the following generations were to repeat in remembrance of him and of the events during the night of his betrayal, then one might consider and utilize the liturgy as a historical account of these events.¹⁹ But as certain as it may be that the apostle Paul had such a conception of things--1 Corinthians 11:24f *ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ*--, it is just as questionable whether he actually does justice to the idea of Jesus and to the original conception of the community.²⁰ In the light of this argumentation, we discover that Spitta distinguishes between two different types of the Eucharist:²¹ (1) The

first type corresponds to the idea of Jesus and to the original conception of the primitive Christian community. (2) The second or the Pauline type is characterized as a memorial meal.

In his search for the original meaning of the eucharistic celebration, Spitta engaged in an investigation of the oldest form of the Christian liturgy of the Eucharist. In this connection, two accounts are of basic importance, the information about the celebration of the Eucharist by Paul in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, and the eucharistic prayers of the Didache.²² A comparison of 1 Corinthians 10 and 11 with Didache 9 and 10 clearly indicates that there is a strong resemblance between these two eucharistic forms. The fact that in the Didache reference is made to a real meal, which is also referred to in 1 Corinthians 11, points to its early origins.²³ In Spitta's opinion, there is a close relationship between these meals and the fraternal meals of Jude 12 and 2 Peter 2:13.²⁴ The ἀγάται of Acts 2:42, 46 occur as an established custom of the Jerusalem church. A comparison of Acts 20:7-11 with Didache 14:1 shows that there is no difference between these meals and the δεινον κυριακόν. Otherwise, one would have to assume that in the primitive Christian community, the agape and the Lord's Supper were considered as two different institutions, existing side by side.²⁵ They would have been united at the time of Paul and separated again during the middle of the second century.²⁶ The primitive Christian agape, however, did not constitute a Christian Passover celebration.²⁷ The following considerations seem to speak against such a view: (1) The agape was repeated frequently, while the Eucharist connected with the Passover would require only an annual repetition. (2) There is no single feature in these ἀγάται.

which shows any resemblance to a Passover meal. In Spitta's opinion the *ἀγάπαι* are closely related to the regular Jewish meal.²⁸

According to Spitta, the Marcan account of institution is the most reliable one with regard to the time and occasion of the Last Supper.²⁹ In Mark, the two actions have closely moved together. The basic conception of the Marcan account of institution, however, is that of a meal.³⁰ The conception of the time of the everlasting covenant of God with Israel, i.e., the Messianic consummation, connects itself with the idea of the great meal of God, which has found its classical expression in Isaiah 25:6-8.³¹ Since that time, this concept occurs in the apocalyptic and rabbinical descriptions.³²

This tradition of the Eucharist, which is characterized by the eschatological perspective, is to be distinguished from the Eucharist as a memorial meal.³³ According to Spitta, those interpretations, which seek to recover the original meaning of the words of institution by starting with the concepts *σῶμα* and *αἷμα Χριστοῦ*, relating them to the death of Christ, prove to be of a secondary nature.³⁴ This kind of interpretation is already manifest in the apostolic age. But it is obviously a misunderstanding of the original meaning, with serious consequences.³⁵

In connection with the origin of the memorial meal, Spitta pointed out that the first Eucharist was not only to be repeated, it was necessary that new elements were to be added, thus introducing a process, whereby the Lord's Supper was turned into a Christian Passover meal, a proclamation of the death of Jesus.³⁶ The causes for this development must be seen in a custom which may be described in terms of a postponed Passover celebration.³⁷ This custom was required by the

Mosaic Law. According to Numbers 9:10ff, uncleanness resulting from touching a corpse or from a long journey is given as the main reason for such a postponed Passover celebration.³⁸ Spitta also pointed to 2 Chronicles 30:2ff, where a Passover celebration of Hezekiah is recorded, as further evidence for his hypothesis.³⁹ The disciples, he argued, did not observe the Passover at the appointed time, the year Jesus was crucified. They celebrated it a month later.⁴⁰ Spitta also held that this postponed Passover celebration is to be considered as the Sitz im Leben of the confession τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός (1 Cor. 5:7). This Passover meal, which was now filled with a new content, must have appealed to the disciples as a new institution. Psalms 116 and 118 must now have been considered as a fulfillment of prophecy concerning the death and resurrection of Jesus. Israel's deliverance from Egypt by Moses was now seen as a type of the final deliverance by the Messiah Jesus.⁴¹

Spitta obviously recognized the hypothetical nature of his argument. Therefore, he attempted to find further support for it by suggesting that during this postponed Passover celebration, the Risen Lord had appeared to his disciples. He also assumed that in the spurious ending of Mark and Acts 1:4, reference is made to this Passover meal.⁴² In the light of this consideration, Spitta discerned a parallel between this last meal of the Risen Lord and his disciples, and the last meal before his death.⁴³ In both cases, after the meal was ended, Jesus led the disciples to the Mount of Olives. Both times he was taken away from them. The first time he was captured by his enemies, who led him to his death. The second time, he was separated from them by the shadows of the night and the darkness of a cloud, in which

he disappeared, in order not to reveal himself to them again. In the light of this argument Spitta concluded that this farewell meal was indeed a Passover meal.⁴⁴

On the basis of his critical examination of his former position, Spitta concluded that the Last Supper could not be identified with a Passover meal. Without engaging in a detailed analysis of his arguments against the Passover theory, it is important to note that according to Spitta the primitive Christian community celebrated the Passover in a specifically Christian way. This basic thesis was recently developed in detail by B. Lohse in Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner.⁴⁵ Spitta's theory, however, was based upon mere speculation, for he contended that the first Christian Passover celebration coincided with the postponed Passover celebration. In support of this view he had appealed to some obscure Jewish regulations concerning the observance of the Passover, in case one was unable to participate in the celebration of the feast at the appointed time.⁴⁶

Since this theory of the postponed Passover celebration fails to be convincing, his basic distinction between the two different types of the words of interpretation becomes untenable also.

According to Spitta, one tradition of the words of interpretation spoken by Jesus at the Last Supper reflects the historical situation of that occasion. But there are also those words which must be understood as a further development of the two concepts *ὥμα* and *αἵμα*. These words represent a later interpretation of the death of Jesus on the basis of the Passover analogy. In other words, the postponed Passover celebration is responsible for the connection of the words of interpretation with the concept of the Lord's death. This

thesis, however, is untenable because his theory of the postponed Pass-over celebration is merely hypothetical. Furthermore, in the light of recent traditio-historical considerations, his view that the interpretative words were spoken by Jesus, must be questioned.

2. Hans Lietzmann

In his famous monograph Messe und Herrenmahl, Lietzmann clearly distinguished between a Jerusalem and a Pauline type of the Eucharist.⁴⁷ Just as his predecessor F. Spitta had, Lietzmann had discovered two different strands of the tradition in the New Testament, and in the liturgical material.⁴⁸ He attempted to trace these traditions back to the historical Jesus for the purpose of establishing not only their historical trustworthiness, but also their theological value.

a) The Jerusalem type of the Eucharist

As the result of his minute reconstruction of both the liturgical and the New Testament materials, Lietzmann portrayed the following development of the Lord's Supper:

The Jerusalem type originated in the table-fellowship of Jesus with his disciples.⁴⁹ In the days of their journeys in Galilee, the disciples had formed with their Master a company of friends, a haburah.⁵⁰ While Jesus was still in the flesh, he had presided at the table. In other words, before the meal began, he pronounced the blessing over the bread, then he broke it and distributed it to the disciples.⁵¹

As soon as the disciples learned that Jesus was not dead but alive, they renewed the daily table-fellowship to which they had become accustomed.⁵² In one respect, this meal celebration had experienced a

change, for Jesus was no longer among his disciples in person. He was now with them "in the spirit," according to his promise in Matthew 18:20. Thus, the daily table-fellowship of the disciples with their Master, had been superseded by the *KOINΩΝΙΑ* with the risen Lord.⁵³

The pattern of the meal celebration remained basically the same. One of the group would pronounce the blessing over the bread, then break it and distribute it to the others. This act was followed by a simple meal.⁵⁴ The disciples drank water rather than wine, because on those journeyings through the land they had learnt from their Master to be temperate and to be content with little.⁵⁵ Not even the "cup of blessing," an essential part of every haburah meal, was passed round at the conclusion of the meal. The meal was not celebrated in a depressed mood, but rather "with gladness" and in answer to the maranatha the "Come, Lord Jesus," of their leader, every meal participant would hail the longed for Lord with shouts of hosannas.⁵⁶ While after the resurrection, the Lord was with his disciples in the Spirit, soon the community came to believe that he would return in the clouds of heaven like Daniel's Son of Man, in order to establish his Messianic Kingdom upon the earth.⁵⁷

This meal celebration soon took on a different form.⁵⁸ To the rather simple nucleus, ideas were added which had their origin in Hellenistic thought.⁵⁹ In other words, those added concepts were unknown to the religion of the Old Testament and the Talmud.⁶⁰ On Hellenistic soil the meal was conceived of in terms of a sacrificial meal.⁶¹ In this process of transformation, other concepts were absorbed as well. Atoning power, for instance, was ascribed to the sacrifice. The elements were no longer considered as simple food, but as

sacred food of a spiritual type. In them dwelt the name, the power of the Lord. As soon as these elements were eaten, they presumably effected in the participant incorruptibility, immortality and eternal life.⁶²

b) The Pauline type of the Eucharist

Besides the Jerusalem type of the Eucharist, there also existed the Pauline type. The latter dates back to about 50 A.D., and can be traced back to an older tradition, which already appears in the Gospel of Mark.⁶³ The Pauline type is different from the Jerusalem type, because here, the supper is not the continuation of the daily table-fellowship of the disciples with the risen and exalted Lord, but is directly connected with the last one of the daily meals. This meal alone was repeated by the community as a memorial of the death of Jesus. It is characterized as a memorial of the death of Jesus, because it was during the last night that Jesus referred to the elements of bread and wine as symbols of his body to be broken in death, and his blood to be poured out.⁶⁴ His death was a sacrificial death for the people. On this basis, he would seal the New Covenant, which was already foretold by the prophet.⁶⁵ Whenever the community re-enacted this meal, it remembered the prophecy of Jesus' death and its fulfillment. It also gave witness to the death, resurrection and the speedy return of their Master.⁶⁶

The further development of this meal type began at a very early stage, for it was soon considered as an analogue to those meals which were held as memorials of great men, founders of religious communities. It was also considered in terms of a sacrificial meal, where elements are invested with divine power and could determine either a man's salva-

tion or his condemnation.⁶⁷ By partaking of these elements, a new union between the Lord and the fellow believer was formed. This in turn resulted in a corpus mysticum of the church. Thus, the transformation of a simple table-fellowship of primitive times into the mystical κοινωνία was effected.⁶⁸

The Pauline type of the Eucharist could be labelled as an etiological cult legend, if the metaphor "This is my body" could be explained in terms of a liturgical development. This cannot be done. The metaphor cannot simply be denied to Jesus. Thus, Lietzmann held that it would be impossible to see a connection between the Jerusalem type and the Pauline type of the Eucharist.⁶⁹ The tradition of Jesus' last meal and of the metaphor of his death, used by him on that occasion is to be recognized as a historically reliable tradition.⁷⁰ But whence comes this second type which deviates from the Jerusalem type? Contrary to Kittel,⁷¹ who argued that Paul is here simply following the tradition, and with Hirsch,⁷² Lietzmann maintained that Paul is the genius who gave a new meaning to the sacred supper of the church at Jerusalem. The idea, however, came to the apostle "by revelation."⁷³ In other words, the risen Lord himself has revealed it to Paul. In this connection, Lietzmann pointed out that even though one is engaged in a historical investigation, it is possible to take the apostle at his word. The basic story of the Last Supper was known to the apostle from the church's tradition, but the special understanding as to the function of this rite in the church, came to him by revelation.⁷⁴

At this point, the question arises: "How did Lietzmann reach such conclusions?"

He held that if it should turn out that the numerous liturgical

forms could be traced to certain primitive types, then it would be possible to work back to their roots. As one compares these roots with the contemporary literary records it may be possible to penetrate to the liturgical practice of the Apostolic Age and of the Jerusalem community of disciples.⁷⁵

Therefore, Lietzmann started his investigation with the great wealth of the liturgical material, in order to recover their oldest strata.⁷⁶ On the basis of his minute analysis of the great authoritative branches of the Eastern and Western liturgies,⁷⁷ he was able to determine their two basic archetypes: (1) the Hippolytan-Roman, and (2) the Egyptian.⁷⁸

Consequently, the starting point for his further enquiry was the extant text of Hippolytus or, alternatively, its Greek reconstruction, and on the other hand, the oldest form of the Egyptian liturgy.⁷⁹ The Anaphora of Sarapion⁸⁰ is the oldest document of the Egyptian liturgy. From this basis, Lietzmann attempted to reach back to the Apostolic Age. He saw a direct connection between Sarapion, the Didache and the Jerusalem type of the Eucharist.⁸¹ The latter type, Lietzmann pointed out, represents the simpler form of the two meal types.⁸²

(1) The Hippolytan liturgy

On the basis of his examination of the Hippolytan liturgy, Lietzmann concluded that this liturgical form could be traced back to a more primitive form, one which was already found in the practice of the Pauline churches.⁸³ In support of his view, Lietzmann pointed especially to the narrative of institution in the Hippolytan liturgy, which characterizes the celebration of the Lord's Supper as a memorial

of the death of Jesus.⁸⁴ On the basis of these considerations, Lietzmann had no difficulty in seeing a close connection between the Hippolytan liturgy, and the Pauline type of the Eucharist.⁸⁵ Since we have already discussed the Pauline type, it will be necessary to turn to Lietzmann's reconstruction of the Jerusalem type of the Eucharist.

(2) The Anaphora of Sarapion

Lietzmann began his reconstruction of the Jerusalem type of the Eucharist with an analysis of the Anaphora of Sarapion, the oldest document of the Egyptian liturgy.⁸⁶ According to Lietzmann, Sarapion's liturgy does not represent one uniform liturgical type. It is rather to be considered as the result of a gradual mingling of different elements.⁸⁷ The narrative of institution even appears as a foreign element.⁸⁸ The original type of this liturgy did not know of such a narrative at all. In other words, this liturgy did not connect the Supper with those conceptions which are characteristic of the Pauline type of the Eucharist, such as the memorial of the death and the remembrance of Jesus' Last Supper. Lietzmann found further support for his thesis on the basis of the omitted anamnesis. This idea was added at a later time. It had arisen on another soil and had the sanction of Pauline authority.⁸⁹

In Lietzmann's opinion, the Egyptian liturgy is rooted in the Didache.⁹⁰ There can be no doubt about the presence of the Eucharist in the Didache.⁹¹ The choice of expressions as well as the position of the section in the whole, lend strong support to this. The "Eucharist" as referred to in Didache XIV is identical with the one of Didache IX

and X.⁹² The course of the ceremony begins with a short prayer over the cup. A longer prayer follows over the broken bread. After this ceremony follows a regular meal for the satisfaction of the people's physical needs of hunger and thirst. At the conclusion of the meal (μετὰ τὸ ἐμπληροθῆναι) a prayer of thanksgiving was offered.⁹³ A comparison of this rite with the Pauline rite, brings the following, rather striking characteristics into focus:⁹⁴

1. Transfer of the "cup of blessing" from the end to the beginning of the meal. Thus it is being placed before the bread, rather than after it.⁹⁵
2. No reference was made to the memorial of the death of Jesus, of his body and blood of the covenant or of a remembrance of the Last Supper on the night of his betrayal.⁹⁶

The meal type as evidenced in the Didache and in Sarapion is also reflected in the Acts of the Apostles,⁹⁷ where the eucharistic service of the church is simply called κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, "the breaking of the bread" (Acts 2:42, 46; 20:11).

Lietzmann found further evidence for this meal type in writings such as the Apocryphal Acts of Peter,⁹⁸ John⁹⁹ and Thomas.¹⁰⁰ He also pointed out that only where this form of the rite had been practiced, could the prototype of the Eucharist be found in the miraculous feeding, where bread was the central feature of the meal. In this connection, Lietzmann called attention to the Roman pictures of the catacombs from the beginning of the second century,¹⁰¹ and to the position of John 6:27-58, in connection with the feeding of the five thousand.¹⁰²

Besides certain meal types where the "breaking of bread" was the central feature, there existed others where milk or even honey could

serve as a substitute for wine.¹⁰³ While this seems to point to Pauline influence upon this meal celebration, the Pauline conception of the remembrance of the Lord's death, however, was foreign to it.¹⁰⁴

The phrase "the breaking of bread" in Acts, according to Lietzmann, is not an a parte potiore description. It rather indicates that on this occasion only bread was broken. This view can also be supported on the basis of Acts 20:11 and Luke 24:30 (cf. vs. 35).¹⁰⁵ These facts are in complete agreement with the facts described in the shorter Lucan text. From this, it follows that Luke describes a Eucharist which is characterized by eschatological hopes and where bread is the essential feature.¹⁰⁶ Thus, Lietzmann has found sufficient evidence in support of his hypothesis of a Jerusalem type, which may be defined as the continuation of the daily table-fellowship of the disciples with their Lord.¹⁰⁷ This type of the Eucharist is characterized by the breaking of ~~the~~ bread at the beginning of the meal and by its total detachment from the last meal of Jesus.

c) The "breaking of bread"

In support of his two-type hypothesis, Lietzmann had appealed to Luke 24:30 (cf. verse 35); Acts 2:42, 46 and 20:7-11 in order to prove that the expression "breaking of bread" is to be understood in the sense that at the eucharistic celebrations of the primitive Christian community, only bread was eaten and no wine was drunk.¹⁰⁸

This hypothesis must now be examined in detail. As to the origin of the term "breaking of bread," Marxsen¹⁰⁹ had pointed out that it stems from Jewish table-customs. Each Jewish meal began with grace (εὐλογία or εὐχαριστία.grk.). After the pronouncement of grace,

the paterfamilias would break the loaf of bread and distribute it to those eating with him.¹¹⁰

What did this particular term designate? Is it possible to equate "the breaking of bread" in Acts with the Eucharist? According to J. Munck,¹¹¹ there is no evidence for such an equation. In his opinion, the Jerusalem church invested these common meals with a quasi-sacramental meaning as a manifestation of unity.

In the opinion of Betz,¹¹² Bultmann¹¹³ and others, the designation "breaking of bread" refers to the whole meal. Betz,¹¹⁴ for instance, maintains that in Judaism this phrase was understood in terms of the introductory rite to the meal. In the Christian community, however, the expression experienced a change of meaning. Here it was applied to the total meal. From the very beginning the term "breaking of bread" had the tendency to develop into a terminus technicus for the actual Eucharist. Therefore, it is quite certain that the phrase κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου has a eucharistic note.¹¹⁵

In Bultmann's opinion, it is very doubtful whether "the breaking of bread" (Acts 2:42) or "to break bread" (Acts 2:46; 20:7, 11;) was ever used as a technical designation for the Lord's Supper. So far as the Lord's Supper was a meal, "breaking of bread" could be used of it, even though the phrase itself did not denote the sacramental meal (1 Cor. 10:16; Didache 14:1). By way of definition, the phrase "breaking of bread" means, simply, a meal. The community meals of Acts 2:42, 46 show a remarkable outward resemblance to the Jewish meals. The latter began with an act of bread-breaking and the accompanying blessing. These two parts of the rite belong together.¹¹⁶ In disagreement with Lietzmann,¹¹⁷ Bultmann¹¹⁸ allows for the use of wine at such a meal,

provided that it was available. Wine, however, had no cultic significance,¹¹⁹ otherwise the meal could not have been called simply "the breaking of bread." As to the origin of these meals, Bultmann pointed to the table-fellowship which Jesus had with his disciples. Like Lietzmann, he saw no relationship between the community meals in Acts and the Last Supper of Jesus.¹²⁰ His argument, however, that the meals in Acts were called "the breaking of bread," because wine had no cultic significance, hardly makes sense.

According to Otto,¹²¹ the phrase "breaking of bread" unquestionably signifies the meal of a fellowship of religious brethren.

In Marxsen's¹²² opinion, however, the whole dispute, whether *κλᾶν ἄρτον* designates the whole meal, or just the introductory rite, is to be settled on a different level. He argued that *κλᾶν ἄρτον* cannot simply be equated with having a meal. The expression *σπῆς σπῆς* does not literally mean "breaking of bread." It also refers to the meal to follow.¹²³ On the basis of an examination of the pre-Easter accounts Matthew 14:19 (par. Mark 6:41 and Luke 9:16, *κατὰ κλᾶν*), Matthew 15:36 and the pericopes of institution, he concluded that with the exception of Mark 8:19, we can clearly distinguish between the following constitutive elements of a meal: (1) the *εὐχαριστία*; (2) the *κλᾶν ἄρτον*, and (3) a brief sketch of the meal itself. In all these cases the breaking of bread designates the introductory rite, or the table-prayer.¹²⁴

In an attempt to determine the meaning of the expression in the post-Easter accounts, Marxsen took Acts 27:35 as his point of departure.¹²⁵ In his opinion, this text as compared with the pre-Easter accounts, shows the least difference.¹²⁶ The text features a simple meal. As a prisoner, the apostle Paul urged the soldiers and the sailors

to partake of some food (μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς) so that they may be strengthened. After that the account continues λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησεν τῷ θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων καὶ κλάσας ἤρξατο ἐσθίειν. Then all of them were encouraged and ate some food themselves (καὶ αὐτοὶ προσελάβοντο τροφῆς).¹²⁷

On the basis of these statements, Nielsen concluded that the expression κλᾶν ἄρτον and μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς are synonyms.¹²⁸ In other words, the phrase κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, cannot mean anything else, but having a meal.¹²⁹ In Marxsen's opinion, this conclusion proves to be false once it is recognized that μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς corresponds to ἐσθίειν. This would mean that εὐχαριστεῖν and the κλᾶν ἄρτον form the introductory rite to the meal, which in this case is indicated by ἐσθίειν.¹³⁰ The view that the breaking of bread designates the eucharistic action as distinct from the meal of satiation, is held by B. Reicke¹³¹ and Ph. H. Menoud.¹³²

With regard to Acts 2:42, 46 Jeremias had argued that the four phrases found in verse 42: (1) teaching, (2) κοινωνία, (3) breaking of bread, and (4) prayers, are a description of the typical stages of a primitive Christian service. On the assumption that the κοινωνία in Acts 2:42 refers to the agape, the breaking of bread must mean the subsequent Eucharist.¹³³

In Haenchen's¹³⁴ opinion, the opening action to the ritual meal came to designate the whole meal. Therefore, the κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου must be considered as a designation for the Christian community meal.

According to Gaugler,¹³⁵ there can be no doubt that the breaking of bread in Acts 2:42 refers to the Eucharist. This argument can be supported on the basis that the κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου appears among the consti-

tutive elements of the community's life. The same phrase also occurs in the writings of Ignatius (Eph. 2:20) and in the Didache (ch. 14).

In Marxsen's opinion,¹³⁶ Gaugler has rightly observed that *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* appears among the constitutive elements of the community's life. He also argued that the term "breaking of bread" neither refers to the mere act of breaking, nor to the *κοινωνία*, which is constituted at the meal.

Marxsen, however, made a distinction between verses 42 and 46 in the sense that in the former text, he finds a reference to a cultic meal, while in his opinion, verse 46 refers to a common meal.¹³⁷ The validity of this argument, however, must be questioned, for in verse 46 the cultic element is also emphasized in the sense that the Christians were *προςκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἵερῳ*.¹³⁸

In Acts 20:7, 11 we probably find the description of a cultic meal. Bultmann doubts that the meal on "the first day of the week" in Acts 20:7 is the Lord's Supper. Barnabas,¹³⁹ for instance, makes reference to the celebration of the "eighth day," as the day of Jesus' resurrection. But he does not mention the Eucharist.¹⁴⁰

According to the text, the Christians at Troas had gathered for the purpose of breaking bread. On this occasion Paul *διελέγετο αὐτοῖς*. It is possible to assume that Paul preached a farewell sermon to the Christians at Troas. He extended it until midnight, because he had intended to depart the following day. According to Nielsen,¹⁴¹ verse 11 is to be understood in the sense that Paul had just stopped preaching for a moment in order to rest and have a little refreshment. In Nielsen's opinion, in verse 11 the term "breaking of bread" is simply mentioned in passing, as though it was only of little importance. He argued that in

this verse, probably a common meal was intended.¹⁴² This view, however, is hardly convincing, because the real purpose of the gathering at Troas was the breaking of bread. Furthermore, it is very unlikely that a common meal was held after midnight. Thus, it would be more reasonable to assume that Paul, after he had presented his farewell discourse, climaxed it with the breaking of bread, which is the Eucharist.¹⁴³

In Marxsen's opinion,¹⁴⁴ the expression *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* as found in Acts, has retained the same meaning which it had in the Old Testament. In agreement with Haenchen¹⁴⁵ and against Jeremias,¹⁴⁶ he contended that this expression does not point to the beginnings of the *disciplina arcani*. Opposing Arnold,¹⁴⁷ Betz,¹⁴⁸ Bultmann¹⁴⁹ and others who argued that the breaking of bread is to be equated with having a meal, Marxsen insisted that this expression is to be defined in terms of the introductory rite to the meal. Thus it could be equated with the table-prayer (Acts 27:35).¹⁵⁰

Assuming that the breaking of bread as the introductory rite is to be distinguished from the meal proper, we must remember that we cannot consider it as an isolated entity which has no connections with the meal itself. Apart from the meal, the rite becomes absolutely meaningless, especially where a living relationship with Jewish customs at meals still existed.¹⁵¹ In Corinth, for instance, the Eucharist, which had developed into a cultic celebration, was still connected with a meal. In the light of this observation, Lessig pointed out that the designation "breaking of bread" cannot be taken as evidence for a meal celebration, where only bread was used. While we agree with Lessig¹⁵² that the breaking of bread does not point to a meal celebration, where only bread was used, it should be pointed out that the Eucharist was a cultic celebration

from the beginning.

How are we to interpret these cultic celebrations in Acts 2:42 and 20:11? Is it possible to detect any eucharistic overtones in these references? In other words, is it conceivable that these primitive communities already celebrated the Eucharist with the two elements of bread and wine? Or must we agree with Lietzmann,¹⁵³ who interpreted the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* as a designation of a single act? In Marxsen's¹⁵⁴ opinion, Lietzmann has rightly observed that in Acts 2:42 and 20:11; reference is made to eucharistic celebrations, although these Eucharists are of the Jerusalem type. Lietzmann was also right in pointing out that the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* is not a designation a parte potiori. He is wrong, however, in arguing that the term designates only one single act, namely the breaking of bread.¹⁵⁵

The two references, Luke 24:30-35 and Acts 27:35 are to be excluded as evidence, because in neither one of these texts is mention made of a community meal. In Luke 24:30, we simply find a description of the whole introductory rite to the meal.¹⁵⁶ While it is not clear how the disciples were able to recognize their Lord, it is quite certain that they did not recognize him in connection with the common meal.¹⁵⁷

According to Kilmartin,¹⁵⁸ the detailed description of the common introductory rite of the meal of Emmaus points to the description found in the account of institution. The term "breaking of bread" (Luke 24:35) is to be understood as the earliest designation of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, it cannot be considered in terms of an isolated action as Marxsen seems to hold. While the eucharistic colouring of this phrase has led some authors to equate this Easter meal (Luke 24:30, 35) with the Eucharist, Kilmartin argued that such an

interpretation does not seem to be well supported.¹⁵⁹

In defense of his thesis that the term "breaking of bread" is to be interpreted in the sense that the meals of the primitive Christian community consisted of bread only, Lietzmann had also appealed to the short text of Luke¹⁶⁰ and to Acts 20:7-11.¹⁶¹

Since we will examine the Lucan text in detail later on, it will not be necessary to deal with these problems here.¹⁶² It is necessary, however, to point out that in our opinion, there are good reasons for giving preference to the longer reading, Luke 22:15-20. But even if we would have to acknowledge the authenticity of the short text, it would hardly lend any support to Lietzmann's thesis of a Lord's Supper without wine. In this connection, Schweizer¹⁶³ has pointed out that the Lucan account cannot be considered as evidence for a wineless Eucharist.

With regard to Acts 20:7-11, we may raise the question: "Does this passage really lend any support to the view that at Troas Paul has eaten bread only?" In the light of this passage, Lietzmann's foundation for the two-type hypothesis appears to be rather shaky.¹⁶⁴ First of all, we notice that it is the apostle Paul himself who "broke bread (κλάσας ἄρτον.) and ate." According to Lietzmann, the apostle was also the creator of the second type of the Eucharist.

Dix¹⁶⁵ had already become very indignant over Lietzmann's argumentation. In his opinion, Paul, who is said to have broken bread at Troas, must have celebrated this rite according to the pattern of 1 Corinthians 11:23ff. In other words, he held that there was no basis for the assumption that at Troas Paul celebrated the Eucharist in the Jerusalem style, while at Corinth he followed his own pattern of the rite.

In Richardson's¹⁶⁶ opinion, however, Dix has simply overlooked

the conflicting evidence. His approach to the problem provides an outstanding example of the presuppositions which paralyze theological research. The basic problem, which deserves our careful consideration, has to do with the relationship between Luke and Paul.¹⁶⁷ This relation between Luke and Paul constitutes a crux which is far from being solved as far as the subject of eucharistic origins is concerned.¹⁶⁸

On the basis of his examination of the Lucan references to the breaking of bread, Richardson concluded that the third evangelist puts the stress upon the breaking of bread, the fundamental rite of the Christian Supper. On high occasions this rite was preceded by the drinking of the cup.¹⁶⁹ On the assumption that Luke was thinking of the Pauline rite in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22, the problem of the relationship between Luke and Paul finds its solution. Unless Luke had this Pauline rite of 1 Corinthians 10:1-22 in mind the gulf between Luke and Paul can never be bridged.¹⁷⁰ But since the inverted order cup-bread in 1 Corinthians 10 could also be explained differently, Richardson's argument fails to be convincing.¹⁷¹

On the other hand, the term "breaking of bread" is fairly common in Jewish sources, in the general sense of "to have a meal." Since the early Christians or at least their leaders were Jews, it would seem to be natural that their meal celebrations would follow the pattern of an ordinary Jewish meal as it was held when friends were present. Such a meal was introduced by the breaking and distribution of bread and the blessing of the cup of wine after the meal. If these community meals are seen against their Jewish background, we can see no basis for Lietzmann's argument that the primitive Christian community meals consisted of bread only.¹⁷²

It should also be pointed out that the Eucharists of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles¹⁷³ can hardly be considered as evidence for a Eucharist without wine. The exclusion of wine from the Eucharist is to be attributed to the encratite tendencies of these works.¹⁷⁴

d) The theological emphases

On the basis of his analysis of the meal traditions in Acts and in 1 Corinthians 11, Lietzmann distinguished between two different theological emphases.¹⁷⁵ He pointed out that the meal celebrations in Acts 2:42, 46 were characterized by an overflowing eschatological joy (*ἀγαλλίασις*), while the Pauline type of the Eucharist (1 Corinthians 11:23f) was essentially characterized by the concept of the death of Jesus.¹⁷⁶ In Lietzmann's opinion, these two distinctly different theological perspectives lend strong support to the two-type hypothesis.

In order to find a solution to this problem it will be necessary to gain an understanding of the situation in the primitive Christian community.¹⁷⁷ The early Christians always interpreted and thought about the death of Jesus in the light of Easter.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, when in Acts 2:15ff Peter speaks about the death of Jesus, he does so in the context of the resurrection.¹⁷⁹ In the light of Easter, the death of Jesus no longer appears as a cause for sadness. On the contrary, since Easter the early Christians interpreted the death of Jesus in terms of a saving event. Thus it was a cause for rejoicing. In view of this consideration, the apparent contradiction between the emphasis upon the death of Jesus on the one hand and on the aspect of gladness on the other, simply disappears.

3. Ernst Lohmeyer

A little over a decade after the publication of Lietzmann's monograph, Lohmeyer¹⁸⁰ published a series of articles in which he discussed the recent developments in eucharistic research. In his essay, "Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," however, Lohmeyer succinctly stated his position as to the problem of eucharistic origins and the development of the rite.¹⁸¹

In reference to the actual purpose of his detailed account to the current literature, Lohmeyer points to the real need of a clear orientation in matters pertaining to eucharistic research. Thus he states: "It is necessary to stop and to look back on the road one has already walked, even if it does not seem to be a very long one, in order to see whether one is not headed in the wrong direction and in order to focus in more intensely on the goal."¹⁸² He points out that during the fifteen years previously, scholars have dealt with detailed questions which they had separated from the total complex. The problem of the Eucharist as a whole still awaits a solution.¹⁸³

Lohmeyer, obviously impressed by the theory of the double origin of the Eucharist in the primitive community, presents another variant of this thesis. His method is different from that of Lietzmann, in that he restricted himself to the examination of the New Testament evidence. His primary concern was with the meal-fellowships of the earthly Jesus.¹⁸⁴

Lietzmann, on the other hand, had started his investigation with the great wealth of the liturgical materials of a later age, attempting to trace the origin back to the first century A.D.¹⁸⁵ In his analysis of the meal customs of Jesus, Lohmeyer does not distinguish between their historical versus their legendary character. Furthermore, he is not con-

cerned to categorize them in terms of community sayings or as Jesus logia. His basic aim was to demonstrate what the primitive church had considered to be the origin of its meal celebration.¹⁸⁶

While Lohmeyer had accepted Lietzmann's basic thesis of the double origin of the Eucharist, he modified it considerably. Lietzmann's Jerusalem type he connected with the nucleus of Galilean Christianity and the Pauline type with the church at Jerusalem.¹⁸⁷ According to Lietzmann, the two meal types existed side by side as distinctly different and unrelated entities.¹⁸⁸ Lohmeyer, on the other hand, was concerned to show their interrelationship.¹⁸⁹ The meal celebration of the primitive community had a double origin--the model of the feeding of the multitude, and the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples.¹⁹⁰

In his criticism of Lietzmann's hypothesis, Lohmeyer pointed out that his predecessor was not concerned with individual questions, but rather with a comprehensive investigation.¹⁹¹ As important as the results of Lietzmann's investigation may be, they do not represent a new avenue of research. Lietzmann's study is primarily concerned with the history of the liturgy.¹⁹² The material itself can hardly be considered as new and the problem had already been recognized by other scholars such as G. P. Wetter.¹⁹³ The new factor which Lietzmann has introduced, however, is the methodological sobriety which is characteristic of his work, and the many historical connections he had pointed out.¹⁹⁴

With regard to English scholarship,¹⁹⁵ Lohmeyer declares that it is not satisfied only with determining the backgrounds of the Christian liturgy, i.e., with the recognition of the existence of the various traditions. It does not decide in favour of one in order to reject the other. English scholarship considers hardly at all the possibility that one or

the other account may be an etiological cult-legend. On the basis of all the data in the New Testament, it rather seeks to define the one event, which, on account of its founder, is the sole reason of the Christian celebration.¹⁹⁶ This aspect comes to the forefront, and because of it, the historical origins, whichever they may be, turn into Jewish backgrounds.¹⁹⁷ All important, however, is the unique action of Jesus, which cannot be explained in terms of religionsgeschichtliche analogies.

German scholarship, according to Lohmeyer, has paid special attention to Jewish backgrounds.¹⁹⁸ Its primary concern was to find out whether the last meal can be identified with a Passover meal, a Sabbath kiddush or a haburah meal.

In Lohmeyer's opinion, only a few characteristics of the Lord's Supper can find an explanation in the light of these special meals.¹⁹⁹ This leads to the question: "What is the actual purpose of the search for these backgrounds?" If, for instance, bread- and cup-blessings as well as bread- and cup-words occurred with the daily, religious meal custom, what would be the significance of this custom for the content of the Lord's Supper? No matter whence we may derive the gestures and words of Jesus, it is always presupposed that there exists a close relationship between the form and the content of that which is reported. In other words, it bears the character of a sacred action.²⁰⁰

According to Feneberg,²⁰¹ Lohmeyer's concern for the specifically historical form of Jesus' meal is original with the English school. His concern with the Jewish backgrounds which might help to clarify the meal conceptions of Jesus, is original to German scholarship.²⁰²

The Lord's Supper poses a problem of a literary and theological nature.²⁰³ It also brings into focus the question concerning its form.²⁰⁴

In his attempt to solve this problem, Lohmeyer attempted to establish the meaning and customs of the Lord's Supper in the primitive Palestinian community. The starting point of his investigation, however, was the meal-conceptions and customs of Jesus.²⁰⁵

In Lohmeyer's opinion, these meal-conceptions of Jesus encompass all aspects of the message of Jesus.²⁰⁶ But the miraculous meal at the Sea of Galilee exhibits all the characteristics and confirms all ideas which have been developed from the meal-words of Jesus.²⁰⁷

First of all, this meal is a simple, daily meal, where Jesus functioned as host. He had probably done this before in a similar manner at the meal with the tax-collectors. As a Jewish paterfamilias, Jesus feeds his guests according to the religious custom and with simple food, so that all will be satisfied. This is the purpose as well as the result of the meal. Its special feature, however, is the miracle which Jesus performs in connection with the feeding of the multitude. On this occasion his power and dignity as the Son of Man is revealed, but it is hidden at the same time. The miracle represents a sign of the eschatological nearness of the Kingdom of God and the presence of its Lord, who is still hidden. While healings can only save the individual, words can only express a demand or a promise. But this miracle represents a piece of the reality of the eschatological consummation, when Jesus will eat and drink with his disciples at his table. The aspect of the miraculous characterizes the meal as an eschatological celebration.²⁰⁸

The way the disciples and the crowd participate in the meal leads to another important consideration. The disciples are the ones feeding the crowd. They do it in an almost ceremonious, solemn manner. Expressed in later terms, one might say that the disciples serve at the table of the

Lord. Their service is characterized by the solemnity of a sacred action.²⁰⁹

The multitude consists of the poor and the hungry. Jesus, however, does not feed them solely in order to satisfy their hunger, but also because of the eschatological significance of the miraculous meal. The multitude, though hidden, represents the eschatological community.²¹⁰

After a brief discussion of the miraculous meal on the Sea of Galilee, Lohmeyer turns to an examination of the last meal of Jesus with his disciples.²¹¹ Of the innumerable questions which are concerned with the theological content of the Eucharist, he touches only on some points of real significance regarding the celebration of the primitive community.²¹² In Lohmeyer's opinion, the meal which Jesus held with the disciples seems to exhibit features which are identical to those of the miraculous feeding, or, Jesus' meals with the tax-collectors:²¹³

1. Jesus eats and drinks with his own and he will continue to do so in the Kingdom of God. In other words, the eschatological Lord eats and drinks with the disciples at the dawn of his life.²¹⁴
2. Jesus appears as the paterfamilias, who offers bread and wine to his disciples. They are his guests and possible future heirs of the Kingdom.²¹⁵
3. No special form of the last meal is known.²¹⁶
4. The cup-word has more than one meaning. On one hand, it is directed against the people of the covenant, the Jewish nation.²¹⁷ On the other hand, it is directed towards those, who some day soon will take hold of the diatheke.²¹⁸ At the moment of the Last Supper, however, it is concerned with the small circle of the disciples, who are fellows of the present and the eschatological meal, members of the Kingdom, heirs of past covenants and bearers of the covenant of God with the many.²¹⁹

The data about the celebration of the Lord's Supper in Acts were rather impenetrable.²²⁰ Of the five references, Acts 20:7, 11 and 27:35 belong to the latter part of the Pauline era and therefore cannot be treated within the context of the present discussion. The term "breaking of bread" cannot be used in a strict sense.²²¹ In Acts 27:35 it may refer to the breakfast which Paul had in order to gain physical strength. The passage Acts 20:7-12 seems to refer to a meal. But if this meal was the aim and purpose of the Sunday meeting, it was cultic in nature.²²² Since the breaking of bread takes place daily (Luke 24:29ff and Acts 20:1), early in the evening, at the time of the main meal, it is probable that the expression, just as in the Old Testament and in late Judaism, refers to a meal.²²³

The breaking of bread in the primitive Christian community is both. It is a daily meal which hardly differs from the customary Jewish meals. At the same time, it is a meal, which is to be considered as the inner core of the true feast of the Jesus-believing community.²²⁴ The interrelationship becomes clear in the light of Acts 6:1-6.²²⁵ The daily meals of the primitive community, which are an eschatological celebration, are also love-meals for the poor.²²⁶ At this point the question arises: "On which basis are these threefold features related to one another?" In Lohmeyer's opinion, there is only one decisive pattern for the serving at table, namely the miraculous feeding (Mark 6:35-44).²²⁷ Therefore, Lohmeyer detects a close relationship between the daily meals of the primitive Christian community, which may be considered as divine service, and agape, and the miraculous feeding of Mark 6.²²⁸ The daily meals of the primitive Christian community do not have their roots in the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples, but rather in Jesus' miraculous meal at

the Sea of Galilee.²²⁹ The Last Supper of Jesus fits into the line of the origin of later meal celebrations. Since it emerged from the meal conception of Jesus in its general character, it is therefore linked with the meal of the primitive Christian community.²³⁰ In support of his thesis, Lohmeyer also appealed to the evidence in Paul, Luke and John.

The addition of the Pauline *ὑμῶν*- phrase, which appears in connection with the bread-word of 1 Corinthians 11:24 but is omitted in Mark 14:22, seems to be the first indication of the influence of the meal custom of the primitive Christian community.²³¹ In the primitive community, this celebration is called the breaking of bread and it is in the process of breaking of bread that the Lord was recognized (Luke 24:30f). Therefore, is it not to be expected that the addition was made to the bread-word?²³²

An even stronger influence becomes apparent as we consider the cup-word. Here, the phrase "poured out for many" is left out.²³³ This omission effected a change in meaning. The Lord's Supper is no longer for the many, i.e., for the nations, but for the community which is gathered for the meal. The bread-word, therefore, establishes a celebration, which is to be considered in terms of the community's most inner sanctuary and constant memorial.²³⁴ With this understanding, however, we find ourselves in the wake of the Galilean tradition of the primitive community and the meal-custom, which is practised by the Jerusalem community.²³⁵

In short, all the deviations of the Pauline version of the account of the Last Supper as compared with the Marcan account teach us one important lesson: the Pauline account of the Lord's Supper displays Galilean features.²³⁶ From a literary point of view, the narrative of

the miraculous meal and the account of the Lord's Supper have influenced each other. The Pauline account of the Lord's Supper helps to clarify this relationship.²³⁷

The results of the analysis of the Pauline account find a strong confirmation by the Lucan accounts.²³⁸ In Luke 22:16 the meal is designated as a Passover meal. But while in this meal description, one can discover a hint to the meal in the Kingdom of God, this account is to be understood as the institution of a special meal-fellowship dependent upon the Passover meal.²³⁹

The idea that the Passover meal represents the first stage towards the meal in the Kingdom of God is closely linked to the proclamation of Jesus, though pale and vague in linguistic form. It appears as an altered repetition of Luke 22:18.²⁴⁰ The last meal of Jesus begins with a special cup-word and a special cup-action. While this action may be rooted in the Passover ritual, it is clear that the command to divide the cup goes beyond the framework of a Passover ritual.²⁴¹

The institution of a new meal fellowship dependent upon the Passover meal becomes meaningful on the basis of the following considerations: The *yp* introduces in a meaningful way the idea that Jesus himself will no longer have a part in this meal fellowship. Therefore, the fellowship of Jesus with the disciples, which is instituted now, is designed to help the disciples bridge the dark interval, which must last "until the Kingdom comes." Since in this meal celebration the relationship between the disciples and their master is still indistinct, the action with the bread and the bread-word is added, for in it, reference is made to the One. Hence, the presence of the master with his disciples is realized. From this point of view the account is in no need of supplementation, for it

establishes the lasting meal-fellowship of Jesus with his disciples.²⁴²

That which is newly established fits into the scheme of development, leading from the earlier to the future meals. In the days to come, the master remains as giver of bread and wine.²⁴³ But the meal fraternity of master and disciples supersedes the meal-fellowship.²⁴⁴ Therefore, in Luke one is able to discover the same ideas controlling the Galilean meal celebration. The peculiarities of the Lucan account present no problem as soon as it is recognized that it is part of the Galilean tradition.²⁴⁵ According to this tradition, Jesus celebrated the Passover bodily with his disciples. Here, the cup-word which makes the death of Jesus the basis of the New Covenant is missing.²⁴⁶ The meaning of the Lord's Supper "for many" is no longer emphasized. These and other features allow us to assign to the Lucan account a special position in the history of the tradition. As happened in a different manner in Paul, so the Galilean tradition has transformed the Marcan account of the Jerusalem tradition and has adapted it according to its own presuppositions.²⁴⁷

The last evidence in support of the view of the connections sketched out thus far, can be seen in John 6 and 13. The close relationship between John 6 and the miraculous feeding undoubtedly points to the Galilean tradition. John 13 shows a close affinity to that tradition also, because of its total silence about the institution of the Lord's Supper.²⁴⁸

According to Lohmeyer, the evidence found in the Gospel of Luke, the Gospel of John and in the Pauline account of the Lord's Supper, confirms the thesis of the double origin of the Eucharist in the primitive Christian community.²⁴⁹ In his opinion, the meal celebration of the

primitive Christian community circles, just like an ellipse, around two foci: the miraculous meal of Jesus at the Sea of Galilee and the last meal of Jesus in Jerusalem.²⁵⁰ From a literary point of view, it is possible to distinguish between a Galilean and a Jerusalem tradition. But this duality has its basis in the uniform meal conception of Jesus. From here, the meal celebration of the primitive community is determined in three directions: It is a daily meal, a feeding of the poor and an eschatological meal. Yet, in its threefold relationship it is only the one, namely the meal of the Lord.²⁵¹

a) Critical appraisal

Lohmeyer's hypothesis was also subjected to severe criticisms. Conzelmann, for instance, was unable to find more than one correct element in Lohmeyer's thesis. In his opinion, Lohmeyer had rightly pointed out that the sacramental interpretation was already in existence at a pre-Pauline stage.²⁵²

On the other hand, Lohmeyer was probably the first scholar who has made an attempt towards a theological evaluation of the total meal tradition in the New Testament.²⁵³ Unfortunately, he has not always made a distinction between Jesus and the post-Easter community. From a theological point of view, this creates a problem in that it becomes difficult to distinguish between the teaching of Jesus and the statements of faith of the primitive community.

