

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION: JESUS' DEATH AS ESCHATOLOGICAL
PASSOVER SACRIFICE

By

BARRY DOUGLAS SMITH, B.A., M.DIV., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

August, 1988

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1988)
(Religious Studies)

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Words of Institution: Jesus' Death as
Eschatological Passover Sacrifice

AUTHOR: Barry Douglas Smith, B.A. (Richmond College)
M.Div. (McMaster University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Ben F. Meyer

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 366

ABSTRACT

How Jesus understood his death is an important datum for the reconstruction of the aims of Jesus. Having experienced the rejection of his message of the Kingdom of God, Jesus found himself in a situation of crisis, wherein he was forced to reflect on the theological significance of his failure. He came to the conclusion that it was God's will that his death be an expiation for sin. This is how he incorporated his death into his understanding of his role as the messenger of the Kingdom of God. If the historian does not take Jesus' understanding of his death into consideration, his reconstruction of the aims of Jesus will necessarily be truncated.

In particular, Jesus came to understand his approaching death in the light of Jewish paschal theology. He viewed the sacrifice of the Passover lambs in Egypt as typological of his own death. In like manner, his death would be a redemptive event, being both an expiation for sin and the means by which the new covenant, foretold by Jeremiah, would be realized. Appropriately enough, he expressed this to his disciples at his last Passover meal. Jesus' understanding of the significance of his death parallels the Jewish tradition of the Binding of Isaac. In post-biblical Judaism, Isaac's sacrifice or at least his

willingness to be sacrificed was interpreted as expiatory and as the ground of the efficacy of the original Passover offerings. Similarly, Jesus saw his own death as expiatory and the typological fulfilment of the original Passover offerings.

The words of institution, moreover, represent the establishment by Jesus of a new liturgical practice in continuity with the Passover, reflecting his self-understanding of being the eschatological messenger of God.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Prof. Ben F. Meyer for his suggestion to me of the topic of Jesus' understanding of his death and his multifaceted assistance in the production of the thesis itself. I wish also to thank Profs. Clark H. Pinnock and Stephen Westerholm for their advice and help during the various phases of this work. In addition, I am indebted to the government of Ontario, which provided me with funding in the form of Ontario Graduate Scholarships; this financial aid made possible my continuation as a full-time student.

But most of all I must thank my wife, Claire, who for the past five years has patiently endured a precarious existence for my sake. She deserved better, and I shall ever be in her debt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	p. 1
II.	Chapter One: A Reconstruction of a Typical, First-century, Palestinian Passover,	p. 6
	A. Introduction	p. 6
	B. The Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the Old Testament	p. 9
	C. The First-Century Celebration of the Passover	p. 12
	1. Preparation for the Celebration of the Passover Feast	p. 13
	2. The Passover Meal	p. 30
	3. Purpose and Meaning of the Passover Celebration	p. 54
	D. Notes to Chapter One	p. 68
III.	Chapter Two: Literary-Critical Analysis of the New Testament Sources	p. 72
	A. The Literary Relationships Between the Four Accounts	p. 73
	1. A Comparison of the Four Accounts	p. 73
	2. The Literary Relationship Between Matthew and Mark	p. 83

3.	The Literary Relationship Between Luke and Mark and Luke and 1 Corinthians	p. 92
B.	The Literary Compositeness of the Markan and Lukan Narratives of the Last Supper	p. 123
1.	The Markan Narrative of the Last Supper	p. 124
2.	The Lukan Narrative of the Last Supper	p. 135
C.	Notes to Chapter Two	p. 140
IV.	Chapter Three: A Tradition- Historical Analysis of the Last Supper Narratives	p. 150
A.	The Paschal Context of the Words of Institution	p. 150
B.	The Tradition-Historical Relationship Between Luke 22:15-18 and Luke 22:19-20	p. 168
C.	The Relative, Tradition- Historical Priority of the Markan and Pauline Versions of the Words of Institution	p. 176
D.	Notes to Chapter Three	p. 192
V.	Excursus One: The Chronological Agreement Between the Accounts of the Last Supper in the Gospel of John and in the Synoptics	p. 198
VI.	Chapter Four: A Historical Reconstruction of the Last Supper	p. 226
A.	Introduction	p. 226
B.	The Outside of the Event	p. 231
C.	The Inside of the Event	p. 242

D.	Objections to the Authenticity of the Words of Institution	p. 283
E.	Notes to Chapter Four	p. 304
VII.	Excursus Two: Jesus and the Servant	p. 317
VIII.	Bibliography	p. 352

INTRODUCTION

The early church understood Jesus' death as expiatory. This was already thematic in the pre-Pauline faith formulas. It is the common testimony of the New Testament writers, including the synoptists, who represent Jesus as understanding his death at the Last Supper as "on behalf of" (hyper) others, that Jesus died for sinners. But does this early interpretation go back to Jesus himself? If so, how Jesus saw his approaching death becomes an important datum for the reconstruction of the aims of Jesus.

In Jesus research it is often held that the portrayal of Jesus as a preacher of the Kingdom of God is incompatible with that of Jesus as one whose death was expiatory. The second of these themes, although present in the synoptics, is not present in abundance. It is a common hypothesis that this conception developed within the soteriological reflection of the early community and was read back into the traditions of Jesus. This implies that Jesus did not conceive of his death in salvation-historical terms at all. We shall explore the possibility, however, that Jesus did think about his death, and thought about it in light of his preaching of the Kingdom of God. It seems likely that Jesus came to the realization that his message would ultimately be rejected and that his ministry would end in death. It is

reasonable to assume that he also developed an understanding of his death in light of his convictions about himself as the preacher of the Kingdom of God. That understanding of his death finds expression most prominently in the words of institution, where Jesus symbolically interpreted his approaching end by means of elements of the Passover meal.

The goal of this work is historical reconstruction. We shall attempt to reconstruct the event of the Last Supper. We shall differentiate, however, using R. G. Collingwood's terminology, between the outside and the inside of an event. The outside of an event is a description of the various empirically observable data constitutive of it. It is represented by the interrogatives of who, what, where, and when. The inside of an event, by far the more important for historical reconstruction, answers the question why. In reconstructing the inside of the event, one attempts to ascertain the purposes and motives pervading the actions of historical figures. Applying Collingwood's distinction to Jesus' words and acts at the Last Supper, we shall undertake to reconstruct not only the who, what, where, and when, but also the why. The why turns out to be the New Testament's principal contribution towards Jesus' understanding of his death.

Our investigation begins with a detailed account of how a typical first-century Passover would have proceeded. Jesus' Last Supper was a Passover meal, according to the synoptics. If this is correct--and we shall argue below that it is--, it follows that a detailed reconstruction of a

first-century Passover would prove to be essential for reconstructing both the outside and the inside of the event of the Last Supper. We shall restrict ourselves to Tannaitic sources and other relatively early texts, in order to ensure the greatest historical accuracy possible.

From this investigation into the history-of-religions background of Jesus' Last Supper, we shall move to an examination of the relevant New Testament texts. These are Matthew 26:26-29, Mark 14:22-25, Luke 22:15-20, and I Cor 11:23-26. The first step is a literary-critical analysis, designed to determine the relative, literary priority of the four accounts. We shall then examine the accounts with a view to determining whether they are literarily composite. Our results in this matter will have implications for historical reconstruction.

Next we shall undertake to answer three tradition-historical questions. First, we shall investigate the question of whether the paschal framework of the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper is secondary. The answer to this will have obvious implications for historical reconstruction. (As we said already, we shall conclude that it was a Passover meal.) Secondly, the tradition-historical problem of the relation of Luke 22:15-18 to the words of institution in Luke 22:19-20 will be dealt with. Finally, we shall deal with the question of the relative, tradition-historical priority of the versions of the words of institution. The assumption is that what shows signs of greater originality is closer to the historical Jesus. There are enough significant differences

between the accounts that one is forced to decide which is the more original.

We reach the point of the thesis where historical reconstruction becomes possible. The task is to correlate the New Testament material on the Last Supper with our conclusions concerning how a typical first-century Passover would have proceeded, in an effort to reconstruct both the outside and the inside of the event of the Last Supper. Our goal, as we said, is to recover as far as possible what actually happened. Paschal theology is the key to understanding the meaning of the words of institution. Jesus conceived his death as antitypical of the death of the Passover lambs in Egypt. The sacrifice of the original Passover lambs in Egypt was seen in Jewish tradition both as an expiation for sin and, consequently, as the means by which the covenant established with Abraham was put into effect. Similarly, Jesus saw his death as expiatory and the means by which the new covenant (Jer 31:31), the further fulfilment of the covenant promises to Abraham, would come into effect. We find a similar tradition in Judaism with the Binding of Isaac. In Jewish tradition, Isaac's sacrifice or willingness to be sacrificed was the ground of all subsequent expiatory sacrifices, including the Passover lambs in Egypt.

In this chapter we shall also deal with objections to the authenticity of the words of institution as reflecting Jesus' understanding of his death. The words of institution have never been a strong candidate for authenticity. We shall argue, however, that they ought to be. First, we shall

argue for the theoretical possibility that Jesus understood his death in expiatory terms. Then we shall present indices that positively point to the authenticity of the words of institution.

Included also as part of the thesis are two excursuses. Excursus I deals with the apparently contradictory Passion chronologies of the gospel of John and the synoptics. I shall argue that John, in fact, agrees with the synoptic chronology. Excursus II concerns the Isaian Servant of the Lord and Jesus' understanding of his suffering and death. Although Passover conceptuality thematically dominates the words of institution, there are traces of the influence of the Isaian suffering Servant on them.

I

A RECONSTRUCTION OF A TYPICAL FIRST-CENTURY PALESTINIAN
PASSOVERA. Introduction

The synoptic gospels portray the Last Supper as a Passover meal (Mark 14:12; Matt 26:17; Luke 22:7). If the Last Supper was, in fact, a Passover meal, a thorough investigation into the celebration of Passover in the first century would be most helpful for the task of determining the outside and the inside of the Last Supper, for it would provide an interpretive context for the entire historical reconstruction. We shall eventually conclude that the paschal context of the Last Supper is historically correct.

To reconstruct a typical, first-century Passover requires a careful sifting of the available sources.¹ Although many of our sources date from the second century, given the conservative tendency of Jewish tradition, we are justified in assuming that the traditions therein reach back to earlier periods. In reconstructing this important festival for Judaism, we must, nevertheless, sound a preliminary note of caution. The sources that have relevance for a reconstruction of the Jewish Passover festival at the

time of Jesus suffer from the problem that plagues all similar endeavours. The sources may be biased, and, therefore, historically inaccurate.

Some sources have passed through the filter of rabbinic Judaism of the post-second-temple period. So it is conceivable that some of the halakic or haggadic material pertaining to the Passover found in the Tannaitic sources--the Mishna, Tosepta, the Mekilta, Sipre Numbers and Deuteronomy, and some material in Midraš Rabbah--was not universally accepted among Jews of the first century. (We also find parallel material in the non-Tannaitic Pirge Rabbi Eliezer.) This material may have originated in the post-second-temple period. Or, if it was in existence at the time of Jesus' Last Supper, it may not have been accepted or practised by Jews outside of Pharisaic circles, whose spiritual descendents the Tannaitic rabbis were. Given Jesus' apparent antipathy towards the Pharisaic conception of Judaism, it is possible that what we find in the gospels' description of the Last Supper could differ from our Tannaitic sources' description of a typical Passover celebration, and yet not imply that the former was not a Passover meal. The book of Jubilees also has material on the Passover, but a sectarian interest may likewise be at work, thereby disqualifying it at certain points as a source for the reconstruction of what Jesus and his disciples would have done during a Passover.

The case of Josephus, however, is a little more hopeful. As an historian, he had his own obvious biases,

such as his anti-Zealotism, which led him to play down the messianic strains of Jewish religious and social life. Since Josephus claimed to be a Pharisee,² it is also arguable that data he provides us on certain topics may be partisan. Nevertheless, he appears to be reliable concerning what he said about the celebration of the Passover in the first century; he does not seem to have any apologetic purpose in this regard, unlike his description of Zealotism and its more prominent figures. There is also some relevant Targumic material on the Passover, and this, as with Josephus, we accept as relatively trustworthy.³ Finally, the New Testament itself, apart from the passages in question, contains some useful historical details.

The methodological principle for our historical work will be to ground our reconstruction of a typical, first-century Passover on the surest sources. This reconstruction will then serve as a heuristic structure for a reconstruction of the event of the Last Supper. Thus, we shall put more confidence in the Old Testament, the New Testament, Josephus' works, and the Targumic material and relatively less in the other sources. This is not to say that these other sources are suspect, but only that we shall exercise greater caution in our use of them.

Unfortunately, the great mass of our information about the Passover comes from sources other than the more reliable ones mentioned above. There is nothing that can be done about this, except to proceed cautiously and to be aware of the possibility of inaccuracy in our sources. When we do

suspect that a source may not reflect the actual situation at the time of Jesus, we shall have to remain sceptical about what it purports to describe.

In addition, as an aid in our reconstruction, we shall also make use of the principle of analogy. Given our empirical knowledge of what is and is not possible, we shall retroject this to the first century in an effort to reconstruct what typically happened during Passover. This is justified as long as one does not make one's present experience an absolute rule respecting what could or could not have taken place, but only a guideline.

B. The Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the Old Testament

The Torah's regulations concerning the Passover celebration were, of course, the ultimate authority for all first-century Jews, regardless of their secondary adherences. A literary-critical analysis of the Old Testament sources on the Passover will not concern us, since the first-century Jew read the Torah synchronically. The modern notion that the emergence of Israel's full self-definition as summarized by the Torah was tied to a long social and religious development was completely foreign to the understanding of a first-century Jew. So, if there was a development in the ritual or meaning of the Passover, reflected within the various sources within the Pentateuch, this is irrelevant to an understanding of the mentality of Judaism at the time of

Jesus.

According to the Torah, as read by the first-century Jew, the Passover was instituted as a commemoration of the Lord's deliverance of Israel from Egypt. The most relevant Old Testament passages are Exod 12:1-13, 21-27, 43-49; Deut 16:1-18. The directives given in Exod 12 are for both the original Passover celebrants and subsequent generations of celebrants, which left commentators with the hermeneutical problem of deciding what was intended as a perpetual ordinance and what was limited to the original event. (cf. t. Pesah. 8:15; we shall further comment on this later.) Exod 12 contains a mixture of legal and historical material. On the tenth day of the month in which Moses was to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, the people were to take a lamb or a kid (śeh), one for each household; if a household (bāyit) was too small, it could join itself to another. The animal was to be a one-year-old male without defect; it was to be kept until the fourteenth of the same month, at which time it was to be slaughtered "between the evenings" (bēn hā ʿarbayim). The Israelites were to take some blood of the victim and put it on the sides and tops of the doorframes of their houses. The same night the Israelites were to roast the lamb or kid whole over fire, and eat it along with bitter herbs. Nothing was to remain of the victim in the morning. The meal was to be eaten in haste.

The Passover meal was meant for subsequent generations to be the first day of a seven-day feast, the Feast of Unleavened bread (yāmim maṣṣôt). On the first day

of the feast (bayyôm hari^ššôn), all leaven was to be removed from the houses of the celebrants, and no leaven was to be eaten for the seven days duration. In Exod 12:18, however, it is stipulated that leaven is to be removed from the houses on the evening of the fourteenth, before the first day of the feast. How this regulation was interpreted by the rabbinic exegesis we shall examine later. On the first and last days a sacred assembly was to be held, and these days were to be considered as sabbaths. Further regulations for the Passover included the following: that no foreigner was to eat of it; it must be eaten within one house (bēbāyit), and no meat was to be taken outside of the house; its bones were not to be broken.

Deut 16:1-18 reiterates many of the regulations stated in Exodus 12, with the exception of the ritual of the smearing of the blood. In this passage, however, we find a significant addition to the Passover halakah. The Passover was to be eaten only at the place where the Lord would choose as a dwelling for his Name. We also find a haggadah on the unleavened bread, for in Deut 16:3 the bread was symbolically understood as the bread of affliction (leḥem ʿonī)⁴. Deut 16:2 seems also to imply that the Passover victim could be taken both from the flock (sheep and goats) and the herd (cattle). How the interpreters dealt with this, we shall examine later.

References to the Passover appear in several non-Torah Old Testament texts. After years of neglect by the Israelites, a second Passover celebration was held by

Hezekiah in Jerusalem (2 Chron 30:1-27). Josiah likewise, as a part of his cultic reforms, reinstituted the Passover festival (2 Kings 23:21-23; cf. 2 Chron 35:1). Finally, Ezra is said to have held the first Passover in the second temple, a joyous occasion for the exiles (Ezra 6:19, 20).

C. The First-Century Celebration of the Passover

The first-century Passover practice was certainly based on the Old Testament, but differed at points from it. For within the intertestamental period new elements were introduced into the Passover festival, while some of the Old Testament regulations relating to it were interpreted as being applicable to the first celebrants only. Our stated aim is to reconstruct how a typical, first-century Passover celebration would have proceeded, so it is at this point that we must turn to our post-biblical sources in an effort to reconstruct what Jesus and his disciples would have been doing, if the Last Supper was a Passover meal. In approaching this task, we shall pose a series of related questions, and then attempt to answer these by recourse to our sources. First, we shall ask, what was entailed for a Jew in order to prepare to celebrate the Passover feast? Secondly, how did the meal itself actually proceed? Finally, what was the purpose and meaning of the Passover feast for the celebrants?

1. Preparation for Celebration of the Passover Feast

In the first century, in order to celebrate the Passover, a Jew had to travel to Jerusalem. The Passover witnessed a great influx of pilgrims into Jerusalem, since the holy city was the place which the Lord chose as a dwelling for his Name (Deut 16). Already in Old Testament times, the cult had been centralized around the temple (Hezekiah, Josiah and Ezra), and Deut 16:16 stipulates that it was the duty of every Jew to appear in Jerusalem three times a year for the three pilgrim feasts. (Exod 23:17; 34:23 merely require that the Israelites appear before the Lord three times a year.) The same concern to make it incumbent on every Jew to celebrate Passover in Jerusalem as a pilgrim festival is also present in our later, non-Biblical sources. Jubilees states that the Israelites must not celebrate Passover in their cities, nor anywhere else except, echoing Deuteronomy, the place wherein God chooses that His Name should dwell (Jub. 49:21). In addition, Passover is called an eternal ordinance (49:8), the neglect of which results in being cut off (Jub. 49:9). Citing Ps 132:13-14, Mek. 12:1 (Pisha 4:42-51) makes the point that Jerusalem alone is the dwelling place of the Shekinah, and therefore the only suitable place for altars. This had not always been the case, but in His dealings with Israel, God progressively restricted the place of His dwelling and thereby the place of divine revelation first to the land of Israel, then to the

city of Jerusalem, and finally to the temple itself. m. Hag. 1:1, in line with the above theologoumena in the Mekilta, states that, with a few classes of exceptions, all are duty bound to appear in Jerusalem tri-annually, for the three pilgrim feasts, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. The same is found in Mek. 23:17 (Pisha 4:32-37) and in Sipre Deut 16:2 (129). Finally, in t. Pesah. 8:16 it is said that one of the differences between the first Passover and subsequent ones was that for the former the lambs were slaughtered in each individual home in Egypt, whereas for the latter they are slaughtered in one place, i.e., in the temple.

That the requirement dutifully to appear in Jerusalem for the Passover festival was actually in force among the people is confirmed by the New Testament, Josephus and the Tosepta.

Certainly, not every Jew appeared for every feast, but enough appeared in Jerusalem in fulfilment of their religious duty to swell the population of the city. Luke 2:41 states that Jesus' parents went to Jerusalem from Galilee once a year; John 7 mentions that Jesus and his brothers were planning to go to Jerusalem to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles; John 11:55 states that many went up to Jerusalem for their ceremonial cleansing before Passover and were looking for Jesus, whom they expected to find there. These New Testament texts converge towards the conclusion that pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the festivals was a feature of Jewish life in first-century Palestine.

Similarly, Josephus tells us that the siege of the

second temple by Titus coincided with Passover, with the result that, with the overcrowding of the city, pestilence and then famine overtook the population. A large number of the casualties of the siege were not Jerusalemites, but Jews from other parts who were unfortunate enough to be in Jerusalem for Passover (B.J. vi. 420-22). Josephus, on the basis on a census taken by Cestus for the emperor Nero, reckoned the population of Jerusalem during Passover to be two million and seven hundred thousand (B.J. vi. 425). Although this is taken to be an exaggeration by most commentators, the point remains that Jerusalem was a crowded place during Passover. Even during the political chaos of 70 A.D., when Eleazer and John were struggling for control of the Zealot resistance movement, pilgrims dutifully appeared in Jerusalem, and requested to be admitted to the temple, to their misfortune (B.J. v. 98-104).

Finally, t. Pesah. 4:15 relates that once King Agrippa wanted to know the number of the population, so he had the priests put aside the kidneys of the sacrificial victims. In total some 600,000 pairs were put aside, and assuming that there were not less ten members per Passover hăbûrâ, we have a minimum total of six million. It is said that this Passover was called the "crowded Passover", so crowded that the temple mount could not contain the numbers. Again, even if these numbers were inflated, the general point that Jerusalem was overflowing with Passover pilgrims is still established.⁵

As with any sacrifice, the Passover had to be eaten

in ritual purity. This meant that, upon his arrival in Jerusalem for the Passover celebration, the pilgrim had to ensure that he was ritually clean and that he remained so (Jub. 49:9; m. Pesah. 5:3; 7:4, 6, 7; 9:1; t. Pesah. 4:2; 6:1, 2, 5; 7:9, 11, 12, 13, 15; cf. B.J. vi. 425-27). Uncleanness resulted from the usual things set forth in the Torah. For example, a menstruating woman or a man who had sexual relations with one was unfit to eat the Passover (Lev 15:19-24; t. Pesah. 8:1), as was the one who had experienced two issues (cf. Lev. 15:1-5; m. Pesah. 8:5; t. Pesah. 7:11; 8:1). Recent childbirth (Lev 12; m. Pesah. 9:4; t. Pesah. 7:11; B.J. 6:421), and, naturally, corpse uncleanness (Num 19; t. Pesah. 7:11; 8:1) also rendered the potential celebrant unclean. Similarly, a mourner, one who had learned of the death of a kinsman, and one who had caused the bones of his parents to be assembled (and, therefore, underwent the second mourning) needed to bathe after their periods of mourning, in order to be fit to eat the Passover in the evening (m. Pesah. 8:8). In addition, any one who slaughtered the Passover in the temple in a state of uncleanness, which included being in the possession of leaven or offering it for unclean or uncircumcised persons, brought problems upon himself and his hăbûrâ, the details of which are set out in the Mishna and Tosepta (m. Pesah. 5:4; 6:6; 9:4; t. Pesah. 5:6).

It is also likely that many of the pilgrims arrived in Jerusalem at least a week before the Passover feast, in order to cleanse themselves from the corpse uncleanness that

they would have acquired on their journey to Jerusalem. John 11:55, for example, states that many Jews went up to Jerusalem before the feast in order to purify themselves. Josephus likewise reported that, during the Passover season before the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D., when several miraculous events were witnessed, which were mistakenly interpreted as portents of divine favour, the people had already begun to assemble for the feast on the eighth of Nisan, seven days before the feast. It was assumed that the Gentile dwelling places with which the pilgrims would have come into contact en route rendered them unclean (m. Ohol. 18:7; t. Ohol. 18:11). The impurity resulted from the assumption that Gentiles buried their miscarried children in their houses, thus transmitting corpse uncleanness to the occupants. Such impurity lasted for a week, and could be removed by the ritual of the ashes of the red heifer (Num 9, 19).

According to the Passover regulations in Exod 12, the original celebrants were to acquire their Passover lambs on Nisan 10. This regulation, however, was interpreted in the first century as pertaining only to the Egyptian Passover. The absence of any reference to the requirement of the purchase of the Passover victim on Nisan 10 in the New Testament, Josephus' works, the Tosepta, and the book of Jubilees is an argument from silence that this restriction was not in place for subsequent Passovers. This is confirmed, moreover, by the Mekilta, the Mishna and Jerusalem Targum I. In Mek. 12:3 (Pisha 3:45), it is explicitly stated

that the purchase of the Passover on the tenth was valid only for the first celebrants. In a midrash on the word "this" (zōt) contained in the phrase "the tenth day of this month", R. Ishmael argued that "this", as a demonstrative adjective, meant to restrict the practice of obtaining the paschal sacrifice to the tenth day of the actual month in which the Israelites came out of Egypt, not its anniversary. Considering the precarious hermeneutical grounds of this bit of exegesis, one ought to look to current practice as the principal inspiration for such an interpretation, rather than the exegetical demands of the text itself. In m. Pesah. 9:5 it is stipulated that, although the first Passover celebrants had to obtain their Passover offerings on the tenth of the first month, this requirement is not in force for subsequent generations. Finally, in Jerusalem Targum I on Exod 12:3, it is stated that the commandment to take a lamb on Nisan 10 is no longer binding. The pilgrim who arrived in Jerusalem for Passover, therefore, could buy his Passover offering at any time before the evening of Nisan 15.

Although the original Passover was celebrated by families, subsequent Passovers were understood as having a different requirement. A ḥābūrā, i.e., voluntary association of adults, replaced the family as the sociological unit of the Passover festival. Josephus wrote that in the first century a phratia of not fewer than ten persons, but as many as twenty, gathered around each sacrifice (B.J. vi. 423/5). Similarly, in Mek. 12:4 (Pisha 3:60-64), R. Ishmael argued that one could enroll unrelated persons in one's ḥābūrā,

because Scripture allowed for the possibility of two families coming together to share a Passover offering. In Mek. 12:46 (Pisha 15:99-104) also, it is argued, based on the phrase "all the congregation of Israel", that a paschal offering could be offered by a mixed group. In t. Pesah. 4:15 and Jerusalem Targum I (Exod 12:4), we find that not fewer than 10 people can belong to a Passover ḥăbûrâ, and in m. Pesah. 8:3 it is stated that any number of people may be included in a Passover ḥăbûrâ, even up to a hundred people (8:7), as long as there is at least an olive bulk's of meat per participant (8:3, 7; cf. t. Pesah. 7:6). There is nothing said in these texts restricting the enrollment of the ḥăbûrôt to family members. A Passover offering, however, cannot be slaughtered for one person, according to m. Pesah. 8:7 and Sipre Deut 16:5 (132). Thus, the pilgrim had to ensure that he belonged to a ḥăbûrâ before the slaughtering of the Passover on Nisan 14.

It must be stressed that enrollment in these ḥăbûrôt was not an informal affair, but rather a formal requirement for the proper celebration of Passover (e.g. t. Pesah. 7:3-17; m. Pesah. 8). In Mek. 12:4 (Pisha 3:68-71), for example, the phrase "according to the number of souls" is interpreted to mean that the lamb must be slaughtered only for those enrolled as partners in it. The membership of a habura could be altered up until the slaughtering of the Passover victim, according to m. Pesah. 8:3. This is confirmed by Mek. 12:4 (Pisha 3:68-71) and 12:21 (Pisha 11:13-19). Moreover, R. Judah is quoted in Mek. 12:4 (Pisha

3:68-71) as stipulating that the final ḥăbûrâ, after the changes had been made, must contain at least one of the original members (cf. also t. Pesah. 7:7). After the point of the slaughtering of the Passover, if one had not been properly enrolled in a ḥăbûrâ, one was disqualified from celebrating the Passover, and had to wait until the Second Passover to fulfil one's religious duty.

In addition, it seems that only qualified adults could enroll as full members of a Passover ḥăbûrâ. In the book of Jubilees, only Jews twenty years and older were allowed to enroll for Passover (49:17); similarly, Mek. 12:4 (Pişa 3:69-71) eliminates as members of a ḥăbûrâ the sick and the little ones, those who are not able to eat the required olive's bulk amount of meat. Minors who could eat an olive bulk's amount could participate in the meal. Such were enrolled by their fathers, and, according to t. Pesah. 7:4, their consent to or knowledge of their enrollment was not required. A ḥăbûrâ, however, according to the Mishna, could not be composed predominantly of minors and women (m. Pesah. 8:7).

More than likely, however, Passover was eaten by families, as the words of the haggagda in m. Pesah. 10:5, attributed to Rabban Gamaliel, assume. Here it states that the youngest son is to ask his father about the meaning of the lamb, bitter herbs, and unleavened bread. t. Pesah. 10:4 mentions that it is the responsibility of a man to bring joy to his wife, children, and dependents during Passover by providing adequate supplies of wine. This also presupposes a

familial setting. Mek. 12:3 (Pisha 3:50-54) also gives evidence that the Passover was eaten by families by answering in the negative the question whether "according to their father's houses" requires that ten families belonging to one father ought to sacrifice only one Passover victim. Rather, ten individual sacrifices are required. Nevertheless, it was not a requirement that Passover be celebrated by families, as it was for the Passover in Egypt. As stated above, the Passover ḥăbûrâ could be a mixed group.

The enrollment in a Passover ḥăbûrâ cost the members a designated amount of money, depending on how much food and drink and of what quality they wished to consume. Beyond the obligatory minimum, which we shall discuss below, a ḥăbûrâ was free to add to their feast at will, so long as no other restrictions on the consumption of food were violated. According to t. Pesah. 2:18, people were permitted to use second-tithe money to fulfil their festival obligations; Mek. 12:20 (Pisha 10:75), however, rules that one cannot use second-tithe money to buy the ingredients for unleavened bread, because, as Deut 16:3 says, it is bread of poverty, and food bought with the second tithe must be eaten when one is joyful. If a person, however, withdrew from a ḥăbûrâ before the point of slaughtering, he would be reimbursed his contribution towards the cost of the meal (t. Pesah. 7:8). Also, owing to the fact that there were always those who did not have the financial means to contribute to the expenses incurred by the celebration, the institution of the poor-dish arose (tmhwy) whereby the cost of the food necessary for a

Passover meal was collected from the general public for the poor (m. Pesah. 10:1; t. Pesah. 7:6; 10:1). Passover was a religious duty, so no one ought to be denied the opportunity to participate.

The Passover sacrifice was often eaten after a meal composed of a hăgîgâ, a festival offering (cf. m. Hag.). The festival offering, obtainable with the use of second-tithe money from the market within the temple (cf. m. Šegal. 7:2), was always eaten first, followed by the Passover, in order that the latter would be eaten in a state of satiation (t. Pesah. 5:3; m. Pesah. 6:3, 4; Mek. 12:8 (Pisha 6:62-64). In sacrificing and eating a festival offering, one fulfilled one's obligations to rejoice during the festival, according to t. Pesah. 5:3. Mek. 12:5 (Pisha 4:11-56) offers several illuminating midrashim on Deut 16:2, "Sacrifice...an animal from your flock (šôṭn) or herd (bāqār)...", giving further evidence of the practice of eating festival offerings at Passover. All of the authorities cited in the Mekilta agree that flock was to be interpreted as the animal sacrificed for Passover, while the herd refers to the festival offering. Again, this not so obvious conclusions from Exod 12:5 interpreted in relation to Deut 16:2 could have been suggested to the exegetes by current practice. The same exegesis is found in Sipre Deut 16:2 (129). That the buying, slaughtering and eating of festival offerings was common practice in Jerusalem for all the pilgrim festivals is also evidenced by Josephus (Ant. iii. 224, 228) and the tractate m. Hag.

There are three conditions set out in m. Pesah. 6:3 for the valid slaughtering of a ḥăgîgâ, offered at the same time as the Passover lamb, for the purpose of consuming it before the Passover meal: when it is offered on a weekday, when it is offered in ritual purity, and when the Passover offering is insufficient to feed the ḥăbûrâ. (A festival offering could be offered at any time during the Feast of Unleavened Bread; in fact, festival offerings and other purchases made with second-tithe money were that on which the pilgrims subsisted during the tri-annual pilgrimages (Deut 14:26).) A Passover ḥăbûrâ would have to decide, therefore, whether they qualified to sacrifice a ḥăgîgâ in addition to the Passover offering. The members, of course, had to share the cost.

The Passover celebrants needed, not only to enroll in a Passover ḥăbûrâ, but to ensure that their ḥăbûrâ had a place in which to celebrate the festival and that they had all the necessary items for Passover. The first-century Jew was required to hold his Passover celebration anywhere in the city of Jerusalem. But this may not always have been the case. The book of Jubilees makes it a requirement that Passover be celebrated in the forecourt of the temple (49:16f.). By the time we get to the first century, however, it was simply impossible to allow the celebrants to eat Passover in the temple. Thus, it was ruled that Passover could be held anywhere within the city limits. This meant that the pilgrims had to find some sort of accommodation within the city, not always an easy task, as our sources

indicate. Although m. Abot. 5:5 considers it one of the ten miracles wrought by the forefathers in the temple that no one ever said that Jerusalem was too crowded to stay overnight there, this did not mean that accommodation during Passover was always ideal.

Not only had the Passover crowds become too large for the temple courts, but they were even too large for each ḥăbūrâ to have a single house or equivalent in which to celebrate the Passover. It is stated in t. Pesah. 6:11 that, although Exod 12:46 stipulates that in one house the Passover is to be eaten, nevertheless, people ate the Passover in courtyards and on roofs. The regulation of eating in one house was interpreted to mean in one ḥăbūrâ. Mek. 12:46 (Pisha 15:76-82) likewise makes the same concession in its interpretation of "You shall not carry it forth outside the house (bayit)". House here is understood as the place where it is to be consumed, i.e., within the ḥăbūrâ. Practically, this meant that more than one Passover celebration could be held in a single house, as long as the ḥăbūrôt faced in opposite directions (m. Pesah. 7:13; t. Pesah. 6:11). The interpretation of the requirement to eat Passover in one house to mean in one ḥăbūrâ, therefore, was probably a response to the physical limitations of the city. So, upon arriving in Jerusalem, unless a ḥăbūrâ had made prior arrangements, one of the group had to find the best accommodation possible.

The place where a Jew celebrated Passover, however, was not always where he spent the night of Nisan 15. It is

unanimously agreed upon among the rabbis that one must spend the night in Jerusalem for Passover (Sipre Deut 16:7 (134); t. Pesah. 8:8). This was understood to be derived from the regulation in Deut 16:7, which stipulated that only in the morning after the Passover meal could one leave and return to one's tent. In the same vein, Sipre Num 9:10 (69) states that the Passover lamb had to be eaten within the gates of Jerusalem; m. Mak. 3:3 rules that the one who eats the lesser holy sacrifices outside the walls of Jerusalem was subject to the penalty of the forty stripes; m. Pesah. 7:9 declares any paschal offering taken out of Jerusalem must be burned immediately.

Nevertheless, in t. Pesah. 8:17, it is said that, although, according to Exod 12, the participants of the first Passover celebrated Passover in one house and spent the night in the same, this requirement is not in force for subsequent Passovers. This is one of the many differences between the Egyptian Passover and subsequent Passovers. Thus, when Passover was completed at or before midnight, the celebrants were free to leave the places where they had celebrated it. Unlike the first Passover, the restriction not to leave one's house before morning was not in effect for subsequent celebrations. Rather, the feast ended at the time when Israel was believed to have left Egypt, i.e., midnight. Given the tremendous overcrowding of the city, it would be unreasonable to require that people sleep in the place where they held Passover. It might be possible to eat a meal on a roof or in a courtyard, but it would not be possible to sleep

there. Josephus gives evidence that pilgrims who could not find accommodation within a house in Jerusalem slept in tents on the plain during the Passover festival (Ant. xvii. 217; BJ. ii. 12). A Jew could sleep anywhere within the ritual boundaries of Jerusalem, which did not coincide with the actual city limits.⁷

Once a ḥăbûrâ was established and the place for the celebration seen to, some member or members needed to purchase the necessary Passover supplies. There were certain essentials for a Passover meal, an obligatory minimum, which understandably had given rise to a vast catering trade in Jerusalem.⁸ t. Pesah. 10:10, for instance, cites R. Eleazar b. R. Saddoq as saying to the grocers of Lud, "Come and buy the spices for a religious duty for yourselves". In accordance with the Torah restrictions (cf. m. Pesah.; t. Pesah. 8:19), a year-old, unblemished male lamb needed to be purchased from the livestock market connected with the temple (cf. m. Šegal. 7:2). The livestock dealers provided a valuable service for the pilgrims, for it was difficult to bring one's own sacrifices to Jerusalem, as well as risky, since the animals might become blemished en route. According to Mek. 12:3 (Pisha 3:45-47), it was not required that all members of the ḥăbûrâ be present for the purchase, for "a man's agent is like himself" (slwhw sl ʔdm kmwtw), a saying attributed to the Sages. It had been, in other words, a long standing tradition that only one need actually make the purchase of the Passover offering. If the ḥăbûrâ had decided in favour of eating a festival offering, this would have to

be purchased along with the Passover lamb.

