

THE EUCHARIST.

BY WM. WEBER.

THE Church has certain solemn ceremonials, called sacraments. They are, according to Protestant doctrine, instituted by Jesus Christ and given to the Church that she should administer them for the benefit of the faithful. That conception compels any one who cannot ascribe the founding of the Church to Jesus to study the question when and how the two sacraments, Baptism and Eucharist, originated. For if Jesus entrusted them to the Church, she must have existed at the time he did so and, consequently, must have been established by him.

The Catholic Church is not interested directly in that problem. Her sacraments are enjoined as such, not by Jesus, but by the Church by virtue of her divine origin and authority.

As to Baptism, we possess not the least bit of evidence that it was ordained by Jesus. The posthumous baptismal commandment and trinitarian formula of Matt. xxviii. 19, is of apocryphal origin and was not added to the text of the First Gospel before the year 350 (see *The Open Court*, May, 1920, "Manifestations of the Risen Jesus"). The Gospels connect the Christian Baptism with that of John the Baptist, by whom Jesus himself was baptized. Only in one instance are we told that Jesus baptized in person (John iii. 22ff). The absolute silence of the Synoptic Gospels as to that fact is rather ominous. The Apostle Paul did not regard baptizing as very important. He writes: "Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). Thus the question whether Jesus instituted the sacraments is confined to the Eucharist.

The New Testament contains four passages which refer to the Eucharist. These are Luke xxii. 14-20; Mark xiv. 22-24; Matt. xxvi. 26-29; and 1 Cor. xi. 23-25. Besides, the Johannine account of the last meal which Jesus ate with his disciples has to be examined.

The Luke version differs to such an extent from the others

that it is advisable to consider it first. Westcott and Hort, the restorers and editors of the oldest text of the New Testament in Greek, attainable by textual criticism, have marked the words: "which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you" (Luke xxii. 19b-20) as a rather late interpolation. The great English text-critics base their conclusion on the testimony of the manuscripts. They sum up their argument as follows: "These difficulties added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Cor. xi. 24f, and the transcriptional evidence given above, leave no moral doubt (see *Introd.* § 240) that the words in question were absent from the original text of Luke, notwithstanding the purely Western ancestry of the documents which omit them." *Notes on Select Readings, Appendix, Introd. to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, p. 63f.)

Some scholars wish to retain at least the words: "which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me" of verse 19b. But just as for these words, the conclusion arrived at by Westcott and Hort is confirmed by the testimony of Matthew and Mark. The common source of the Synoptic Gospels read without doubt only "This is my body" without any modifying remarks. (Matt. xxvi. 26 and Mark xiv. 22.)

Our Luke text read, therefore, about the years 350: "When the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. And he said unto them. With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I shall not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body" (Luke xxii. 14-19a).

Even this comparatively short text has been enlarged by several interpolations. That is not to be wondered at; for just the chapters which record the passion of Jesus aroused from the beginning the keenest interest.

"And the apostles with him" has to be dropped as a gloss, suggested by mistaken zeal for improving the traditional text. The title "apostles" belongs to the Twelve only when they acted as messengers of Jesus and in relation to people to whom they brought the message of the kingdom of God. But where their personal relation to Jesus is referred to, they are called "disciples." The

expression "the Twelve" may be used in either case. Therefore, the noun "apostles" is out of place in our passage. That is confirmed by the rather awkward position of the words at the end of the sentence and furthermore by the corresponding readings in the first two Gospels. Matt. xxvi. 20, we find "with the twelve disciples" and Mark xiv. 17, "with the Twelve." These three variants prove that none of them appeared in the original text. If "and the apostles with him" as well as the parallel phrases are omitted, the text is absolutely clear and perfect. For anybody familiar with Jewish customs, and for such the original Synoptic source was written, knew Jesus would not take his place at the table alone. The passover meal was not eaten by a single person. Thus it was understood that the disciples were with Jesus. Besides, the narrator was intent upon relating what Jesus, not his companions, did and said.

Another difficulty is presented by verse 16: "For I say unto you, I shall not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Both verse 16 as well as verse 15 are missing in Matthew and Mark. That does not imply that the statements in Luke are spurious. For it is impossible to explain how any one could have added them to the Luke text if they were not part of it from the beginning. On the other hand, it is not difficult to understand why those sayings of Jesus should have been left out in Matthew and Mark. They refer to the passover meal whereas the first two Gospels treat of the Eucharist. For that reason, I am compelled to accept Luke xxii. 15-16, as genuine with the exception of the clause "until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

The subject of "be fulfilled" must be the passover meal. For there is no other noun which could be connected with that verb. But in what respect could the passover be fulfilled in the kingdom of God? All the promises of God, of course, were expected to be fulfilled; but the passover meal in the New Testament age was considered as a thanksgiving feast in remembrance of the deliverance of the people of Israel out of the house of bondage in the land of Egypt. There is, to the best of my knowledge, no Jewish tradition concerning the fulfilment of the passover in the kingdom of God. For that reason, I have to reject the clause under discussion as spurious. It was probably inserted in order to harmonize verse 16 with verse 18. Jesus, very likely, said only: "I shall no more eat it from now on," or words to that effect. Some reader missed in that statement a reference to the kingdom to come and altered and enlarged his text accordingly.