In Marxsen's opinion, the fact that the early Christians enjoyed regular fellowships (Acts 2:46, 6:1-6), does not warrant the conclusion that these common meals have had a separate existence besides the Lord's Supper.²⁵⁴ On the other hand, Marxsen was very certain that as a rule, the Eucharist with the words attributed to Jesus was celebrated in association with a meal. The conditions at Corinth confirm this view.

Marxsen agreed with Lohmeyer that the disciples only gradually arrived at a fuller understanding of the meaning of the Lord's Supper. Hence it is possible to assume that the form of the celebration has been the result of a certain development.²⁵⁵

But Lohmeyer's thesis of a Galilean and Jerusalem type of the Eucharist is unfounded. In his book Galilaea und Jerusalem²⁵⁶ Lohmeyer had developed the thesis that there were really two "earliest churches" on Palestinian soil, or at least two differing parties: the Galilean and that of Jerusalem. This view is primarily based upon the assumption that the Galilean community expressed its faith in the Son of Man, while the Jerusalem community believed in the Messiah.²⁵⁷ In Bultmann's²⁵⁸ opinion, it is probably correct to assume that there were various practices in the Palestinian church. But he can find no basis for Lohmeyer's contention that the titles "Messiah" and "Son of Man" are the expressions of two differing views about Jesus. Consequently, they cannot be considered as distinguishing marks of two different churches or practices. According to Bultmann, both titles denote the eschatological salvation-bringer.²⁵⁹

In Hahn's²⁶⁰ opinion, Lohmeyer's thesis of the coexistence of two primitive Christian communities, which subscribed to two different Christologies, is unfounded. Lohmeyer's treatment of individual texts fails to be convincing. He concluded that there is no basis for the theory that the Son of Man concept had its Sitz im Leben in the Galilean community, while the faith in the Messiah was a basic characteristic of the Jerusalem community.²⁶¹

Lohmeyer's attempt to distinguish between various centers of the primitive Christian community within the realm of Palestine fails to

convince.²⁶² Consequently, his theory of the existence of the two basic meal-types, namely a Galilean and a Jerusalem-type of the Eucharist, becomes untenable.

4. Oscar Cullmann

Another variation of Lietzmann's two-type hypothesis can be discovered in a series of articles by O. Cullmann.²⁶³ His essay "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper" best presents the author's position on the question of the origin and meaning of the Eucharist.²⁶⁴

Cullmann, like Lohmeyer, has accepted somewhat uncritically Lietzmann's basic thesis of the double origin of the eucharistic rite. He states very succinctly that Lietzmann has made his case by demonstrating the absolute distinctiveness of the two ways of celebrating the Eucharist,²⁶⁵ which, Cullmann holds, would not have a common origin in Jesus' last meal with the disciples.²⁶⁶ In other words, the meal-celebrations in Acts, which are held in a mood of an overflowing, eschatological joy, are evidently of a different origin than the Pauline Lord's Supper, the only type which can claim to have a direct connection with the last meal of Jesus.²⁶⁷

While Cullmann has accepted Lietzmann's basic position of the two types of the Eucharist,²⁶⁸ he disagrees with him on the question of the origin of the eucharistic celebrations by the Christian community before Paul.²⁶⁹ Cullmann argued that Lietzmann had been unable to provide textual evidence for his assumption that the breaking of bread, celebrated by the first Christians, was nothing other than the continuation of the daily table-fellowship which the historical Jesus had shared with his disciples during his lifetime.²⁷⁰ In Cullmann's opinion,

Lietzmann has not satisfactorily demonstrated how Paul could have linked the joyful feast of the first Christians with the Last Supper and its association with the death of Jesus.²⁷¹ Cullmann, therefore, attempts to demonstrate that the love-feasts of the primitive church are not a continuation of the daily meals of Jesus with his disciples, but are rooted in those meals which the disciples held with the Risen Lord.²⁷²

Cullmann also warns of the danger of Lietzmann's "liturgical method."²⁷³ In Cullmann's opinion, it would be wrong to assume that the germ of later developments can already be found in the early days.²⁷⁴

From the beginning, the eucharistic meal of the first Christians was just an ordinary meal, as the phrase "breaking of bread" (Acts 2:42, 46 and 20:11) implies. This term definitely excludes the use of wine, as is also evidenced by the wineless Eucharists being attested by the Apocryphal Acts of John, Peter and Thomas.²⁷⁵

In Cullmann's opinion, there is a fundamental difference between the love-feasts in Acts and the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples.²⁷⁶ The term ἀγαλλίασις in Acts 2:46 denotes a strong manifestation of joy, which appears to be incompatible with a recalling of the Last Supper and with the words of Jesus uttered on that occasion.²⁷⁷

With reference to the meal practices of the primitive church, it is rather significant to notice that in early Christian art as well as in the Gospel of John, fish appears to be an essential feature of the meals which the disciples held with the Risen Lord (Luke 24:42; John 21:12).²⁷⁸

According to Cullmann, this consideration lends support to the view that there exists a relationship between the meals of the primitive Christian community and the meals which were held during the first

appearances of Christ.²⁷⁹ Further support for this thesis can be found in Acts 10:41 and 1:3-4.²⁸⁰ Thus it is clear that the primitive Lord's Supper was strongly motivated by the certainty of the resurrection, the reason for its enthusiastic celebration.²⁸¹

According to Cullmann, these Christian love-feasts are characterized by the recollection of the historical facts of the resurrection, the experience of the invisible presence of the Lord in the bread-breaking community and the eschatological prospect (Rev. 3:20).²⁸² The latter points to the messianic age, where a meal will be the central feature.²⁸³

Cullmann also pointed out that there is a basic difference between the Last Supper and the Lord's Supper. In the latter there is a total lack of the essential concepts which Jesus had expressed at the Last Supper.²⁸⁴

Furthermore, Cullmann clearly distinguishes between the concepts of realism and Christ's real presence. The primitive community thought of Jesus' coming as a real coming, but they did not conceive of it in terms of his descent into the elements.²⁸⁵

In the light of these observations, Cullmann concludes that the joy expressed by the early Christians during the "breaking of bread" has its source in the consciousness they have of eating with the Risen Christ, whom they consider to really be present with them as on Easter Day.²⁸⁶

The Pauline version of the Eucharist is the result of Paul's creative work as a theologian.²⁸⁷ On account of the excesses at Corinth, Paul had to point out to the believers that at the Eucharist the Lord manifests himself as the Risen Lord and also as the Crucified One.²⁸⁸ In the course of his exposition, Paul focussed their attention on the

connection between the Lord's Supper and the last meal of the historical Jesus with his disciples, shortly before his death.²⁸⁹ In Cullmann's opinion, this association was legitimate, because of the historical link which existed between the first meal of the Risen Lord and the Last Supper of the historical Jesus, for the disciples were gathered together after the Lord's death, in order to reflect upon the last meal celebration with their Master.²⁹⁰ This last meal, of course, had taken place only a few days before. The apostle, however, was not interested in the historical connection. He perceived an internal link uniting the eucharistic meal of the early Christians with the meal which was accompanied by words of interpretation.²⁹¹ Paul is the first one who has established this relation between the recalling and the Eucharist. If we may believe his own words (1 Cor. 11:23), this relationship was made plain to him by special revelation. The object of this revelation "of the Lord" was not the historical account of the Last Supper recorded by the apostle. It was, rather, an internal connection.²⁹²

a) Critical appraisal

By appealing to the meals of the disciples with the Risen Lord, Cullmann not only found a basis for the daily meals in Acts. He also considered them in terms of a connecting link between the daily meals and the Pauline Eucharist.²⁹³ On the assumption that the celebration of the meals of the primitive Christian community was directly connected with those meals at which the Risen One appeared, one would expect to find some information about the character of the latter in texts such as Luke 24:36, Acts 1:3ff. This information, however, is simply not there. Luke, for instance, informs us only that Jesus was given some

dried fish (Luke 24:36). The expression in Acts 1:3: "He ate salt with them," does not at all allude to the breaking of bread in the primitive Christian community.²⁹⁴

In Conzelmann's opinion, there is hardly any justification for Cullmann's hypothesis, which seeks to derive the bread breaking in the primitive Christian community from the meals with the Risen Lord, because a meal is not the essential element in these Easter appearances.²⁹⁵

Contrary to Conzelmann's view, Rordorf²⁹⁶ even assumed that at these meals the Risen Lord not only distributed bread and wine, he also pronounced the words of institution.²⁹⁷ This view, however, is merely hypothetical, for it has no basis in the texts themselves. These meals at which the Risen One appeared can hardly be utilized for the purpose of a historical reconstruction, because it is very difficult to establish their historical value.²⁹⁸

Furthermore, Cullmann maintained that the breaking of bread refers to the eucharistic meals of the primitive Christian community, where bread was the essential feature. At such meals one ate and drank whatever one wanted. In other words, wine was not an essential feature of these meals. This consideration was primarily based upon an examination of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles: Here, a cult-meal is being described, where bread was the essential element and where no mention was made of wine.²⁹⁹ With regard to these documents Dix³⁰⁰ pointed out that the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles can hardly be considered as evidence for bread Eucharists. In his opinion, it seems to be quite unscientific to attribute any weight to the tradition which is represented by these relatively late documents.³⁰¹

In basic agreement with Lietzmann, Cullmann sees no valid reason

to deny the historicity of those words, which were believed to have been spoken by Jesus at the Last Supper: "This is my body; this is the blood of my covenant." He, too, holds that these words cannot simply be considered as the result of liturgical practice. Jesus uttered these words in order to affirm that by his death, a new covenant was concluded between God and the Messianic community.³⁰² Cullmann's criterion for the authenticity of these words, however, appears to be inadequate. While he insists that there is no valid reason to deny their authenticity, he fails to provide proof that they were actually spoken by the historical Jesus.

It will be noticed that Cullmann's hypothesis is almost identical to Lietzmann's theory. While Lietzmann had argued that the breaking of bread could be traced back to the daily fellowship of Jesus with his disciples, Cullmann held that this practice had its origin in the consciousness the disciples had of eating with the Risen Lord.

In our opinion, Cullmann's hypothesis is untenable for at least two basic reasons: First, we have recognized that it is primarily based upon Lietzmann's two-type hypothesis, which we were unable to accept. Secondly, his attempt to establish a historical connection between the last meal of Jesus and the daily meals of the primitive community, with the help of the appearances of the Risen Lord during a meal, fails to be convincing. These narratives of the appearances of the Risen One during a meal can hardly be utilized for the purpose of a historical reconstruction.

5. Eduard Schweizer

Schweizer's essay, "Das Abendmahl eine Vergegenwaertigung des

Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl," was published in 1946.³⁰³ It represents the first serious attack on Lietzmann's hypothesis of the sharp division of the two different meal traditions in the New Testament.³⁰⁴ It is safe to say that since that time New Testament scholars have no longer concerned themselves with this two-type hypothesis.

It will be discovered, however, that Schweizer, in developing his own thesis, was faced with this old problem of the two distinct traditions in a different way.³⁰⁵ Keeping this consideration in mind, it will be necessary to examine Schweizer's solution to the problem of eucharistic origins. But first, we will briefly discuss Schweizer's argument against Lietzmann's hypothesis.

In his opinion, a number of factors seem to lend strong support to Lietzmann's hypothesis, but on close examination they lose their force.³⁰⁶ He pointed particularly to the shorter Lucan text as a basic pillar in Lietzmann's theory. This text-form presents a strongly pronounced eschatological prospect, focussing on the meal of the consummation.³⁰⁷ This is followed by the breaking of bread and a short word of interpretation for the bread.³⁰⁸ Luke therefore must be considered as witness of a Eucharist, which is eschatologically oriented and where bread seems to have been the central feature.³⁰⁹

In his debate with Lietzmann, Schweizer took sides with other New Testament scholars who had also accepted the longer Lucan account as the primary text-form.³¹⁰ This position is now widely accepted by German New Testament scholars, while a number of British New Testament scholars still defend the shorter Lucan text.

If the longer Lucan text-form is accepted as the primary one,

then there is no text in which the eschatological prospect was not connected with the words of interpretation.³¹¹ Therefore, one cannot appeal to the Lucan text as evidence for a Eucharist in which the idea of the death of Jesus did not play an important role.³¹² Furthermore, it is no longer possible to argue that the Lucan text refers to a wineless Eucharist where bread was the central feature.³¹³ In the light of these negative arguments, it is obvious that Lietzmann's theory can no longer be upheld. Schweizer also presented some positive arguments which enabled him further to expose the weaknesses of Lietzmann's hypothesis.³¹⁴

In his opinion, J. Behm³¹⁵ showed that the Pauline type of the Eucharist is by far less Hellenistic than it may appear. The actual ideas of sacrifice are not foreign to it. Furthermore, the Pauline type of the Eucharist is also characterized by its orientation towards the past and the future.

In his monograph Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament, Gaugler³¹⁶ had already pointed to a possible synthesis of the two theological concepts of the death of Jesus and the eschatological prospect in the covenant motif.

Bo Reicke³¹⁷ had pointed to the farewell meals of the patriarchs, which are well attested by the writings of late Judaism. These meals were characterized by the two aspects of great joy and an allusion to the imminent death of the patriarch.

But even if one assumes that the combination of the two concepts occurs in each of the eucharistic accounts, it is extremely important to note that the tradition-history of each of the two elements had followed its own course.³¹⁸ In Mark,³¹⁹ the eschatological prospect is confined to the wine-word following after the words of interpretation. In Luke,³²⁰

the strongly pronounced eschatological prospect appears in connection with the Passover and the wine-word before the words of interpretation. In the Pauline account,³²¹ the eschatological prospect appears only in a truncated form. In view of the two traditions, Schweizer raised the question as to whether the coordination of the two aspects existed from the very beginning, or whether it was the result of a later development.³²²

Paul, for instance, knows of a Lord's Supper tradition consisting mainly of the words of interpretation. There is only a hint that the eschatological perspective was once connected with them. Since, in Paul's opinion, this tradition goes back to Jesus, it can be assumed that the apostle never knew of any tradition of the Supper without the words of interpretation.³²³

Schweizer holds that Schuermann,³²⁴ on the basis of his linguistic analysis, has made it probable that Mark 14:25 originated in the Lucan version of the Supper and not vice versa. Thus, he speculates that in Luke 22:15-18; Mark 14:22-24 and in 1 Corinthians 11:23-25 we have two independent and differing accounts of Jesus' last meal. He contended that in Mark, the eschatologically coloured account appears in a truncated form (14:25) after the words of institution. In Paul it shrinks to the short phrase ("... until he comes").³²⁵ At this point the question arises: "How could two independent accounts of the last meal come into existence if both had been linked from the very beginning?"³²⁶

The Lucan tradition in its present form as the frame of the words of interpretation, must be seen together with 22:27-30. Both sections are characterized by the reference to Jesus' serving and the eschatological prospect.³²⁷

The same thing can also be found in a much more developed form

in John.³²⁸ Here, too, the words of interpretation are absent, as well as any institution of the Lord's Supper. Jesus' last meal is presented in terms of his serving (John 13; cf. Luke 22:27) and of the eschatological prospect (John 14-16; cf. Luke 22:15-18, 28-30).

According to Kuhn,³²⁹ there is a Palestinian strand of the tradition about the last meal of Jesus which corresponds to the special tradition Luke 22:15-18 and 21-28. Verses 19 and 20 do not belong to this special material. The eschatological character of the primitive Christian meal celebration (Acts 2:46), however, grew out of this combination.³³⁰

Schweizer³³¹ also pointed out that in Didache 9-10 the emphasis is placed upon the eschatological assembly of the church. He cautions, however, that in the text only the prayers are given and none of the other parts. The eschatological emphasis appears also in Didache 16.³³² Thus he concluded that one may be able to trace this aspect back to Jesus or to the church of his time rather than to an older stratum of the tradition.³³³

As to the meal blessings, Dibelius³³⁴ pointed out that according to Didache 9 and 10, two blessings were pronounced, one before the meal in 9:2; 9:3, 4 and the other after the meal, 10:2-4.³³⁵ Their peculiarities cannot be explained in connection with the eucharistic action. These blessings are rather to be considered in terms of a Christianized version of Hellenistic-Jewish table-prayers.³³⁶ In agreement with Dibelius, Schweizer concluded that we have only a limited knowledge about the sacramental prayers of the Didache. In his opinion, it is possible that they have their origin in the Hellenistic synagogue.³³⁷

For the unique position of the words of interpretation, reference

can be made to the Pauline account in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff.³³⁸ Here the apostle expressly points to the revelation of the Lord.³³⁹ Schweizer, however, does not accept Lietzmann's theory of a private revelation, a theory which is now rejected by most New Testament scholars.³⁴⁰

With regard to the identification of the Last Supper with a Passover meal, Schweizer held that this question cannot be settled. Since we have already dealt with his view in connection with Jeremias' Passover theory, it will not be necessary to give a detailed presentation of it here.³⁴¹

a) Critical appraisal

In his 1954 report of recent research in the Theologische Literaturzeitung, Schweizer had decided that both traditions of the interpretative words and the eschatological saying probably go back to the historical Jesus.³⁴² He was quick to suggest, though, that historical certainty was scarcely possible.³⁴³

In his critique of Schuermann's hypothesis, however, he stated that Luke 22:15-18 seems to represent an accurate description of the historical situation and therefore of the very first celebration of the Lord's Supper in the primitive Christian community.³⁴⁴ In his essay "The Lord's Supper" he concluded that the words of institution are to be considered as an explicit expression of what was already implicit in the meal.³⁴⁵

With Kuhn³⁴⁶ and Bornkamm,³⁴⁷ Schweizer³⁴⁸ was convinced that there is a double strand in the supper tradition: the eschatological saying and the interpretative words. According to Fuller,³⁴⁹ this differentiation is to be accepted as one of the assured results of recent analysis.

While he is correct in stating that this theory has added a new complexity to the old question of a double origin of the Eucharist, we can hardly agree with him that this is one of the assured results of recent analysis.³⁵⁰ In our opinion, the differentiation between the eschatological saying and the interpretative words must be seriously questioned.

For instance, if one decides in favour of the first line, then the oldest Palestinian tradition can be discovered in John or in Luke 22:15-18. The Urform, which was transmitted in the Palestinian community, could be interpreted as Jesus' reference to his imminent death and the eschatological consummation, for he will not even eat the Passover with them. He will eat it with them in the glory of the Kingdom of God.³⁵¹

The words of institution, on the other hand, are only a further interpretation by the community, which seeks to preserve the cause of Jesus.³⁵² If one emphasizes the independence of the words of interpretation one comes to the original duality of the celebration, consisting of the two words of interpretation and the eschatological reference in connection with the cup.³⁵³

Thus it appears that this differentiation is rather arbitrary. It leads to a one-sided interpretation of either the eschatological prospect or of the words of interpretation.

With regard to Mark 14:22-24 and 25, Dibelius has warned against a separate treatment of the words of interpretation and the eschatological prospect. In his opinion, it would be wrong to consider the words of interpretation as a death prophecy and to interpret the prediction in terms of a joyful prospect.³⁵⁴

In the light of these considerations, Schweizer's differentiation between the words of interpretation and the eschatological saying is hardly

warranted.

6. Robert D. Richardson

In his supplementary essay, which accompanies Lietzmann's study Messe und Herrenmahl, Richardson proposed the theory that Jesus' simple act of breaking bread in the setting of the Last Supper is to be considered as the starting point of all further developments of the eucharistic rite.³⁵⁵

While he paid tribute to Lietzmann's work on eucharistic origins, he was critical of his thesis of the radical duality of the eucharistic rite from the beginning.³⁵⁶ Richardson envisioned two lines of interpretation already within the New Testament itself. In his opinion, the accounts of Mark 14 and 1 Corinthians 11, which emphasize the words of institution, gave a distinctive character to the Western liturgies.³⁵⁷ The Eastern rite, on the other hand, which emphasizes the bread and the presence of the Risen Lord, has its basis in texts such as John 6, 1 Corinthians 10, part of Luke-Acts and the feeding miracles of Mark.³⁵⁸

In harmony with his basic thesis, Richardson pointed to the need for a study which pays special attention to both the New Testament texts and the church's rites, while both were still fluid, and with reference to their respective localities.³⁵⁹ Such a study lends support to the thesis that the initial rite was basically an act of breaking bread.³⁶⁰ This does not mean, though, that the use of wine was excluded.³⁶¹

The longer Lucan text, which is of the same nature as 1 Corinthians 11:23ff,³⁶² first appeared in the second century.³⁶³ The shorter Lucan text, on the other hand, is to be considered as authentic.³⁶⁴ In his defense of the shorter Lucan text, Richardson pointed out that according

to Westcott and Hort, the Western text frequently omits and alters genuine longer readings.³⁶⁵ But these two scholars held that there is a group of nine Western readings, whose absence from the Western text must be considered as the result of a faithful transmission of the text of the original documents.³⁶⁶ Since these allegedly genuine readings are part of the Western text, Westcott and Hort have chosen the term Western non-interpolations.³⁶⁷ Richardson, who favoured this designation, argued that Jeremias was not successful in overthrowing the judgment of Westcott and Hort.³⁶⁸

On the basis of his examination of the Western text, Richardson concluded that the shorter reading had its origin in Antioch.³⁶⁹ It entered syr^{vet} in an inverted verse order. Since the Latin versions b e follow the same order, but do not feature the words of remembrance, they probably did not belong to the basic text from which both the Syrian and Latin versions derive.³⁷⁰ The words of remembrance, however, were probably present in the common source of syr^{sin cur}.³⁷¹ In this connection, Richardson raised the question whether the words of remembrance have been added to the syr^{vet} under the influence of Tatian's Diatessaron.³⁷² He was quick to declare that this could hardly be the case, because Tatian did not find them in any Gospel MS.³⁷³ These words are probably later scribal additions to the Diatessaron and the Evangelion da - Mepharreshe.³⁷⁴ Contrary to some scholars such as Schuermann,³⁷⁵ who appealed to Tatian as a witness to the longer Lucan text, Richardson argued that Tatian did not know the longer Lucan reading as a whole. But he admits that Tatian may have known the words of remembrance.³⁷⁶

Justin may be considered as the earliest non-canonical witness

to the words of remembrance, but not to the pericope of institution as a whole. There is, therefore, no evidence in support of the view that Justin was quoting either from 1 Corinthians 11:23ff or from the longer Lucan text.³⁷⁷ Furthermore, Justin's doctrine of the Eucharist is in marked contrast with that of his supposed sources. For his sacramental doctrine, he seems to have strongly relied upon Johannine concepts.³⁷⁸

In connection with his examination of Justin's words of remembrance, Richardson concluded that the accounts of institution probably came into existence sometime between the writing of the Fourth Gospel and Justin's First Apology.³⁷⁹ In other words, the full pericope of institution did not have its origin at the Last Supper, but rather represents a second-century development. Thus, doctrine, rite and text can be shown to coincide in the two centers of Christianity, first at Ephesus and later at Rome.³⁸⁰ From the time of Justin one is able to trace the past and future developments of the eucharistic rite.³⁸¹

On the basis of his examination of a series of rather complex facts Richardson found further confirmation for his thesis that the eucharistic worship, in becoming the focal point of Christianity, was influential in shaping the New Testament text.³⁸²

The initial step of a rather complex development must have been from the repetition of the regular supper of the Master with his disciples, to another regular supper, a suitable occasion for reflecting upon past events and for cherishing great hopes.³⁸³

During this meal celebration, the thoughts of the disciples would not only be focussed upon the death of Jesus, but also upon his parousia, the Messianic feast and the eating of bread in the Kingdom of God. They also seem to have entertained thoughts about Christ as head of the table,

about bread and wine as food which he had blessed and about the spiritual communion between Christ and his members. Most of these ideas were susceptible of development. The form of the rite itself would also be subject to change, especially after the first generation of disciples had passed away, and on Gentile soil. The controlling ideas of the eucharistic celebration came to be those of the death of Jesus, his resurrection and the parousia. While the concept of the death of Jesus had exerted its influence upon the Western liturgies, the ideas of the Risen Lord and of his parousia were instrumental in shaping the Eastern liturgies.³⁸⁴

In Richardson's opinion, there can hardly be any doubt that the longer Lucan text is the result of a gradual growth of the eucharistic formula, which made its appearance in the second century A.D.³⁸⁵ His judgment with regard to the Pauline form of the eucharistic formula is very similar. Two considerations lend support to the thesis that the formula of 1 Corinthians 11:23ff is the product of the second century: (1) A knowledge of this formula from the very beginning cannot be reconciled with a different second-century practice of the Eucharist throughout the Mediterranean world.³⁸⁶ (2) If this formula was known from the very beginning, then it is rather strange that the early Fathers nowhere make any reference to these crucial verses, while at the same time they make frequent use of 1 Corinthians.³⁸⁷ The earliest MS evidence for the presence of a full formula in the New Testament is that of the Chester Beatty papyrus p⁴⁶. But this applies to the Pauline Epistles only. The full eucharistic formula seems to merge into the text of the New Testament towards the end of the second century.³⁸⁸

According to Richardson, we may distinguish between three different forms of the words of institution:³⁸⁹

1. In the Roman form, that of 1 Corinthians 11:23-26, the special emphasis rests upon the concept of Christ's death. The cup signifies the New Covenant established through Christ's blood-shedding.
2. In the Ephesian form, that of Luke 22:19-20 the cup-words seem to display secondary features and a Roman character. The bread-words, on the other hand, are of greater importance. The word "given" seems to be an indication of Johannine influence.
3. In the Antiochene form, bread is the central element.

While the Roman form is to be considered as the key to the ideas of Tertullian and Cyprian on eucharistic sacrifice, the Ephesian form has exerted only a secondary influence in the East.³⁹⁰ The Antiochene form with its emphasis upon the bread became influential in the development of the Syro-Byzantine liturgies.³⁹¹

It is very essential to recognize that eucharistic worship was influential in shaping the New Testament texts. This knowledge provides us with an important criterion of judgment for the purpose of reconstructing the original form of the text.³⁹²

For the purpose of reconstructing the primitive eucharistic practice, it will be necessary to give special consideration to the Eastern rite in which bread was the central element.³⁹³

In Mark one can discern two different lines of interpretation.³⁹⁴ In the doublet account of the Feeding of the Multitude, there is one strand of teaching which seems to reflect an increasing stress upon the mystery of the bread. On the other hand, there is the account of the Last Supper, with a strong emphasis upon the cup, to emphasize the significance of the atoning death of Jesus.

But since a rite with a strong emphasis upon the atoning death

of Jesus seems to emerge in the second century for the first time, Richardson concluded that Mark 14:22-24 represents only a short narrative with an imparted interpretation of its significance.³⁹⁵

According to Richardson, in Mark there is a strand of teaching which is linked with John's eucharistic discourse. It is to be found after the Feeding of the Multitude (Mark 8:14-21). Here, Mark anticipates John when he refers to the "inexhaustible adequacy of Jesus as author and giver of the fullness of life."³⁹⁶ Furthermore, this teaching is closely related to the mystery of the loaf of bread.³⁹⁷ While John indicates his acquaintance with the bread-Eucharist, this does not mean that wine was excluded.³⁹⁸

There are also close ties between John and Luke.³⁹⁹ Several illustrations used by John reveal his indebtedness to Luke.⁴⁰⁰ Luke, on the other hand, shows a literary dependence upon the Marcan account of institution.⁴⁰¹ Without giving any further consideration to the question whether Luke was indebted to another written source, Richardson asked: "What motivated Luke to produce a version with the reverse sequence cup-bread?"⁴⁰² He pointed out that the evangelist was under pressure of his knowledge of a rite which was customary in the churches he knew.⁴⁰³ Luke, he argued, took it for granted that the cup-bread rite with its eschatological, but non-sacrificial outlook had its origin in the supper practice of Jesus.⁴⁰⁴ His amendment of his literary source reflects the eucharistic practice of Christians towards the end of the first century.

Luke's writings deserve special consideration, for they cast light upon the first-century table-practice of the Christians.⁴⁰⁵ Besides this version on the Last Supper, his reference to the "breaking

of bread" must be carefully examined.⁴⁰⁶

What does the term "breaking of bread" denote?⁴⁰⁷ The total Lucan evidence seems to lend support to the view that the breaking of bread described in Acts represents the main eucharistic rite of the church, with its deeply interwoven, backward and forward, connections.⁴⁰⁸ In the light of the references to the "breaking of bread," it becomes apparent that it was Luke's intention to put a special emphasis upon that which is fundamental and common to the churches with differing outlooks and histories.⁴⁰⁹ At the same time he was concerned to give an account of the origin of Christianity in all of its diversity. The fundamental rite of the Christian supper, however, was the "breaking of bread." On special occasions it was preceded by the drinking of the cup.⁴¹⁰

At first, the breaking and distributing of bread was a rite which marked the supreme moment of the meal itself.⁴¹¹ In Luke, Richardson found certain indications which lend support to the view of a development from the simple act of breaking bread by Jesus, "while they were eating," to the "breaking of bread" before the supper, a rite which could also include a cup.⁴¹² According to Richardson, the daily observance of the cult-meal was superseded by a weekly celebration. As to the pattern of this meal celebration, Richardson pointed out that it began with a blessing and the distributing of bread. The "Remembrance of the Day" over the cup of wine which preceded the meal proper was also a part of this celebration. But even though this feature was a part of the meal celebration, the meal was still referred to as "the breaking of bread."⁴¹³

While Luke considered the breaking of bread as the central

aspect of the supper rite, on some occasions such as on the first day of the week, when the Christians gathered into an "upper room," the drinking of the cup came first. The fact that in Luke's account of the Last Supper these two actions appear at the very beginning, is a clear indication that he linked this Christian procedure to a Jewish model, namely to that of a Sabbath Supper.⁴¹⁴

Since the apostle Paul is to be considered as the ultimate hero of Acts, the question arises: "Was Luke ignorant of the practice of the Pauline churches, in which according to 1 Corinthians, a cup had reference to the blood of Christ?"⁴¹⁵ In spite of the fact that the author of Acts seems to consider himself as an apologist for Pauline Christianity, there is hardly any trace of the theology of the Pauline epistles in Acts. Furthermore, the relationship between Luke and Paul represents a problem which has not been solved, as yet.⁴¹⁶ In Richardson's opinion, Dix is wrong in assuming that Paul, who is said to have "broken bread" at Troas, must have celebrated a rite which was identical to the one outlined in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff. Such an interpretation not only fails to consider the conflicting evidence, but it is also an outstanding example of the presuppositions that can hinder biblical and theological research.⁴¹⁷ On the other hand, the solution to the problem is rather simple. The Pauline rite of which Luke is thinking is the one referred to in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22, rather than the one of 1 Corinthians 11:23ff. Unless such a connection can be assumed, the gulf between Luke and Paul cannot be bridged.⁴¹⁸

While Luke's references to the Eucharist were strongly influenced by purely Jewish meal conceptions, those of 1 Corinthians 10 came under the influence of both Jewish and Hellenistic ideas. But both

developments have essentially the same foundation--that of a communion in bread.⁴¹⁹

According to Richardson, there is also a close relationship between John 6 and 1 Corinthians 10.⁴²⁰ In both cases we are dealing with Jewish-Hellenistic ways of celebrating the breaking of bread, and the words attributed by John to Jesus, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him," represent a further development of the Pauline thought "the cup of blessing which we bless" and "the bread which we break" are a communion in the blood and body of Christ.⁴²¹

Richardson recognized that the conflicting interpretations of the Synoptics and of John make it extremely difficult for us to recover their historical foundation. But he is rather optimistic, for he is convinced that this can be accomplished:

We are most likely to be in touch with it when two independent traditions support each other. And where the witness of the Fourth Gospel and that of the Synoptists appear to converge, the probability is strong that we are near to historical bedrock. So far as eucharistic origins are concerned, that bedrock is reached where John's profound meditation joins with those elements in Mark-Matthew, Luke-Acts, and also Paul, which witness to a tradition of the breaking of bread.⁴²²

From John the tradition can be traced forward to Justin Martyr, and backwards to an original breaking of bread with mystical overtones. In these rites of the first century there is no ultimate duality of origin.⁴²³

In his attempt to come as close as possible to the Last Supper of the historical Jesus with his disciples, Richardson had to follow the eucharistic rite backwards through earlier stages of theological interpretations to its very beginnings as a cult-meal. As a cult-meal it was known in terms of the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist, or the breaking of bread. In Richardson's opinion, the rite, whose central feature

was the breaking of bread, brings us into the proximity of the historical Jesus. Since the breaking and distributing of bread probably originated with Jesus himself, it would be erroneous to seek the origin of the cult-meal in any established formal Jewish custom such as the haburah supper, the sacramental cult-meal, whose sources are the romance called Joseph and Asenath or the sacred meal of the Qumran community.⁴²⁴

a) Critical appraisal

With regard to Richardson's hypothesis, Reumann⁴²⁵ has pointed out two basic problems: (1) Richardson's attempt to trace the Lord's Supper to the historical Jesus may be considered as a reflection of an uncritical approach, which accepts the New Testament's ascription of the founding of the church and the sacraments to Jesus.⁴²⁶ Furthermore, he did not come to terms with the basic issues of the "new quest."⁴²⁷ His essay, of course, was written before the "new quest" was formally launched in 1953, when E. Kaesemann published an article, entitled "The Problem of the Historical Jesus."⁴²⁸

It should be pointed out, however, that Richardson⁴²⁹ was aware of an existing gap between the meal-practice of the primitive Christian community and the historical Jesus, for he stated: "To this historical figure we come very close in the rite, whose central feature was the breaking of bread." On the other hand, he thinks that the Christian cult-meal probably goes back to an individual act of Jesus.⁴³⁰

Richardson's position may be defined in terms of a reflection of traditional and liberal views.⁴³¹ He has not employed any of the critical methods of New Testament scholarship such as form- or literary criticism. He has also failed to come to terms with Jeremias' massive

study, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.

His reputation as a scholar may be questioned on the basis of a remark, which he made in connection with his view about Justin Martyr: "Having arrived at this conclusion I have preferred not to acquaint myself with Harnack's arguments . . . or with what I understand is Zahn's reply".⁴³²

(2) With Reumann⁴³³ and Jeremias,⁴³⁴ we must also object to Richardson's traditio-historical reconstruction of the words attributed to Jesus. While Lietzmann⁴³⁵ was unable to find a bridge from the Jerusalem rite to the one practiced as a memorial of the death of Jesus, Richardson was confident that the evidence could be found in the second century.⁴³⁶ On the basis that New Testament text-types and the church's rites must be studied together, Richardson argued that our MS evidence for 1 Corinthians stems from the latter part of the second century.⁴³⁷

While his text-critical judgment, that our earliest MS evidence for the Pauline account of institution stems from the second century,⁴³⁸ can hardly be refuted, there is no shred of MS evidence for the omission of this passage.⁴³⁹ Such evidence, however, is available in the case of the words attributed to Jesus in Luke 22.⁴⁴⁰

On the assumption that the short Lucan text is authentic, a view which we cannot accept, Richardson claimed that verses 19b-20 were probably inserted into the text at Ephesus during the second century A.D.⁴⁴¹ The Pauline account of 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 is also considered as an interpretation of a Roman form of eucharistic formula.⁴⁴² This formula is to be considered as the key to the sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist by Tertullian and Cyprian.⁴⁴³

From an exegetical point of view, the Pauline account of insti-

tution can hardly be treated as the result of a second century development. Goguel, for instance, pointed out that the teaching about the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 is one of three pieces, which are all concerned with the question of worship: (1) the veiling of women (11:2-16), (2) the Lord's Supper (11:17-34), and (3) spiritual gifts and their part in worship.⁴⁴⁴ He also indicated that there is a close organic connection between the general introduction in 1 Corinthians 11:2, the three pieces of introduction and the beginning of the piece covering the Lord's Supper.⁴⁴⁵ Furthermore, the Pauline account of the Eucharist cannot be treated as a second-century insertion into the text, because it is Paul's most important weapon against the existing grievances at the Corinthian celebration of the Eucharist.⁴⁴⁶

Therefore, in the light of text-critical, traditio-historical and exegetical considerations, Richardson's hypothesis, according to which the Pauline account of the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff, represents the result of a post-Pauline development must be refuted. His traditio-historical sketch of the development of the Lord's Supper may even be considered to be perverse.⁴⁴⁷

7. Willi Marxsen

In his dissertation "Die Einsetzungsberichte zum Abendmahl" (1949), Marxsen concerned himself with a meticulous analysis of the eucharistic accounts with the sole purpose of coming as close as possible to the historical situation of the Last Supper.⁴⁴⁸

His text-critical investigation of the Lucan text resulted in a negative evaluation of this text, which Marxsen claimed has to be excluded from any further discussion, because it raises too many problems

which still remain unsolved and are perhaps insoluble.⁴⁴⁹

Further text-critical and historical investigations led him to the conclusion that within the New Testament there can be found no traces of any mutation, parallelism or amplification of the oldest accessible tradition of the Eucharist.⁴⁵⁰

His essay "The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem," (1963), represents a complete departure from his dissertation, in which he had attempted to interpret the Eucharist with the help of Old Testament conceptions such as remembrance and representation.⁴⁵¹ Marxsen's basic concern now is to demonstrate the development of the eucharistic conception along traditio-historical lines. In other words, he seeks to trace out the tradition-history from Jesus to Ignatius.⁴⁵² He shows particular concern for the pre-Pauline period, Paul and Mark.⁴⁵³ While he does not attempt to recover the ipsissima verba of Jesus as Jeremias did, it is rather surprising, as Reumann has pointed out, that "Marxsen does point to certain roots in the historical ministry of Jesus for the meal celebration which grew up in Christianity."⁴⁵⁴ Marxsen manifests a historical concern in spite of his full avowal of the various critical methods of New Testament research and his position that the historical Jesus by no means said and did all those things with which the gospels credit him.⁴⁵⁵

The essay does not only show the author's reflection of the "new quest for the historical Jesus," but Marxsen's personal understanding of the problems involved.⁴⁵⁶ Thus he is in line with other New Testament scholars who hold similar views. His thesis, of course, is different from theirs, because he argues that the development in Christology is analogous to the development of the eucharistic tradition.⁴⁵⁷

In other words, Marxsen, in his analysis of the Jesus-tradition clearly distinguishes between the pre-Easter emphasis on Jesus' functions whereby the eschaton is being actualized, and the post-Easter christologizing process, reflecting upon the person of Christ.⁴⁵⁸

Marxsen's thesis must be considered as a very significant contribution to eucharistic research, being unequalled by a great number of other studies dealing with the eucharistic problems. Consequently, it will be imperative to discuss it more in detail.

Marxsen formulates his thesis right at the beginning of his essay as follows: "In Christology one can show a development from an 'implicit' to an 'explicit' Christology, from a Christology that is indirect to one that is direct, from a 'Christology in action' to a considered Christology." Exactly the same development can be shown when one traces the early history of the Lord's Supper.⁴⁵⁹

How does Marxsen develop his thesis? The study is divided into three sections, dealing with (1) the development of early Christology, (2) the early development of the Lord's Supper, and (3) the theological consequences resulting from these developments.⁴⁶⁰ A literary-critical analysis of the gospel materials reconfirms the position of other New Testament scholars that there are two different stages of development of the Jesus-tradition: (1) The early Synoptic tradition, and (2) the post-Easter proclamation of the Jesus-tradition.⁴⁶¹ These two aspects correspond to what Marxsen calls, a "Christology of action" and a "considered Christology."⁴⁶²

According to Marxsen, the assertion of an action or of a function marks the initial step of the development from the "Christology of action" to a "considered Christology."⁴⁶³ After Easter the Jesus-tradition was

subjected to a christologizing process, whereby the Christ of action becomes the object of reflection.⁴⁶⁴ In the light of these considerations Marxsen attempted to demonstrate that a development "analogous to this unfolding of Christology is to be found also in the tradition about the Lord's Supper."⁴⁶⁵

The accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper are cult-formulas.⁴⁶⁶ Their Sitz im Leben is cultic.⁴⁶⁷ Consequently, they reflect the practice and understanding of the primitive community.