The Torah also required the consumption of bitter herbs and unleavened bread, so some member of the ḥābûrâ had to purchase these. According to our sources, however, in addition to the three Passover staples mentioned above, other foods had become fixtures of the Passover meal. We read of a spiced fruit puree and a sauce in which to dip the bitter herbs (m. Pesah. 10:3; t. Pesah. 10:9), but most significantly we find that the consumption of wine had been added as a requirement of Passover.⁹ The Jewish festival meal, which included the Passover, was structured around the blessing and drinking of four cups of wine (cf. t. Ber. 4:8). The first known reference to wine as a part of the Passover meal is in the book of Jubilees (49:6). According to this passage, the first Passover celebrants drank wine, which is more than likely an anachronism, reflecting rather the practice at the time of the author. At Passover in first-century Palestine, therefore, a minimum of four cups of wine per celebrant was required (m. Pesah. 10:1; t. Pesah. 10:1). According to t. Pesah. 10:1, each cup must be a quarter log, or an eighth of a litre.¹⁰ So enough wine was drunk over the course of the meal to promote a feeling of well-being on the part of the participants. In fact, t. Pesah. 10:4 considers it the religious duty of man to bring joy to his children and dependents by providing enough wine for mild intoxication. The wine was diluted with various amounts of water, depending on its strength (m. Pesah. 10:2; t. Pesah. 10:2).

The final requirement before the festival could begin was that all leaven be removed from the houses where the Passover meal was to be eaten. That this was practised around the time of Jesus is confirmed by our sources.

When exactly the leaven was to be removed from the houses was, however, a subject of controversy. The Mekilta offers us a glimpse of the rabbinic debate concerning how best to interpret the requirement set out in Exod 12:15 that leaven be removed on the first day of the festival (Nisan 15). R. Ishmael, R. Jonathan, and R. Jose all concluded, by the use of different interpretive techniques, that "on the first day" in Exod 12:15, referred, in fact, to the day preceding the first day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread, i.e., before the sacrifice of the Passover on Nisan 14. The stipulation of the removal of leaven in Exod 12:15 presented a problem for several reasons, one of which was, as R. Ishmael explained, that Exod 34:25 required that the Passover offering be offered without leavened bread, meaning, in his view, that it could not be offered while yeast was still in the houses. This meant that the yeast must be removed from the houses before the offering of the Passover on the afternoon of Nisan 14 (Mek. 12:15 (Pisha 8:38-41)). This brings the regulations about the removal of leaven into line with Exod 12:18, where it is stipulated that on Nisan 14 only unleavened bread was to be eaten. The phrase "on the first day" in Exod 12:15 was interpreted, therefore, by the first-century Jew as meaning before the first day, i.e., inclusive of Nisan 15.

The actual practice was, in fact, to remove the leaven from the houses on Nisan 14. According to m. Pesah. 1:1, leaven is to be removed on the night of the fourteenth. In addition, at the sixth hour of Nisan 14, i.e., midday, m. Pesah. 1:4 says that all consumption of leaven is to cease and everything leavened is to be burned. Nisan 14 had become de facto the first day of the festival; or, at least, after midday on Nisan 14 the festival was seen to begin. This gave rise to the occasional reference in rabbinic literature to Nisan 14 as the first day of the feast.¹¹

The rabbis also debated the proper method by which to dispose of leaven (Mek. 12:15 (Pisha 8:47-86)). Based on the hermeneutical principle that what applied to one thing applied to another thing exactly like it, R. Jose argued that, inasmuch as the leftovers of a sacrifice had essentially the same status as leaven, legally and ritually speaking, the latter must be disposed of in the same way as the former, i.e., by burning. The Mishna takes it for granted that the preferred method of the disposal of leaven is burning, although this is not seen as legally required; one need only destroy the leaven in such a way that it can no longer be seen or found. R. Judah ruled that removal of leaven meant burning, but the Sages allowed one to crumble it and scatter it to the wind or throw it into the sea (m. Pesah. 2:1). The Tosepta agrees with the Mishna in the matter of the necessity of removing of leaven at Passover, but adds additional halakic material.

2. The Passover Meal

Now we shall attempt to reconstruct the stages of a typical, first-century Passover celebration.

Exod 12:16, Lev 23:7, and Num 28:18 designate Nisan 15, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, as a day in which no work was to be done. Exod 12:16, however, allows the preparation of food on Nisan 15, unlike the sabbath day proper. That, in general, these regulations were in force in first-century Palestine is evident from our sources. m. Beṣa 5:2 and m. Meg. 1:5 both state that a holy day differs from a sabbath, in that one may prepare food on the former. Mek. 12:16 (Pisha 9:53-67) likewise forbids work on the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and, in fact, extends this requirement to the last day of the festival, including all the intervening days. The preparation of food for oneself and for one's cattle, however, is exempted from this regulation, but not the preparation of food for a stranger.

Certain classes of work were also prohibited after midday on Nisan 14. The Mishna, however, reflects the conditions after the destruction of the temple, because it stipulates that the prohibition against working on Nisan 14 is subject to local practice: in those places where it is the custom to work after midday, it is allowed and vice versa (m. Pesah. 4:1; t. Pesah. 3:14-18). What the practice was in Jerusalem is uncertain. In another ruling, one is allowed to finish work begun prior to Nisan 14, but not allowed to

begin work on Nisan 14, even if one is able to complete it the same day (m. Pesah. 4:6). According to the Sages, those involved in the occupations of tailoring, barbering, and laundering were allowed to practise their trades, for these were essential services for Passover pilgrims (m. Pesah. 4:6; t. Pesah. 3:18). In conclusion, the exact details of the regulations concerning work on Nisan 14 in Jerusalem prior to the destruction of the temple are unknown. It is likely, however, that work, with some exceptions, was not done after midday on Nisan 14, in order to allow for the preparation of Passover.

Exod 12:6 requires that the Passover offering be sacrificed "between the evenings", whereas Deut 16:6 gives the time of sacrifice as "in the evening as the sun sets". Since the meaning of Exod 12:6 is somewhat ambiguous, it was interpreted by post-biblical Judaism in the light of its parallel in Deuteronomy. This seems to be what the book of Jubilees has done, for it interprets "between the evenings" to mean during the period bordering on the evening of Nisan 15. It is forbidden to sacrifice while it is still light. Yet, somewhat liberally, the period of time considered to be between the evenings begins at the third part of the day, i.e., 2:00 p.m. (Jub. 29: 10-12; 19). Mek. 12:6 (Pisha 5:113-29) records the opinions of Rabbi, R. Simon ben Yohai, and R. Nathan, each of whom also read Exod 12:6 in the light of Deut 16:6 and arrived at a conclusion different from that of the book of Jubilees: the time denoted by "between the evenings" began after the sixth hour of the day. For Rabbi

the phrase in Deut 16:6 "at the time when you came out of Egypt" occurring immediately after the phrase "in the evening when the sun goes down" became decisive for the determination of the time of the paschal sacrifices. Time (mô^led) in Deut 16:6 was taken by him to mean the time of the day, rather than the year, i.e., its anniversary. So, since the Israelites were believed to have left Egypt at the sixth hour of the day, the slaughtering was allowed to take place, according to this interpretation, from the sixth hour of the day until evening. R. Simon ben Yohai argued similarly. R. Nathan held that there was no direct proof that "between the evenings" meant after the sixth hour of the day, but he did find a suggestion that this was the case in Jer 6:4 "...The daylight is fading and the shadows of evening grow long." After midday, when the shadows began to grow long, evening could be said to begin.

When we examine Josephus' writings, we discover that the actual practice around the time of the siege of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. was to sacrifice from the ninth hour to the eleventh (B.J. vi. 421). The Mishna, on the other hand, sets the time of the Passover sacrifices after the daily burnt offering (cf. t. Pesah. 4:10), sacrificed normally at the eighth hour and a half and offered up at the ninth hour and a half, but put ahead an hour on Passover. When Nisan 15 fell on a sabbath, however, the daily burnt offerings were slaughtered at the sixth hour and a half and offered up at the seventh hour and a half; the Passover sacrifices are allowed to be slaughtered after that time (m. Pesah. 5:1).

There was also debate concerning how early a properly designated Passover victim could be sacrificed and still be valid (t. Pesah. 4:8, 9). The Mishna sets the earliest possible time for the valid sacrificing of a Passover offering at the sixth hour (m. Pesah. 5:3).

From the evidence given above, it is clear that our sources do not agree concerning the exact time of the Passover sacrifices. We must conclude that, not only were there differing interpretations of this requirement, but possibly also, at different times, different standards were followed. Which source is the most reliable for fixing the time of the sacrificing of the Passover offerings for the time of Jesus is impossible to say. All that one can say with any certainty is that the requirement in Deuteronomy was not taken literally, and for good reason. There were so many Passover victims that several hours were needed to process them.

At the appropriate time, therefore, a member of the hăbûrâ would take the Passover lamb and, in some cases, the festival offering to the temple. Again, the entire hăbûrâ¹ was not required to be present ("A man's agent is like himself"). Information on many points concerning how the actual offering of the Passover sacrifices proceeded is available, however, only from the Mishna and Tosepta. This opens up the possibility of bias, especially as these two works have their roots in Pharisaic Judaism. But, given that what is being described was no longer practised after 70 A.D., in general, there does not appear to be any reason to

suspect bias in our sources. That is, since it was no longer possible to bring Passover offerings to the temple, the correct procedure of sacrificing and preparing them was likely a dead issue. What we have in our sources seems like genuine historical memory, although it is possible that some of the detailed halakic material concerning the cooking and eating of the Passover lamb contained in the Mishna and Tosepta could reflect earlier Pharisaic practice, to which non-Pharisees celebrating the Passover before the destruction of the temple may not have adhered. There really is no way of knowing for certain.

The Passover lambs were sacrificed in three groups; presumably, this was to prevent overcrowding at the temple (m. Pesah. 5:5; t. Pesah. 4:10). m. Pesah. 5:5 justifies this practice by a midrash on "all the assembly of the congregation of Israel", found in Exod 12:6: there are three groups mentioned in this verse--the assembly, the congregation, and Israel--, so the Passover sacrifices ought to be offered in three groups. According to m. Pesah. 5:5, when the first group had entered the forecourts of the temple, the priests closed the gates, and a sustained note (tqy^ch) was sounded and the priests stood there row upon row, each row holding either gold or silver dishes to catch the blood. t. Pesah. 4:10 quotes R. Judah as saying that the third group was the smallest and was known as the "slothful group", probably because they were last to come. The third group, because their turn came during the final third of the allotted time for slaughtering would not be ready to eat

until late, since the lamb would take several hours to roast. When Nisan 14, however, fell on a sabbath, all three groups had to wait until nightfall to carry their offerings back to roast them, since such was forbidden to do on the sabbath. The first group stayed with its offerings at the Temple Mount, the second in the fortification, while the third stayed where they were, in the forecourt of the temple (m. Pesah. 5:10; t. Pesah. 4:12). Thus, when Nisan 14 fell on a sabbath, everyone ate relatively late.

The lamb was brought before a priest, and the representative of the hăbûrâ was required to properly designate the lamb as a paschal sacrifice by telling the officiating priest the purpose for which the lamb had been brought for slaughter (Mek. 12:21 (Pisha 11:20-25); m. Pesah. 5:2; t. Pesah. 4:4; Sipre Deut 16:1 (128); 16:2 (129). An improperly designated sacrifice was invalid. The priests then killed the victim, collected its blood in a dish, and poured the blood on the side of the base of the altar (m. Pesah. 5:2, 5, 6; t. Pesah. 4:0, 11, 12; t. Pesah. 8:14;; Jub. 49:20). If so desired, the offerer could kill the lamb himself (m. Pesah. 5:6). During this entire procedure, the hallel was sung by the Levites (t. Pesah. 4:11); if they completed the hallel before the sacrifices had been completed, they started again, but never, according to t. Pesah. 4:11 and m. Pesah. 5:7, did they have to sing it a third time. After this, the lamb was given back to the offerer, at which time it was hung upon a hook fixed to the wall of the forecourt of the temple, and was flayed (m.

Pesah. 5:9). Then a portion of the the fat was removed, placed upon a tray, and burnt on the altar before the Lord by a priest (Jub. 49:20; m. Pesah. 5:10; t. Pesah. 4:10; 8:14). The lamb was now ready for roasting, and was carried back for that purpose. As was mentioned, at the time of the writing of the book of Jubilees, it was required that the Passover not only be sacrificed in the temple, but be eaten there also. So, either Jubilees represents a sectarian interpretation of the requirements for the Passover festival, or it reflects a time when the Passover meal was eaten in the temple. In any event, the weight of the evidence from our other sources and the sheer physical impossibility of fitting all of the celebrants into the temple for Passover at one time, rule against accepting the practice outlined in the book of Jubilees as the norm for the first century.

Not only did the celebrants need to be culticly pure, the sacrificial lamb itself had to be prevented from contact with uncleanness, which would disqualify it or a part thereof (m. Pesah. 7:5, 9, 12; t. Pesah. 6:4; cf. Lev 7:19). If a lamb became unclean for whatever reason, it had to be burned in front of the temple (m. Pesah. 7:8). Moreover, according to the Mishna, if a Passover lamb happened to be taken outside of Jerusalem, it became unclean and likewise had to be burned (m. Pesah. 7:9); even if a small piece of an offering protruded outside of the house in which it was to be eaten, this portion must be cut away and burned (m. Pesah. 7:17). It is difficult to understand, however, how this last regulation would have been applicable to those who were

forced to hold Passover on roof tops and in court-yards. The uncleanness of the officiating priests or their instruments could also communicate uncleanness to the lamb and the members of the hăbûrâ (t. Pesah. 6:1).

It should be pointed out that the paschal sacrifice at the time of Jesus was classified as belonging to the category of sacred things of the lower grade (qdsym qlym) (m. Zebah 5:6-8; Mek. 12:46 (Pisha 15:76-82)).⁶ In this category is included thank-offerings, the ram of the Nazarite, the peace offerings, the firstling, and the tithe of the cattle. This class of lesser offerings did not have expiatory value, unlike the offerings of the most holy sacrifices. This is further confirmed by Josephus, who classified and explained all the various sacrificial offerings, but never referred to the Passover offering as having an expiatory purpose. Rather, it was a memorial of the original sacrifices, on account of which God passed over the Israelites when he struck down the first-born of the Egyptians (Ant. iii. 224-257; cf. also Ant. ii. 313). Jubilees likewise does not view the paschal lamb as expiatory; rather, it is an acceptable offering before the Lord and a memorial well-pleasing before the Lord (49:9). We shall return to the nature of the Passover feast when we deal with the question of its meaning for the celebrants.

The lamb was then roasted whole on a wooden spit, since a metal one might possibly become hot enough to cause the offering to boil, which was forbidden in the Torah (t. Pesah. 5:8; m. Pesah. 7:2; Mek. 12:9 (Pisha 6:66-70)). It

also seems that portable clay ovens were available in Jerusalem to the Passover pilgrims for the roasting of the lambs (cf. m. Ta'an. 3:8). But the offering could not touch the sides of the oven, since cooking would no longer be the direct result of being roasted by fire, but of the heat of the oven walls. The part of the lamb that came into contact with the oven wall would have to be pared away, according to m. Pesah. 7:2. The same rationale lay behind the injunction against the use of a grill: by grilling, the lamb would be cooked partially by the heat of the metal (m. Pesah. 7:2; Mek. 12:9 (Pisha 6:91)). The lamb was basted while roasting with wine or oil (m. Pesah. 7:3; t. Pesah. 5:9). In literal fulfilment of the command that the Passover be roasted only, the lamb's intestines, which later would be served as an appetizer before the Passover meal proper, and legs were affixed to the spit to prevent their being cooked as a result of indirect heat (Jub. 49:13; m. Pesah 7:1; Mek. 12:9 (Pisha 6:88-91)). The breaking of the bones of the paschal lamb, moreover, was forbidden, in accordance with the Torah proscription, under penalty of the forty stripes (m. Pesah. 7:11; t. Pesah. 6:8).

Although the roasting of the lamb would normally be begun before sunset, i.e., immediately after it was slaughtered, the lamb could not be eaten until evening. The Torah injunction that the Passover be eaten at night (e.g. Exod 12:8) was understood to mean any time after the sun went down (Jub. 49:12; m. Pesah. 10:1; t. Pesah. 10:1). The terminus ad quem, however, was set well before dawn. Jub.

49:12 has it as the third part of the night, i.e., 10:00 p.m., but other sources set it at midnight (m. Ber. 1:1; m. Pesah. 10:9; Mek. 12:8 (Pisha 6:29-44)). The justification, as given in the Mekilta and m. Ber., was that the men of the Great Synagogue set the limit at midnight in order to keep a man from transgression. That is, they put a fence around the Torah, so that, although the Torah allowed the celebration to last until dawn, this limit was brought forward. In addition, the time for the completion of Passover was understood to correspond to the time when Israel went out from Egypt, i.e., at midnight (m. Pesah. 10:9; m. Zebah. 5:8; Sipre Deut 16:6 (133)). At any rate, it was hard enough for some people, especially children, to stay awake during the evening (cf. t. Pesah. 10:9); to be required to make the meal last until dawn would certainly have been physically taxing on the celebrants.

After several hours of roasting, the lamb would be ready for consumption. At this time the Passover meal proper would begin. It must be stated from the outset that our source material for a reconstruction of the details of the meal proper is not as reliable as one would like. First, the account of the meal in our Tannaitic sources, i.e., m. Pesah. 10 and its counterpart in the Tosepta is disappointingly sketchy. Unfortunately, the other sources that have been so useful in other respects fail us at this point. Secondly, therefore, the historian must rely on a description of festival meals in general found in t. Ber., with only a few isolated parallels in m. Ber., in order to fill in the

details of the proceedings of a Passover meal lacking in m. Pesah. and t. Pesah. This means that our reconstruction will, at crucial points, rest principally on one text. The margin for error is thereby greatly increased. Accordingly, our conclusions in this matter when we move to a reconstruction of the Last Supper will be employed tentatively.

What do m. Pesah. 10 and t. Pesah. 10 agree upon as the order of the Passover meal? The meal is eaten in a reclining position, with a minimum of four cups of wine. The drinking of the four cups of wine formed the skeleton of the Passover meal. When the first cup has been filled (lit. "When they mixed for him the first cup" in both texts), he is to recite the benediction over the day and the wine. Who is the "he" in this statement? Given other usages of it in the m. Pesah. 10, it could be that "he" refers to the individual Passover celebrant, so that what is being described is the saying of the blessing individually by each member of the hăbûrâ over his cup of wine.^{12, 13} The "he", however, may also refer to the paterfamilias, which would mean that the blessing would be a common one. In other contexts in the Mishna and Tosepta, the "he" clearly can only refer to the representative of the hăbûrâ. We shall postpone a decision on this question until later. In any case, according to Shammai, the blessing is to be said over the day and then the wine, but, according to Hillel, over the wine and then over the day. In t. Pesah. 10:3, however, we are told that the law decided in favour of Hillel, but whether this ruling was

in place at the time of Jesus is not certain. Whether or not, moreover, the non-Pharisaic Jew used either form is not certain.

What happens after the pouring of the first cup and the saying of the benedictions, however, is difficult to infer from m. Pesah. and t. Pesah. alone. m. Pesah. is the clearest as to the order of the meal from the pouring of the first cup onwards. According to m. Pesah. 10:3, lettuce and, for want of a better term, salad dressing are set before "him", i.e., each participant, and they dip the lettuce and eat until the breaking of the bread. After the pouring of the first cup, t. Pesah. 10:5 says that the servant, i.e., the waiter, presses the innards in salt and offers them to the guests. It is here in the Tosepta that any attempt at giving an orderly and complete account of the Passover meal ends.

After the eating of the lettuce, m. Pesah. 10:3 states that they bring before "him", i.e., each celebrant, unleavened bread, lettuce, fruit spice purée, two cooked dishes, and, when the temple existed, the Passover offering. Obviously, this is the main meal. At this point, they mix for "him" the second cup. Next in sequence is the Passover haggadah, wherein the son asks the father the meaning of the various elements of the meal. But when exactly in the order of the meal this takes place is not stated, although the logical place for it is before the guests begin to eat. Also, at some point before or during the meal, the first part of the hallel is recited (m. Pesah. 10:6; cf. t. Pesah.

10:6-9). Jub. 49:6 likewise includes singing as part of the Passover meal.

The meal having been completed, they mix for him the third cup, and he recites the grace after the meal (m. Pesah. 10:7). Whether each says grace individually or one says it representatively, is not said, but as we shall see, the he/him more than likely refers to the paterfamilias. Finally, the fourth cup is mixed, the hallel is completed, and after it the benediction over the song is recited (m. Pesah. 10:7). According to t. Pesah. 10:7, the end of Ps 118 is to be sung antiphonally by the children. There is no additional drinking allowed between the third and the fourth cup, only between the second and third (m. Pesah. 10:7). Likewise, no dessert (ṣpyqwmn), such as nuts, dates, and parched corn (t. Pesah. 10:11), is to be eaten after the Passover meal.

Passover was one of several types of festival meals, so presumably what is said about festival meals in general in the Tannaitic literature ought also to apply to the Passover. Syllogistically, the logic of this is impeccable, but in historical reconstruction what ought to be is not always the case. The only reliable source for the ascertainment of historical fact is the convergence of evidence. Two possible sources of error exist. First, as we said above, our only Tannaitic source for the order of festival meals is t. Ber., with a few parallels in m. Ber. Secondly, what is true of festival meals in general may not be true of the Passover meal.

According to t. Ber. 4:8, the participants arrive at the place of the festival meal; they are then seated in an antechamber, where they wait for the remaining guests to arrive. When all have assembled, they, i.e., the attendants, give each water, in order to wash one hand. Then they mix individual cups of wine for the participants, and each recites his own benediction over the cup. The wine is mixed and served to the guests in accordance with their importance (t. Ber. 5:6). Next, the appetizers are brought in, and each guest says the blessing over them for himself. Having completed the course of appetizers, the guests leave the antechamber, and recline to the second stage of the meal.

At this point, the attendants bring more water, and the participants wash both hands. They mix the second cup, but this time one person recites the benediction representatively. This is stated explicitly in the Mishna, where it is stipulated that, if people recline to eat, one says the blessing for them all (m. Ber. 6:6). In t. Ber. 4:8, unfortunately, it is ambiguous whether the blessing is said individually or in common, although in p. Ber. 10d4 it is stated that the blessing is said in common. When the cups are refilled during the meal, however, the point is made in t. Ber. that each recites the benediction for himself (t. Ber. 4:12; m. Ber. 6:6), the justification being that one might choke if he attempts to respond with the obligatory amen to a common blessing (t. Ber. 4:12). This implies that there was a previous blessing said in common. More appetizers are then brought in, according to t. Ber. 4:8, and

one person says the benediction over the food on behalf of the entire company of diners; presumably, after several courses of appetizers--although it is not stated explicitly in the account in t. Ber.--the main meal would be served, and a blessing would be said over it, since, according to t. Ber. 4:1, nothing is to be consumed without first being blessed. Also, Billerbeck found evidence in the Talmuds for such a blessing recited in common over the main course.¹⁴

After the main course, the third cup would be mixed, and the blessing recited. According to m. Ber. 6:6, the blessing over the third cup is said representatively. Although t. Ber. 4:8 says nothing about the blessing over the third cup, the grace after the meal, unlike m. Pesah. 10, we do find data on this in other places within this tractate. It is taken for granted in the many texts related to the matter of the blessing over the third cup that it is to be recited in common. (E.g. t. Ber. 5:6; cf. also m. Ber. 7:3, 5; 1 Cor 10:16). Also, if the one appointed to say the blessing wished to honour another, he could transfer the duty to that person (t. Ber. 5:6). Immediately after eating, however, and before the reciting of the blessing, the participants wash their hands and the floor has to be swept (m. Ber. 8:4; t. Ber. 5:28; t. Yoma 2:12f.). There was a dispute between the schools of Hillel and Shammai whether one ought to wash first and then sweep or vice versa, and a dispute about whether one ought to place the napkin after drying one's hands on the table or a cushion (m. Ber. 8:3; t. Ber. 5:27).

We should note that it seems that it was common at some point in the history of the festival meal, including the Passover, that a single cup be used for the third blessing. In t. Ber. 5:9, there is a prohibition against the sharing of a cup, probably for hygienic reasons. Dalman argued convincingly that this reference prohibiting the use of a common cup at meals implied that this was, in fact, the practice of certain groups at certain times. (The same is said of a common plate for the same reason in t. Ber. 5:8.) This makes sense if we assume that prohibitions arise as a response to actual practice. Moreover, Dalman cited post-Tannaitic sources to support the view that the cup of blessing was passed around, the rationale for this practice being that all who drank from the cup participated in the blessing said over the cup. These strengthen his conclusions when taken in conjunction with the single Tosepta passage.¹⁵
¹⁶ It is likely that the cup of blessing was passed around at some point by all or some Jews.

The dessert, eaten after the blessing over the third cup, also requires a blessing (t. Ber. 4:4, 14; m. Ber. 6:7), although not every separate item. The saying of a blessing over one type of food frees another from needing a separate blessing. Incense is also brought in with the dessert, and a blessing over it is recited (m. Ber. 6:6). There is no mention of the fourth cup in t. Ber. and m. Ber., although there is in b. Ber. 6:6, which parallels m. Pesah. 10:7.

The seating arrangement for the feast is worth noting. As was said the participants reclined for a festival

meal. (Ordinary meals were apparently eaten in a sitting position.) This required the use of couches, a very common item in the ancient world. One's status would determine one's place at the table. According to t. Ber. 5:5, if there are two couches, the greatest among them reclines at the head of the first, whereas the second greatest reclines below him. If there are three couches, the greatest reclines at the head of the middle couch, the second most important reclines above him, whereas the third reclines below him. The other guests are then arranged in order.²⁰ The couches could hold more than one person, and usually held three.

The t. Ber. account of the Jewish festival meal can be correlated with the accounts of the Passover meal in t. Pesah. and m. Pesah. What we lack regarding the order of the meal in the latter is supplied for us by the former. The following is a reconstruction of how an actual Passover meal would have proceeded.

The first Passover cup corresponds to the cup given to the individual guests as they entered the antechamber of the house where the meal was to be held. Likewise, the lettuce and salad dressing in m. Pesah. and the lamb intestines in t. Pesah. seem to be the appetizers mentioned in m. Ber. 4:8. The blessing recited over the cup and the day would, therefore, have been said individually, because the ḥăbûrâ had not yet reclined.

Thus, when m. Pesah 10:1 states that the guests have reclined, we take this to mean that they have reclined after having completed the first course of wine and appetizers in

the antechamber. Likewise the existence of a first course makes sense of the son's question in the Passover haggadah concerning why on other nights they must dip only once, but on this night twice, i.e., why there is a first course during which they dip lettuce (m. Pesah. 10:4).

When the group had moved into the dining room from the antechamber and had reclined, more appetizers were served. The second cup was also mixed, corresponding to m. Pesah. 10:3, 4. Whether the wine was mixed first (t. Ber.) or the food was brought in first (m. Pesah.) is not certain. At this point the servant brought water for a second hand washing by the guests, which m. Pesah. omits. The blessing over the second cup was then said in common, which the Mishna omits, but t. Ber. 4:8 includes. Likewise a blessing in common would have been said over the food. In t. Ber., however, as we saw, the meal over which a blessing in common was said was another course of appetizers. Nothing is said of the blessing in common over the meal itself, although we are justified in concluding that this is an oversight in our source. The Mishna, similarly, reports nothing of a course of appetizers nor a blessing in common over the course of appetizers or the meal proper. The Mishna does, however, make reference to the festival offering, which had to be eaten before the Passover meal. The Passover meal had to be that which satiates, so had to be served at the end of the festival meal. It is possible, therefore, that the festival offering corresponds to the second course of appetizers mentioned in t. Ber., taken while reclining.

When the Passover haggadah was recited is not certain, but it must have been sometime between the second and third cups. Jeremias and most others put the recitation of the haggadah prior to eating. This would be the logical place for it, but the sources available to us do not situate it exactly. The first part of the hallel was more than likely sung prior to eating; again this would be the logical place for it, as it would be difficult to sing with a mouth full of food.

When the meal was completed, as all our sources report, the third cup was mixed and a blessing in common said over it. The cup was likely passed around. Afterwards, hands were washed again and the floor was swept. Perhaps incense was brought in. Finally, the fourth cup--mentioned only in m. Pesah.--was filled, and the last part of the festival meal began. No dessert was served, however, after the Passover meal. The second part of the hallel was sung, and a blessing was recited over it.

Billerbeck, however, questioned whether a ḥābūrā at a Passover meal would have eaten the first course in an antechamber and then have moved into the main room, where they then reclined. The statement in m. Pesah. 10:1, "And even a poor person in Israel may not eat until he reclines (ʿd šysb)", taken literally, forbids any eating until the habura has reclined. In addition, the shortage of available space in Jerusalem would have necessitated the elimination of the eating of the course of appetizers in a separate room. We saw that some ḥābūrôt were forced to eat on roofs and in

courtyards. What Billerbeck suggested happened at Passover was that the first and second courses were both eaten in a reclining position: "Wenn es daher in unsrem Mishnasatz heisst, dass auch der Aermste nicht essen soll, bis er sich zu Tische gelegt hat, so folgt daraus, dass beim Passahmahl abweichend von obiger Sitte auch das Vorgericht im Speisesaal selbst in engster Verbindung mit dem Hauptgericht eingenommen worden ist." ^{17, 18} Gordon Bahr's rejoinder to Billerbeck's point was that one must not take the restriction in m. Pesah. 10:1 that nothing be eaten except in a reclining position too literally; instead, he interpreted this to mean that the main course may not be eaten until all have reclined. The exceptions to the rule of reclining before eating that Bahr quoted as proof against a strict interpretation of the passage in question are weak, so Billerbeck's position still remains possible.¹⁹ We should add that there is no indication in the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper that Jesus and the disciples moved from an antechamber to a dining room at some point during the meal. One would expect some hint of this, if the Last Supper was originally a Passover meal, or even if the Passover context was a secondary development.

The question of whether the appetizers were eaten in a reclining position or not will have a bearing on our reconstruction of the Last Supper. In particular, in Mark 14:18 = Matt 26:20, where Jesus and the disciples are said to have reclined, are we to interpret this as a reference to the eating of the main meal or a reference to the reclining for

the course of appetizers?

Similarly, in Luke 22:17, where Jesus took the cup and blessed it, after he and the twelve had already reclined (22:14), are we to understand this as the first or the second cup? The blessing over the cup and the blessing over the day said at the opening of a Passover meal can be interpreted as being recited in common or individually. Again, our decision in this matter hangs on how much we rely on the regulations for festival meals in general to influence our reconstruction of the Passover meal. According to m. Ber. 6:6, when the diners have reclined, the blessing over the wine is said in common. The question is whether, during the first course of the Passover meal, the course of appetizers, the Passover hăbûrâ would already be reclining. In the description of the festival meal in m. Ber. and t. Ber., the company is seated on stools in the antechamber when the first cup is mixed, so they say individual blessings over their cups of wine and over the day. But if during a first-century Passover meal the diners ate the course of appetizers in a reclining position, then the blessing over the first cup would have been said in common. Again, we shall take up this question later.

The accounts of the Passover meal in m. Pesah. and t. Pesah. both lack any reference to the blessing over the bread, which we find in the accounts of the Last Supper. Nor is the blessing over the bread mentioned in the short account of the festival meal in t. Ber. 4:8. Nevertheless, there seems to be adequate evidence in our Tannaitic sources that

the recitation of the blessing over the bread was practised. t. Ber. 4:1 establishes the principle that nothing can be eaten without first having been blessed. This means that, with respect to the course of appetizers, either each individual said his own blessing over the food or the blessing was said in common. This also means that a blessing must have been said over the main course before eating could begin. Our sources, however, are less than clear about the blessing over the main course, although Billerbeck²¹ and Dalman²² found much relevant Talmudic material in this regard. At any rate, it is safe to say that some blessing was said before the meal, but the question is whether that blessing would have been a blessing over the bread alone as representative of the entire meal, as we find in the gospels.

m. Ber. and t. Ber. allow for the possibility of a blessing said over one food representative of all the foods, based on the principle that what is the most important or is the best quality can exempt the other foods from needing separate blessings (m. Ber. 6:7, t. Ber. 4:14, 15). It seems also that bread became such a representative food, and was blessed and distributed by the paterfamilias to begin the meal. The Talmudic material on the centrality of the blessing over the bread and its distribution cited by Billerbeck and Dalman confirms this. In t. Ber. 5:7, moreover, we find a reference to what is likely the blessing over the bread. The passage says that the one who recites the blessing stretches out his hand (to partake of the food) and if he wants to bestow an honour on someone he allows that

person to take the first piece of food from the common plate. What is on this common plate that is blessed and distributed is not said, but it is likely bread. The above evidence, therefore, in conjunction with the existence of the blessing over the bread, its breaking, and its distribution in the accounts of the Last Supper and other places in the gospels (Mark 6:41, 8:6; Luke 24:30), leads to the conclusion that the blessing over the bread was understood as a representative blessing, not only for a first-century Passover meal, but even ordinary, non-festival meals. The absence of any reference to the blessing over the bread in the Mishna and Tosepta is not significant, since these sources evidently do not intend to supply an exhaustive account of the Passover meal.²³

3. Purpose and Meaning of the Passover Celebration

This leads us to our third question of what the meaning of the Passover festival was for a first-century Jew. We shall not concern ourselves with the ultimate origins and, by inference, the original meaning of the Jewish Passover feast. Rather, we shall restrict ourselves to the first century.²⁴

According to the Old Testament, the annual Passover festival commemorated the past event of Israel's miraculous deliverance from Egypt. It was the means by which the Jewish

people are to remember the passing over of the Israelites, when God killed all the first-born of the Egyptians. With one exception, the particular aspects of the meal were not given individual meanings. Deut 16:3 interprets the unleavened bread as the bread of affliction, a symbol of the affliction that the Israelites suffered in Egypt and from which they were delivered.

Our sources for the reconstruction of the first-century Passover meal agree with the Old Testament in this respect. Josephus understood the Passover as a memorial to the great act of God's deliverance, whereby a phratia offered the same sacrifice that the original celebrants did (Ant. iii. 248). The Mekilta makes the same point (Mek. 12:14 (Pisha 7:96-103)). Targum Onkelos (Exod 12:27) states that the Lord had compassion on Israel because of the blood and that the subsequent generations are to celebrate the Passover as a "sacrifice of compassion before the Lord, because he had compassion on the house of the sons of Israel in Egypt". The book of Jubilees specifies that the celebration of Passover ought to be a joyous occasion for its participants (Jub. 49:2, 22), since it is a memorial to the fact that the Israelites were spared the ravages of Mastema, the avenging angel, let loose on the Egyptians (Jub. 49:2). It was a time for lauding, blessing, and giving thanks to the Lord for deliverance from the yoke of bondage (Jub. 49:6). The proper observance of Passover year by year, moreover, ensured that no plague would come upon the people for that year (Jub. 49:15). Finally, t. Pesah., although it lacks any

reference to the meaning of Passover, nevertheless states that it is the religious duty of a man to bring joy to his family and dependents during the festival; this is accomplished in part, as we said already, through sufficient quantities of wine (t. Pesah. 10:4).

The Passover haggadah contained in the Mishna also interprets the meal as the occasion to explain the history of the Jewish people and, in particular, how the people entered into slavery and how they were delivered from the same (m. Pesah. 10:4). In addition, according to R. Gamaliel, three things were necessary to be mentioned on Passover night, or else one had not fulfilled one's duty. These were the Passover lamb--because the Almighty had passed over the houses of the fathers in Egypt--, unleavened bread--because the fathers had been delivered from Egypt--, and bitter herbs--because the Egyptians had made the lives of the fathers bitter. The interpretation given to the unleavened bread probably suggested itself owing to the linguistic similarity between maṣṣâ and the verb yāṣâ, "to go out".²⁵ In every generation, according to R. Gamaliel, it was the duty of each participant to consider himself as if he had just come forth from Egypt. This historical empathy with the original celebrants led to being duty bound to give thanks, to praise, to laud, to glorify, to exalt, to honour, to bless, to extol and to adore God. The feast, in other words, was to be more than a simple remembering of a past event; it was a joyous occasion wherein one celebrated one's own deliverance from slavery into freedom (m. Pesah. 10:5).²⁶

The celebration of the historical event of God's deliverance of his people from their Egyptian bondage was also understood in terms of the covenant. In conformity with the self-understanding of the Jews as the principal participants in salvation-history, the exodus was interpreted as the putting into effect of the promises to Abraham. This interpretation is already explicit in the Old Testament itself. Abraham was told that God was establishing an everlasting covenant with him and his descendants and that the latter would inherit the land (Gen 12, 15, 17). This promise, however, was qualified by the proviso that Abraham's offspring must be enslaved in a foreign country for four hundred years, before the promises would be realized (Gen 15:18). The exodus, therefore, is understood as that promised redemption and the beginning of the fulfilment of the promises.