A third difficulty we encounter in verse 18: "For I say unto

you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." The words must have been spoken by Jesus toward the end of the meal when he passed the fourth and last cup of wine to his disciples. But in that case they would represent merely a superfluous repetition of the thought expressed in verse 16 in its present form. For the eating of the passover there implies as a matter of fact the partaking of everything that belonged to the meal, including the four cups of wine.

We cannot avoid this dilemma by assuming verses 15-16 to have been pronounced at the beginning, whereas verse 18 was uttered at the end of the passover. For the words "I shall no more eat it" point very distinctly to the conclusion of the sacred repast. If they belonged to the opening scene, they would imply that Jesus, although the head of the company, did not eat the passover. That, however, is contradicted by the words of verse 15 "I have eagerly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer."

Moreover, the conjunction "for," introducing verse 18, appears out of place. The same conjunction is entirely proper in verse 16, where it supplies the reason why Jesus had desired to eat that passover with his disciples. He was in urgent need of the spiritual strength imparted by that memorial of the almighty assistance which God would and could give his chosen ones. In verse 18 it contradicts verses 15-16 and explains why Jesus wanted his disciples to divide the wine among themselves. He expected to drink better wine in the kingdom of God. As a matter of course, Jesus as the president, the father of the family, partook of the cup before he offered it to his disciples. Besides, the parallel versions do not have the conjunction "for." Matt xxvi. 29, reads: "But I say unto you, I shall not drink," etc., and Mark xiv. 23: "Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink," etc. In both instances Jesus evidently drank of the wine together with his disciples. Mark xiv. 23, states expressly: "they all drank of it." The adjective "all" includes Jesus.

These observations show in my opinion that Luke xxii. 18, cannot belong to the original text of the Fourth Gospel, but must have been borrowed from Matthew and Mark. According to verse 17: "Take this and divide it among yourselves" Jesus did not want to drink another time after the cup had made its first round.

Verse 19a: "And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them saying, This is my body" is quite clear. Jesus offers after the fourth cup of wine of verse 17 the apikomen which closed the celebration of the passover. In handing the pieces to his disciples, he uttered one more personal remark, "This is my

body." The *tertium comparationis* is that the bread was broken and crushed just as his body was to be broken and crushed a few hours later. What happened to the malefactors who were crucified with Jesus (John xix. 31f) was done, of course, to all who were taken off the cross and buried before sunset in Palestine.

The oldest text of the account of the last passover, as preserved in the Third Gospel, was therefore:

"And when the hour was come, he sat down. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I shall eat it no more. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body."

Those words certainly do not relate how the Eucharist was first celebrated, or instituted. The short paragraph simply records a few personal remarks which Jesus made in connection with the closing rites of the passover. They were prompted by his foreknowledge of the fate which was swiftly approaching. The occasion did not favor longer discourses nor the institution of a new sacrament. The entire program of the feast was minutely prescribed in all its details. Jesus had no chance of voicing his personal feelings till they had reached the closing exercises. On the other hand, everything on the table, including bread and wine, formed part of the passover meal and had to be consumed as such.

Even the ancient Christians were fully aware of the true character of Luke xxii. 14-19a. That is demonstrated beyond the possibility of a doubt by the addition of verses 19b-20 to our text. The Third Gospel, in their estimation, contained originally a description of the first Eucharist just as Matthew and Mark did. Failing to find that in Luke, they felt in duty bound to replace what, as they thought, had been lost, by adding verses 19b-20.

Mark xiv. 22-25, and Matt. xxvi. 26-29, are derived without question from the same source. There are slight differences between the two accounts. Mark xiv. 22, Jesus says: "Take, this is my body." Matt. xxvi. 26: "Take, eat, this my body." Mark xiv. 23, reads: "and they all drank of it." Matt. xxvi. 27, the drinking of all is enjoined as a command, "Drink ye all of it." The words pronounced over the cup are Mark xiv. 24: "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many." Matt. xxvi. 28: "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." The relationship of the common Matthew and

Mark source to that of the Third Gospel is not so easily determined. As a rule the accounts of the same occurrence found in all the Synoptic Gospels is based on closely related documents which, however, may have had each a history of its own and, consequently, have undergone important changes. In view of such a possibility, it cannot be decided as yet which version, that of Luke or that of the first two Gospels, is more reliable.