In the light of this consideration, the differences among the eucharistic accounts find an explanation.⁴⁶⁸ In this connection, Ligier has pointed out that the primitive communities were primarily concerned to preserve those historical data which would help to inspire and to legitimize the cultic practice.⁴⁶⁹

Marxsen begins his traditio-historical sketch with a comparison of Matthew's version to that of Mark's.⁴⁷⁰ In his opinion, Matthew's account of the Last Supper represents a further development of the one given by Mark.⁴⁷¹ Luke, on the other hand, can be considered as a mixture, containing features of the Marcan as well as of the Pauline accounts.⁴⁷²

A comparison of the Marcan account with that of Paul reveals the existence of considerable differences.⁴⁷³ Marxsen, in line with many other scholars, assumes that the Pauline form represents the older one, because the phrase "after supper" allows for the idea that the two actions are separated by the meal.⁴⁷⁴ In Mark on the other hand, the two actions appear only as two excerpts which have been drawn together.⁴⁷⁵

On the basis of the Pauline formula two different stages of development come into focus: (1) In the pre-Pauline stage, the two

actions are still separated by a meal; (2) in the Corinthian practice a meal takes place first.⁴⁷⁶ The Lord's Supper forms the conclusion to the ordinary meal. The sacramental meal, therefore, becomes more independent. Consequently, the phrase "after supper" no longer serves a definite purpose. Thus it disappears.⁴⁷⁷ As a result of this, a third stage of the development comes into focus, which can be discerned in the Marcan formula.⁴⁷⁸ This formula is an indication that the sacramental meal has reached a stage of independence.⁴⁷⁹

The second argument in support of the priority of the Pauline version is based upon a literary-critical analysis.⁴⁸⁰ The Marcan formula as compared with that of Paul indicates that the former has passed through a process of harmonization.⁴⁸¹

For the purpose of showing the progression of thought from the perspective of tradition-history, Marxsen first turns to the pre-Pauline formulas of 1 Corinthians 10:16 and 1 Corinthians 11:23ff.⁴⁸² In both instances he discovers that the emphasis is not on food, but rather on fellowship, which is described as a "new covenant" or in terms of the body of Christ.⁴⁸³ Both expressions have basically the same meaning with only one difference. One employs Jewish, while the other uses Hellenistic terminology.⁴⁸⁴

Paul takes the development a step further.⁴⁸⁵ The following arguments are presented in support of this view: Marxsen points out that Paul assumes a clear distinction between the cultic celebration and the meal as a whole.⁴⁸⁶ Furthermore, with reference to the Pauline formula, Marxsen pointed out that Paul is the first one to make mention of eating and drinking.⁴⁸⁷ This consideration leads to the conclusion that Paul expressly includes what was already implicit in the formula.⁴⁸⁸

He points out, however, that "the partaking, which is actualized at the eating" is at issue, rather than Paul's reference to food as such.⁴⁸⁹

Mark represents a later stage of the development.⁴⁹⁰ A comparison of the Pauline with the Marcan formula indicates a definite shift of emphasis to be discerned in the Marcan formula, for here the elements themselves come into focus.⁴⁹¹ The phrase "after supper" is dropped and the two actions of eating and drinking occur together, thus sharing a common interpretation.⁴⁹² Body and blood come into focus as the two "components" of the Christ, who gave himself in death.⁴⁹³ At this point sacramental reality is being attached to the elements, a feature which was not yet present in Paul, because no trace of it can be found in the formula which he transmits.⁴⁹⁴ Thus it is possible to distinguish between three stages of development within the primitive Christian community in its practice of the Eucharist.⁴⁹⁵ At the outset the meaning for the whole meal was expressed at the two liturgical places.⁴⁹⁶ In the course of time the actual meal was omitted.⁴⁹⁷ Paul still makes reference to the meal, but the action is tied to eating bread and drinking wine.⁴⁹⁸ In the Marcan formula, the emphasis is placed on the food, which is understood in terms of the "body and blood of Christ."⁴⁹⁹

Marxsen now attempts to discover the origin of the Pauline formula. Will this search enable one to get to the institution of the Lord's Supper by Jesus?⁵⁰⁰

The introductory phrase "on the night when the Lord Jesus was betrayed," does not help to settle the historical question.⁵⁰¹ It fails to do so, because it does not inform us as to what was instituted at that time. For two basic reasons one may not be able to provide a positive answer to the question about the institution of the Eucharist:

(1) it is difficult to refer the contents of the Pauline formula back to Jesus, and (2) all the information about the preaching and activity of Jesus cannot be considered as sufficient proof for the assumption that the cult was instituted by Jesus.⁵⁰²

The reference to the night of betrayal must be considered in terms of a theological interpretation, which fits well with the tendency in the development of early Christian assertions.⁵⁰³ Other examples of a chronological reference used for the purpose of a theological statement can be found in the Fourth Gospel, for instance, in connection with the dating of the Passover.⁵⁰⁴ In Marxsen's opinion, the two datings found in the Synoptics and in John, cannot be harmonized historically.⁵⁰⁵ The whole problem can be solved quite easily, as soon as one sees that the theological statements have been historicized.⁵⁰⁶ In the light of this consideration, the discrepant datings of the Last Supper in the Synoptics on one hand, and in the Gospel of John on the other, no longer pose a historical problem.⁵⁰⁷ The same also holds true of the dating in the Pauline formula.⁵⁰⁸ But if "dating" is used in this way it becomes extremely difficult to speak of the institution of the Lord's Supper by Jesus.⁵⁰⁹ This result, however, does not permit us to draw overhasty conclusions and call the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist "etiologal cult-legends," for such a definition is only acceptable if the Lord's Supper originated in the early post-Easter church and most probably on Hellenistic soil.⁵¹⁰ It was here where cult-meals were known.⁵¹¹ Furthermore, one would have to assume that the early church developed a meal analogous to such sacred meals, which it then referred back to, etiologically, as an institution by Jesus. Only then may one describe the account of the institution in terms of an etiologal

cult-legend.⁵¹²

Marxsen pointed out that the attempt to push back from the Pauline formula to an earlier stage is beset with numerous problems.⁵¹³ He therefore proposed a different solution to the problem on hand.⁵¹⁴ He argued that the line of development can be extended backwards, and not necessarily to a specific last meal of Jesus with the disciples, but rather to the meal fellowship of Jesus with tax-collectors, sinners and his disciples.⁵¹⁵ This hypothesis was first introduced by Lohmeyer⁵¹⁶ in connection with the "old quest" for the two types of the Eucharist. More recently, this theory was taken up again by scholars such as E. Schweizer,⁵¹⁷ and F. Hahn.⁵¹⁸

These meals with tax-collectors and sinners which must be considered as "cultic" meals are characterized by the eschatological prospect.⁵¹⁹ In the same way, the personal encounter of people with Jesus had eschatological implications as well. In the light of Marxsen's argument, the eschatological word belongs to the reflection and interpretation of the action. Consequently, there is no difference of quality between the eschatological word and the words of interpretation. Both are necessary for the continuation of the cause of Christ.⁵²⁰ It is important to remember that the tradition has transmitted only those meals which Jesus had offered as a gift. On the basis of Jesus' invitation and offer to sinners, the eschaton is realized already.⁵²¹

In Marxsen's opinion, the meals with tax-collectors and sinners may be responsible for the development which resulted in the Eucharist of the church.⁵²² On the basis of this development hypothesis, Marxsen is able to bring the "breaking of bread" in Acts as well as other meal celebrations in the New Testament, such as the feeding miracles, e.g.,

into close relationship with the Eucharist.⁵²³ Thus he has created a much broader platform for further eucharistic discussions, which had been narrowed by those theories with a basic concern for the two traditions.⁵²⁴

The meal celebration in Acts 2 is characterized by the spirit of great joy (*agalliasis*). In the context of a meal celebration, the Christian community came to an awareness of itself as an eschatological community. Consequently, their understanding of these meals, as well as their self-understanding, calls for an interpretation.⁵²⁵ The logical places for this interpretation are at the beginning and the end of the meal. In Jewish meals, these were the places where the saving activities of Yahweh were recalled.⁵²⁶ The further development is summarized by Marxsen in the following way: In the Pauline formula an initial interpretation of an action can be discerned. This action, however, is tied to the eating of bread ~~and~~ the drinking of wine. The Marcan formula represents another stage of the development. This further development could best be expressed in the sense that the gift of the action is now associated exclusively with bread and wine. Thus in the Marcan formula the emphasis is placed upon the food, which is understood in terms of the "body and blood of Christ."⁵²⁷

As soon as the meal was omitted, the eschatological character of the last meal was changed. Food was now considered as medicine of immortality containing supernatural powers.⁵²⁸ In this connection, Marxsen pointed to the striking similarity of the two parallel developments in Christology and the Eucharist.⁵²⁹ But at the same time, he was fully aware of the basic difference, which comes into focus when both developments are compared with each other.⁵³⁰

a) Critical appraisal

In his attempt to come to grips with the problem of eucharistic origins Marxsen has created a broader basis for his discussion than some other New Testament scholars had done before him, especially those who defended the two-type hypothesis. Thus, by following in the footsteps of scholars such as Lohmeyer,⁵³¹ Marxsen⁵³² did not limit himself to the Pauline and Synoptic accounts of institution and the meal celebrations in Acts. He also gave consideration to the meal situations of the Jesus-tradition such as the feeding miracles, the parables of the wedding-feast and the table-fellowship of Jesus with the tax-collectors and sinners. These meal celebrations put in motion a development which led to the Lord's Supper of the church.

The advantage of Marxsen's hypothesis is obvious, for he is able to consider the meal celebrations of Acts as a vital part of the one development of the eucharistic conceptions. Therefore, his theory may be considered as a real breakthrough, in the sense that it leaves no basis for the old two-type hypothesis with all its variants.

While Marxsen's sketch is to be considered as the result of much reflective thinking on the subject of eucharistic origins, upon examination of his argumentation, some basic questions come into focus which need to be discussed in detail.

In connection with his thesis the question arises: "Can we be certain that the development of the Lord's Supper was analogous to the development in Christology?" Marxsen himself had some reservations on this point, for he stated that in the tradition one can detect different explications of Christology.⁵³³ Each of these explications points backwards to the more complex conception of Christology in action.⁵³⁴

With regard to the tradition of the Lord's Supper, the situation is different. Here, one explication was developed further. Every new stage of the development represents a further departure from the previous one. As the result of this development "only a torso has remained, namely, the real presence of the *KÚPIOS* in the holy food."⁵³⁵ While there can be no question that the Lord's Supper as well as Christology have passed through several stages of development, there is a basic difference between these two developments. From the very beginning, the Eucharist was part of a liturgical tradition. Therefore, its traditio-historical development took a different course to that of Christology.⁵³⁶ Consequently, these two developments do not correspond to one another.

For Marxsen's development hypothesis, the Pauline account of institution is of basic importance. From the Pauline formula, he attempts to trace the pre- and post-Pauline developments of the Lord's Supper. While Bornkamm, Neuenzeit and others have produced some weighty arguments in favour of the priority of the Pauline account of institution, Marxsen's remark that "a common consensus among scholars seems to be developing on this point" fails to do justice to the rather complex situation resulting from recent traditio-historical studies.⁵³⁷ Marxsen has obviously paid no attention to Schuermann's source-critical analysis, which is to be considered as a serious attempt to restore the reputation of the Lucan text. According to Schuermann, the Lucan account of institution is part of an independent tradition.⁵³⁸ Jeremias⁵³⁹ and Kuhn,⁵⁴⁰ on the other hand, have presented weighty arguments in favour of the priority of the Marcan account.

While it is true that from a text-critical standpoint, the Lucan

text represents a number of problems which may be insoluble, there is no reason for considering it a mixture of Marcan and Pauline elements.⁵⁴¹

In his attempt to fix the various stages of development, Marxsen contended that the Pauline formula is older than the Corinthian practice of the Lord's Supper. This argument is based upon the assumption that in the Pauline formula one can recognize that the meal was still framed by the two ritual acts of the "breaking of bread" and the "cup of blessing."⁵⁴² At Corinth on the other hand, a meal was held first, which was then climaxed by the Lord's Supper.⁵⁴³ The latter simply occurs as a sacramental appendix or conclusion to the ordinary meal.⁵⁴⁴ On this particular point scholarship is still divided. The information, which is provided by 1 Corinthians 11:17ff hardly allows us to draw any definite conclusions regarding the ritual order of the Lord's Supper at Corinth.

It is possible to argue that at Corinth the Lord's Supper still followed the ritual pattern of a Jewish meal. The familiarity of these Christians with concepts such as the "breaking of bread" and the "cup of blessing" seems to lend support to the view that at Corinth the Lord's Supper followed the same basic pattern as outlined in the Pauline formula.⁵⁴⁵

If the position that at Corinth the Last Supper was still following the ritual pattern of a Jewish meal could be shown to be the correct one, then Marxsen would have no firm basis for his development hypothesis. But there are several considerations which seem to lend support to his view that at Corinth a meal was held first. This meal was then followed by the celebration of the Lord's Supper.⁵⁴⁶

If it is to be assumed that at Corinth the Lord's Supper was a

meal which was still framed by the two rites of the "breaking of bread" and the "cup of blessing," then Paul could hardly have ordered the Corinthians to eat and drink at home so that the grievances at Corinth could be corrected.⁵⁴⁷ In that case, the breaking of bread and the "cup of blessing" would have disappeared together with the meal, because Paul would not have been able to tell the Corinthians to make a separation of meal and Lord's Supper.⁵⁴⁸ Furthermore, in 1 Corinthians 11:21 reference is made to the problem that the Corinthians did not commence the celebration of the Lord's Supper while everyone was present. Therefore, if the "breaking of bread" had been still taking place at the beginning of the meal celebration, then late comers could only have shared in the cup-Eucharist.⁵⁴⁹ This exclusion of the poor from the bread-Eucharist would have been censured by the apostle Paul.⁵⁵⁰ Neuenzeit holds that in 1 Corinthians 11:34, one can already detect a trend leading towards the separation of meal and Eucharist.⁵⁵¹ Outside the corpus paulinum there are indications such as Acts 20:7ff, which seem to point to the one Eucharist rather than to two separate eucharistic actions.⁵⁵² While Barrett has avoided making any comment on the meal pattern of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:17ff, stating that the occasion included an ordinary meal as well as symbolic acts and significant words, it appears that there is some justification for Marxsen's position.⁵⁵³

Besides giving consideration to the traditio-historical development of the eucharistic formulas, Marxsen has also concerned himself with their theological development. On the basis of his comparison of the Marcan cup-word with that of Paul, he concluded that the former represents a later stage of the development. In this connection, it should be pointed out that on the basis of his analysis of the Marcan

and Pauline cup-words, Neuenzeit⁵⁵⁴ came to an identical conclusion. In his opinion, the theological conception of the Pauline cup-word belongs to an earlier stage of the development than those found in the Marcan formula.⁵⁵⁵ The Pauline cup-word, for instance, reflects a more original understanding of the death of Jesus than the Marcan version of the cup-word.⁵⁵⁶ The conceptions of sacrifice in the Marcan formula, which are based upon a synthetic parallelism, reflect a later stage of the development.⁵⁵⁷ In the light of these observations one may assume that the Pauline version is more original than the Marcan one.⁵⁵⁸ Neuenzeit, however, was fully aware of the fact that these criteria alone would be insufficient for establishing the priority of the Pauline version of the cup-word.⁵⁵⁹ Therefore, he appealed to the basic rule of textual criticism,⁵⁶⁰ which from a literary-critical standpoint may also be applied to the cup-word. According to this rule, preference should be given to the more difficult reading.⁵⁶¹ Since the Pauline cup-word seems to present a more difficult reading than the Marcan cup-word, it must, therefore, be the older one.⁵⁶² These arguments are far from being conclusive and Neuenzeit hardly adds any strength to his argument by stating that the available source-material and the theories which have been advanced by scholars do not lend any support to the hypothesis of the priority of the Marcan account of institution.⁵⁶³ This argument, however, fails to take into account the serious efforts of Jeremias and Kuhn to defend the priority of the Marcan formula. Neuenzeit was well aware, however, that one's acceptance of the priority of the Marcan account has serious implications, because it would require a restructuring of the theological development.⁵⁶⁴

With regard to the Pauline cup-word, Marxsen has cautioned us

not to read anything into the formulations which we know from other texts. He then pointed out that the interpretation refers to the covenant rather than to the blood.⁵⁶⁵ In the present context, blood serves to define the covenant concept more closely. There can be no doubt that here it is not an element which is interpreted, but rather the cup itself.⁵⁶⁶ This cup, which at the meal is passed around the table, is to be identified in terms of the "New Covenant." But what does this mean? Marxsen is quick in pointing out that by sharing in the cup the celebrating congregation is the "New Covenant."⁵⁶⁷ The community is this on the basis of the blood of Christ, that is by virtue of his death.⁵⁶⁸

According to Patsch, it may be inferred that the "cup of blessing" was drunk by all participants in the meal. But he pointed out that there is no reference to "participation" in the text itself. Thus, in Patsch's opinion, Marxsen, against his own methodological principle, has interpreted more than the cup.⁵⁶⁹ Participation in the cup, however, can only mean participation in the contents, for one can only enter into the covenant by drinking the cup. At this point a discrepancy in Marxsen's argument comes into focus, because he has just informed us that the cup cannot be equated with the contents of the cup.⁵⁷⁰ On the other hand, it cannot be denied that there is a difference between the Antiochene and the Caesarean form of the cup-word. The former reads: "This is the new covenant in my blood." This version is clearly to be distinguished from the Marcan version: "This is my blood of the covenant."

Conclusion:

On the basis of our examination of the various theological approaches from Spitta to Marxsen it has become apparent that the two-type

hypothesis has passed through several stages of development. It reappeared in a new form in the writings of Schweizer, Richardson and Fuller. In the light of Marxsen's development hypothesis, this theory in all its variations can no longer be upheld.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹R. D. Richardson, "Introduction," in Mass and Lord's Supper, fasc. 1, p. IX.

²Spitta, Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums I, (Goettingen: 1893), pp. 207ff.

³Spitta, op. cit., p. 207; see also, Zur Reform des evangelischen Kultus, p. 107f, cited by Spitta, loc. cit., n. 3, p. 207.

⁴Ibid., pp. 207-208.

⁵Ueber den gegenwaertigen Stand der johanneischen Frage: Vortraege der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen, V, p. 62f, cited by Spitta, op. cit., p. 212.

⁶Das Johannesevangelium, p. 33, cited by Spitta, op. cit., p. 212.

⁷Spitta, op. cit., pp. 212-13.

⁸Ibid., p. 214.

⁹Ibid., p. 214.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 214.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 216-17.

¹²Ibid., pp. 222ff.

¹³Ibid., pp. 222ff.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 237.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 237.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 237.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 245.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 245.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 245.

²⁰Ibid., p. 245.

²¹Ibid., p. 245.

²²The meal Paul refers to in terms of the *δεῖπνον κυριακόν* followed the order of the wine-bread with the corresponding blessings; see Spitta, op. cit., pp. 245, 248.

²³Ibid., pp. 250ff.

²⁴Ibid., p. 263.

²⁵Ibid., p. 263.

²⁶Ibid., p. 263.

²⁷Ibid., p. 263.

²⁸Ibid., p. 263.

²⁹Ibid., p. 266.

³⁰Ibid., p. 267

³¹Ibid., p. 270.

³²Ibid., p. 270.

³³Ibid., pp. 270-84.

³⁴Ibid., p. 284.

³⁵Ibid., p. 284.

³⁶Ibid., p. 290.

³⁷Ibid., p. 291.

³⁸Ibid., p. 290.

³⁹Ibid., p. 291.

⁴⁰"Einen Monat nach dem Todestage Jesu, am 14. Ijjar, werden wir sie wieder in Jerusalem zur Feier des Nachpassah zu suchen haben." Spitta, loc. cit., p. 291.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 291-92.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 292-93.

⁴³Ibid., p. 293.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 293.

⁴⁵Bernhard Lohse, Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1953).

⁴⁶Fuller, "The Double Origin of the Eucharist," BR, VIII, (1963), pp. 60-72.

⁴⁷Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 4, pp. 204-205.

⁴⁸In the NT, Lietzmann makes a sharp distinction between those meals, which are characterized by an eschatological joy (ἀγαλλίασις) and where bread is the essential feature, and those, which are characterized by the idea of the remembrance of the Lord's death and where both bread and wine are considered as the basic elements. The former meal-type can be traced back from the Egyptian liturgy to the Didache and from there to the Lucan bread types. The latter, on the other hand, is part of the Hippolytan-Roman type, which can be traced back to the Pauline type of the Last Supper in 1. Cor. 11:23ff. According to Lietzmann, there is no bridge leading from the Jerusalem rite to the metaphor of the bread and the body; see Lietzmann, op. cit., fasc. 4, pp. 204ff. Later on we will attempt to show that this sharp distinction is hardly warranted by the NT evidence. See, e.g. pp. 123ff.

⁴⁹Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 204.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 204.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 204.

⁵²Ibid., p. 204.

⁵³Ibid., p. 204.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 204.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 204.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 204.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 204.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 204.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 205.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 204.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 205.

⁶²Ibid., p. 205.

⁶³Ibid., p. 205.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 205.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 205.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 205.

⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 205-206

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 206.

⁶⁹See note 48.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 207.

⁷¹Die Probleme des palaestinensischen Spaetjudentums und des Urchristentums, pp. 63ff, cited by Lietzmann, Mass, n. 1, p. 208. In this book Kittel disputes the "mystical interpretation" of 1. Cor. 11:28.

⁷²In a discussion with Lietzmann, Hirsch disputed the customary assumption that Paul was following a tradition of the church which was already known to him. He took the position that Paul himself was the creator of this type; see Lietzmann, Mass, n. 2, p. 208.

⁷³Lietzmann, loc. cit., p. 208.

⁷⁴With the aid of his vision theory, Lietzmann obviously attempted to establish the historicity of the Pauline account. He is aware of the fact that the concept of revelation does create a problem in connection with a historical enquiry; see Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 208.

⁷⁵See Lietzmann, "Preface," op. cit., fasc. 1, p. XXV.

⁷⁶Lietzmann begins his investigation with the most important eucharistic liturgies: (1) The Byzantine liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil; (2) The liturgies of the Syrian church province; (3) The liturgy of the church of Jerusalem; (4) The liturgy of the Persian Nestorians; (5) The Egyptian liturgies of Mark, Papyrus Der-Balyzeh and the Euchologion of Sarapion; (6) The Egyptian Church Order whose author is probably Hippolytus; (7) The Ambrosian liturgy of Milan; (8) The Gallican and Mozarabic liturgies. Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 1, pp. 1-19. Cf. August Arnold, Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung (Freiburg i.B.: Herder & Co. G.M.B.H. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937), pp. 11ff.

⁷⁷Lietzmann, "Preface," fasc. 1, p. XXV.

⁷⁸Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 3, p. 142.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 144.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 142.

⁸¹Ibid., pp. 160, 194, 212-13.

⁸²Ibid., p. 203.

⁸³Ibid., pp. 145, 147.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 133, 145.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 147.

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 152.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 159.

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 159-60.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 160.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 195. According to Lietzmann, a variant of the prayers in Didache for the unity of the church (IX:4) is contained in the liturgy of Sarapion. It occurs also in Apostolic Constitutions VII, 25:3. This prayer looks like a relic of ancient times in the midst of the mosaic of the institution pericope, which was added at a later time. In the light of this consideration, Lietzmann concluded that there is a connection between the ancient Egyptian liturgy and that of Didache. Ibid., p. 194. This view was challenged by du Toit, who argued that the prayer of Didache, especially the most important third prayer (Did. 10:1-6), appears to be much more closely related to the eucharistic prayer of Hippolytus than to the one contained in the liturgy of Sarapion. Therefore, he concludes that it is very probable that there must be a developmental historical connection between Hippolytus and the liturgy of the Didache. See A. B. du Toit, Der Aspekt der Freude im urchristlichen Abendmahl (Winterthur: Verlag, P. G. Keller, 1965), pp. 123-36; esp. pp. 130-31.

⁹¹ Lietzmann, Mass, p. 189.

⁹² Ibid., p. 189.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 189.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 190.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 190.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 193.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 195.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 196.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 196.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 198.

¹⁰¹ Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms, pp. 285ff, cited by Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 4, n. 11, p. 200.

¹⁰²Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 200.

¹⁰³Lietzmann points to the custom of giving the newly baptized, in addition to the bread, three cups, containing water, milk and honey, and wine respectively. See Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 203-204.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 203.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 195.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 176.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 204. For a detailed critical analysis of Lietzmann's liturgical evidence in support of the two-type hypothesis, see e.g. K. G. Goetz, Der Ursprung des kirchlichen Abendmahls: blosse Mahlgemeinschaft von Jesus und seinen Juengern oder eine besondere Handlung und Worte von Jesus? (Basel: Universitaets-Buchdruckerei, Friedrich Reinhardt A. G., 1929), pp. 1-64. More recently Lietzmann's two-type hypothesis was also challenged by du Toit, Aspekt, pp. 122ff.

¹⁰⁸Lietzmann, Mass. p. 195.

¹⁰⁹Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," pp. 89-90.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 89.

¹¹¹Johannes Munck, The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 31. of The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1967), p. 284.

¹¹²The significance of a technical term is attributed to it in passages such as 1. Cor. 10:16; Acts 20:7, 11; Did. 14:1 and Ign., Eph. 20:2. It is certain therefore, that κλῆσις τοῦ εὐχριστοῦ points to the Eucharist as the actual culmination point, while primarily it refers to the meal as a whole. See Johannes Betz, Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Vaeter: Die Realpraesenz des Leibes und Blutes Jesu im Abendmahl nach dem Neuen Testament, II/1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1961), pp. 1ff. On the other hand, it would be more plausible to assume that the breaking of bread alone denotes the whole eucharistic rite in the Jerusalem church.

¹¹³Bultmann, Theology, Vol. 1, pp. 55-58.

¹¹⁴Betz, op. cit., p. 2.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 2.

¹¹⁶Bultmann, op. cit., Vol. 1, pp. 57-58.

¹¹⁷Lietzmann, Mass. p. 195.

¹¹⁸Bultmann, op. cit., p. 58.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 58.

- ¹²⁰Ibid., p. 58.
- ¹²¹Otto, Kingdom, pp. 278-80.
- ¹²²Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 89f.
- ¹²³Ibid., p. 89f.
- ¹²⁴Ibid., p. 89.
- ¹²⁵Ibid., p. 90.
- ¹²⁶Ibid., p. 90.
- ¹²⁷Joseph M. Nielsen, Gebet und Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 1967), p. 228.
- ¹²⁸Ibid., p. 228.
- ¹²⁹Ibid., p. 228.
- ¹³⁰Marxsen's differentiation between the introductory rite and the actual meal is hardly warranted.
- ¹³¹Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapefeier, p. 1125, cited by Betz, Eucharistie, II/1, no. 9, p. 3. In Reicke's opinion, the designation "breaking of bread" is a practical expression, which belongs to the realm of the divine service; see also Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde (Zuerich: Zwingli Verlag, 1957), p. 56-57; 60-61.
- ¹³²Les Actes des Apôtres et l'Eucharistie, 33, (1953), pp. 21-36, cited by Betz, op. cit., n. 9, p. 3.
- ¹³³Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 118-20.
- ¹³⁴E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), p. 191.
- ¹³⁵Gaugler, Abendmahl, pp. 32-33. An identical view is also held by Renatus D. Hupfeld. Die Abendmahlsfeier: ihr urspruenglicher Sinn und ihre sinnemaesse Gestaltung (Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1935), p. 100.
- ¹³⁶Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 90.
- ¹³⁷Ibid., p. 90f.
- ¹³⁸Acts: 2:46.
- ¹³⁹Barn. 15:9, cited by Bultmann, Theology, Vol. I, p. 145.
- ¹⁴⁰Bultmann, op. cit., p. 145.

¹⁴¹Nielen, Gebet, p. 229.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 229.

¹⁴³Hupfeld equates the meal in Acts 20:7, which is designated in terms of "the breaking of bread," with the Pauline type of the Eucharist; see R. D. Hupfeld, op. cit., p. 100.

¹⁴⁴Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 92.

¹⁴⁵Haenchen, Acts, p. 191.

¹⁴⁶Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 136.

¹⁴⁷According to Arnold, the Lord's Supper was known in Jerusalem. Paul did not invent it. Luke must also have known it. Since it would be improbable that Luke should never have mentioned it in his double work, therefore, Acts 2:42, 46 and 20:7, 11; are to be interpreted in terms of a Eucharist. See Arnold, op. cit., p. 46f. In Marxsen's opinion, Arnold presupposes something which he still intends to prove. Lietzmann, of course, denies that the Pauline type was celebrated in Jerusalem; see Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 92f.

¹⁴⁸Betz, op. cit., pp. 1ff.

¹⁴⁹Bultmann, Theology, Vol. I, p. 145.

¹⁵⁰Marxsen, op. cit., p. 92.

¹⁵¹This was pointed out by Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 168.

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 168.

¹⁵³Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 4, p. 195.

¹⁵⁴Marxsen, op. cit., p. 93.

¹⁵⁵According to Marxsen, Lietzmann has failed to recognize that the designation "breaking of bread" is to be understood in terms of a "Darstellung einer Funktion." See Marxsen, op. cit., p. 93.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 92.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 92.

¹⁵⁸In Kilmartin's opinion, the meal recorded in Luke 24:30 belongs to the transitory period between Jesus' death, glorification and the coming of the Spirit. Pentecost is the decisive moment for the inauguration of the Eucharist. Thus, he holds, it is difficult to imagine that Luke viewed this Easter meal as the first Eucharist of the church; see Kilmartin, "The Last Supper and the Earliest Eucharists of the Church," Concilium, 40, op. cit., pp. 40, 35-47, esp. p. 42f.

- ¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 42.
- ¹⁶⁰Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 195.
- ¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 195.
- ¹⁶²See pp. 204ff.
- ¹⁶³Schweizer, "Das Abendmahl, eine Vergegenwaertigung des Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl?" ThZ, 2 (1946), pp. 81-101.
- ¹⁶⁴du Toit, Aspekt, p. 132.
- ¹⁶⁵Dix, Shape, p. 62f.
- ¹⁶⁶Richardson, "Essay," p. 319.
- ¹⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 319-20.
- ¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 319.
- ¹⁶⁹Ibid., p. 318.
- ¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 320.
- ¹⁷¹See Paul Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl: Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung (Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1960), p. 59.
- ¹⁷²Ibid., pp. 69ff.
- ¹⁷³Dix, op. cit., p. 61.
- ¹⁷⁴Ibid., p. 61.
- ¹⁷⁵Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 204ff.
- ¹⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 204ff.
- ¹⁷⁷du Toit, op. cit., p. 133f.
- ¹⁷⁸Ibid., p. 133f.
- ¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 133f.
- ¹⁸⁰Ernst Lohmeyer, "Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," JBL, LVII (1937), pp. 217-52. See also his articles "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), pp. 168-95; 195-227; 273-312; ThRNF, 10 (1938), pp. 81-99.
- ¹⁸¹Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," pp. 217-52.
- ¹⁸²Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9, p. 176. (cf. Feneberg, Passafeyer, p. 11.)

¹⁸³Ibid., p. 176.

¹⁸⁴Lohmeyer is probably the first scholar, who has engaged in a minute examination of the meal-customs in the NT, in order to discover the possible germ of the later problems of the Lord's Supper. See Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," p. 218.

¹⁸⁵Lietzmann, op. cit., fasc. 4, p. 204f.

¹⁸⁶Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 228.

¹⁸⁷John Reumann, "Introduction," in The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem, Facet Books (Philadelphia: Fortress Books, 1920), p. XVI.

¹⁸⁸According to Lietzmann, there was no bridge leading from the Jerusalem rite to the metaphor of the bread and the body. Lietzmann, Mass, p. 207.

¹⁸⁹Lohmeyer stated: "Diese Doppelheit hat ihren nachweisbaren Grund in einer einheitlichen Mahlanschauung Jesu, die sich in beiden Erzählungen nur in besonderer Weise ausprägt. Durch sie ist auch die Mahlfeier der Urgemeinde nach drei Richtungen bestimmt. Sie ist tägliche Mahlzeit, Speisung der Armen und eschatologische Feier, und ist in diesen dreifachen Beziehungen doch nur das Eine, naemlich das Mahl des Herrn." Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," p. 252.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 252.

¹⁹¹From the broad streams of a liturgical tradition, he attempted to trace the way back to the original sources. "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 172.

¹⁹²Ibid., p. 172.

¹⁹³Ibid., p. 172.

¹⁹⁴Ibid., p. 173.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., p. 200.

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 200.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 201

¹⁹⁸Ibid., p. 201.

¹⁹⁹Lohmeyer has rightly emphasized that these special Jewish meal-customs hardly contribute anything more towards our understanding of the Lord's Supper, than the customs of the daily eating and drinking. Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 301.

²⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 201-202.

²⁰¹Feneberg, Passafeier, p. 55.

²⁰²Ibid., p. 55.

²⁰³Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," p. 217.

²⁰⁴Ibid., p. 218.

²⁰⁵Ibid., p. 218.

²⁰⁶Ibid., p. 223.

²⁰⁷Ibid., p. 224.

²⁰⁸Ibid., pp. 224-25.

²⁰⁹Ibid., p. 225.

²¹⁰Ibid., p. 225.

²¹¹Ibid., p. 225. For a detailed discussion of the last meal of Jesus with his disciples; see Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 302-10.

²¹²Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," pp. 225-28.

²¹³Ibid., p. 226.

²¹⁴Ibid., p. 226.

²¹⁵Ibid., p. 226.

²¹⁶Ibid., p. 227.

²¹⁷Ibid., p. 227.

²¹⁸Ibid., p. 227.

²¹⁹Ibid., p. 227.

²²⁰Ibid., p. 228.

²²¹On this question, Lohmeyer refers to the works by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, The Acts of the Apostles (1933), The Beginnings of Christianity IV; also Th. Shermann, "Das Brotbrechen im Urchristentum," BZ, VII (1910), p. 33f., 162f., cited by Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," p. 228.

²²²Ibid., p. 228.

²²³Ibid., p. 230, III, p. 51.

²²⁴Ibid., p. 231.

225 Ibid., p. 231.

226 Ibid., p. 233.

227 Ibid., p. 236.

228 Ibid., p. 238.

229 Ibid., p. 238.

230 Ibid., pp. 243-44.

231 Ibid., p. 244.

232 Ibid., p. 244.

233 Ibid., p. 245.

234 Lohmeyer's literary-critical considerations, which in his opinion point to the Galilean tradition, are unconvincing; see Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," pp. 242-44. Agreeing with Lohmeyer, Black pointed out that Lohmeyer has conclusively shown that primitive Christianity had a double origin. See Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 81.

235 Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 245.

236 Ibid., p. 245.

237 Ibid., p. 246.

238 Ibid., p. 246.

239 Ibid., p. 246.

240 Ibid., p. 246.

241 Ibid., p. 247.

242 Ibid., p. 247.

243 Ibid., p. 247.

244 Ibid., p. 247.

245 Ibid., p. 247.

246 Ibid., p. 248.

247 Opposing Jeremias, who held that the arcane discipline is responsible for the omission of the account of institution, Lohmeyer pointed out that Jeremias has forgotten to take the words of Mtt. 10:26 (cf. Mk. 14:22) into consideration. Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 249.

- 248 Ibid., p. 252.
- 249 Ibid., p. 252.
- 250 Ibid., p. 252.
- 251 Ibid., p. 252.
- 252 Hans Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 53.
- 253 Conzelmann's criticism of Lohmeyer's position appears to be unjustified, because the latter has rightly emphasized the importance of the Jewish meal practices for our understanding of the eucharistic meals of the primitive Christian community. See Conzelmann, Outline, p. 53.
- 254 Marxsen, op. cit., p. 95.
- 255 Ibid., p. 95.
- 256 Lohmeyer, Galilaea und Jerusalem (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), p. 92f.
- 257 Ibid., p. 92f.
- 258 Bultmann, Theology, Vol. 1, p. 52.
- 259 Ibid., p. 52.
- 260 Hahn, Hoheitstitel, n. 2, p. 180.
- 261 Ibid., p. 180.
- 262 Ibid., p. 11.
- 263 Cullmann, Essays, pp. 5-23; see also Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, trans. by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969)
- 264 Cullmann, Essays, pp. 5-23.
- 265 Cullmann, "Preface" in Essays on the Lord's Supper, p. 6.
- 266 Ibid., p. 6.
- 267 Ibid., p. 6-7.
- 268 Ibid., p. 7.
- 269 Ibid., p. 7.

270 This view was also held by J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, cited by Cullmann, op. cit., n. 1, p. 7.

271 Ibid., p. 7.

272 Ibid., p. 8.

273 Cullmann, Worship, p. 8.

274 Ibid., p. 8.

275 In support of his theory as regards the existence of a cultic meal where bread is the central feature, Cullmann has rather uncritically adopted the evidence of the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas, John and Peter, quoted by Lietzmann, Mass, pp. 246. See Cullmann, Essays, p. 10.

276 Cullmann, loc. cit., p. 9.

277 Ibid., p. 9.

278 In support of his view, Cullmann appeals particularly to the book by F. J. Doelger, Die Fischdenkmäler in der fruechristlichen Plastik und Kleinkunst, (1928); see Cullmann, Essays, n. 3, p. 10.

279 Cullmann pointed out that the meals which the Risen Lord had with his disciples did involve fish (Luke 24:42), Cullmann, op. cit., p. 11.

280 With regard to Acts 10:41, Cullmann affirmed that this text supports the view that the appearances took place during a meal. He argued that the translation of the participle συναιζόμενος is very imprecise. Since the word was derived from the substantive αἶς, salt, συναιζόμενος means "to take salt with someone." In other words, the author of Acts, speaking of the appearances of the Risen One, makes use of the expression "to take salt together," Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

281 Ibid., p. 12.

282 Ibid., p. 13.

283 Ibid., p. 13.

284 Ibid., p. 13.

285 Ibid., p. 15.

286 Ibid., p. 16.

287 Ibid., p. 17.

288 Ibid., p. 17.

289 Ibid., p. 17.

290 Ibid., p. 17.

291 Ibid., p. 17.

292 Ibid., pp. 17-18.

293 Cullmann, Essays, p. 17.

294 Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 10 (1938), pp. 85-86. In connection with Lohmeyer's criticism of Cullmann's interpretation of the word συνάλίζω it should be pointed out that the interpretation in the sense of "to eat (salt) with," fits rather poorly into the context. Strictly speaking, this meaning does not occur anywhere else; see William A. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, "συνάλίζω" in A Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament, 4th ed., p. 791.

295 Conzelmann, Outline, p. 53.

296 Rordorf argued that the breaking of bread and the meals of the Risen Lord with his disciples are identical. Both proceed as follows: Thanksgiving, word of interpretation, distribution of bread and wine at the beginning and the conclusion of the meal. See Willi Rordorf, Der Sonntag: Geschichte des Ruhe-und Gottesdiensttages im aeltesten Christentum (Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1962), p. 229.

297 Ibid., p. 229f.

298 For a discussion of the material value of the appearance stories, see e.g. Conzelmann, Outline, p. 67. The source-critical problems of the appearance story in John 21:1-14 are discussed by R. E. Brown, The Gospel According to John, Vol. 29a of The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), pp. 1077-1085; see also Bultmann, The Gospel of John: a Commentary, trans. by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), pp. 706-11. According to Bultmann, this story has been reworked. Features are interwoven, which betray a specifically ecclesiastical interest. The story serves the redactor as a preparation for verses 15-23; Bultmann, John, p. 711. For a discussion of the Easter Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels, see Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 284ff. See also C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to John (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), pp. 480-81; Alan Shaw "Eucharistic Narratives," JTSNS XXV, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1974), pp. 12ff. Regarding the use of fish at early Christian meals, Vogels argued that such meals were not related to the Eucharist, but to Jewish fish meals that had an eschatological importance. This view is presented in Revue des Sciences Religieuses, 40, 1-26, cited by Brown op. cit., p. 1099. See also Bultmann, John, n. 4, p. 710.

299 Cullmann, Essays, p. 10.

300 Dix, Shape, p. 61.

301 Ibid., p. 61.

302 Cullmann, op. cit., p. 18.

³⁰³ Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," pp. 81-101.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., esp. pp. 85f.

³⁰⁵ In his article "Das Herrenmahl im Neuen Testament" Schweizer raises the question whether or not in the oldest form of the Eucharist, the words of interpretation and the eschatological prospect were already connected. See Schweizer op. cit., ThLZ, 10 (October 1954), p. 583; see also his article "Das Abendmahl im NT," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 15. Engl. trans. The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament, Facet Books (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967).

³⁰⁶ Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," pp. 83f.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 83.

³⁰⁸ According to Lietzmann, greater emphasis was placed upon bread, rather than wine. Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 3, p. 176.

³⁰⁹ For a detailed discussion of the Lucan text-problem, see pp. 204ff.

³¹⁰ Schweizer, "Abendmahl im NT," p. 15.

³¹¹ Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," p. 88.

³¹² Ibid., p. 88.

³¹³ Ibid., p. 89.

³¹⁴ Ibid., p. 89f.

³¹⁵ "κλῆς" in ThWBNT, Vol. 3, p. 378, cited by Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," p. 89.

³¹⁶ Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament, cited by Schweizer, op. cit., p. 9.

³¹⁷ Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, cited by Schweizer "Herrenmahl," ThLZ, 10 (1959), p. 579.

³¹⁸ Schweizer, op. cit., p. 584.

³¹⁹ Ibid., p. 584.

³²⁰ Ibid., p. 584.

³²¹ The argument that in the Pauline account the eschatological prospect appears in a truncated form appears to be unfounded.

³²² See note 305.

³²³ Schweizer, Lord's Supper, p. 20.

³²⁴Der Paschamahlbericht: Luke 22:(7-14) 15-18, pp/ 42-45, cited by Schweizer, Lord's Supper, p. 21.

³²⁵Ibid., p. 21.

³²⁶Ibid., p. 21.

³²⁷Ibid., p. 21.

³²⁸Ibid., p. 21.

³²⁹Karl G. Kuhn, "Die Abendmahlsworte," ThLZ, 75 (1950), p. 403.

³³⁰Ibid., p. 403.

³³¹Schweizer, Lord's Supper; p. 21.

³³²Ibid., p. 22.

³³³Ibid., p. 22.

³³⁴M. Dibelius, "Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache," ZNW, 37 (1938), pp. 32-41.

³³⁵Ibid., p. 41.

³³⁶Ibid., p. 41.

³³⁷Schweizer, op. cit., n. 58, p. 22.

³³⁸Schweizer, "Herrenmahl," op. cit., p. 585.

³³⁹Ibid., p. 585.

³⁴⁰In disagreement with Lietzmann, Schweizer stated: "Das damit nicht eine direkte Offenbarung gemeint sein kann, wie Lietzmann meinte, ist schon längst erkannt." Schweizer, "Herrenmahl," op. cit., n. 58, p. 585.

³⁴¹For a discussion of Schweizer's view concerning the identification of the Last Supper with a Passover meal, see p. 29f.

³⁴²Schweizer, op. cit., p. 586.

³⁴³Ibid., p. 586.

³⁴⁴Heinz Schuermann, review of Der Paschamahlbericht, by Eduard Schweizer in ThLZ, 3 (1955), pp. 156-67.

³⁴⁵Schweizer, Lord's Supper, pp. 16-17.

³⁴⁶Kuhn, "Abendmahlsworte," ThLZ, 7 (1950), p. 399f.

- ³⁴⁷Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl," pp. 312-49.
- ³⁴⁸Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 20ff.
- ³⁴⁹Reginald H. Fuller, "The Double Origin of the Eucharist," BR, VIII. (1963), pp. 60-72.
- ³⁵⁰Ibid., p. 64.
- ³⁵¹Feneberg, op. cit., p. 68f.
- ³⁵²Ibid., p. 68f.
- ³⁵³Ibid., p. 68f.
- ³⁵⁴Martin Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966), pp. 208ff.
- ³⁵⁵Richardson "Essay," fasc. 6, pp. 366-67.
- ³⁵⁶According to Richardson, the "bridge" from the "Jerusalem" rite to the one practiced as a memorial of Christ's death is there. It is to be found in that part of the second-century evidence, which Lietzmann has failed to re-examine and in which the words of institution are still developing. Ibid., fasc. 5, p. 273.
- ³⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 248ff.
- ³⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 249ff.
- ³⁵⁹Ibid., p. 221.
- ³⁶⁰Ibid., fasc. 6, p. 367.
- ³⁶¹Professor Richardson pointed out that in Luke we can discover clues, suggesting a development from the breaking of bread by Jesus to the breaking of bread before the Supper in a rite which could include a preliminary, but subsidiary cup. Ibid., p. 314.
- ³⁶²Ibid., fasc. 4, p. 225.
- ³⁶³Professor Richardson surmised that the words of institution, Luke 22:19-20 are a Western interpolation of the second century. Ibid., fasc. 5, p. 278.
- ³⁶⁴In Richardson's opinion, the Syriac evidence suggests that the longer Lucan reading was abandoned from the text during the first four centuries. Since this shortened text-form was known in a district, closely dependent upon Antioch, it is to be concluded that the Syriac tradition was of the shorter reading. It derived not from Rome, but from Antioch. Ibid., fasc. 4, p. 235.
- ³⁶⁵Ibid., p. 226.

³⁶⁶Ibid., p. 226.

³⁶⁷Professor Richardson is fully aware of the negative reactions by various NT scholars to this term. Ibid., n. 1, p. 226.

³⁶⁸Ibid., p. 227.

³⁶⁹Ibid., p. 235.

³⁷⁰Ibid., p. 235.

³⁷¹Ibid., p. 235.

³⁷²Ibid., p. 235.

³⁷³Ibid., p. 235.

³⁷⁴Ibid., p. 236.

³⁷⁵Schuermann, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), p. 162.

³⁷⁶Richardson, "Essay," p. 236.

³⁷⁷Ibid., p. 239.

³⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 239-40.

³⁷⁹Ibid., p. 246.

³⁸⁰Ibid., p. 246.

³⁸¹Ibid., p. 246.

³⁸²Ibid., fasc. 5, p. 285.

³⁸³Ibid., p. 274.

³⁸⁴Ibid., p. 274.

³⁸⁵Ibid., p. 274.

³⁸⁶Ibid., p. 275.

³⁸⁷Ibid., p. 275.

³⁸⁸Ibid., p. 275.

³⁸⁹Ibid., p. 281.

³⁹⁰Ibid., p. 231.

³⁹¹With regard to the first two forms, Professor Richardson pointed out that they are fixed in the canonical text of the NT. The third form, how-

ever, is not; it continued to develop. It was influential in contaminating later texts. Ibid., p. 281.

³⁹²Ibid., p. 285.

³⁹³Ibid., p. 286.

³⁹⁴Ibid., fasc. 6, p. 331.

³⁹⁵Ibid., p. 332.

³⁹⁶Ibid., fasc. 5, p. 298.

³⁹⁷Ibid., p. 298.

³⁹⁸Ibid., p. 299.

³⁹⁹Ibid., p. 299.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 300-301.

⁴⁰¹Ibid., p. 302.

⁴⁰²Ibid., p. 302.

⁴⁰³Ibid., p. 304.

⁴⁰⁴If this observation should prove to be correct, it would be the earliest substantial evidence of an interaction between the Christian liturgy and the NT text. Ibid., fasc. 6, p. 306.

⁴⁰⁵Ibid., p. 307.

⁴⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 307-308.

⁴⁰⁷Ibid., p. 308.

⁴⁰⁸Ibid., p. 311.

⁴⁰⁹Ibid., p. 312.

⁴¹⁰Ibid., p. 312.

⁴¹¹Ibid., p. 313.

⁴¹²Ibid., p. 314.

⁴¹³Ibid., p. 319.

⁴¹⁴Ibid., p. 318.

⁴¹⁵Ibid., p. 319.