This point is restated and expanded in the Mekilta. In its interpretation of Exod 12 the Mekilta makes explicit that the exodus was the realization of the covenant promises to Abraham. The meaning of the Passover is to be a memorial (zkrwn) for the Jewish people (Mek. 12:14 (Pisha 7:96-103)). Israel's redemption from slavery in Egypt, moreover, was the reward for their good deeds. This reward consisted of the putting into effect of the covenantal promises given to Abraham (cf. Mek. 12:6 (Pisha 5:1-65)). According to R. Matia ben Heresh, before the exodus, Israel had nothing whereby to merit redemption, so God could not fulfil His age-old promise to Abraham to deliver his progeny. Yet no

reward could be given without religious deeds, and no religious deeds could be performed without law. This was why God gave the command of circumcision (Exod 12:44) and the command to take a lamb four days before its slaughter and to keep it. Without these two meritorious deeds on the part of the Israelites, there could have been no redemption from slavery. The exodus was made possible by both the covenant established with Abraham and the religious merit of the Israelites; the latter put into effect the former.

The Mekilta continues its midrash on Exod 12:6 by quoting R. Eliezer ha-Kappar to the effect that Israel had four virtues whereby it merited redemption: they were above suspicion with regard to chastity, and tale-bearing; they neither changed their names nor their language. Their major fault, and it was major enough to break off the yoke of the law, i.e., to annul the covenant between God and Abraham's offspring, was idolatry. It was for this reason that the people were commanded to obtain a lamb four days before its slaughter. It is not stated exactly what the nature of the connection between the obtaining of the lamb four days prior to Passover and the cessation from idolatry was, but presumably the Israelites renounced idolatry as part of fulfilling the command.

We have seen that the Passover lambs of subsequent celebrations did not have an atoning value; it was one of the minor sacrifices, which were not expiatory in nature. Yet, according to the Old Testament, the sacrifice of the first Passover lambs was redemptive. It was on account of the

blood spread on the door frames that the angel of death passed over the homes of the Israelites, sparing their first-born. With respect to their classification, therefore, it seems that the Passover offerings in Egypt were sui generis. They cannot be classified in the subsequent system of sacrificial offerings that arose after the exodus. But there is no doubt that these sacrifices were instrumental in preventing harm from being worked upon the Israelites by the angel of death and in effecting their subsequent redemption out of Egypt. The application of the blood in the first exodus, in other words, had genuine redemptive benefits. The original Passover lambs were qualitatively different from the subsequent Passover offerings, classified as minor sacrifices and viewed as memorials.

The redemptive value of the blood of the the Passover lambs in Egypt was further elaborated in later exegesis. This seems to be the logical outworking and clarification of what the Old Testament itself says about the Passover sacrifices. Zech 9:11 states, "...In the blood of your covenant I will release your prisoners from the waterless prison." Targum Zech 9:11, however, connects the blood of the covenant, by which Israel shall be released from the waterless pit, with Israel's redemption from servitude in Egypt (ms'bd mšr'w). The blood of the covenant thereby became the means by which the Israelites were redeemed from Egypt, instead of, as in the biblical text, from the waterless pit (mibbôr šên mayim bô), a cipher for the Babylonian captivity. The blood referred to in the Targum is

more than likely the blood of the Passover lambs. The paschal blood, therefore, is the blood of the covenant; that is, it is the blood that makes possible the realization of the covenant promises to Abraham.

Mek. 12:6 (Pisha 5:9-13) also connects Zech 9:11 with the exodus, understanding the reference to the waterless pit, as Targum Zach on the same verse does, as referring to the Egyptian slavery. The "blood of your covenant" (dam beritek) is both the circumcision blood and the blood of the Passover lambs. Circumcision and the obtaining and slaughtering of the Passover lambs were, as we noted, the two duties given to the Israelites whereby they merited the covenant promises. Each duty required the shedding of blood. (We should note that in this interpretation of Zech 9:11 the theme of covenant is connected with the exodus event.)

Ezek 16:6, "Then I passed by and saw you kicking about in your blood, and as you lay there in your blood I said to you, Live", is also connected in rabbinic tradition with circumcision and the blood of the Passover offerings. Both references to blood in Ezekiel are actually in the dual form, so a more appropriate translation would be "in your two-fold bloods" (bēdamyik). The interpreters exploited this peculiarity of the text. In the Mekilta, as we have already seen, both circumcision and the choosing of the paschal sacrifice on Nisan 10 were commands given by God in order to merit redemption from Egypt. Both acts of obedience entailed the shedding of blood, hence the connection with the two-fold bloods of Ezek 16:6; the two-fold bloods shed in obedience to

God's command, moreover, were redemptive (Mek. 12:6 (Pisha 5:1-14)). Similarly, in Exodus Rabbah 12:22 (xvii. 3), it is asked why God protected the Israelites' first-born in Egypt. The response is that through the merit of two kinds of blood Israel was spared, the blood of circumcision and the blood of the Passover sacrifices. Ezek 16:6 is quoted to make the point. Finally, Pirge Rabbi Eliezer (Ch. 29) understands the two-fold bloods in Ezekiel as referring to the blood of circumcision and the Passover lambs, but, additionally, makes it explicit that the redemption out of Egypt was a result of the merit of both bloods.

The Palestinian Targums on Exod 12 likewise interpret the blood of the Passover lambs and circumcision as the means of Israel's redemption from Egypt: "And the blood of the paschal oblation, (like) the matter of circumcision, shall be a bail for you...and I will look upon the worth of the blood, and I will spare you."

Finally, in Exodus Rabbah 12:1 (xv. 12), we find an important midrash pertaining to the redemptive benefits of the paschal blood. Until now, our sources have simply made the point that the blood of the original Passover lambs was instrumental in bringing about the redemption of the Israelites out of Egypt. The midrash by R. Meir preserved in Exodus Rabbah, however, specifies that the redemptive benefit was the expiation of sin, which was the sine qua non of the exodus. It is assumed in most sources that the Israelites were involved in idolatry in Egypt (e.g. Mek. 12:6 (Pisha 5:38-56; cf. Ezek 20:7f.)). According to R. Meir, the first

month was to be the time of redemption, when God would see the blood of the Passover and make an atonement for the Israelites (šny rw^h dm hpsh wmkpr 'lykm). Later, a parable attributed to R. Meir is related, designed to explain the significance of the slaughter of the Passover lambs:

It is as if a king said to his sons: "Know ye that I judge persons on capital charges and condemn them; offer therefore presents to me, so that in case ye are brought before my tribunal I may commute your sentences for something else." So God said to Israel: "I am now occupied in judging souls, and I will tell you how I will have pity on you, through the blood of the Passover and the blood of circumcision, and I will forgive you (w^h ny mkpr 'l npswtykm).

Forgiveness was obtained partly through the sacrifice of the Passover lambs.

The idea that the Passover sacrifices expiated the sins of the Israelites is also implied in Josephus' re-telling of the exodus narrative in his Jewish Antiquities. According to him, the Israelites purified (hegnizon) their houses by the application of the blood of the lambs (Ant. ii. 312). To purify implies the removal of sin, and the term is used in the LXX to designate ritual purity. Also in the Mek. 12:7 (Pisha 6:16-21), R. Ishmael is quoted as teaching that the forefathers in Egypt had three altars: the threshold, the lintel and the two side-posts. The implication is that the blood of the Passover lambs was considered to be expiatory.

At some point in the development of Jewish tradition, the Binding of Isaac and its expiatory value was brought into

relation to the Passover.²⁷ The efficacy of the blood of Passover lambs was viewed as a result of Abraham's prior willingness to sacrifice Isaac and Isaac's willingness to be sacrificed.²⁸ The Fragmentary Targum on Gen 22 has the following prayer offered by Abraham after he had sacrificed the ram found caught in the thicket, "And now I pray for mercies before you, O Lord God, that when the children of Isaac offer in the hour of need, the binding of Isaac their father you may remember on their behalf, and remit and forgive their sins, and deliver them out of all need." Mek. 12:13 (Pisha 7:78-82), similarly, interprets the phrase in Exod 12:13 "And when I see the blood" as "(when) I see the blood of the sacrifice of Isaac". In Mek. 12:23 (Pisha 11:92-96) likewise "blood" in the phrase "And when He sees the blood" is interpreted to mean the blood of Isaac: when Abraham named the place where he bound and was willing to sacrifice Isaac "The Lord will see", what he meant, according to R. Ishmael, was that God would see the blood of Isaac, when the angel of death passed over the houses of the Israelites. According to the Mekilta, it seems that Isaac's blood was actually shed before the ram was substituted for him. This parallels the haggadah on the Binding of Isaac in Pirke Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 31), where Isaac dies--his soul leaves his body--presumably from fright, just as the blade touched his neck, but is revived shortly afterwards. Genesis Rabbah 22:12, however, states that not a drop of Isaac's blood was shed; it was his readiness to be sacrificed that was meritorious. At any rate, Isaac's act was seen as being

the basis for the redemptive value of the Passover lambs. In particular, the value of the Binding of Isaac was expiatory, which grounded the expiatory quality of the Passover blood.

The same idea occurs in the poem of the four (Passover) nights in the Palestinian Targums, where it is said that the Binding of Isaac took place on Passover night. The occurrence of the Passover on the same date on which Isaac was offered up was not coincidental, but owing to the fact that both events belong together salvation-historically. The book of Jubilees confirms this connection between Passover and the Binding of Isaac, insofar as it also specifies that the incident on Mount Moriah involving Abraham and Isaac occurred on Nisan 15 (ch. 17/18), as does Exodus Rabbah (xv. 11), which places the birth and the Binding of Isaac in the month of Nisan, the first month of the year. Exodus Rabbah also grounds the redemptive efficacy of the Passover offerings on the expiatory effects of the Binding of Isaac. R. Meir brought Gen 22:8, "God will provide Himself a lamb etc.", i.e., a substitution for Isaac, into association with Exod 12:5, "Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year." Previously in his midrash on Exod 12, the Passover lambs were said to have made atonement for Israel, so by extension Isaac is really the expiatory basis of the Passover sacrifices. (Exodus Rabbah xvii. 3) Finally, in Exodus Rabbah 12:22 (xvii. 3), the striking of the two side-posts was effective as a result of the merit of Isaac and Jacob. It was for them that God did not allow the Destroyer to enter. It should also be stressed that, not

only did Isaac's binding render efficacious the Passover offerings, but also other sacrifices were intended to be a memorial of Isaac's willing offering of himself and derived their efficacy from this event.²⁹

Finally, in post-biblical interpretation, Mount Moriah, the location where Abraham took Isaac to be sacrificed, was identified as the site where David would later build the temple. Josephus made this explicit (Ant. i. 226); Targum Neofiti on Gen 22 also makes the connection between Mount Moriah and, not only the temple mount, but also the antediluvian altars built by Adam and Noah. The book of Jubilees likewise makes the identification of the mountain of the Lord on which Abraham bound Isaac (Jub. 18:7f.) with the mountain on which the temple was later built, i.e., Mount Zion (Jub. 18:13). The point is clear: the Binding of Isaac is related salvation-historically to the cultic centre of the world, i.e., Zion. His binding, therefore, had a expiatory value.

The significance of the connection of the Binding of Isaac with Passover for Jesus' Last Supper shall be dealt with later. Suffice it to make two points. First, in Jewish tradition, the sacrifice or at least willingness to be offered as a sacrifice of a righteous individual was understood as expiatory. Secondly, Isaac's expiatory act was connected with the Passover offerings both salvation-historically, insofar as it, like the sacrificing of the Passover lambs, took place on Nisan 15, the night of redemption, at the place of the site of the future temple,

and culticly, insofar as it was the ground of the efficacy of the Passover offerings.

Not only, however, does the celebration of Passover intend a past event, but also a future one. On analogy to the redemption from Egypt in the past, the first-century Jew looked forward to a future messianic redemption. The evidence for this is not as abundant as the evidence for the meaning of Passover as a memorial of God's redemptive work in Egypt; nevertheless, it is there in our sources. Since most of our material dates from after the destruction of the second temple and some after the Bar Kokba revolt, it is likely that the messianic-nationalistic hopes were played down in view of these recent disasters. Josephus, for example, said nothing about this future redemption, for obvious reasons, since he wished to present his people to the Roman world as good citizens. He consistently suppressed the messianic elements of Jewish religious and social life. The same could be said of Mishna and Tosepta collections.

Nevertheless, in the Mekilta and Targumic material, we find evidence that the Passover meant for its first-century participant, not only the remembering of past redemption, but also the hope of a typologically analogous event on the same date in the future.³⁰ Nisan 15, according to the Mekilta, is the designated time of redemption. On Nisan 15, God spoke to Abraham at the covenant between the parts (Gen 15:10-18); likewise on Nisan 15 the ministering angels announced to Abraham that Sarah would give birth in a year's time, and Isaac was born exactly a year later;

finally, on Nisan 15, Israel was redeemed from Egypt. These calculations are based on God's foretelling to Abraham of the 430 years of slavery that his descendents must endure in Egypt. The text in Exod 12:41 states that at the end (miggēš) of 430 years in Egypt, which is understood by the Mekilta to mean 430 years from the promise made to Abraham at the cutting of the covenant in Gen 15, Israel would come out of Egypt. The 400 years mentioned in Gen 15:13 refers to the time period from the birth of Isaac to the exodus; hence, Issac must have been born on Nisan 15. The reconfirmation of the promise a year before Issac's birth must also have been Nisan 15 (Gen 18:10). From the covenant between the parts to the exodus there were, therefore, exactly 430 years to the very day (Mek. 12:41 (Pisha 14:78-84)).

It stands to reason that some time in the future on Nisan 15 Israel would be redeemed again. This is R. Joshua's interpretation, found in Mek. 12:42 (Pisha 14:113-121), of the phrase "a night of watching unto the Lord...for all the children of Israel throughout their generations": it was a night of watching and it continues to be for all Israel, for Israel will be redeemed in the future. R. Eliezer, however, expresses a contrary opinion; he sees the future redemption as coming in the month of Tishri. His exegesis, however, seems to be idiosyncratic.

In the poem of the four (Passover) nights, which we have already mentioned in connection with the tradition of the Binding of Isaac, Passover night is said to be the night of redemption, whereupon, not only did God redeem Israel out

of Egypt, but prior to this event had already acted savingly and will act savingly again at the end of the world. The first Passover night was the creation of the world. The second Passover night was when the Lord revealed himself to Abraham. In the same verse, it is said that at thirty-seven years of age Isaac was offered on the altar. It seems that from the context and what we have already seen concerning the connection that Jewish tradition posited between the sacrifice of Isaac and the Passover, we are to understand that this also occurred on Nisan 15. The third night saw the exodus of the Israelites, in fulfilment of the promise to Abraham. The fourth night is yet to come:

When the world reaches its end to be redeemed: the yokes of iron shall be broken and the generations of wickedness shall be blotted out; and Moses will go up from the desert. One will lead at the head of the flock and the other will lead at the head of the flock and his Word will lead between them, and I and they will proceed together. This is the night of the Passover to the name of the Lord: It is a night reserved and set aside for the redemption of all the generations of Israel.

In addition to Moses, the Fragmentary Targum mentions the Messiah as one who will lead at the head of the flock; that Targum Neofiti has two figures leading at the head of the flock with the memra between them, but only mentions Moses as one of the two suggests that the omission of the reference to the Messiah was unintentional. One would naturally expect the Messiah to be involved in the redemption at the end of the world. The Messiah, according to the Fragmentary Targum,

shall come from on high, or this could be translated as from Rome (rwm). A Passover night in the future will be, therefore, the night in which the final redemption of all the generations of Israel shall take place.

We might add that the idea of Passover being the eschatological time of redemption is found in an interpretation in Exodus Rabbah of Exod 12:1, "This month is for you the first month, the first month of your year" (15:11). In this month, Isaac was born, and bound as a sacrifice. In this month, Jacob received his blessings and predicted that this month would be the beginning of salvation. In this month, God redeemed Israel out of Egypt. Finally, in this month Israel "is destined to be redeemed again, as it says: 'As in the days of thy coming forth out of the land of Egypt will I show unto him marvelous things (Micah 7:15)'".

According to Pirge Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 29), not only is it by the merit of the blood of the Passover offerings and circumcision that the first exodus was brought about, but also by the merit of the twofold blood will Israel be redeemed in the future, at the end of the fourth kingdom, i.e., at the Messianic redemption (210).

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

¹ Although it is true that the various sources we have give an idealized portrayal of the Passover and that there could have been greater diversity in its observance than our sources allow, it is likely that, on the whole, our sources for a reconstruction of a first-century Passover mirror what actually happened. In the first place, in many cases a motivation is lacking for falsifying the record. In the second place, the centralization of the festival around the temple in Jerusalem would have encouraged uniformity in the celebration of the Passover, and would have discouraged too much diversity and laxity in practice. Nevertheless, there were, no doubt, many whose Passover celebration fell short of the ideal.

² Josephus, The Life, 7-12.

³ For evidence of the antiquity of the Palestinian Targumic material, cf. Roger Le Déaut, La nuit pascale (Rome: Institut biblique pontifical, 1963), ch. 1.

⁴ Cf. Sipre Deut 16:3 (130)

⁵ Joachim Jeremias attempted to calculate the approximate number of the inhabitants of Jerusalem during Passover in his book, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, revised ed., trans. F. C. and C. H. Cave (London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 77-84

⁶ Notker Fueglistner, in his work Die Heilsbedeutung des Pascha (Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1963), pp. 77-103 argued that the Passover offerings of subsequent generations were seen as expiatory. It does not seem, however, that he can maintain this position against the explicit evidence to the contrary.

⁷ Cf. also Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 3rd ed., trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 43, n. 2; p. 55; p. 75; Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, pp. 115f.; Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, trans. P. Levertoff (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), pp. 93-95.

⁸ Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, p. 46-51.

⁹ For further details, cf. G. J. Bahr, "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words," Novum Testamentum 12 (1970): 181-202. and Billerbeck, IV, 611-39.

¹⁰ For further details, cf. Dalman, op. cit., p. 149.

¹¹ Cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 17, n. 2.

¹² Cf. Ibid., pp. 69f.

¹³ The ambiguous references to "he" and "him" in the account of the Passover meal in m. Pesah. 10 creates a problem for the historian. M. Pesah. uses the third person singular to describe every aspect of the Passover meal, the mixing of and blessings over the cups, as well as the consumption of the meal. Presumably we are to interpret the third person singular as referring to the same historical subject in each instance. But this is not the case. The use of the third person singular in m. Pesah. 10 can refer to one person doing something on behalf of the rest (e.g. blessing) or it could refer to what each person does for himself (e.g., blessing or eating) The use of the third person singular in describing every aspect of the order of the Passover meal seems, therefore, to be stylized, and ought not to be taken as historically descriptive.

¹⁴ Billerbeck, IV, 621.

¹⁵ Dalman, op. cit., p. 153f.

¹⁶ Heinz Schuermann argued in his various articles pertaining to the Last Supper that there was no single cup passed around by the paterfamilias; rather individual cups were used. (Cf. Der Paschamahlbericht (Muenster: Aschendorffesche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968), pp. 60f.; "Das Weiterleben der Sache Jesu im nachoesterlichen Herrenmahl," Biblische Zeitschrift N.F. 16 (1972): 1-23.; "Die Symbolhandlungen Jesu als eschatologische Erfuellungszeichen," Bible und Leben 11 (1970): 29-41; 73-78.; "Jesus' Words in Light of His Actions at the Last Supper," Concilium 40 (1969): 119-41.) Jesus' decision to use a single cup and to pass it around to his disciples departed from the usual practice and was remembered by the disciples precisely for its unusualness. (It was an ipssissimum factum Jesu.) Jesus' intention in using a single cup, according to Schuermann, was to communicate a blessing to his disciples by means of the passing around of the cup. The blessing was a participation in the salvation-historical benefits of his death. Schuermann, however, appears to be wrong in this.

¹⁷ Billerbeck, II, 56; cf. Dalman, op. cit., pp. 115f.

18 Dalman (op. cit., p. 115.) agreed with Billerbeck in this regard.

19 Bahr, op. cit., p. 191.

20 Cf. Dalman, op. cit., p. 115.

21 Billerbeck, IV, 621.

22 Dalman, op. cit., pp. 133-40.

23 The celebration of the Passover became more complicated when Nisan 14 or 15 coincided with the Sabbath. When this happened, certain requirements took priority over the Sabbath laws. R. Akiba laid down the general principle that anything that could be done legally on the eve on the Sabbath did not override the Sabbath laws (m. Pesah. 6:2; t. Pesah. 5:1). Things lawful on the Sabbath included the slaughtering of the Passover, the sprinkling of the blood, the cleansing of the entrails, and the offering up of the fat, but not the roasting, the swilling of the innards, the transporting it beyond the Sabbath's limit, or the removing of its wart (m. Pesah. 6:1). Likewise, on the Sabbath, one was required to flay the lamb without using the hooks in the temple (m. Pesah. 5:9). A festival offering, as we saw, could not be offered on the Sabbath along with the Passover (m. Pesah. 6:3). If one happened to slaughter the Passover lamb on the Sabbath, but did not properly designate it as such, one was liable to a sin-offering for performing a forbidden act of work on the Sabbath (m. Pesah. 6:5; t. Pesah. 5:4).

24 Of particular significance in this regard are: Fueglistter, op. cit.; Le Déaut, op. cit.

25 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 56.

26 We should note that the ritual meaning of the unleavened bread appears not to have been fixed in the time of Jesus. The Mekilta understands the significance of the unleavened bread as a symbol of the haste in which the Israelites left Egypt, i.e., they did not have time to let the dough rise (Mek. 12:39 (14:38-41)). Yet, the same work preserves the Deuteronomic interpretation of the bread as the bread of affliction. The reason that one could not use second tithe money to purchase flour for the purpose of making unleavened bread was that second tithe money was to be used only when one was joyful. But the ritual purpose of eating unleavened bread was not to be joyful, but to feel historical empathy with the sufferings of the forefathers (Mek. 12:20 (10:55-76)). R. Gamaliel's interpretation differs from both.

27 For a fuller exposition of the place of the Binding of Isaac in Jewish theology of the atonement, cf.:

Geza Vermes, "Redemption and Genesis XXII" in Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961); H. J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans H. Knight (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 141-49; Le Deaut, op. cit.; Fueglister, op. cit..

28 For examples in Jewish tradition of Isaac's willingness to be sacrificed, cf. Josephus, Ant. i. 22-236; 4 Macc 13:12, 16:20; Sipre Deut 6:5; Ps-Philo 32:2-4, 40:2.

29 Cf., Vermes, op. cit.; Fueglister, op. cit., pp. 210-15.

30 For a more detailed study, cf. Fueglister, op. cit., pp. 219-26.

II

LITERARY-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SOURCES

We have four potential sources for historical reconstruction. Paul provides us with a version of the words of institution. Matthew, Mark, and Luke also have versions of the words of institution, but situate them within the context of Jesus' last Passover meal, held one day prior to his crucifixion.¹ Our goal in this chapter is to subject these four accounts to a literary-critical analysis. First, we want to investigate the literary relationships among these four potential sources for historical reconstruction. We shall begin by simply comparing the four accounts. Next we shall examine the literary relationship between Mark and Matthew, and then move to a consideration of the more complicated relationship of Luke's account to Mark and 1 Cor 11. The literary-critical questions that we put to our four accounts will necessarily be selective, in accordance with their potential contribution to a reconstruction of the event of the Last Supper. Secondly, we shall examine the Last Supper narratives with a view to ascertaining whether they show evidence of being literarily composite.

A. The Literary Relationships Between the Four Sources

1. A Comparison of the Four Accounts

In the gospel of Mark, the Last Supper is set within the larger context of the Passion narrative, which begins at 14:1. It follows the anointing of Jesus at Bethany, two days prior to his execution. The anointing serves to introduce the reader to the coming events of the Passion, for in 14:1f., two days before the beginning of the festival, the chief priests and the scribes had already plotted to kill Jesus, and in 14:9 Jesus himself said of his being anointed that it was a preparation for his burial. The reader is then reintroduced (cf. 3:19) to the tragic figure of Judas Iscariot, who, in 14:10f., set out to betray Jesus.

The next scene in the sequence of Mark's Passion narrative finds Jesus sending two of his disciples into the Jerusalem to meet a man at whose house they were to eat the Passover. This happened on Nisan 14, "the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread", when it was customary to sacrifice the Passover lamb. The man who would meet them would be carrying a jar of water, and they were to say to him, "The Teacher asks, where is my guest room where I am to eat the Passover with my disciples". Upon being led to an upper room of a house, furnished and ready, the two were to make the necessary preparations. Everything happened as Jesus said it would, and the two disciples prepared the

Passover. That evening Jesus and the twelve arrived.

In 14:18 Jesus and the twelve were already reclining at the table and eating, when Jesus announced that he knew that someone eating with him--one who dipped into the bowl with him--would betray him. The group was saddened, and Jesus then pronounced a woe on his betrayer (14:21): "The Son of Man will be led away just as it is written about him. But woe to that man who betrays the Son of Man; it would be better for him if he had not been born".

At this point Jesus recited the words of institution. While they were eating, Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke it, and gave it to them, saying, "Take; this is my body." (labete; touto estin to sōma mou.) Next Jesus took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to the disciples; they all drank from it (Kai labōn potērion eucharistēsas edōken autois, kai epion ex autou pantes). Concerning the cup Jesus said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" (Touto estin to haima mou tēs diathēkēs to ekchunnomenon hyper pollōn). Jesus next announced that he would not drink from the fruit of the vine again until that day when he would drink it anew in the Kingdom of God. The group sang a hymn, and went out to the Mount of Olives.

Matthew's presentation is in outline identical with that of Mark. Like Mark, Matthew begins with the plot to kill Jesus, moves to the anointing at Bethany, then to Judas' agreement to betray Jesus, to the preparation of the Passover, and finally to the Last Supper itself, after which the group departed for the Mount of Olives.

There are differences, however, between the Matthean words of institution and the Markan. In 26:26, Matthew has an enclitic de, rather than Mark's kai, and identifies explicitly Jesus as the "Handelner".² He also has a kai before the verb eulogesas, and, instead of the Markan indicative (edōken), uses the aorist participle (dous). Also, instead of Mark's simple labete, Matthew has labete, phagete, in addition to identifying the recipients as tois mathētais, different from Mark's autois. In 26:27, Matthew again has a kai before the verb, in this case eucharistēsas, and, in the word over the wine, he has Jesus giving a command to all of his disciples to drink from the cup, whereas Mark uses the indicative, merely describing what the disciples were doing. This necessitates Matthew's use of legōn to introduce this unit of direct speech. In 26:28, Matthew has an enclitic gar after touto, and does not have the Markan kai eipen autois. This is understandable, since, in Matthew's account, Jesus was still speaking, and, therefore, it is unnecessary to introduce direct speech again. In the Matthean text, peri is used instead of the Markan huper in the phrase to echunomenon peri pollōn; Matthew also has eis aphasin hamartiōn completing the participial phrase.

Matthew's account of Jesus' eschatological saying situated, as in the Markan text, after the words of institution differs to some extent from its Markan parallel. In 26:29, Matthew does not have amēn, unlike Mark's account, but has in its place an enclitic de. He also does not introduce the saying with a hoti. Mark's eschatological

saying reads as follows: ouketi ou mē piō ek tou genēmatos tēs ampelou heōs tēs hēmeras ekeinēs hotan auto pinō kainon en tē basileia tou theou. Matthew's version of the same is: ou mē piō ap' arti ek toutou tou genēmatos tēs ampelou heōs tēs hēmeras ekeinēs hotan auto pinō meth' humon kainon en tē basileia tou patros mou. The differences between Matthew and Mark are as follows: Matthew has ap' arti, toutou to tou genēmatos, meth' humon, whereas Mark omits these phrases; rather than the Markan tē basileia tou theou, Matthew has tē basileia tou patros mou.

We conclude that overall Matthew's account differs from Mark in only a few details. Two questions arise from this conclusion. First, how is it that the Matthean words of institution and his version of the eschatological saying are so literarily close to Mark, yet still contain many minor differences? Secondly, of what value is Matthew's account as a potential source for our historical study? We shall answer both of these questions in due time.

In Luke's account, the decision of the chief priests and the scribes to execute Jesus and Judas' plot to betray Jesus (22:1-6) are combined. Then follows the account of the Passover preparation, which is substantially the same as that in Mark/Matthew, except that the two disciples are identified as Peter and John. The anointing at Bethany is omitted by Luke, and, as we shall see, the announcement of the betrayal is situated after the meal.

Next in the sequence of events, Jesus and his disciples were reclining to eat the Passover meal. At first

glance, Luke 22:15-18 is without parallel in Matthew's and Mark's gospels. Jesus said that he greatly desired (epithumiā epethumēsa) to eat this Passover with his disciples before he was to suffer, since he would not eat again until it found fulfilment in the Kingdom of God (ouketi mē phagō auto heōs hotou plērōthē en tē basileia tou theou). Then Jesus took the cup (dexamenos potērion), gave thanks (eucharistēsas), and said (eipen) to his disciples to take the cup and share it among themselves (labete touto kai diamerisate eis autois). After the distribution of the cup, he added that he would not again drink from the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God had come (ou mē piō apo tou nun apo tou genēmatos tēs ampelou heōs hou hē basileia tou theou elthē).

All that is obviously similar in Luke 22:15-18 to material in Mark/Matt is the eschatological saying in Luke 22:18 = Mark 14:25/Matt 26:29. But Luke places this before the breaking of bread, whereas Mark/Matt place it after. The differences between the Lukan and Markan/Matthean versions of this eschatological saying are relatively insignificant. Luke has gar, different from Mark amēn and Matt de; Luke has no hoti + noun clause, different from Mark, but parallel to Matt; Luke has ou mē piō parallel to Matt, different from Mark ouketi ou mē piō; Luke has apo tou nun, different from Matt/Mark, but parallel in meaning to Mark. Luke has apo tou genēmatos, different from Mark ek tou genēmatos tēs ampelou and Matt ek toutou tou k.t.l.; Luke has heōs hou, different from Mark/Matt heōs tēs hēmeras ekeinēs; Luke has hē basileia

tou theou elthē, different from Mark hotan auto pinō kainon en tē basileia tou theou and different from Matt hotan auto pinō meth' humon kainon en tē basileia tou patros mou. The differences between Luke and Mark/Matt are greater than the differences between Mark and Matthew.

A textual problem exists with respect to Luke 22:19-20. A shorter textual tradition ends the Last Supper with 22:19a, whereas the longer text includes 22:19b-20. The longer text, Luke 22:19-20, has more parallels to Mark/Matt than the previous unit, Luke 22:15-18; it also overlaps with Paul's account.

Luke's version of Jesus' handling of the bread in 22:19 parallels both Mark/Matt and 1 Cor at various points. According to Luke, Jesus took bread (kai labōn), parallel to Mark/Matt, but different from 1 Cor (elaben); gave thanks (eucharistēsas), different from Mark/Matt (eulogēsas), but parallel to 1 Cor; broke it (eklasen), parallel to Mark/Matt/1 Cor; distributed it (edōken) parallel to Matt/Mark, but different from 1 Cor (omitted), to them (autois) parallel to Mark, but different from Matt (tois mathētais), and different from 1 Cor (omitted), saying (legōn), different from Mark/Matt/1 Cor (kai eipen). Luke's version of the word over the bread parallels Mark/Matt as far as they go: touto estin to sōma mou, different from 1 Cor (touto mou estin to sōma). He adds, however, the phrase to hyper humōn didomenon, parallel to 1 Cor to hyper humōn, and the anamnesis command touto poieite eis tēn emēn anamnēsin, parallel to 1 Cor.

Jesus' handling of the cup in Luke departs from Mark/Matt, but parallels 1 Cor, the only difference being minor: Luke kai to poterion hōsautōs meta to deipnēsai legōn, different from 1 Cor hōsautōs kai to potērion meta to deipnēsai legōn. Luke's word over the cup parallels 1 Cor for the most part, different from Mark/Matt, again the only difference between Luke and 1 Cor being minor: Luke touto potērion hē kainē diathēkē en tō haimati mou, 1 Cor touto potērion hē kainē diathēkē estin en tō emō haimati. Luke adds, however, to hyper humōn ekchunnomenon, parallel to Mark/Matt, but different from 1 Cor (omitted). The differences between Luke and Mark/Matt with respect to the ekchunnomenon participial phrase are minimal: position of the participle, Luke to hyper humōn ekchunnomenon, parallel to Matt to peri pollōm ekchunnomenon, but different from Mark to ekchunnomenon hyper pollōn; Luke humōn different from Mark/Matt pollōn. Unlike Mark/Matt, Luke has no eschatological saying after the word over the cup.

In Luke's account, Jesus next said that the one who was to betray him was with him at the table, and pronounced a woe on him, referring to himself as the Son of Man. Luke's announcement of the betrayal is different from the Markan/Matthean version in several respects. First, as we said, its position is after the words of institution, so chronologically speaking Jesus and his disciples finished the Passover meal before Jesus announced his foreknowledge of his betrayal. Secondly, unlike Mark/Matt, Luke's version is not broken into two halves, separated by the dispute among the

disciples concerning the identity of the betrayer. Luke has the dispute among the disciples occurring after the announcement. Thirdly, there are significant linguistic differences between the two versions, although there are commonalities. If we leave Luke 22:22 out of consideration, there is only one linguistic commonality between Mark/Matt and Luke, the verb ἔρξαντο in Luke 22:23, parallel to Mark 14:19 and Matt 26:22. Otherwise, there is nothing in these verses to suggest literary dependence. Luke 22:22 and Mark 14:21, however, are very close linguistically. Luke has hoti ho huios men tou anthrōpou kata to hōrismenon poreuetai, plēn ouai tō anthrōpō ekeinō di' hou paradidotai. Mark's and Matthew's version is longer, and reads as follows, hoti ho men huios tou anthrōpou hupagei kathōs gegraptai peri autou; ouai de tō anthrōpō ekeinō di' hou ho huios tou anthropou paradidotai; kalon autō ei ouk egennethe ho anthropos ekeinos (Matt: kalon en auto ei ouk egennēthē ho anthrōpos ekeinos). The distribution of common words among Mark 14:18b-21/Matt 26:21b-25 and Luke 22:21-23 is, therefore, very inequitable: with one exception it is concentrated in Luke 22:22, parallel to Mark 14:21/Matt 26:21.

Luke proceeds to report another dispute over who among the disciples would be the greatest. Jesus replied that the greatest was as the youngest, and the one who ruled like the one who served. Drawing an analogy to the meal that they had just finished, Jesus asked who was greater, the one at the table or the one who served. The question was rhetorical, for he was the one who had served them. Jesus

then conferred on them a kingdom, just as the Father had done for him, so that the disciples would eat and drink at Jesus' table when the reign of God would have come, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. The foretelling of Peter's denial followed upon this, and then Jesus said some final words in which he again predicted his approaching death. Finally, they left, and went to the Mount of Olives. Mark and Matthew have Jesus leave the Upper Room immediately after finishing the meal.

The literary questions that arise from our examination of Luke's account are many and complicated. First, the textual question of the originality of 22:19b-20 must be considered. Then the literary status of 22:15-18 will have to be broached. Is this section a Lukan redaction of Mark, or does it represent the Lukan special tradition? Thirdly, assuming the originality of 22:19b-20, we must inquire into the literary origin of 22:19-20. Fourthly, we shall investigate the literary relationship between Luke 22:15-18 and 22:19-20; Luke differs from Mark and Matthew in including an account of events preliminary to the words of institution. Finally, we shall inquire into the relationship between Luke 22:21-23 and Mark 14:18b-21/Matt 26:21b-25. Are these two literarily related?

The account of the words of institution in 1 Cor, which Paul said that he received from the Lord (ego gar parelabon apo tou kuriou) and delivered to the Corinthian church (ho kai paredōka humin), is given in the context of the correction of abuses at the Lord's Supper. The church at

Corinth had members who, when they came together for the Lord's Supper, would start eating and drinking before all had arrived, with the result that some had eaten their fill and had become drunk, while others were hungry. Paul, in taking steps to rectify this problem, reiterated for them the words of institution.³

Paul's account offers several parallels to Luke's, as we have already seen. There are, however, some differences between 1 Cor 11:23-26 and the synoptics. 1 Cor does not include an introduction to the meal, unlike the synoptics, but has in its place the simple phrase ho kurios Iēsous en tē nukti hē paredidoto k.t.l. The handling of the bread in 1 Cor, unlike Mark/Luke/Matt, consists of a participle and three finite verbs: ...elaben arton kai eucharistēsas ekklasen kai eipen. Paul's word over the bread, different from Luke/Mark/Matt, is touto mou estin to sōma to hyper humōn. The last phrase, to hyper humōn, is absent from Mark/Matt, but parallel to Luke to hyper humōn didomenon. 1 Cor concludes, different from Luke/Mark/Matt, with a second command to repeat, touto poiete, hosakis ean pinēte, eis tēn emēn anamnēsin. For, according to Paul, whenever the Corinthians ate the bread or drank the cup, they proclaimed the Lord's death until he came. The idea, it seems, was that the Lord's Supper proclaimed the kerygma, the Lord's death, every time it was celebrated. The clause "until he comes" relates to the eschatological saying found in Luke 22:15-18, Mark 14:25 and Matt 26:29.