The Eucharist paragraph is separated from the passover account in both Matthew and Mark; and before the Lord's Supper is held, Jesus predicts his betrayal, without indicating the traitor in Mark, while exposing Judas in Matthew. Luke xxii. 21-23, Jesus likewise mentions the presence of the traitor, but does so after the passover had been finished. That difference is very significant. The Third Gospel tells only of the closing scene of the passover, which as a religious ceremony did not admit of any general conversation. But after that sacrament had ended, the participants might stay together and discuss their own affairs. In Mark and Matthew Jesus interrupts the passover in order to celebrate the Eucharist. The presence of Judas as a guest at this celebration was apparently not wanted; and Jesus seemingly forces him to withdraw by speaking of his treachery. Still neither of them states expressly that Judas left. It is the Fourth Gospel alone which informs us: "He then, having received the sop, went out straightway: and it was night" (John xiii. 30). By the way, the participle construction in Mark xiv. 22, and Matt. xxvi. 26, translated "as they were eating" as well as Mark xiv. 26, and Matt. xxvi. 30, where the last part of the Hallel (Ps. cxv-cxviii) closes the passover exercises, place the Eucharist within the passover meal.

The question suggests itself whether Jesus could arrange under such conditions a new religious ceremony, destined to supersede and abolish the ancient sacrament of his nation. It has been noticed already that not only the lamb but also the bread and wine belonged to the passover feast. Moreover, Jesus himself had warned his disciples: "Think not that I came to destroy the law and the prophets. I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 17-19). Jesus would have acted in contradiction to this his own principle if he

had employed anything of the passover for any other purpose than that hallowed by the Jewish law.

There is another reason why the origin of the Eucharist cannot be connected with a celebration of the passover. The latter was an annual festival. If Jesus had added to it the Lord's Supper, the Christians, at least, those of Jewish descent would have observed it only once every year on the fifteenth day of the month of Nisan. But exactly the early Jewish Christians, as we learn from the Acts, partook of the Eucharist every day. The Pentecost account closes with the statement: "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and of prayers" (Acts ii. 42). Acts ii. 46, we are told: "And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart." The Breaking of Bread in this connection must be a religious ceremony of a private character as distinguished from the public religious services in the temple. In the first place, it is mentioned apart from their partaking of ordinary food. In the second place, it would be preposterous to assume the author of that passage had thought it worth while to inform his readers that the first followers of the apostles did eat and drink. The phrase can refer only to the Eucharist, which, as follows from Acts xx. 7, was held by the early Gentile Christians on the first day of the week, that is to say, on Sunday.

Some scholars, denying the force of the just given argument, insist that the Lord's Supper may have been ordained at the passover and yet celebrated immediately afterwards day by day. They overlook entirely the influence which the hypothesis that the Eucharist was ordained in connection with the passover has exercised upon the Church. Up to the age of the Reformation, the Eucharist was the main and central part of all religious services because that had been customary ever since the earliest times. The reformers, looking for scriptural authority and finding the Eucharist instituted at an annual Jewish feast, reduced at once the number of times it was to be observed by their adherents and arranged for regular Sunday services without the Lord's Supper. Even the Roman Church has given way to their influence and, while celebrating the Eucharist at every mass, insists only on her members observing the annual Easter Communion.

A comparison of the words reported to have been spoken by Jesus over the bread and wine renders it absolutely sure that the words: "This is my body" belong to Jesus. All our sources, the Synoptic Gospels as well as First Corinthians agree as to that fact.

As soon as this text-critical rule, agreement of all our sources, is applied to the words spoken over the wine, it becomes apparent immediately how uncertain our tradition is. Matthew and Mark read: "This is my blood of the covenant." 1 Cor. xi. 25, has: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood." Luke does not know of any such formula.

It is rather difficult for us to appreciate the meaning of the two variants. We should expect Jesus to have said simply: "This is my blood." That is, at least, what Justin Martyr puts into the mouth of Jesus (*Apol.*, I, 66). But the Jews were strictly forbidden to taste blood in any shape and form. For they believed blood to be the carrier of life, of the breath of God. That idea prevailed just as much during the Apostolic age as during any preceding period of Jewish history. It was shared as a matter of fact by the Christians of Jewish descent as is demonstrated by the decree of the Apostles' Council at Jerusalem. (Acts xv. 20, 29). The thought of drinking blood, and that, blood of Jesus Christ, at the Eucharist would have been utterly repulsive and terrifying to Jewish believers in Jesus. Gentile Christians, however, were not troubled by such scruples; they were used to consider blood as an article of food. Hence, it is very unlikely that Jesus should have spoken of blood in connection with the wine he offered his disciples. For he respected all Jewish prejudices. That confirms both the uncertain tradition of our records and especially the silence of the Third Gospel. Jesus has not pronounced the words, ascribed to him as spoken over the cup.