- ⁴¹⁶ Ibid., p. 319.
- ⁴¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 319-20.
- ⁴¹⁸ Ibid., p. 320.
- ⁴¹⁹ Ibid., p. 321.
- ⁴²⁰ Ibid., p. 329.
- ⁴²¹ Ibid., p. 331.
- ⁴²² Ibid., p. 334.
- ⁴²³ Ibid., p. 334.
- ⁴²⁴ Ibid., pp. 366-67.
- ⁴²⁵ John Reumann, "Introduction," in The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem, Facet Books (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. XVIII.
- ⁴²⁶ Ibid., p. XVIII.
- ⁴²⁷ Ibid., p. XVIII.
- ⁴²⁸ "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," cited by John Kselman, The Jerome Biblical Commentary (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.), Vol. II, p. 18.
- ⁴²⁹ Richardson, "Essay," fasc. 6, p. 366.
- ⁴³⁰ Ibid., p. 367.
- ⁴³¹ Reumann, "Introduction," op. cit., p. XVIII.
- ⁴³² Ibid., p. XIX.
- ⁴³³ Ibid., p. XIX.
- ⁴³⁴ For a criticism of Professor Richardson's traditio-historical judgments concerning Luke 22:19b-20 and 1 Cor. 11:23-26; see Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, n. 5, p. 159.
- ⁴³⁵ Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 4, p. 207.
- ⁴³⁶ Richardson, "Essay," fasc. 5, p. 275.
- ⁴³⁷ Ibid., p. 275.
- ⁴³⁸ According to Lessig, most commentaries and relevant works consider the reading of p⁴⁶ ~~ε~~ as the most original one. See Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 39.

⁴³⁹Professor Reumann pointed this out in his discussion of Professor Richardson's thesis. Reumann, "Introduction," op. cit., p. XX.

⁴⁴⁰Ibid., p. XX.

⁴⁴¹Richardson, "Essay," fasc. 5, pp. 278-81.

⁴⁴²Ibid., p. 285.

⁴⁴³Ibid., p. 281.

⁴⁴⁴Maurice Goguel, The Primitive Church, trans. by H. C. Snape (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1964), p. 332.

⁴⁴⁵Ibid., p. 332.

⁴⁴⁶Paul Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, p. 34.

⁴⁴⁷Reumann, "Introduction," op. cit., p. XX.

⁴⁴⁸Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 3.

⁴⁴⁹Ibid., p. 53.

⁴⁵⁰Ibid., p. 100

⁴⁵¹Ibid., pp. 109ff.

⁴⁵²Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 30.

⁴⁵³Ibid., pp. 4ff.

⁴⁵⁴Reumann, "Introduction," p. VII.

⁴⁵⁵Ibid., p. VII.

⁴⁵⁶Ibid., p. VII. See also Marxsen, The Beginnings of Christology, Facet Books (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 58-66.

⁴⁵⁷Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 1.

⁴⁵⁸Ibid., p. 3.

⁴⁵⁹Ibid., p. 1.

⁴⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 1-4.

⁴⁶¹Ibid., p. 4.

⁴⁶²Ibid., p. 4.

⁴⁶³Ibid., p. 3.

464 Ibid., pp. 3-4.

465 Ibid., p. 4.

466 Ibid., pp. 4-5.

467 Ibid., p. 5.

468 Ibid., p. 5.

469 Louis Ligier, op. cit., p. 11.

470 Marxsen, op. cit., p. 5.

471 Ibid., p. 5.

472 In the light of Schuermann's source-critical analysis, this view can hardly be upheld. See Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht: Luke 22:21-38. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 19/5 [Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955]), p. 131.

473 Marxsen, op. cit., p. 6.

474 Marxsen's remark: "I think a consensus among scholars is developing nowadays on this point," is no proof that the Pauline account of the Eucharist is to be understood as the oldest form of the tradition. See Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 6.

475 Ibid., p. 9.

476 Ibid., p. 6.

477 Ibid., p. 6.

478 Ibid., p. 6.

479 Ibid., p. 6.

480 Ibid., p. 7.

481 Ibid., p. 7.

482 Ibid., p. 8.

483 Ibid., p. 12.

484 Ibid., p. 12.

485 Ibid., p. 13.

486 Ibid., p. 13.

487 Ibid., p. 13.

488 Ibid., pp. 13-14.

489 Ibid., p. 14.

490 Ibid., p. 14.

491 Ibid., p. 15.

492 Ibid., p. 15.

493 Ibid., p. 15.

494 Ibid., p. 15f.

495 Ibid., p. 16.

496 Ibid., p. 16.

497 Ibid., p. 16.

498 Ibid., p. 16.

499 Ibid., p. 16.

500 Ibid., p. 16.

501 Ibid., p. 16.

502 Professor Marxsen pointed out that Jesus was not interested in the future as such. With him there is no apocalyptic speculation. Furthermore, there is no indication that Jesus intended something like a church. Therefore, if the problem of the church lay outside the range of Jesus' reflection, so also must the institution of a cult for his church. Ibid., p. 18.

503 Ibid., p. 19.

504 Ibid., p. 19.

505 Ibid., p. 19.

506 Ibid., p. 20.

507 Ibid., p. 20.

508 Ibid., p. 20.

509 Ibid., p. 20.

510 According to Heitmüller, an etiological cult legend is to be defined in terms of a narration, whose purpose it is to make understandable the origin and kind of cultic act, which is customary in a religious community. See e.g. Taufe und Abendmahl, p. 41; cited by Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, p. 97.

In disagreement with Marxsen, Neuenzeit pointed out that in contrast to the pagan cult-legends, the Pauline account of institution renders prominent the concrete timing of the institution and the historically tangible figure of its founder. See Neuenzeit, op. cit., p. 97.

⁵¹¹Marxsen, op. cit., p. 20.

⁵¹²Ibid., p. 20.

⁵¹³Ibid., p. 21.

⁵¹⁴Ibid., p. 21.

⁵¹⁵Ibid., pp. 21-22.

⁵¹⁶Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl," p. 217f.

⁵¹⁷Schweizer, Lord's Supper, p. 27.

⁵¹⁸Hahn, "Motive," p. 345.

⁵¹⁹Marxsen, op. cit., p. 22.

⁵²⁰Feneberg, Passafeier, p. 71.

⁵²¹Marxsen, op. cit., p. 22f.

⁵²²Ibid., p. 23.

⁵²³Marxsen's proposal appears to be a very plausible answer to the problem created by the two-type hypothesis. See Feneberg, op. cit., p. 71.

⁵²⁴Feneberg, op. cit., p. 71.

⁵²⁵Marxsen, op. cit., p. 23.

⁵²⁶Ibid., p. 23.

⁵²⁷Ibid., pp. 29ff.

⁵²⁸Ibid., p. 30.

⁵²⁹Ibid., p. 30.

⁵³⁰Ibid., p. 30f. See also Marxsen, Beginnings, pp. 65-66.

⁵³¹Lohmeyer, "Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," pp. 217ff.

⁵³²Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 21.

⁵³³Ibid., pp. 30-31; see also Marxsen, Beginnings, pp. 65ff.

⁵³⁴Marxsen, op. cit., pp. 65-66.

- 535 Ibid., p. 66.
- 536 This was pointed out by Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 51.
- 537 For the arguments presented in support of the priority of the Pauline account by Bornkamm, Neuenzeit and others, see pp. 248ff.
- 538 For a discussion of Schuermann's hypothesis, see pp. 235ff.
- 539 For a detailed discussion of Jeremias' hypothesis, see p. 244.
- 540 See Kuhn, "Abendmahls Worte," ThLZ, 7 (1950), col. 404.
- 541 Schuermann has made out a good case for the hypothesis that both the Marcan and Pauline accounts of the Last Supper are dependent upon a pre-Pauline source. Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 151ff; see V. Taylor, Passion Narrative, pp. 47ff.
- 542 Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 6.
- 543 Ibid., p. 6.
- 544 Ibid., p. 6.
- 545 Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 174f.
- 546 See Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 69ff.
- 547 Lessig, op. cit., p. 174f.
- 548 Ibid., p. 174.
- 549 Neuenzeit, op. cit., p. 71.
- 550 Ibid., p. 71.
- 551 Ibid., p. 71.
- 552 Ibid., p. 72.
- 553 C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1967), p. 262.
- 554 Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 115-16.
- 555 Ibid., p. 116.
- 556 Ibid., p. 119.
- 557 Ibid., p. 119.
- 558 Ibid., p. 119.

⁵⁵⁹Ibid., p. 119.

⁵⁶⁰Ibid., p. 119.

⁵⁶¹Ibid., p. 119.

⁵⁶²Ibid., p. 119.

⁵⁶³Ibid., p. 120.

⁵⁶⁴Ibid., p. 120.

⁵⁶⁵Marxsen, Lord's Supper, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁶⁶Ibid., p. 10.

⁵⁶⁷Ibid., p. 10.

⁵⁶⁸Ibid., p. 10.

⁵⁶⁹This discrepancy in Marxsen's argument was pointed out by Patsch, op. cit., p. 54f.

⁵⁷⁰Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 9.

CHAPTER III

TRADITIO-HISTORICAL APPROACHES

In their attempt to determine the oldest attainable form of the eucharistic tradition, scholars had to decide whether the long or the short Lucan text is authentic. Since a decision in favour of either one of these two text-forms is of theological importance, it will be necessary to consider the argumentation in favour of both positions and to give an appraisal of them, before we can engage in an evaluation of the most important traditio-historical theories.

The Lucan Text-Problem

In our examination of the Lucan text-problem we are confronted by the fact that the Lucan account of the Eucharist is transmitted to us in a twofold form: (1) the long form, Luke 22:15-20 and, (2) the short form, Luke 22:15-18.¹

Both the long and the short text-forms show a basic agreement from verse 15 to 18. After verse 18 they diverge.² In the longer reading there follow verses 19-20. The shorter text-form adds only 19a, which ends rather abruptly after the words τὸ σῶμά μου, thus omitting verses 19b-20 from τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον to τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.³

1. Survey of research

At this point the question arises: "Are verses 19b-20 original or not?" A survey of scholarly opinion clearly indicates that this question is not simply a subordinate text-critical problem.⁴ Jeremias, for instance, has pointed out that the decision in favour of the long or short text of 'Luke' has a definite bearing upon one's basic understanding of the Eucharist.⁵

Since Westcott and Hort, the short text has been considered by the majority of British and German scholars as the original text-form.⁶ Schuerer was probably the first German scholar to follow in the footsteps of the two British text-critics.⁷ He was followed by Lietzmann and Jeremias, who stand out as strong defenders of the shorter Lucan text-form.⁸ In his second edition of Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, however, Jeremias completely changed his mind on this fundamental issue.⁹ Since then he has defended the longer Lucan text-form at great length.¹⁰

Jeremias' move in the opposite direction was interpreted by some scholars as an indication that the weight of argument is more evenly divided.¹¹ Thus, Chadwick, who defends the originality of the shorter text, maintains that the position which Jeremias had adopted in the first edition of Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, is still irrefutable.¹² He even speculates that in his next edition, Jeremias might revert to his former position and defend the shorter Lucan text-form once again.¹³ Chadwick's optimism appears to be unfounded, because the majority of German New Testament scholars are now strongly convinced that the acceptance of the longer Lucan text-form creates fewer problems.¹⁴

It should be pointed out that those scholars who defended the shorter Lucan text-form can be classified into two different groups:

(1) The first group maintained that verses 15-18 constitute the original text-form.¹⁵ (2) The second group held that verse-19a forms part of the original tradition as well.¹⁶

In this connection, it should be mentioned that R. Bultmann, K. L. Schmidt, R. Otto, E. Kaesemann and others held the view that the short text represents a tradition which would be historically even more reliable than the accounts of Mark 14 or 1 Corinthians 11.¹⁷ While R. Otto, E. Kaesemann and H. Lietzmann were strongly convinced that verse 19a formed a part of the original tradition of the Eucharist, K. L. Schmidt, J. Wellhausen and others considered verse 19a as a troublesome appendage which needed to be omitted.¹⁸ K. L. Schmidt, especially, gained a reputation for his radical approach to the Lucan text-form. In his opinion, both the longer and the shorter Lucan texts are beset with problems.¹⁹ While in the longer text the cup appears twice, this problem is eliminated in the shorter text. In this text, bread and cup appear in an inverted order. The formula of distribution is connected only with the bread-word. In Schmidt's opinion, this problem could be eliminated on the assumption that verse 19a represents a later addition to an older tradition for the purpose of making adjustments to the Marcan and Pauline accounts.²⁰ Schmidt was also inclined to dismiss verse 17 as a secondary feature.²¹ In Marxsen's opinion, this critic operates with scissors, for not only did he eliminate verses 19b-20, but also verses 17 and 19a.²² Lohmeyer was very critical of Schmidt's approach to the Lucan text-problem. He held that this questionable procedure is geared towards producing a text which lends support to one's own pre-conceived ideas.²³

According to Schmidt, in verses 15, 16 and 18, the concept of

salvation based upon the death of Jesus is not present. Furthermore, he was convinced that this account showed no traces of a Passover meal. Jesus, Schmidt argued, had partaken of a simple meal. On that particular occasion he made an eschatological statement. Schmidt clearly distinguished between this rather simple meal and the later cultic accretions made by the primitive Christian community.²⁴ His text-critical judgments, however, which were not at all based upon MS evidence, have invited severe criticisms by scholars such as Feine.²⁵ The latter pointed out that on the basis of such a method he would be able to prove anything from the New Testament he wanted to prove.²⁶

In the light of these considerations, it is obvious that we are confronted by a complex textual problem which we may never be able to solve.

From this point of view, it is hardly surprising that Marxsen and others have taken a negative view of the Lucan text-form. In Marxsen's opinion, the different textual variants simply raise too many problems.²⁷ This negative view of the Lucan text-form was not shared by the majority of New Testament scholars. Dibelius,²⁸ Lohmeyer²⁹ and Jeremias,³⁰ for instance, have pointed to the relative value of this text as an expression of the liturgical practice of the primitive Christian community.

More recently, H. Schuermann has made a gigantic effort to raise the Lucan account of the Eucharist from its lowly position of a Cinderella to that of a royal child.³¹

We have presented in a broad outline the basic positions of New Testament scholars with regard to the Lucan text-problem. It will now be necessary to consider the argumentation of the different positions

and to give an appraisal of them. In the following chart the various forms of the Lucan account of the Eucharist are presented as attested to by the most important MSS. These data will form the basis for the following discussion.

1. 15-20.	Attested by all the Greek MSS the earliest being at present p ⁷⁵ , 175-225 A.D. Marcion read verse 20, probably with the omission of "καὶ νῦν." Justin and Tatian may be wit- nesses for the long text.
2. 15-19a.	D a d ff ² i l
3. 15, 16, 19a, 17, 18.	b e
4. 15, 16, 19 (without ' <i>didōnevov</i> ') 17, 18.	sy ^c
5. 15, 16, 19, 17, 18 plus five additions.	sy ^s
6. 15, 16, 19, 20.	sy ^p

2. Appraisal of various textual theories

In the light of the textual attestation it is possible to distinguish between three basic text-forms: (1) a long form, consisting of verses 15-20; (2) a short form, verses 15-19a, and (3) three transposed short forms.³²

With regard to the Latin witnesses b and e, it should be pointed out that verse 19a appears between verses 16 and 17.³³ The Old Syriac versions, on the other hand, present a mixed text, which, according to Jeremias, was enlarged with the assistance of 1 Corinthians 11:24.³⁴ The position of verses 15-18 in group three is rather peculiar, and seems to be directly related to the attestation of verses 19b and 20. It is here where the actual Lucan text-problem lies.³⁵

As we compare the various forms of group three, we notice that there is a certain similarity between the Latin witnesses b e and the Old Syriac version sy^C. According to Jeremias, it is disputed whether the Old Syriac is derived from the short or the long text.³⁶

In Benoit's opinion, it is possible that the correctors of the mixed text had knowledge of the short text.³⁷ Since in this text-form the order cup-bread created an inconvenience, these correctors sought to reestablish the order bread-cup (syr^{CS}). Therefore, Benoit sees in the Old Syriac a compromise between the short and the long text.³⁸

Some scholars, such as E. Schweizer, were able to see a relationship between the Syriac versions and the Latin witnesses b e.³⁹ He pointed out that it would be possible to assume that in complete independence from each other, the Latin witnesses b e and the Syriac version sy^C were both motivated to change the rather offensive cup-bread order.⁴⁰ But Schweizer did allow for the possibility that b e and sy^C were dependent

upon each other.⁴¹

Manson was rather hesitant to admit any dependence of the Old Syriac versions upon the Old Latin witnesses b e.⁴² In his opinion, the transposition seems to be the kind of emendation that might be made in several places independently, especially if the influence of liturgical practice can be assumed.⁴³

Jeremias, on the other hand, was strongly convinced that sy^C is dependent upon D e, because it shares two special readings with these witnesses: (1) the omission of *καὶ* before *διὰ μέριον* in verse 17 (omitted in D e sa bo syr^{CS}), and (2) the omission of *τῷ ὁρισμῷ* in verse 22 (omitted only in D e syr^{CS}).⁴⁴

On the assumption that the transposed forms of group three are dependent upon each other, we must now raise the question: "How did these short forms originate?" According to Jeremias, the transposed short forms probably had their origin in the short text, verses 15-18, rather than in the long text, verses 15-20.⁴⁵ In support of his thesis, he pointed out that the text of syr^{sin} is based upon that of syr^{cur}, for syr^{sin}, with the exception of two meaningless variants, offers exactly the wording of syr^{cur} with five additions.⁴⁶

At this point the question arises: "Is syr^C based upon the short or upon the long text?" Many scholars hold the view that the Old Syriac version was derived from the short, rather than the long text. Burkitt⁴⁷ and Jeremias have pointed to the omission of the *διδομεν*. According to Jeremias, the syr^{cur} cannot have its basis in the long text, because in verse 19 after the words, "This is my body, which (is) for you," the word "given" is omitted.⁴⁸ This word, however, can be found in all witnesses to the long text of Luke, without any exception. In the light of

this observation Jeremias holds that it seems to be improbable that the longer text has served as a Vorlage.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the words, "which for your sakes," "this do in remembrance of me" (verse 19 sy^{cur}) do not stem from Luke 22:19, but rather from 1 Corinthians 11:24.⁵⁰ Since sy^C and D e share two insignificant, but rather unusual readings, already referred to, therefore Jeremias concluded that sy^C is a representation of the short text in the form of b e (15, 16, 19a, 17, 18) with verse 19 enlarged from 1 Corinthians 11:24.⁵¹

In Manson's opinion both forms b e and sy^C were derived from an original short text of the form as represented by D a d ff² i l because the transposition of the loaf to a position before the cup would have been unnecessary if the corrector had found verse 20 in his copy of Luke.⁵² On this assumption, Chadwick pointed out, it would be impossible for K. T. Schaefer, to defend the thesis that b e must be considered as the original form of the short text.⁵³ In Schaefer's opinion, the Latin witnesses b e are to be considered as the original form of the shorter text which represents a secondary development.⁵⁴ This text was produced by someone who was offended by the double cup, but who did not simply omit verses 17 and 18. He put them into the place of verse 20, in order to harmonize the authentic longer Lucan text with the accounts of Mark and Matthew.⁵⁵ Chadwick argued that in the light of Schaefer's hypothesis, the reading of D a d ff² i l becomes inexplicable. If the corrector wanted to restore the true Lucan text, it is difficult to understand why he gave the order cup-loaf and omitted verses 19b-20. Schaefer's hypothesis does not account for this half-hearted correction.⁵⁶ His theory concerning the rise of D a d ff² i l is unconvincing.

On the basis of his minute analysis of the textual data,

Schuermann concluded that sy^C was derived from b e rather than from D, because in this transaction only one major redactional intervention would be required.⁵⁷

With regard to sy^S, Schuermann has pointed out that dependence upon the Alexandrian text-form is hardly possible, because of the striking resemblances with sy^C.⁵⁸ Furthermore, verse 20 is not a reproduction of the Alexandrian text. There are rather two fragments of Luke 22:20 inserted in two different places of the text, namely before and after verse 17.⁵⁹

The Old Latin witnesses, Schuermann pointed out, are probably based upon a Western text in which the offensive sequence cup-bread had been corrected.⁶⁰ Such a text seems to have served as Vorlage for b e.⁶¹ The Old Syriac version sy^S, which Schuermann considered as an expansion of sy^C indicates the influence of both the longer and the shorter readings.⁶²

In Lessig's opinion, there is hardly any basis for the assumption that the long text gave rise to the various transposed short forms, b e and sy^{SC}.⁶³ The number of cups appears to be the only offense caused by the long text. The order bread-cup, which is known to us from Mark 14 and 1 Corinthians 11, can also be discerned in the long text. Thus, it would have been unnecessary to establish it on the basis of a transposition. If the long text needed to be corrected, one would expect only a deletion of the first cup. It is hard to imagine, however, that a corrector would have omitted verses 19b-20 from his Vorlage first, and that he should have filled the gap after the bread-word on the basis of a transposition. The transpositions of b e sy^{SC} are comprehensible only if it is assumed that they use as Vorlage a form which mentioned

only one cup. This cup was found in an unusual position. Such a form, Lessig pointed out, is represented by the short text.⁶⁴

In the following part of our examination, an attempt will be made to determine the origin of the additions found in sy^{CS}. The purpose of this examination is to find out whether they originate from the long text. If so, then the long text could be considered as the original text-form.⁶⁵ The hypothesis that the long text was derived from the short text and the Old Syriac versions sy^{CS} from the long text is extremely complicated and, therefore, improbable.⁶⁶

In Jeremias' opinion, sy^{SC} does not show any knowledge of the long text-form, because sy^S omits the ~~ὑπὲρ~~ phrase, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον of Luke 22:20.⁶⁷ On the other hand, it reads τούτο τὸ αἷμα ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, which is different from the cup-word of the longer version τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου.⁶⁸

The cup-word in sy^S is basically different from the cup-word of the Alexandrian text, because in sy^S τούτο (probably τὸ ποτήριον) and αἷμα appear as parallel concepts, while in the Alexandrian text τούτο τὸ ποτήριον and διαθήκη stand opposite each other. Therefore, the cup-word in sy^S after verse 17 cannot have its origin in the long text.⁶⁹

The cup-word of sy^S τούτο τὸ αἷμα ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη resembles the Matthaean form of the cup-word τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης.⁷⁰ In Schuermann's opinion,

the Alexandrian text seems to have influenced the cup-word in sy^S.⁷¹ This cup-word in its peculiarity had its origin in a Gospel text of Tatian and not in 1 Corinthians 11.⁷² He assumes that the participial phrase was not supplemented independently of the Alexandrian text of Luke 22:19b in sy^S. Therefore, it would be more probable that sy^C was supplemented in sy^S on the basis of an Alexandrian Lucan text

rather than on the basis of 1 Corinthians 11.⁷³

In the light of these considerations, it seems that the transposed shorter forms b e sy^C were derived from the shorter Lucan text, while in sy^S we must allow for some influence from the longer Lucan text.⁷⁴

On the assumption that the transposed shorter forms depend upon the short text rather than upon the long one, it is possible to distinguish between two basic texts.⁷⁵ It will now be our task to decide which of these two texts represents the more original version. Such a decision is of vital importance for our understanding of the Lord's Supper.

At this point, we will briefly summarize the arguments in support of the originality of the long text. First of all, the weight of MS evidence is in favour of the long text. As Jeremias has convincingly demonstrated, of all the Greek MSS, only D offers the short text.⁷⁶ To assume that the short text represents the original text-form, would mean that verses 19b-20 had been introduced into every text of the manuscripts with the exception of the Western witnesses D a b d e ff² i l.⁷⁷ In addition to the evidence of the Greek MSS, Jeremias,⁷⁸ Benoit⁷⁹ and Schuermann⁸⁰ have also pointed to the early Christian writers, beginning with Marcion, Justin and Tatian, as witnesses of the long text.⁸¹

On the other hand, the arguments in support of the short text cannot simply be minimized or ignored.⁸² The rules of textual criticism definitely speak in favour of the originality of the short text.⁸³ According to these two basic rules, the shorter text is the older one and preference is to be given to the more difficult reading.⁸⁴ In addition to these basic rules of textual criticism, it should be mentioned

that the attestation of the short text-form is not at all that insignificant.⁸⁵ On the other hand, if these two arguments in support of the short text are carefully compared with each other, it appears that the MS evidence represents a stronger argument in support of the long text than that of the two canons of textual criticism in support of the short text.⁸⁶

While the weight of MS evidence lies with the longer Lucan text, we must recognize that this argument is not the decisive one, in favour of the originality of the longer text-form. In Benoit's opinion, we are not dealing with an accidental corruption of the text due to a scribal error, but rather with an intended and deliberate alteration.⁸⁷ Thus, Benoit,⁸⁸ like Jeremias,⁸⁹ recognized that in this particular case it would be impossible to make a decision in favour of the long text on the basis of the overwhelming MS evidence alone. Jeremias has, therefore, made further attempts to find proof for the originality of the longer text-form. Having shown that Luke 22:19-20 cannot be considered as a literary compilation from Mark and Paul,⁹⁰ he examined the relationship between the Alexandrian and the Western text.⁹¹

Thus, he has focussed his special attention on eighteen passages in Luke where an identical problem to that of Luke 22:19b-20 occurred.⁹² In each of the eighteen Western non-interpolations, he has tried to determine whether the long or the short reading was original. On the premise that the long text should prove to be original, the Western readings simply represented a text which was shortened in the West.⁹³ If on the other hand, the short text should prove to be original, then all the ecclesiastical provinces with the exception of the one in the West, would be in possession of an interpolated text.⁹⁴ On the basis

of his minute examination, Jeremias concluded that in sixteen out of eighteen passages examined, preference had to be given to the Alexandrian long text, while in the remaining two cases, greater originality had to be attributed to the Western text.⁹⁵ In Jeremias' opinion, this conclusion is of real importance for the originality of the longer text.⁹⁶ Westcott and Hort, on the other hand, have also made a careful analysis of these eighteen instances, but they have reached completely different conclusions.⁹⁷ In the light of this consideration, Richardson argued that the results of Jeremias' investigation can neither be considered as successfully overthrowing Westcott and Hort's judgment, nor do they amount to "a decisive argument in favour of the longer text of Luke's account of the Last Supper."⁹⁸ Even if it could be assumed that Jeremias is right, he has hardly presented proof for the originality of the longer Lucan text.

With regard to Westcott and Hort's text-critical judgment, it should be pointed out that as a rule these scholars gave preference to the Neutral text, which is best represented by codex Vaticanus (B) and by codex Sinaiticus (X).⁹⁹ In their opinion, this text comes nearest to the text of the autographs.¹⁰⁰ Only in the case of Matthew 27:49, Luke 22:19-20, 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52, do they give preference to the Western text.¹⁰¹ The basic reason why in these cases they abandon the testimony of X and B is that here the Western text, which normally is the fuller and more circumstantial text-form, did not add any material.¹⁰² The Neutral text on the other hand, presents the expanded reading.¹⁰³ Westcott and Hort's judgment is to be questioned, for it appears to be merely conjectural.¹⁰⁴ Consequently, one can hardly appeal to the Western text in support of the short text.

With regard to the origin of the short text, some scholars held that it was the result of an omission of verses 19b-20.¹⁰⁵ Others contended that the rise of the long text can best be explained on the basis of an interpolation or addition of verses 19b-20 to the short text.¹⁰⁶

According to Jeremias, the short text can best be understood on the assumption that it has arisen from the long text on the basis of a deletion of verses 19b-20.¹⁰⁷ In his opinion, the popular view, according to which the short text arose because of the exception taken to the two cups (Luke 22:17f, 20) and that the second cup was omitted because of the supposed repetition, is hardly satisfactory.¹⁰⁸ If either of the two cups was to be omitted it could only have been the first one, because it is much less significant theologically and liturgically.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, there was absolutely no reason for the deletion of verse 19b.¹¹⁰ The deletion of this verse appears to be a real problem when one attempts to derive the short text from the long one.¹¹¹ In his opinion, the abbreviation can best be explained on the basis that a pagan around the middle of the second century requested a copy of the Gospel of Luke.¹¹² Since the copyist was hesitant to give to him the complete text of the sacramental formula, he simply omitted it after the beginning words.¹¹³ This argument, however, is nothing more than a mere conjecture.

A similar explanation was given by Kilpatrick.¹¹⁴ He held that the short text was the result of an omission of verses 19b-20, for the purpose of preserving the arcanum of the rite from the uninitiated. Therefore, the text ended with a deliberate abruptness of *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου* (19a). This, he held was a cue which the faithful would know how to supplement.¹¹⁵ In the light of the early history of the text of Luke 22:19f, it may be assumed that verses 19b-20 were probably interpolated

before A.D. 120.¹¹⁶ Kilpatrick also pointed out that an archetype of c also lacked Luke 22:19b-20.¹¹⁷

The theory that verses 19b-20 were omitted in order to keep the Eucharist from profanation appears to be untenable for two reasons:

(1) First, we have no evidence that the arcane discipline was practiced at the time when Luke was written.¹¹⁸ (2) Secondly, by assuming that the omission of Luke 22:19b-20 resulted from the practice of the arcane discipline, it becomes clear that the Lucan account of the Eucharist, as compared with 1 Corinthians 10:16, 11:23ff, John 6:51 and Justin's Apol. I, 66:3 represents a remarkable exception.¹¹⁹ In the light of this consideration, the theory of the arcanum of the rite becomes very questionable. Even if the above arguments could be totally discredited, the arcanist theory would still be unconvincing.¹²⁰ In Chadwick's opinion, it may not be totally impossible, but it is extremely difficult to uphold it in view of verse 19a, which the abbreviator had left untouched. This verse contains the mysterium fidei: "This is my body."¹²¹

With these considerations in mind it is difficult to defend the view that the short text is the result of an omission of verses 19b-20. In particular, the omission of verse 19b appears to be unmotivated.¹²² This half-verse, Schweizer pointed out, is of importance and not offensive at all.¹²³

He has tried to evade the problem of the omission of verse 19b by appealing to Tatian, who presents verse 19 without verse 19b.¹²⁴ According to Schuermann,¹²⁵ Tatian presents his text in the following sequence: (1) verse 19a, (2) verse 20, and (3) verse 19b.¹²⁶ According to Zahn, verse 18 follows also. Thus it appears that verse 19b is missing between verses 19a and 20, but it follows after verse 20.¹²⁷

Jeremias has pointed out that Tatian omitted the command to repeat the rite after the bread.¹²⁸ According to Schweizer, this command occurs after verse 20.¹²⁹ How can the omission of the command to repeat the rite before verse 20 be explained? Did a redactor simply omit it? In Lessig's¹³⁰ opinion, it hardly makes any difference whether verses 19b, 20 or verses 20, 19b were omitted. It is still inexplicable why verse 19b should have been omitted. Thus, the detour over Tatian hardly pays.¹³¹

Furthermore, we must raise the question concerning the relevance of Tatian as a witness to the longer Lucan text. In Tatian, this pericope is based upon Mark and Matthew.¹³² In Jeremias' opinion, the term "the New Covenant" and "the command to repeat the rite" are an indication that Tatian must have depended upon the longer Lucan text.¹³³ On the other hand, Lessig thinks that Tatian's reference to the "New Covenant" is not necessarily an indication that he knew the longer text, because in Mark as well as in Matthew the phrase *καὶ τὴν διαθήκην* is also read by D lat sy^s P and lat sy.¹³⁴

The words of remembrance do not necessarily lend any support to the theory that Tatian had knowledge of the longer text, either. Richardson,¹³⁵ for instance, argued, that these words were not included by Tatian because he did not find them in any Gospel MS. In his opinion, they were added to the Diatessaron and the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe by later scribes. According to Lessig, the position and formulation of the words of remembrance lend support to the view that they have their origin in 1 Corinthians 11.¹³⁶ On the other hand, derivation from 1 Corinthians 11 becomes uncertain because Tatian does not give the command to repeat the rite twice like Paul, but only once like Luke.¹³⁷

Schuermann¹³⁸ has pointed out that Tatian's dependence upon a liturgical account of institution must be seriously taken into consideration, because the single command to repeat the rite with reference to the two eucharistic actions is well known in the liturgies of the East and the West.¹³⁹ Justin and Aphraates may be considered as the earliest witnesses to the Western and Eastern liturgies, respectively.¹⁴⁰

Furthermore, the command to repeat the rite has its suitable Sitz im Leben at the end of the liturgy.¹⁴¹ In the light of this consideration, it is difficult to ascertain whether the postulated liturgy was dependent upon the longer Lucan text or upon 1 Corinthians 11. If Tatian did not find his command to repeat the rite in a liturgy, it is very unlikely that he adopted it from 1 Corinthians 11, because he does not reproduce the Pauline remark ὁσάκις ἐὼς θύητε.¹⁴² While Lucan influence upon Tatian cannot be ruled out, one can hardly appeal to this text to prove the originality of the long text. Neither can Tatian's text be considered as proof for the originality of the short text.

As compared with the long text, only the moderate attestation of the short text seems to speak against its greater originality.¹⁴³ Whoever decides in favour of the short text has to make a decision as to what Luke actually wrote. If it is assumed that he wrote only verses 15-18, then verse 19a must be considered as a later addition and verses 19b-20 were added after that.¹⁴⁴

Some scholars, such as Otto¹⁴⁵ and Leaney,¹⁴⁶ held that Luke 22:15-19a is to be considered as the original text-form. In reaction to Kilpatrick's argument that the account of institution was cut short

in order to preserve the arcanum of the rite, Leaney argued that the case of the genuineness of the shorter text need not rest only upon this view.¹⁴⁷ Luke, he held, was governed by the idea of the Kingdom and its association with the meal.¹⁴⁸ Luke's shorter text links the verb *διατίθεμαι* with the Kingdom (verse 29).¹⁴⁹ A similar view was already advanced by R. Otto, whose rather ingenious textual theory we must carefully consider. Otto took up F. Dibelius' idea that the *διαθήκη* concept in Luke 22:29 is very old and was preserved by Luke in its original form.¹⁵⁰ On the basis of this consideration, Otto argued that verses 15-19a and 29, 30 formed a typical, compactly joined, unified paragraph on the Last Supper.¹⁵¹ This account, Otto maintained, was similar to the other three accounts. It bears a fully archaic character and was not influenced by the theology and the customs of the church. It reports an event, which had but one organic connection, namely, with the life of Christ himself.¹⁵²

According to Otto, the long text could not be original, for if the words of verses 19b-20 had originally stood in Luke, their later omission by anyone would simply be inexplicable.¹⁵³ In Lietzmann's opinion, Luke had created the introductory cup by moving it with the eschatological prospect to the beginning.¹⁵⁴ Otto, on the other hand, had favoured exactly the reverse process. He maintained that a simple introductory cup was later on interpreted from the perspective of the meaning of the breaking of bread and analogous to it.¹⁵⁵ On the basis of Lietzmann's thesis, the words about the New Covenant and the shedding of blood would, of course, have been lost, for there is absolutely no sense in making any reference to the shedding of blood before the breaking of bread.¹⁵⁶ In Otto's opinion, it is impossible that those signifi-

cant and weighty words should have been lost once they had been formulated.¹⁵⁷ Thus, Lietzmann's theory that the initial cup in Luke was really a cup after the meal, which Luke had transformed into an introductory cup, becomes untenable.¹⁵⁸

He held that Luke followed his early source and recorded verses 17-19a up to and including the words, "This is my body."¹⁵⁹ In combination with verses 29, 30 we find the original account of the Eucharist.¹⁶⁰ Verses 19b-20 are later interpolations. Verses 21-28 were either interpolated by Luke himself or by a predecessor.¹⁶¹

The first interpolation, verses 21-23, contains a warning to Judas (cf. Mark 14:18ff, Matt. 26:17ff).¹⁶² It was interpolated for dogmatic reasons, because it points to the fulfillment of a prophecy of Obadiah 7.¹⁶³

The second interpolation (verses 24-27) makes reference to the ambitious strife of the disciples with one another (cf. Mark 10:45ff, Matt. 20:24ff).¹⁶⁴ In Otto's opinion, these verses can easily be understood as an interpolation in a supper incident, because, according to Luke, Jesus had already reprimanded his disciples twice for their desire to occupy the chief seats at the supper as an example of culpable ambition.¹⁶⁵

Finally, in verse 28 reference is made to the temptations of Christ, which are still in the future.¹⁶⁶ According to Otto, the words of verse 28 are obviously a redactional supplement, in order to create a necessary transition from the scene of reproof in the preceding verses to the words concerning the inheritance of the Kingdom.¹⁶⁷

With the *diatēxai* (verse 29), Jesus turns to the eleven only.¹⁶⁸ The apocalyptic sayings which occur are closely connected with the

eschatological prospect of verses 15-18.¹⁶⁹

Otto's theory did not go unchallenged. Bultmann was very sceptical about Otto's reconstruction of the original account of the Eucharist.¹⁷⁰ In his opinion, Otto's approach to the problem represents a rather peculiar example of his treatment of the sources.¹⁷¹ Although Bultmann does not deny that Luke has joined together various sayings of a different character, in order to provide a historical framework for them, he has rightly pointed out that verses 29 and 30 are not different from verses 21-28. They too must be considered as sayings which were transmitted in isolation.¹⁷²

In Marxsen's¹⁷³ opinion, it would be wrong to conclude with Otto that Luke 22:28 represents an awkward transition to the thought of verse 29f. The opposite seems to be more probable.¹⁷⁴ The tradition of Luke 22:28-30 obviously corresponds to that of Matthew 19:28. In both cases we are dealing with one coherent piece of tradition, which appears in different contexts.¹⁷⁵ Therefore, Marxsen rightly pointed out that there is no reason for dividing it into two different parts. In the light of this argument, however, verse 28 would follow after verse 19a.¹⁷⁶ But this is an impossibility. Therefore, Otto's hypothesis would have to be rejected.¹⁷⁷

V. Taylor was also very sceptical of the critical foundation of Otto's exegesis.¹⁷⁸ He can see no fault with Otto's argument that the sections 21-23 and 24-27 were inserted by the evangelist into his source.¹⁷⁹ But he puts a big question mark behind Otto's view concerning verse 28.¹⁸⁰ In Taylor's opinion, this verse cannot simply be cancelled as a redactional supplement, because for both Jesus and his disciples the ~~τῆς πόλεως~~ still belong to the future.¹⁸¹ Jesus makes reference only to

his own trials. With regard to his disciples, he simply states that they "continued with" him. On the basis of this argument, Taylor is inclined to consider verses 14-18 and 28-30 as the original account of the Supper.¹⁸² But he rightly emphasized that this kind of textual reconstruction is very speculative.¹⁸³

Schuermann¹⁸⁴ has also objected to Otto's textual theory on the basis that in Luke 22:15-18 and 28-30 two different ideas are being expressed. While in Luke 22:15-18 the concept of the meal in the coming basileia of God is central, in Luke 22:28-30 the idea of participation in the rule of Christ in the coming Messianic Kingdom comes into focus.¹⁸⁵ For these reasons, and especially because this thesis presupposes the omission of verse 28, the theories of Otto, Dibelius and Bacon are not tenable.¹⁸⁶ Furthermore, these scholars consider verses 19b-20 as secondary material.¹⁸⁷

While Schuermann has clearly pointed to the difference of ideas expressed in verses 15-18 and 28-30, he has also recognized that these two pieces of tradition have certain elements in common.¹⁸⁸ With the eucharistic cup of verse 20, the New Covenant is now binding for the twelve. In Luke 22:28-30, the claim of rulership is transferred to them, as well as the promise to rule with Christ in his future Kingdom.¹⁸⁹ In Schuermann's opinion, the composition of verses 15-20a and 28-30 was probably fixed in writing prior to the time when Luke wrote his gospel.¹⁹⁰

In reaction to Otto's attempt to reconstruct the original account of the Eucharist, no one had objected to the idea that verses (28) 29-30 represent a very old tradition. But in spite of the archaic character of these verses, we are hardly justified in considering them as part of the original account of the Eucharist. Otto's argument that verse 28 repre-

sents an editorial supplement is absolutely unfounded. With Taylor, we must agree that Otto's textual reconstruction is based upon speculation. Therefore, it is absolutely impossible to attribute any historical value to the account which Otto had postulated.

Since Otto's textual hypothesis proved to be untenable, we may now raise the question: "Can it be assumed that Luke 22:15-19a constituted the original account of the Eucharist?" According to Grundmann,¹⁹¹ the short text, Luke 22:15-19a originally served to protect the sacred rite from profanation. At a later date it was supplemented by the old liturgical formula. In the course of the development, verse 19a was expanded and made plain.¹⁹² According to Lessig, the existence of a eucharistic account in the form of Luke 22:15-19a is highly improbable.¹⁹³ In his opinion, it is very unlikely that verses 15-19a reflect a form of the Eucharist which had no knowledge of the cup-word.¹⁹⁴ As compared with Mark 14:25, the Lucan account, verses 15-18, must be later.¹⁹⁵ Since the older Marcan form of the eschatological prospect appears in connection with the cup-word, therefore it seems to be reasonable to assume that the cup-word is older than the later form of the eschatological prospect. This, he argued, holds true even if the eschatological prospect were not connected with the cup-word.¹⁹⁶ Lessig finds a strong confirmation for his view on the basis that verse 19a shows a striking resemblance to Mark 14:22.¹⁹⁷ Since Luke 22:19a appears to be later than Mark 14:22, he therefore assumed that it was derived from Mark.¹⁹⁸

In the light of Schuermann's source-critical investigation, Lessig's argument that Luke 22:15-18 represents a later stage of the development than Mark 14:25 may be questioned. With regard to Luke 22:19a, Schuermann has argued against Lucan dependence upon Mark 14:22

and 1 Corinthians 11:23b-24.¹⁹⁹ The striking agreement of Luke 22:19a with Mark 14:22 was interpreted by some scholars to be Lucan dependence upon the Marcan Vorlage.²⁰⁰ Schuermann, on the other hand, held that this half-verse must rather be considered as a relatively original Lucan reproduction of a pre-Lucan tradition.²⁰¹ In the Pauline account, this tradition shows traces of redactional activity. It stands close to Mark 14:22.²⁰² In this connection it should be pointed out that Schuermann had to change from the literary-critical to the traditio-historical method.²⁰³ Only on the basis of the historical method was he able to reach the conclusion that Luke 22:19a is probably an original Lucan reproduction of a pre-Lucan tradition.²⁰⁴ Schuermann's contention, however, that Luke 22:19a is older than Mark 14:22, is merely hypothetical.

On the basis of his source-critical analysis of Luke 22:15-18, Schuermann concluded that this passage can be traced back to a non-Markan source.²⁰⁵ He also maintained that these verses form one unit, whose style and content differ from the account of institution.²⁰⁶ He has also pointed out that this pre-Lucan piece represents an archaic account of Jesus' last meal.²⁰⁷ Therefore, it must have preserved the oldest tradition.²⁰⁸ The view that Luke 22:15-18 retained the oldest tradition was also held by Bultmann.²⁰⁹ He has argued that verses 19 and 20 did not²¹⁰ in their entirety represent an interpolation.²¹¹ While Luke preserved the oldest tradition, its wording appears to be secondary.²¹² With the exception of verse 17, Marcan influence upon this passage can be detected.²¹³ In Bultmann's opinion, the following elements are the result of an editorial revision: (1) The parallelism of the Passover meal and the cup is not convincing, since the cup is only one part of the Passover meal.

(2) With the cup there is no reference to the death of Jesus, and there is absolutely none to his person; the saying over the cup appears to be just a pointer to the coming Kingdom of God. (3) The reference to the Passover cannot be original either.²¹⁴ Bultmann maintained that bread was probably mentioned instead of the Passover.²¹⁵ Unfortunately, this argument lacks conviction because it is based on mere speculation, rather than upon sound evidence.

In Chadwick's opinion, the phrase τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν is very odd.²¹⁶ He argued that according to Septuagintal usage, the Passover is either "sacrificed" or "done," but not "eaten."²¹⁷ He maintained that the word pascha refers to the whole rite. Therefore, in verse 15 the bread is there by implication.²¹⁸ The evangelist, however, had failed to recognize it in this verse. Since he had found an unambiguous reference in his source, he only saw the need for supplementing it by adding some words about the bread. These words he found in the Marcan tradition.²¹⁹ Thus, he bluntly appended verse 19a.²²⁰

While the expression "to eat the Passover" is not commonly used, it should be pointed out that the phrase "eating it" is used (with the direct object) in 2 Chronicles 30:18. The expression "eating of it" is found in Exodus 12:48. In Dalman's²²¹ opinion, only the phrase found in 2 Chronicles 30:18 can be assumed in Matthew 26:17, Mark 14:12, Luke 22:11 and John 18:28. In Luke 22:15 an "of it" should be expected, but it is not there.²²² According to Barrett,²²³ whose view was accepted by Jeremias,²²⁴ the phrase τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν is not odd at all (if odd means strange, or unusual). In fact, it is quite common.²²⁵ Whenever it is used, it does not mean "to celebrate the feast or rite of the Passover," but "to eat the Passover lamb."²²⁶ In Luke 22:15, he pointed

out, the word ~~φάειν~~ determines the meaning of ~~τοῦ α~~. Here, the lamb and not the rite as a whole is meant.²²⁷ Whether this be so or not, we must object to Chadwick's hypothesis, which presupposes an evangelist, who for reasons of ignorance or carelessness had failed to perceive that in verse 15, the bread was present by implication.²²⁸ Such an assumption seems unfounded. The argument that verse 19a was bluntly appended in order to compensate for the unrecognized reference to the bread in verse 15, fails to be convincing.