The central literary question that emerges from our

analysis of Paul's account is its relation to Luke. Because the tradition of the words of institution preserved in 1 Cor has such obvious parallels to its Lukan counterpart, we must ask what the exact relationship between them is? In our analysis of the literary origin of Luke 22:19-20, however, we shall, as a part of our inquiry, answer this very question. There is no need, therefore, to deal with the Pauline text separately.

2. The Literary Relationship Between Matthew and Mark

There is no doubt that the Matthean version of the words of institution is literarily related to the Markan. The two texts are practically identical. Matthew reproduces 32 of the 49 words of the Markan account, with four variants, and 13 differences.⁴ The same literary relatedness to the Markan account is evident in the Matthean version of the eschatological saying. A further relevant question, therefore, arises from these observations. What is the nature of this relatedness? Assuming Markan priority, which is a well grounded hypothesis, the answer to this question is that the literary relatedness is the result of Matthew's taking over the Markan account.

We saw, however, that the Matthean words of institution and eschatological outlook differed from Mark at certain points. Whence arise the differences? If Matthew relied upon Mark as a source, why did he introduce changes into his Markan source? This is a little more difficult to

answer. Two further questions follow from this one. First, are the differences to be accounted for by postulating an independent, non-Markan tradition or to Matthean redaction? Secondly, if the latter, under what impulse did the Matthean redactor make his changes?

If Matthew does introduce non-Markan tradition into the Markan source, it would be consistent with his redactional method.⁵ A Matthean tendency is to conflate and abbreviate parallel sources.⁶ This is evident in his redactional treatment of Q and Mark. The reason for our interest in this question is that knowing how Matthew arrived at his final account is relevant to a historical reconstruction of the Last Supper. If Matthew does preserve for us material from an independent source, then this ought to be considered as potential data for a reconstructing of the event; but, if the differences are a result of Matthean redaction, then Matthew's account has only secondary value. The best example of the potential contribution that Matthew could make is towards the problem of how Jesus understood his death. How exactly Jesus conceived the pouring out of his blood in Mark (and Luke/Paul) is ambiguous, and has given rise to differing interpretations. If, however, the Matthean phrase eis aphesin hamartiōn has its origin in the Matthean special tradition, we have a source of equal authority to Mark that portrays Jesus as understanding his death as an expiation for sin. The possibility is then left open that Matthew's word over the cup is authentic. But if the phrase is an element of Matthean redaction, then it is clearly

secondary.⁷

Virtually all exegetes have concluded correctly that Matt 26:26-29 is a Matthean redaction of Mark.^{8, 9} The differences between the two gospels can be accounted for satisfactorily as Matthean redactional alterations to Mark.¹⁰ There is no need to postulate the existence of an independent Matthean source.

It has been demonstrated convincingly that Matthew improves Mark stylistically in the following manner.¹¹ The replacement of the Markan kai with de is an improvement in style, a well attested tendency in Matthew. The addition of ho Iēsous is also a Matthean tendency. Its addition, moreover, is made necessary by Matthew's omission of the name of Jesus in 26:21, unlike the parallel in Mark 14:18. The addition of a kai before eulogēsas is also a stylistic improvement, in that it avoids the undesirable asyndetic juxtaposition of participles, a tendency exhibited by Matthew in other places. The participle dous in Matthew avoids the threefold parataxis in Mark, again resulting in a stylistic improvement. The order kai dous (participle) + eipen (indicative) parallels the previous order of kai eulogēsas eklasen, thus laying stress appropriately on the breaking of the bread and the word of interpretation. Phagete is added to the labete in Mark; as such it is a typical example of the Matthean tendency towards parallel forms, in that phagete stands parallel to piete in 26:27. The disciples are named explicitly as the recipients of the bread, again for good reason, since, unlike Mark, the antecedent of a personal

pronoun at this point in the Matthean narrative would not be the disciples, but Judas. The use of autois would, therefore, be inappropriate. Moreover, a redactional peculiarity of Matthew is to add a reference to Jesus' disciples to his source.¹²

In Matt 26:27 another kai is inserted between two participles (labōn and eucharistēsas), again in order to avoid an asyndetic structure, and in an effort to make 26:26 and 26:27 symmetrical. Matthew changes the indicative epiōn in Mark to the imperative piete, thereby transposing indirect speech into direct speech. This forces him to introduce legōn before piete, and omit the eipen found in Mark 14:24 as unnecessary. The tendency to transpose indirect speech from his source into direct speech is characteristic of Matthew. That Matthew is dependent on Mark's phrase, and not a non-Markan source, is evident from the superfluity of the phrase ex autou pantes. This phrase is redundant when used with the imperative piete.

The addition of gar in Matt 26:28 is made necessary by the Matthean command to drink. Matthew replaces the Markan huper pollōn with peri pollōn; this is typical of the Matthean redaction, and not evidence of a translation variant possibly indicating an independent source. Matthew's addition of eis aphasin hamartiōn ought to be understood as an elaboration of the Markan text. It is improbable that such a theologically important tradition would be excluded by the other sources.

The eschatological saying in Matthew differs from

Mark's account in several respects. These changes are also explainable as stylistic innovations. The omission of hoti is in keeping with Matthean redactional tendencies.¹³ The replacement of the Mark amēn with de is not typical of Matthew, who prefers to include it, although it is not completely foreign to him as participant in the tendency to hellenize the tradition. Matthew also eliminates the Markan Semitism ouketi ou mē as redundant. Ap' arti can be seen as clarification of Mark, consistent with Matthean usage: "The force of the phrase is to indicate the strong heightening of a moment in time by a decisive separation from the past."¹⁴ The addition of touto, likewise, serves to improve Mark's account by making explicit that the genēματος tou ampelou is the cup over which Jesus says his word of interpretation.

Some of the Matthean alterations to the Markan words of institution have, however, been accounted for by recourse to the redactional aims of the evangelist. Such attempts at explanation are, by their very nature, highly tenuous, since it is always possible to fall into over-interpretation and find redactional intention where none exists.¹⁵ It is often impossible to know whether a particular deviation from the Markan text is theologically significant or not. Moreover, in any individual case many hypotheses may fit the same set of data, and it becomes impossible to know which one is correct. This is not to deny that Matthew's redactional aims influenced his handling of Mark, but simply to state that it is not always possible to know precisely what those redactional aims are.

Heinz Schuermann allowed for what he called sacramental interests as a motive behind some of the Matthean changes. In particular, the transposition of Mark's epion ex auto pantes into piete k.t.l. and the addition of eis aphen̄sin hamartiōn reflected Matthew's interest in the "haeufigen Kommunion der Gemeinde".¹⁶ This is not the same thing as positing a liturgical influence on the final shape of the Matthean account, since these redactional changes are directly from the hand of the Matthean redactor, and not secondarily taken over from existing liturgical practice. Rudolf Pesch reduced the differences between Mark and Matthew not accounted for from stylistic considerations to Matthew's christology and ecclesiology. For example, according to Pesch, Matthew added the phrase eis aphen̄sin hamartiōn to Jesus' words in Mark, and at the same time deleted the same from the account of John the Baptist's preaching in Mark 1:4, different from Matt 3:2, for christological reasons: "Die Vergebung der Suenden ist fuer Matt nicht an die Taufe des Johannes, sondern an Jesu Suhnetod gebunden."¹⁷ The reference to the disciples in 26:26 (tois mathētais) and in 26:29 (meth' humōn), similarly reflected Matthew's interest in the disciples, "die zugleich freilich typologische Funktion im Blick auf die Christen uebernehmen".¹⁸ According to Donald Senior, Matthew's theological interest influencing his redaction of Mark was soteriological (similar to what Pesch calls christological), evidenced in Matthew's insertion of eis aphen̄sin hamartiōn. In addition, the phrase ap' arti informed the reader most dramatically of Jesus' foreknowledge

of his own Passion and of the decisive turning point in history that this represented.¹⁹ Finally, Dahl saw the Matthean reworking of Mark as an attempt to establish the eucharist as the eschatological replacement of the Passover, to be celebrated by the new community of God, the church.²⁰

Another widely accepted explanation of the differences between the Matthean words of institution and the Markan not attributable to stylistic improvement is the postulation of a liturgizing tendency. That is, Matthew's account has been influenced by the eucharistic liturgy of the early church. Xavier Leon-Dufour, Hermann Patsch, Joachim Jeremias, and others argued for this view.²¹ This heuristic device accounts also for some of the above mentioned differences attributed to the tendency towards stylistic improvement. The addition of the name Jesus to Mark's account allows the narrative to begin anew, independent of what went before. In other words, "Das laesst auf selbstaendige Rezitation schliessen."²² Such would be necessary for liturgical purposes.²³ The placing of kai between labōn and eulogēsas and a kai between eklasen and dous, unlike Mark, puts the stress on the breaking of the bread and the corresponding word of interpretation. This again is evidence of liturgical stylization. (Cf. also the addition of a kai in 26:27, although there is no action corresponding to the verb eklasen.) Matthew's addition of phagete to Mark's labete is an attempt to make the drinking of the wine symmetrical to the breaking of the bread: Piete in 26:27 is parallel to phagete in 26:26. The change of

Mark's indicative epion to Matthew's imperative piete, which leads to the addition of phagete, took place, according to the liturgizing hypothesis, as a result of actual use of imperative forms in the eucharist. The change personalizes the narrative for the participants; the Lord is speaking directly to them, so that the text ceases to be a strictly historical account. As Jeremias pointed out, the words of interpretation became a formula of distribution.²⁴ Similarly, the insertion of gar in 26:28 places the stress on the command to drink and grounds it theologically on the word over the cup. We should notice the chronological change that results from this. In Mark, the disciples have finished drinking before Jesus' word over the cup, whereas in Matthew it is said prior to drinking. For liturgical purposes, it is understandable how such a change would take place. With the addition of the interpretive gloss eis aphesin hamartiōn we have the attempt to clarify in what sense the blood was poured out for the many, perhaps for the sake of the participants in the eucharist. Patsch concluded, "So seht fuer augenblickliche Fragestellung fest, dass der Einsetzungbericht des Matt nicht literarisch aus Mark entwickelt ist, sondern die liturgische Tradition der Matt Gemeinde wiedergibt."^{25, 26}

Fortunately, it is not necessary for our purposes to solve the problem of whether the present form of the Matthean words of institution ought to be explained by recourse to Matthew's redactional aims or by the postulation of a liturgizing tendency. Stylistically, it is evident that

Matthew is working to improve the Markan account, and not working into Mark a non-Mark unit of tradition. If, however, some of these differences are not stylistic improvements, but are theologically motivated or reflect the eucharistic liturgy of the Matthean community, for the purpose of a historical reconstruction of the Last Supper, this is irrelevant. Whatever the particulars of the Matthean redaction, his account is clearly secondary. This means that Matthew is excluded as a historical source. For what it is worth, it would seem that the liturgizing hypothesis is preferable to the postulation of Matthean redactional aims, since the former seeks to explain an unknown--Matthew's alterations to Mark--by a known--the liturgy of the eucharist, rather than an unknown by another unknown--the Matthean redactional aims.

Nevertheless, Matthew may prove to be relevant to our investigation in another way. We have seen that he interprets Mark's hyper pollōn as peri pollōn eis aphasin hamartiōn. Does Matthew, therefore, merely clarify what is already there in the Markan account, or does he impose a theological interpretation upon it? In other words, can Matthew's account be used to help elucidate Jesus' own understanding of his death, that is, assuming that Mark's account gives us access to the event of the Last Supper? Obviously, Matthew cannot be used uncritically as a direct entry into Jesus' intentions, but still perhaps his interpretation imposes on us a prima facie obligation to consider the possibility that Jesus did view his death as

expiatory.²⁷ Matthew's interpretation may be useful as a guideline for a reconstruction of the event. It is wrong to draw the conclusion that, because Matthew's account is secondary, it is also irrelevant.

3. The Literary Relationship Between Luke and Mark and Luke and 1 Corinthians

The Lukan text, as we have seen, is similar to but also different from Mark, and has undeniable parallels to the words of institution in 1 Cor. By far it presents the most problems with respect to its evaluation as a potential source for historical reconstruction.

Let us begin with the textual problem. Is the shorter or the longer text the more original? Before 1950, the general consensus was in favour of the shorter text; Luke 22:19b-20 was judged to be a later interpolation. Since that time, most exegetes have decided in favour of the longer text, principally on grounds of the external textual evidence. The Greek mss. evidence supports the longer text. It is unnecessary to go into much detail into the textual evidence supporting the greater originality of the longer text, since this has already been done competently several times.²⁸ In addition, as Fitzmyer pointed out, on the basis of the principle of the lectio difficilior the longer text should have priority. It is more conceivable that the two cups in Luke would be reduced to one, in assimilation to the other accounts.²⁹ An objection to greater originality of the

longer text is that 22:19b-20 appears to be an interpolation from the accounts in 1 Cor 11:23-25 and Mark 14:24b. We shall deal with this more fully later; for the moment, suffice it to say that, even assuming that there is a literary dependence of Luke 22:19b-20 on 1 Cor 11:23-25/Mark 14:23a, 24b, one cannot conclude that this is evidence of textual interpolation. It only allows such a conclusion, rather than compels it. The manuscript evidence in favour of the longer text outweighs this objection by far. The only substantial objection to the longer text is the difficulty of explaining the origin of the shorter text from it. But the lack of such an explanation does not overturn the other considerations. We shall proceed on the premise that the longer text is the more original.

We move now to the question of the literary status of Luke 22:15-18. It has been suggested that 22:15-18 is a redactional composition based on Mark 14:22-25. What is common to Mark 14:22-25 and Luke 22:15-18 that one might conclude that there exists a literary dependence? Both have a version of Jesus' eschatological saying of not drinking from the fruit of the vine until the coming of the Kingdom of God. Luke has ou mē piō apo tou nun apo tou genēmatos tēs ampelou heōs hou hē basilea tou theou elthē (22:18), whereas Mark's version is: ou mē piō ek tou genēmatos tēs ampelou heōs tēs hēmepas ekeinēs hotan auto pinō kainon en tē basileia tou theou (14:25). The two are similar, but do differ significantly. In addition, Luke places his eschatological saying after the distribution of the first

cup, whereas there is only one cup mentioned in Mark. Luke, moreover, has a similar eschatological saying uttered by Jesus situated before any mention of the bread or the cup: ouketi ou mē phagō auto heōs hotou plerōthē en tē basileia tou theou. (2:16) It is introduced by Jesus' statement that he greatly desired to eat the Passover with his disciples, which is also unparalleled in Mark. There is also some, but not much, similarity between Luke 22:17, Kai dexamenos poterion eucharistēsas eipen; labete touto kai diamerisate eis autous, and Mark 14:23, Kai labōn potērion eucharistēsas edōken autois. If, then, there is a Lukan literary dependence, one must postulate significant Lukan redactional activity. This makes it much more difficult to prove that Luke was working from the Markan text.

According to Martin Dibelius,³⁰ who was followed by Kuemmel,³¹ Luke was supposed to have taken a version of the words of institution and to have joined them to a Passover framework, a literary creation of his own based on the Markan version of the eschatological outlook. Mark's literary fault, from the Lukan perspective, was to introduce the Last Supper as a Passover, but not subsequently describe a Passover meal. Luke remedied this by introducing an eschatological word of Jesus on the Passover lamb (22:15f.) and another on one of the Passover cups (22:17f.). These sayings were variations on Mark 14:25. Only after having established for the reader that the meal was paschal, did Luke give the words of institution (22:19-20).

Pierre Benoit likewise depicted Luke as a corrector

of Mark; as a part of this corrective process, according to Benoit, Luke created 22:15-18 from Mark 14:22-25.³² In support of this view, he pointed to the Lukan linguistic features of 22:15-18, such as the avoidance of Semitisms, the use of the Hebraism epithumia epethumēsa, the absolute use of pathein, and the use of diamerizein.^{33, 34} Benoit recognized that there were two or three Aramiasms, the presence of which were untypical of the Lukan style, but he accounted for these as borrowings from Mark.³⁵ As a Markan redactor, Luke intended to expand on that in Mark which would be open to misunderstanding. Mark's account of the Last Supper was a liturgical formula, according to Benoit, and, as such, had been stripped of any element that did not have some liturgical function. Luke attempted to ensure that his readers understand that the meal was a Passover meal. The theological point aimed at by Luke was that the Last Supper represented the eschatological replacement of the Passover meal. To this end, he made it clear the the bread and wine over which Jesus spoke the words of institution (which, according to Benoit, Luke took from Paul not Mark) were part of a Passover meal. The Passover lamb was mentioned in 22:15-18 (touto to pascha) in order to ensure further that the readers understand that the meal was a Passover. Benoit's view is, therefore, similar to that of Dibelius; the only difference is that Benoit claimed that Luke was making a theological point, while for Dibelius Luke's primary concern was for narrative and historical consistency.

Pesch also argued that Luke 22:15-18 was a Lukan

redaction based on Mark 14:22-25, but offered a different explanation as to the Lukan redactional interests behind this unit. Pesch stated that Luke wanted to portray the Last Supper as a farewell meal; Luke 22:15-18, therefore, served to fill out the too brief account of the Last Supper in Mark. Luke's intention in portraying the Last Supper as a farewell meal--in the literary form of the symposium--was to use it in order to allow Jesus to communicate some important theological points.³⁶ Pesch, like Benoit, explained the non-Lukan features of the text as borrowings from Mark and the Lukan features as from the Lukan redactor.

We find the same approach taken in Joachim Wank, who also began with the assumption that Luke heavily edited the Markan text, in order to make a redactional point about the meaning of the early Christian community's eucharistic practice.³⁷

There are other explanations of the Lukan redactional aim, some different and some complementary to those mentioned above.³⁸ What they all have in common is the view that Luke 22:15-18 is a creation of the Lukan redactor from Mark 14:22-25.

The argument for Lukan literary dependence on Mark, however, tends to be precariously circular: one assumes that Luke made use of Mark, and then one attempts to discover how he redactionally modified his source and to what end. Prima facie, the Lukan narrative 22:15-18 appears to be an independent account with traditional-historical connections with Mark (thus accounting for the parallels on the level of

individual words and phrases). The burden of proof, it would seem, lies with the one who denies that this is the case. But there are no compelling reasons to do this: there are no grounds for accepting the view that the passage is a Lukan redactional construction based on Mark 14:22-25. The hypotheses offered as explanations of the Lukan redactional aim really only hang from a thread. As is often the case with redaction-critical work, cogent evidence is in short supply. There are, in fact, as we shall see, compelling reasons to reject the hypothesis of Lukan literary dependence on Mark.³⁹

Before proceeding further, we should again orient ourselves. If it were provable that Luke 22:15-18 was a product of Lukan redaction, then we would eliminate it as a potential source for historical reconstruction. The case for literary dependence, however, is, as we have said, very weak. So we must reckon with the possibility that Luke 22:15-18 is an independent account of what took place on the night of the Last Supper.

What compelling reasons are there for rejecting the hypothesis that Luke 22:15-18 is a Lukan redactional construction based on Mark 14:22-25? On the one hand, there are general considerations concerning Lukan redactional tendencies. An examination of the Markan material in Luke indicates that 22:15-18 can hardly be based on Mark. Leaving out of consideration the question of proto-Luke, it is clear that Luke, unlike Matthew, keeps Markan material separate from non-Markan,⁴⁰ and, similarly, follows carefully Mark's

order when he does include Markan material. There are four blocks of Markan material taken over by Luke: Luke 4:31-6:11 = Mark 1:21-3:6; Luke 8:4-9:50 = Mark 4:1-25; 3:31-35; 4:35-6:44; 8:27-9:40; Luke 18:15-43 = Mark 10:13-52; Luke 19:29-22:13 = Mark 11:1-14:16.⁴¹ In the taking over of each block, Luke faithfully follows the Markan order, possibly with two minor exceptions: Luke 6:17-19 = Mark 3:7-11a; Luke 8:19-21 = Mark 3:31-35. Luke 6:12-16 is parallel to Mark 3:13-19, so Luke 6:17-19 = Mark 3:7-11a could be interpreted as a change in the Markan order; similarly, Luke 8:19-21 may represent a transposition of Markan material into another block of Markan material.

Jeremias⁴² and Schuermann⁴³ argued, however, that these are not bona fide examples of a change in the order of the pericopes, because Luke merely inserted these units of Markan material, left out of his own redaction of Mark, into the places he deemed appropriate.⁴⁴ According to Schuermann, to whom Jeremias gave his approval, in Luke 6:17-19 and 8:19-21, what we have is not a change in the Markan order, but a postponement ("Nachtrag") of sections of Markan material omitted by Luke. Luke ended his dependence on Mark's order at Luke 6:11 = Mark 3:6; he then retained three pericopes from what he omitted--Luke 6:12-16 = Mark 3:13-19; Luke 6:17:19 = Mark 3:7-11a; Luke 8:19-21 = Mark 3:31-35--and inserted them at different places in his gospel.

This argument is, however, not fully convincing, although it is possible that Luke operated in this manner. One could equally say that these represent genuine changes in

the Markan order.⁴⁵ At first glance, it appears that Luke simply transposed his Markan material: Mark 3:7-12 = Luke 6:17-19 was placed after Mark 3:13-19 = Luke 6:12-16, and Mark 3:31-34 = Luke 8:19-21 was put into another Markan section in Luke (8:4-9:40). But these data may be coincidental, and in fact, Luke may not have transposed, as Jeremias and Schuermann claimed. It seems that the data could be explained in either way.

Whatever our conclusions concerning whether Luke ever transposes his Markan material, it is clear that, if he transposes at all, he does so only rarely. This means that overall Luke is very faithful to the Markan order. But, if Luke's account of the Last Supper is based on Mark, then we must conclude that our author deviates from the Markan order not fewer than four times: the placing of the eschatological saying before the words of institution; the announcement of the betrayal following the words of institution 22:21-22; the lament over the traitor preceeding the disciples' speculations concerning his identity 22:22-23; the prophecy of Peter's denial coming before the group left for Gethsemane. Four such transpositions of the Markan order would be an uncharacteristic handling of Mark as a source. The conclusion, therefore, stands that, when Luke consistently deviates from the Markan order, he is not using Mark as a source, but is drawing on non-Markan material. Luke's narrative of Last Supper, although tradition-historically related to Mark's account, is literarily independent of it. Luke 22:15-18, therefore,

appears to be part of a unit of non-Markan material.

Not only is it uncharacteristic for Luke to transpose the Markan order, it would also be untypical for him to create a completely new unit of tradition from material in Mark.⁴⁶ Luke's respect for Mark as a source tells against the hypothesis that Luke 22:15-18 is a Lukan redaction based on Mark 14:22-25. One need only compare, for example, Luke 22:7-14 with its parallel in Mark 14:12-17 to appreciate the stark contrast between a Lukan redaction of Mark and the Lukan special tradition.⁴⁷ Moreover, the doubling of Mark's eschatological outlook would be uncharacteristic of the evangelist. The gospel of Luke has doublets, but these have not been created intentionally out of one saying taken from a single source. Rather, their origin is a result of the evangelist's taking over two similar sayings from two different sources.⁴⁸ We might add, as further confirmation, that it is a Lukan tendency to shorten his Markan source, not to lengthen it.⁴⁹

On the basis of the above observations, we are justified in holding that Luke 22:15-18 is literarily unrelated to Mark 14:22-25, and must be assigned to the Lukan special tradition.

On the other hand, there are literary grounds based on considerations of the Lukan preferred vocabulary and style for differentiating in 22:15-18 Lukan special tradition from Lukan redaction and both from Markan tradition. In this type of study, it is true that any individual result is tenuous. The data often can be construed in different ways.

Nevertheless, the cumulative force of the results is solid. There is no doubt that Luke 22:15-18 is not a redactional composition based on Mark, for there are simply too many literary particularities unexplainable on the hypothesis of a Lukan redaction of Mark. In particular, there are too many examples of non-Lukan and non-Markan usage. This means that Pesch's reconstruction of the sources for Luke's redactional composition, for example, verges on complete supposition. Although one may have problems at times differentiating the Lukan tradition from the Lukan redaction, both unquestionably exist, and this leads to the conclusion that 22:15-18 is literarily unrelated to Mark.

A disputed point, however, is whether Luke 22:14 is a Lukan redaction of Mark 14:17-18a. This is a good example of how tenuous this type of argumentation can be. Jeremias saw 22:14 as the beginning of a section of non-Markan material in Luke.⁵⁰ Lukan redaction was postulated for the designation of the twelve as hoi apostoloi, a Lukan preferred word and the use of sun, a characteristic Lukan usage. Kai hote, on the other hand, was Lukan tradition, since Luke normally avoided this phrase. Anepesen likewise was Lukan tradition, since Luke preferred to use kata-verbs to describe the reclining at a table (to eat).

Schuermann viewed 22:14, however, as part of the Lukan redaction of Mark 14:17-18a.⁵¹ Luke changed Mark's opsias genomenēs into egeneto he hōra, in order to avoid the use of a non-preferred manner of speaking. Schuermann remarked that "Bei Mark ist an die Vorschrift von Ex 12,8

errinert, wo als Termin der Paschafeier die Nacht angegeben ist" ⁵², whereas Luke avoided this, in accord with his insensitivity to Jewish themes in his sources. Schuermann admitted that Luke disliked the phrase kai hote, but pointed out that he did not avoid it completely. He concluded that Luke wrote kai, rather than de, most often when he was dependent on one of his sources. Luke used anepesen rather than the Markan erchetai. Schuermann accounted for this by positing that Luke dropped erchetai from Mark's phrase epchetai...kai anakeimenon, replacing the participle anakeimenon by anepesen, although he recognized that Luke had no preference for this verb. Luke changed the Markan meta tōn dōdeka to apostoloi sun auto, because, as Jeremias pointed out, these were part of the Lukan preferred vocabulary.

The evidence, therefore, is ambiguous with respect to the literary origin of Luke 22:14. This verse is similar enough to Mark 14:17-18a to support Schuermann's hypothesis of Markan literary dependence. On the other hand, Jeremias would argue that the similarity is the result of both functioning as introductions to the same event. Fortunately, for the purposes of historical reconstruction, it is not important to solve this apparently insoluble problem.

Although it is impossible one way or the other to determine the literary origin of Luke 22:14, this is not the case for Luke 22:15-18. A comprehensive analysis of Luke 22:15-18 reveals that it is non-Markan. As we said, it is a mixture of Lukan redaction and Lukan tradition. The details

of its composition, i.e., what is Lukan redaction and what is Lukan tradition, we shall touch upon only in broad outline, since too detailed an analysis would lead us too far afield.

Vincent Taylor estimated that the percentage of common vocabulary between Luke 22:15-18 and Mark 14:22-25 was too low to ground an argument for literary dependence; the two had only thirty-four words out of ninety-one (37.3 per cent) in common.⁵³ If the passage was a Lukan redaction of Markan, then one would expect a higher percentage of linguistic agreement. But this is not the case.

Jeremias⁵⁴ and Schuermann⁵⁵, moreover, gave ample evidence of the pre-Lukan and non-Markan origin of 22:15-18. There are enough deviations from the Lukan preferred vocabulary and style that have no parallels in Mark to conclude that the passage is largely composed of Lukan special tradition with some Lukan redaction. One can isolate the phrase kai eipen (22:15) as pre-Lukan (Luke prefers eipen de). The omission of amēn is likewise pre-Lukan. Luke takes amēn over from Mark three of five times, translating it in the remaining two as alēthōs. This means that the Lukan legō gar humin (22:16; 22:18) is not an example of the deliberate avoidance by the Lukan redactor of Mark's amen legō humin (14:25). Rather, the Lukan form stems from the Lukan special tradition. Luke also normally places a demonstrative adjective after a substantive, rather than before, as in 22:15 (touto to pascha). The phrase legō...humin, although very prevalent in Luke (but not Acts) is pre-Lukan. (The Lukan preference is the use of pros + acc. after a verbum

dicendi.) In addition the use of gar in lego gar humin, different from Mark 14:25 amēn legō humin, is not an indication of Lukan redaction. As stated above, Luke does not tend to replace the Markan amēn with a more graecized equivalent. Gar is part of the Lukan tradition. Ou mē (22:16, 22:18) likewise is pre-Lukan, since Luke generally avoids it. It is unlikely, therefore, that in 22:18 he would replace Mark's ouketi ou mē (14:25) with it. The use of heōs houtou in 22:16 (rather than heōs hou in 22:18) is also pre-Lukan; it is again unlikely that in 22:16 Luke would change the Markan heōs tēs hēmeras ekeinēs to heōs outou. Luke does not use the verb eucharisteō absolutely; he prefers to use the verbs eucharisteō and eulogeō with the dative. We could also add: epithumeō with the infinitive (22:15) is pre-Lukan; the construction diamerisate eis heautous (used in the sense of to distribute) is foreign to the Lukan usage.

Now, as Schuermann recognized, not all these examples have the same level of probability of being pre-Lukan and non-Markan in origin; he often ranked individual cases more or less probable. Sometimes Schuermann and Jeremias disagreed concerning which linguistic usages were distinctive of the Lukan special tradition (eg. apo tou nun in 22:18). And, in some cases, Pesch suggested plausible alternative explanations for the apparent non-Lukan character of a Lukan redaction of Mark. He also cited many examples of Lukan redaction. The question, therefore, is whether there are enough instances of non-Lukan usage unexplainable as Markan redaction to justify the conclusion that Luke 22:15-18 is

lightly edited, Lukan special tradition. It would seem that there are. As Schuermann put it, "Die literarkritische Untersuchung hat zu dem Ergebnis gefuehrt, dass Lk 22,15 eine von Luk leicht redigierte und von Mk 14:25 literarisch unabhaengige T bewahrt ist, von der ein Rudiment in teilweise urspruenglicherer Fassung auch noch Mk 14,25 auf uns gekommen ist."⁵⁶

In addition, Schuermann offered further arguments pointing to the unlikelihood that Luke 22:15-18 was constructed from Mark 14:22-25. First, if the Lukan redactor created the eschatological sayings found in 22:16 and 22:18 from Mark 14:25, he would not likely have made the two sayings unparallel. But in their present forms they are: 22:16 has a hoti + noun clause, whereas 22:18 does not; 22:16 has ouketi ou mē phagō, whereas 22:18 has ou mē piō; 22:16 has heōs hotou, whereas 22:18 has heos hou; 22:16 has plerōthē...en tē basileia tou theou, whereas 22:18 has hē basileia tou theou elthē. Secondly, Schuermann examined 22:17 in relation to Mark 12:23, and concluded that the dependence was of Mark on Luke, not vice versa. In addition to the non-Lukan features of Luke 22:17, he pointed to several considerations, which we cannot reproduce here. Thirdly, Schuermann found evidence that the Markan placing of eschatological outlook immediately following upon the words of institution was literarily secondary; the Lukan placement was more original. We shall enumerate these arguments later.

Finally, the overlap in vocabulary between Mark 14:22-24 and Luke 22:15-18 could be the result of both

reflecting common liturgical usage: e.g., eucharistēsas, apo tou genēmatos tēs ampelou, labete. This would explain the parallels between the two without presupposing that Luke's account is a redacted version of Mark.

We conclude that Luke 22:15-18 is literarily independent of Mark. From a historical point of view, this means that we have at least two independent traditions of the events of the Last Supper. The status of Luke 22:14, however, remains uncertain. But not being able to solve the problem of the literary origin of this verse will not affect our investigation.

What will concern us now is the literary origin of Luke 22:19-20. As we saw, this Lukan unit has parallels to the accounts in Mark and 1 Cor. For the sake of simplicity, we shall deal with Luke 22:19a and 22:19b-20 separately.

How does one explain the parallels between Luke 22:19a and Mark 14:22? We have seen that Luke's use of Markan material en bloc ends with Luke 22:13 or 14; his Passion narrative, including the Last Supper, is Lukan special tradition. But could our author have introduced Markan material at individual points within his non-Markan Passion narrative? Or is there some other way to explain the parallels, such as the sharing of a common liturgical tradition?⁵⁷ In Luke 22:19a, 12 of the 14 words have parallels to Mark 14:22, 1 variant, 1 different. How does one account for such extensive linguistic overlap?

If it is characteristic of Luke to introduce portions of Markan material into his non-Markan Passion narrative, the

likelihood that 22:19a is a Lukan redaction of Mark is increased. As we have already pointed out, Luke does not use Mark in a piecemeal fashion, removing individual verses and amalgamating them with non-Markan material. He keeps the Markan material separate from his other sources, and adheres closely to the Markan order in the arrangement of pericopes. Yet there is evidence that there are individual units of Markan material inserted into the Lukan Passion narrative. (The major criterion for suspecting a Markan insertion is a large percentage of common vocabulary.) Taylor provided the following list of possible Markan insertions: Luke 22:22 = Mark 14:21; Luke 22:34 = Mark 14:30; Luke 22:46b = Mark 14:38; Luke 22:50b = Mark 14:47; Luke 22:52-3a = Mark 14:48-9; Luke 22:54b-61 = Mark 14:54, 66-72; Luke 23:3 = Mark 15:2; Luke 23:26 = Mark 15:21; Luke 23:34b = Mark 15:24b; Luke 23:38 = Mark 15:26; Luke 23:44-5 = Mark 15: 33, 38; Luke 23:50-4 = Mark 15: 42-7; Luke 24:10 = Mark 16:1.^{58, 59} Whether or not all of these are genuine Lukan interpolations of Mark is debatable, but some undoubtably are. (Taylor himself was not fully convinced.) It seems at least probable, therefore, that Luke 22:19a is also a Markan insertion.

Indeed, many have argued that it is obvious that Luke 22:19a is a mixed text, combining elements from Mark and 1 Cor, but with a decided preference for the Markan version. (Luke would have followed the Pauline account only in his use of eucharistēsās instead of the Markan eulogēsās.) This seems to be the most popular explanation of the data. Pesch

is one of the more recent exegetes to take this position; he breaks the Lukan text down into its sources, differentiating between Mark, 1 Cor and Lukan redaction.⁶⁰

Why Luke would interpolate Markan material, and then depart from the Markan text is, however, problematic. As we saw above, the verbal agreement between Luke 22:19a and Mark 14:22 seems too great not to suspect literary dependence (12 words of 14 in Luke are paralleled in Mark). But a motive is lacking to explain why Luke would follow Mark closely until 22:19b and then abandon it for another source, evident in 22:19b-20.⁶¹

In this vein, Schuermann argued that the parallels between Luke 22:19a and Mark 14:22 were coincidental and that, in fact, Luke was following his special tradition.⁶² Luke uncharacteristically began with kai, parallel to Mark, suggesting that he was dependent on Mark. But Schuermann pointed out that 22:15, which he concluded was Lukan special tradition, also began with kai, and Luke may, therefore, have been dependent on the same source for 22:19a. Moreover, according to Schuermann, the phrase kai labōn is a traditional formula for meal narratives, and, in fact, Mark's kai esthiontōn autōn labōn, functioning as an introduction to the words of institution, was redactional. Similarly, Luke's use of eucharistēsas, different from Mark eulogēsas, but parallel to 1 Cor, was not to be understood as an abandonment of Mark in favour of 1 Cor. Luke avoided the absolute use of eucharisteō, preferring to use it with the dative. It is unlikely that he would favour eucharisteō over the Markan

eulogeō, especially as at other times he took over the Markan eulogeō (Luke 9:16 = Mark 6:41). The same reasoning applied to Luke's supposed omission of the Markan labete. Since Luke had a labete in 22:17, there was no conceivable reason why he would omit the Markan labete. Rather, "Die Auffordungsformel haette in Luke 19a gut der von Luke 17 entsprochen."⁶³ Finally, the Lukan legōn unexpectedly differed from the Markan and the Pauline kai epien. In summary, according to Schuermann, there was no reason to assume that Luke was dependent on Mark or the tradition contained in 1 Cor.