That conclusion is corroborated by a very prominent mark of later origin which characterizes the formula both in Matthew and Mark as well as in First Corinthians. That is the term "covenant" or "new covenant." The word is altogether foreign to the vocabulary of Jesus. His mission was to bring, not a new covenant, but the kingdom of God. The new covenant is opposed to the old covenant. Since the kingdom of God is not the opposite of the old covenant it cannot be a synonym of new covenant. The latter term was coined during the Apostolic age. It occurs only in the Pauline epistles and that to the Hebrews. The Catholic epistles employ it as little as the Gospels, where it is used only in the two passages under discussion (Matt. xxvi. 28, and Mark xiv. 28). It is easy enough to explain how the new theological term was formed. The Gentile Christians had to meet the Jews who claimed their religion was the only true religion because it was the covenant made by God himself through Moses with their nation. St. Paul and his associates could not deny that historical fact but maintained God had established

through Jesus a new and greater covenant, embracing not one nation but the whole human race. Consequently, the noun "covenant" alone proves that the words of Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24, and 1 Cor. xi. 25, were not spoken by Jesus. In other words, it becomes more and more probable that Luke xxii. 14-19a, is the only true account of what happened actually at the last passover of Jesus.

The words: "Verily I say unto you, I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mark xiv. 25) as well as the parallel passage in the First Gospel require special attention. Unable to recognize a genuine saying of Jesus in Mark xiv. 24, one might be tempted to drop the closing utterance together with it as unhistorical. Its relation to the Eucharist is not very intimate, and I doubt whether it is quoted anywhere in celebrating the Lord's Supper. It does not occur 1 Cor. xi, and we have reasons for considering it an interpolation in Luke. Nevertheless the question remains to be answered why the text of Matthew and Mark should have been burdened with a statement rather out of tune with the context and the situation.

My impression is the party who revised the original passover account upon which the Matthew and Mark version is based and made out of it the first celebration, not the institution, of the Eucharist, took exception to the statement of Jesus that he was no more to eat the passover. According to his way of thinking, Jesus must have proclaimed at that solemn occasion his second coming. For we know the early Christians when observing the Eucharist strengthened their faith in the coming kingdom. The introductory prayer over the bread in the Didache ends as follows: "Let thy ecclesia be brought together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom" (Didache, IX). The prayer after the Eucharist has the same refrain: "Remember, O Lord, thy ecclesia to deliver her from all evil and to perfect her in thy love and bring her together from the four winds, when hallowed, into thy kingdom which thou hast prepared for her" (Didache, X). Also St. Paul writes: "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). Our commentator wanted apparently Jesus to express the same sentiment when he observed the first Eucharist with his disciples. He did that by taking his clue from Luke xxii. 16, which he did not care to retain because it applied to the passover, not to the Lord's Supper.

The passage under discussion must be spurious, not because wine is prohibited in the kingdom of God, but because the implied conception of that kingdom was not shared by Jesus and not ever

by the Pharisees. Matt xxii. 30, has preserved a saying put into the mouth of Jesus: "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven." Any intelligent Pharisee might have given the Sadducees the same answer. For it is based on the Book of Enoch, a pre-Christian apocryphal writing (chap. li. 4, and civ. 4). Not even the Jews, not to speak of Jesus, cherished grossly materialistic views of the kingdom of God. The Apostle Paul writes, Rom. xiv. 17: "The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking." That is the general principle from which he deducts his advice not to cause a weak brother to stumble by inducing him to eat meat he believes to be defiled by the sacrificial rites of the heathen. The words quoted do not impress me as the personal wisdom of the Apostle but as an axiom current among his compatriots and known and accepted as true by the Christians to whom the advice is given. Accordingly not even the pious Jews expected to drink wine in the kingdom of God. That Jesus can but have held the same view is self-evident.

The words "unto remission of sins" are found only in Matthew and cannot be genuine on that account alone. They point to the age of decadence when the Church had begun to offer the Eucharist to her members as the means of securing forgiveness of all their little and great sins in which they continued to indulge in spite of their conversion to Jesus. At first Baptism assured the new converts of the remission of all the sins they had become guilty of while they were ignorant heathen. After being baptized, they were expected to live a holy life, devoted to the practice of the ideal virtues which Jesus Christ held up before them. The Eucharist was, as its very name tells us, an offering of thanks for the new life, and knowledge, and immortality which Jesus had revealed to them (Didache, IXf). Christian virtue at that time possessed still its positive, offensive character. But after a while, when the first zeal and enthusiasm had slackened, the Church made, so to say, a truce with the devil. She confined herself to the purely negative task of condemning sin and sinners in general, whereas she connived at the sins of her members as long as they remained faithful and obedient supporters of the Church. Such people were assured of remission of their sins at any time by means of the Eucharist.