While Schuermann²²⁹ and others have attempted to prove that Luke 22:15-18 can be traced to a special source, Dibelius²³⁰ held that these verses represent a Lucan composition.

In his opinion, the rise of this complicated text presents no riddle. In Mark a discrepancy comes into focus, because the legend of the disciples' search for a hall announces a Passover meal.²³¹ Mark 14:22-25, on the other hand, does not feature a Passover meal. Therefore, Luke was particularly concerned with the description of a Passover meal.²³² For his composition, Luke had utilized an announcement of suffering (verse 15), and a command to divide the cup (verse 17). Luke, however, added to both references a variation of the eschatological saying of Mark 14:25.²³³ To this completed composition, he added the words of institution, which stem from his cultic tradition.²³⁴ According to Dibelius, the whole Lucan account represents an attempt to historicize the words of institution, by inserting them into the frame of a Passover meal.²³⁵ Dibelius' reconstruction appears to be rather hypothetical.

The question whether Luke 22:15-18 represents a Lucan composition, or whether these verses can actually be traced back to a non-Markan pre-Lucan source, is of little consequence in determining the historical

value of this tradition. Schuermann²³⁶ has argued that verses 15-18 represent an independent account of Jesus' Last Supper, which has preserved the oldest tradition. In basic agreement with Schuermann, Schweizer²³⁷ has even gone so far as to say that Luke 22:15-18 correctly describes the historical situation of the very first Eucharist in the primitive church.²³⁸ These scholars, no doubt, are strongly convinced that the passage Luke 22:15-18 represents a tradition which is historically more reliable than any other tradition of the Eucharist found in the New Testament.²³⁹ From a traditio-historical point of view, this thesis could be challenged.

Thus far, we have observed that the overwhelming MS evidence favours the originality of the long text. The reasons given by several scholars for the omission of verses 19b-20 appeared to be rather inadequate. The hypothesis of an original text of 15-19a or of 15-19a and 29, 30 proved to be untenable. In agreement with Schuermann, we hold that a short text in the form of verses 15-18 is to be considered as a possibility. Luke would have found this text in his special source.²⁴⁰

On the assumption that Luke 22:15-18 represents the original text of the Last Supper, the question arises: "How can we explain the origin of the long text?"

In this connection it should be pointed out that verse 19a and the closing words of verse 20, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, seem to indicate a close relationship with Mark 14:22ff.²⁴¹ Furthermore, there are striking similarities between Luke 22:19b-20 and 1 Corinthians 11:23ff.²⁴² Jeremias, for instance, has pointed out that the connecting clause ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον (Luke: καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως) μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι is a clear indication of the close relationship between the Lucan and

Pauline accounts of institution.²⁴³

This consideration, however, tends no support to Lietzmann's claim that Luke 22:19-20 shows a definite dependence upon 1 Corinthians 11:24-25.²⁴⁴ Does Luke 22:19b-20 represent a synthesis from Luke and Paul? This hypothesis falls to the ground as soon as both accounts are carefully compared with each other. Goguel, for instance, did not consider Luke 22:19b-20 in terms of an interpolation from 1 Corinthians 11.²⁴⁵

Thus he is in disagreement with scholars such as G. B. Caird²⁴⁶ and others who hold that the disputed verses appear to have been partly drawn from 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 and partly from Mark 14:24.²⁴⁷ Goguel's argument was based upon the fact that in 1 Corinthians 11:23, the command to repeat the rite is linked with both bread- and cup-word.²⁴⁸ In the Lucan account, on the other hand, its absence with reference to the cup-word creates a problem. If it is to be assumed that Luke himself had intended only one command to repeat the rite, he probably would have placed it at the close, in such a way that it would refer to the whole.²⁴⁹

Schweizer did not simply consider verses 19b-20 as a copy of 1 Corinthians 11:23ff.²⁵⁰ In addition to some minor deviations, he also discovered

the incongruity which was created by the missing second command to repeat the rite.²⁵¹ On the basis of a careful comparison of the two accounts, Schuermann discovered five Lucan-Pauline differences in Luke 22:19b-20.²⁵² In his opinion, this great number of Lucan-Pauline differences in just one and a half verses presents a strong argument against the theory that the Lucan formula was derived from 1 Corinthians

11:24b-25.²⁵³ In basic agreement with Schuermann, Betz²⁵⁴ has also pointed to the numerous differences in Luke 22:19, 20 as compared with 1 Corinthians 11:23-25. Betz was also strongly convinced that Luke

22:19-20 was not simply adopted from 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25.²⁵⁵ Cirlot,²⁵⁶ on the other hand, argued that the Lucan formula belongs to a tradition which Luke had probably received from Paul. This tradition was then supplemented by the Marcan Gospel, which constituted one of his major sources. A similar position was taken by Throckmorton,²⁵⁷ who proposed the theory that Luke 22:18-20 is Marcan in essence, with Pauline terminology inserted by Luke himself, and conflated with Mark, especially in verses 19b and 20a.²⁵⁸ Verse 20a is straight from Mark.²⁵⁹ According to Throckmorton it is not true that at a later time Pauline words were omitted, because of the Marcan characteristics of these verses.²⁶⁰ In Throckmorton's opinion, the rise of the short forms can best be explained as attempts to solve the problem of the two cups.²⁶¹ In the light of Schuermann's analysis, the theory that the Lucan formula was influenced by Pauline terminology, becomes untenable.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that Jeremias' hypothesis has cast new light on the question of the relationship between Luke 22:19b-20 and 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25.²⁶² In his opinion, the view that Luke 22:19-20 represents a liturgical formula accounts for the resemblance with the Pauline account.²⁶³ Jeremias also held that the incongruence of the participial construction *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυρόμενον* would be acceptable in a liturgical formula. In agreement with Dibelius, Jeremias considers verses 19-20 as a "third variant" on the liturgical formula relating to the Eucharist.²⁶⁴ In support of this view, V. Taylor pointed out that in contrast to Luke 22:14-18 there are no characteristic Lucan words in 22:19-20.²⁶⁵

Contrary to those scholars who maintained that the Lucan formula shows dependence upon Paul and Mark, Schuermann has argued that Luke

22:19, 20 represents an independent tradition, which shows no dependence upon Paul or Mark.²⁶⁶

On the basis of his text-, literary-, and form-critical investigation of Luke 22:19b-20, Schuermann concluded that there is a moral certainty that these verses belong to the original Lucan account of the Eucharist.²⁶⁷ In his opinion, the long text, Luke 22:15-20, seems to reflect a eucharistic celebration of the apostolic age.²⁶⁸ The short text, Luke 22:15-19a, on the other hand, may be considered as the result of the great liturgical upheaval during the early second century, which effected the separation of the Eucharist from the community meal.²⁶⁹ In the light of these considerations, Luke 22:19-20 seems to belong to the original tradition of the text.²⁷⁰ This conclusion, however, is not without some difficulties, for within the context of the two books, Luke-Acts, these verses seem to stand out as a foreign element. On the assumption that Luke-Acts belong together and can be considered as the work of one author, it is rather peculiar that every time this author makes reference to the eucharistic celebration of the primitive community, he designates it in terms of "breaking of bread." According to Schuermann this designation cannot be interpreted in the sense of a mere bread communion. In his opinion, it includes the eating of bread and the drinking of the cup.²⁷¹

Since the author of Luke-Acts refers almost exclusively to the eucharistic celebration of the primitive community in terms of the "breaking of bread," it is obvious that he is not very familiar with the description of the Eucharist found in verses 19b-20. In the light of this consideration it is difficult to see how these verses could have belonged to the original tradition of the text.

3. Conclusion

On the basis of our examination of the Lucan text-problem, we have seen that the transposed shorter forms seem to be dependent upon the short, rather than the long text. The various attempts to explain the rise of the short text as the result of an omission of verses 19b and 20 have failed to be convincing. In the light of Schuermann's source-critical analysis, it has become very probable that the original short form consisted of verses 15-18 rather than of 15-19a. Verse 19a probably had no existence of its own. It could be explained in terms of a Marcan addition, but it also might have been drawn from a pre-Lucan source. The consideration that originally verse 19a did not form a part of the short text finds support on the basis that all of verses 19 and 20 belonged to an independent tradition. These verses do not represent a compilation from Mark 14 and 1 Corinthians 11.

The long text, verses 15-20, can be explained in terms of a combination of two different sources. In the special source, which Luke utilized as a Vorlage, these two traditions of the eschatological prospect and the eucharistic words had already been combined. The fact that in verse 17 *ποτήριον* occurs without, but in verse 20 with the article has been considered as an indication of a seam between verses 15-18 and 19, 20.

Dibelius, Jeremias and others have made it very plausible that verses 19-20 represent a "third variant." If it can be assumed that verses 15-20 represent the original text-form, then the rise of the short text can best be explained in terms of an omission of verses 19b-20 rather than by the addition of these verses to an original "short text."

The Quest for the Oldest Form of
the Eucharistic Tradition

Since the introduction of the historical-critical method of research, the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist have become the subject of very meticulous investigations.²⁷² The search for the oldest attainable form of the tradition has led to numerous philological examinations, traditio-historical studies and literary-critical hypotheses.²⁷³

The words of institution in their relationship to one another, as well as to a possible archetype, were at first examined on the basis of literary-critical principles. The main criteria established were:²⁷⁴

1. Parallelism: The tendency towards the creation of parallel forms is an indication of development.
2. Linguistic criteria: Semitic wording is older than Greek formulations.
3. Theological criteria: A text which displays an advanced theological development is of later origin than a text which is less developed.
4. Cultic influences are considered as secondary developments.

These criteria were accepted as tools, enabling important decisions to be made. At the same time, they were not taken in an absolute sense, for it was realized that this could lead to false judgments.²⁷⁵

A survey of recent literary-critical and traditio-historical studies clearly indicates that there is no consensus among scholars as to the oldest attainable form of the tradition. New Testament scholars have obviously defended the originality of every eucharistic account in the New Testament with the exception of Matthew's.²⁷⁶ This account is not considered as an independent witness to the eucharistic tradition.²⁷⁷ Most scholars agree that Matthew had used Mark as his Vorlage. The

additional phrases, which cannot be traced back to Mark, are attributed to Matthew's redactional activity.²⁷⁸ This view has been challenged by Lessig,²⁷⁹ who claimed that it would be more reasonable to postulate a common source for Mark 14 and Matthew 26. "If one considers the Marcan form as a witness to the Roman tradition," he argued, "then a glance at Matthew will teach us that the Roman tradition must have been spread to such an extent, which hardly corresponds to the facts."²⁸⁰

For a long time, New Testament scholarship attributed greater originality to the Marcan and Pauline accounts of the Eucharist.²⁸¹ The Pauline account was considered to be the earliest written pericope of institution,²⁸² but the Marcan account, which was written about two decades later was said to be more primitive than the Pauline version, because it contains many Semitisms.²⁸³

Since scholarship is still divided on the question concerning the oldest attainable form of the tradition and the question concerning a possible archetype, it will be the purpose of this chapter to survey some of the most important traditio-historical contributions.

Thus we will focus our attention upon (1) Schuermann's Lucan hypothesis, (2) Jeremias' Marcan hypothesis, and (3) upon the various arguments which were presented in support of the priority of the Pauline account of the Eucharist.

1. The Lucan account is the oldest

In an attempt to reconstruct the historical situation of the Last Supper of Jesus, Schuermann²⁸⁴ had engaged in a form- and literary-critical analysis of Luke 22:7-38. Since from a text-critical point of view the Lucan text has raised many problems, some scholars held that this text

was only of secondary importance.²⁸⁵ Schuermann, on the other hand, was determined to elevate the Lucan text from its lowly position of a Cinderella to that of a royal child.²⁸⁶

It was the purpose of Schuermann's source-critical analysis to present proof that under the cover of the present text is still preserved some original, traditional material.²⁸⁷ He held that by subtracting the secondary elements of redaction it might be possible to reconstruct the archetype of the eucharistic accounts in the New Testament.²⁸⁸

Schuermann's investigation is divided into three parts. In part one he attempted to show that contrary to the opinion of many New Testament scholars, Luke 22:15-18 cannot be considered as a literary formation based upon Mark 14:25.²⁸⁹ According to Schuermann, this passage represents a Lucan redaction of a pre-Lucan, non-Markan tradition.²⁹⁰

In the second part of his source-critical investigation, Schuermann attempted to show that the Lucan account of institution, Luke 22:19-20a, represents an independent, pre-Lucan tradition.²⁹¹

The purpose of the final part of his investigation was to discover and to determine more precisely the postulated, written Vorlage. This Vorlage, which contained the passage Luke 22:15-18, 19-20a, 24-27, 28-30, 31-32, 35-38 must have been available to Luke.²⁹²

In connection with his literary-critical analysis of Luke 22:15-18, Schuermann cited five literary-critical observations in support of his thesis:²⁹³

1. Luke exercises greater freedom in editing synoptic narrative material than in editing the transmitted words of the Lord.²⁹⁴

2. No proof can be presented that Luke has ever created a parallel sentence on his own.²⁹⁵

3. At least outside the passion narrative, it is impossible to find any proof for the transposition of pericopes by Luke.²⁹⁶

4. It is Luke's custom to shorten his Marcan Vorlage extensively. This tendency can be detected in his dialogues. In other words, in Schuermann's opinion, an independent expansion of the dialogue Luke 22:15-18 by Luke would be rather unusual.²⁹⁷

5. There are indications that Luke 22:15-18 was used for literary purposes at an early date:²⁹⁸

a) A pre-Lucan existence of verses 15 and 16 could be established, if it should turn out that in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff Paul shows knowledge of the unit Luke 22:15-18, for in 1 Corinthians 11:23b a required statement of the meal situation is missing.²⁹⁹

b) During the following investigation, it will become probable that the passage Mark 14:22-24, 25 represents a Marcan redactional revision of a pre-Lucan composition like Luke 22:15-18, 19-20.³⁰⁰

On the basis of a word-by-word examination, Schuermann attempted to show that Luke had preserved a tradition which was lightly edited by Luke.³⁰¹ This tradition shows no literary relationship with Mark 14:25.³⁰² Therefore, Luke must have utilized a non-Markan tradition.³⁰³ For our present purpose, we will briefly summarize his arguments in support of his thesis:³⁰⁴

1. Verse 15 can hardly be considered in terms of a Lucan creation, because Luke always seeks to preserve the wording of transmitted dominical words.³⁰⁵ It will not be an easy task to find any examples of such words, which are to be considered as Lucan creations. Verse 15 represents a

pre-Lucan piece of the tradition, which exhibits traces of Lucan editorial activity.³⁰⁶

2. There is hardly any basis for the assumption that verse 16 is a Lucan creation.³⁰⁷ In this verse, Schuermann discovered verbal parallels to Mark 14:25: (1) ὅτι , (2) οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ ;³⁰⁸ etc. It is inconceivable that Luke should have created these expressions as an imitation of Mark 14:25, while in verse 18 he has avoided them.³⁰⁹ It would, then, be more reasonable to assume that verses 16 and 18 are a pre-Lucan unit, which is independent of Mark 14:25.³¹⁰ Schuermann is quite certain that verse 16 is a Lucan redaction of a pre-Lucan tradition.³¹¹

3. Verse 17 cannot be considered as a Lucan creation.³¹²

4. In the light of the previous results of his investigation, which had assured Schuermann of the pre-Lucan origin of Luke 22:15-17, it has become probable that verse 18, in connection with verses 15-17 represents an independent tradition also, although Mark 14:25 must be considered as a more original form than Luke 22:18.³¹³

On the basis of his literary-critical analysis, Schuermann concluded that the unit, Luke 22:15-18 has preserved a tradition which shows some traces of Lucan editorial activity. This tradition shows no literary dependence upon Mark 14:25.³¹⁴

Schuermann has also examined this unit on a form-critical basis. He concluded that Luke 22:15-18 is to be considered as a unit which is independent of Luke 22:19a (b-20).³¹⁵ This piece of the tradition belongs to a pre-Lucan stage of development.³¹⁶ It was not created on the basis of Mark 14:25.³¹⁷

In the light of his minute form- and literary-critical investigation, Schuermann concluded that Luke 22:15-18 represents an old account

of the last meal of Jesus, which did not contain words of institution.³¹⁸

In the second part of his source-critical investigation, Schuermann focussed his attention on Luke 22:19-20.³¹⁹ On the basis of his preliminary investigations,³²⁰ he concluded that Matthew 26:26-28 represents a further development of the Marcan form, which exerted no influence upon the Lucan text.³²¹ Consequently, the Matthaean text had to be excluded from any further investigations.³²²

Luke 22:19-20 occupies a middle position between Mark 14:22-24 and 1 Corinthians 11:23b-25.³²³ According to Schuermann, it is its particular position which constitutes the traditio-historical problem of the Lucan account of institution.³²⁴

Schuermann held that in Luke 22:19b-20a, the Pauline-Lucan archetype has been preserved in a more original form than in 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25a.³²⁵ While it is probable that Luke passes it on with some insignificant revisions, Paul seems to cite it much more freely and in a strongly altered form.³²⁶

In support of his thesis, Schuermann discussed five differences between Luke and Paul.³²⁷ He concluded that in four out of five cases Lucan redaction of Pauline material appeared to be improbable.³²⁸

In Schuermann's opinion, the Lucan phrase *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* is probably more original than the Pauline construction *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*.³²⁹ As for the Lucan command to repeat the rite, his omission of the copula and the phrase *ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου* (Luke 22:20a), he comes to an identical conclusion.³³⁰ Only in one case, the Pauline phrase *ὡσαύτως καὶ* (1 Cor. 11:25a) is preferred to the Lucan *καὶ ... ὡσαύτως* (Luke 22:20a).³³¹

In the light of these considerations, Schuermann concluded that this result, in its "cumulative force," compels one to seek a traditio-

historical, rather than a literary solution.³³² Luke 22:19b-20a cannot be considered as a Lucan redaction of 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25a under the possible influence of Mark 14:22-24.³³³ Moreover, in Luke 22:19b-20a the Lucan-Pauline Grundbericht is still preserved in a more original form than in 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25a.³³⁴

In Schuermann's opinion, this traditio-historical result is relatively certain.³³⁵ If only one of the five Lucan-Pauline differences could not be explained in terms of a Lucan redaction of Pauline material, it would be evident that Luke 22:19b-20a represents a tradition which shows no literary dependence upon the Pauline tradition.³³⁶ While in these five cases Lucan redaction of Pauline material appears to be improbable, the obtained results in their cumulative force lead to a virtual certainty.³³⁷

On the basis of his comparison of Luke 22:19 with Mark 14:22 and 1 Corinthians 11:23b-24a, Schuermann concluded that Luke 22:19a can be considered neither as a Lucan reproduction of Mark 14:22, nor of 1 Corinthians 11:23b-24.³³⁸ Therefore, the attempt to explain the middle position of Luke 22:19a between Mark 14:22 and 1 Corinthians 11:23b-24a on a literary basis, is no longer important.³³⁹ The traditio-historical solution appears to be more promising: Luke 22:19a is to be considered as the relatively original Lucan reproduction of a pre-Lucan tradition, which in 1 Corinthians 11:23ff, appears in a strongly revised form and which is closely related with Mark 14:22.³⁴⁰

In the light of his minute investigation of the Lucan text, Luke 22:19-20a, Schuermann concluded that in verse 19a Luke has preserved this independent tradition.³⁴¹ It is possible, however, that it was influenced by Mark.³⁴² Such influence can be detected in verse 20b.³⁴³ It is very

certain that the Lucan account of institution in Luke 22:19-20a is not a literary composition based upon the Pauline and Marcan accounts of institution.³⁴⁴ It is rather a Lucan reproduction of an independent form of the tradition of the accounts of institution in the New Testament. This tradition can be traced back to an archetype which is common to both Paul and Luke.³⁴⁵

In the second section of his investigation, Schuermann compared the Lucan-Pauline Grundform with the Marcan tradition.³⁴⁶ On the basis of a comparison between the Pauline-Lucan version of the bread- and cup- words with that of Mark, Schuermann concluded that in the dominical words, the archetype, which is to be postulated, shows verbal agreements with the Lucan-Pauline Grundbericht.³⁴⁷ With the exception of the attributive addition in Luke 22:20b, it also agrees with the Lucan account of institution.³⁴⁸

The two units; Luke 22:15-18, 19-20 were originally independent.³⁴⁹ Schuermann pointed out, however, that an examination of Luke 22:15-18, Mark 14:12-18a, 22-24, 25; 1 Corinthians 11:23b-25, 26; Luke 22:19-20; Luke 22:28-30 lends support to the view that Luke 22:19-20a and Luke 22:15-18 represent a pre-Lucan combination.³⁵⁰

On the basis of his source-critical analysis of Luke 22:15-20a Schuermann concluded that the eucharistic traditions of the New Testament could be traced back to an Aramaic archetype.³⁵¹ Before the tradition was divided into the Lucan-Pauline and Marcan branches, it had formed a combination with the account of the Passover (Luke 22:15-18). This early combination of the two accounts, Luke 22:15-18 with 19-20a became part of the passion narrative.³⁵²

Schuermann also held that the pericope Luke 22:15-18 must have

had an introduction which would serve to indicate the paschal character of the last meal.³⁵³ This introduction is not represented by Luke 22:7-14, which must be considered as a Lucan redaction of Mark.³⁵⁴ The passage Luke 22:7-14 has displaced an original introduction, Luke 22:X, which is identical with Mark 14:12-18a.³⁵⁵ In other words, the original introduction to the old pre-Lucan Passover narrative lives on in the secondary expansion Mark 14:12-18a, which Luke had revised, being influenced by Mark 11:1-7ff.³⁵⁶

a) Critical appraisal

The primary purpose of Schuermann's traditio-historical analysis was to recover the ipsissima verba of Jesus. In the pursuit of this task, Schuermann had to move from suppositions to probabilities, from an accumulation of probabilities to moral certainties.³⁵⁷ In the light of these methodological reflections, the hypothetical nature of Schuermann's analysis comes into view. Contrary to Jeremias,³⁵⁸ Kuhn,³⁵⁹ and others who were convinced of the originality of the Marcan account of institution, Schuermann set out to prove the even greater originality of the Lucan account.³⁶⁰ Convinced of the great age of this tradition, Schuermann also attempted to prove the existence of a pre-Lucan, non-Markan form of the passion story.³⁶¹ In his opinion, it is very probable that such a passion story did exist.³⁶²

Did Schuermann reach his basic objective? In Schweizer's³⁶³ opinion, Schuermann has shown it to be very probable that Luke 22:15-18 represents an old account of the last meal of Jesus without words of institution. He even held that verses 15-18 correctly describe the historical situation of the first Lord's Supper in the primitive Christian

community.³⁶⁴ He agrees with Schuermann that the Pauline-Lucan tradition is older than the one represented by Mark and Matthew.³⁶⁵

Winter³⁶⁶ was more skeptical than Schweizer about the results of Schuermann's analysis. In Winter's opinion, considerable weight of argument presses against the acceptance of Schuermann's proposition.³⁶⁷ He preferred not to offer any counter-arguments.³⁶⁸ He did point out, though, that we may never be able to disentangle the various strands of the tradition that are combined in each of the passion stories.³⁶⁹ The, rather, complex structure of the Marcan account of the Passover meal seems to justify his skepticism.³⁷⁰

In the course of his reconstruction, Schuermann concluded that the Pauline-Lucan Grundbericht largely agrees with the archetype which he had postulated for the Lucan-Pauline and Marcan traditions.³⁷¹ He was quick to point out, however, that the originality of this archetype is to be understood in a relative sense.³⁷² Schuermann had derived this archetype by subtracting all secondary elements of redaction which came into focus as the result of a comparison of the Pauline-Lucan with the Marcan-Matthean tradition.³⁷³ This reconstructed archetype, however, is not identical with the historical account of the Last Supper.³⁷⁴ There is still a considerable gap between the two.³⁷⁵ In the final analysis then, the attempt to reconstruct the ipsissima verba of Jesus proved to be unsuccessful. Since the actual words of Jesus could not be recovered on a traditio-historical basis, Schuermann proposed to apply a different method.³⁷⁶ He was hopeful that a firm basis for understanding the words of Jesus might be reached by examining Jesus' actions at the Last Supper.³⁷⁷

While Schuermann's attempt to recover the ipsissima verba of

Jesus on a traditio-historical basis has proved to be unsuccessful, he has made out a good case for the hypothesis that the Lucan account of the Eucharist belongs to an independent strand of the tradition.³⁷⁸ In other words, the Lucan account cannot be considered as a compilation of Marcan and Pauline elements. Luke has instead relied upon a pre-Pauline liturgical source.³⁷⁹

2. The Marcan account is the oldest

While Schuermann had attempted to defend the originality of the Lucan text,³⁸⁰ Jeremias held that this position was untenable.³⁸¹ Jeremias, however, did not fail to utilize Schuermann's arguments in support of his own thesis. Unfortunately, he has not dealt with the basic hypothesis concerning Luke 22:15-18 as an original Passover account.³⁸²

In his search for the ipsissima verba of Jesus, Jeremias also analyzed the various strands of the eucharistic tradition in the New Testament. He did so by applying the form- and literary-critical methods.³⁸³

He started his investigation with a literary-critical analysis of the passion narrative in order to determine the position of the account of the Last Supper within the framework of that narrative.³⁸⁴ His analysis shows that the passion narrative has passed through certain stages of development.³⁸⁵ On the assumption that 1 Corinthians 15:3b-5 represents the initial stage, the following pattern of development emerges:

1. The early kerygma is to be understood as the first stage of the development.³⁸⁶
2. The short account of the passion narrative forms the second stage of

development. This is followed by the long account.³⁸⁷

3. The present form of the passion narrative as found in the four gospels represents an expansion of a more primitive form.³⁸⁸

A very similar pattern of development can be discerned when the individual accounts of the Last Supper are being subjected to the detailed scrutiny of literary criticism, resulting in the following picture:³⁸⁹

1. The words of interpretation form the earliest part of the eucharistic accounts (Mark 14:22-24 par.). They can be traced back to the early kerygma.³⁹⁰

2. The announcement of the betrayal (Mark 14:17-21) constitutes an original part of the long account, being attested by all four gospels.³⁹¹

3. Everything else is part early special tradition, part composition, and part expansion.³⁹²

The account of the institution of the Lord's Supper circulated as an independent piece of tradition, as is evidenced by 1 Corinthians 11:23-25.³⁹³ Jeremias argued that verse 23 can only be understood in the sense that the chain of the tradition goes back to Jesus.³⁹⁴ On the basis of his literary-critical analysis, Jeremias gained two important results: (1) the independence and antiquity of the tradition has been established,³⁹⁵ and (2) the eucharistic accounts represent the result of a living process of growth in the tradition.³⁹⁶

Jeremias was also concerned to show that these eucharistic accounts, which had been transmitted as an independent tradition, have been influenced by liturgical usage in many ways.³⁹⁷ It is very important to recognize that the eucharistic words of Jesus can only be obtained in the form of liturgical texts.³⁹⁸ According to Jeremias, it is even more important to realize that an examination of the liturgical influence upon

the transmission of the eucharistic words, points to a pre-liturgical stratum of the tradition.³⁹⁹ In the light of these considerations and with the help of the literary-critical method, Jeremias maintained that it should be possible to recover the original tradition.⁴⁰⁰

Having decided that the longer Lucan reading, 19b-20 is authentic, Jeremias is now in the position to compare the eucharistic words of Jesus in the five texts.⁴⁰¹ The purpose of this investigation was to reconstruct the oldest attainable form of the tradition.⁴⁰² On the basis of his analysis, he concluded that the Marcan account appears to be the oldest form, because of its strong Semitic speech colouring.⁴⁰³ The Lucan form, on the other hand, shows signs of assimilation to Greek style.⁴⁰⁴ In the Pauline account, this trend is even more strongly pronounced. These results are of real importance as one seeks to determine the age of the tradition of the eucharistic words.⁴⁰⁵

A literary analysis of the Marcan and Pauline-Lucan accounts indicates that both traditions can be traced back to a common eucharistic tradition, which may be the Grundform of both texts.⁴⁰⁶ This Grundform was probably formulated in Aramaic or Hebrew.⁴⁰⁷ The Marcan account, however, has preserved an older tradition than the Pauline-Lucan accounts.⁴⁰⁸ In Jeremias' opinion, it is closest to the original tradition. It probably belongs to the first decade after the death of Jesus.⁴⁰⁹

The results of Jeremias' minute investigation, however, do not agree with those of an equally careful examination of the evidence by Schuermann, who concluded that the Lucan text has preserved a more primitive tradition than the Marcan account of the Eucharist.⁴¹⁰

Jeremias found Schuermann's hypothesis untenable, claiming that the

Lucan form reveals a stronger tendency of grecizing than the Marcan text.⁴¹¹ A comparison of Luke 22:18 with Mark 14:25 will certainly lend support to this thesis.⁴¹²

As to the command to repeat the rite, the question concerning its origin has come into focus. Here the question arises: "Is it a command given by Jesus, or did it develop from the meal practices of the early church, which in turn put it into the mouth of Jesus?"⁴¹³ Since there exists a close relationship between the command to repeat the rite and the Passover ritual, it is highly probable that the command may even originate with Jesus himself.⁴¹⁴

On the whole, the substance of the tradition has not been tampered with, because the primitive Semitic tradition can be traced back to the first decade of the lifetime of Jesus.⁴¹⁵ In fact, there are certain expressions in the eucharistic words which bring us into touch with the historical Jesus.⁴¹⁶

1. *Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν*. This idiom, which neither has any parallels in Jewish literature nor in all of the New Testament writings, except in the gospels, must be original with Jesus.⁴¹⁷
2. *Παράκλησις* (Luke 22:16). The frequency of the passive for the circumlocution of the name of God, as it is found in the words of Jesus in the five lines of the tradition, is also unparalleled. Therefore, Jeremias concluded that this must be an indication as to how Jesus spoke.⁴¹⁸
3. Finally, Jeremias held that the predilection for similitudes, comparisons and parabolic expressions in the words of interpretation are unique with Jesus.⁴¹⁹

In the light of these observations, Jeremias concluded that the common core of the tradition of the Lord's Supper is preserved to us in

a very reliable form.⁴²⁰

Jeremias' thesis that the Marcan account of the Eucharist represents the oldest form of the tradition is to be questioned. As Lessig has rightly pointed out, the number of Semitisms in a given text does not allow us to draw any conclusions regarding the temporal distance of this text from its source.⁴²¹

Furthermore, Jeremias' thesis that the common core of the tradition is preserved in a reliable form, because several idiomatic expressions are unique with Jesus is unconvincing.

3. The Pauline account is the oldest

The priority of the Pauline account of the Eucharist went unchallenged until Jeremias published the first edition of Die Abendmahls-
worte Jesu, in 1935.⁴²² Until then, most New Testament scholars had been convinced that the Pauline version was the oldest eucharistic account.⁴²³

What are the basic reasons in support of the greater originality of the Pauline version of the Eucharist?

1. From a literary point of view, the Pauline account is the older.⁴²⁴
2. Bornkamm,⁴²⁵ in agreement with Marxsen⁴²⁶ and Neuenzeit⁴²⁷ has decided in favour of the Pauline account, because of the short phrase *μετὰ τὸ δεῖνῃσαι*, which appears only in the Pauline account and in the longer text of Luke.⁴²⁸
3. In accordance with his basic thesis of the two eucharistic types, Lietzmann maintained that the apostle Paul was the originator of the second type of the Eucharist.⁴²⁹ The real understanding of the Eucharist, however, came to him by special revelation.⁴³⁰ In this connection it should be pointed out that Loisy held the view that the apostle

Paul had received the whole account of institution by direct revelation.⁴³¹ In support of his thesis, Loisy had pointed to Galatians 1:12, where the apostle Paul authenticates "his Gospel" on the basis of a direct revelation from Jesus Christ.⁴³² This revelation, Loisy held, had come to Paul during a personal encounter with Jesus Christ on the road to Damascus.⁴³³ Loisy's view is now no longer accepted.

In his criticism of Lietzmann's position that the command to repeat the rite constitutes the substance of the revelation, Lohmeyer⁴³⁴ argued that the language of this whole account is un-Pauline. Only here do we find words such as ἀνάμνησις or ὁμολογία and phrases such as μετὰ τὸ δεῖνῃσαι. Only here the word παραδίδοσθαι is used in the absolute sense, while ὡσαύτως occurs only once more in Romans 8:26. No parallel for the address κύριος Ἰησοῦς can be found in a Pauline or Synoptic narrative.⁴³⁵

These linguistic peculiarities are an indication that the Pauline account, 1 Corinthians 11:23ff, appears in a special form.⁴³⁶ It is a single story of the same kind, which can also be found in the Synoptic tradition.⁴³⁷ The form and colour of the sentences are determined by liturgical practice. Therefore, the narration, if one may still call it a narration, begins with the address κύριος Ἰησοῦς.⁴³⁸ This is also the reason why everything is omitted which may emphasize the uniqueness of a particular event. We are not told, for instance, who were the former meal companions of Jesus, nor what they did with the bread and the cup.⁴³⁹ Furthermore, the word παραδίδοσθαι points to the eschatological enigma of God according to which the Son of Man will be delivered into the hands of sinners.⁴⁴⁰ More specifically, the hour of Gethsemane is the night when he was "handed over," and during this night of escha-

tological secret, was born the eschatological grace of the Lord's Supper.⁴⁴¹ Therefore, it is understandable that the uniqueness and eschatological validity of this event can hardly be described in more depth and greatness.⁴⁴² In the true sense of the word, the Pauline account of the Eucharist represents an etiological cult legend.⁴⁴³

A number of scholars⁴⁴⁴ have challenged Lietzmann's theory of a direct revelation on the basis of the terminology found in 1 Corinthians 23a. They have argued that in the introduction *Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν* the apostle has employed the rabbinical termini technici *יְדִיבָר* and *לִיבָר* for transmitting the tradition.⁴⁴⁵

On the basis of a careful examination of the terminology employed by the apostle, Marxsen concluded that the linguistic evidence hardly favours the theory of a direct revelation.⁴⁴⁶ In Neuenzeit's opinion, from a philological point of view it cannot be decided whether in 1 Corinthians 11:23 one has to assume a direct or indirect revelation "from the Lord."⁴⁴⁷

While Cullmann⁴⁴⁸ agrees with the majority of scholars that 1 Corinthians 11:23 does not refer to a vision, but rather to a tradition of the church, he differs as regards the words "from the Lord." He attempted to interpret them within the framework of the whole problem of *παράδοσις*, in the New Testament.⁴⁴⁹ According to Cullmann's definition, the title *κύριος* can refer to the historical Jesus as the chronological beginning and the first link of the tradition.⁴⁵⁰ It can also refer to the exalted Lord as the real author of the whole tradition.⁴⁵¹ In Cullmann's opinion, this hypothesis best explains St. Paul's direct identification of the *παράδοσις* with the *κύριος*.⁴⁵² He holds that in the transmission of his words by the apostles, the Lord himself is at work,

not a human agent.⁴⁵³ On this basis, the distribution between the transmission of the facts and their theological importance is hardly justified. The Lord reveals both aspects to the apostle Paul, the immediate witness.⁴⁵⁴

In Neuenzeit's opinion, Cullmann's exposition is not clear-cut.⁴⁵⁵ For instance, he fails to distinguish between transmission and interpretation. Thus, he is able to find an explanation that in 1 Corinthians 11:23a Paul has received his tradition from the Lord and from the apostolic tradition at the same time.⁴⁵⁶ According to Neuenzeit, no evidence is needed in support of the view that in transmitting the apostolic kerygma, Paul acted sub assistentia Spiritus Sancti. But in 1 Corinthians 11:23a his primary concern was to fix the starting-point of his tradition.⁴⁵⁷ While the aspect of the cooperation of the Spirit of Christ in the process of transmission cannot be ignored, it is important to recognize that this process is subject to the human laws of transmission.⁴⁵⁸ Therefore, it is impossible to equate paradosis with the kurios.⁴⁵⁹

As to the question where and when the apostle Paul had received the tradition, Bornkamm⁴⁶⁰ pointed to the time of Paul's sojourn at Antioch, before he engaged in his missionary task. The formulae of 1 Corinthians 11 and 15, which Paul had received at Antioch, were probably known to the church of that city at the beginning of the forties.⁴⁶¹ These observations, however, are merely hypothetical. Some have argued that Paul may have come in contact with the tradition during his first visit to Jerusalem in the year 35 or 37 A.D. This argument is based on Galatians 1:18.⁴⁶²

In harmony with his thesis that the Lucan account of institution neither represents a post-canonical form of the tradition, nor a Lucan

compilation based upon 1 Corinthians 11:23b-25 and Mark 14:22-24, Schuermann attempted to show that Paul had drawn upon a pre-Pauline source.⁴⁶³

Schuermann finds support for his thesis on the basis of a number of linguistic features in 1 Corinthians 11:23-25:⁴⁶⁴

1. The description of the table rite "he took bread, broke it and gave thanks" seems to be part of an established tradition.⁴⁶⁵

2. In most instances, Paul uses the verb *ευχαριστεῖν* with the object in the dative rather than absolutely, as in 1 Corinthians 11:24.⁴⁶⁶ The use of the verb without the object may indicate dependence upon an Aramaic Vorlage.⁴⁶⁷ Schuermann holds that it is probably a Semitism.⁴⁶⁸

In the apostolic church the verb may have become a terminus technicus. In the Greek speaking churches it was probably known in its pre-Pauline form. Therefore, it is rather improbable that the verb *ευχαριστήσας* in verse 24 is of Pauline origin.⁴⁶⁹

3. Nowhere does Paul introduce a direct speech with *καὶ εἶπεν*.⁴⁷⁰

4. The participial phrase *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* is not a new creation by the apostle Paul, but rather the transformation of a phrase, which is also attested by Mark 14:24 and Luke 22:19b.⁴⁷¹ The Lucan form *τὸ ὑπὲρ διδόμενον*, however, is probably more original than the Pauline form.⁴⁷²

5. With the possible exception of Romans 7:4, the phrase *σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is used by Paul as a designation for the Christian community.⁴⁷³

6. *Ἀσκήσεις* is found in Paul's writings here only.⁴⁷⁴ According to Schuermann, this observation is of little importance, because the word occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Hebrews 10:3.⁴⁷⁵ In

Schuermann's opinion, Paul would probable have written *μνησθῆναι τοῦ*.⁴⁷⁶

7. The *ᾠδαὶ τῶν* was probable more original than the *καὶ... ᾠδαὶ τῶν*.⁴⁷⁷

8 *Meta tō* with the infinitive is found in Paul here only.⁴⁷⁸

9. Only in the Pauline cup-word is the new *diathēkē* connected with the sacrificial death of Jesus.⁴⁷⁹ In view of the fact that Paul makes only a few references to the new *diatheke*, this argument is hardly significant.⁴⁸⁰ It is important to notice, however, that the understanding of Jeremiah 31:31ff in 1 Corinthians 11:25 is different from the one found in other texts, where Paul refers to the same passage.⁴⁸¹ Just as in Jeremiah 31:31, in the cup-word the *diathēkē* concept conveys the original meaning of the eschatological condition of fulfillment.⁴⁸² On the other hand, in texts such as Romans 11:27, 2 Corinthians 3:4-18, Galatians 4:24, Paul is thinking of an order which is already present on earth but contrary to the Sinaitic order.⁴⁸³

10. The phrase *τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς* exhibits pre-Pauline features. In connection with Gersdorf's research, Schuermann pointed out that in forty-nine cases, Paul has *οὗτος*, *αὐτός* and *τὸ τοῦ* after the noun.⁴⁸⁴ Only in Romans 13:9, 2 Corinthians 2:10; 1:15; 8:7; 11:17; has he put it before the noun.⁴⁸⁵ In the light of his examination of these linguistic peculiarities, Schuermann had to admit that in some instances it was impossible to determine their pre-Pauline usage.⁴⁸⁶ But, if the evidence is being considered in its cumulative force, it becomes highly probable that these basic elements belong to a pre-Pauline stage of the development.⁴⁸⁷

In Taylor's opinion, Schuermann has made out a good case for the hypothesis that in 1 Corinthians 11:23-25 Paul is editing an earlier liturgical source.⁴⁸⁸ He also seems to infer that Schuermann's hypothesis was strengthened by the results of Jeremias' researches, since Jeremias had reached the same conclusions as Schuermann.⁴⁸⁹

According to Jeremias,⁴⁹⁰ the Pauline account of the Lord's Supper contains idioms foreign to Paul. Therefore, Luke did not necessarily reproduce 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25, but may have drawn upon a pre-Pauline liturgical source.⁴⁹¹ Both Jeremias and Schuermann held that Luke shows dependence upon a pre-Pauline liturgical source.⁴⁹²

As we have already pointed out, Schuermann had attempted to prove that Luke did not edit material from 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25.⁴⁹³ He defended the view that the Lucan construction *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* is to be preferred to the Pauline phrase *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, because the latter represents an almost intolerable difficulty.⁴⁹⁴

According to Neuenzeit,⁴⁹⁵ from a literary-critical standpoint, the lectio difficilior is to be preferred to the smoother Lucan version.⁴⁹⁶ In his opinion, Schuermann's argument that the Pauline form represents a shortened form of the more complete Lucan version is untenable.⁴⁹⁷ Since the participle conveys the idea of devotion, it would have greatly strengthened Paul's argumentation.⁴⁹⁸ An omission of the participle, on the other hand, would obviously have made an understanding of the text more difficult.⁴⁹⁹ Therefore, Schuermann can only appeal to his stylistic observation as evidence for the priority of the Lucan phrase.⁵⁰⁰ Schuermann's argumentation brings a basic methodological problem into focus.⁵⁰¹ He seems to have placed much emphasis upon the Synoptics and their sources, but he has hardly done any justice to the transmitted pieces of the Pauline tradition.⁵⁰²

According to Schuermann, the omission of the copula in Luke 22:20a is another clear indication that Luke is faithfully following his Aramaic Vorlage.⁵⁰³ Neuenzeit, who strongly defended the priority of the Pauline account of institution, pointed out that in the mouth of Jesus, the word

of institution could not have contained a copula, because only in the later Aramaic was this copula reproduced by hū.⁵⁰⁴ As to the Pauline and Lucan accounts, this is of little significance, since both had already been formulated in Greek during the pre-Lucan or pre-Pauline stage of the development. But since the copula is present in the Lucan bread-word, it would be inconceivable for the Lucan account as a whole to be closer to its Aramaic source than the Pauline version.⁵⁰⁵ Furthermore, it is possible to assume that Luke himself had omitted the copula for stylistic reasons.⁵⁰⁶

In connection with Schuermann's preference for the Lucan possessive phrase *ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου* to Paul's *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*, Neuenzeit has argued that the possessive pronoun in the Lucan cup-word may not necessarily be of pre-Lucan origin.⁵⁰⁷ It could also be explained as a stylistic adaptation.⁵⁰⁸ Schuermann's argument that the possessive pronoun was transposed by Paul for the purpose of accentuating the concepts *ὄψα* and *αἷμα* fails to be convincing. Any attempt by the apostle Paul to change the cultic formula would have resulted in a loss of his authority. He would have put himself on the same level with the libertines at Corinth, who were carelessly handling the normative material based on revelation.⁵⁰⁹

Neuenzeit pointed out that on the basis of traditio-historical considerations, it may be concluded that the Pauline conception of the Eucharist is not original with the apostle himself, for it is in full agreement with the primitive apostolic conception of the Eucharist.⁵¹⁰ Where the apostle first came into contact with this tradition it is impossible to say.⁵¹¹ He cited it in his letter to the Corinthians in the year 49/50.⁵¹² Marxsen was certain, however, that this tradition

can be traced back to the proximity of the historical situation of the Last Supper.⁵¹³ Consequently, one could hardly assume that during the short period of time between the historical supper and Paul's reception of the tradition, a change of content should have taken place.⁵¹⁴

In the light of these considerations, it seems that a good case could be made out for the hypothesis that the Pauline account of the Eucharist represents the oldest attainable tradition of the Eucharist.

The Form of the Eucharistic Words

1. Grouping of the texts

On the basis of a careful comparison of the eucharistic texts, scholars have recognized that the four accounts can be grouped into two main strands of the tradition.⁵¹⁵ On one hand, Paul and Luke show a very close relationship.⁵¹⁶ In Schuermann's⁵¹⁷ opinion, both represent two independent forms of one and the same stream of the tradition which was probably circulating at Antioch.⁵¹⁸ The source of this tradition, however, is Palestine.⁵¹⁹ We will have to decide which of these two forms represents the older one.