Taylor offered further arguments for Schuermann's position. Luke's adjectival participle didomenon, since it was found in neither in Mark nor 1 Cor, suggested an independent source. In addition, one must consider the possibility that the agreement of 12 of 14 words was not that significant, when one took into account that a standardized vocabulary for the events of the Last Supper was bound to emerge. The fact that Luke 22:19a had 9 words in common with 1 Cor 11 was evidence that a stylized expression had arisen.⁶⁴

There seems to be no way to prove definitively one way or the other whether Luke 22:19a is a Lukan redaction and interpolation of Mark. The data can be read in two incompatible ways, one suggesting a redaction, the other suggesting an independent tradition, related tradition-historically to both Mark and 1 Cor. Nevertheless, the agreement in 22:19a of 12 of Luke's 14 words with Mark 14:22, barring any further decisive proof to the contrary,

tilts the evidence towards the conclusion of dependence on Mark. The argument against literary dependence fails to make its case; its evidence is too circumstantial. Luke's dependence on his Markan source for 22:19a would mean, therefore, that he was probably also secondarily dependent on the tradition preserved in 1 Cor 11:23. This accounts for his single agreement with the Pauline account in his use of eucharistēsas, different from Mark's eulogēsas.

We move now to the question of the literary status of Luke 22:19b-20. We concluded already that Luke likely is dependent on Mark for 22:19a, and to a lesser extent also dependent on the Pauline account. There is also evidence that Luke abandons the Markan account after 22:19a in favour of the Pauline. Unlike Luke 22:19a, 22:19b-20 stands very close to words of institution cited by Paul in 1 Cor 11:23-26. Of the 28 words in Luke, 25 stand parallel to, 2 variant of, and 1 different from 1 Cor, whereas 4 stand parallel to, 5 variant of, and 19 different from Mark.⁶⁵ Schuermann and Jeremias, however, offered evidence that Luke and the tradition preserved in 1 Cor were not literarily related, but both reached back to a common tradition. Schuermann further concluded that Luke was closer to this earlier tradition.

What evidence is there that Luke 22:19b-20 is pre-Lukan tradition? Jeremias and Schuermann cited many examples of non-Lukan linguistic usage in 22:19b-20.⁶⁶ The use of huper in reference to the atonement of Christ is foreign to Luke, as is anamnēsis. Luke normally uses the

possessive pronoun emos predicatively and pronominally, but not attributively, as in 22:19b. Luke usually prefers the word order hōsautōs...kai rather than kai hōsautōs (22:20); the estin is missing in 22:20b, which is unusual for Luke, since he tends to add the copula to his sources. The awkwardness of 22:20 is an additional proof that 22:19b-20 is not Lukan redaction, but possibly taken over by him from already established liturgical tradition. The nominative participle to huper humōn ekchunnomenon agrees with to poterion and not, as expected, with the dative en tō haimati mou, thus giving the confused impression that the cup is shed and not the blood.⁶⁷ Luke, as a redactor, would have been more precise in his formulations. According to Jeremias, the use of the nominative, rather than the grammatically correct dative, would not have been intolerable in a liturgical setting. Three factors would have contributed towards this. First, in the liturgy, the participial phrase would likely have been heard independently of the previous sentence. Secondly, in the nominative, the phrase would stand parallel to the participial construction of the word over the bread, thus creating a symmetrical form. Thirdly, the familiarity with a long established liturgical formula would have contributed to making the grammatical error inoffensive to the hearer.

We ought also to note that the version of the words of institution in 1 Cor is, similarly, non-Pauline in character. Paul himself claims that the tradition that he passed on to the Corinthians was what he had received from

the Lord (11:23). The terms paralambanō and paradidomai are technical terms in Judaism for the receiving and passing on of oral tradition, corresponding to the Hebrew terms māsar lē and gibbēl min.⁶⁸ In addition, Schuermann argued successfully that the words of institution in 1 Cor had many non-Pauline features.⁶⁹ The conclusion follows that what Paul delivered to the Corinthians was traditional material, which he believed to have originated with Jesus.

The non-Lukan character of 22:19b-20 and its divergences from 1 Cor, along with the traditional character of Pauline account, can be interpreted as indicating that the Lukan words of institution are a liturgical tradition related to, but independent of, the form in 1 Cor.⁷⁰ It is a "third variant" of the liturgical eucharistic formula.⁷¹, which Luke found in his special tradition. This hypothesis explains the differences between 1 Cor. 11 and Luke 22:19-20. It also explains the similarities, in that there was bound to be verbal overlap among the liturgical formulas.

But it is still arguable that Luke interpolated 22:19b-20, part of a version of the words of institution based on a tradition represented by 1 Cor, into his Last Supper narrative. That 22:19a appears to be Markan in origin lends weight to the hypothesis that 22:19b-20 is also an interpolation. This hypothesis would also explain both the non-Lukan and non-Pauline vocabulary and style. Jeremias, like Friedrich Rehkopf and Tim Schramm, worked from the premise that the entire Passion narrative was Lukan special tradition, devoid of any interpolation of Markan material.

Since Luke 22 deviated significantly from the Markan order, he concluded that it had to be Lukan special tradition.⁷² But we ought not to exclude the possibility that Luke introduced Markan or other traditional material into his non-Markan Passion narrative. That is, we ought to leave open the possibility that Luke 22:19b-20 could still be such an interpolation.

Schuermann recognized this explanatory possibility, but rejected it on literary-critical grounds. In conjunction with his conclusion that Luke 22:19a was not a Lukan redaction of Mark, he argued at length, based on his literary and tradition-historical analysis of five differences between Luke and 1 Cor, that 22:19b-20a could not be viewed as a Lukan redaction of the version of the words of institution preserved in 1 Cor. He concluded that in four of the five cases Luke had a reading closer to the common source.⁷³ Luke's to hyper humōn didomenon was more original than 1 Cor to hyper humōn. Luke's command to repeat, according to Schuermann, although grammatically identical to 1 Cor, nevertheless, within the entire context, was a more of a Wiederholungsbefehl, and, therefore, more original, as opposed to the more liturgical Pauline Gedaechtnisbefehl. Likewise, Luke's omission of the copula (estin) was more original, and Luke's use of the possessive personal pronoun placed after the noun (en tō haimati mou) was also more original than Paul's possessive adjective placed before (en tō emō haimati). The Pauline order of hosautos kai, as opposed to Luke's kai...hōsautōs was the only case where the

Pauline version preserved a more original form of the tradition. According to Schuermann, Luke 22:20b to huper humōn ekchunnomenon, which Paul did not include, was a possible Markan interpolation.⁷⁴ Similarly, Paul's addition, touto poieite, hosakasis ean pinēte, eis tēn emēn anamnēsin, was a Pauline redaction.⁷⁵ The point that Schuermann attempted to establish was that Luke's version was not a redaction of a tradition represented by 1 Cor, but, in fact, a related, but more original version of the same tradition that Paul claimed to be quoting. Vincent Taylor found Schuermann's arguments convincing.

It is doubtful, however, whether it is really possible to conclude so much from these five differences between Luke and 1 Cor. Schuermann presented a reasonable case, but he resembled more a criminal lawyer mustering every scrap of evidence in the defense of his client. Patsch correctly questioned the strength of the conclusions that Schuermann drew from such internal evidence.⁷⁶ Paul Neuenzeit, moreover, argued for the opposite conclusion from the same data, which suggests at the very least that the evidence is insufficient to draw such far-reaching conclusions.⁷⁷ Neuenzeit's argument for the priority of the account in 1 Cor would support the hypothesis that Luke 22:19-20 is a mixed text. It seems also that Schuermann may have noticed features and redactional intentions that did not exist.

The data supporting the non-Lukan character of Luke 22:19b-20, the traditional character the Pauline words of

institution, and Luke's divergences from 1 Cor, sometimes in agreement with Mark, therefore, can be explained by another hypothesis. Luke 22:19b-20 may be a Lukan mixed text, a redaction and interpolation of the traditions of the words of institution found in 1 Cor and Mark, but with a decided preference for the Pauline version. Luke's procedure is to follow the tradition represented by 1 Cor, making minor changes to it, but elect to follow Mark's touto estin to sōma mou, rather than the Pauline version touto mou estin to sōma. He also adds the participial phrase to huper humōn ekchunnomenon to the Pauline account, a redacted version of the Markan phrase to ekchunnomenon huper pollōn, found in Mark 14:24. This hypothesis, therefore, postulates that the Pauline and Markan versions are closest to original formulations of the words of institution, and, not only accounts for the non-Lukan usage in 22:19b-20, but also the parallels to 1 Cor and Mark.⁷⁸

Pesch is the most recent advocate of this hypothesis. On the premise that the longer text is more original, a position to which he did not necessarily adhere, Pesch approached the Lukan text on the literary-critical assumption that where Luke agreed with Mark, he was following Mark, where he agreed with 1 Cor he was following the Pauline tradition, and where he diverged from both he was making independent changes in accordance with his redactional intention or stylistic preferences. As we already said in the context of our discussion of Luke 22:15-18, according to Pesch, Luke's interest was to establish the Last Supper as

Jesus' farewell meal. The circular nature of Pesch's explanation is clear, for it assumes from the outset what it attempts to prove. This circularity, however, may yet be justified.

The possibility of presenting feasible cases for the origin of Luke 22:19b-20 in the Lukan special tradition and for its being a mixed text primarily dependent on the tradition of the words of institution preserved in 1 Cor again leads to inconclusive results. The evidence pertaining to the literary origin of Luke 22:19b-20 is ambiguous. A plausible argument can be presented for both alternatives. Assuming that Luke 22:19b-20 is Lukan special tradition, the secondary question whether Luke or 1 Cor has the more original form of the tradition is also unanswerable. What is indisputable is that Luke is non-Lukan, that the tradition in 1 Cor is non-Pauline, and that in some way they are either literarily or historical-traditionally related. But what the exact relation is and which form is earlier is debatable.

Nevertheless, given the verbal parallels between Luke 22:19b-20 and its counterparts in 1 Cor and Mark, and the likelihood that Luke 22:19a is a Lukan redaction of Mark, tentatively we must conclude that Luke 22:19b-20 is a mixed text, principally dependent on the Pauline version but influenced on two occasions by the Markan. Jeremias and Schuermann did not prove beyond reasonable doubt that Luke's version was a third variant of the tradition of the words of institution. This, therefore, allows the conclusion that Luke's special source did not have a version of the words of

institution, but only the description of the Last Supper contained in Luke 22:15-18. Their absence would explain Luke's conflation of the Markan and Pauline accounts.

For the purposes of historical reconstruction, fortunately, it makes little difference that in this matter one can decisively establish neither conclusion. The fact that Luke 22:19b-20 parallels for the most part 1 Cor 11:23b-25 places it in a line of tradition standing against Mark. The differences between Luke and 1 Cor, likewise, are insignificant enough for the purposes of our historical reconstruction that one need not decide which variant is more original.

The more important question for the historian is the relation between Luke 22:15-18 and Luke 22:19-20. Two options present themselves: the two passages are related chronologically, as two parts of the same meal, or they are related thematically, as two versions of the same meal. If the former, the cups in 22:17 and 22:20 are two different cups, drunk at two different times of the meal; if the latter, the cups are the same cup. At this point, we shall restrict ourselves to a study of the literary and redactional relation of Luke 22:15-18 to 22:19-20. Later we shall take up the question of the history of the tradition of these two literary units. As we shall see, Schuermann argued extensively under the rubrics "formkritische" ("aeussere and innere") and "sachkritische", for the separate tradition-historical origins of 22:15-18 and 22:19-20.

Luke's stated purpose in writing his gospel is to

produce an orderly account, after having investigated everything carefully (1:1-3). His sources were previous attempts to put together an account of things handed down by the eyewitnesses and servants of the word. It would seem inconsistent for Luke, therefore, to place two parallel accounts of the Last Supper together without giving sufficient indication of this intention. We ought to read Luke 22:15-20 as a single chronological sequence. This is confirmed by the chronological consistency of the account. The key transition in the narrative is 22:20, where the phrase meta to deipnēsai denotes that the meal has been completed. It is clear, therefore, from the context that the two cups are not identical. The cup in 22:17 corresponds to the first or second Passover cup, whereas the cup in 22:20 corresponds to the cup of blessing, drunk after the meal.⁷⁹

We come now to our final question pertaining to the Lukan narrative. Is Luke's version of the announcement of the betrayal literarily dependent on Mark 14:18b-21? (We shall assume, as we did earlier for the Matthean words of institution and eschatological outlook, that the Matthean account is a Markan redaction.) If we answer in the affirmative, there is a further question to answer: how exactly are the two literarily related? Did Luke insert Mark's announcement of the betrayal after the Last Supper? (Whether the Lukan special source only had Luke 22:15-18 or had a version of the words of institution we shall leave out of the question.) Or did Luke take over a version of the announcement of the betrayal from his special source, where

it was positioned after the Last Supper, and then made individual interpolations from Mark into the text? We should note the implications of this question for historical reconstruction. If the Lukan special source had the announcement of the betrayal after the Last Supper, then we have a chronological disagreement between two traditions of equal authority. But, if Luke as a redactor was responsible for the interpolation of the Markan announcement of the betrayal into his special source, where none existed previously, then the Markan order has priority and the Lukan must be judged to be secondary.

We begin by observing that the Lukan unit 22:21-35 appears to be a self-contained non-Markan block of material, so it seems that the announcement of the betrayal, positioned, as it is, after the Last Supper, belongs to the pre-Lukan tradition.⁸⁰ The burden of proof, therefore, is on the one who claims that Luke 22:21-23 is a redactional reworking and interpolation of Mark. Not only must there be sufficient linguistic evidence to justify considering 22:21-23 as Markan in origin--it is not enough to demonstrate similarity in content--, but it must also be shown that there are Lukanisms in 22:21-23 and no unexplainable deviations from the Lukan style and vocabulary. These two conditions must be met in order to overturn the conclusion of its origin in the Lukan special tradition.

Luke 22:22 has significant linguistic similarity to its counterpart in Mark 14:24. As we noted earlier, the two versions of Jesus' woe against the betrayer in Luke and Mark

are very close. Of the 18 words in Luke 22:22, 12 stand parallel to Mark, 2 are variants, and 4 are different.⁸¹ Most of the differences could be explained, according to Schuermann, as Lukan redaction. For example, he argued that the Lukan kata to hōrismenon, different from Mark kathos gegraptai peri autou, was Luke's attempt to sharpen Mark's point that Jesus' arrest and execution were divinely ordained. The verb horizein is typical of Luke, and so is the use of the substantive participle (to hōrismenos). Poreuetai, which differs from Mark's hupagei is among Luk's preferred words. Luke also characteristically shortens the Markan version.⁸²

Friedrich Rehkopf sought to prove, however, that Mark 14:24 and Luke 22:22 were two variants of an Aramaic original.⁸³ His argument is feasible, but not sufficient to overturn the conclusion that the two are literarily related. With such linguistic similarity between Mark and Luke and indisputable examples of Lukan redaction in Luke 22:22, the burden of proof shifts to the one who would prove that Luke 22:22 is not a Lukan redaction.

Luke 22:21, 23, however, are dissimilar enough from their Markan counterparts that one must either posit significant Lukan redaction, as Schuermann did, or declare that they are literarily unrelated to Mark. There is little, however, that commends the hypothesis that Luke 22:21, 23 are a redaction of Mark 14:18b-20. The only common linguistic feature is the verb erxanto in Luke 22:23, parallel to Mark 14:22. But this is scarcely sufficient to prove that there

is literary dependence. Schuermann attempted to show that the differences between Luke and Mark were not inconsistent with what one would expect from a Lukan redaction, but he was only partially successful.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, both he and Rehkopf agreed that there was ample evidence of Lukan redaction in Luke 22:23. (Lukan redaction in Luke 22:21 was not so evident.) The use of to to introduce an indirect question, the use of the optative eiē, apa, mellōn, prassein and kai autoi could all be reasonably viewed as Lukan. But, as we shall see, there are some linguistic features in Luke 22:21, 23 that cannot be attributed to Lukan redaction.

The decisive question is whether there is evidence that Luke 22:21-23 derives from the Lukan special source. Both Rehkopf and Jeremias pointed to several features that suggested that Luke was working from a non-Markan source. Although the connective plēn is commonplace in Luke's gospel, Rehkopf and Jeremias argued convincingly that its use in Luke 22:21 was not owing to Lukan redactional preference.⁸⁵ Similarly, Luke has no preference for the use of idou without a verb (22:21). Luke is also unlikely to have changed Mark's version to hē chēir tou paradidontos k.t.l., since he normally shows a greater reverence for the words of Jesus (22:21). The rendering of the future by the genitive tou paradidontos me in Luke 22:21 speaks against Lukan redaction, because Luke prefers to give the future by means of a future participle or the use of mellein. The use of the reflexive pronoun heautous with a preposition is likely pre-Lukan, since Luke generally avoids this structure (22:23).⁸⁶

Schuermann recognized the validity of some of these arguments, but judged that Luke was still capable of such vocabulary and style.

The linguistic evidence is more ambiguous than desirable. Schuermann and Rehkopf argued for opposite conclusions, which suggests that the evidence does not clearly point one way or the other. Nevertheless, it would seem that the case for a Markan redaction has not been made. The preferable hypothesis is that Luke took over his version of the announcement of the betrayal from his special source. The existence of non-Lukan and non-Markan linguistic features in 22:21-23 certainly points in this direction. Besides, there is the further problem of why Luke would change Mark so completely, in spite of Schuermann's ingenious reconstructions of the Lukan redactional aims. The explanation in terms of stylistic improvement or theologically motivated redaction seems inadequate to explain the differences. It is more probable that Luke was redacting a non-Markan source.⁸⁷ It is possible, however, as Taylor argued, that Luke 22:22 bears the influence of Mark 14:21. (Rehkopf's point that they represent two versions of the same Aramaic tradition is also possible, but less likely.)

Correlative evidence that Luke 22:21-23 is non-Markan comes from a consideration of Luke's use of Mark in his Passion narrative. What appear to be Markan insertions in Luke follow the Markan order in their appearance. But, if Luke 22:19a is a Markan insertion, which is at least arguable, and Luke 22:21-23 is likewise Markan in origin,

then we have the unusual case of an inversion of the Markan order in Luke's Passion narrative. Mark places the announcement of the betrayal before the words of institution, whereas, in Luke, it is the inverse. On the assumption that 22:19a is a Markan insertion, Luke 22:21-23 seems not to be Markan.

We conclude that the announcement of the betrayal in Luke is not a Markan insertion. It was part of the Lukan special tradition. This means that the tradition of the announcement of the betrayal comes to us in two lines of tradition, each of which has a different position relative to the words of institution.

B. The Compositeness of the Markan and Lukan Narratives of the Last Supper

We move now to the task of analyzing the Last Supper narratives in the synoptic gospels with a view to ascertaining whether they are literarily composite. Since Matthew's account is a redaction of Mark, we shall restrict our analysis to the Markan and Lukan narratives. Is there any evidence that these are composite in nature, and not organic unities? In our attempt to answer this question, we shall look for literarily awkward features, which point to the existence of literary seams. The results of this investigation will have implications for our historical reconstruction and for our tradition-historical analysis, which, in turn, will also affect our attempt to reconstruct

the event of the Last Supper. We shall begin with the Markan

1. The Markan Narrative of the Last Supper

The reference in Mark 14:17 to Jesus' coming to the place of the Passover with the twelve (meta tōn dōdeka) appears contradictory, since, having sent two disciples ahead to prepare the Passover (Mark 14:12-16), Jesus could only have arrived with ten.⁸⁹ This datum is interpreted to mean that, at some point in the history of the tradition, either the unit of the preparation of the Passover or the betrayal was inserted into an already existing narrative and the appropriate changes were not made to the text. There is, in other words, a literary seam between 14:16 and 14:17.

Assuming that Luke 22:14 is derived from Mark, Luke's change of meta tōn dōdeka to hoi apostoloi sun autō could reflect his perception of the contradiction of referring to the remaining disciples as the twelve.

It can be argued that the discrepancy in saying that Jesus and the twelve arrived in the evening for Passover, when in 14:12-16 two are already there, need not be interpreted as indicating the presence of a literary seam, but is simply a narrative oversight. That the two had returned was perhaps accidentally omitted. In preparing for Passover, both or, at least, one of the disciples would have had to take the lamb to the temple to be slain sometime in the late afternoon. It is conceivable that Jesus and the ten met the two disciples in charge of preparations at the

temple, and went to the Upper Room together. Or the term the twelve could be used conventionally to mean the disciples. These are two other explanatory possibilities.

Nevertheless, it would seem that these attempts to explain how twelve disciples could arrive with Jesus, when he earlier had sent two to prepare the Passover, ultimately fail. The lack of recognition in 14:17-20 that two disciples had been sent ahead of Jesus and the remaining ten is, therefore, a symptom of the overall literary awkwardness of the account, pointing to 14:17 as a Markan redaction designed to connect two previously unrelated units of tradition. The phrase kai opsias genomenēs epchetai meta ton dōdeka joins 14:16 with 14:18, thus providing a link between the tradition of the preparation of the Passover and the announcement of the betrayal. But this transition between the two narratives results in such an impression of discontinuity that the conclusion that 14:17 is a redactional connective seems unavoidable. Schenke wrote, "Dennoch verbieten es einfach die Regeln des Erzählens, mit so grossen Zeitzwischenräumen innerhalb einer zusammenhängenden Erzählung zu arbeiten und diese durch so ungenaue Angaben zu überbrücken, wie dies in V.17 geschieht."⁹⁰ If the two narratives originally belonged together, one would expect the transition between them to be much smoother than it is.

The different designations for the disciples as mathētai in Mark 14:12, 13, 14, 16 and hoi dōdeka in 14:17 and 14:20 can be construed as further evidence that two originally unrelated sources, 14:12-16 and 14:18-21, each

referring to the disciples differently, have been joined together.⁹¹ (Matthew takes over this problem from Mark without attempting to correct the problem, although he does drop the second reference to hoi dōdeka from his Markan source; Luke avoids it altogether.) We concluded above that it was likely that 14:17 is a Markan redactional link, joining two previously unrelated units of tradition. If so, then one must ask why Mark would not have said that Jesus arrived with the disciples, rather than with the twelve. It would seem that Mark was faced with two traditions in which the followers of Jesus were designated differently; he did his redactional best to bring the two together. He chose, therefore, to designate Jesus' Passover hăbûrâ in 14:17 as hoi dōdeka in conformity with the use of dōdeka in 14:20.

If Mark 14:17 is not a Markan redaction, then one would have to conclude that it belongs to 14:18-20, since it is unlikely that Jesus' followers would be designated as hoi mathētai four times in a row and then as hoi dōdeka, especially when they were no longer twelve. But it does not seem possible that an independent unit of tradition would begin with 14:17, because this presupposes familiarity with which day was beginning with the commencement of evening and to where Jesus and the twelve had arrived. Similarly, Schenke attempted to establish that 14:17-21 was largely a Markan redaction, but that there is a parallel tradition of the announcement of the betrayal in the Lukan special source attests that it was part of the early tradition connected with the Last Supper, and not a Markan creation.⁹²

Pesch claimed that the use of dōdeka in 14:17 and 14:20 was a linguistic variation demanded by the context and that, therefore, there was no literary awkwardness in the use of two different designations for the followers of Jesus in Mark 14:12-20.⁹³ The change in terminology after 14:16 was necessitated by the reintroduction of Judas. Since Judas, who in 14:10 was designated as one of the twelve, again became the focus of the narrative in 14:17, the disciples accordingly were referred to as the twelve. Pesch is correct in pointing out that in the Passion narrative Iudas ho heis tōn dōdeka is used titularly. But, as said previously, the transition between 14:12-16 and 14:18-21 is too literarily rough not to be redactional; 14:17 is more probably a Markan redactional link used to join two previously unrelated units of tradition, each of which had a different designation for the disciples.

Other attempts have been made to justify the use of these two different designations. It is claimed that the author may have been using the term hoi dōdeka conventionally as a synonym for hoi mathētai.⁹⁴ Or it is suggested that the use of the term hoi dōdeka is necessary because hoi mathētai denotes the larger group of Jesus' followers, which includes the twelve.⁹⁵ Neither effort at explanation, however, is totally convincing. The use of mathētai and dōdeka as designations for the disciples points to the conclusion that at some point in the history of the tradition the traditions of the preparation of the Passover and the announcement of the betrayal were originally unrelated.

That the tradition of the announcement of the betrayal originally circulated independently of the larger context of Jesus' last Passover meal, which 14:12-16 establishes, would also explain the lack of any indication that the meal at which Jesus announced his betrayal was a Passover. This would be superfluous for the purposes of the narrative.

But is there evidence that the event depicted in the tradition of the announcement of the betrayal contradicts a Passover context? Luke's version is consistent with a Passover context, but it is also consistent with any meal eaten in common by Jesus and his disciples. Bultmann argued, however, that Mark's version did not fit a Passover context.⁹⁶ According to him, during a first-century Passover meal, the participants would have had separate bowls, whereas Mark 14:20, ho de eipen autois, heis tōn dōdeka, ho embaptomenos met' emou eis to trublion, implied that there was only a single bowl into which all dipped their food. The meal at which Jesus identified his betrayer, therefore, could not have been a Passover meal. This unit of tradition at some point in the history of the tradition became fixed in a Passover context with the resulting inconsistency.

Bultmann's claim that the tradition of the announcement of the betrayal contradicted the framework of a Passover meal, however, is inaccurate. He held that Billerbeck's placing of this event before the Passover meal proper, during the course of appetizers, was historically impossible. But Bultmann offered no evidence for his

position, and, in fact, Billerbeck's reconstruction is fully convincing. The announcement of the betrayal could, without contradiction, be situated during the course prior to the Passover meal proper. The dipping into the common bowl could be the dipping of the lettuce into the bowl of salad dressing (m. Pesah. 10:3). But even if Billerbeck's position were not convincing, there are other possible ways to integrate the dipping into a paschal framework. Pesch claimed that the bowl into which Jesus and the disciples dipped was the bowl of the fruit puree.⁹⁷ (The fruit puree according to m. Pesah. 10:3 was served along with the meal after the course of appetizers.) This presupposes a different placement of the words of institution relative to the Passover meal from Billerbeck's.⁹⁸ In addition, it is unlikely, contrary to Bultmann, that the participants had individual bowls anyway, whatever was in them. There is no reference to the use of individual bowls in our sources.

The words of institution follow upon the announcement of the betrayal in Mark's gospel. Is there evidence that the connection between these two units of traditions is secondary?

The literary awkwardness in Mark of having two references to the disciples and Jesus eating (14:18a, 22) has been seen as evidence of the work of a redactor, fusing together two originally unrelated traditions.⁹⁹ In this case, it is the tradition concerning the announcement of the betrayal and the words of institution. It is normally assumed that the second esthiontōn was inserted before the

words of institution in order to connect them with a larger narrative context. A literary seam was thereby created.

This is one explanation of the data, but is it the only one, and is it even the best? Pesch argued that the two references to the eating were not redundancies resulting from the fusion of different traditions, but referred to two different stages in Jesus' last Passover meal.¹⁰⁰ The reclining and eating of 14:18a represented the preliminary course, the stage between the first and second cups at which time the guests ate appetizers and drank wine. The eating referred to in 14:22a took place during the meal proper. Thus the second esthiontōn did not signify the existence of a literary seam, but functioned as a narrative connective. The two references to eating were fully intelligible through correlation with a Passover meal. Pesch's explanation assumes that the order of the Passover meal was an exception to the usual procedure at a Jewish festival meal, where the guests would not have reclined for the course of appetizers. But, if the reference to the reclining of the hăbûrâ in 14:18a is to be taken to refer to the meal proper, then the literary seam still exists.

On the other hand, the redactional awkwardness of two references to Jesus and the disciples eating could coincidentally conform to one possible reconstruction of the order of a Passover meal. This is probably the case, since, as we shall argue later, the words of institution, before their incorporation into their present context in the Markan Passion narrative, were a liturgical formula. The kai

esthiontōn in 14:22 is, therefore, a secondary connective link designed to incorporate the eucharistic liturgy into a larger narrative framework. Even if the Markan chronology is historically intelligible, this does not necessarily mean that the text is a unity.

In addition, the words of institution themselves in Mark contain surprisingly no reference to anything distinctly paschal. To be sure, the bread and the wine are parts of a Passover meal, but they are also parts of any Jewish festival meal. Since the reader is told that the meal the two disciples went to prepare was the Passover, one would expect a description of a Passover meal. We conclude that, before their being situated within their larger context in Mark, the words of institution were originally contextless.¹⁰¹ This lack of a context could be the result of various causes, which we shall take up later. But whatever the cause, it is certain that originally the words of institution did not belong to the preceding narratives of the announcement of the betrayal and the preparation for the Passover.

In Mark the eschatological outlook is appended to the words of institution. It has been suggested that the connection in Mark between the two is artificial. This would mean that Mark 14:22-25 contains two distinct units of tradition, which at one time were unrelated. Mark 14:25 portrays Jesus as prefiguring the eschatological banquet by his last meal with his disciples. The orientation is eschatological and future looking. This parallels the thrust behind Luke 22:15-18. But the words of institution are

sacramental and liturgical in nature, with a backward looking emphasis.¹⁰² The two do not seem to belong together.

Bultmann argued that Mark 14:25 was the remnant of a version of the Last Supper represented more fully by Luke 22:15-18¹⁰³; Schuermann held a similar view.¹⁰⁴ Bornkamm also held that the eschatological outlook and the words of institution had separate tradition-historical origins.¹⁰⁵ Some who argue for two versions of the Last Supper view the version with the eschatological thrust as more original and even authentic.¹⁰⁶

Schenke dealt extensively with the Markan arrangement, and concluded that formally and in terms of content 14:25 was too different to belong to 14:24.¹⁰⁷ He also agreed with Pesch that Luke 22:15-18 was a Lukan construction based on Mark 14:25. Formally, 14:25 had to be viewed as an addition to the original unity of 14:22-24; its place in the context was secondary. Since it was introduced by the form amēn legō humin, the saying must originally have been an isolated unit of tradition. Schenke stated that everywhere else in Mark's gospel where a saying of Jesus began with amēn legō humin its context was secondary, so the same was probably true of Mark 14:25. Moreover, the eschatological saying disturbed the parallelism of 14:22-24, because it related only to the word over the cup and not to the word over the bread. That is, its starting point in the text was the fact that the disciples had just drunk the cup of blessing, which Jesus had interpreted in relation to his death. Without 14:25, the Markan words of institution would

be formally parallel, so it was likely that 14:25, since it disturbed this parallelism, was secondary.

In terms of content also Mark 14:25 did not belong to 14:22-24, according to Schenke. Mark 14:25 concerned Jesus' own drinking anew in the Kingdom of God. The implication was that Jesus drank during the Last Supper. This was in tension with the thrust of the words of institution, where Jesus gave to the disciples to eat and drink but did not do so himself. In addition, only the cup (potērion) was mentioned in 14:24, because what was in the cup was not "wine", but the to haima mou tēs diathēkēs; in 14:25, however, the cup was not mentioned but only its contents, the wine (genēmatos tēs ampelou). What was stressed in 14:24 was the contents of the cup, the blood of the covenant, which was to be drunk in the present, whereas in 14:25 the stress was on the drinking of wine in the future Kingdom of God. There was therefore, according to Schenke, an incongruity here, indicating that the two verses did not originally belong together.

Mark's redactional purpose in appending 14:25, which, according to Schenke, Mark himself created, to 22-24 was to counter the tendency in his community to eliminate the eschatological thrust of the kerygma. The problem was the Markan community's anti-eschatological theos-aner theology. It neither understood the divine necessity of Jesus' suffering, nor appreciated the eschatological dimension of their Christian hope. Instead, it understood the sacraments along the lines of those found in the mystery religions.

Pesch, however, argued for the opposite

conclusion.¹⁰⁸ In his opinion, from a literary viewpoint, there were no grounds to question the unity of Mark 14:22-25. The phrases piō ek and genēmatos tēs ampelou were phrases that belonged to a Passover context. . From a genre and form-critical viewpoint, there were likewise no grounds for questioning the unity of the passage. The genre was historical narrative, which formed a part of the larger context of the Passion narrative. Its form was not a cult aetiology, unlike the words of institution in 1 Cor 11. The immediate context of the Markan words of institution was Jesus' last Passover meal before his death, and 14:25 was, correspondingly, Jesus' prophecy of his death with a view to his participation in the future realization of the Kingdom of God. As Pesch put it, "Die Todesprophetie ist geradezu der Schluessel zur Deutung der ganzen Szene, in der von Jesu Todesdeutung beim Paschamahl mit den Zwoelfen berichtet wird."¹⁰⁹ That is to say, Mark 14:22-25 was a meal narrative, in which Jesus, in the context of his last Passover meal, explained by means of the words of institution the significance of his death.

Pesch's arguments are partly successful in proving the unity of the Mark 14:22-25. In the gospel of Mark, the words of institution are a part of a larger historical narrative, but, as we shall argue, they also represent the reconversion of a liturgical formula to narrative form. So Schenke's point that formally 14:22-24 was a unity, which was disturbed by the addition of 14:25, is correct. Schenke's further point that the eschatological outlook, because it

began with amēn legō humin, must originally have been an isolated unit of tradition, since this was the case for other saying beginning with the same form, is weak. Rather, it seems that Pesch is correct in his insistence that, as a part of the narrative of the Last Supper, the eschatological outlook, since it is partially at least a prophecy of Jesus' approaching death, was integral to the narrative itself and was, therefore, compatible with the words of institution. During his last Passover meal, Jesus interpreted his death for his disciples; without his declaration that his death was imminent, the words of institution would be unintelligible.

We should also note that Schenke's point that 14:25 did not belong in the same context as 14:22-24 because, in the former, Jesus drank, but in the latter he abstained, is weak. There is insufficient evidence to conclude from Mark 14:22-24 that Jesus abstained from eating and drinking.

We conclude that the Markan Last Supper narrative does show obvious signs of being literarily composite. We shall discover that the same is true of its Lukan counterpart.

2. The Lukan Narrative of the Last Supper

We have already concluded that the Lukan narrative is composed of Lukan special tradition, of Markan tradition, and of Lukan redaction. This is enough to conclude in favour of its being literarily composite. But in addition to this, we find evidence of the existence of literary seams in the Lukan

text, similar to those found in Mark.

Luke takes over from Mark the tradition of the preparation for the Passover. To this he joins a much longer version of the eschatological outlook, which he took from his special tradition. As we shall demonstrate shortly, 22:15-18 forms a self-contained literary unit. Before its inclusion as part of the Lukan Last Supper narrative and even the pre-Lukan Passion narrative, 22:15-18 stood independently of a larger context. The connection between the Lukan version of the preparation for the Passover and the eschatological outlook is, therefore, secondary.

The same must also be true of the connection in Luke between the eschatological outlook and the words of institution. We argued earlier that Luke's aim was to present a chronologically consistent account of the Last Supper, so that 22:15-20 should be read as a single meal. But this does not preclude the use of two independent units of tradition to achieve this end.

The participial connective labōn (22:19) allows the transition to be made between from Luke 22:15-18 to the words of institution. It, therefore, represents a literary seam.

But why does Luke's account (22:15-20) read so smoothly as a Passover meal, if it is composite? The cup in Luke 22:17 corresponds without contradiction to the first or second Passover cup. We saw that Schenke argued for the incongruity of the narrative sequence of the words of institution followed by the eschatological outlook on the grounds that, in the former it was the cup/covenant that was

the focus, whereas, in the latter it was the wine. Schenke's argument, however, loses its sting when we assume that in a more original form the eschatological outlook did not follow immediately upon the words of institution, but were situated sometime during the meal, as in Luke. We shall later contend that, although at an intermediate point in the history of the tradition the eschatological outlook existed as an isolated unit of tradition, independent of a larger context, originally it and the words of institution formed a continuous narrative, similar to the Lukan arrangement. It is this original sequence that Luke attempts to retrieve.

The Lukan version of the words of institution is probably, as we said, a mixed text based on Mark and the tradition represented by 1 Cor. Thus it also inappropriately contains no reference to anything distinctly paschal.

The announcement of the betrayal in Luke's Last Supper narrative, which Luke took from his special source, shows signs of being secondarily joined to the words of institution. We saw that Mark 14:17 was likely a redactional link between two traditional units, the preparation of the Passover and the announcement of the betrayal. The announcement of the betrayal in its Lukan placement is likewise literarily awkward. In Luke, after the meal had been completed, Jesus announced that the one who would betray him was with him at the table. This assumes, as Mark's account has it, that the group was still eating together, i.e., was still constituted as a unit. But in the Lukan context, the meal had already come to an end, since the

blessing over the third cup had been recited (22:20) and there was no dessert served at a Passover meal. Jesus' statement, therefore, seems out of place. It would have been more appropriately said during the meal.^{16, 17, 18} Schuermann supposed that this was proof that Luke 22:20-23 was a Lukan redaction. Another possibility is that Luke, by incorporating the words of institution from the Mark and Pauline traditions, disturbed a more original and consistent narrative, which originally moved from Luke 22:15-18 to 22:21-23. At any rate, it is clear the connection between the announcement of the betrayal and the words of institution in Luke represents a literary seam.