That was the period when Christianity was emasculated, when the ideal of striving after moral perfection was exchanged for the idea of avoiding sin or of obtaining forgiveness of sins whenever that might become necessary. What Jesus had declared to be the only mortal sin, the sin against the Holy Spirit, the cowardly denial

of one's true convictions, was proclaimed as the highest Christian duty. Of course, it was not called any longer the sin against the Holy Spirit; but a more pleasant name was given to it. It is known to day as *sacrificium intellectus*.

When the later additions to the Mark and Matthew version of what is called the institution of the Lord's Supper are omitted, the Mark text reads as follows: "And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it." The remainder of Matthew's text is: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to them, and said, Take eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink all of it." That evidently cannot be accepted as the original text. For it would have been silly to report such statements. Therefore, the Third Gospel alone has preserved the unaltered Synoptic source as far as the last supper is concerned.

1 Cor. xi. 23-25, reads: "The Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." These words are generally considered as the most authentic version of the institution of the Lord's Supper; and if they were written by St. Paul, there is no room for doubt as to their genuineness. Nevertheless, taken by themselves alone, they are subject to very serious objections. In the first place, the repeated enjoinder: "This do in remembrance of me!" and "This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me!" are not vouched for by Matthew and Mark. They constitute clearly the ordaining of the sacrament and prescribe its constant observation as a Christian duty. If 1 Cor. xi. 23-25, were older than the corresponding passages in the first two Gospels, we could not account for the later omission of the most important part of the ceremony, namely, the command to observe it. The sentence: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" has been discussed above, and the conclusion was reached that they conform neither with the ideas nor the vocabulary of Jesus. Furthermore, the absence of the reference to the drinking of wine in the kingdom of God in first Corinthians implies in comparison with the Gospel text a later origin of the version of the birth of the Eucharist in the Pauline epistle. We

possess indeed documentary evidence showing how long it took to develop the most satisfactory Eucharist formula which we have. For in the *First Apology* of Justin Martyr we read, Chap. LXVI B: "The Apostles record in the memoirs that were written by them that they had thus been enjoined: "Jesus took bread, offered thanks, and said: This do in remembrance of me. This is my body. And he likewise took the cup, offered thanks, and said: This is my blood." Consequently, the formula ascribed to St. Paul was unknown as late as the year 150, if not even later. For I am not certain whether Chap. LXVI is not a later addition to the *First Apology* of Justin Martyr.

All these difficulties urge us to study 1 Cor. xi. 23-25, with the greatest care. For if that passage forms an integral part of First Corinthians, the Pauline formula of the Eucharist must be accepted as absolutely authentic in spite of all the doubts and difficulties it presents.

We have to direct our attention first upon the words which introduce the Eucharist formula. They are: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." "I received of the Lord" can only mean: I received directly of the Lord, that is to say, out of his own mouth. As St. Paul never met Jesus before his crucifixion, the latter must have imparted that information to the former after his resurrection. But up to the time when the Apostle composed first Corinthians he had seen the risen Christ but once. That follows from 1 Cor. xv. 5-8, where only one manifestation of the risen Christ to St. Paul is enumerated and expressly denoted as the last of all. But at that occasion St. Paul cannot have received the information under discussion.

Nothing is said 1 Cor. xv. about the risen Christ having spoken to St. Paul or any of the other persons to whom he appeared. From the statement of Gal. i. 15f, "When it was the good pleasure of God to reveal his Son in me," we might conclude that the conversion of St. Paul was an experience rather of his mind than of his senses. In any case, the Apostle cannot have obtained any specific historical information on that occasion. The Acts present three different accounts of the same event (Act ix. 3ff, xxii. 5ff, and xxvi. 12ff). According to all Jesus speaks with St. Paul, but does not instruct him in the Christian faith, neither as a whole nor as to any of its details. On the contrary, he is told Acts. ix. 6, to go to Damascus and learn from the Christians at that place what he had to do.

Besides, there existed no necessity whatsoever for enlightening the Apostle elect of the Gentiles concerning the true words with

which Jesus had ordained the Eucharist. The personal disciples of Jesus were still living and not only willing but eager to share their knowledge as eye-witnesses with all who asked them for it. The zealous disciple of the rabbis had persecuted the Christians and learned from them what they knew and believed. He had to do so; for otherwise he would have been unable to controvert them. Hence, the introductory statement of 1 Cor. xi. 23, is, to say the least, very strange in the mouth of St. Paul, and it is hard to believe he could have written those words.

That observation is confirmed by the whole construction of the Eucharist formula. It is reported from beginning to end in direct discourse but not as Jesus himself would have related it. It is without question a direct quotation of what a third party had told the writer.