On the other hand, the accounts of Mark (14:22-25) and Matthew (26:26-29) seem to be closely related, because of the striking resemblances which can be discovered in these two forms.⁵²⁰ In Betz's⁵²¹ opinion, Palestine seems to be the home of this strand of the tradition. Benoit⁵²² has pointed to Jerusalem as home of the Marcan account, while Lessig⁵²³ contended that Caesarea must be considered as the starting-point for the two-traditions of Mark (Roman) and Matthew (Syrian). In spite of these differences between the two strands of the tradition,

scholars have found good reasons in support of the thesis that the different text-forms represent a further development of a basic core of the tradition.⁵²⁴ At this point, the question must be raised: "Will it be possible to determine the oldest, attainable form of the tradition and to recover the common archetype of the variant forms of the tradition?"

In order to answer this question we must examine (1) the bread- and cup-words, (2) the ὑπὲρ -phrases, (3) the command to repeat the rite, and (4) the eschatological prospect.

2. The bread-word

In connection with the bread-word, we observe that with the exception of the non-semitic position of the pronoun in the Pauline phrase, all texts transmit the logion: τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου.⁵²⁵ Patsch has pointed out that the same sentence is also found in John 6:51c, with the exception that here the τοῦτο is paraphrased and σὰρξ has taken the place of σῶμα.⁵²⁶ It remains uncertain, however, whether σὰρξ represents a translation variant of σῶμα.⁵²⁷

A glance at the Marcan tradition reveals the presence of an invitation to take (Mark λάβετε; Matthew λάβετε, φάγετε).⁵²⁸ This invitation is missing from the Lucan-Pauline tradition.⁵²⁹ But here we find the phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and the command to repeat the rite. Luke adds the διδόμενον.⁵³⁰ In Matthew, a φάγετε was added, which appears as a parallel form to πίνετε.⁵³¹

At this point the question arises, "How did the imperative originate?" In Lessig's opinion, this invitation "to take" was first introduced when the breaking of bread as a cultic action found its way into circles which were not acquainted with the Jewish rite.⁵³² He has

also directed our attention to the inscription on the Jewish golden beaker, *ΛΑΒΕ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑ*. According to Lessig, this inscription is an indication that the invitation to take was customary in Judaism.⁵³³ With Schuermann,⁵³⁴ Patsch conjectured that originally this invitation "to take" formed part of the Lucan tradition (Luke 22:17). For liturgical reasons it was transposed to the word of institution in Mark 14:22.⁵³⁵ The hypothetical nature of these various attempts to explain the origin of *ΛΑΒΕ* is apparent. None of them may be considered to be a satisfactory answer to our question. Since it is only of minor importance, we will, therefore, focus our attention upon the *ὕψ*-phrases.

3. The *ὕψ*-phrases

The *ὕψ*-phrases are of real importance, for they are theologically motivated.⁵³⁶ The addition to the Pauline bread-word reads: *τὸ ὕψ ὁ μῶν*.⁵³⁷ In Luke 22:19 the *ὕψ* phrase is supplemented by the participle *διδομενον*.⁵³⁸ In the Marcan-Matthaeian tradition, the bread-word appears without the *ὕψ*-phrase.⁵³⁹ If one does not try to explain the omission of this phrase in terms of an attempt to create a specially short formula, then one must assume that originally the bread-word was without the interpretative phrase.⁵⁴⁰ This explanation, however, is by no means convincing. Betz, on the other hand, argued that originally the phrase was indispensable.⁵⁴¹ It was omitted as soon as the Lord's Supper became a very familiar rite to the Christian community.⁵⁴² But why did Mark retain it in connection with the cup-word? In Lessig's⁵⁴³ opinion, it is conceivable that originally the bread-word was without an interpretative phrase. It was probably missing from the cup-word as well. Only at a later time, was it added to the already transformed Caesarean

version of the cup-word. From here it found its way into the Antiochene tradition.⁵⁴⁴ In the Pauline account, it moved to the bread-word, while in Luke it was attracted to both the bread- and cup-words.⁵⁴⁵ In support of the view that the interpretative phrases in the Antiochene tradition are later than those of the Caesarean tradition, Lessig argued that the Marcan $\piολλῶν$ is more original than the Antiochene $ὑμῶν$.⁵⁴⁶ According to Betz, the Marcan $\piολλῶν$ is a Semitism which is to be understood in an inclusive sense, for it embraces the many.⁵⁴⁷

With regard to the original position of the $ὑπὲρ$ -phrase, Marxsen⁵⁴⁸ envisioned the following course of development. The Pauline account consists of a double equation: $ὄψος = σῶμα$ and $ποτήριον = διαθήκη (ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι)$. Since $σῶμα$ and $διαθήκη$ are not corresponding terms, Marxsen argued that the first part of the equation required a different accentuation for the purpose of creating a parallelism. This resulted in the following equation: $ὄψος = σῶμα$ and $ποτήριον = αἷμα$.⁵⁴⁹ This equation is found in Mark. According to Marxsen, this does not mean that the Marcan form had developed out of the Pauline version. In Marxsen's opinion, it is possible to assume that in the primal form, the second word of interpretation aimed at the $διαθήκη$ concept. This form is preserved in 1 Corinthians 11. Since the Pauline version represents the more difficult reading, it must be considered as the older form of the tradition.⁵⁵⁰ In the light of this consideration it will be possible to make some judgment concerning the original location of the $ὑπὲρ$ -phrase. On the assumption that the original cup-word was transformed into a cup-blood word, it can easily be seen that the interpretative participle $ἐκχυννόμενον$ moved to $αἷμα$.⁵⁵¹ The participle in turn attracted the $ὑπὲρ$ -word.⁵⁵² Marxsen held that in the archetype the $ὑπὲρ πολλῶν$ was connected with

the bread-word. In the Pauline tradition it was changed into a *ὑπὲρ ὄψων*, which in its Semitic form of the archetype, moved to the wine-word in the Marcan tradition.⁵⁵³

Contrary to Marxsen, Schuermann argued that the Lucan version is to be preferred to that of Paul.⁵⁵⁴ In his opinion, the Pauline phrase cannot be original because a retranslation into Aramaic is hardly possible.⁵⁵⁵ On the other hand, the *didόμενον* would be indispensable in Aramaic.⁵⁵⁶ From a grammatical point of view, it would be easier to assume that Paul has shortened the attributive form rather than that Luke has supplemented it.⁵⁵⁷ Opposing Schuermann, Neuenzeit argued that from a literary-critical point of view, preference should be given to the more difficult reading.⁵⁵⁸ Thus, in basic agreement with Marxsen, he defends the greater originality of the Pauline tradition. He raised the question: "Why should Paul have omitted the *didόμενον*?"⁵⁵⁹ In Neuenzeit's opinion, the omission of the participle would have made the understanding of the text more difficult.⁵⁶⁰ In the light of these considerations, Schuermann's arguments are hardly convincing. They become even less persuasive in connection with the cup-word.⁵⁶¹

Schuermann admits that there is a coherence between Luke 22:20b and Mark 14:24b.⁵⁶² Since in his opinion Mark 14:24b was hardly derived from Luke 22:20b, he therefore considers the possibility of Lucan redaction of Mark 14:24b.⁵⁶³ Schuermann himself was well aware of the fact that this conjecture is not without problems. But at least it must be considered as a possibility.⁵⁶⁴ He has outlined the traditio-historical development of the *ὑπὲρ*-phrases as follows: In Schuermann's opinion, there can be no doubt that the Lucan participial phrase, Luke 22:19b, represents the original form.⁵⁶⁵ In the primal stages of the tradition,

a participial phrase was also connected with the Marcan bread-word. It resembled that of Luke 22:19b. The original phrase of the Marcan bread-word, however, moved to the Marcan wine-word, where it was transformed, and the participle ~~ἐκχυνόμενον~~ was added.⁵⁶⁶ The hypothetical nature of Schuermann's attempt to solve the complex problem of the original location of the ~~ὑπὲρ~~ phrase is obvious. As a result, it fails to be convincing.

Jeremias,⁵⁶⁷ on the other hand, has envisioned the following traditio-historical development of the ~~ὑπὲρ~~ -phrase. In his opinion, Mark is to be considered as the oldest text, because the participial phrase ~~τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν~~ corresponds to the Semitic word order.⁵⁶⁸ Furthermore, he pointed out that ~~πολλῶν~~ represents a Semitism, which is older than the ~~ὑμῶν~~.⁵⁶⁹ The Pauline short form of ~~τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν~~ does not stem from a Semitic tradition, because it cannot be retranslated into Aramaic.⁵⁷⁰ Jeremias also maintained that in Hebrew, a participle could hardly be omitted.⁵⁷¹ The short form ~~ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν~~ probably goes back to Paul himself.⁵⁷² Originally, the ~~ὑπὲρ~~ -phrase had formed a part of the wine-word.⁵⁷³ At this point, we must raise the question, "How does Jeremias explain the move of the ~~ὑπὲρ~~ -phrase from the cup-word to the bread-word?" First, he pointed to the asymmetry, which he detected in the Marcan tradition of the words of interpretation.⁵⁷⁴ In Mark, the bread-word is without a theological interpretation.⁵⁷⁵ Therefore, the emphasis is placed rather one-sidedly upon the cup-word.⁵⁷⁶ The emptiness which occurred after the bread-word called for a completion, especially in view of a celebration sub una.⁵⁷⁷ Hence, a movement of the ~~ὑπὲρ~~ -phrase from the wine- to the bread-word is more easily conceivable than the reverse procedure.⁵⁷⁸ Jeremias' attempt to reconstruct the

original position of the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase is hardly convincing. Since both the Pauline and Lucan accounts may go back to a common source, it is difficult to understand why the Lucan account doubles the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase, while in the Pauline account it appears only in connection with the bread-word.

With regard to the original position of the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase, Patsch⁵⁷⁹ has attempted the following reconstruction: He suggests that originally in Luke 22:19b, just as in the Pauline text, only the phrase, ^{τὸ} ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ ^{ὑμῶν} was found.⁵⁸⁰ This tradition came into contact with another one of the Marcan type, where the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase was connected with the cup-word.⁵⁸¹ In the harmonizing process, the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase of the cup-word was assimilated by the Lucan tradition.⁵⁸² The redaction, however, was carried out rather haphazardly, because the grammatical subject is now ^{ποτήριον}, while the logical subject ~~ὁ~~ appears rather awkwardly in the dative.⁵⁸³ The doubling of the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase is to be understood as an attempt at harmonization.⁵⁸⁴ This process probably took place as soon as two traditions corresponding to the Pauline and Marcan versions met. This does not necessarily mean that the Lucan text represents a mixture based on Mark and Paul, for it contains parts which belong to a pre-Pauline stage.⁵⁸⁵ At the pre-Pauline, pre-Lucan stage, the ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase was probably not connected with the cup-word.⁵⁸⁶

According to Schuermann, it is possible that Luke himself has added the participial phrase in verse 20b.⁵⁸⁷ In agreement with Schuermann, Patsch has also maintained that the Lucan ^ὁ ~~ὁ~~ ^ὁ -phrase in connection with the cup-word can be understood as a secondary addition.⁵⁸⁸ But with regard to his own reconstruction, he had to admit that his criteria are insufficient for a decision concerning the original position of the

ὑπερ -phrase.⁵⁸⁹

4. The cup-word

In an attempt to reconstruct an archetype of the eucharistic words, scholars have discovered that the cup-word poses a difficult problem.⁵⁹⁰ The interpretation of the eucharistic words seems to depend upon the decision regarding the oldest attainable form of the tradition.⁵⁹¹ Thus it will be necessary to determine which form of the cup-word is the oldest one. Lessig⁵⁹² emphasized the difference between the Caesarean and Antiochene forms of the cup-word. In his opinion, the Antiochene version of the cup-word *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου* (Luke 22:20) or *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι* (1 Corinthians 11:25) is to be distinguished from the Caesarean version of the cup-word, *τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης* (Mark 14:24).⁵⁹³

According to Lessig,⁵⁹⁴ if special consideration is given to the religionsgeschichtliche motifs, it is to be admitted that the concept of the "New Covenant" is much closer to the specific milieu of Jesus and the primitive community than the concept "blood of the covenant." He pointed out, however, that on the basis of this consideration one could hardly draw any conclusions with regard to the age of these two versions.⁵⁹⁵ Another religionsgeschichtlicher point of view has been introduced into the discussion. Several scholars held that the drinking of blood was regarded by Jews with horror.⁵⁹⁶ Since the verses describing the institution of the Eucharist are repulsive to Jews, therefore, the Antiochene version of the cup-word was considered to be the more original one.⁵⁹⁷ On the other hand, the great number of Semitisms in the Marcan logion

seems to lend support to the theory that the Marcan version of the cup-word is the more original one.⁵⁹⁸

According to Betz,⁵⁹⁹ linguistic considerations lend support to the view that the Marcan phrase represents a Jesus-logion. He was quick to point out, however, that the parallel form of the interpretative words in the Marcan formula must be regarded as the result of an effort to transform the original non-parallel form found in the Lucan-Pauline tradition.⁶⁰⁰ Therefore, the Marcan form must be secondary. Furthermore, the argument that the two concepts *oīma-dīma* belong to the Semitic sacrificial terminology, lends no support to the view that the Marcan interpretative phrases are more original, for in the LXX, *oīma* cannot be found as a correlative of *dīma*. Instead, one can only find the two concepts *oīpe-dīma* or *kréas-dīma*.⁶⁰¹

Higgins⁶⁰² maintained that the words "of the covenant" form no part of the original tradition of this saying of Jesus. He reached this conclusion on the following basis:

In Greek, the expression is rather harsh. The words "of the covenant" are probably a later addition to the reported utterance of Jesus for the purpose of interpreting "my blood."⁶⁰³ The genuineness of the phrase becomes even more questionable, when it is realized that it cannot be retranslated into Aramaic.⁶⁰⁴ Furthermore, the expression "blood of the covenant" or "covenant blood" in later Judaism was understood in the sense of blood of circumcision. Therefore, the concept "of the covenant" may represent a later addition.⁶⁰⁵ But while the covenant-concept may be a later addition, Higgins is convinced that the Marcan cup-word must be older than the one of the Pauline version.⁶⁰⁶

In Jeremias' opinion, the Pauline-Lucan version of the cup-word,

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood," signifies substantially the same thing as the words found in the Marcan-Matthaeian tradition, "This is my blood of the covenant."⁶⁰⁷ From a linguistic point of view, the Marcan cup-word may be secondary.⁶⁰⁸ Wrede, for instance, had already pointed out that a retranslation of two genitives appearing in succession, such as in the Marcan covenant phrase *τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης*, creates a problem.⁶⁰⁹ In his essay "The Aramaic Underlying *τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης* in Mark XIV:24," Emerton⁶¹⁰ maintained that the Marcan construction would be possible in Syriac. It should be pointed out, however, that no solution has been found to this rather complex linguistic problem, as yet.⁶¹¹ Therefore, we can hardly draw any conclusions as to the greater originality of the Marcan version on a linguistic basis alone.

Neuenzeit⁶¹² did not set up any linguistic or literary criteria to establish the traditio-historical development of the eucharistic accounts in the New Testament. He, rather, examined the text, trying to determine to what extent each text reflects an interest in the gifts of salvation, namely in the body and blood of the Lord. On the basis of these criteria, he determined that the Pauline conception of the Eucharist was less developed than the Marcan conception. He concluded that the Pauline version must be older than the Marcan one.⁶¹³

Neuenzeit's method of arranging the eucharistic texts of the New Testament has a definite advantage over a literary-critical analysis of the texts, for it is far less complicated. On the other hand, we can scarcely discern any substantial difference between the Marcan and Pauline words of interpretation with regard to the interest in the body and blood of the Lord. His criteria, therefore, are hardly adequate for

separating the eucharistic texts of the New Testament on a historical development basis.

In an attempt to determine the original form of the cup-word on a literary-critical basis, Patsch was concerned to find out whether the Pauline-Lucan version may have been derived from the Marcan form.⁶¹⁴ Then, he reversed the process, in order to see whether the Marcan form represents a further development of the Pauline-Lucan version. He held that if one of these two transpositions would prove to be more sensible than the other, an important criterion would have been gained.⁶¹⁵ In Patsch's opinion, the one who wanted to express in the Marcan text that the covenant is to be understood in terms of the "New Covenant," could hardly have inserted the attribute, because the phrase is already over-charged.⁶¹⁶ In the light of later liturgies it is possible to determine how this phrase would sound in the Greek: τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης.⁶¹⁷ The one who inserted the phrase must have placed the emphasis upon the "New Covenant."⁶¹⁸ In Patsch's opinion, it may be stated with certainty: "To the one who understood the phrase 'my blood of the covenant'" (acc. to Mark) in the light of Jeremiah 31:31 and who wanted to see this particular interpretation in the text, it was an easy step to make the concept of the διαθήκη the logical subject. In the light of this transposition, the further development can be outlined as follows: (1) The construction with ἐν (= Aram. b^e ?); (2). The phrase τούτο τὸ ποτήριον, which was to define the New Covenant more precisely; (3) Finally, the deletion of the ὑπὲρ -phrase, which from the grammatical point of view, would not only be awkward, but would place the emphasis upon blood again.⁶¹⁹ In conclusion, Patsch pointed out that with the help of the key-word καινή, it is possible to show a logical development from the

Marcan to the Pauline-Lucan form of the covenant phrase.⁶²⁰

Second trial: From Paul-Luke to Mark.⁶²¹

Luke. *ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου*

Mark: *ΤΟΥΤΟ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης*

According to Patsch a development from Paul-Luke to Mark appears to be more plausible than a development from Mark to Paul-Luke.⁶²² Since the Pauline-Lucan text can logically be derived from Mark, this seems to lend support to the view that the Marcan form represents the relatively older one.⁶²³ Furthermore, a secondary addition of the attribute for the purpose of interpreting the covenant appears to be more plausible than a deletion of *καινὴ*.⁶²⁴ On the basis of such considerations, it is conceivable that the Marcan form of the covenant phrase is more original than the one of the Pauline-Lucan tradition.⁶²⁵ Patsch, however, was quick to point out that it would be improper to say that a definite conclusion has been reached. On the whole, the Marcan text seems to be the relatively older one.⁶²⁶ Therefore, one may be able to outline the following development:

ΤΟΥΤΟ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου

*ΤΟΥΤΟ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.*⁶²⁷

While Patsch has attempted to demonstrate that the Marcan covenant phrase is more original than the one of the Lucan-Pauline tradition, his argument is far from being conclusive. Thus we conclude that scholars have been unable to determine the oldest parts of the eucharistic tradition. Our examination of the command to repeat the rite may serve as a further illustration that no certainty can be gained with regard to the oldest attainable form of the tradition.

5. The eschatological prospect

The eschatological prospect is found in the Synoptic accounts of the Eucharist, and in the Pauline account of the Last Supper.⁶²⁸ The Lucan form of the eschatological saying differs from that of the other texts in two ways. (1) it appears before the account of institution, and (2) it occurs in a double form (verses 16 and 18).⁶²⁹

This difference in the form of the eschatological prospect has led scholars to raise the question concerning its original wording and position.⁶³⁰ Thus one must decide whether the Lucan form represents a further development of the Marcan-Matthæan tradition or whether the eschatological saying of Mark and Matthew has its basis in the Lucan version of the eschatological prospect.⁶³¹

While some scholars have suggested the idea that Luke 22:15-18 is to be treated as an independent tradition which the evangelist had adopted,⁶³² Lietzmann⁶³³ was convinced that these verses are the result of a literary construction by the third evangelist. He maintained that Luke had transferred the Marcan eschatological saying, which follows after the saying over the wine, to the beginning of the meal.⁶³⁴ Then, he has prefixed a parallel eschatological saying referring to the meal as a whole.⁶³⁵

According to Higgins, Lietzmann's hypothesis is hardly tenable, because it is not a Lucan practice to transpose Mark's order of events.⁶³⁶ In his opinion, the eschatological saying of verse 18 has occupied different places in the special tradition, which Luke had followed, and in the Marcan tradition.⁶³⁷ With regard to verse 16, Higgins maintains that it could not be the creation of the evangelist to balance verse 18, for Luke, instead of creating parallelisms, tends to remove them, whenever

he finds them in his sources.⁶³⁸ The absence of the first eschatological saying in Mark, can best be explained on the basis that Mark did not know it.⁶³⁹ The first eschatological saying, which had formed part of Luke's special source, but was absent from the Marcan tradition, cannot simply be considered as a redundant variation of the second eschatological saying in verse 18.⁶⁴⁰ Therefore, Luke probably represents a tradition of considerable value in the sense that he supplements our information of what took place at the Last Supper.⁶⁴¹

Since the doubling of the eschatological prospect can hardly be explained on a literary-critical basis, it may be original.⁶⁴² It should be pointed out, however, that original cannot be equated with historical. Higgins has recognized that the present form of Luke 22:15-18 shows traces of Lucan redaction.⁶⁴³ Bultmann had already indicated that these verses do not represent the original account, but rather an editorial revision.⁶⁴⁴

According to Dibelius, the passage Luke 22:14-18, does not represent an independent special tradition, but rather a Lucan tradition. Since Luke was primarily concerned to give a description of a Passover meal, therefore, he utilized an announcement of the passion (verse 15) and a command of distribution (verse 17). To both verses he added a corresponding variation of the eschatological saying, Mark 14:25. Thus, he combined verses 14-18 with the words of institution. The whole Lucan account, Luke 22:14-20 represents an attempt to historicize the words of institution by fitting them into the framework of a Passover meal. This Lucan creation resulted in a text, which contained four acts: (1) Passover lamb (verses 15 and 16); (2) Passover cup; (3) Bread; and (4) Eucharistic cup (verse 20).⁶⁴⁵

Jeremias pointed out that in his passion narrative, Luke follows

his special source. In support of his thesis he presented the following arguments. (1) Wherever in his gospel Luke follows the Marcan account, he follows his sequence of the pericopes with great precision. (2) There are only two insignificant deviations prior to the passion narrative: Luke 6:17-19, 8:19-21.⁶⁴⁶

According to Jeremias, Luke was an enemy of transpositions.⁶⁴⁷ Therefore, any deviation from the arrangement of the material must be considered as an indication that Luke does not follow the Gospel of Mark.⁶⁴⁸ In the Lucan account of the Last Supper, a number of deviations from the Marcan order of the material can be detected.⁶⁴⁹ This proves that the Lucan account of the Last Supper, beginning with verse 14, does not represent an expansion of the Marcan text, but that it had its origin in proto-Luke.⁶⁵⁰ Furthermore, the fact that the unit Luke 22:15-18 exhibits strong linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of the Lucan source, speaks against the thesis of Lucan dependence upon Mark 14:25.⁶⁵¹

Jeremias has also pointed out that in this passage there are numerous Semitisms.⁶⁵² These Semitisms, Patsch contended, were hardly created by the author himself, who was primarily concerned to grecize the account. According to Patsch, there are strong indications that verses 15-18 represent special material.⁶⁵³

The thesis of a literary dependence of Luke 22:15-18 upon Mark 14:25 is unlikely to be substantiated, because of the rather complicated relationship between the Lucan text and the Marcan account of the Last Supper.⁶⁵⁴ It should be pointed out, however, that there is a striking resemblance between the Lucan phrase *καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας* (verse 17) and the Marcan phrase *καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας* (Mark 14:23).⁶⁵⁵

Schuermann held that Mark 14:23 shows dependence upon a pre-Lucan form of Luke 22:17. In his opinion, Luke 22:15-18 represents a completely independent account of the Eucharist.⁶⁵⁶

Since Luke 22:16 and 18 can hardly be made plausible as expansions of Mark 14:25 it is probable that Luke found the double form of the eschatological prospect in his special source.⁶⁵⁷

Thus we are able to distinguish between two different forms of the eschatological prospect.⁶⁵⁸

6. The command to repeat

This command is found only in Luke 22:19b in connection with the bread-word and in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 in a double form.⁶⁵⁹

The omission of this command in Mark and Matthew has given rise to various hypotheses.⁶⁶⁰ On the assumption that Mark's formulation of the bread- and wine sayings represent the earliest text underlying the New Testament accounts of the eucharist words, one may conclude that the reference to remembrance is to be understood as a later addition to the words attributed to Jesus.⁶⁶¹

According to Barrett, the significance of commensality in ancient societies is well known. Therefore, it was understood that by their eating and drinking with Jesus, the disciples indicated their preparedness to defend their master, or even to die with him.⁶⁶² In the light of this consideration, the command to repeat the rite could hardly have formed a part of the original tradition, for if they were going to die with Jesus, we may infer that there would have been no need to think of any future celebration of the Lord's Supper.

According to Jeremias,⁶⁶³ for linguistic and stylistic reasons

this command belongs to the pre-Pauline stage of the tradition but not to the earliest form of the Lord's Supper narrative. This argument, however, does not speak against its authenticity. The command to repeat is not necessarily a part of the liturgical formula, for the celebration itself was its fulfillment. In agreement with Benoit, Jeremias stated, "On ne récite pas une rubrique, on l'exécute."⁶⁶⁴ This view was also endorsed by du Toit who argued that every eucharistic celebration of a later time is in reality an execution of the command to repeat the rite.⁶⁶⁵ He agrees with Jeremias that the absence of the reference to remembrance in Mark and Matthew does not necessarily speak against its historicity.⁶⁶⁶

Higgins, on the other hand, argued that the absence from Mark of the double command to repeat is a clear indication that he did not know it.⁶⁶⁷ Otherwise, it would be very difficult to understand why he should have omitted it.⁶⁶⁸

With regard to the omission of the reference to remembrance in Mark, Dix suggested that the bread- and wine sayings were originally separated by the meal proper.⁶⁶⁹ Jesus used the word of remembrance, in order to connect the breaking of bread at the beginning of the meal and the "cup of blessing" at the end of it in a new meaning, to the exclusion of all that came in between.⁶⁷⁰ As soon as the connection was made in the minds of the disciples, even on the first occasion after the Last Supper, the command to repeat the rite became obsolete and was dropped.⁶⁷¹ But this argument is hardly convincing, because Paul himself did not drop it. Furthermore, the argument that the command to repeat the rite was no longer necessary after the rite was fixed must be questioned, especially if we consider the fact that Luke was written after 70 A.D.⁶⁷²

It is conceivable, however, that the omission of the reference to remembrance in Mark was due to the eucharistic practice of the community.⁶⁷³ Thus, whenever these Christians celebrated the Eucharist, they were consciously eating the bread and drinking the wine in remembrance of Him.⁶⁷⁴ Therefore, the reference would have been unnecessary.⁶⁷⁵ It is obvious, however, that our attempts to solve the problem are only of a hypothetical nature. This means that we must remain rather sceptical on this particular point.

7 The quest for an archetype

Since the various attempts by competent New Testament scholars to determine the oldest parts of the tradition are merely hypothetical we can hardly expect to recover the archetype of the words attributed to Jesus.

With a note of resignation, du Toit pointed out that one may continue to present arguments for or against the originality of a certain tradition without reaching any definite conclusions.⁶⁷⁶ In his opinion, since the publication of Schuermann's source-critical studies, the situation has become more complex, still.⁶⁷⁷ Even Schuermann,⁶⁷⁸ himself, who had attempted to reconstruct an archetype of the different versions, had changed his mind with regard to a possible recovery of the ipsissima verba of Jesus, for he stated:

The accounts of Jesus' two actions in all four forms of the tradition are in fact relatively uniform, but the words that accompany them differ considerably. The differences clearly show that we do not know the actual words spoken by Jesus, and we can scarcely hope, now, to be able to reconstruct their original form behind these different versions. We can hope with greater confidence to make out what Jesus actually did at the last supper.⁶⁷⁹

Having realized that we do not know the ipsissima verba of Jesus, therefore, Schuermann was hopeful to reach a firm basis for understanding the eucharistic words of Jesus, by examining his actions at the Last Supper.⁶⁸⁰

While Jeremias was still convinced that the common core of the tradition of the accounts of the Last Supper was still available in an essentially reliable form,⁶⁸¹ Schuermann and others did not share his optimism.⁶⁸² In the conclusion to his traditio-historical considerations, du Toit pointed out that New Testament research, attempting to recover the oldest attainable form of the tradition, has reached an impasse.⁶⁸³ While scholars have presented weighty arguments for the priority of three out of four eucharistic accounts, one must raise the question: "Who is able to decide whose arguments are to be considered as the decisive ones?" Du Toit held that those scholars who have attempted to reconstruct an archetype of the eucharistic words are far too optimistic.⁶⁸⁴ In basic agreement with du Toit and Schuermann, Patsch⁶⁸⁵ expressed his view on the matter in no uncertain terms: "An account of institution, which supposedly consisted of the relatively older parts of the tradition, has never existed." In his opinion, one will never be able to reconstruct an archetype on the basis of subtraction or with the aid of the literary-critical method.⁶⁸⁶ With Schuermann, he holds that the eucharistic words cannot be treated as the ipsissima vox of Jesus.⁶⁸⁷ These texts simply summarize what was important for the community's celebration of the Eucharist, not more and not less.⁶⁸⁸ In the light of the more recent traditio-historical studies, the following important considerations come into focus: (1) The eucharistic texts in the New Testament reflect the liturgical practice of the primitive community; (2) In

spite of the fact that all four forms of the tradition are relatively uniform, the words accompanying them differ considerably. These differences are an indication that we are not dealing with the ipsissima verba of Jesus; (3) The search for an archetype which formed the basis of all later developments must be considered as a hopeless enterprise.⁶⁸⁹

Christian Passover and Eucharist

While Jeremias⁶⁹⁰ Passover theory proved to be untenable, we must not overlook the fact that the Synoptists were concerned to portray the Last Supper in terms of a Passover meal.⁶⁹¹ Paschal associations can also be detected in theologoumena such as 1 Corinthians 5:7. In the light of these considerations the question arises: "Is there evidence in the New Testament for a Christian Passover celebration?" If so, we must seek to determine whether there is a basis for Feneberg's contention that the Christian Passover celebration is to be considered as the possible Sitz im Leben of the eucharistic accounts.⁶⁹² In order to answer these questions, we will turn to the studies by H. Schuermann,⁶⁹³ J. Jeremias,⁶⁹⁴ F. Hahn,⁶⁹⁵ B. Lohse⁶⁹⁶ and R. Feneberg.⁶⁹⁷

1. Heinz Schuermann

Schuermann had found traces of a primitive Christian Passover celebration in Acts 12:3 and 20:6.⁶⁹⁸ In both texts reference is made to the ἡμέραι τῶν ἁγίων. He also appealed to the Passover celebration

of the Quartodecimans.⁶⁹⁹ In his opinion, they rely upon traditions which point back to the apostolic age. Schuermann sees a definite connection between the Quartodeciman Passover celebration and the theologoumena of 1 Corinthians 5:7 and John 19:36.⁷⁰⁰

The Quartodecimans celebrated the Passover simultaneously with the Jews, namely during the night of Nisan 14/15. The purpose of this celebration was to commemorate the redemptive death of Christ. It was not a memorial of the Exodus from Egypt. The Quartodecimans seem to have considered Nisan 14th as the date for the death of Jesus.⁷⁰¹ According to Schuermann, the comparison of Jesus with the Passover lamb is a possible indication that Paul was following a chronology which coincided with that of John.⁷⁰² He appealed especially to the longer Lucan text, Luke 22:15-20, as support for the theory of a primitive Christian Passover celebration. This unit represents an archaic account of Jesus' Last Supper. These verses describe Jesus' Last Supper in terms of a new paschal meal.⁷⁰³ In its taciturnity the Lucan account, Luke 22:15-18, was in need of supplementation. Therefore verses 19 and 20 were added.⁷⁰⁴ The combination Luke 22:15-20, however, results in a new unit, which presents several problems.⁷⁰⁵

In Schuermann's opinion, it seems to be certain that the eucharistic cup followed after the meal (Luke 22:20, 1 Cor. 11:25). He argued that this must have been the third cup, which at Jewish festive meals was offered to each meal participant. This cup was offered before the meal, provided sufficient wine was available.⁷⁰⁶

On the basis of the combination of the two units, Luke 22:15-18 and 19-20, an expanded Passover meal account came into existence.⁷⁰⁷ It presents the primitive Christian celebration of the Passover, in which

the Eucharist became the substitute for the eating of the Passover meal.⁷⁰⁸

In the light of several observations,⁷⁰⁹ Schuermann concluded that a community which in a new and Christian manner continued to celebrate the Jewish Passover feast, sought the pattern for its new action in the Last Supper of Jesus. Here is the basis for its interest in the paschal characteristics of the first celebration of the Eucharist. Therefore, the Synoptic accounts and the early traditions which form the basis of these accounts, are to be considered as a reflection of the primitive Christian Passover celebration of the apostolic era. In other words, besides the celebration of the Eucharist, which determines the day of the Lord, the writings of the New Testament already attest an oesterliche Hochform of the same.⁷¹⁰

2. Joachim Jeremias

Jeremias,⁷¹¹ like Schuermann,⁷¹² Lohse⁷¹³ and others held that the primitive Christian community celebrated a ~~Christian~~ Passover. This Passover of the early church lived on in that of the Quartodecimans. In agreement with Lohse, he pointed out that all previous conceptions of the procedure and meanings of the Quartodeciman Passover celebration were erroneous.⁷¹⁴

In his opinion, the "breaking of the fast" came at cock-crow during the Passover night. This has been established by the discovery of the Epistula Apostolorum (140-70 A.D.).⁷¹⁵ According to Jeremias, the Passover celebration of the Quartodecimans as well as that of the early Jewish Christian community, whose practice lived on in that of the Quartodecimans took the following form: While the Jews were holding

the Passover meal in the night of Nisan 14/15, the Christians fasted representatively for Israel.⁷¹⁶ On this occasion, Exodus 12 was read and explained. At about 3 a.m., the fast was discontinued and the Lord's Supper (agape and Eucharist) was celebrated. In their celebration they were greatly concerned with the expectation of the parousia. Both Jews and Christians alike entertained the hope that the Messiah would come on the night of the Passover.⁷¹⁷ Each year, therefore, during the Passover night, the primitive community would pray and fast until midnight, thus awaiting the return of the Lord. Their waiting was prolonged even for hours after midnight. If the Lord had not bodily come by cock-crow, they united themselves with him in the celebration of table-fellowship.⁷¹⁸

According to Jeremias, the same sequence of the Quartodeciman Passover celebration can also be detected in Luke 22:15-20.⁷¹⁹ In Luke, the fasting of Jesus comes at the very beginning, because the tradition preserved in the Lucan account has been influenced by the primitive Christian Passover celebration. In Jeremias' opinion, Luke portrays the Last Supper as the prototype of the Christian Passover.⁷²⁰ As Jesus renounced the feast and the wine in view of the fulfillment of the Passover in the Kingdom of God (Luke 22:15-18), so the Christians fasted on Passover eve. In this way, they prepared themselves for the coming of the Kingdom in the parousia. As Jesus tendered bread and wine (Luke 22:19f), so the Christians broke their fast when the cock crew by celebrating the Lord's Supper.⁷²¹ In agreement with Schuermann,⁷²² Jeremias pointed out that Jesus is the founder of the new Passover, in which the Eucharist replaces the paschal lamb.⁷²³ A community which continued the celebration of the Jewish Passover in a "new" Christian manner sought a

model for its new celebration in the Last Supper of Jesus.⁷²⁴ But while the arrangement of the two pieces of the tradition corresponds to the sequence of the early Christian Passover celebration, the historical basis for this celebration is not to be ignored. According to Jeremias, the early Christian practice of fasting must have developed out of Jesus' avowal of abstinence.⁷²⁵

3. Ferdinand Hahn

In his essay "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsüberlieferung," Hahn has attempted to determine the extent of the influence of the Jewish Passover celebration upon the eucharistic accounts and other New Testament passages, such as 1 Corinthians 5:7.⁷²⁶

With regard to the Pauline-Lucan accounts of institution (1 Cor. 11:23ff; Luke 22:19ff) and those of the Marcan-Matthaeian tradition (Mark 14:22-25; Matt. 26:26-29), he pointed out that one cannot find any reference to the Passover.⁷²⁷ On the other hand, the eschatological prospect in Mark, Matthew and in Paul, plays an important rôle.⁷²⁸ Another form is to be found in the context of the Marcan account of institution. Here, the Last Supper takes place in the framework of a Passover celebration. The meal itself, however, is not at all related to a Passover celebration.⁷²⁹

The Lucan account, Luke 22:15-20, represents a third form.⁷³⁰ In disagreement with Schuermann⁷³¹ and Jeremias,⁷³² Hahn averred that we fail to comprehend the peculiarity of Luke 22:15-20, when we attempt to find in verses 15-18 reminiscences or even a reliable historical account of Jesus' last meal.⁷³³

Hahn argued that in Luke 22:15-18 we do not find the description

of a Jewish Passover meal.⁷³⁴ Opposing Schuermann, who had defended the authenticity of verses 15-18, Hahn declared that Higgins⁷³⁵ has seen much more clearly that "The Last Supper was the pattern of future celebrations of the Passover for the followers of Jesus." Unfortunately Higgins does not pursue the idea any further, because he is primarily concerned to prove the paschal character of the Last Supper and the historicity of the Lucan account.⁷³⁶ In Hahn's opinion, verses 15-18 are to be treated as a cult-etiology.⁷³⁷ In combination with verses 19-20, they reflect the liturgical custom of a community celebration.⁷³⁸ The cup-rite was the only remaining part of the entire Passover ceremony.⁷³⁹ In connection with the promise and avowal of abstinence, this rite became a substitute for the traditional meal.⁷⁴⁰ According to Hahn, this primitive Christian Passover celebration was climaxed by the celebration of the Eucharist.⁷⁴¹ An identical pattern can also be detected in the meal practice of the Quartodecimans.⁷⁴² Their meal celebration took place after the Passover night had expired. It was held according to Luke 22:19ff in its oldest form. In other words, the bread-word introduced the total meal and the cup-word "μετὰ τὸ δεῖναι" concludes the meal celebration.⁷⁴³ While Hahn had attempted to explain the Lucan account of the Last Supper in terms of a cult-etiology, Patsch was opposed to this theory. In his opinion, the unit Luke 22:15-18 can best be understood in terms of a catechesis.⁷⁴⁴

4. Bernhard Lohse

Lohse held that the Passover celebration of the Quartodecimans can be traced back to the Passover celebration of the primitive Christian community.⁷⁴⁵ He also assumed that the Last Supper of Jesus was a

Passover meal.⁷⁴⁶

He pointed out that the primitive Christian community was still following the Jewish calendar. The days of unleavened bread, referred to in Acts 12:3 and 20:6 were used by the Christians for the purpose of dating. Thus he assumed that to the Christians these days were still of importance.⁷⁴⁷

The Quartodeciman Passover celebration coincided with that of the Jews. This phenomenon can best be explained on the basis that the Quartodecimans had adopted the Jewish feast.⁷⁴⁸

Melito of Sardis and Hippolytus had used Exodus 12 as a text for their Passover homilies,⁷⁴⁹ while Origen had utilized Exodus 13:1ff.⁷⁵⁰

The reading of this chapter forms a vital part of every Jewish Passover celebration. The fact that the Christians also made use of it during their Passover celebration is important. It seems to indicate that the Christians, who had come out of Judaism, had been accustomed to the reading of this text. Thus when they became Christians, they continued to use this chapter in connection with their own Christianized Passover celebration.⁷⁵¹

The Christians, however, interpreted the liberation from Egypt in terms of the redemptive act of Jesus, the true Passover Lamb.⁷⁵² This idea that the liberation from Egypt had found its fulfillment in the redemption through Jesus, characterizes the Passover homily of Melito of Sardis.⁷⁵³

According to Lohse, 1 Corinthians 5:6-8 and the Synoptic accounts of the passion, point to a primitive Christian Passover celebration.⁷⁵⁴ From the perspective of the Quartodeciman Passover celebration, Lohse argued that the primitive Christian Passover cele-

bration consisted of agape and Eucharist.⁷⁵⁵ In agreement with Schuermann,⁷⁵⁶ he held that this practice is reflected by Luke 22:15-18, 19-20. While verses 15-18 refer to the agape, verses 19-20 point to the Eucharist.⁷⁵⁷

5. Rupert Feneberg

According to Feneberg,⁷⁵⁸ all previous attempts to solve the eucharistic problems on a historical and theological basis have failed. In his opinion, one has no choice, but to dispense with Objektivierbarkeit.⁷⁵⁹ Faith, he pointed out, is a vital factor which enables one to comprehend the eucharistic accounts and the whole gospel as an expression of life.⁷⁶⁰ Faith, however, cannot be shown on the basis of a right coordination of the historical and the theological questions.⁷⁶¹ This coordination of the historical and the theological question can only be experienced as a living process, in the sense that one enters into the relationship with the faith and its history.⁷⁶²

The eucharistic accounts are to be treated as the expression of the faith of a certain community.⁷⁶³ As such they can only be comprehended if one is a part of this reality of life, and as one enters into relationship with this Sprachgeschehen as its very expression.⁷⁶⁴ Only on the basis of this pre-understanding of faith can one avoid turning the scientific investigation of the text into a lifeless and unfruitful calculation.⁷⁶⁵

While Feneberg's methodological principles call for a personal involvement in the reality of life, he does not at all think that a scientific investigation is superfluous.⁷⁶⁶ He maintains, however, that a scientific enquiry cannot take place outside the hermeneutical circle.

Faith must be considered as an essential key to the understanding of the eucharistic accounts as well as to the gospel as an expression of life.⁷⁶⁷ In order to get a correct view of the life which finds expression in the accounts as part of the gospel, a careful form-critical investigation of the gospel materials is necessary.⁷⁶⁸

With regard to the form-critical work in the gospels, the researches of K. L. Schmidt, M. Dibelius and R. Bultmann are of great value.⁷⁶⁹ Among Old Testament scholars, V. Rad has shown a remarkable grasp of the problems connected with the Hexateuch. This is clearly indicated by his question: "Which guiding statements of faith determine the Hexateuch in its present form?"⁷⁷⁰

Unfortunately, New Testament scholars have not as yet determined the form of the Gospels on the whole, considering and treating the small units as a sociological fact.⁷⁷¹ Apart from the form-critical considerations, it is essential to view the Eucharist in its central function in the primitive community. Its celebration is the first unfolding of a Christian mystery. Loisy had already pointed to this central aspect of the Eucharist, when he stated that it is "le Mystère chrétien, qui consistait essentiellement dans le culte du Seigneur Jesus-Christ, mort et ressuscité, prince du siècle à venir."⁷⁷² The centrality of the Eucharist for the life of faith is not expressed by the designation "cult-narrative." This fact was recognized by Bertram⁷⁷³ and Schille.⁷⁷⁴ Pointing to the passion plays at Oberammergau, Bertram raised the question concerning the relationship between these mimical plays and the New Testament narratives of the suffering of Jesus on Golgatha.⁷⁷⁵ In Bertram's opinion, the passion narratives must be considered as the shaping of the kerygma of the crucified Saviour. They are to be under-

stood in connection with the cultic life of the primitive community.⁷⁷⁶ The passion narratives, no doubt, contain a historical core, but this core was covered with layers of legendary features, which, if removed, would only leave behind some insignificant results.⁷⁷⁷ Bertram also referred to the cultic experience of the early Christians as the motivating force behind the formation of the tradition. Jesus was the focal point of the cultic life of the community. The Christians looked up to him as their cult-hero. In turn, they projected their conceptions back into history.⁷⁷⁸ In his analysis of the sources, Bertram has manifested a concern for the historical events in the life of Jesus. But he makes a clear distinction between the actual facts of the passion story and the Christ cult.⁷⁷⁹ Schille⁷⁸⁰ on the other hand, is more concerned about the aspect of the cult. In his opinion, with the passion narrative, the community has formed a new genre of literature.

The works of Bertram and Schille are of real importance, because these scholars have made the first attempts to determine the Sitz in der Geschichte des Glaubenslebens (Sitz in the history of the life of faith).⁷⁸¹ While Bertram's hypothesis is characterized by a historical concern,⁷⁸² Schille⁷⁸³ maintained that the historical, not the cultic, calls for an explanation. For Schille, the anamnesis is the cultic venue for the passion narrative. Thus, he creates a cultic frame for a certain historical interest, which in his opinion, determines the form of the passion.⁷⁸⁴

According to Feneberg, Bertram and Schille did not concern themselves with the question of the independent position of the eucharistic accounts within the passion narrative and their coordination to it. For Feneberg, the relationship between the celebration of the Eucharist and the passion is a cardinal point for determining the Sitz in der Geschichte

des Glaubenslebens.⁷⁸⁵ The solution to this problem is of real importance for a clearer understanding of the historicized form of the gospel as an expression of the life of faith of the Christian community.⁷⁸⁶ With regard to the celebration of the Eucharist, Feneberg proposed the following solution:

In harmony with his basic thesis, Feneberg argued that the eucharistic accounts had their origin in the Easter celebration of the Christian community, and not in the weekly celebration of the Eucharist.⁷⁸⁷ In the light of this presupposition, the historical question as to whether Jesus' last meal was a Passover meal or not, is no longer significant.⁷⁸⁸ Neither the Synoptic nor the Johannine dating of the Passover meal are adequate in explaining the nearness of the Passover atmosphere. If the celebration of Easter can be considered as the Sitz im Glaubensleben for the eucharistic accounts, then Easter was celebrated in the atmosphere of the Passover.⁷⁸⁹ The Eucharist is to be considered as a cult-mystery, for it refers to the saving work of God in the community.⁷⁹⁰ In Feneberg's opinion, there is a close connection between the eucharistic tradition and the passion on one hand, and the two acts of the Passover feast, the Haggadah and the meal, on the other.⁷⁹¹ Which evidence does Feneberg present in support of his thesis?