As we noted earlier, unlike Mark, Luke does not have Jesus and his disciples leave the Upper Room directly after the meal; rather, during the period between the end of the meal and their departure to the Mount of Olives, he situates several additional units of tradition (22:24-38). (We have already examined one of these, the announcement of the betrayal, which has a parallel in Mark.) Luke is chronologically at variance with Mark, because his version of the foretelling of Peter's betrayal is included as part of 22:24-38, whereas Mark's occurs after the departure of Jesus and the disciples from the Upper Room. The fact that there is nothing about the units of traditions in Luke 22:24-38 that requires a Passover framework, that they all appear to stand independently of one another in terms of their intelligibility, and that Mark places one of them in a different position relative to the Last Supper points to the

conclusion that their context as part of the Lukan Last Supper narrative is secondary. Luke likely found the unit of 22:15-38 in his special source, as Schuermann argued. This means that at some point prior to the Lukan redaction these originally independent traditions were loosely joined together and placed in the context of Jesus' Last Supper.

We conclude that both the Markan and the Lukan Last Supper narratives show signs of being composite. Neither is an organic unity.¹¹⁰

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

¹ We shall not include the eucharistic teaching in John's gospel as a source for the reconstruction of the Last Supper, since it is too far removed from the Last Supper as a historical event to be considered a reliable source.

² A helpful synopsis of the words of institution is found in Rudolf Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverstaendnis (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder, 1978), pp. 22f.

³ For a more complete description of the problem in Corinth centred around the celebration of the Lord's Supper, cf. Gerd Thiessen, "Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 65 (1974): 232-72.; id., "Soziale Integration und Sakramentales Handeln," Novum Testamentum 16 (1974): 179-206.; Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 53 (1956): 312-49.; Paul Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl. Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung (Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1960); Hans Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, trans. J. W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 192-203; Franz-J. Leenhardt, Le sacrement de la sainte cene (Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1948), pp. 71-90.

⁴ Heinz Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22, 19-20 (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970, p. 2.

⁵ Ibid., p. 3, n. 4.

⁶ B. F. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1924), pp. 246-49.

⁷ Xavier Léon-Dufour, in his book Le partage du pain eucharistique selon le Nouveau Testament (Paris: Seuil, 1982), p. 174, for example, argued that Matthew's version represented a later interpretation of the words of institution along the lines of an expiatory sacrifice. Schuermann held the same position (op. cit., pp. 6f.), as did D. P. Senior (The Passion Narrative according to Matthew (Leuven: Louvain University Press, 1975), p. 87.)

⁸ E.g., Schuermann, Pesch, Lohmeyer, Senior, Streeter, Fenton, and Jeremias.

⁹ It should be noted that, since he was dealing with the Lukan text, which does not have an eschatological saying after the words of institution, Schuermann did not inquire into the literary relationship between Mark 14:25 and Matt 26:29, although he probably would have concluded that the dependence was of Matthew on Mark.

¹⁰ Schuermann, op. cit., p. 7.

¹¹ The sources drawn upon for the following data are: Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 1-7; Pesch, op. cit., pp. 24f.; Senior, op. cit.; Hermann Patsch, Abendmahl und historischer Jesus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), pp. 69f., 92, 103f.; N. A. Dahl, "Die Passionsgeschichte bei Matthaeus," New Testament Studies 2 (1955/56): 17-32.

¹² Cf. Schuermann, op. cit., p. 4 for examples.

¹³ Senior, op. cit., p. 85, contrary to Patsch, op. cit., p. 92.

¹⁴ Senior, op. cit.

¹⁵ Dahl, op. cit., p. 27.

¹⁶ Schuermann, op. cit., p. 6.

¹⁷ Pesch, op. cit., p. 25; cf., Ernst Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," Theologische Rundschau, n.F. 9 (1937): 168-227, 177.

¹⁸ Pesch, op. cit., p. 24.

¹⁹ Senior, op. cit., pp. 85f.

²⁰ Dahl, op. cit., p. 27.

²¹ Cf. Léon-Dufour, op. cit.; Patsch, op. cit., pp. 69f.; Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus 3rd ed., trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1960), ch. 3 and 4.

²² Patsch, op. cit., p.

²³ We find a parallel in 1 Cor, where ho kurios is introduced at the beginning of the eucharist liturgy.

²⁴ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 171.

²⁵ Patsch, op. cit., p. 70.

26 It should be noted that Patsch (op. cit., p. 104) did not hold that the so-called "eschatologische Ausblick" was part of the eucharistic liturgy of the Matthean community, and, therefore, bore no marks of the liturgizing tendency. The Matthean redactions made to Mark 14:25 are strictly redactional.

27 This runs counter to Léon-Dufour's conclusion that Jesus did not interpret his death in expiatory terms.

28 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 139-59; Heinz Schuermann, "Lk 22, 19b-20 als urspruengliche Textueberlieferung" in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), pp. 159-92.; Pierre Benoit, "Le recit de la cene dans Lc. xxii, 15-20," Revue Biblique 48 (1939): 257-93.; I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 799-801.; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke, X-XXIV (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1985), pp. 1387-89; E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 254-56.

The recent attempts to reestablish the shorter text as more original are not convincing, since they often rely on arguments based on the redactional aim of Luke or other such tenuous foundations, rather than the textual evidence. Cf. M. Rese, "Zur Problematik von Kurz- und Langtext in Luk. XXII. 17ff.," New Testament Studies 22 (1975/76): 15-31; Arthur Voobus, "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke," New Testament Studies 15 (1968/69): 457-63; id., "Kritische Beobachtungen ueber die lukanische Darstellung des Herrenmahls," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 61 (1970): 102-10.; Henry Chadwick, "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII. 15-20," Harvard Theological Review 50 (1957): 249-58.

29 Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 1388.

30 Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel reprinted, trans. B. L. Woolf (Cambridge, England: James Clarke and Co., 1982), p. 210.

31 Werner G. Kuemmel, Promise and Fulfilment, 3rd. ed., trans. D. M. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1961), pp. 30f.

32 Benoit, op. cit.

33 Ibid., p. 380.

34 Cf. Pesch, op. cit., pp. 28-30, for a more complete list of Lukanisms. It must be stressed that the presence of Lukanisms allows, but does not compel, the conclusion that 22:15-18 is a Lukan redactional composition.

35 Benoit, op. cit., p. 379.

36 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 26-31.

37 Joachim Wank, Beobachtungen zum Eucharstieverstaendnis des Lukas auf Grund der lukanischen Mahlberichte (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1973).

38 E.g. Ferdinand Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motiven in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung," Evangelische Theologie 27 (1967): 337-74, 352-58.; Helmut Merklein, "Erwaegungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahlstraditionen," Biblische Zeitschrift 21 (1977): 88-101, 235-44, 235f.

39 Uncharacteristically, Pesch bolstered his conclusion of the redactional origin of Luke 22:15-18 from Mark 14:25 by citing many who held a similar view to his own. But those whom Pesch cited as authorities do not lend weight to his own conclusion.

40 Cf. Kuemmel, op. cit., p. 31; Jeremias op. cit., p. 98; Heinz Schuermann, Der Paschamahlbericht, Lk 22, (1-14.) 15-18 (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968), p. 2., n. 9.; Fitzmyer, op. cit., pp. 1386f.; Vincent Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 49f.

41 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 96-100.; Streeter, op. cit., ch. 8.; Tim Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 5f.; Patsch, op. cit., p. 94.

42 Joachim Jeremias, "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" New Testament Studies 4 (1957/58): 116-19.

43 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 2, n. 9; id., "Die Dubletten im Lukasevangelium," in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), pp. 272-78, 273, n. 9.; comp. also "Die Dublettenvermeidungen im Lukasevangelium," in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), pp. 279-89.

44 H. F. D. Sparks argued unsuccessfully that Luke did transpose sections of his Mark. This was the occasion for the writing of Jeremias' article "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?". F. Neirynck, in his article "The Argument from Order and St. Luke's Transpositions," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 49 (1973): 784-815, made the case that Luke may have inverted the Markan order for redactional reasons, and not under the influence of non-Markan sources. His argument is quite complicated, and suffers from the problem from which many redactional arguments suffer, namely, an excess of

supposition.

45 Cf. Kuemmel, op. cit., p. 31.

46 Cf. Schuermann, op. cit., p. 2.

47 Schramm, op. cit. made this clear in his work.

48 Schuermann, Der Paschamahlbericht, Lk 22, (7-14.) 15-18, p.2; id., "Die Dubletten im Lukasevangelium"; id., "Die Dublettenvermeidungen im Lukasevangelium".

49 Schuermann, Der Paschamahlbericht, Lk 22, (7-14.) 15-18, p. 3.

50 Joachim Jeremias, Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980), p. 286.

51 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 104-10.

52 Ibid., p. 104.

53 Taylor, op. cit., p. 48.

54 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 286f.

55 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 3-46.

56 Ibid., p. 45.

57 Cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 155.

58 Taylor, op. cit., pp. 32f.; id., Behind the Third Gospel (Oxford, 1926), p. 74, 124.

59 Rehkopf disagreed that there were Markan interpolations in the Lukan Passion narrative (Die lukanische Sonderquelle, whereas Schuermann, like Taylor, allowed for the possibility of interpolation from Mark.

60 Pesch, op. cit., p. 32.

61 Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, p. 57.

62 Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22, 19-20, pp. 43-48.

63 Ibid., p. 48.

64 Taylor, op. cit., p. 52.

65 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 17.

66 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 154f.; id., Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums, pp. 287f; id. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 154f.; Schuermann, op. cit.

67 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 155; Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 178.

68 Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 196.; Patsch, op. cit., pp. 104f.; Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 96-100.; Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 7-14.

69 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 7-14; cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 101-105.

70 E.g. Jeremias, Schuermann, Taylor, Marshall, Higgins, Fitzmyer

71 Dibelius, op. cit., p. 210.; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 156.

72 Neiryneck, op. cit., pp. 806f.

73 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 17-42.

74 Ibid., pp. 65-69, 80-81.

75 Ibid., pp. 69-73.

76 Patsch, op. cit., pp. 67f.

77 Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 103-23.

78 Cf. Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 326; Benoit, op. cit., pp. 371f.; Pesch, op. cit.,

79 Cf. Marshall, op. cit., p. 787.

80 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 98f.; Heinz Schuermann, Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk 22, 21-38, 2. Auflage (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1977.), pp. 139-42; contrary to Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 1408.

81 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 4.

82 Cf. also Fitzmyer, op. cit., for an commentator who argued for the Markan origin of Luke 22:21-23.

83 Friedrich Rehkopf, Die lukanische Sonderquelle (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959), pp. 8-13; 22-28.

84 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 8-21.

85 Rehkopf, op. cit., pp. 8-10; Jeremias, Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums, pp. 288, 139f.; contrary to Schuermann,

op. cit., pp. 14f. and Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 1409.

86 Schuermann also conceded this (op. cit., p. 11).

87 Marshall, op. cit., p. 808.

88 We should state at the outset that we shall not take into consideration arguments based on the Markan preferred vocabulary or style. Ludger Schenke, Detlev Dormeyer, and Wolfgang Schenk all use this method, which is an outgrowth of redaction criticism, in order to prove that Mark 14 was the result of the synthesis of Markan tradition and Markan redaction. They claim to be able to isolate Mark's contributions to the Passion narrative by Wortstatistik. The use of this method, however, is suspect.

The Wortstatistik method is a resource of literary-criticism. Simply stated, it attempts to define an author's preferred vocabulary and style, and is useful in differentiating multiple authorship in the same text. As applied to the gospel of Mark, it assumes that the final redactor of the work played an active role in the formation of his Passion narrative and that what he had to work with as a redactor was a collection of unrelated units of tradition. In addition, it assumes that Mark had distinctive redactional purposes in writing and that he did not hesitate to organize the material in such a way as to make this point, or even to create new sayings to the same end. Mark, in other words, as redaction criticism presupposes, was as much an author as a compiler of traditions. (Pesch, who assumes that the Passion narrative is a compendium of the eyewitnesses in the early Jerusalem church, takes the opposite point of departure.)

Few would doubt that Mark had some role in joining units of tradition into a gospel. It is possible to isolate on literary-critical grounds those parts of the gospel of Mark that probably come from its author. These are usually connectives between units of traditions or summaries at appropriate places in the gospel. But it is always possible that some of these connectives or summaries were part of the tradition inherited by him. This makes the task of isolating the Markan redaction more difficult. At any rate, because one can isolate units of Markan redaction, it is theoretically possible to ascertain the Markan preferred vocabulary and style. But, given the fewness of these identifiable Markan redactional units and the limits of their topical ranges, the results of this investigation will always be partial. We shall never have a complete catalogue of the Markan preferred vocabulary and style.

Since one can produce a partial list of the Markan preferred vocabulary and style, then hypothetically one could on linguistic grounds alone identify what may be Markan tradition. If one comes across a unit of tradition that is full of non-Markan vocabulary and stylistic features, and if Mark could have used these in his redactional contributions, but did not, then one can conclude that the material is non-Markan. The danger, however, is that one would mistake a

unique word (e.g., hapax legomenon) or stylistic feature that is unique owing to the subject matter of the material for a non-Markan usage, when in fact Mark simply never had the occasion to use such words or stylistic features.

The reverse procedure, however, is methodologically unadvisable. When one encounters Markan vocabulary in what, on literary-critical grounds, is not part of the Markan redaction, but appears to be Markan tradition, one cannot conclude that the material is Markan redaction for three reasons. First it is difficult ever to be sure in individual cases that, when Mark and the tradition are similar in their vocabulary and stylistic features, this is not simply coincidental. After all, any two compositions in Greek are bound to have much in common linguistically by virtue of sharing the same language. There is, moreover, no way of proving that the tradition always is marked by the same preferred vocabulary and style and that on some occasions it may agree with Markan usage, while at other times depart from it. Secondly, it is always possible that Mark was influenced by the style or the vocabulary of the tradition, while he was writing his redactional contributions to the gospel. In this case it would be erroneous to conclude that Mark added to the tradition when it reflects his preferred vocabulary and style. Thirdly, it is possible that Mark may have made vocabulary and stylistic changes in the tradition, but not have changed the substance of his Vorlage. This is not only possible, but likely, since Luke, for instance, operated in a similar manner in his handling of Mark.

We might also add that the Wortstatistik procedure demands too much linguistic consistency from the author, when it is likely that he varied his style and vocabulary for no apparent reason, the way that any author will. A good example relating to Mark's gospel is his use of kai and de. Mark predominantly uses kai as a connective, but occasionally one comes across a de in Mark. The appearance of a de in the narrative, however, is no sure indication that it is part of the Markan tradition. It may be, but it may not be. This observation in combination with the fact that we do not have an independent and more complete example of Markan linguistic usage nor examples of the pre-Markan tradition outside of Mark, makes it impossible ever on linguistic grounds to separate with any accuracy what is Markan redaction and what is Markan tradition. The practitioners of this method often implicitly rely on theological criteria to separate what is Markan redaction from Markan tradition. What is assumed to be essential to make the Markan theological point is assumed to be Markan. Obviously, this is circular, because what is the Markan theological point is based on knowing the Markan redactional contribution to the gospel.

We conclude that the Wortstatistik method is too unreliable for separating the Markan redaction from the Markan tradition to be of much use. The identification of the Markan redactional contribution to his Vorlage is methodologically such a precarious undertaking, for reasons stated above, that one can put only minimal confidence in the

results thereof. We shall, therefore, rely solely on other literary-critical indices to determine whether the Passover setting of the Last Supper is secondary.

89 Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Markus (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1977), p. 384.

90 Ludger Schenke, Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus (Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971), p. 200.

91 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus., p. 93.

92 Schenke, op. cit., pp. 200-85.

93 Rudolf Pesch, Das Markusevangelium, II Teil (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder, 1977), p. 347.

94 Detlev Dormeyer, Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell (Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974), p. 95.

95 Wolfgang Schenk, Der Passionsbericht nach Markus (Berlin: Evangelischen Verlagsanstalt, 1974), p. 185.

96 Rudolf Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, revised ed., trans. J Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976), p. 264.

97 Rudolf Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverstaendnis, p. 81.

98 A. E. J. Rawlinson, St. Mark, 5th ed. (London: Methuen and Co., 1942), p. 202f.

99 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 113; Bultmann, op. cit., p. 265; Schenke, op. cit., pp. 286-90; Schenk, op. cit., p. 189.

100 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 70f.

101 Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 265f.; Schenke, op. cit., pp. 307-41; Guenther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. Fraser and F. Fraser (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1975), pp. 160-62.

102 Cf. Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel 4. Auflage (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), p. 105.

103 Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 265f.

104 Heinz Schuermann, Der Paschamahlbericht, Lk 22, (7-14.) 15-18, pp. 42-45.

105 Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 160.

106 Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (London: Lutterworth Press, 1965), pp. 106f.; id., "The Double Origin of the Eucharist", Biblical Research 8 (1963): 60-72

107 Schenke, op. cit., pp. 290-306.

108 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 35-38, 76-81.

109 Ibid., p. 80.

110 Cf. Patsch, op. cit., pp. 59-61.

III

A TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LAST SUPPER NARRATIVES

We move now from a literary to a tradition-historical analysis of the texts. We shall seek to answer three questions. First, in the history of the tradition was the Last Supper originally paschal? Secondly, what was the tradition-historical relationship between Luke 22:15-18 and Luke 22:19-20? Finally, which of the versions of the words of institution--the Pauline or the Markan--was the more original?

A. The Paschal Context of the Words of Institution

Was the context of the words of institution in the synoptic gospels originally paschal, or did it become paschal at some point in the history of the tradition? Context determines meaning. The synoptic gospels themselves relate the Last Supper as a Passover meal. Luke's account (22:15-18) is the most explicit in this regard, but Mark and Matthew likewise view the Last Supper as paschal. The question is whether this context is artificial, and whether the words of institution in the history of the tradition were originally transmitted without any context or within a different context.

What would count as evidence in favour of the words

of institution in the history of the tradition being understood as originally unconnected with a Passover meal? There are two conditions that need to be filled in order to establish this hypothesis. If the Last Supper narratives can be shown to be composite in nature, then it is at least permissible to hold that the words of institution were originally without context. This would further permit the conclusion that the Passover setting is secondary. Compositeness of a text is an indication that a text as it stands evolved through stages to its present form. If the complex of traditions making up the narratives relating the Last Supper give indications of being composite, then it is possible that the paschal setting was a part of the later development that accrued to the eucharistic tradition.

Secondly, in addition to the above condition, if positive evidence that the words of institution themselves did not originally belong to a Passover framework can be produced, then it is not only permissible to hold the view that the Passover context is secondary, but actually requisite.

In the last chapter, we concluded that the Lukan and Markan Last Supper narratives were composite. The first condition for the establishment of the hypothesis, therefore, has been met. The texts have many features that indicate the existence of literary seams. Even Pesch must judge the narrative sequence to be secondary to a certain extent, in that, if it is a Passover meal, the whole scene is greatly reduced, so that it is scarcely recognizable as such. So it

seems that the more important question is whether a historian, owing to the compositeness of the Last Supper narratives, can conclude that the identification of the Last Supper as a Passover meal is unhistorical. If we could prove, as Pesch failed to do, that there were no grounds to question the original unity of the Last Supper narratives, then we could not even entertain this possibility.

Bultmann hypothesized that the following tradition-historical process took place.¹ The narrative of the preparation of the Passover (Mark 14:12-16), since it could not stand alone, and since the words of institution were originally a cult aetiology (of Hellenistic origin²), originally independent of a specific historial context, must have been composed as an introduction to the words of institution, in order to create a Passover context for them. The foretelling of the betrayal, as an originally isolated tradition, was then wedged between these two. Matthew took this over from Mark. Bultmann further said that Luke 22:15-18 was an independent tradition from the Lukan special tradition³, which, as a biographical legend originally unrelated to the Passion narrative and the Last Supper, was joined by Luke to Mark 14:12-16. (Bultmann viewed Luke 22:19-20 as a later interpolation.⁴) Also, the Markan cult aetiology (14:22-24) displaced an original version of the words of institution similar to Luke 22:15-18. The remnant of this original version can be found in Mark 14:25.⁵

In addition, according to Bultmann, the Last Supper in Mark (Mark 14:22-25), parts of which are taken over by

Matthew and Luke, formed the mid-point of an obviously artificially created, larger unit, consisting of the preparation of the Passover (14:12-16), the foretelling of the betrayal (14:17-21), and the journey to Gethsemane with the prophecy of the disciples' desertion and Peter's denial.^{6, 7}

Bultmann's hypothesis is consistent with what we have seen so far concerning the composite character of the narratives of the Last Supper. But by no means is it demanded by the evidence. Before we can conclude that the paschal framework is secondary, we must prove that the meal described in the words of institution was not Jesus' last Passover meal. We move now to an investigation of the possibility of fulfilling the second condition. What would compel assent to the hypothesis that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal is positive evidence that the paschal setting of the words of institution is secondary.

Many scholars point to 1 Cor 11 as the more original setting of the words of institution; that is to say, it is an isolated piece of cult aetiology, without a historical context.⁸ This is the premise underlying Bultmann's position, as summarized above. At some point in the history of the tradition, the words of institution found their way into a paschal context, then into the pre-Markan Passion narrative, and finally were taken over by Mark, who later served as the model for Luke and Matthew. The Last Supper became Jesus' last Passover meal.

That Paul did not place his version of the words of

institution in a Passover context does not prove that the words of institution at some point in the history of the tradition had no historical context. It is possible to argue that the Corinthians already had a full knowledge of the events of the Passion and knew that the context of the words of institution was Jesus' last Passover meal.⁹ It is clear that, for liturgical purposes, the words of institution were separated from their Passover context, a fact to which 1 Cor 11 is witness. But one cannot conclude from this that the recipients of this tradition had no interest in or knowledge of its historical context. Such a judgement betrays the untenable, form-critical prejudice that the gospel tradition originated or survived only insofar as it served the practical interests of the church. A liturgical Sitz-im-Leben for the words of institution does not exclude an interest in and knowledge of its place within the larger context of the life of Jesus.

Bornkamm made the further point that Paul could not have considered the context of the Last Supper as originally paschal, because, elsewhere in his writings, Paul never explicitly connected the Lord's supper with the Passover or the Passover lamb where one would have expected him to do so (eg. 1 Cor. 10:1ff.; 5:7): "Wo vom Passalamme geredet wird, wird nirgends vom Herrenmahl gesprochen, und umgekehrt: wo vom Herrenmahl die Rede ist, fehlt die Bezug auf das Passah."¹⁰ By extension, he concluded that in the pre-synoptic stage of the tradition the Lord's Supper was non-paschal.

Bornkamm's observation is significant, but it is still only an argument from silence. If one accepts Luke 22:15-18 as part of the Lukan special tradition, then we have an early tradition identifying the Last Supper with the Passover. This undermines Bornkamm's conclusion.

It has also been pointed out that Mark 14:2 = Matt 26:5 states that the Jewish authorities wanted to arrest Jesus before the start of the feast: Mē en tē heortē, mēpote estai thorubos tou laou.¹¹ If they were able to realize their objective, then Jesus was crucified before the evening of Nisan 15. This incongruity in the Markan narrative sequence casts doubt on the originality of the Passover context of the Last Supper.

This argument, however, is weak for two reasons. On the one hand, the phrase en tē heortē is probably better translated as "among the festival crowd", as the antonym of "in private" or "in isolation". It is not intended as a temporal adverbial phrase at all. The crowds had been arriving in Jerusalem for days before Passover, so the city would have been just as crowded a few days before Nisan 14/15 as on it. It makes no sense, therefore, to plan to arrest Jesus before the festival began for fear of the crowds.¹² On the other hand, even assuming that en tē heortē is a temporal adverbial phrase, we have no guarantee that the arrest of Jesus was carried out according to plan. We conclude that the argument from Mark 14:2 is weak.

In the same vein, the Last Supper in John can be interpreted as having occurred on Nisan 13/14.¹³ This would

mean that we have an independent tradition relating the Last Supper--although without a version of the words of institution--that does not identify it as a Passover meal. If the Johannine chronology does contradict the synoptic, this also would count as evidence for the secondary character of the paschal context of the synoptic account. In addition, if it could be shown that the Markan chronology actually shows signs of being a clumsy modification of the Johannine chronology, with the consequent inconsistencies, then it would be even more likely that the Last Supper became a Passover meal at some point in the history of the tradition. That the Johannine chronology is not incompatible with the synoptic chronology is argued in Excursus One.

What contextualizes the Last Supper is the narrative of the preparation of the Passover (14:12-16). Were it not for this Markan tradition, which both Matthew and Luke take over, there would be little evidence that Jesus' Last Supper was a Passover meal. It has been argued, however, that the narrative of the preparation of the Passover was originally unconnected with the words of institution, the eschatological outlook, and the announcement of the betrayal and that it was Mark who prefaced these latter with it in order to make the Last Supper a Passover meal. (Bultmann's view that Mark created this unit of tradition has little to commend it.) Both Schenk¹⁴ and Schenke¹⁵ presented cases for such a tradition-historical reconstruction, although they differed in the details of their work. Apart from their "Wortstatistik" arguments, which we concluded could not count

as evidence, they construed the following data to point to this conclusion.

Foremost was the observation that there appeared to be two "Zielrichtungen", a twofold intentional thrust, within the narrative of the preparation of the Passover. On the one hand, the stress seemed to be on Jesus' miraculous foreknowledge. On the other hand, the point of the narrative appeared to be the preparation of the Passover meal. According to Schenk and Schenke, the union of these two intentional thrusts was awkward and, therefore, one of them had to be secondary. They both concluded that it was the latter.

The literarily awkward features in Mark 14:12-16, pointing to the existence of seams within the text, strengthened the conclusion that the present shape of the text was the result of Markan redaction. According to Schenke, Mark 14:16 contained two different endings. The first ending was kai exēlthon hoi mathētai kai ēlthon eis tēn polin kai heuron kathōs eipen autois; the second ending was kai hētoimasan to pascha. Each ending served one of the two narrative purposes outlined above. Mark 14:16a concluded a narrative, the purpose of which was to relate the miraculous finding of a room for Passover. Mark 14:16b concluded a narrative intending to make the point that the Passover had been prepared; it corresponded with 14:12b, which reported that the disciples asked Jesus where he wanted them to make the Passover preparations for him. Schenke concluded that 14:12b and 14:16b were Markan redactional contributions.

Mark's aim was to make an original unit of tradition, the purpose of which was simply to relate an instance of Jesus' miraculous foreknowledge, usable as an introduction to the events of the Last Supper. This necessitated the addition of 14:12b and its correlative in 14:16b. He needed this introduction in order to make the Last Supper a Passover meal.

Another obviously awkward feature resulting from Mark's redactional activity was that in 14:13ff. Jesus did not respond in accordance with the question put to him by his disciples in 14:12b. According to Schenke, 14:13 implied that Jesus had initiated the acquisition of a room for Passover, rather than the disciples, as is presupposed in 14:12b. In addition, it was all the disciples who asked about a room for Passover in 14:12b, but the task was assigned to two only in 14:13; again, this could be read as a discrepancy in the narrative. The above data were further confirmation for Schenke that 14:12b was secondary to the context.

Schenke also pointed to the two different uses of hetoimazō as correlative evidence of his thesis that 14:12b and 14:16b were secondary additions. Hetoimazō in 14:15 was used without an accusative object, but with a dative object, meaning to make a meal ready, while the same verb in 14:16b was used with the accusative object, to pascha, meaning to prepare the Passover meal/lamb. Although the occurrence of hetoimazō in 14:12b had no direct object, nevertheless, its completion was the subjunctive phrase hina phagēs to pascha,

so that it paralleled the use of hetoimazō in 14:16b. Schenke concluded that 14:12b was a grammatical middle position (Mittelstellung) between 14:15 and 14:16b, designed to make the transition from the use of hetoimazō with a dative object in 14:15 to its use with an accusative object in 14:16b. The instances of the verb hetoimazō in 14:12b and 14:16b were redactional.

Schenke also claimed that the transition from the third person plural in 14:12b to the first person singular was evidence of a literary seam. Whereas in 14:13ff. the Passover was being prepared for Jesus and his disciples, in 14:12b the disciples asked Jesus where he would eat the Passover (hina phagēs to pascha). This was taken by Schenke to be a redactional incongruity.

Schenk added that the word pascha had two meanings in the narrative, which he took to prove that a redactional hand was at work. The first instance of pascha in 14:12 denoted the Passover lamb, whereas the second denoted the Passover meal. Pascha in 14:14 and 14:16, on the other hand, meant Passover meal. This inconsistency would not be expected if a single author was responsible for the narrative unit.

Both Schenk and Schenke demonstrated that the narrative of the preparation of the Passover was strikingly similar in style and vocabulary to Mark 11:1-9, where it is related that Jesus foreknew there was a donkey for his entry into Jerusalem, and sent his disciples to retrieve it. The similarity was interpreted to mean that form-critically the two traditions had the same function, so that 14:12-16 must

have been, as 11:1-9 was, a narrative relating an instance of Jesus' miraculous foreknowledge. This tradition was taken up by Mark, redacted, and used in its redacted form as a means by which to make the Last Supper a Passover meal.

Finally, E. Schweizer offered further evidence supporting the conclusion argued for by Schenk and Schenke.¹⁶ It was his contention that 14:12-16 was extraneous to the context of the Passion narrative and must have been a later addition for three reasons. First, as we observed, the different designations for the disciples suggested that 14:12-16 and 14:17-21 were not originally conjoined. But more than this, Schweizer claimed that, with one exception, in the entire Passion narrative it was only in 14:12-16 that the disciples were called mathētai; their usual designation was hoi dōdeka. "Während in V. 10. 17. 20. 43 von den 'Zwoelfen' die Rede ist, heissen die Begleiter Jesu in V. 12-16 viermal die 'Juenger', was zwischen 13,1 und 16,7 nur noch 14,32 einmal vorkommt."¹⁷ The other two features that set 14:12-16 apart from the rest of the Passion narrative were the awkwardness of combining the sending of two disciples in 14:12 with Jesus' arrival with the twelve in 14:17, and the temporal designation in 14:12, which differed from 14:1 and was, according to Schweizer, inaccurate. He concluded from these three data that the tradition of the preparation of the Passover did not belong to the Passion narrative. This left open the possibility that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal.

How compelling are the arguments that the context of

the preparation of the Passover in the Passion narrative is secondary? They are weak to the point of being unconvincing. What is presented as evidence is far too ambiguous to be conclusive.

First, it is not obvious that there is a twofold intentional thrust within the narrative. A straightforward reading of the text reveals nothing awkward about Jesus' disciples asking him where he is going to eat the Passover, meaning he and they together, and Jesus' sending two disciples to find a room, about which he had miraculous foreknowledge. The two "Zielrichtungen" of Jesus' miraculous foreknowledge and the preparation of the Passover can literarily co-exist without contradiction.

The so-called literarily awkward features in the text are also unproblematic. There are not two conclusions to the narrative in 14:16, but, in accordance with the foregoing, Jesus' disciples both found the room and prepared the Passover meal. 14:12b is parallel to 14:16b, but there is nothing awkward about their inclusion in the narrative. In addition, Jesus did respond appropriately to his disciples' question in 14:12 by sending two disciples to find the room about which the disciples were asking. Also, to restrict an author to using the verb hetoimazō in a certain way to the exclusion of others is too rigid; besides, Schenke's hypothesis that the occurrence of hetoimazō in 14:12 functions as a transition from its use in 14:15 to that in 14:16 is groundless. The change from the singular in 14:12b to the implicit plural in 14:13ff. is literarily

insignificant, because it cannot be taken seriously that Mark, as the hypothetical creator of 14:12b, thought that Jesus could have celebrated Passover alone or without the disciples. Finally, the two distinct meanings given to pascha are consistent with its polyvalence prevalent in other texts dating from the first century.¹⁸

That the narrative parallels the vocabulary and style of Mark 11:1-9 does not mean that Mark 14:12-16 at some time circulated as an isolated legend and was prefixed in a redacted form by Mark to the Last Supper. The parallels between the two accounts simply mean that the two traditions influenced each other in vocabulary and style during their development. But to claim that both were originally isolated units of tradition betrays the untenable, form-critical assumption that the earliest stages of the tradition consisted of collections of unrelated pericopes. Schenke himself recognized the need to bolster his position with the argument that, since there was nothing distinctly paschal about it, originally the meal represented by the words of institution was not a Passover. We shall deal with this shortly. Or, one could argue, as Taylor did¹⁹, that both narratives, received from the tradition, were worked over by Mark. This would explain the affinities in style and vocabulary. In this connection, Pesch argued that the similarities between 14:12-16 and 11:1ff. was proof of the former's original place within the Passion narrative, because it was evidence that the same pre-Markan narrator was at work.²⁰

E. Schweizer's arguments likewise are unsupportable. That in 14:13 Jesus sent two of his disciples ahead to prepare the Passover but in 14:17 Jesus arrived with the twelve, and that the temporal designation in 14:12 differs from that in 14:1 do not prove that 14:12-16 is extraneous to the Passion narrative, and, therefore, secondary. At best, they prove that 14:1-21 is composite, but nothing about the relative originality of the component parts can be deduced from these data. Besides, it is questionable whether the different designations in 14:1 and 14:12 are significant as an indication of different sources (cf. Excursus One).

The only datum that can be construed as indicating that 14:12-16 is extraneous to the Passion narrative is its fourfold use of mathētai as a term for Jesus' followers, whereas in the rest of the Passion the disciples are called hoi dōdeka. But upon closer examination this turns out to be immaterial. In two of the instances in Mark 14, the term hoi dōdeka is used as a modifier in connection with Judas (14:10, 14:43). (Ho) heis tōn dōdeka has a titular status, as a designation for the betrayer. The other two instances are found in 14:17 and 14:20. The former is a Markan redaction, used in conformity with the terminology of 14:20, while the occurrence of hoi dōdeka in 14:20 is owing to its being used in connection with Jesus' betrayer. Again, it is used as part of a title denoting Judas. The purpose of designating Judas as one of the twelve was to lay stress on the gravity of his deed, because the twelve in Mark's gospel are always distinguished from the rest of Jesus' followers as being

those specially selected by Jesus (Mark 3:14; 4:10; 9:35; 10:32; 11:11). The same is true of Matthew (Matt 26:14, 20, 47) and Luke (Luke 22:3, 47, 48). Furthermore, mathetai does appear in 14:32, which is outside of 14:12-16. Schweizer's position, therefore, is not substantiated.

We conclude that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the prefacing of Mark 14:12-16 to the words of institution is a Markan innovation intended to make the Last Supper a Passover meal.

We observed already that there is nothing distinctly paschal about the meal described in the words of institution. The wine and the bread are, of course, elements of a Passover meal, but one would expect more than this, since the gospel texts make a point of depicting the meal as a Passover. This is, therefore, the sole basis for questioning the originality of the connection of between the narrative of the preparation of the Passover and the words of institution. The lack of unambiguous paschal references is the only piece of positive evidence that can be adduced as support for the hypothesis that the Passover context is not original. We ought to note, however, that the words of institution do not directly contradict what we would expect from a Passover meal celebrated at the time of Jesus.

If we could find an alternative explanation for the lack of explicit references to anything paschal in the words of institution, consistent with the position that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, then we would have grounds for rejecting the reconstruction of the history of the tradition

proposed by Bultmann and equally radical critics. The tradition-historical question that we are attempting to answer is: why is the meal described in the words of institution not unambiguously paschal? The answer to this lies, not in the words of institution being secondarily given a paschal context, but in the fact that they functioned at one point in the history of the tradition as a liturgical formula. What we have in the synoptic gospels is the conversion to narrative form of an originally liturgical unit of tradition.²¹ As 1 Cor 11 confirms, the words of institution were used liturgically without being situated in a larger historical context. The lack of distinctly paschal references is a result of the elimination of all descriptive elements that were not required by the liturgy. The recontextualization of the liturgy into the historical context out of which it emerged in the first place occurred at some point during the development of the pre-synoptic tradition. This development addressed the natural interest of the church concerning the origin of the eucharistic practice by tracing it back to the words and deeds of Jesus at the Last Supper.

How else can one understand the odd state of affairs of a Passover meal having nothing distinctly paschal about it? Pesch suggested that for the sake of simplicity only the exceptional aspects of the meal were recorded. The reader was expected to put the narrative into its proper historical context.²² Schuermann made a similar point, arguing that it was Jesus' actions at the Last Supper that

departed from the usual order of the Passover meal that were remembered. This was the cause of their becoming part of the early tradition.²³ Pesch's and Schuermann's arguments, however, are not convincing. It is hard to believe that no clues as to the paschal context of the meal would have been preserved in the words of institution, if their purpose was simply to give an account of what happened.

It should also be pointed out that it is possible to establish inferentially from the Pauline account that the Last Supper was originally viewed as paschal. Paul said that Jesus spoke the words over the bread and the cup "in the night in which he was betrayed". Since that night, according to the Passion tradition, was Nisan 15, the meal previous to his betrayal must have been a Passover.