The main objection to the entire passage, however, arises from its grammatical connection with the context. The very first word "for" denotes that verses 23-25 furnish the reason why the preceding statement is correct. The Apostle writes immediately before verse 23: "What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you? In this I praise you not." It is absolutely inconceivable how the Eucharist formula could justify St. Paul for not praising, but blaming the Corinthians who had indulged in gluttony and drunkenness while celebrating the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, verse 26 likewise begins with the causal coordinate conjunction "for." It reads: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." That sentence does not furnish an explanation why the Eucharist formula is quoted, but states very clearly why the Apostle has to blame the Corinthians. The Lord's Supper proclaimed the Lord's death. Therefore, it was utterly unbecoming to turn that solemn ceremony into a drunken bout. That is to say, verse 26 joins verse 22 directly, and verses 23-25 are an interpolation which interrupts the original context.

Some reader of 1 Cor. xi. 17-34, imagined he could render that passage stronger by inserting the at his time current formula of the institution of the Eucharist. Admitting that even only as a possibility, one can no longer maintain that Luke xxii. 19b-20, has been derived from the Pauline epistle. Both passages may have been added to the text of the Gospel and First Corinthians quite independently of each other.

At this stage of our investigation it becomes necessary to turn to the Fourth Gospel to ascertain whether it confirms the conclusion arrived at or not. John xiii-xvii treats apparently of the last supper

which Jesus had with his disciples. For it contains the Judas Iscariot episode (xiii. 21-30) and the prediction of Peter's denial (xiii. 36-38). The meal is followed by the arrest of Jesus (xviii. 1ff). But these few items exhaust the list of parallels between the Synoptic and Johannine supper. The latter is not the passover meal. It is called simply "a supper" (xiii. 2) and was held, not on the day of the passover, but "before the passover" (xiii. 1). According to John xix. 14, Jesus was crucified on the day called "preparation of the passover"; and when his enemies took him to Pilate, they did not enter into the Prætorium "that they might not be defiled, but eat the passover" (xviii. 28). Finally the Fourth Gospel does not mention the Eucharist.

The last-mentioned fact might be taken for a sufficient proof that Jesus did not ordain the Eucharist. But that argument *e silentio* would only be decisive if we could be sure of the apostolic origin of the Gospel in its present condition. For the Apostle John as an eye-witness must have known and reported what actually was done and said during the last supper; and his testimony would outweigh the Synoptic account. But what we know of the composition and history of the Synoptic text prevents us from claiming *a priori* for the Fourth Gospel a miraculous escape from the same fate. Thus we have to study carefully the Johannine tradition. Yet for our purpose, it is sufficient to form a correct opinion of chapter xiii. For the quartodeciman controversy lies beyond the scope of the present investigation.

We notice first of all that the narrative is interrupted frequently by interpolations which may belong partly to the compiler, partly to later commentators.

The first passage of that kind are the words of verse 1: "Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them unto the end." The clause "he loved them unto the end" in this connection must refer to the washing of the disciples' feet, related verses 4ff. But that act is defined there rather as a lesson in love and humility to be learned and practised by the disciples than a direct manifestation of the love of Jesus. For he himself offers the explanation: "If I, the Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you" (verses 14-15). The author of verse 1, therefore, failed to grasp the true significance of the episode he deemed proper to preface with his would-be mystic remarks. Moreover, the statement

does not connect with the adverbial phrase "before the feast of the passover," at the beginning of verse 1. Does it modify the participle "knowing," that is to say, had Jesus just learned, within the last six days before the Jewish Easter, what fate was in store for him? According to xii. 1, Jesus had arrived at Bethany "six days before the passover." But the Synoptic tradition represents Jesus as preparing his disciples for the coming catastrophe even before he set out on that fatal pilgrimage to the temple (Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22). If the temporal phrase should be constructed with the principal statement "he loved them unto the end," it would set a date for the end of the love of Jesus. That very idea is utterly foreign to Christian sentiment and experience. Jesus is believed to live the life everlasting and to love his own "world without end."

The second interpolation is found in verses 2-3 and was inserted perhaps by the party who added the Judas pericope to the account of the Washing of the Feet. A true translation of the passage reads: "The devil having already put into his heart that Judas Iscariot Simon's son would betray him, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and he came forth from God and goeth to God." The participial construction "having put" and "knowing" without any principal statement is highly suspicious in itself in comparison with the clear and simple style of the following narrative. Verse 3 refers again to the Feet Washing and improves upon verse 1 in as far as it touches the exact meaning of that pericope. Still Jesus himself washes the feet of his disciples although he is their teacher and master. The interpolator is not satisfied with such an humble title; he emphasizes that Jesus was conscious of being the divine master of the universe. The most obvious proof that the passage does not belong to the original text is presented by verse 2, which contains an altogether impossible statement. Our translators, of course, conceal this fact by adding "Jesus" to the text and by rendering the Greek nominative "Judas Iscariot Simon's son" as if it were a genitive which modified the noun "heart," from which it is separated by the way by the subordinate conjunction and the verb of the dependant clause. "Judas Iscariot Simon's son" may be a secondary gloss, for it does not stand in its proper place. But dropping the name of the traitor does not improve the remaining text.