Feneberg argued that the Christian celebration of the old Jewish feast led to a transformation of the two basic parts of the feast, the Haggadah and the meal.⁷⁹² The Haggadah was the place where the Jews had remembered the saving work of Yahweh with his people. Therefore, it must be considered as the logical place where the Christians would give a reason for their new celebration.⁷⁹³ Feneberg outlines a hypothetical

celebration as follows: The paterfamilias does not only relate the Exodus experience from Egypt and the anticipation of the future redemption during the coming night, but he also refers to the saving death of Jesus. In the course of the transformation of the ancient Exodus Haggadah, the saving act of God in Jesus became an aspect of central importance. Therefore, it is only consequent when soon the Christians also actualize the second part of the Passover feast from the perspective of their new historical experience.⁷⁹⁴ For the Christians, Christ is the true Passover Lamb, but a Christian Passover meal cannot exist.⁷⁹⁵

On the assumption that in their core, the Gospels are to be interpreted as historicizing accounts of a Christian Passover celebration which can be traced back to Jesus, new possibilities of understanding will emerge.⁷⁹⁶ In the light of this consideration, the basic material, which was historicized, consisted of the Christian Haggadah and the account of the Christian meal celebration.⁷⁹⁷ The process of historicizing, of course, required a change of the order, which was prescribed by the cult. The meal was narrated as a meal of institution by Jesus and found its place before the passion narrative. The eucharistic tradition in the Synoptics is characterized by an assimilation of the meal to the Passover, while in John it is the death of Jesus which is assimilated to the Passover celebration. These differences in the understanding of the separation from Judaism is reflected by various traditions of an apocalyptical and typological nature.⁷⁹⁸

If the Christian Passover celebration can be understood as a sacral realm, which is to be considered as the locale of the mediation and realization of salvation, then the cultic tradition of the Passover

feast appears to be the common origin of the various forms of this salvation history in the New Testament. From this perspective, the cultic tradition could be understood in its difference as well as in its unity.⁷⁹⁹

6. Critical appraisal

In his attempt to trace the Christian Passover celebration back to New Testament times, Schuermann⁸⁰⁰ was fully aware of the fact that there is little definite evidence in the New Testament itself which seems to favour such a theory. On the other hand, various testimonies and considerations seem to lend support to the view that a Christian Passover celebration was already known in apostolic times.⁸⁰¹ Like Jeremias, Lohse, Hahn and others, Schuermann had appealed to the Quartodeciman practice of the second-century. In his opinion, this practice is based upon traditions which point back to the apostolic era.⁸⁰² His view that the Johannine chronology already reflects a Christian Passover celebration is very probable, but it is hardly more than a conjecture.

With regard to Acts 12:3 and 20:6, Schuermann pointed out that these days of Unleavened Bread are mentioned in such a way as to allow for the conjecture that such references were still significant to the Christians.⁸⁰³ As regards 1 Corinthians 5:7 as definite evidence in support of the theory of a primitive Christian Passover celebration, Schuermann was very cautious.⁸⁰⁴

His theory that Luke 22:15-18 in its present form is the account of a transformed Passover meal, where the Passover lamb was substituted for by the eucharistic gift, must be considered as a serious attempt to cast new light on a rather complex problem.⁸⁰⁵ Schuermann's proposal,

though, fails to be convincing, because there is no evidence that the primitive Christian community ever celebrated a Christian Passover according to Luke 22.⁸⁰⁶

In his attempt to explain the peculiarity of the Lucan text, Luke 22:15-18, Jeremias had also appealed to the Quartodeciman practice of the second century.⁸⁰⁷ But opposing Jeremias, Hahn⁸⁰⁸ has rightly pointed out that there is no mention of a Passover fast in the Lucan text as it was practised by the Quartodecimans. Thus Jeremias is projecting a second-century practice into the Lucan text, which in our opinion is a serious methodological mistake.

Hahn⁸⁰⁹ had also focussed his attention upon the Lucan complex, Luke 22:15-20. Following Schuermann, Jeremias and Lohse, he also appealed to the Passover practice of the Quartodecimans.⁸¹⁰ As we have already indicated, Hahn was more careful than Jeremias not to project a second-century practice back into the Lucan text.

Hahn was impressed with Lohse's⁸¹¹ reconstruction, but he suggested that Lohse had barred his own way towards a correct understanding of the passage, because he had considered verses 15-18 as an account of the agape, which was climaxed by the celebration of the Eucharist in verses 19 and 20.⁸¹² According to Hahn, the only possible reference to an agape would be the phrase *μετὰ τὸ δεῖνναι* of verse 20.⁸¹³ In his opinion, verses 15-18 point to this Christian Passover celebration preceding the celebration of the Eucharist.⁸¹⁴

Hahn's explanation of the Lucan text is hardly convincing, for if we assume that Luke 22:15-18 reflects a Christian Passover celebration which is the result of a transformation of the Jewish Passover, the following question comes into focus: "What changes were effected by

this process of transformation?" It would be quite conceivable that Jesus was considered as the Passover Lamb of the Christians. On the assumption that the elements of bread and wine pointed to Jesus as the Passover Lamb, it is very difficult to understand why other parts of a regular Passover meal should have been left out, while the cup-rite was still retained. According to some scholars, this cup was probably the third cup of the Passover celebration, or the cup of benediction.⁸¹⁵ The Lucan account, Luke 22:15-18, appears to be rather fragmentary, and it seems to be difficult to envision a Christian Passover celebration as outlined in this passage.

Several scholars have attempted to explain this rather enigmatic passage. Dibelius⁸¹⁶ and Schmid, for instance, pointed to the historicizing tendencies of the author. According to Schmid, in Luke 22:15-18 one can detect the hand of Luke, the historian, who was concerned to give to his presentation the character of a clear and continuing account.⁸¹⁷ He also argued that Luke does not follow a tradition which is independent of Mark, for there are indications that Luke has independently transformed and unfolded the Marcan text.⁸¹⁸ Thus, he is in disagreement with Schuermann, who had attempted to show that Luke is following a pre-Lucan tradition which is independent of the Marcan tradition.⁸¹⁹ Since Luke may have found the account in his special source the question arises: "In which sense can Luke be considered to be a historian?" Is he not simply a conservative transmitter of the tradition, who, according to Luke 1:1-4 is just concerned to record in sequence the results of his findings?" Only in connection with Luke's formation of the following farewell speech, can his historical-theological interest be recognized.⁸²⁰

In harmony with his basic thesis that the Christian Passover

celebration is a transformation of the Jewish Passover feast, Schwartz argued that Luke had transformed the whole narrative. He did not do it for literary reasons, but because the community's position towards the Passover had changed.⁸²¹ What Wellhausen had expressed with some doubt--namely, that Luke was opposed to the Christians' continuation of the Jewish Passover--was fully endorsed by Schwartz.⁸²² In his opinion, Luke had reversed the legend of the Passover meal, because he was concerned, rather, to present it as antiquated.⁸²³ This argument, however, is unconvincing, because verses 15-18 can hardly be considered as a polemic against existing Jewish Passover customs.

In his examination of the Lucan complex, Luke 22:15-20, Patsch argued that this passage is to be understood as catechetical material.⁸²⁴ The author was primarily concerned to preserve a picture of the historical situation of the earthly days of Jesus.⁸²⁵ At the same time, he was aware of the historical distance between those days and the practice of his own time. Therefore, the Lucan account cannot be understood in terms of an etiological cult-legend, but rather as an historicizing effort.⁸²⁶

Once the author's concern to narrate past events in a selective way is recognized, then the concentration upon the kiddush-cup, which could not be explained on a cult-historical basis, can easily be accounted for.⁸²⁷ This view, however, is based upon the assumption that the Last Supper was a Passover meal and that the eschatological prospect has its original position in Luke.⁸²⁸

In view of the various problems created by the Lucan text, Ligier has rightly pointed out that the account of the Passover preparation and the longer Lucan text remain in our hands as the lectio difficilior.⁸²⁹ On account of the various problems connected with the Lucan text, some

scholars such as Conzelmann and Marxsen have simply excluded it from their discussion.

In his book Die Mitte der Zeit, Conzelmann⁸³⁰ has not treated the particular problem of the Lucan complex. In his opinion, according to Luke, the Eucharist dates back to the time of salvation. Luke, he argued, considered the Eucharist as a strengthening of the disciples for the approaching πείρασμοι (Luke 22:35-38).

Feneberg's thesis seems to offer a good option for a concrete Sitz im Glaubensleben for the passion narrative and the account of the Last Supper in the New Testament.⁸³¹ His investigation was stimulated by studies dealing with the origin and development of Easter. These studies are especially associated with the names of E. Schwartz, K. Holl, O. Casel, B. Lohse and W. Huber.⁸³²

In his attempt to determine the celebration of Easter as the Sitz im Glaubensleben of these accounts, Feneberg was not primarily concerned about their historical origin.⁸³³ His basic concern was to show that these accounts are to be understood as an expression of the community's life of faith.⁸³⁴ In agreement with Casel, Feneberg is convinced that Easter is indeed the Passover feast of the New Testament community.⁸³⁵

Schuermann, who argued that the Quartodeciman practice is based on traditions which point to the apostolic age, is also in agreement with Casel when he states: "Tatsaechlich spricht alles dafuer, dass schon in der apostolischen Zeit der Unterschied sich durchsetzte, indem vor allem die kleinasiatischen Gemeinden die paulinisch-johanneische Paschatheologie in ihrem Feste darstellten."⁸³⁶

In basic agreement with Schwartz, Feneberg defends the view that the Christian Passover celebration is rooted in the Jewish Passover.⁸³⁷

In other words, he does not tolerate the view that the Lord's Supper originated independently of the Passover. But if we compare the Lord's Supper with the Passover meal, the following differences will come into focus:

At the Lord's Supper, the lamb, fruit puree and bitter herbs are missing. With regard to the lamb, it could be argued that in the Christian Passover celebration Jesus represents the Lamb. Bread and wine are basic elements, which can be found in both the Passover meal and the Lord's Supper. These two elements, however, are also part of any other Jewish meal. This incongruity of the elements hardly lends support to the view that the Lord's Supper represents a Christianized version of the Jewish Passover.⁸³⁸

In the interpretative texts of the Lord's Supper, however, it is possible to detect a remarkable resemblance to the Passover Haggadah.⁸³⁹ In the Haggadah the meaning of the celebration, the use of the elements was explained. The saving action of God with its historical circumstances formed the content of the Haggadah.⁸⁴⁰ Especially noteworthy is the eschatological reference in the interpretation. This interpretation, however, is primarily confined to the matzoth and the cup.⁸⁴¹ It does not refer to the substance of the bread or the content of the cup. According to Lessig, it is very significant that the use of this special bread and this special cup receives an eschatological meaning.⁸⁴² Since some of the basic elements of the Passover meal, such as bitter herbs, fruit puree and the lamb are missing from the Lord's Supper, Feneberg's thesis that the Lord's Supper developed out of the Passover celebration must be questioned.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 139.

²Ibid., p. 139.

³Ibid., p. 139. Benoit, "Récit," p. 358.

⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 139.

⁵Ibid., p. 139.

⁶Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 31f. See also Chadwick, op. cit., p. 249. Professor Barclay has pointed out that the newer translations of the New Testament have given preference to the shorter Lucan text; see William Barclay, The Lord's Supper (London: SCM Press, 1967), pp. 38ff; see also Pierson Parker, "Three Variant Readings in Luke - Acts," JBL, Vol. 83 (1964), pp. 165-67.

⁷Benoit, op. cit., p. 357.

⁸Professor Marxsen pointed out that in Germany, Lietzmann and Jeremias were the two main defenders of the Lucan short text; see Marxsen, op. cit., p. 32.

⁹This was pointed out by Professor Chadwick, op. cit., p. 249.

¹⁰See Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 138-59.

¹¹Chadwick, op. cit., p. 249.

¹²Ibid., p. 249.

¹³Ibid., p. 249.

¹⁴Since Dibelius' publication of Formgeschichte des Evangeliums in 1933, German scholars have begun to give preference to the longer text of Luke; see Betz, Eucharistie I/1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1955), n. 8, p. 3.

¹⁵Marxsen, op. cit., p. 32. Lessig, "Abendmahlsproblème," p. 12.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁷This was pointed out by Lessig, op. cit., p. 12.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁹Karl L. Schmidt, "Abendmahl im Neuen Testament," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 2nd ed., I, pp. 9ff.

- ²⁰Ibid., p. 8.
- ²¹Ibid., p. 8.
- ²²Marxsen, op. cit., p. 44.
- ²³Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 180.
- ²⁴Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 8ff.
- ²⁵Paulus, p. 337, cited by Marxsen, op. cit., p. 44.
- ²⁶Marxsen, op. cit., p. 44.
- ²⁷Marxsen, Lord's Supper, p. 5; see also Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," pp. 53ff.
- ²⁸M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, pp. 210-11.
- ²⁹Lohmeyer, op. cit., 178.
- ³⁰Jeremias, op. cit., p. 155.
- ³¹Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. VII.
- ³²Benoit, op. cit., p. 358. See also Lessig, op. cit., p. 15.
- ³³Benoit, op. cit., p. 358.
- ³⁴According to Jeremias, syr^{cur} has the short text in the form of b e (15, 16, 19a, 17, 18) with the enlargement of verse 19 from 1. Cor. 11:24. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 143.
- ³⁵Lessig, op. cit., p. 15.
- ³⁶Jeremias, op. cit., p. 142.
- ³⁷Benoit, op. cit., p. 376.
- ³⁸Ibid., p. 376.
- ³⁹Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," pp. 85ff.
- ⁴⁰Since b e agrees in all details with it and not with sy^C, Professor Schweizer holds that it is possible to assume that they have, independently of sy^C, placed verses 17f after verse 19. Schweizer, op. cit., n. 23, pp. 85-86.
- ⁴¹On the assumption that D represents the oldest text, Professor Schweizer thinks that sy^{CS} represents a transposition and shortening of verses 15-20. In both cases, b e either takes over sy^C and deletes verse 19b on the basis of the D-text, with which he is familiar, or, it origi-

notes in D and finds independently the same solution as sy^C, Ibid., n. 34, p. 87.

⁴²Jeremias, "The Oldest Text of the Eucharistic Words of Jesus." review of Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, by T. W. Manson, in the JTS, (1950) p. 202.

⁴³Ibid., p. 202.

⁴⁴Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 143.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 144.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 144.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 142.

⁴⁸Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe II, pp. 300-302, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 142.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 143.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 143.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 143.

⁵²Jeremias, review of Abendmahlsworte, by Manson, op. cit., p. 202.

⁵³K. T. Schaefer, "Zur Textgeschichte von Lk. 22:19b-20," Biblica, XXXIII (1952), pp. 237-39; see also Chadwick, "Shorter Text," p. 251.

⁵⁴Schaefer, op. cit., pp. 237-39.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 237-39.

⁵⁶Chadwick, "Shorter Text," p. 251.

⁵⁷Schuermann, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), p. 164.

⁵⁸Professor Schuermann pointed out that sy^S can be traced back to sy^C. Ibid., pp. 165 and 170.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 165.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 167.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 167.

⁶²Ibid., p. 166.

⁶³Lessig, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 17-18.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 18.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 18.

⁶⁷Jeremias, op. cit., p. 143.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 143-44.

⁶⁹Lessig, op. cit., p. 19.

⁷⁰Lessig pointed out that in both forms ταῦτο (τὸ ποτήριον) and αἷμα stand opposite each other; Lessig, op. cit., p. 19.

⁷¹Schuermann, Untersuchungen, p. 166.

⁷²Ibid., p. 166.

⁷³Ibid., p. 166.

⁷⁴Schuermann, op. cit., p. 166.

⁷⁵Lessig, op. cit., pp. 20-22.

⁷⁶Jeremias, op. cit., p. 144. See also Chadwick, op. cit., p. 252.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 144.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 139.

⁷⁹Benoit, op. cit., pp. 357ff.

⁸⁰Schuermann, op. cit., p. 171.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 171.

⁸²Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 153ff.

⁸³Chadwick, op. cit., p. 352.

⁸⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 153.

⁸⁵Professor Lohmeyer pointed out that the most important Latin versions read as D. Thus the tradition is broader than one may think. Nevertheless, it is hardly more than a narrow creek as compared with the broad stream of the Greek MSS. See Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 179.

⁸⁶Lessig has rightly pointed out that one has to have greater confidence in the reliable textual attestation than in the rules of textual criticism. Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," pp. 24-25.

⁸⁷ Benoit, op. cit., p. 359f.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 359.

⁸⁹ Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 144ff.

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 155-56.

⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 148ff.

⁹² Ibid., pp. 148ff.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 152.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 145, cf. Lessig, op. cit., pp. 25ff.

⁹⁵ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 152.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 152.

⁹⁷ Richardson, "Essay," p. 226f.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 226f.

⁹⁹ Bruce M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 133.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 133.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., n. 1, p. 134.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 134.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 134.

¹⁰⁴ Professor Metzger indicates that Westcott and Hort's judgement regarding the Western reading in the last three chapters of Luke and in Matt. 27:49 is based on their belief. Ibid., p. 134.

¹⁰⁵ Professor Jeremias held that the short text is the result of a deletion of verses 19b-20 from the long text. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 157.

¹⁰⁶ This view was held by Professor Bultmann. See Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, n. 1, p. 266.

¹⁰⁷ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 159.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 157.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 157.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 157.

- ¹¹¹Ibid., p. 157.
- ¹¹²Ibid., pp. 157-58.
- ¹¹³Ibid., p. 159.
- ¹¹⁴G. D. Kilpatrick, "Luke XII, 19-20," JTS, 47 (1946), pp. 52-53.
- ¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 53.
- ¹¹⁶Ibid., pp. 52-53.
- ¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 54.
- ¹¹⁸Lessig, op. cit., p. 293.
- ¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 294.
- ¹²⁰Chadwick, op. cit., pp. 254-55.
- ¹²¹Ibid., p. 255.
- ¹²²Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," p. 86.
- ¹²³Ibid., p. 86.
- ¹²⁴Ibid., pp. 86-87.
- ¹²⁵Schuermann, op. cit., p. 162.
- ¹²⁶Ibid., p. 162.
- ¹²⁷Tatian's Diatessaron, p. 204, cited by Schuermann, op. cit., p. 162.
- ¹²⁸Jeremias, op. cit., p. 141.
- ¹²⁹Schweizer, op. cit., p. 86.
- ¹³⁰Lessig, op. cit., p. 28.
- ¹³¹Ibid., p. 28.
- ¹³²Jeremias, op. cit., p. 141.
- ¹³³Ibid., pp. 141-42.
- ¹³⁴Lessig, op. cit., p. 28.
- ¹³⁵Richardson, "Essay," fasc. 4, pp. 235-36.
- ¹³⁶Lessig, op. cit., p. 28.

- ¹³⁷For a reconstruction of Tatian's text, see Richardson, "Essay,"
p. 235.
- ¹³⁸Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 162-63.
- ¹³⁹Ibid., p. 163.
- ¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 163.
- ¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 163.
- ¹⁴²Ibid., p. 163.
- ¹⁴³Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 28.
- ¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 29.
- ¹⁴⁵Otto, Kingdom, p. 269.
- ¹⁴⁶Leany, Luke, pp. 73ff.
- ¹⁴⁷Ibid., p. 73.
- ¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 74.
- ¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 75.
- ¹⁵⁰Otto, op. cit., p. 268.
- ¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 268.
- ¹⁵²Ibid., p. 268.
- ¹⁵³Ibid., p. 266.
- ¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 266.
- ¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 267.
- ¹⁵⁶This sequence is also found in the Didache. See Otto, op. cit.,
p. 267.
- ¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 267.
- ¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 267.
- ¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 270.
- ¹⁶⁰Ibid., p. 270.
- ¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 270.
- ¹⁶²Ibid., p. 270-71.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 271.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 271.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 271.

¹⁶⁶On the basis of the perfect participle *διαμενηκότες*, Otto's argument that verse 28 refers to the future temptations of Christ appears to be unfounded. See Otto, Kingdom, p. 273.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 273.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 273-74.

¹⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 273-74.

¹⁷⁰Bultmann, "Reich Gottes und Menschensohn," ThRNF, 9 (1937), p. 5.

¹⁷¹Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁷²Ibid., p. 5f.

¹⁷³Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," pp. 49-50.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 49-50.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 49-50.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁷⁸Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Co., 1937), p. 177.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 177.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., p. 177.

¹⁸¹Ibid., p. 177.

¹⁸²Ibid., p. 177.

¹⁸³Ibid., p. 178.

¹⁸⁴Schuermann, Jesu Abschiedsrede, Luke 22:21-38. (Muenster: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957), pp. 58-59.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 58-59.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., p. 59.

¹⁸⁷Ibid., p. 59.

- 188 Ibid., pp. 58-59.
- 189 Ibid., p. 59.
- 190 Ibid., p. 63.
- 191 Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963), pp. 394-97.
- 192 Ibid., p. 397.
- 193 Lessig, op. cit., p. 36.
- 194 Ibid., p. 30.
- 195 Ibid., p. 30.
- 196 Ibid., p. 30.
- 197 Ibid., pp. 31ff.
- 198 Ibid., p. 31.
- 199 Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, p. 64.
- 200 Professor Taylor, for instance, argued for the Marcan origin of verse 19a, because of its fourteen words, twelve agree exactly with Mark 14:22. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926), p. 37.
- 201 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 64.
- 202 Ibid., p. 64.
- 203 Ibid., p. 64.
- 204 Ibid., p. 64.
- 205 Schuermann, Der Päschemahlbericht, p. 123.
- 206 Ibid., pp. 46-47.
- 207 Schuermann, "Der Abendmahlsbericht Lk 22:7-38 als Gottesdienstordnung, Gemeindeordnung, Lebensordnung," in Ursprung und Gestalt, p. 110.
- 208 Ibid., p. 110.
- 209 Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 266-67.
- 210 Ibid., n. 1, p. 266.
- 211 Ibid., p. 266.

²¹²Ibid., p. 266.

²¹³Ibid., p. 266.

²¹⁴Ibid., p. 266.

²¹⁵Ibid., p. 266.

²¹⁶Chadwick, "Shorter Text," pp. 255ff.

²¹⁷Ibid., p. 257.

²¹⁸Ibid., p. 257.

²¹⁹Ibid., p. 257.

²²⁰Ibid., p. 257.

²²¹Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, trans. by Paul P. Levertoff (London: The Macmillan Co., 1929), pp. 126-27.

²²²Ibid., p. 127.

²²³Charles K. Barrett, "Luke XXII:15: To Eat The Passover," JTS, 9 (1958), pp. 305-307.

²²⁴Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 214.

²²⁵Barrett, op. cit., pp. 305-307.

²²⁶Ibid., pp. 305-307.

²²⁷Ibid., pp. 305-307.

²²⁸Chadwick, op. cit., p. 257.

²²⁹Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. 45f.

²³⁰Dibelius, Formgeschichte, pp. 210-11.

²³¹Ibid., p. 211.

²³²Ibid., p. 211.

²³³Ibid., p. 211.

²³⁴Ibid., p. 211.

²³⁵Ibid., p. 211.

²³⁶Schuermann, "Abendmahlsbericht," p. 110.

- ²³⁷Schuermann, review of Der Paschamahlbericht by E. Schweizer in ThLZ, 3 (1955), pp. 156-57.
- ²³⁸Ibid., p. 157.
- ²³⁹Ibid., p. 157.
- ²⁴⁰Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. 123.
- ²⁴¹In view of the agreements between verse 19a and Mk. 14:22, and on the assumption that verse 19a is later than the Marcan text, Lessig concluded that the Lucan text has its origin in the Marcan text. See Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 31. On the other hand, Schuermann thinks that verse 19a represents a Lucan reproduction of a non-Marcan tradition. See Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 48. While it may be impossible to reach any certainty on this point, it appears that on account of the four Marcan-Lucan differences, which are also Pauline-Lucan agreements, it is difficult to agree with Lessig.
- ²⁴²V. Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation, ed. Owen Evans (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1972), p. 52.
- ²⁴³Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 153.
- ²⁴⁴Lietzmann, Mass, fasc. 3, p. 175.
- ²⁴⁵Leben Jesu, pp. 298ff., cited by Lessig, op. cit., p. 33.
- ²⁴⁶Caird, op. cit., pp. 273ff.
- ²⁴⁷Taylor, op. cit., p. 52f.
- ²⁴⁸Leben Jesu, pp. 298ff., cited by Lessig, op. cit., p. 33.
- ²⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 298ff.
- ²⁵⁰Schweizer, "Abendmahl-Vergegenwaertigung," p. 86.
- ²⁵¹Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 17-42.
- ²⁵²Ibid., pp. 17-42.
- ²⁵³Ibid., pp. 41-42.
- ²⁵⁴Betz, Eucharistie, II, p. 14.
- ²⁵⁵Ibid., p. 14.
- ²⁵⁶Cirlot, Eucharist, p. 252f.
- ²⁵⁷Burton, H. Throckmorton, "The Longer Reading of Luke 22:19b-20." ATHR, Vol. XXX, (1948), pp. 55ff.

258 Ibid., p. 56.

259 Ibid., p. 56.

260 Ibid., p. 56.

261 Ibid., p. 56.

262 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 155.

263 Ibid., p. 155.

264 Ibid., pp. 155-56.

265 Taylor, Passion Narrative, p. 55.

266 Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 131.

267 Ibid., p. 132.

268 Schuermann, Untersuchungen, p. 190.

269 Ibid., pp. 190-91.

270 Ibid., p. 191.

271 Ibid., p. 182.

272 Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 59.

273 Ibid., p. 59.

274 Ibid., p. 68.

275 Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 62; Patsch, op. cit., p. 68.

276 While a group of New Testament scholars such as Bornkamm, Neuenzeit and others have defended the view that the Pauline account of the Eucharist represents the oldest attainable form of the tradition, Schuermann and Jeremias have argued at great length in support of the priority of the Lucan and Marcan tradition, respectively.

277 Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 7. Higgins, Lord's Supper, p. 24.

278 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 7.

279 Lessig, op. cit., p. 58.

280 Ibid., p. 58.

281 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 159, 189; see also Higgins, op. cit., p. 24.

282 Jeremias, loc. cit., p. 159.

²⁸³Ibid., p. 189.

²⁸⁴Schuermann is fully aware of the problem in reconstructing the historical situation of the Last Supper. Thus, he states: "Die Untersuchung musste nicht nur in dem Dunkel getaetigt werden, dass naturgemaess ueber dem Geschehen einer bedeutungsvollen Stunde vor ueber 1900 Jahren und den bald ebenso alten Berichten davon lagert, sondern auch in dem Zwielficht, das die guten wie irreleitenden Lichter einer langen und muehseligen Abendmahlsforschung verursacht haben. Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. VIII.

²⁸⁵In his dissertation Professor Marxsen concluded that verses 19 and 20 can at the most be utilized for the purpose of further comparison. They cannot, however, be considered as proof. Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 54.

²⁸⁶Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. VII.

²⁸⁷Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. VII.

²⁸⁸Ibid., p. VII.

²⁸⁹Ibid., p. 1.

²⁹⁰Ibid., p. 123.

²⁹¹Ibid., p. 150.

²⁹²Schuermann, Abschiedsrede, p. 140.

²⁹³Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, pp. 1-3.

²⁹⁴Ibid., p. 2.

²⁹⁵Ibid., p. 2.

²⁹⁶Ibid., p. 2.

²⁹⁷Ibid., p. 3.

²⁹⁸Ibid., p. 3.

²⁹⁹Ibid., p. 3.

³⁰⁰Ibid., p. 3.

³⁰¹Ibid., p. 123.

³⁰²Ibid., p. 123.

³⁰³Ibid., p. 123.

³⁰⁴Ibid., p. 3ff.

³⁰⁵Ibid., p. 14.

³⁰⁶Ibid., p. 14.

³⁰⁷Ibid., p. 23.

³⁰⁸Ibid., p. 23.

³⁰⁹Ibid., p. 23.

³¹⁰Ibid., p. 23.

³¹¹Ibid., p. 23.

³¹²Ibid., p. 34.

³¹³Ibid., p. 45.

³¹⁴Ibid., p. 45.

³¹⁵Ibid., p. 73.

³¹⁶Ibid., p. 73-74.

³¹⁷Ibid., pp. 73-74.

³¹⁸Ibid., p. 123. See also Schuermann, "Abendmahlsbericht," in Ursprung und Gestalt, pp. 110ff., 117ff.

³¹⁹Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 15ff.

³²⁰Ibid., pp. 1-7.

³²¹Professor Schuermann stated: "In einer ersten Voruntersuchung ist Mtt. 26:26-28 als literarische Mk. Redaktion ohne jeden Einfluss auf Lk. 22:19-20 erwiesen und ist aus der weiteren Untersuchung ausgeschieden. Ibid., pp. 2-7.

³²²Ibid., p. 1.

³²³Ibid., p. 1.

³²⁴Ibid., p. 1.

³²⁵Ibid., pp. 152f.

³²⁶Ibid., p. 152.

³²⁷Ibid., pp. 17ff.

³²⁸Ibid., pp. 41-42.

³²⁹Professor Schuermann argued that the participial phrase can be understood as originating in the Semitic world of thought. Thus it may even be

original. Ibid., p. 23.

³³⁰Ibid., pp. 34,39, 41,

³³¹Ibid., p. 36.

³³²Ibid., p. 42.

³³³According to Schuermann, if only one of the five Lucan-Pauline differences could not be explained as Lucan-Paulin  redaction, this would be proof that Lk. 22:19b-20a represents an independent tradition with no literary dependence upon the Pauline tradition. Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 42.

³³⁴Ibid., p. 152.

³³⁵Ibid., p. 42.

³³⁶Ibid., p. 42.

³³⁷Ibid., p. 42.

³³⁸Ibid., p. 64.

³³⁹Ibid., p. 64.

³⁴⁰Ibid., p. 64.

³⁴¹Ibid., p. 64.

³⁴²Ibid., p. 64.

³⁴³Ibid., p. 80.

³⁴⁴Ibid., p. 80.

³⁴⁵Ibid., p. 80.

³⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 83ff.

³⁴⁷Ibid., p. 129.

³⁴⁸Ibid., p. 129.

³⁴⁹Ibid., p. 133.

³⁵⁰Ibid., p. 133.

³⁵¹Ibid., p. 151.

³⁵²Ibid., p. 151.

³⁵³Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. 74.

- 354 Ibid., p. 75.
- 355 Ibid., p. 110.
- 356 Ibid., p. 120.
- 357 Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. VIII.
- 358 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 189f.
- 359 Kuhn, "Meal," p. 89.
- 360 Professor Schuermann stated: "Die ganze Untersuchung moechte den Nachweis erbringen, dass der lukanische Abendmahlsbericht unter den neutestamentlichen derjenige ist, in welchem sich unter der Decke der juengsten synoptischen Redaktion noch urspruenglichstes Traditionsgut verbirgt." See Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. VII.
- 361 Schuermann, Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 2.
- 362 Ibid., p. 140.
- 363 Schuermann, review of Paschamahlbericht, by Eduard Schweizer in ThLZ, 3 (1955), pp. 156-57.
- 364 Ibid., p. 157.
- 365 Schuermann, review of Einsetzungsbericht, by Eduard Schweizer, in ThLZ, 4 (1956), p. 218.
- 366 Schuermann, review of Einsetzungsbericht and Abschiedsrede by Paul Winter, in NTS, 4, (1957-58).
- 367 Ibid., p. 224.
- 368 Ibid., n. 1, p. 224.
- 369 Ibid., p. 224.
- 370 Ibid., p. 224.
- 371 Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 129-30.
- 372 Ibid., n. 448, p. 130.
- 373 Ibid., n. 448, p. 130.
- 374 Professor Schuermann had to admit: "Es gibt aber keine zuverlässigen Beobachtungen, die einen Regress von dem hier erarbeiteten relativ urspruenglichsten Bericht auf einen Urbericht im historischen Sinne erlauben wuerde," Ibid., n. 448, p. 130.

³⁷⁵Ibid., n. 448, p. 130.

³⁷⁶Schuermann, "Jesu Abendmahls Worte im Lichte seiner Abendmahlshandlung," in Ursprung und Gestalt, p. 100. (Engl. trans. in Concilium 40, pp. 119-31)

³⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 119-31.

³⁷⁸Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 80.

³⁷⁹Ibid., p. 80, pp. 131-32.

³⁸⁰For a discussion of Schuermann's hypothesis, see p. 235.

³⁸¹Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 189-90.

³⁸²This was pointed out by Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 67.

³⁸³Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 89ff.

³⁸⁴Ibid., pp. 89-96.

³⁸⁵Ibid., p. 95.

³⁸⁶Ibid., p. 96.

³⁸⁷Ibid., p. 96.

³⁸⁸Ibid., p. 96.

³⁸⁹Ibid., pp. 96ff.

³⁹⁰Ibid., p. 100.

³⁹¹Ibid., p. 100.

³⁹²Ibid., p. 100.

³⁹³Ibid., p. 101.

³⁹⁴Professor Jeremias pointed out that there should never have been any doubt that the terms παράλαμβάνειν and παράδιδόναι represent the rabbinical technical terms kibbel min and masar le. Ibid., p. 101.

³⁹⁵Ibid., p. 105.

³⁹⁶Ibid., p. 105.

³⁹⁷Jeremias has rightly pointed out that the eucharistic tradition has its Sitz im Leben in the eucharistic practice of the early church. In spite of this recognition, he is still primarily concerned with a historical reconstruction of the eucharistic words of Jesus. Ibid., p. 106.

³⁹⁸Ibid., p. 137.

³⁹⁹Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁰¹Ibid., p. 160.

⁴⁰²Ibid., p. 160.

⁴⁰³Ibid., p. 184.

⁴⁰⁴Ibid., p. 186.

⁴⁰⁵Ibid., p. 186.

⁴⁰⁶Ibid., p. 186.

⁴⁰⁷Ibid., p. 187.

⁴⁰⁸Ibid., pp. 188-89.

⁴⁰⁹Ibid., p. 189.

⁴¹⁰Ibid., p. 189.

⁴¹¹Ibid., p. 190.

⁴¹²Ibid., p. 190.

⁴¹³Ibid., p. 237.

⁴¹⁴Ibid., p. 255.

⁴¹⁵Ibid., p. 196.

⁴¹⁶Ibid., p. 201.

⁴¹⁷Ibid., p. 201.

⁴¹⁸Ibid., p. 202.

⁴¹⁹Ibid., p. 202.

⁴²⁰There is no proof that these expressions can be considered as Jesus' manner of speaking.

⁴²¹Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 54.

⁴²²Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 65.

⁴²³Ibid., p. 65.

⁴²⁴See Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, n. 5, p. 159.

⁴²⁵Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl," p. 327.

⁴²⁶In his dissertation, Professor Marxsen concluded: "Alle Ergebnisse der Untersuchung lassen darauf hinzufuehren, dass die von Paulus wiedergefundene Tradition so dicht an das historische Abendmahl heranreicht, dass kein Raum bleibt die markinische dazwischenzuschieben." In his opinion, it would be possible to postulate two strands of the tradition, which originated in a common Urform. He also allowed for the possibility that the Marcan tradition was derived from the Pauline tradition; see Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 75; see also his essay, "Lord's Supper," p. 6.

⁴²⁷In connection with his study, Neuenzeit stated: "Es setzt an der literarisch fruehest fixierbaren Eucharistieauffassung des 1. Korintherbriefes an, um von dort aus eine erste Position theologisch zu umschreiben." Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, p. 9.

⁴²⁸Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 327.

⁴²⁹Lietzmann, Mass, p. 208.

⁴³⁰Ibid., p. 208.

⁴³¹Les Evangiles Synoptiques, II. p. 532, cited by Higgins, Lord's Supper, p. 25.

⁴³²Ibid., p. 25.

⁴³³Ibid., p. 25.

⁴³⁴Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), pp. 183-84.

⁴³⁵Ibid., p. 184; see also Higgins, op. cit., p. 26.

⁴³⁶Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 183-84.

⁴³⁷Ibid., p. 184.

⁴³⁸Ibid., p. 184.

⁴³⁹Ibid., p. 184.

⁴⁴⁰Ibid., p. 184.

⁴⁴¹Ibid., p. 184.

⁴⁴²Ibid., p. 185.

⁴⁴³Ibid., p. 185.

⁴⁴⁴See e.g. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 101; see also Neuenzeit,

Herrenmahl, pp. 77ff. In this connection Professor Schuermann stated:
"Die Meinung gewinnt an Boden, dass Paulus in 1. Kor. 11:23a eine Traditionskette, die auf den geschichtlichen Jesus zurueckgeht, behaupten will, nicht aber eine unmittelbare Offenbarung nach Art von Gal. 1:12."
Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 7-8.

445 Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

446 According to Marxsen, die sprachliche Untersuchung der Termini παραλαμβάνειν - παραδιδόναι spricht eher gegen als fuer eine unmittelbare Offenbarung. Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 67.

447 Neuenzeit, op. cit., p. 82.

448 Cullmann, The Early Church: Studies in Early Christian History and Theology, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 62.

449 Ibid., p. 62.

450 Ibid., p. 62.

451 Ibid., p. 62.

452 Ibid., p. 62.

453 Ibid., p. 62.

454 Tradition, cited by Neuenzeit, op. cit., p. 81.

455 According to Neuenzeit, Cullmann's presentation lacks "der begrifflichen Eindeutigkeit." Neuenzeit, op. cit., p. 81.

456 Ibid., p. 81.

457 Ibid., p. 81.

458 Ibid., p. 82.

459 Ibid., p. 82.

460 Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl," p. 321.

461 Ibid., p. 321.

462 Patsch, op. cit., p. 66.

463 Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 7.

464 Ibid., pp. 9ff.

465 Ibid., p. 9.

- 466 Ibid., p. 9.
- 467 Ibid., p. 9.
- 468 Ibid., p. 9.
- 469 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
- 470 Ibid., p. 10.
- 471 Ibid., p. 10.
- 472 Ibid., p. 30.
- 473 Ibid., p. 10.
- 474 Ibid., p. 11.
- 475 Ibid., p. 11.
- 476 Ibid., p. 11.
- 477 Ibid., p. 11.
- 478 Ibid., p. 11.
- 479 Ibid., p. 11.
- 480 Ibid., p. 11.
- 481 Ibid., p. 11.
- 482 Ibid., p. 11.
- 483 Ibid., p. 12.
- 484 Ibid., p. 12.
- 485 Ibid., p. 12.
- 486 Ibid., p. 12.
- 487 Ibid., p. 14.
- 488 Taylor, Passion Narrative, p. 53.
- 489 Ibid., p. 50.
- 490 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 104-105.
- 491 Ibid., pp. 104-105.
- 492 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 188; Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 142ff.

- ⁴⁹³Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 130.
- ⁴⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 18ff.
- ⁴⁹⁵Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, p. 75.
- ⁴⁹⁶Ibid., p. 75.
- ⁴⁹⁷Ibid., p. 108.
- ⁴⁹⁸Ibid., p. 109.
- ⁴⁹⁹Ibid., p. 109.
- ⁵⁰⁰Ibid., p. 109.
- ⁵⁰¹Ibid., p. 109.
- ⁵⁰²Ibid., p. 109.
- ⁵⁰³Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 36.
- ⁵⁰⁴Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, p. 116.
- ⁵⁰⁵Ibid., p. 116.
- ⁵⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 116-17.
- ⁵⁰⁷Ibid., p. 106.
- ⁵⁰⁸According to Neuenzeit, "das Personalpronomen koennte zu Vers 19 parallelisiert oder aber an den gewoehnlichen synoptischen Sprachbrauch angeglichen worden sein." Ibid., p. 106.
- ⁵⁰⁹Ibid., p. 107.
- ⁵¹⁰Ibid., p. 238.
- ⁵¹¹Professor Marxsen, e.g., pointed out that it would be natural to assume that he received it from Ananias during his stay at Damascus. Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 71.
- ⁵¹²Ibid., p. 70.
- ⁵¹³Ibid., p. 75.
- ⁵¹⁴Ibid., p. 71.
- ⁵¹⁵Betz, Eucharistie, II/1, p. 11.
- ⁵¹⁶Ibid., p. 11.

⁵¹⁷Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 17-81, esp. p. 80.

⁵¹⁸Professor Schuermann pointed out that the Lucan-Pauline Grundbericht may represent an Antiochene tradition, Ibid., p. 151.

⁵¹⁹Betz, op. cit., p. 11; see also Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," pp. 56ff.

⁵²⁰Betz, op. cit., p. 11; Lessig, loc. cit., pp. 56ff.

⁵²¹Betz, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵²²Les Récits de l'Institution et leur Portée: LV, 31, p. 50, cited by Betz, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵²³Lessig, op. cit., pp. 59ff.

⁵²⁴Attempts to reconstruct an archetype of the eucharistic accounts were made by Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 129ff; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 186ff.; see also Betz, Eucharistie, Vol. II/1, pp. 14ff. and Lessig, op. cit., pp. 60ff.

⁵²⁵Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 73.

⁵²⁶Ibid., p. 73.

⁵²⁷Ibid., p. 73.

⁵²⁸Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 63.

⁵²⁹Patsch, op. cit., p. 73.

⁵³⁰Ibid., p. 73.

⁵³¹Ibid., p. 73.

⁵³²Lessig, op. cit., p. 63.

⁵³³Ibid., p. 63.

⁵³⁴Lietzmann held that the Marcan bread-word (Mk. 14:22) gave rise to the ἀράρε of Lk. 22:17, Lietzmann, Mass, p. 176. On the other hand, Schuermann speculated that the ἀράρε of Lk. 22:17 moved to Mk. 14:22. Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 114.

⁵³⁵Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 74.

⁵³⁶Ibid., p. 74; Lessig, op. cit., p. 63.

⁵³⁷Patsch, op. cit., p. 74. In Luke the ὑπὲρ -phrase appears in connection with the bread- and the cup-word.

⁵³⁸Ibid., p. 74.

- 539 Ibid., p. 74.
- 540 Lessig, op. cit., p. 64.
- 541 Betz, op. cit., II/1 p. 19.
- 542 Ibid., p. 19.
- 543 Lessig, op. cit., p. 63. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 165.
- 544 Ibid., pp. 65-66.
- 545 Ibid., pp. 64-65.
- 546 Ibid., p. 65.
- 547 Betz, op. cit., p. 22.
- 548 Marxsen, "Der Ursprung des Abendmahls," EvTh, 12 (1952/53), pp. 293-303.
- 549 Ibid., p. 297.
- 550 Ibid., pp. 298-99.
- 551 Ibid., p. 299.
- 552 Ibid., p. 299.
- 553 Ibid., p. 299.
- 554 Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 18f.
- 555 Ibid., p. 18.
- 556 Ibid., p. 18.
- 557 Ibid., p. 18.
- 558 Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, p. 108.
- 559 Ibid., p. 109.
- 560 Ibid., p. 109.
- 561 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 94-113.
- 562 This was pointed out by Professor Schuermann, who stated: "Die beiden so verwandten Partizipialwendungen, Lk. 22:20b und Mk. 14:24b koennen nicht gaenzlich unabhaengig voneinander entstanden sein." Einsetzungsbericht, p. 73.
- 563 Ibid., p. 79.

⁵⁶⁴Ibid., p. 79.

⁵⁶⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁵⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 79-80.

⁵⁶⁷Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 166ff.

⁵⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 167, 172.

⁵⁶⁹Ibid., p. 172.

⁵⁷⁰Ibid., p. 167.

⁵⁷¹Ibid., p. 167.

⁵⁷²Ibid., p. 167.

⁵⁷³Ibid., pp. 167-68.

⁵⁷⁴Ibid., p. 167.

⁵⁷⁵Ibid., p. 167.

⁵⁷⁶Ibid., p. 167.

⁵⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 167-68.

⁵⁷⁸Ibid., p. 168.

⁵⁷⁹Patsch, op. cit., p. 78.

⁵⁸⁰Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸¹Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸²Patsch described the harmonizing process as follows: "Der erschlossene Traditionsbestand begegnete einem dem Markustext entsprechenden, der die ~~erste~~ ^{Becher}-Wendung beim Becherwort hatte. In harmonisierender Weise wurde der Ausgleich so vorgenommen, dass die Becherwendung an ihrer Stelle uebernommen wurde, wobei das ~~erste~~ ^{Becher} des Brotwortes einwirkte, und die griechische Satzstellung anregte, die zugleich den Hiatus vermied." Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸³Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸⁴Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸⁵Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸⁶Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁸⁷Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 69.