In summary, we must object to the view that the paschal setting of the words of institution is secondary. The proponents of this position argue in two stages. First, they argue (correctly, as we have seen) that the narratives relating the events of the Last Supper are composite, the result of the combining in various ways related traditions considered to be connected with Jesus' last Passover meal. Secondly, the composite character of the narrative permits them to conclude that the Passover setting is secondary. But the only positive evidence for this is the lack of explicit Passover references in the words of institution. That they are bereft of direct paschal references can be construed as indicating that the Passover setting is secondary, but does not compel such a conclusion, since, as we saw, this datum

can be explained in another way, namely, by the influence of the liturgy. We conclude that there is insufficient reason to hold that the words of institution were originally contextless and that the Passover setting was an afterthought in the history of the tradition. All the data is explainable without recourse to this hypothesis.

As further evidence, one might add that a tradition-historical motive for making the Last Supper a Passover meal is lacking.²⁴ The Last Supper viewed as a Passover meal runs counter to the liturgical practice of the early church. The Passover was an annual affair, whereas the Lord's Supper was held daily or at least on every Lord's day. Likewise, a Passover background is not essential for understanding the basic theological point of the Last Supper, Jesus' representative suffering and the establishment of the new covenant, which the lack of explicit paschal features in the words of institution prove, so there was no reason for the early church to transform it into a Passover meal. This is not to say, however, that the Passover context does not significantly enhance one's understanding of Jesus' intentions.

Finally, as an addendum to the question of whether the Passover context is secondary in the history of the tradition, Jeremias's, Dalman's, and Billerbeck's history-of-religions work, wherein they positively correlate features of the gospels' description of the Last Supper, many seemingly accidental to the narrative, with a reconstruction of a typical, first-century Passover celebration, confirms

the view that the context is originally paschal. Such a complete correlation would not be expected if the Passover framework was an afterthought. It is true, as we said, that the words of institution are not distinctly paschal in nature²⁵, but the fact that the entire narrative in which the words of institution find themselves correlates so well with a Passover framework puts it beyond doubt that the Passover framework is not secondary.

This is not to say that Jeremias has convinced everyone. Critics such as Léon-Dufour, Hahn, Bornkamm, E. Schweizer, and Lohmeyer, to name a few, have declared Jeremias' work to be inconclusive at best. But this is not justifiable. It may be possible to put forward alternative readings of individual elements of the correlation; nevertheless, the convergence of the evidence is overwhelmingly convincing. Patsch, similarly, did a history-of-religions study of possible backgrounds against which to understand the Last Supper. His conclusion was that the only viable option was the Jewish Passover.²⁶

2. The Tradition-Historical Relation of Luke 22:15-18 to Luke 22:19-20

The second tradition-historical problem that we shall investigate concerns the relationship between Luke 22:15-18 and the words of institution in 22:19-20. We have touched upon this briefly already. Luke, as previously stated, appended the words of institution to 22:15-18, and intended

that the two sections be read as chronologically related parts of the same meal. The tradition-historical question is whether the bringing together of these two is a Lukan redactional innovation. The conclusion to this problem will have obvious implications for historical reconstruction.

Schuermann argued from what he referred to as "form-critical considerations" that Luke 22:15-18 showed itself to be an independent account of the Last Supper, complete in itself, and unrelated to Luke 22:19-20.²⁷ The "outer form" of 22:15-18, i.e., considered as a whole, gave evidence that 22:15-18 was a traditional unit. To begin, there were stylistic differences between 22:15-18 and 22:19-20:²⁸ a. 22:17 had dexamenos; 22:19 had labōn b. 22:17 had a command formula; 22:19 did not c. 22:15, 22:17 had eipen; 22:19, 22:20 had legōn d. 22:19 had kai edōken autois; 22:17 did not e. 22:17 had poterion; 22:20 had to potērion. In addition, Schuermann pointed to differences in content between 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 to prove that they originally did not belong together. 22:15-18 focused on the "eschatologische Ausblick", whereas 22:19-20 concerned the death of Jesus as a "Heilstat" to be repeated in remembrance. Schuermann also summoned a history-of-religions datum in support of his position. According to him, the celebrants would have said their own blessings over the first and second cups during a Passover meal. This meant that the cup in 22:17 could not be understood in a Passover framework as the second cup at the start of the main course. It could only be the third cup. Finally, to these arguments Schuermann added

formal indications that 22:15-18 was to be understood as a unity. 22:15 paralleled 22:17, whereas the two eschatological sayings, 22:16 and 22:18, were likewise parallel.

Still form-critically considered, but this time with respect to its "inner form", according to Schuermann, Luke 22:15-18 gave evidence of having been reworked in a pre-Lukan redaction by a community whose redactional purpose was to ground its eucharistic practice in a continuation of the Passover feast. This process occurred in two stages. The original form of the tradition consisted of a double prophecy of Jesus' imminent death (22:16, 18). These prophecies were then in the pre-Lukan redaction transformed into a "Paschamahlbericht" (Luke 22:15-18), for the purpose of grounding the community's eucharistic practice. The two halves of the text 22:15f. and 22:17f. revealed that they had the identical narrative aim of relating the eucharist to the Jewish Passover: 22:15f. established the Passover as the place of the foundation of the eucharist, whereas 22:17f. related the cup of blessing to the eucharistic sharing of the cup. Schuermann attempted to prove that originally there was no connection between 22:15/16 and 22:17/18 (the gar in both 22:16 and 22:18 was secondary), that the connection was redactional. In its development of a "Paschamahlbericht"; the community was attempting to explain and deal with the elements of the early Christian Passover and eucharist that departed from the usual Jewish paschal practice, such as the use of a single cup and its being passed around without being

returned to Jesus.²⁹

According to Schuermann, the words of institution (Luke 22:19-20), derived from the Lukan special source³⁰, and at some time during the pre-Lukan redaction were appended to the "Paschamahlbericht" for the sake of the eucharistic practice of the early church. The purpose was to clarify what was obscure in 22:15-18. Schuermann argued that Mark, similarly, combined a fragment of a "Paschamahlbericht" and a version of the words of institution in Mark 14:22-24; 25, but that Luke's version was more original. An indication of the greater originality of the Lukan version was its greater length. Paul, on the other hand, deliberately omitted from his source the description of the situation of the meal, which Luke shared and retained as 22:15-18. 1 Cor 11:26, however, was an allusion to the tradition represented by Luke 22:15-18, and, therefore, proof that Paul had more than simply the words of institution at his disposal. They both had a similar traditional unit, but each used it in a different way.

It is difficult to refute hypothetical literary and form- or tradition-critical reconstructions, because the evidence is often so ambiguous that a number of equally feasible hypotheses are possible, none of which, however, is fully provable or disprovable. Schuermann's form-critical reconstruction is one such example. Nevertheless, it seems that there is an easier way of explaining the relationship between 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 without resorting to so many hypothetical extremes. Schuermann concluded from the

differences between 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 that these were two separate accounts of the same event joined together in the history of the tradition. We grant to Schuermann that evidence exists to conclude that Luke 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 should be considered as independent units of tradition. But is it not possible that they were joined together in a chronological sequence simply because they originally belonged together tradition-historically? It is clear that the words of institution in an intermediate stage of the history of the tradition existed separately from Luke 22:15-18, the eschatological outlook, or what Schuermann called the "Paschamahlbericht", and were later joined to it by Luke. (Schuermann viewed the joining of the two, however, as pre-Lukan.) The simplest explanation for the reason they were brought together is that they originally belonged together.

In the history of the tradition, the words of institution were originally situated in the context of Jesus' last Passover meal, and relatively early, for liturgical purposes, were separated from this larger context. Similarly, the eschatological outlook (Luke 22:15-18) was isolated from its larger context of Jesus' last Passover meal, perhaps for the purpose of an early Jewish Christian Passover celebration. In an intermediate stage of the tradition, then, both existed as independent units. What Luke appears to be doing is joining together two units of tradition that originally belonged together. This would explain the stylistic differences between 22:15-18 and

22:19-20 and the unity of 22:15-18, but not deny that the two ought to be understood as chronologically related parts of the same meal, as Luke would have us believe. Luke 22:15-20 reads so well as a Passover meal that there are no grounds for suspecting that 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 intend the same event. The hypothesis that the two halves belong together chronologically also coheres with Luke's redactional aim to provide an accurate account of the events in the life and ministry of Jesus.³¹ That Mark and 1 Corinthians have a version of the eschatological saying after the words of institution is indicative of this original relatedness. Schuermann's hypothesis, moreover, that the "Paschamahlbericht" was composed from two prophecies of Jesus' imminent death is too tenuous to be credible.

The history-of-religions datum that Schuermann brought forward to prove that the same event was being described in the "Paschamahlbericht" as in the words of institution, namely, that the Passover participant said his own blessing over the first and second cup, is open to contradiction. We saw that when the ḥăbûrâ was reclining a common blessing was said over the cup. The only question is whether they reclined for the first cup or the second cup. In either case a blessing in common would have been said before the drinking of the third cup. (After the blessing over the second cup, blessings were said individually only when the cups were refilled during the meal.) If this is so, then the cup mentioned in 22:17 could be the first or second cup, and not the third. So the history-of-religions support

for Schuermann's position can be turned into support for the opposite view. Luke 22:15-20 can be correlated with a Passover meal without contradiction.

In summary, we conclude with the following possible tradition-historical reconstruction. There were three stages in the history of Luke 22:15-20. Originally, Luke 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 were joined in some now lost narrative describing the Last Supper as a Passover meal.³² The exact contents of this are unrecoverable, but its genre was evidently that of historical narrative. An intermediate stage saw the separation of what became the eschatological outlook, or what Schuermann called the "Paschamahlbericht", and the words of institution. What changes were made to the two units composing the original unified narrative is unknown. Nevertheless, during this stage the genre of the words of institution became that of liturgy, and functioned as such, whereas the genre and purpose of the eschatological outlook is an open question.³³ Then, during the last stage, we have the chronological juxtaposition by Luke of 22:15-18 and 22:19-20, rejoining what originally belonged together. This hypothesis explains why both appear as independent units of tradition and why they form such a consistent narrative. It also does justice to Luke's claim to be giving an accurate account of the events.

The above tradition-historical reconstruction would make Mark's version and placement of the eschatological outlook less original than Luke's.³⁴ We saw earlier that Luke did not create 22:15-18 from Mark 14:22-25, as has often

been suggested, but found it in the tradition. So it seems likely that Mark or a pre-Markan redactor also had access to a similar tradition and, differently from Luke abbreviated and appended it to the words of institution. That Luke's account (22:15-20) forms such a single and coherent narrative, correlating without contradiction with a Passover meal, tells against the view that Mark's version and placement is more original. Also Schenke's observation, noted earlier, that 14:25 did not cohere well with 14:22-24 further supports this conclusion. Luke's account is more original, in other words, because it is closer to the first stage in the history of the tradition of an original narrative relating Jesus' Last Supper as a Passover meal. This reconstruction makes the best sense of the available data.^{35, 36}

Whatever the details of the history of the material contained in Luke 22:15-20, nothing can be concluded against its being seen in the history of the tradition as originally a chronological description of a single event, as Luke intends it. That event was Jesus' last Passover meal with his disciples. We shall consider Luke 22:15-18, therefore, tradition-historically as a description of the events that occurred prior to the words of institution. This means that Luke gives us the fullest picture of what actually happened and will serve as the chronological basis of our reconstruction.

3. The Relative, Tradition-Historical Priority of the Two Versions of the Words of Institution

We move to the question of the tradition-history of the words of institution themselves. Which version is the more original, the Pauline or the Markan? It is at this point, however, that we reach our exegetical limits. It is one thing to pose a question, it is something else again to answer it. That there have been perfectly plausible attempts to prove both the Markan and the Pauline forms of the words of institution as more original raises the suspicion that perhaps the data are insufficient to conclude very securely one way or the other.³⁷

To trace the texts as they stand to their original form in the history of the tradition implies recourse to criteria by which one can distinguish earlier and later elements of the tradition. Most commentators do not reflect extensively on criteria of originality, but from their actual practice one can distil the following list. (An exception to this is Patsch, who does attempt to make a list of criteria.) Not all commentators agree with all the criteria, because, in order to ascertain the most original form of the tradition, one must make assumptions about the stages of its history, which is precisely what one is attempting to recover by means of the criteria. This further complicates the whole problem.

The greater presence of Aramaisms and Semiticisms

within a text is an indication of its relative originality vis-a-vis other more graecized formulations of the same. There are two applications of this criterion. First, if one version of the words of institution shows evidence of having a greater number of Semitic grammatical features within the Greek text, then it is likely that it is more original, on the assumption that in the history of the tradition the Greek would become more polished and thereby less Semitic. Secondly, if a retranslation into Aramaic or Hebrew is unproblematic, then it is assumed that there is nothing preventing the present Greek formulation from being considered relatively old. If, on the other hand, such a retranslation is difficult or impossible, then one must conclude that significant development has taken place in the tradition, which is an indication of lateness.

On the assumption that liturgical interests have influenced the history of the tradition, it is claimed that where one finds evidence of liturgical form then one has a relatively late formulation of the tradition. The following is a list of suggested liturgical features: the tendency to draw together the words over the bread and the cup; the tendency to create liturgical parallelisms between similar sayings; the tendency to eliminate the original Passover framework (this naturally assumes that the original meal was a Passover, which, as we saw, many reject); the elimination of particularities such as names, places, and times irrelevant to liturgical use; the tendency to eliminate liturgically awkward, unnecessary, or offensive features.

Theological reflection that has been incorporated into the words of institution during the history of the tradition has also been put forward as an indication of lateness. In order to apply this criterion correctly, one needs to know what Jesus could have meant by what he said during the Last Supper, and thereby differentiate from this the later additions of the early church.

There are two ways in which the versions can differ, and therefore two applications of the criteria. First, one version may have a feature that the other does not have. When this is the case, in order to determine which version is the more original, the effort is made to determine whether the word, phrase, or sentence in question would be more easily understandable tradition-historically as an addition or as a deletion. Secondly, the accounts may simply have two different versions of the same feature. In this case, again the criteria are employed to decide which version is likely the more original.

The aim of the application of the criteria to the contending versions of the words of institution is to arrive at the earliest recoverable form of the tradition or even an "Urform" (Pesch). We shall discover, however, that the application of these criteria can prove the originality of both the Markan and Pauline versions of the words of institution. The evidence is ambiguous. This is quite a puzzling state of affairs, since, in theory at least, one ought to be able to ascertain which version of the words of institution is the earliest. There is, unfortunately, a gap

between theory and practice. This is further complicated by the fact that ingenious exegetes, of which Schuermann is the most notable, are able to present alternative explanations for evidence that seems to contradict their own findings. To use Lonerganian terminology, many insights present themselves, but the data are insufficient to allow for one of these insights to become confirmed.

Many arguments have been put forward for the greater originality of both the Markan and Pauline words of institution. We shall enumerate what we consider to be the more cogent of these, and shall discover that both lines of tradition are equally as strong in their probability of being the most original.

Applying the above criteria, one can produce evidence for the tradition-historical priority of the Markan version of the words of institution. Jeremias argued that liturgical development was evident in every account of the words of institution, including Mark. Nevertheless, he found that Mark's words of institution were the most original, for various reasons, chief of which was its greater number of Semitisms.³⁸ The other versions betrayed more graecizing influences, suggesting lateness.³⁹

Conversely, in the Pauline account we find an example of a phrase that is difficult to translate into Aramaic, which suggests that it originated in a Hellenistic environment.⁴⁰ The hyper-formula attached to the word over the bread, to hyper humōn, is unsemitic, since Aramaic and Hebrew require the addition of a participle, such as Luke has

added (to hyper humōn didomenon). Schuermann suggested that the hyper-formula in 1 Cor is from Paul himself, since the use of post-positive attributes with the article characterizes the Pauline style. At any rate, the Markan hyper-formula (and Lukan) is decidedly more Semitic.

Pesch also argued for Markan priority, but for different reasons. He eliminated Luke 22:15-20 as a contender for originality, and then compared Mark's words of institution to that of 1 Cor. He concluded, as we said already, that 1 Cor was essentially liturgical in form (cult aetiology), implying less originality, whereas Mark had all the marks of a historical narrative (berichtende Erzählung), which Pesch took to be the pre-liturgical, eyewitness account belonging to the Passion narrative of the early Christian community in Jerusalem.⁴¹ Unlike the Pauline account, the Markan words of institution had many instances of unparallel forms, had more concrete references to people and circumstances, and had a forward looking thrust towards Jesus' coming death, as opposed to 1 Cor's backward looking interest in participating in the Lord's Supper as a memorial. These features are signs that Mark's version was earlier than the later liturgical accounts, based upon Mark.⁴²

Mark's account shows itself to be uninfluenced by liturgical practice in the following ways. The commands to repeat in Luke/1 Cor, which Mark omits, could be understood as secondary additions for the sake of the liturgical practice of the community.⁴³ Their inclusion in the history of the tradition is easier to explain than their exclusion.⁴⁴

One could also argue that Mark's version of the distribution of the cup is longer and, therefore, that it is more likely that Luke/1 Cor would have abbreviated the longer account for liturgical purposes, rather than vice versa.⁴⁵ This abbreviation of Mark would also have the effect of emphasizing the distribution of the bread. Since regular wine drinking was a rarity in the first century among the common people, it was inevitable that in actual liturgical practice the stress begin to be placed on the more easily obtainable bread.⁴⁶ This is confirmed by the clause in 1 Cor. "as often as you drink this cup...", since this implies that the use of wine at the Lord's Supper was not a regular occurrence.

The presence of an interpretive phrase attached to the word over the bread in Luke/1Cor, in contradistinction to the simple "This is my body" found in Mark's version, could be taken as a liturgically motivated desire for a form parallel to the interpretive phrase attached to the word over the cup. Conversely, the liturgically unnecessary clause in Mark 14:23, "...kai epion ex autou pantes" suggests that Mark is earlier than the Pauline account, which omits such a clause. One could even make the case that the Markan word over the wine was altered, because, as liturgy, it offended the Jewish abhorrence of the consumption of blood, since it implied that the wine was the blood of Jesus. Finally, Hahn argued that, although Mark's touto estin to sōma mou/touto estin to haima mou was a result of a liturgical tendency towards parallel forms and was secondary in comparison to the

incongruent formulas in the Pauline version, nevertheless Mark's account was older in another respect: in the history of the tradition, the two motifs of covenant and expiation became separated, the former being placed in the word over the cup, the latter being placed in the word over the bread. This is an indication of the liturgical tendency towards neat and parallel forms. This implied that Mark's word over the bread was more original, because it did not have an expiatory motif connected with it.⁴⁷

Theologically, the addition of the adjective "new" to "the covenant" could be understood as a secondary attempt to make it clear that the covenant referred to was that foretold by Jeremiah. Patsch argued that it was more conceivable that the movement would be from the mention of covenant in Mark 14:24 (which he attributed wrongly to Exod 24:8, but which is not a necessary part of the argument) to the connection with the new covenant of Jer 31:31 in the Pauline version than vice versa.⁴⁸ Similarly, Pesch held that, theologically, in the history of the tradition the reference to the new covenant in 1 Cor was secondary and that the original emphasis was on the expiatory shedding of blood. The participle exchunnomenon was only appropriately placed in conjunction with cup/blood (Mark), not with covenant (1 Cor/Luke). Finally, in addition to being less Semitic, the Pauline hyper humōn contained in the word over the bread, unlike Mark's hyper pollōn, could be interpreted as presupposing the community's celebration of the eucharist.⁴⁹ (We concluded that probably Luke's phrase to hyper humōn

ekchunnomenon joined to the word over the cup is a Markan interpolation; the original Markan pollōn would have been changed by Luke to humōn in dependence on the huper-formula connected with the word over the bread.)

As strong as the case is for the originality of the Markan version of the words of institution, the case for the originality of the Pauline is equally strong. For every feature pointing to the originality of Mark's account, one can point to an equal number of features in 1 Cor (and Luke when applicable) that suggest the alternative conclusion.

Schuermann was not convinced by Jeremias's argument that the Markan account was more original owing to its greater number of Semitisms. At many points in his comparison of the 1 Cor/Luke "Grundform" with the Markan words of institution, he argued that the apparent greater originality of Mark on account of its Semitisms could be explained as due to other factors. He gave extensive arguments, for example, for understanding Mark's eulogesas instead of eucharistēsas, kai eipen instead of legōn, potērion instead of to potērion, and huper pollōn instead of huper humōn as secondary developments in the history of the tradition, despite their seemingly Aramaic flavour.⁵⁰ Schuermann's arguments are plausible, although he appears to be reaching at times (Jeremias, however, was not convinced.⁵¹), and have the effect of reducing the confidence of the investigator in taking Semitisms as guarantees of greater originality. Schuermann even occasionally found examples of Aramaisms in the Lukan/1 Cor version of the words

of institution, different from Mark, as in the use of the instrumental en (Luke: en tō haimati mou; 1 Cor: en tō emō haimati)⁵² and the omission of the copula estin (Luke only) in the word over the cup.⁵³

Jeremias' argument is even further weakened by another consideration. It is possible, as Marxen pointed out, that 1 Cor is a deliberately graecized form of the tradition that Paul received for the sake of the liturgical practice of the non-Palestinian churches, thereby avoiding potential misunderstanding that would result from a literal rendering of the Aramaic original.⁵⁴ If this is the case, the Pauline version would be both less Semitic, but could be more original.

It must also be noted that Pesch's argument is dependent on his view that Luke 22:15-18 is a redaction based on Mark. If this is not granted, then Pesch's argument from literary genre is severely undermined, for Luke's account has as many features of a historical report as Mark's does, if not more. Luke, for instance, gives a much more complete account of the Last Supper as a Passover meal insofar as he appends the words of institution to 22:15-18, thereby including the first or second Passover cup. Pesch's argument for Markan originality based on its literary genre, therefore, can no longer stand.⁵⁵ If any version had claim to originality based on its being a historical report, it is the Lukan. As we said earlier, Luke the redactor probably retrieved a more original form of the tradition of the Last Supper by bringing 22:15-18 and 22:19-20 together. We could

add that Pesch failed to recognize a third possibility distinct equally from historical report and cult aetiology, namely a cult aetiology that was originally derived from a historical report and has subsequently been reconverted into narrative form. This means that, although the Markan account of the Last Supper context is historical report, it does not follow that the words of institution themselves were also of that genre before their inclusion into this context. His view that Mark is earlier, therefore, because it is a historical report is not established.

Schuermann also made a detailed comparison of the Lukan/1 Cor "Grundform" of the words of institution with that of Mark, and quite plausibly argued that at many points Mark showed signs of being secondarily influenced by liturgical use. Schuermann's arguments were sometimes circular, in that he often presupposed the correctness of the results of his previous work on Luke 22:15-18 and its relationship to Mark. In particular, he argued that Mark 14:25 was a shortened form parallel to Luke 22:15-18, and that Luke 22:17 had influenced Mark's formulation in 14:23. Nevertheless, he did present some plausible tradition-historical reconstructions.

Of particular significance is the Luke/1 Cor phrase meta to deipnēsai.⁵⁶ If one takes the stand, as we have done, that the original context of the words of institution is a Passover meal, this phrase should be interpreted as indicating that the words over the bread and over the wine were separated by the entire meal. This phrase is, in other words, a liturgically redundant part of an earlier version of

the words of institution, which was eliminated by later versions, i.e., Mark, as unnecessary. This was how Schuermann understood it. The later liturgical tendency was to draw these two words together, blurring the original paschal context. Bornkamm also, although for different reasons, pointed to this as a factor in favour of the priority of the Pauline account. He saw it as the remnant of a stage in the evolution of the Lord's Supper when a meal separated the word over the bread from the word over the wine; at the time of the writing of Paul's first epistle the meal was no longer part of the eucharistic practice of the Corinthian church.⁵⁷ Pesch accounted for the phrase to potērion meta to deipnēsai as a liturgical technical term for the third cup, rather than being temporal reference to the completion of the meal.⁵⁸ The cup was "the cup after the meal". Luke, presumably, misunderstood Paul's intention, and transformed it into a temporal reference by changing hosautos kai to potērion meta to deipnēsai to kai to potērion hōsautōs meta to deipnēsai. Pesch's explanation is not convincing.

Other arguments can be produced in favour of the priority of Luke/1 Cor. In spite of a few notable examples to the contrary, it has been argued that Mark shows a greater tendency towards parallel forms than its counterpart. As mentioned previously, the Markan introduction to the word over the cup is parallel to his introduction to the word over the bread, whereas there exists in 1 Cor/Luke an asymmetry in this respect. In addition, the Markan formulas touto estin to sōma mou/touto estin to haima mou "kundet ein viel

staerkeres Interesse an den Elemente als solchen, zeigt also eine groessere Tendenz zu der sich spaeter entfaltenden, dezidiert 'sakramentalen' Betrachtungsweise".⁵⁹ Mark could be seen as the first step towards the sacramentalism that characterized the eucharistic practice of the second-century church. The imperatives in Mark's version of the words of institution could also be interpreted as secondary, liturgical influences. We saw earlier that Matthew may have changed Mark's kai epion ex autou pantes to piete ex autou pantes for reasons of liturgical practice; a liturgical tendency towards parallel forms would also be behind the addition of phagete to Mark's labete. So analogously, one may argue that Mark may have added the imperative labete (14:22) for liturgical reasons.⁶⁰ Also the word over the cup in Luke/1 Cor is the more difficult reading, so presumably Mark simplified his source for liturgical reasons.⁶¹ Finally, presupposing the context of a Passover meal or the as yet undifferentiated "Saettigungsmahl" and the eucharist, the word over the bread in Mark would have been separated from the word over the bread by the entire meal. This would render Mark's simple touto estin sōma mou isolated from a larger context and, therefore, unintelligible on its own.⁶² When, at a later stage the words of interpretation were drawn together, thus becoming mutually interpretive, the need for a fully interpreted word over the bread would no longer be necessary. Thus, on this basis, one could argue that Mark's form represents this later stage.

It has likewise been argued that theologically 1

Cor/Luke is more original, because it is more likely that the covenant motif would appear earlier in the history of the tradition than the motif of Jesus' expiatory death (contrary to Pesch and Patsch). The latter stages of the tradition saw the emergence of a greater soteriological interest in the death of Jesus, so the emphasis on the covenant receded into the background.⁶³ Similarly, Neuenzeit argued that the presence of huper pollōn rather than huper humōn in Luke/1 Cor reflected the increasing interest of the early community in the interpretation of Jesus' death against the background of Isa 53, thus making Mark's version later.⁶⁴

Two arguments that have been put forth in defense of the priority of the Markan version can be turned against it. One could argue that the reference to the "new covenant" became simply "covenant", because the adjective "new" was no longer necessary owing to the familiarity with the idea.⁶⁵ In addition, the Markan reference to the wine being the blood of Jesus could be interpreted as late rather than early. It can be argued that the Markan version arose in the Hellenistic church, where the sensibility toward the consumption of blood was not severe, unlike the Jewish Christian community.⁶⁶

In addition to the above tradition-historical considerations, one can point to historical indications that the Lukan/1 Cor account is more original than that of Mark.⁶⁷ First, 1 Corinthians literarily is older than Mark's gospel (55-56 A.D.), which prima facie puts the onus on the one who would prove that tradition-historically the contents of

Mark's words of institution is older. Secondly, Paul claimed to have received the tradition from the Lord, and delivered it to the Corinthian church during his first missionary journey. Again such a claim at such an early time, points to the greater originality of 1 Cor, since no similar claim is made in Mark. Where Paul received this tradition is unsure, although Patsch argued that it was possible, but not provable, that he received it quite early (c.35/37 A.D.) from the Jerusalem church. If this is the case, then the antiquity of the Pauline version of the words of institution is uncontestable.

Concerning the second point stated above, that Paul claimed to have received and delivered genuine tradition, Jeremias argued that the version of the words of institution in 1 Cor was as old as Paul claimed it to be, but that it was the form of the eucharistic words used by the Hellenistic churches. This implied, according to Jeremias, that it was less original than the version represented by Mark. What Jeremias presupposed was that a Hellenistic milieu for a tradition concerning Jesus was not as reliable as a Palestinian. But only when one assumes that there was also some distortion in meaning in comparison to the original Aramaic version that underlay Mark could one make such a claim. Jeremias' point cannot be proven. In fact, since Paul claimed that his tradition was apo tou kuriou, one ought to assume a faithfulness in the transmission of the tradition of the Last Supper to the Hellenistic churches unless proven otherwise. In addition, there is no definite proof that Paul

received his tradition in Antioch, the centre of Hellenistic Christianity. As Patsch pointed out, he could also have received it from the Jerusalem church. The burden of proof is on anyone who wishes to prove that Paul's version of the words of institution, because it was used by the Hellenistic churches, is, therefore, of Hellenistic origin and not as original as the tradition underlying Mark.

We conclude that in theory the application of the various criteria for relative originality is a valid procedure, but in practice three problems emerge. First, the selection of criteria is circular, for often one has already presupposed how the history of the tradition progressed in formulating criteria. Secondly, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether a criterion is applicable in a particular case. Thirdly, it is impossible to know which criterion ought to have priority when the application of criteria pointing to opposite conclusions conflict. The problem is one of ranking conflicting applications of criteria. Several recent writers on the topic have given formal recognition to this difficulty, but they have not, nonetheless, been deterred from attempting to solve the problem.⁶⁹ We can only conclude that no certain results will be forthcoming from this approach.

In light of the inconclusiveness of the results obtained from the application of the criteria, some have decided that both versions of the words of institution have more and less original elements in them. The task then becomes ascertaining which version of the four units making up

the words of institution--the frameworks of the words over the bread and wine; the words over the bread and the wine--is more original, rather than which complete version of the words of institution is. But even when the problem is approached in this more piecemeal manner, serious difficulties remain.⁶⁸ The three problems with the application of criteria mentioned above are still with us. Besides, it is questionable whether this approach is even justified: it seems improbable that in the history of a given line of the tradition of the words of institution that one component would retain its original form, while another would be altered. It strikes one as a grasping at straws.

If the ascertainment of which version of the words of institution is the most original is as difficult to solve as it appears to be, it would be preferable for the historian occupied with the reconstruction of the event represented by these not to base his work on either hypothesis. Neither the Markan nor the Pauline can be shown to be more original than the other. It is better to recognize the limits of the data and work within these. This shall be our approach to the task.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

¹ Cf. also Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, 2nd ed., trans. B. L. Woolf (Cambridge, England: James Clarke and Co., Ltd., 1982), pp. 182, 189, 206.

² Rudolf Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, revised ed., trans. J Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976), p. 265.

³ Ibid., p. 279.

⁴ Ibid., p. 265.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 262-84; Cf. also Hermann Patsch, Abendmahl und historischer Jesus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), p. 63.

⁷ Dibelius (op. cit., p. 200) took a different view of Luke's Last Supper narrative. Rather than seeing it as a piece of Lukan special tradition, he viewed it, as already mentioned, as Lukan redaction based on Mark 14:25. Luke's redactional aim, therefore, was to smooth out the historical incongruities in Mark, caused by the artificial connections of individual units of tradition. In particular, according to Dibelius, Luke corrected the incongruity caused by the lack of anything explicitly paschal in nature in the words of institution although it was introduced as such by Luke 22:15-18. This section clearly is to be read as the precursor to the words of institution, and there is no doubt that it describes a Passover meal. In any case, in spite of their different views of the history of the tradition in Luke's account of the Last Supper, the end result was the same for Bultmann and Dibelius, namely that the Passover setting was secondary in nature. The history of the tradition was from an independent cult aetiology to a secondary, and, therefore, unhistorical place in the Passion narrative as Jesus' last Passover meal.

⁸ Albert Eichhorn, Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament (Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1898); Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 266, 275; Dibelius, op. cit., pp. 180, 205; Guenther Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 53 (1956): 312-49, pp.

322f.; Hermann Patsch, op. cit., p. 61; Theo Preiss, "Le dernier repas Jesus fût-il un repas pascal?" Theologische Zeitschrift 4 (1948): 81-101.; Ernst Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl", Theologische Rundschau n.F. 9 (1937): 168-227; Hans Conzelmann, Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976), p. 76.

⁹ Heinz Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22, 19-20, 3. Auflage. (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970), pp. 8f., 50-57.

¹⁰ Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 324.

¹¹ E.g., Guenther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. Fraser and F. Fraser (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 191975), p. 160.

¹² D. W. B. Robinson, "The Date and Significance of the Last Supper," The Evangelical Quarterly 23 (1951): 126-33; Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 3rd ed., trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1960), pp. 71-73.

¹³ Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 323.

¹⁴ Wolfgang Schenk, Der Passionsbericht nach Markus (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974), pp. 182-84.

¹⁵ Ludger Schenke, Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus (Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971), pp. 152-98.

¹⁶ Eduard Schweizer, "Das Herrenmahl im Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung 10 (1954): 577-92.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 582.

¹⁸ Cf. Detlev Dormeyer, Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell (Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974), pp. 91f. and Rudolf Pesch, Das Markusevangelium, II Teil (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder, 1977), pp. 340f., who argued for a unified narrative.

¹⁹ Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to Mark, 2nd ed. (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1966), p. 536.

²⁰ Pesch, op. cit., pp. 340-45.

²¹ Pierre Benoit, "Le récit de la cène dans Lc. xxii, 15-20", Revue Biblique 48 (1939): 257-93, 384; Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 66f., 97, 113f.; A. E. J. Rawlinson, St. Mark, 5th ed. (London: Methuen and Co., 1942), p. 204.

²² Rudolf Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverstaendnis (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1978), p. 83.

23 Heinz Schuermann, "Das Weiterleben der Sache Jesu im nachosterlichen Herrenmahl", Biblische Zeitschrift n. F. 16 (1972): 1-23; id., "Die Symbolhandlungen Jesu als eschatologische Erfuellungszeichen", Bibel und Leben 11 (1970): 29-41, 73-78; id., "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?" Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Fued Josef Schmid. ed. P. Hoffmann, N. Brox, Pesch (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1973), pp. 325-63.; id., "Jesus' Words in the Light of His Actions at the Last Supper", Concilium 40 (1969): 119-41.

24 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 52.

25 Cf. I. Howard Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter, England: The Paternoster Press, 1980), pp. 58-66.

26 Patsch, op. cit., ch. 1.

27 Heinz Schuermann, Der Paschamahlbericht, Lk 22, (7-14.) 15-18 (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968), pp. 47-74.

28 Cf. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 99f.

29 Ferdinand Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung", Evangelische Theologie 27 (1967): 337-74, 353-56; Cf. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 124.

30 Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 133-50.

31 Cf. also Joseph Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke, x-xxiv. (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1985), p. 794; Patsch, op. cit., p. 98.

32 I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), p. 784.

33 Patsch (op. cit., pp. 95-102) questioned the validity of the hypothesis of an early Christian Passover.

34 Schuermann, Der Paschamahlbericht, pp. 42-46.

35 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper, pp. 34f.; id., The Gospel of Luke, pp. 793f.

36 Patsch (op. cit., pp. 95-102) argued that Luke 22:15-20 did not consist of two separate units of tradition, but formed a unified narrative. Patsch is correct in noticing the present unity of 22:15-20 and Luke's intention to give a historical account, but errs in denying that its pre-Lukan form likely consisted of two separate units of tradition. In fact, as we said earlier, it is possible that

22:19-20 is a mixed text taken from Mark and 1 Cor. At any rate, Schuermann's "formkritische Beobachtungen", pointing to the original unity of 22:15-18 are strong enough to overturn Patsch's contention.

37 Cf. Patsch, op. cit., p. 68.

38 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 173-86.

39 Nigel Turner, in his article "The style of Mark's Eucharistic Words" Journal of Theological Studies 8 (1957): 108-111, sought to neutralize Jeremias' results by pointing out that Semitisms were a common linguistic feature in Mark's gospel, so "instead of supporting the contention of Dr. Jeremias, the Semitisms demonstrate the unity of this passage and the gospel as a whole." (111). For each of the twenty Semitisms in the Markan words of institution, Turner found a parallel in another part of the gospel. He concluded that it was impossible to know whether the Semitisms in the words of institution were the result of the generally Semitic Markan style, or the result of the taking over of an early version of the words of institution. Semitisms in a less Semitic gospel such as Luke would be far more significant as an index for originality. A Markan Semitism in comparison to a non-Semitic parallel form in the other words of institution may be an index for greater originality, or it may simply reflect the Semitic character of the Markan style.

Jeremias' argument, however, is not so much dependent on there being Semitisms in Mark as it is on the fact that there is such a great concentration of Semitisms in Mark's words of institution in combination with instances of non-Markan style and vocabulary. (Jeremias, op. cit., p. 173).

40 Ibid., p. 167; Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 18-26; Friedrich Lang, "Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im Neuen Testament," Evangelische Theologie 25 (1975): 524-38, 525; Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels, trans. P. Levertoff (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), pp. 144f.