The words "and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew him that should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean" (verses 10-11) must likewise be a later addition to the text. For they refer

to a previous statement which has been diagnosed as an interpolation. Apart from that argument, verses 10b-11 are evidently a superfluous comment on the preceding words of verse 10. The passage shows how much the Christians during the formative period of the Gospels were disturbed by the thought that Judas the traitor might have shared in any of the blessings which Jesus imparted to his disciples. They misunderstood in the given instance the real import of what Jesus did and imagined him to have imparted to his followers some special spiritual gift. Simon Peter evidently did the same thing when he begged to have his hands and head washed in addition to his feet. When refusing to permit Jesus to wash his feet, he showed how little he possessed of the spirit of his master. For as he considered himself unworthy of accepting menial services from Jesus, so he would have abstained from offering such services to others whom he imagined to outrank. Such a disposition has, of course, no part with Jesus. He did not care to impress upon his followers the duty of performing humble service for superiors. That is a mere selfish dictate of worldly prudence. Jesus desired his disciples to serve willingly and heartily the weak and the lowly. That being the case, he was not thinking of the uncleanness of Judas Iscariot.

There are other interpolations which it is unnecessary to discuss in detail: for instance, verses 18-19 interrupt the close connection between verses 17 and 20. Also verses 34-35 belong to the Foot-Washing episode, from which they are separated at present by verses 21-33.

The original text of the Foot-Washing pericope, as far as it can be recovered from the traditional text, reads therefore:

"(Before the feast of the passover) Jesus during a supper riseth from the table and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel and girded himself. Then he poureth water into the basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. So he cometh to Simon Peter. He saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter. Peter said to him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter says unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.

"So when he had washed their feet, and taken his garments, and sat down again, he said unto them,

"Know ye what I have done to you?

Ye call me, Teacher, and, Lord:

And ye do well; for so I am.

If I then, the Lord and Teacher have washed your feet,

Ye also ought to wash one another's feet.

For I have given you an example,

that ye also should do as I have done to you.

Verily, verily, I say unto you,

A servant is not greater than his lord,

neither one that is sent greater than he that sent him.

If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them.

Verily, verily, I say unto you,

He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me;

and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.

A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another;

even as I have loved you, that ye love one another.

By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples,

if ye have love one to another."

These words of Jesus do not rise into the realm of mystics and metaphysics. The statements are as clear and simple as in the Synoptic Gospels. Even the parallelism of members, so characteristic of the language of the prophets, is to be discerned. Jesus as teacher and master illustrates for the instruction of his disciples his New Commandment. There is nothing to suggest the fast approaching death of Jesus except possibly the date "before the feast of the passover." One thing, however, is certain, Jesus cannot have waited with proclaiming his New Commandment, "the Golden Rule," till the last week of his life. The Synoptic Gospels place the event rather close to the beginning of his Messianic career (Matt. v. 43ff; Luke vii. 27ff; Matt. vii. 12; Luke vi. 31; comp. Matt. xxii. 37-40).

The words ascribed to Jesus have not only the true Synoptic ring but there exist also Synoptic parallels. Matt. x. 24, we read: "A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his lord;" and Luke vi. 40: "The disciple is not above his teacher."

The quotation from Matthew occurs among the instructions which Jesus gave his disciples when they were about to start on their first missionary journey. Also in Luke it precedes that mission and follows almost immediately upon the commandment "Love your enemies" (Luke vi. 35). That missionary journey may be dated approximately. For the report of the returning Apostles led to

what is called erroneously Peter's Confession. The latter was followed in turn by the Transfiguration, after which Jesus began to acquaint the disciples with the fate that awaited him at Jerusalem. I am inclined to think that a term of about three months will cover the whole period from the sending out of the Apostles to the day of the crucifixion. Our Johannine pericope contains not only a saying of Jesus, preserved as a fragment in the Synoptic Gospels, but also the noun "apostle" itself. That term denotes in verse 16, not the ecclesiastical dignitary of a later age, but simply a messenger. Therefore, the Am. R. V. translates it "one that is sent" instead of "apostle."

Also John xiii. 20, has an echo in Matt. x. 14 (comp. Luke ix. 5, and Mark vi. 11). "Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words" etc. It is a negative version of what is expressed in the Fourth Gospel positively. The latter is therefore in all probability the more authentic one.

Matt. xx. 26f, and Mark x. 43f, we come upon another saying of Jesus, reminding us of the Johannine pericope.

"Whosoever would become great among you, shall be your servant;
And whosoever would be first among you, shall be your slave."