⁵⁸⁸Patsch, op. cit. p. 78.

⁵⁸⁹Ibid., p. 75.

⁵⁹⁰Ibid., p. 80.

⁵⁹¹Ibid., p. 80.

⁵⁹²Lessig, op. cit., pp. 66-67.

⁵⁹³Ibid., pp. 66-67.

⁵⁹⁴With regard to the Antiochene version of the cup-word, Lessig commented: "Es besteht keinerlei Veranlassung die antiochenische Fassung als verzwickt, sonderbar oder auffaellig kompliziert zu bezeichnen. Das ist sie nur wenn man ihre Aussage exegetisch vergewaltigt ... Sie ist hingegen klar und eindeutig wenn man sie aussagen laesst, was ihr Wortlaut verlangt," Lessig, op. cit., p. 66.

⁵⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 66-67.

⁵⁹⁶Ibid., p. 67.

⁵⁹⁷Ibid., p. 67; see also Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, p. 332, cited by Higgins, Lord's Supper, p. 30. M. Dibelius stated: "Die juden-christliche Gemeinde mit ihrere Blutscheu wird Jesus schwerlich haben sagen lassen: "Dies ist mein Blut," wohl aber: "Dieser Becher bedeutet die neue Ordnung, die in meinem Blut, d.h. in meinem Tod begruendet wird." Dibelius Formgeschichte, p. 208.

⁵⁹⁸Higgins, Lord's Supper, p. 30.

⁵⁹⁹Betz, Eucharistie, II/1, pp. 20-21.

⁶⁰⁰Ibid., p. 21.

⁶⁰¹Ibid., p. 21.

⁶⁰²Higgins, op. cit., p. 33.

⁶⁰³Ibid., p. 32.

⁶⁰⁴Ibid., p. 33.

⁶⁰⁵Ibid., p. 33.

⁶⁰⁶Ibid., p. 34.

⁶⁰⁷Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 169.

⁶⁰⁸Patsch, op. cit., p. 80.

⁶⁰⁹ZNW, 1, pp. 69-74, cited by Patsch, op. cit., p. 80. Since Wrede, the Marcan text was often considered as a combination of two theologumena, which originally did not belong together. see Patsch, loc. cit., p. 80.

⁶¹⁰J. A. Emerton, "The Aramaic Underlying τὸ αἶμα μου τῆς διαθήκης in Mk. XIV:24," JTSNS, 6 (1955), pp. 238-40.

⁶¹¹Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 81.

⁶¹²Neuenzeit, Herrenmahl, pp. 171ff.

⁶¹³Ibid., p. 171.

⁶¹⁴Patsch, op. cit., p. 84.

⁶¹⁵Ibid., p. 84.

⁶¹⁶Ibid., p. 84.

⁶¹⁷Ibid., p. 84.

⁶¹⁸Ibid., p. 84.

⁶¹⁹Ibid., p. 84.

⁶²⁰Ibid., p. 84.

⁶²¹Ibid., p. 84.

⁶²²Ibid., p. 84.

⁶²³Ibid., p. 85.

⁶²⁴Ibid., p. 87.

⁶²⁵Ibid., p. 87.

⁶²⁶Ibid., p. 87.

⁶²⁷Ibid., p. 87.

⁶²⁸du Toit, Aspekt, p. 88.

⁶²⁹Ibid., p. 88.

⁶³⁰Patsch, op. cit., p. 89.

⁶³¹Ibid., p. 89.

⁶³²Higgins, Lord's Supper, p. 40.

⁶³³Messe und Herrenmahl⁶, pp. 216ff., cited by Higgins, loc. cit., p. 40.

⁶³⁴Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 216ff., cited by Higgins, loc. cit., p. 40f.

⁶³⁵Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 216ff., cited by Higgins, loc. cit., p. 41.

⁶³⁶On this point Higgins is in agreement with Jeremias; see Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, 2nd ed., pp. 56, 87, cited by Higgins, op. cit., p. 41f.

⁶³⁷Higgins, op. cit., p. 42.

⁶³⁸Ibid., p. 42.

⁶³⁹Ibid., p. 42.

⁶⁴⁰This was pointed out by G. H. C. Macgregor, Eucharistic Origins, p. 62., cited by Higgins, op. cit., p. 42.

⁶⁴¹Higgins, loc. cit., p. 42.

⁶⁴²Patsch, op. cit., p. 94.

⁶⁴³Higgins, op. cit., p. 42.

⁶⁴⁴Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 266.

⁶⁴⁵Dibelius, Formgeschichte, pp. 210ff.

⁶⁴⁶Jeremias, "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" NTS, 4 (1957-58), p. 115ff.

⁶⁴⁷Ibid., p. 115ff.

⁶⁴⁸Ibid., p. 115ff.

⁶⁴⁹Ibid., p. 115ff.

⁶⁵⁰Ibid., p. 115ff.

⁶⁵¹Ibid., p. 115ff.

⁶⁵²Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 173ff.

⁶⁵³Patsch, op. cit., p. 91.

⁶⁵⁴Ibid., p. 92; see also du Toit, Aspekt, pp. 88-89.

⁶⁵⁵According to Patsch, this striking parallelism of Luke 22:17 and Mark 14:23 is to be explained on the basis of "formelhafter" language, having its origin in the Jewish terminology of distribution. Patsch, op. cit., p. 92f.

⁶⁵⁶Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. 34.

⁶⁵⁷Patsch, op. cit., pp. 93-94.

⁶⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 93ff.

⁶⁵⁹du Toit, Aspekt, p. 95; McCormick, Lord's Supper, pp. 73, 110.

⁶⁶⁰In Lessig's opinion, the omission of this command to repeat the rite in the Casarean tradition is to be understood on the basis that this command did not belong to the oldest substance of the tradition. Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 65. For a different view, see Higgins, Lord's Supper, p. 34f.

⁶⁶¹Lessig, op. cit., p. 65.

⁶⁶²Barrett, Tradition, p. 50.

⁶⁶³Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 237ff.

⁶⁶⁴Ibid., p. 238.

⁶⁶⁵See Benoit, "Récit," p. 386, cited by Jeremias, op. cit., p. 238; see also du Toit, Aspekt, p. 95.

⁶⁶⁶du Toit, op. cit., p. 95.

⁶⁶⁷Higgins, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

⁶⁶⁸Ibid., p. 35.

⁶⁶⁹Dix, Shape, p. 67-69.

⁶⁷⁰Ibid., p. 67.

⁶⁷¹Ibid., p. 68.

⁶⁷²Alfred Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, trans. by Joseph Cunningham (Freiburg: Herder, 1960), pp. 220-21.

⁶⁷³McCormick, Lord's Supper, pp. 110-12; see also du Toit, Aspekt, p. 95.

⁶⁷⁴McCormick, op. cit., p. 112.

⁶⁷⁵Ibid., p. 112.

⁶⁷⁶du Toit, Aspect, p. 81.

⁶⁷⁷Ibid., p. 81.

⁶⁷⁸Schuermann, "Jesus' Words," pp. 119-31.

⁶⁷⁹Ibid., p. 119.

⁶⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 119-20.

⁶⁸¹Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 188, 173.

⁶⁸²Schuermann, op. cit., p. 119.

⁶⁸³du Toit, Aspekt, p. 81.

⁶⁸⁴Ibid., p. 81.

⁶⁸⁵Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 87.

⁶⁸⁶Ibid., p. 87.

⁶⁸⁷In conclusion to his literary-critical analysis, Patsch stated:
"Die Bestimmung der relativ aelteren Teile war viel zu unsicher, die Rueck-
uebersetzungen ... konnten nur illustrierenden Charakter tragen. Was zu
erreichen war, war die hypothetische Klassifizierung der literarisch ueber-
lieferten Textteile, aber eben nur der ueberlieferten Texte als literarischer
Produkte." Ibid., p. 88.

⁶⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 88-89.

⁶⁸⁹Ibid., p. 87.

⁶⁹⁰For a detailed discussion of Jeremias' Passover theory, see pp. 24ff.

⁶⁹¹Lessig, Abendmahlsprobleme, p. 139.

⁶⁹²Feneberg, Passafeier, pp. 113ff.

⁶⁹³See e.g. his chapter on "Die Anfaenge Christlicher Osterfeier" (Ur-
sprung und Gestalt [Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1970]), pp. 199ff. The
same article was also published in ThQ, 131 (1951), pp. 414-25. For a dis-
cussion of the originality of the Lucan tradition, Lk. 22:15-18, see Der
Paschamahlbericht, esp. pp. 1-74.

⁶⁹⁴Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 122ff.

⁶⁹⁵Hahn, "Motive," pp. 337-74.

⁶⁹⁶Lohse, Passafest,

⁶⁹⁷Feneberg, op. cit.

⁶⁹⁸According to Schuermann, "die Tage der Ungesaeuerten sind in einem
Ton erwaehnt, der die Vermutung erlaubt, dass dieselben auch fuer die
Christen noch von Bedeutung gewesen sind." Schuermann, "Anfaenge," p. 201.

699 In his investigation about the origin of the Christian Passover celebration, Schuermann argued that the Quartodecimans of the second century may have relied upon traditions which point to the apostolic age. In his opinion, the chronology of the Gospel of John seems to reflect a Christian Passover celebration; see Schuermann, "Anfaenge," p. 201; see also George Ziener, "Johannesevangelium und urchristliche Passafeier," BZNF, 2 (1958), pp. 263ff. In his essay, Ziener has attempted to find further support for Schuermann's hypothesis according to which the dating of the death of Jesus in John may be based upon a Quartodeciman practice of the Johannine communities. For a summary of the most important arguments for the existence of a Christian Passover celebration, see Ziener, loc. cit., pp. 263-66.

700 Schuermann, "Anfaenge," p. 201.

701 In such circles, one commemorated the death of Jesus on Nisan 14th, according to the Johannine tradition. Schuermann, op. cit., p. 201f.

702 As far as ancient perceptions are concerned, the comparison of Jesus with the Passover lamb, 1. Cor. 5:7, seems to presuppose that day and hour of the Lord's death and the slaying of the Passover lamb coincide. In the light of this consideration, Paul seems to have followed a chronology which agreed with the Johannine chronology. This chronology would allow for the possibility of a Quartodeciman Passover celebration. But more cannot be said. Schuermann, "Anfaenge," pp. 202-203.

703 Ibid., p. 110.

704 Ibid., pp. 115; 116.

705 For a discussion of the Lucan text problem, see Schuermann, "Luke 22:19b:20 als urspruengliche Textueberlieferung," Biblica, 32 (1951), pp. 364-92.

706 Schuermann admits that it is hard to say how this early composition, Luke 22:15-18, 19-20 is to be read and understood. He raises the question whether the cup of verse 20 could be identified with the one of verse 17f.. Schuermann, "Anfaenge," n. 6, p. 117. If verses 15-18 are to be considered as an old account of the Passover celebration, it is indeed peculiar why reference was made only to the third cup. According to Ligier, the first Lucan cup does not represent the first cup of the Passover seder, or the kiddush cup. It is, rather, the cup of blessing, to be identified with the third cup of the Jewish Passover; see Louis Ligier, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

707 Schuermann, op. cit., n. 5, p. 117.

708 Ibid., pp. 117-18.

709 Ibid., pp. 201-205.

710 The view that the Christian Passover celebration goes back to apostolic times was held by several scholars; see Schuermann "Anfaenge," n. 28, p. 205. Lietzmann, for instance, pointed out that the oldest

Christian community actually continued to celebrate the Jewish Passover. Through a succession of varied stages, the Easter festival developed out of it; see Lietzmann, Mass, p. 172. His argument, however, lacks precision. In Nielsen's opinion, the fact of a Passover meal of Jesus is not the necessary presupposition for the equation Christ, our pascha, especially since it cannot be proven that Jesus' Last Supper was a Passover meal. Contrary to Hoenneke, who argued that the Christian meal celebration has nothing to do with the Passover celebration, Nielsen argued that even if the Christian meal is nothing else but a continuation of Jewish meal customs filled with a new content, it is not plausible why it should not have a relationship to the most solemn feast. This is especially so, since 1. Cor. 5:7 seems to refer to this "new content"; see Nielsen, Gebet, n. 68, p. 260. Contrary to Nielsen, Marxsen argued that the equation is not Christ, our pascha, for it reads: τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη, Christ. Therefore, in his opinion, on the basis of this reference it is hardly possible to determine the paschal character of the Lord's Supper. See, Marxsen, "Einsetzungsberichte," p. 14.

⁷¹¹Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 122.

⁷¹²Schuermann, "Anfaenge," pp. 201-205.

⁷¹³Lohse, op. cit., pp. 101ff.

⁷¹⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 122.

⁷¹⁵Ibid., p. 122-23

⁷¹⁶Ibid., p. 123.

⁷¹⁷Ibid., p. 123.

⁷¹⁸Ibid., p. 123.

⁷¹⁹Ibid., p. 123.

⁷²⁰Ibid., p. 124.

⁷²¹Ibid., p. 124.

⁷²²"Anfaenge," ThQ, 131 (1951), p. 422, cited by Jeremias, n. 2, p. 124.

⁷²³Jeremias, op. cit., p. 124.

⁷²⁴"Anfaenge," ThQ, 131 (1951), p. 422, cited by Jeremias, n. 2, p. 124.

⁷²⁵Jeremias, op. cit., p. 124.

⁷²⁶Hahn, "Motive," p. 352.

⁷²⁷Ibid., p. 357.

⁷²⁸Ibid., p. 357.

⁷²⁹ According to Hahn, Schuermann has rightly observed that in Luke 22:15-18 a transformation of the Passover by Jesus has taken place and that the text is to be considered as the account of a "neutestamentlich erfuelltes Passamahl." But Schuermann is not prepared to take the consequences. Under all circumstances, he wants to defend the authenticity of the dominical words of verses 15ff and 18ff. See Hahn, "Motive," p. 353.

⁷³⁰ Ibid., p. 357.

⁷³¹ Schuermann, Paschamahlbericht, p. 123.

⁷³² Hahn pointed out that Jeremias is concerned to show that verses 15-17 are not to be understood in terms of a liturgical formula. According to Jeremias a historical account forms the basis of these verses. See Hahn, "Motive," n. 53, p. 353.

⁷³³ Hahn, ibid., p. 353.

⁷³⁴ Ibid., 353.

⁷³⁵ The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, p. 53, cited by Hahn, op. cit., n. 55, p. 353.

⁷³⁶ Hahn, op. cit., p. 353.

⁷³⁷ Ibid., p. 353.

⁷³⁸ Ibid., p. 355.

⁷³⁹ Ibid., p. 355.

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 353.

⁷⁴¹ Ibid., p. 356.

⁷⁴² Ibid., p. 356.

⁷⁴³ Ibid., p. 356.

⁷⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 356.

⁷⁴⁵ Lohse, Passafest, p. 111.

⁷⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 105.

⁷⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 98-101.

⁷⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 49f.

⁷⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 75-77.

⁷⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 75-77.

751 Ibid., pp. 75-77.

752 Ibid., p. 112.

753 This was pointed out by C. Bonner, Studies and Documents, XII, p. 115, cited by Lohse, op. cit., p. 16; cf. G. Ziener, "Johannesevangelium und urchristliche Passafeier," BZNF, 2 (1958), p. 263f.

754 In this connection Lohse stated: "Neben dieser christologischen Linie laesst sich jedoch noch ein zweites Moment des fruehchristlichen Passa bis auf Jesu Passamahl zurueckverfolgen: die eschatologische Erwartung." Lohse, op. cit., p. 105.

755 Ibid., p. 110f.

756 "LK. 22:19b-20 als urspruengliche Textueberlieferung," pp. 364-392, 522-541, cited by Lohse, op. cit., p. 111.

757 Ibid., p. 111.

758 Feneberg, Passafeier, p. 85.

759 Ibid., p. 85.

760 Ibid., p. 86.

761 Ibid., p. 85.

762 Ibid., p. 86.

763 Ibid., p. 86.

764 Ibid., p. 60.

765 Ibid., p. 86.

766 Ibid., p. 86.

767 Ibid., p. 86.

768 Ibid., pp. 87ff.

769 These scholars, in dependence upon H. Gunkel, have started the form-critical work on the New Testament. Feneberg, op. cit., p. 87.

770 Feneberg, op. cit., p. 88.

771 "Das Leiden des Herrn: die evangelische Passionstradition und ihr Sitz im Leben," ZThK, 52 (1955), pp. 161-205, cited by Feneberg.

772 "Les Origines de la Cène Eucharistique," in: Congrès d'Histoire du Christianisme, 1928, pp. 177-95, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 101.

773 Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult: eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 102.

774 "Leiden," pp. 161-205, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 102.

775 Leidensgeschichte, Vorwort, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 102.

776 Leidensgeschichte, p. 2, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 103.

777 Leidensgeschichte, p. 7, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 103.

778 Leidensgeschichte, p. 5, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 104.

779 Feneberg, op. cit., p. 105.

780 "Leiden," p. 81, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 105.

781 Feneberg, op. cit., p. 115.

782 Leidensgeschichte, p. 96, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 105; see also p. 115.

783 "Leiden," pp. 188, 199, cited by Feneberg, op. cit., p. 115.

784 Feneberg, op. cit., p. 115.

785 Ibid., pp. 116-17.

786 Ibid., p. 117.

787 Ibid., p. 118.

788 Ibid., p. 121.

789 Ibid., p. 121.

790 Ibid., pp. 131-33.

791 Ibid., pp. 132-33.

792 Ibid., p. 134.

793 Ibid., p. 134.

794 Ibid., pp. 134-35.

795 Leidensgeschichte, p. 10, cited by Feneberg, p. 134.

796 Ibid., p. 137.

797 Ibid., p. 137f.

798 Ibid., p. 137f.

799 Ibid., p. 138.

800 Schuermann, "Anfaenge," pp. 199-205.

801 Ibid., p. 199f.

802 Ibid., p. 201.

803 Ibid., p. 201.

804 Ibid., pp. 202-203. For a positive argument in support of the view that 1 Cor. 5:7 points to a Christian Passover celebration, see Professor Kirby's chapter on "The Jewish Liturgical Tradition and the New Testament," (Ephesians Baptism and Pentecost [Montréal: McGill University Press, 1968])

805 Ibid., p. 203.

806 Patsch, op. cit., p. 99.

807 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 122.

808 Hahn, "Motive," p. 356.

809 Ibid., p. 352ff.

810 Ibid., p. 353f.

811 Lohse, Passafest, pp. 9ff., 20ff., cited by Hahn, op. cit., p. 354.

812 Hahn, op. cit., p. 354.

813 Ibid., p. 354.

814 Ibid., p. 354.

815 Ligier, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

816 Dibelius, Formgeschichte, p. 211.

817 Schmid, Lukas, p. 316.

818 Ibid., p. 323.

819 Schuermann, Einsetzungsbericht, p. 131.

820 Patsch, Abendmahl, p. 98.

821 Erwin Schwartz, "Osterbetrachtungen," ZNW, 7 (1906), 1-33.

822 Ev. Lukas, p. 122, cited by Schwartz, loc. cit., p. 25.

823 Ibid., p. 25.

⁸²⁴Patsch, op. cit., p. 100f.

⁸²⁵Ibid., p. 100f.

⁸²⁶Ibid., p. 100f.

⁸²⁷Ibid., p. 100f.

⁸²⁸Patsch's argument is based upon the presupposition that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, a view which can hardly be substantiated by the evidence.

⁸²⁹Ligier, op. cit., p. 13.

⁸³⁰Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of Luke, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), pp. 199ff.

⁸³¹Rupert Feneberg, review of Christliche Passafeyer und Abendmahl by Edward J. Kilmartin, in Biblica, (1972), pp. 587-89.

⁸³²Ibid., p. 13.

⁸³³Ibid., p. 118.

⁸³⁴Ibid., pp. 118ff.

⁸³⁵Ibid., p. 127.

⁸³⁶Schuermann, "Anfaenge," n. 10, p. 201; Casel holds that the Quarto-deciman practice and the practice of an Easter celebration on Sunday must be dated back to apostolic times; see Schuermann, loc. cit., p. 201.

⁸³⁷With regard to the origin of the Christian Passover celebration Schwartz stated: "Woher in Wahrheit das Fest gekommen ist zeigt der Name an. Niemand bezweifelt, dass das ~~pascha~~ ^{pascha} der Christen dasselbe Wort ist wie das Passah der Juden; dann muss man aber auch die Konsequenzen ziehen und eingestehen, dass das Pascha der Kirche eine juedische Erbschaft ist. Die aeltesten Christen waren Juden und wollten es sein." "Osterbetrachtungen," cited by Feneberg, Passafeyer, p. 124.

⁸³⁸Cf. Lessig, "Abendmahlsprobleme," p. 148.

⁸³⁹Ibid., p. 142.

⁸⁴⁰Ibid., p. 142.

⁸⁴¹Ibid., p. 142.

⁸⁴²Ibid., p. 142.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary:

1. The identification of the Last Supper with either a haburah-meal or a kiddush for the purpose of a historical reconstruction of the Last Supper proved to be inadequate. For this reason most New Testament scholars have abandoned these theories.

2. Our negative judgment about the haburah-meals and the kiddush also applies to the Passover theory. Even if it could historically be established that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, how much would it help to advance our understanding of the Lord's Supper?

In our opinion, Jeremias, who is the champion of this view, has not succeeded in proving his point that the Last Supper was indeed a Passover meal.

His insistence upon the historicity of the Synoptic dating, according to which the Last Supper was a Passover meal has failed to be convincing for two basic reasons: (1) The chronological data of the Synoptics are imprecise and he has not made a strong enough case for the view that the execution could have taken place on a feast-day; (2) Jeremias' presentation of the new material can hardly be considered as proof that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, for all the symptoms, which could be referred to in support of the Passover theory could also accompany any other regular Jewish meal. He is correct, however, in pointing out that the various attempts at harmonization, including the one by Mlle A. Jaubert, have been unsuccessful.

While the actual date of the Last Supper has not been established as yet, it is certain that Jesus died on a Friday in or near the Passover season.

Jeremias' historical reconstruction, which was primarily aimed at the recovery of the ipsissima verba of Jesus must also be considered as unsuccessful. From a traditio-historical point of view, the reconstruction of an archetype, from where one might expect to reach back to the actual words spoken by Jesus has proved to be impossible. For various reasons the words of interpretation cannot be considered as the ipsissima verba of Jesus. The liturgical characteristics of the formulae of institution are an indication that their Sitz im Leben is the creative milieu of the primitive Christian community.

Jeremias' exegetical sections, which are primarily based on the assumption that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, appears to be weak, especially his view that Jesus considered himself in terms of a Passover Lamb and as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.

3. With the discovery of the Qumran documents it was hoped that these texts might furnish us with new and valuable material, which would enable us to make important decisions with regard to the date and identity of the Lord's Supper. On the basis of a comparison of the meal types referred to in the Qumran materials and the texts of the New Testament, we conclude that the Qumran texts have no immediate bearing upon the problem of eucharistic origins.

4. Lietzmann's monograph Messe und Herrenmahl set in motion a whole series of discussions. Some of them turned out to be mere modifications of Lietzmann's hypothesis, while others were serious attempts to overcome the two-type hypothesis.

Lietzmann obviously approached the references to the meals in Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7 and in 1 Corinthians 11:23f with the theological *a priori* of a Lutheran scholar. In his opinion there was no bridge leading from the meals in Acts, which are characterized by an eschatological joy, to the Pauline type, which was primarily a memorial of the sacrificial death of Jesus. In our opinion, Lietzmann's hypothesis falls to the ground for the following reasons: (1) The meals in Acts are not exclusively bread-eucharists. On the assumption that these meals followed the pattern of a regular Jewish meal, which was introduced by the breaking of bread and concluded with "the cup of blessing" Lietzmann's argument becomes untenable; (2) the shorter Lucan text lends no support to the theory of a wineless Eucharist and (3) Lietzmann's distinction between two different meal types on a theological basis results from a misunderstanding of the situation in the primitive Christian community. In the light of Easter, the death of Jesus was no longer considered as a cause of sadness. Jesus' death and resurrection are considered as the basis of the Christian hope and are therefore a reason for rejoicing rather than mourning.

5. A duplicate of Lietzmann's hypothesis occurs in the writings of O. Cullmann. His thesis differs from Lietzmann's only in one respect. The meals of the disciples with the Risen Lord are introduced as the historical link between the Last Supper and the daily meals of the primitive Christian community. Cullmann's theory, however, is untenable, because it is primarily based upon Lietzmann's two-type hypothesis. Furthermore, his argument, according to which the narratives of the meals of the disciples with the Risen Lord are to be considered as the historical link between the Last Supper of Jesus and the daily meals of the primitive Christian community, fails to be convincing. The appearance narratives can hardly

be utilized for historical purposes.

6. Lohmeyer's theory is also a variation of Lietzmann's hypothesis. Lohmeyer, however, does not make such a sharp distinction between the two types as Lietzmann and Cullmann do. He must be credited with the theological evaluation of the meal-customs and practices of Jesus. He has particularly pointed to the eschatological nature of these meals. They allowed for the opportunity to have table-fellowship with the one in whose person and word, one must meet the call to decision for the Kingdom of God. On the other hand, Lohmeyer's distinction between a Galilean and a Jerusalem type of Christianity appears to be unwarranted. Therefore, his reconstruction, which is primarily based on the assumption that there was a Galilean and a Jerusalem type of the Eucharist is to be abandoned.

7. While Schweizer's reaction against Lietzmann's theory was probably the first serious attack upon the two-type hypothesis, he himself had to face the old problem in a new way. His distinction between two different traditions, namely, the eschatological strand of the tradition and the words of interpretation appears to be unwarranted by the evidence.

8. A variation of this "new hypothesis" was presented by R. D. Richardson, who also claimed that it would be possible to distinguish between two lines of interpretation in the New Testament itself. While Richardson's presentation does not only lack clarity, it fails to be convincing, especially in view of his contention that the Pauline account of the Eucharist represents a second-century insertion into the text. In the light of recent traditio-historical studies this view appears to be almost perverse.

9. Another variation of this "new hypothesis" was introduced by R. H. Fuller, who distinguished between the daily meals, which were char-

acterized by an eschatological joy and the words of interpretation, whose creative milieu is to be found in the Christianized version of the annual Passover. This Passover began with the azuma and was concluded with the "cup of blessing". The Passover anamnesis has its Sitz im Leben in this Passover celebration. Fuller's theory is essentially a combination of the "new hypothesis" with the researches of B. Lohse. Fuller, however, has uncritically accepted the presuppositions of E. Schweizer and others and of B. Lohse. His sketch is rather speculative and needs to be more thoroughly argued

10. Marxsen's development hypothesis must be considered as a major breakthrough as regards the question of eucharistic origins. In agreement with him, we hold that the whole development of the Lord's Supper started with him, we hold that the whole development of the Lord's Supper started with a regular meal, which Jesus held with his disciples shortly before his death. Since traditio-historical studies indicate that the words of institution cannot be treated as the ipsissima verba of Jesus, Marxsen is correct in stating that the Sitz im Leben of these accounts of institution is cultic.

11. In the light of this observation, it was necessary to consider some recent theories, which seek to demonstrate the close connection of the Eucharist with the primitive Christian Passover celebration. The Lucan text, Luke 22:15-18, 19-20, viewed from the perspective of the Quarto-deciman practice seemed to portray a primitive Christian Passover celebration, which was climaxed by the Eucharist. Since Luke 22:15-18 presents only a rather fragmentary description of a Passover meal, because of all the basic elements of this meal only the third cup has been retained, it is very unlikely that this passage reflects a primitive Christian Passover celebration.

Even though our first evidence in support of a Christian Passover celebration comes from the second century A.D. in the light of 1 Corinthians 5:7f and other general considerations it appears that this practice was already known in apostolic times.

The view that the Lord's Supper had its Sitz im Leben in the Christianized version of the Passover is based on the assumption that the Lord's Supper represents a Christianized version of the Jewish Passover celebration. In other words, the account of the Last Supper and the passion narrative are considered in terms of the transformed Passover Haggadah and the Passover meal. The hypothetical nature of this argument comes into focus, however, as soon as we recognize that in the accounts of the Lord's Supper, the main elements of a Passover meal are missing. The Lord's Supper can hardly be considered as a Christianized version of the Jewish Passover. It is easier to assume that it developed independently of the main feast of the Jews. On the other hand, its association with paschal motifs seems to indicate that it was considered by the Christian community as a Christian Passover.

Conclusion:

At this point it has become clear that there is no easy solution to the complex problem of eucharistic origin. In spite of the various attempts by competent New Testament scholars to solve it on a historical or theological basis, it is to be admitted that the question concerning the origins of the Eucharist still remains a puzzle. This rather negative result, however, must not surprise us, because the New Testament data available for our investigation are scanty. Furthermore, we have only a limited knowledge of the forms of worship in the primitive Christian community.

The hypotheses of Marxsen and Feneberg, however, must be considered as a breakthrough with regard to the question of eucharistic origin. We may not be able to agree with these scholars on all points, but they have placed the emphasis where it belongs. Thus they have redirected our attention from a strictly historical concern, which, for example, dominates the works of Jeremias, towards an understanding of the Eucharist in its variant forms as the result of the liturgical development. As in Judaism, it was in worship that the primitive Christian community found the best way of expressing its faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arnold, August. Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co., G.M.B.H. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937.
- Barclay, William. The Lord's Supper. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.
- _____. The Gospel According to St. John. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- _____. Jesus and the Gospel Tradition. London: S.P.C.K., 1967.
- Barth, Markus. Das Abendmahl, Passamahl, Bundesmahl und Messiasmahl. (Theologische Studien, No. 18.) Zuerich: Evangelischer Verlag, Zollikon, 1945.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 4th ed. revised. Translated by William F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Betz, Johannes. Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Vaeter: Die Aktualpraesenz der Person und des Heilswerkes Jesu im Abendmahl nach der vorephesinischen griechischen Patristik. Vol. I/1, Freiburg: Herder, 1955.
- _____. Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Vaeter: Die Realpraesenz des Leibes und Blutes Jesu im Abendmahl nach dem Neuen Testament, Vol. II/1. Freiburg: Herder, 1964.
- Black, Matthew. The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Blinzler, Joseph. Der Prozess Jesu. 4th ed. revised. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1969.
- Bornkamm, Guenther. Jesus of Nazareth. Translated by F. McLuskey and J. M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- Bouyer, Louis. The Eucharist. Translated by Charles U. Quinn. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Bowmann, John. The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Branscomb, B. H. The Gospel of Mark. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.

Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John. Vol. 29a of The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970.

Braun, Herbert. Qumran und das Neue Testament. Vol. II, Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The Gospel of John: A Commentary. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971.

_____. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

_____. Jesus and the Word. Translated by Louise P. Smith and Erminie Huntress. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1935.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951/1955.

Caird, George B. The Gospel of Luke. London: Cox and Wymann Ltd., 1963.

Clark, N. An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments. London: SCM, 1956.

Conzelmann, H. "Historie und Theologie in den synoptischen Passionsberichten" in Zur Bedeutung des Todes Jesu. ed. Fritz Vierung. Guetersloh: Guetersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1967.

_____. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

_____. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber & Faber, 1960.

Cullmann, Oscar. Early Christian Worship. Translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1951.

_____. The Early Church: Studies in Early Christian History and Theology. ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

_____. "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity," in O. Cullmann, F. J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper. Translated by J. G. Davies. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Cirlot, Felix L. The Early Eucharist. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930.

- Dalman, Gustaf. Jesus-Jeshua. Translated by Paul P. Levertoff. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.
- Delorme, J. "The Last Supper and the Pasch in the New Testament," in The Eucharist and the New Testament. A Symposium. Translated by E. M. Stewart. Baltimore Helicon Press, 1964.
- Dibelius, Martin. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. Tuebingen. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.
- Dix, Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1947.
- Dugmore, C. W. "The Study of the Origin of the Eucharist: Retrospect and Revaluation," Studies in Church History. II. Edited by G. J. Cuming. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1965.
- Dupont-Summer, A. The Essene Writings From Qumran. Translated by G. Vermes. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Ebeling, Gerhard. Word and Faith. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Elbogen, Ismar. Der juedische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung. 4th ed. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
- Feine, Paul. Theologie des Neuen Testaments 8th ed. revised. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1951.
- Feneberg, Rupert. Christliche Passafeier und Abendmahl: Eine biblisch-hermeneutische Untersuchung der neutestamentlichen Einsetzungsberichte. Muenchen: Koesel Verlag, 1971.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. The Fontana Library. London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1972.
- _____. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus: An Examination of the Presuppositions of NT Theology. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," 12) London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Gaugler, E. Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament. ("Gegenwartsfragen biblischer Theologie," 2.) Basel: 1943.
- Goetz, Karl G. Der Ursprung des kirchlichen Abendmahls: blosse Mahlgemeinschaft von Jesus und seinen Juengern oder eine besondere Handlung und Worte von Jesus? Basel: Universitaets-Buchdruckerei, Friedrich Reinhardt A.G., 1929.
- Goguel, Maurice. The Primitive Church. Translated by H. C. Shape. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1964.
- Grant, Frederick C. An Introduction to New Testament Thought. New York: Abingdon Press, 1950.

Grundmann, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.

Haenchen, E. The Acts of the Apostles: a Commentary. Translated by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971.

Hahn, Ferdinand. Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im fruhen Christentum. 3rd ed. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Higgins, A. J. B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.

Hirsch, Emanuel. Fruehgeschichte des Evangeliums. Das Werden des Markusevangeliums Vol. I. 2nd ed. revised. Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951.

_____. Fruehgeschichte des Evangeliums Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthaeus. Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1941.

Hook, N. The Eucharist in the New Testament. London: Epworth Press, 1964.

Hooker, Morna D. Jesus and the Servant. The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.

Huber, Wolfgang. Passa und Ostern. Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche. (ZNW, Beiheft 35) Berlin: Toepelmann, 1969.

Hupfeld, Renatus D. Die Abendmahlsfeier. Ihr urspruenglicher Sinn und ihre sinnemaesse Gestaltung. Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1935.

Jaubert, Annie. La Date de la Cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1957.

Jeremias, Joachim. Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

_____. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated from the 3rd German edition, by Norman Perrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

_____. New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Kilmartin, E. J. "The Last Supper and the Earliest Eucharists of the Church," Concilium, 40. Edited by Pierre Benoit, Roland E. Murphy and Bastiaan van Iersel. New York: Paulist Press, 1969.

_____. The Eucharist in the Primitive Church. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Kirby, John C. Ephesians Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Montréal: McGill University Press, 1968.

Kosmala, Hans. Hebraeer-Essener-Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der fruehchristlichen Verkuendigung. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Kuemmel, Werner G. Introduction to the New Testament 14th ed. revised. Translated by A. J. Mattill. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

_____. Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," 23) London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957.

_____. Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments nach seinen Hauptzeugen Jesus, Paulus, Johannes. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Kuhn, Karl G. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," The Scrolls and the New Testament Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.

Lietzmann, Hans. Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy. Translated by Dorothea H. G. Reeve, with Introduction and Supplementary Essay by R. D. Richardson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953-

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Markus. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.

_____. Galilaea und Jerusalem. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.

Lohse, Bernhard. Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner. (Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," 2nd series, No. 54.) Guetersloh: Bertelsmann, 1953.

Lohse, Eduard. Maertyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkuendigung vom Suehntod Jesu Christi. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.

Macgregor, G. H. C. Eucharistic Origins. A Survey of the New Testament Evidence. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1928.

Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.

Marxsen, Willi. The Beginnings of Christology. Translated by Paul J. Achtemeyer. Facet Books. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

_____. The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem. Trans-

lated by Lorenz Nieting with Introduction by John Reumann Facet Books.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.

The New Testament as the Church's Book. Translated by
James E. Mignard. Philadelphia Fortress Press, 1972.

Metzger, Bruce M. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

McCormick, Scott. The Lord's Supper: A Biblical Interpretation. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

Moore, George F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Munck, Johannes. The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 31. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1967.

Nielen, Joseph M. Gebet und Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1937.

Neuenzeit, Paul. Das Herrenmahl: Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung. (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, I) Muenchen: Koesel Verlag, 1960.

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925.

Otto, Rudolf. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion. Translated by Floyd F. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1938.

Oulton, J. E. L. Holy Communion and Holy Spirit. A Study in Doctrinal Relationship. London: S.P.C.K., 1951.

Patsch, Hermann. Abendmahl und Historischer Jesus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972.

Preiss, Theo. Life in Christ. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," 13) Translated by Harold Knight. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954.

Reicke, Bo. Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde. (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 32) Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957.

Rengstorff, Karl H. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958.

Richardson, R. D. "Supplementary Essay," A Further Inquiry into Eucharistic Origins with Special Reference to NT Problems, Mass and Lord's Supper. Translated by Dorothea H. G. Reeve. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953-

- Rordorf, Willi. Der Sonntag: Geschichte des Ruhe- und Gottesdiensttages im aeltesten Christentum. Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1962.
- Scherer, Paul. "The Gospel According to Luke," in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VIII. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952.
- Schmid, Joseph. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. The Gospel According to John, II. Translated by Kevin Smith. Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Schuermann, Heinz. "Der Abendmahlsbericht Lukas 22:7-38 als Gottesdienstordnung, Gemeindeordnung, Lebensordnung," in Ursprung und Gestalt. Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1970.
- _____. "Die Anfaenge christlicher Osterfeier," in Ursprung und Gestalt. Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1970.
- _____. Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk. 22:19-20. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 20/4.) Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955.
- _____. Jesu Abschiedsrede. Lk. 22:2-38. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 20/5.) Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956.
- _____. "Jesus' Words in the Light of His Actions at the Last Supper" in Concilium, 40. Edited by Pierre Benoit, Roland E. Murphy and Bastiaan van Iersel. New York: Paulist Press, 1969.
- _____. Der Paschamahlbericht. Lk. 22, (7-14). 15-18. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 19/5.) Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953.
- _____. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien. (Kommentare und Beitraege zum Alten und Neuen Testament) Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968.
- _____. "Vorgang und Sinngehalt der urchristlichen Osterfeier" in Ursprung und Gestalt. Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1970.
- Schweizer, Eduard. The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament. Translated by J. M. Davis. Facet Books. (Biblical Series 18). Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Spitta, Friedrich. Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums. Goettingen, 1893.
- Strack, Hermann L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. A Temple Book. New York: Atheneum, 1969.

Strack, Hermann L. and Billerbeck, Paul. Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus. 3rd ed. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961.

Taylor, Vincent. Behind the Third Gospel. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926.

_____. Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1937.

_____. The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation. ed. Owen E. Evans. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1972.

Toit, A. B. du. Der Aspekt der Freude im urchristlichen Abendmahl. Winterthur: Verlag P. G. Keller, 1965.

Toedt, Heinz. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965.

Wolff, H. W. Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. New Testament Introduction. Translated by Joseph Cunningham. Freiburg: Herder, 1960.

ARTICLES

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "Luke XXII, 15: To Eat the Passover," JTSNS, 9 (1958), pp. 305-307.

Behm, J. "κλέω," in TDNT, Vol. III. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 19 , pp. 730-43.

Benoit, Pierre. "Le Récit de la Cène dans Lc XXII, 15-20." RB, No. 48 (1939), pp. 357-93.

Blinzler, Joseph. "Die Strafe fuer Ehebruch in Bibel und Halacha: Zur Auslegung von Joh. VIII:5." NTS, 4 (1957-58), pp. 32-47.

Bornkamm, Guenther. "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," ZThK, 26 (1956), pp. 312-49.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Reich Gottes und Menschensohn." ThRNF, 9 (1937), pp. 1-35.

- Burkitt, F. C., Brooke, A. E. "St. Luke XXII, 15, 16: What is the General Meaning?" JTS, 9 (1907-08), pp. 569-72.
- Chadwick, Henry. "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII, 15-20," HThR, 50 (1957), pp. 249-58.
- Conzelmann, Hans. "Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel 1. Kor. 15:3-5," EvTh, 25 (1965), pp. 1-11.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," JBL, 74 (1955), pp. 213-26.
- Dibelius, Martin. "Die Mahlgebete der Didache," ZNW, 37 (1938), pp. 32-41.
- Dunbitz, Lewis N. "Kiddush," in The Jewish Encyclopedia VII, (1904), pp. 483-84.
- Emerton, J. A. "The Aramaic Underlying τὸ αἶμα μου τῆς διαθήκης in Mk. XIV, 24" JTSNS, 6 (1955), pp. 238-40.
- Fuller, Reginald H. "The Double Origin of the Eucharist," BR, 8 (1963), pp. 60-72.
- Gnilka, Joachim. "Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener," BZNF, 5 (July 1961), pp. 39-55.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung," EvTh, 27 (1967), pp. 337-74.
- Heawood, P. J. "The Time of the Last Supper," JQRNS, 42 (1951-52), pp. 37-44.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Origin of the Eucharist," NTS, 1 (1954), pp. 22ff.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" NTS, 4 (1957-58), pp. 115ff.
- _____. "The Last Supper," ET, 64 (1952-53), p. 91f.
- Jones, Douglas. "Anamnesis in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI:25," JTSNS, 6 (1955), pp. 183-91.
- Johnston, L. "The Date of the Last Supper," Scripture, 9 (1957), pp. 108-115.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Luke XXII, 19b-20," JTS, 47 (1946), pp. 49-56.
- Kselman, John S. "Modern New Testament Criticism." The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968, II, pp. 7-20.
- Kuhn, Karl G. "Die Abendmahlsworte," ThLZ, 75 (1950), cols. 399-408.
- _____. "Zum essenischen Kalender," ZNW, 52 (1951), pp. 65-73.

Ligier, Louis "De la Cène de Jesus à l'Anaphore de l'Eglise," La Maison Dieu, No 87 (1966), pp. 7-49.

Lohmeyer, Ernst "Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde," JBL, 56 (1937), pp 217-65

_____. "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 9 (1937), pp 168-94, 195-227

_____. "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," ThRNF, 10 (1938), pp 81-99

Maurer, Christian. "Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsbericht des Markusevangeliums," ZThK, 50 (1953), pp. 1-38.

Marxsen, Willi. "Der Ursprung des Abendmahls," EvTh, 12 (1952-53), pp. 293-303

Parker, Pierson "Three Variant Readings in Luke-Acts " JBL, 80 (1964), pp 165-67.

Schaefer, K. T. "Zur Textgeschichte von Lk. 22:16b. 20 " Biblica, XXXIII (1952), pp 237-39.

Schmidt, Karl L. "Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament," in RGG, 2nd ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnak Vol. 1 Tuebingen J. C. Mohr, 1927, cols 6-16

Schuermann, Heinz. "Lk. 22:19b-20 als urspruengliche Textueberlieferung," Biblica, 32 (1951), pp. 364-92; 522-41.

Schwartz, Erwin. "Osterbetrachtungen," ZNW, 7 (1906), pp. 1-33.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Das Abendmahl eine Vergegenwaertigung des Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl?" ThZ, 2 (1945-46), pp. 81-101.

_____. "Das Herrenmahl im Neuen Testament," ThLZ, (1954), pp. 577-92.

_____. "Abendmahl," in RGG, 3rd ed., cols. 10-21.

Shepherd, Massey H. "Are Both the Synoptics and John Correct About the Date of Jesus' Death?" JLB, LXXX (1961), pp. 123ff.

Strobel, August. "Der Termin des Todes Jesu," ZNW, 51 (1960), pp. 69-101.

Taylor, Vincent. "The New Testament Origins of Holy Communion," in New Testament Essays, London: Epworth Press, 1970, pp. 48-59.

Zeitlin, S. "The Time of the Passover Meal," JQRNS, 42 (1951-52), pp. 45-50.

Ziener, G. "Johannesevangelium und urchristliche Passafeier," BZNF, 2 (1958), pp. 263-74.

BOOK REVIEWS

Dix, Gregory. Review of The Shape of the Liturgy, by C. W. Dugmore, JTS, 47 (1946), p. 109f.

Feneberg, Rupert. Review of Christliche Passafeyer und Abendmahl: Eine biblisch-hermeneutische Untersuchung der neutestamentlichen Einsetzungsberichte, by Eduard J. Kilmartin, Biblica, 54 (1973), pp. 587-89.

Jeremias, Joachim. Review of The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, by George B. Caird, ET, 78 (Oct. 1966), p. 58.

Schuermann, Heinz. Review of Der Paschamahlbericht, by Schweizer, E. ThLZ, 3 (1955), pp. 156-57.

_____. Review of Der Einsetzungsbericht, by Schweizer, E. ThLZ, 4 (1956), p. 218.

_____. Review of Der Einsetzungsbericht, and Jesu Abschiedsrede, by Winter, Paul, in NTS, 4 (1957-58), pp. 223-27

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Lessig, Hans. "Die Abendmahlsprobleme im Lichte der neutestamentlichen Forschung seit 1900." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Bonn, 1953.

Marxsen, Willi. "Die Einsetzungsberichte zum Abendmahl." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Kiel, 1951.