That word was pronounced apparently shortly before the last arrival at Jerusalem. But it may belong to an earlier time. For we have, at least, the testimony of Papias to the effect that the subject-matter of the Gospels is not arranged in strictly chronological order. Thus the just given quotation may after all belong to the same date as the earlier parallels of the Foot-Washing pericope.

All these observations assign the principal part of John xiii. to the time when the disciples were going forth to proclaim the message of the kingdom of God on their own responsibility. That is to say, the compiler of the Fourth Gospel did not possess an account of the Last Supper, looking for one, he came upon the Foot-Washing pericope, which he imagined to treat of the Last Supper because the Washing of the Feet occurred at a supper. The words "before the feast of the passover," which are placed in parentheses above, were added by the compiler.

The result of this excursus is purely negative as far as the Eucharist is concerned. Since the Fourth Gospel has not preserved an account of the Last Supper, we cannot even guess what the lost chapter may or may not have contained.

Our investigation has proved so far that Jesus did not ordain the Eucharist at the last passover. Nevertheless, the notices of the

Acts, however short and casual they are, speak of the Eucharist as observed by the first Christians as early as the day of Pentecost. That fact can be explained in only two ways. Either Jesus instituted the sacrament before the Last Supper or the ceremony came into use immediately after his death. Our sources are utterly silent as to the observance of the Lord's Supper previous to Good Friday eve. Indeed, if the early Christians had known about a celebration of the Eucharist before that date, the two Gospel accounts and that of first Corinthians would never have found a place in the New Testament. For that reason, we must assign the birth of the sacrament to the days following the death of Jesus. In this case it must go back to some old Jewish custom. For the disciples were law-abiding Jews and neither willing nor authorized to withdraw from the temple and the synagogue. From this viewpoint, Jer. xvi. 5-7, throws light upon our problem. It reads:

"Thus saith Jahveh,
Enter not into the house of mourning,
neither go to lament,
neither bemoan them.

For I have taken away my peace from this people, saith Jahveh,
even loving kindness and tender mercies.
Both great and small shall die in this land;
they shall not be buried,
neither shall men lament for them,
nor cut themselves,
nor make themselves bald for them;
neither shall men break bread for them in mourning,
to comfort them for the dead;
neither shall men give them the cup of consolation
to drink for their father or for their mother."

The prophet bears witness to a Jewish mourning custom, consisting in breaking bread and offering the cup of consolation to the bereaved relatives. That custom was still observed during the age of Jesus, as it is with certain modifications even to-day. It therefore stands to reason that after the death of Jesus his disciples offered each other the bread and wine of consolation. For their crucified Master was more to them than their own parents. Of course, the Eucharist has become within the Church a public ceremony which is celebrated at certain intervals if not every day, or Sunday. But the necessity of that change or development is not difficult to understand.

In the first place, the Eucharist of the first Christians was of a strictly private character and held as such in their homes. In the second place, there was a good reason for repeating the ancient rite. Jesus left behind the twelve Apostles and quite a number of other followers whose hearts longed to be comforted and who looked upon the collation of bread and wine as a source of consolation and renewed faith. So one Christian, or one group of Christians, would serve the other in turn with the time-honored repast of the mourners. The next step would be that all new converts would observe that meal. For they too would be afflicted with the keenest sorrow over the cruel fate of their Messiah, especially as they must feel guilty of having assented to the unspeakable crime of their priests. That constant repetition, brought about by the ever increasing number of new believers, invested by and by the ancient Jewish ceremony with a new Christian character. When Gentiles accepted the message of Jesus, they adopted the Eucharist as the principal religious exercise of their new faith. They could not, as the Jewish Christians did, continue to take part in the temple services of their heathen neighbors and friends. For they were taught to abhor them as idolatrous. They were accustomed, however, to sacrificial banquets at their temples and naturally wanted to have something like it in their new organization. 1 Cor. xi. 17ff, shows how good a time they managed to have when they celebrated the Lord's Supper in accordance with their old heathen notions and customs. The Gentile Christians, unacquainted with the true origin of the Eucharist, must have ascribed its enjoinder very early to Jesus Christ himself. But even then it took quite a time until the final satisfactory formula was worked out.

The question may be asked: What is the use of such rather tedious, longwinded investigations? They are necessary to enlighten those people who take an interest in religion and are inclined to accept the leadership of the Church. They will protect them from narrow-mindedness and fanaticism. It was just the Eucharist which caused the first great schism among the Protestants and has prevented the Protestant nations up to the present day from treating each other with brotherly love and mutual forbearance. Moreover, people familiar with the true beginnings of the Church and her ceremonies will never be carried away by the blind zeal and ignorance of those self-appointed leaders of public religious opinion who want to put the tyrannical yoke of their bigotry upon the neck of all their fellow men and teach them to practise hatred instead of love.