41 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 34-66.

42 Ibid., p. 35.

43 Ibid., pp. 49f.

44 Willi Marxen, "Der Ursprung des Abendmahls," Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952-53): 293-303, 299.

45 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper, p. 42.

46 Ibid.; Pesch, op. cit., pp. 43-45; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 52.

- 47 Hahn, op. cit., pp. 340f.
- 48 Patsch, op. cit., pp. 80-87.
- 49 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 35-37.
- 50 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 83-129; cf. Schenke, op. cit., pp. 305f.
- 51 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 190.
- 52 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 106.
- 53 Ibid., p. 95; Helmut Merklein, "Erwaegungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahlstraditionen" Biblische Zeitschrift 21 (1977): 88-101, 235-44, 96.
- 54 Marxen, op. cit., pp. 300f.
- 55 Cf. Marshall, op. cit., pp. 33-35, who followed Pesch in this.
- 56 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 87.
- 57 Bornkamm, op. cit.; Hahn, op. cit., p. 339.
- 58 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 44f.
- 59 Merklein, op. cit., p. 96; Hahn, op. cit., p. 340.
- 60 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 113; Hahn, op. cit., pp. 339f.
- 61 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 106.
- 62 Merklein, op. cit., p. 97; Schuermann, op. cit., p. 118; Marxen, op. cit., pp. 298f.; Paul Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl (Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1960), p. 110.
- 63 E. Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 587f.; Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 95-112, 122f.; Merklein, op. cit., p. 95.
- 64 Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 110f.
- 65 Friedrich Lang, "Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im Neuen Testament," Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 524-38; Marshall, op. cit., p. 46.
- 66 Merklein, op. cit., p. 96; Schuermann, op. cit., p. 106; Joseph Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. H. Danby (New York: Menorah Publishing Co., 1979), p. 329.
- 67 Patsch, op. cit., pp. 65f.; Marshall, op. cit.,

p. 32.

⁶⁸ E.g., Patsch, Bornkamm, Merklein, and Conzelmann

⁶⁹ Patsch, op. cit., pp. 64-69; Marshall, op. cit.,
p. 51.

EXCURSUS ONE: THE CHRONOLOGICAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE
ACCOUNTS OF THE LAST SUPPER IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN AND IN THE
SYNOPTICS

The fact that one can interpret the chronology of the Johannine Passion in such a way as to contradict the synoptic chronology of the same has been used to prove that Jesus' Last Supper was not a Passover meal, or at the very least, to prove that the words of institution were originally without context in the earlier stages of the tradition. The Johannine chronology can be interpreted as placing the crucifixion of Jesus on Friday, Nisan 14, and therefore the Last Supper during that previous evening. T. Preiss argued, for instance, that the Markan chronology was inconsistent, and, in fact, represented an altered version of the Johannine. The more original Johannine chronology was adapted in order to make the Last Supper into a Passover meal. Mark 14:1 says that it was two days before the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread, whereas in Mark 14:12, it is Nisan 14, the "first day" of the Festival of Unleavened Bread. In Preiss' estimation, this was contradictory, because apparently only one day ought to have elapsed between 14:1 and 14:12. He pointed to Luke's changing of Mark's reference in 14:1 to the less precise "Now the Festival of Unleavened Bread called the Passover was approaching" (Luke 22:1) as proof that Luke felt the tension in Mark's chronology and wished to expunge the difficulties.

Luke also made the Last Supper explicitly paschal by his addition of 22:15-18. The pre-Markan tradition, according to Preiss, did not identify the Last Supper as a Passover meal.¹

This tension between the synoptics and John with respect to the day of Jesus' crucifixion, however, is likely the result of the imprecise use of festival terminology at the time of the writing of the gospels. We err in demanding too much consistency from our sources. If it can be demonstrated that the gospels of Mark and John are not contradictory with respect to their chronologies, then the basis for tradition-historical arguments like that of Preiss is undercut.

It is advisable to begin by noting that John shows signs that he is following the synoptic chronology. The meal described by John as the Last Supper is unusual in many respects, if it is to be understood simply as an ordinary fellowship meal.² The meal was held in Jerusalem, when Jesus' residence for the festival was Bethany (John 12:1). (The synoptics confirm this.) But why would Jesus and his disciples eat this meal in Jerusalem, unless it was required of them, as it was for the Passover meal? In addition, Jesus and his disciples did not return to Bethany that night, but went to the valley of Kidron (18:1). This is difficult to make sense of, unless one assumes that they were forbidden to go to Bethany, because it was stipulated that the night had to be spent within the ritual limits of Jerusalem, a requirement for Passover night (John 18:1). The meal was held at night (John 13:30), which was an unusual time to be

eating, unless it was so required.³ Jesus and his disciples reclined at the table (John 13:23, 25), which indicates that the meal was not an ordinary one. Rather, it was a festival meal, and given the context, it could only have been a Passover.

The meal seems also to have been eaten in Levitical purity. Pilgrims to Jerusalem were required to cleanse themselves with the ashes of the red heifer over a period of seven days,⁴ the seventh day's cleansing being a full bath (Num 19:19). Jesus' statement that the person who had had a bath needed only to wash his feet implies that prior to the meal the disciples had ritually bathed (13:10). Finally, that the disciples are recorded to have thought that the reason Judas left was in order to buy provisions for the feast or to give alms to the poor fits the context of a Passover meal (13:29). If the meal had been held on Thursday, Nisan 14 there would have been no need to buy goods that night during the meal, since there was still the entire next day to do such things. But if the meal was a Passover eaten on Friday, Nisan 15, then the urgency would be understandable, since the next day was a high feast day, the Sabbath of Passover week. Purchases were lawful during Passover night.⁵ Likewise, it was customary for the celebrants to give alms on Passover.⁶ The above data converge toward the conclusion that the Johannine depiction of the Last Supper should not be interpreted as that of an ordinary fellowship meal, but is consistent with its being a festival meal, and in particular a Passover.⁷

The fact that the Last Supper in John appears to be a Passover meal should caution against premature conclusions concerning the incompatibility of the Johannine chronology with that of the synoptics. There are, nevertheless, several 'problem' passages in John, which have been interpreted as being incompatible with the synoptic chronology. But in order to deal with these satisfactorily, we need first to examine the use of festival terminology relating to the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread in texts temporally close to the gospel of John.

In the Old Testament, the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread are usually differentiated. The Passover offerings were slaughtered on Nisan 14, and the Passover meal took place in the evening of Nisan 15, whereas the Festival of Unleavened Bread began on Nisan 15, and lasted until Nisan 21. The two feasts were distinct, but obviously closely related (Exod 12; Lev 23:5f.; Num 28:16f.). This clarity of distinction, however, did not persist into the post-biblical period.

What does the term Passover and the related term, the Festival of Unleavened Bread, mean in the New Testament outside of the gospel of John? Mark 14:1 reads ēn de to pascha kai ta azuma meta duo hēmeras. Here Passover appears to be differentiated from the Festival of Unleavened Bread, if we take the term ta azuma to mean the period of seven days between Nisan 15 and 21. In this case, the phrase would mean that in two days began the period consisting of Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread. Whether Passover would

include Nisan 14 is uncertain. If ta azuma, however, means the days of unleavened bread, then it ought to be taken to be inclusive of the Passover, probably extending from Nisan 14 to 21.

The parallel passages in Matthew and Luke, however, are different. Matthew (26:2) has changed Mark's version to read Oidate hoti meta duo hēmeras to pascha ginetai, kai ho huios tou anthropou paradidotai eis to staurothēnai. He omits the reference to the festival/days of unleavened bread. Matthew could mean by to pascha either the entire festival period or the meal eaten in the evening of Nisan 15. It is impossible, however, to determine which option is more likely. Luke's gospel (22:1), different from both Mark and Matthew, has ēggizen de hē heortē ton azumon he legomenē pascha. Luke clearly identifies the Festival of Unleavened Bread with the Passover. The two are indistinct. We might also point out that a similar phrase is used in Luke 2:41. It is said that every year Jesus' parents went to Jerusalem for tē heortē tou pascha. It is unlikely that they went simply for Nisan 14/15; rather, Luke means by the entire festival period.

We find a similar ambiguity in the terminology used in Mark 14:12 and its parallels in Matthew and Luke. Mark 14:12 reads kai tē protē hēmera tōn azumōn, hote to pascha ethuon k.t.l.. What does this passage mean? By ta azuma may be meant the Festival of Unleavened Bread, the first day of which is when the Passover offerings are sacrificed. If this is true, then, according to use of festival terminology used

in the Old Testament, Mark has made an error.⁸ But in the first century would it have been wrong to call the first day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread the day on which the the Passover offerings were slaughtered? It may be that 14:12 simply reflects an imprecision in first-century festival terminology. Other sources testify to the possibility of calling Nisan 14 the first day of the festival.⁹ It is also possible that Mark meant by ta azuma the days of unleavened bread, which presents no historical problem, for, since unleavened bread was not to be eaten after a certain hour on Nisan 14, it rightly became one of the days on which Jews were obliged to eat unleavened bread (cf. Luke 22:7). It is difficult to know which option is correct.

Matthew (26:17) abbreviates Mark to tē de protē tōn azumon k.t.l.. The meaning of this phrase, as with Mark's, is either the first day of the days of unleavened bread or the first day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread. Again, which one of the two is the intended meaning is probably irrecoverable, and one wonders whether the meaning was ever meant to be as precise as the two interpretive options presented above. Luke's version in 22:7 reads ēlthen de hē hēmera tōn azumōn, (en) hē edei thuesthai to pascha. Luke prefers to call the entire eight-day period of Nisan 14-21 the days of unleavened bread, identifying the first day as the day on which the Passover offering was slaughtered (cf. also Acts 12:3; 20:6). In 22:1, we should recall, Luke calls the Festival of Unleavened Bread the Passover.

The terminological imprecision of both Markan phrases

and their parallels is evident. In particular, a clear distinction between the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread is not maintained.¹⁰

The imprecision of terminology related to the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread is equally evident in sources outside of the New Testament. Josephus consistently blurred the distinction between the two.¹¹ In one place he referred to the whole festival period, from Nisan 14 to Nisan 21, as the Festival of Unleavened Bread (...heortēn...tōn azumōn) (Ant. ii., 317). Jeremias held that what Josephus meant by the eight-day festival was the period of Nisan 15-22, the 22nd being included in deference the diasporan practice.¹² This is unlikely, however, since Josephus was not a diasporan Jew, and would have been more inclined to give the Palestinian practice. He is rather, in accordance with his practice, compressing the two festivals into one, including both feasts under the one name. In addition, if Josephus did make a point of accommodating his terminology to the diasporan practice, one would expect consistency, which we do not find, because in another place he described the feast as lasting seven days (Ant. iii., 249). The hypothesis that he was inconsistent in his use of terminology, as his contemporaries were, makes better sense of the data. Further evidence for Josephus' inclusion of Nisan 14 as part of the Festival of Unleavened Bread can be found in B.J. ii. 224, 244, 280. In these passages, he referred to the festival period as the Festival of Unleavened Bread. Now it is likely that he meant by this the entire

feast period of Nisan 14-21, rather than the period of Nisan 15-21. In addition, Josephus referred to Nisan 14 in one place as the day of unleavened bread, suggesting that the day of preparation had been assimilated to the subsequent seven-day feast (B.J. v. 99).

Elsewhere Josephus used the terms the Festival of Unleavened Bread and the Passover as synonyms (Ant. xiv., 21; xvii., 213; xviii. 29, 90; xx., 106; B.J. ii., 10). When he was commenting on the biblical text, however, he maintained the distinction between Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread, as in Ant. iii., 248-51. In that same passage, he called Nisan 16 the second day of Unleavened Bread.

It is clear that for Josephus the terms used to designate the two festival periods had become imprecise to the point of being interchangeable. That Josephus could refer to this eight-day period in one place as the Festival of Unleavened Bread and in another places in his writings use Passover as a synonym for the Festival of Unleavened Bread, confirms what we have seen from our examination of the synoptic terminology. It seems that, in popular use, a distinction was no longer made between Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread.

We find a different set of terms related to the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread in place in the Mishna and the Tosepta.

Pesah can mean the Passover offering.¹³ It can also mean the entire festival period. In many passages it is

impossible to know whether Nisan 14 is included as one of the days of Passover; but in other passages it is clear that Passover only begins on the fifteenth.¹⁴ Nisan 14 in the Mishna and Tosepta is referred to as the "eve of the Passover" (ʿrb psh).¹⁵ Correspondingly, the "first holy day of Passover" (ywm twb hr šwn sl psh) is Nisan 15 (cf. m. Ta'an. 1:2; m. Hag. 1:3), and the second day of Passover is Nisan 16, the day on which the omer is offered (cf. m. Men. 10:1, 3). The period of time during which the meal itself was eaten on the evening of Nisan 15, however, what the Old Testament usually calls the Passover, seems to be called in the Mishna the one of the "nights of Passover" (lyly pshym).¹⁶ There are also passages referring to the Passover as a period of time that can only denote the meal eaten on the evening of Nisan 15. When m. Pesah. 2:6, for example, refers to the eating of bitter herbs on Passover, since bitter herbs were not required eating at any time but Nisan 15, Passover in this context must mean the evening of Nisan 15.¹⁷

In other Tannaitic sources pesah can mean, not only the Passover offering, but the festival offering (ḥgygh) also. This phenomenon has its antecedents in the Old Testament. In 2 Chr 35:7, Josiah provides his people with thirty thousand sheep and goats (kēbāśīm; bēnē-ʿazīm) as Passover offerings, as well as three thousand cattle (bāqār). The implication is that the cattle were also considered to be Passover offerings. The meaning of the term pesah in this context, therefore, could include the festival offering,

since it was not permissible to sacrifice cows for the Passover offering of Nisan 14. Cows were permissible, however, for festival offerings (cf. m. Tem. 3:1).

In Deut 16:2 the Passover is to be sacrificed to the Lord in the place where it shall please him to make his name dwell. This sacrifice can be from the flock (šō ʾn) or the herd (bāqār). The flock denotes either sheep or goats, both of which are permissible for the Passover sacrifice on Nisan 14. The herd denotes cattle, which, as we said, is not permissible as the Passover offering on Nisan 14. The meaning of pesaḥ in Deut 16:2, therefore, is ambiguous.

The rabbinic exegetes resolved the ambiguity by interpreting pesaḥ in Deut 16:2 as denoting both the Passover offering and the festival offering (Sipre Deut 16:2 (129)). The obligation of the Passover pilgrim was to sacrifice both the Passover offering from the flock and a festival offering from the herd during the festival period. Similarly, later in Sipre Deut 16:4 (131), we find that the Deuteronomic stipulation that the meat of the Passover sacrifice must not remain until morning is understood to mean the morning of the third day. How is this possible? The meat of the sacrifice offered on the first day of the feast can be, according to the context in Deut 16, nothing but the pesaḥ. Now if read in light of Exod 12:10 pesaḥ must be interpreted as the Passover offering sacrificed at sunset of Nisan 14 and consumed before daybreak of Nisan 15. But this is not how Sipre Deut 16:4 interprets this passage. Again the term pesaḥ is understood as including the festival offering, so

that the morning referred to is the morning of the third day after the slaughter of the victim, in accordance with the stipulations set out in Lev 7:16 pertaining to the free-will offerings (cf. Sifra Lev 7:16).

Mek. 12:5 (Pisha 4:10-56) also reflects the confusion that Deut 16:2 created for the rabbis in their attempts to establish the procedure for the Passover of subsequent generations. The problem, as we said, was that Deut 16:2 could be interpreted as allowing the offering sacrificed on Nisan 14 to be taken from the herd (cattle) as well as from the flock. This interpretation, however, is rejected by all the authorities cited. R. Akiba, for example, justified his conclusion by the application of the hermeneutical principle that when two passages seem to contradict each other, they are to stand as they are, until a third passage can be brought to bear on the point in question. In this case, Deut 16:2 seemed to allow the sacrifice of cattle for Passover, whereas Exod 12:5 stipulated that it must be from the flock. The third and mediating verse was Exod 12:21, where Moses explicitly said that the Israelites were only to take a lamb for the Passover offering. Accordingly, the Passover offerings taken from the herd must be the festival offerings, not the Passover offering slaughtered on Nisan 14. We might add that in t. Pesah. 5:2, 3 the same ruling is made with respect to the proper animals for the Passover and festival offerings as we find in Sipre Deut and the Mekilta, but without the reference to its probable midrashic origin in Deut 16:2 (cf. m. Pesah. 6:4). Zeitlin is wrong, therefore,

when he says that the festival offering (hgygh) was never called Passover.^{18, 19}

We have established that at some point in the history of the Jewish festivals of the post-biblical period the terminology related to Passover and the subsequent Festival of Unleavened Bread changed. The Old Testament usually differentiates Passover from the Festival of Unleavened Bread, with a few exceptions, as we noted above. (We might also add to this list Ezek 45:21 where Passover denotes the entire seven-day feast.) In the New Testament and Josephus' writings, we find that there has been a shift in terminology, resulting in an imprecision of meaning in the use of the terms Passover and Festival of Unleavened Bread. They tend to be used interchangeably. In the Mishna and Tosepta the term Festival of Unleavened Bread has been eliminated. We also saw that in some sources pesah can even denote the festival offering. When and under what impulse this terminological shift took place is probably impossible to reconstruct. Also how Jesus and his disciples used the two terms is not important. What is important to establish is that at the time of the writing of the gospels the biblical terminology had disappeared, and along with it the accompanying semantic precision. This finding has important consequences for the investigation of the chronology of the gospels.

We turn now the 'problem' passages in the gospel of John. The evangelist writes in 12:1 that Jesus and the disciples arrived in Bethany six days before Passover (pro

hex hēmerōn tou pascha). Then in 13:1 we read, "Before the feast of Passover (pro tēs heortēs tou pascha), Jesus, seeing (eidōs) that his time had come to leave this world and go to the Father, loved his own, those in the world, and he loved them to the end." Passover as a temporal designation in the gospel of John denotes the entire festival period (cf. 2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:55). (Whether it denotes Nisan 14-21 or only Nisan 15-21 is uncertain, although it is probable that it is the latter, in conformity with the use of pesah in the Mishna.) The chronologically relevant question is whether the "before the feast of Passover" adverbially modifies the prepositional phrase beginning with eidōs or modifies the entire sentence. If the latter, then Jesus loved his own to the end on the afternoon of Nisan 14 before the Passover festival began on Nisan 15. The sentence is complicated as it stands²⁰, but without contradiction the adverbial phrase "before the feast of Passover" can be taken to belong to the verb eidōs. This means that what was before the feast of Passover was Jesus' knowledge that his death was imminent.²¹ John 13:1, therefore, cannot be taken to establish that Jesus was crucified before the Passover festival had begun.

In John 18:28 we read about Jesus' accusers kai autoi ouk eisēlthon eis to praitōrion, hina mē mianthōsin alla phagōsin to pascha. The crux interpretationis is the clause hina mē mianthōsin alla phagōsin to pascha. Two questions need to be answered. First, Why would Jesus' accusers be prevented from eating the Passover if they entered the praetorium? Secondly, what does "to eat the Passover" mean?

There seems only to be one possibility concerning why entering the praetorium would cause ritual defilement and, therefore, prevent Jesus' accusers from eating the Passover. The dwellings of Gentiles were considered defiling, because it was assumed that there was corpse uncleanness therein, owing to the belief that Gentiles buried their miscarried children within their houses.²² This type of defilement rendered one unclean and it was forbidden for an unclean person to take part in the sacrificing of the Passover lamb or the festival offerings.²³ This is confirmed by the Mishna, which stipulates that one affected by any ritual uncleanness, including of course corpse uncleanness, can participate in neither the Passover meal (cf. m. Pesah.. 7:7) nor meals composed of festival offerings (cf. m. Pesah.. 6:3). (Cf. parallel material in t. Pesah. 6:5; 8:1, 2.)²⁴,
25

We turn now to the second question, namely, what does "to eat the Passover" mean? "To eat the Passover" in the synoptics without a doubt means to eat the Passover lamb or meal.²⁶ But does "to eat the Passover" mean the same thing in John's gospel? The phrase only appears this once in John, and every other use of Passover denotes the festival period, similar to its use as a temporal designation in the Mishna and Tosepta.

Obviously, if the phrase phagōsin to pascha means what the Old Testament usually means by Passover, the meal on the evening of Nisan 15, then Jesus' arrest, according to the gospel of John, took place on the evening of Nisan 14 and his

execution took place between the evenings, i.e., in the afternoon of Nisan 14. But given that the Johannine Last Supper appears to be a Passover meal and that the meaning of Passover, as we saw, does not necessarily mean the meal eaten on the evening of Nisan 15, this conclusion by no means follows.

The interpretation of "to eat the the Passover" as to eat the Passover meal on the evening of Nisan 15 is not the only construal of the data. There are two other interpretations of the phrase phagōsin to pascha. First, Passover could mean one of the festival offerings, sacrificable on any day of the festival, but required to be sacrificed by Passover pilgrims on the first day of the festival, Nisan 15. When Jesus' accusers expressed hesitation about entering the praetorium for fear of not being able to eat the Passover, they could have been referring to the festival offering which they would sacrifice on Nisan 15.²⁷ Or Passover could mean the entire festival period, so that "to eat the Passover" would be a synonym for to participate in the festival. The phrase in 2 Chr 30:22 (wayyôkelu ʔet-hāmmô'ēd), "to eat the feast", parallels the Johannine phrase "to eat the Passover". If one assumes that Passover is a general term for the entire festival period, as it is elsewhere in John and other sources, then "to eat the Passover" is the functional equivalent of the phrase "to eat the feast" in 2 Chr 30:22. Both, in other words, could be idiomatic for to celebrate the festival. Jesus' accusers feared becoming defiled for the first day of the festival,

Nisan 15, and thereby disqualify themselves for the entire feast.²⁸

Another verse in John that has been construed as evidence that the Johannine chronology does not agree with that of the synoptics is 19:14: When Pilate brought Jesus out and presented him before the mob, which then shouted for his execution, it was said to have been paraskeuē tou pascha, hōra ēn hōs hektē. Should the term paraskeuē tou pascha be understood as a translation of the Hebrew ʔrb psh, which we saw in the Mishna means Nisan 14?²⁹ Or could the term denote something other than Nisan 14? The most appropriate way of proceeding with this investigation is to begin with John's own use of paraskeuē and then proceed to other sources.

In John paraskeuē occurs, apart from 19:14, in 19:31, 42. In both instances it means the day before the Sabbath, i.e., Friday. In John 19:31, because it was paraskeuē and the next day was a high Sabbath (a Sabbath during a festival period), the Jews could not leave Jesus' body on the cross. Similarly, in 19:42, since it was the paraskeuē tōn Ioudaiōn, Jesus' body was buried in a nearby tomb. Clearly both uses of paraskeuē mean the day of preparation of the Sabbath, i.e., Friday.

In the synoptic gospels also the term means the day before the Sabbath, i.e., Friday. Mark 15:42 is a case in point: in the sentence kai ēdē opsias genomenēs, epei ēn paraskeuē, ho estin prosabbaton, paraskeuē is a synonym for the day before the Sabbath. Luke 23:54, similarly, says that the day of Jesus' death was on the day of preparation and

that a Sabbath followed: kai hēmera ēn paraskeuē, kai sabbaton epephōsken. Clearly, the day of preparation is the Friday before the Sabbath.

Matt 27:62, however, poses a difficulty with respect to the interpretation of the phrase meta tēn paraskeuēn found therein. In this verse it is said tē de epaurion, hētis estin meta tēn paraskeuēn, sunēchthēsan hoi archiereis kai hoi Pharisaioi pros Pilaton. The difficulty is the awkwardness of describing the day on which the event occurred as the day "after the day of preparation". Why would not Matthew simply give the name of the day itself, the Sabbath, rather than rely on this circumlocution? Torrey argued that it was mistranslation of the Aramaic by the Greek translators.³⁰ Whatever the explanation of this awkward phrase, it cannot be used to prove that paraskeuē does not mean Friday. If one interprets paraskeuē in Matthew as the eve of the Passover, so that the phrase means the day after the day of preparation for the Passover, i.e., Nisan 15, one could make the same objection that this also is an unnecessary circumlocution, since one could designate that day as the first day of Passover or the Festival of Unleavened Bread.

Greek sources outside of the New Testament also give evidence that the day before the Sabbath was referred to as paraskeuē. Josephus, in Ant. xvi. 163 wrote en sabbasin ē tē pro autēs paraskeuē apo hōras enatēs. There is no doubt that paraskeuē means here the day before the Sabbath. It is true that Josephus also used the term pro tou sabbatou to

designate the day before the Sabbath (Ant. iii. 255), as Zeitlin pointed out, but contrary to Zeitlin's claim, he did not use this exclusively. Mark shows a similar tendency to use the terms paraskeuē and prosabbaton as synonyms, as we saw. The Didache (8:1) is explicit in naming Friday as paraskeuē, one of the days of the week upon which Christians were not to fast. Likewise, The Martyrdom of Polycarp (7:1) uses paraskeue to denote Friday, the day before the Sabbath.

We conclude that the Greek term paraskeue is used in John as well as other sources to mean the day before the Sabbath, i.e., Friday. Torrey argued that this use was the result of the Aramaic influence of the term ṣārûbatṣā on the Greek language as used by Aramaic speaking Jews and then by Christians.³¹ Whether or not this is the case is not important. All that needs to be established is that the term can mean Friday. In fact, we should note that in the other two places of its occurrence in the gospel of John, apart from the verse under investigation, the term in both instances means Friday.

Returning now to the question of whether paraskeuē tou pascha should be interpreted as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew ṣrb psh (or its Aramaic counterpart), it seems that it should not. It is methodologically incorrect to interpret out of context. In the case of John 19:31 the immediate context of the phrase is the gospel of John, and in the fourth gospel paraskeuē means the day before the Sabbath. Should the exegete not also interpret paraskeuē in the phrase paraskeuē tou pascha (19:31) as the day before the Sabbath of

Passover, i.e., the Friday of Passover week? Since, again as we saw, Passover could designate (and does so exclusively in John's gospel) the entire festival period rather than the period of Nisan 14/15, there is no objection to this reading. There would have to be good reason to give paraskeuē the meaning of the day of preparation in order not to do so, but there is not. The phrase paraskeuē tou pascha does not denote Nisan 14, therefore, but the Friday of Passover week, which in the year of Jesus' execution happened to be Nisan 15. That with this interpretation the chronology of John's gospel is brought into agreement with that of the synoptics is further evidence that this interpretation of paraskeuē tou pascha is correct. The odds against such a chronological coincidence are seven to one.

Finally, those who argue for the view that John intends to depict Jesus's crucifixion as having taken place on Nisan 14 point to John 19:36 as further proof that this was the case: egeneto gar touta hina hē graphē plerothē, Ostoun ou suntribēsetai autou. The argument is as follows. John pushes the date of Jesus' crucifixion forward to coincide with the exact time when the Passover lambs are slaughtered at the temple in order to make a theological point. That point is that Jesus typologically was the greater Passover lamb, whose bones were likewise not to be broken. The Old Testament quotation is taken to be from Exod 12:46 or a parallel in Num 9:12.

It ought to be pointed out, however, that the Old Testament citation in John 19:36 can also be Ps 34:20, a

verse which concerns the death of the righteous. Nevertheless, assuming that John does intend that Jesus' death be understood in the light of the death of the Passover lambs, it does not follow that Jesus had to die at precisely the time of the slaughtering of the Passover lambs in order to make this possible. In the synoptic accounts of Jesus' Last Supper, which obviously was eaten after the slaughter of the Passover lambs, Jesus made the typological connection between himself and paschal sacrifices during the Passover meal. Thus we have no real motivation for John to have falsified the historical record in order to make a theological point.

One might argue that there are just too many verses in John that need to be harmonized in order to make John's chronology agree with that of the synoptics. In other words, the evidence converges towards the conclusion that John and the synoptics are irreconcilable. Admittedly, the number of verses that appear to contradict the synoptic chronology is significant, and, therefore, any attempt to bring these into line with one another appears to be an apologetically motivated harmonization. Nevertheless, it seems that the gospel of John is a victim of circumstance. We have seen already that there is evidence that the Last Supper in John is not an ordinary meal, but is consistent with a Passover meal. And really there are only two phrases that give strong reason to place Jesus' death on Nisan 14 (John 18:28; 19:31). But these two phrases, as we have seen, are explainable in terms of the synoptic chronology. It is regrettable that

twentieth-century exegetes often misinterpret these phrases as a result of our not sharing the linguistic world of the readers of the gospel of John. We conclude that John's chronology is fully consistent with that of the synoptics. This means that the Johannine chronology is not evidence that the Last Supper originally was not a Passover meal or that the words of institution circulated in the early tradition without a context.

NOTES TO EXCURSUS ONE

¹ Theo Preiss, "Le dernier repas Jesus fut-il un repas pascal?" Theologische Zeitschrift 4 (1948): 81-101.

Cf. Raymond. B. Brown, The Gospel According to John, (xiii-xxi) (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1970), pp. 555-58 and Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 774-85 for recent examples of exegetes who reject the possibility of harmonizing the two accounts.

² Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 3rd ed., translated by Norman Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1966), pp. 81-84

³ Ibid., pp. 44f.

⁴ Cf. also Victor Eppstein, "The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 55 (1964): 42-58. 47.; Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua. Studies in the Gospels, translated by Paul P. Levertoff (London: S. P. C. K., 1929), p. 116.

⁵ Percy, J. Heawood, "The Time of the Last Supper," The Jewish Quarterly Review 42 (1951/52): 37-50. 39f.; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 53.

⁶ Jeremias, Ibid., p. 54.; Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, "Exkurs: Die Angaben der vier Evangelien ueber den Todestag Jesu unter Beruecksichtigung ihres Verhaeltnisses zur Halakha" in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, zweiter Band, Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas, und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte (Muenchen: C. H. Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924), p. 842.

⁷ The problem still remains that, if John intended to relate Jesus' last Passover meal, why did he not say so. Torrey explained this by assuming that John wrote in light of the synoptics, so he considered it unnecessary to mention that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, since the synoptic accounts had already ("The Date of the Crucifixion According to the Fourth Gospel", p. 229). This is a possible explanation, but it is not fully provable. On the other hand, if one claims that John did not mention that the meal was a Passover because it was not, one is hard pressed to explain the peculiarities of the meal outlined above, which

most certainly would confuse the reader. Passover was the logical choice as the meal that Jesus and his disciples would be eating.

8 Dalman held that the calling of Nisan 14 the first day of Unleavened Bread was the result of Gentile ignorance of the Jewish festival calendar (op. cit., p. 105). Schenke (op. cit., p. 152-60) drew the conclusion that this error was one of the tell-tale signs that the redactor of Mark was responsible for the Passion chronology; the redactor thereby proved that he cannot be trusted with Jewish chronology.

9 There is limited evidence in rabbinic sources that Nisan 14 was considered the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (St.-B. II 813-15; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 17, n.2). Josephus also at times includes Nisan 14 as the first day of the festival period (B.J. ii. 224, 244, 280; v. 99).

10 The term pascha in the synoptics could also mean the Passover offering or the Passover meal. Mark 14:12 = Matt 26:17; Luke 22:8; Mark 14:14 = Luke 22:11; Luke 22:15 use the phrase phagein to pascha. In Mark 14:12 = Matt 26:19; Luke 22:13 we find hetoiman to pascha. Finally, in Matthew, Jesus tells the two disciples to say to a certain man in Jerusalem that the Teacher pros se poiō to pascha meta tōn mathētōn mou.

11 Zeitlin in his rebuttal of Heawood's arguments made the claim that only after the destruction of the temple did the term (feast of) Passover as a designation for the entire eight-day period come into existence. He further claimed that Josephus reflected this development in his writings. In the earlier work, The Jewish War, Josephus, according to Zeitlin, did not confuse the term Passover with that of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Zeitlin wrote, "In the Jewish War Josephus mentions the Festival of Unleavened Bread but specifies the Passover only in connection with the slaughtering of the Paschal lamb." (49) For the earlier chapters of the Jewish Antiquities he made the same claim. Only in the latter chapters of the Jewish Antiquities (17, 18, and 20), did Josephus begin to call the Festival of Unleavened Bread the Passover. In these passages, according to Zeitlin, he used the Greek equivalents of the term "the festival which is called Passover", in order to introduce his readers to the new terminology. From these data Zeitlin concluded, "Any serious student of Josephus can see that by this term he wanted to convey something new which was not known to his readers at large". Josephus' readers would not have known that the new term for the festival period formerly called the Festival of Unleavened Bread was now called simply the festival of Passover.

Zeitlin's ulterior aim was to prove that Jesus must have used the term Festival of Unleavened Bread to refer to the period of Nisan 15-21; conversely, when he spoke of the

Passover he could only have meant the Passover offering or meal or the events of Nisan 14/15. Now apart from the difficulty of proving such a point as this terminological shift at some time just prior to the destruction of the temple, Zeitlin did not realize that his evidence was irrelevant to the question of the chronology of John and the synoptics. He wanted to prove that, since the gospels related events that were before the period of the terminological shift, the terms used must reflect the old usage. In particular when John's gospel used the term Passover, this had to mean the Passover meal or Nisan 14/15. This is obviously a fallacy. There is no reason why the gospels should not reflect the new terminology, assuming that Zeitlin's historical reconstruction is correct. In fact, one would expect the gospel writers to use the revised terminology. Most scholars date John around 90 A.D., the same period in which Josephus wrote his Antiquities. Thus the use of the term Passover in John ought to reflect the usage current at the time. Passover, in other words, ought to denote the entire eight-day period.

But we have been assuming that Zeitlin's point that there was a terminological shift and that this is evidenced in Josephus' writings has been proven. This, however, is highly questionable. First, Zeitlin claimed that in his earlier writings, Josephus used the older terminology. Only in the later portions of the Jewish Antiquities did he begin to reflect the new terminology, and clearly showed that the terminology was new by using the phrase "the festival which is called Passover" to qualify the older term. Zeitlin's claim is simply false. First, in his earlier work, The Jewish War ii. 10, Josephus wrote kai dē tēs tōn azumōn enstasēs heortēs, hē pascha para Ioudaiois kaleitai. Clearly, we have an early example of his calling the Festival of Unleavened Bread the Passover. Luke 22:2 also uses a similar term: ēggizen de hē heortē ton azumōn hē legomenē pascha, as we saw already. Both Josephus' and Luke's use of the phrase "called/named Passover" is explainable on the hypothesis that the two terms had come to denote the same thing and that they felt obliged to include both for the sake of completeness when describing the festival period. Strangely enough, Zeitlin cited this passage in his footnotes, but did not notice that it undermined his own position.

Secondly, we find in his later works only two of four passages in which Josephus took pains to use the phrase "the festival which is called Passover", as if he was explaining to those who were not yet used to the change in terminology what the Jews now called this festival period (Ant. xvii., 213; xviii. 29). In Ant. xviii. 90 and xx. 106 Josephus simply referred to the festival period as Passover. He, in other words, did not write as someone who was mediating a shift in terminology to his readers. This would be unexpected, if Zeitlin's theory were correct. We conclude that Josephus does not demonstrate any rhyme or reason in his use of terminology relating to the Passover and the Festival

of Unleavened Bread, except that, as we mentioned previously, when he was commenting on the Old Testament texts, he, as they usually do, distinguished between Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread.

Zeitlin's point has not been made. As both the New Testament and Josephus show, the terminology had become blurred by the first century. In particular, Passover could denote the Passover sacrifice or meal, the period of Nisan 14/15, the festival offering, the period of Nisan 15-21, or even the period of Nisan 14-21 in different contexts. Whether or not Jesus and his disciples used this "new" terminology, as Zeitlin claimed they did not, is irrelevant, since we are dealing with the gospels and what they intend. From the evidence, however, it seems that the shift in terminology did not suddenly happen at some time prior to the destruction of the temple, but probably slowly emerged over a period of time. There is no reason to doubt that there were those at the time of Jesus who used the terms interchangeably. The problem for the exegete, therefore, is determining which of these semantic options is the correct one in any given passage.

12 Jeremias, op. cit.

13 Outside the tractate m. Pesah., pesah means the Passover offering in m. Šabb. 23:1; m. Arak. 2:3 par t. Arak.; m. Ker. 3:8. Within the tractate m. Pesah. the references to the pesah as the Passover offering sacrificed on Nisan 14 are too numerous to list.

14 Outside the tractate m. Pesah., pesah means the festival period in m. Seb. 2:1; m. Ma'as. Š. 5:6; m. Hal. 1:1, 8; m. Šabb. 23:1; m. Šegal. 3:1, par t. Šegal. 2:1; t. Beša. 2:15; m. Roš. Haš. 1:2, 3 par t. Roš. Haš. 1:12, 13; m. Ta'an. 1:2; m. Meg. 3:5 par t. Meg. 3:5; m. Hag. 1:3 par t. Hag. 1:4; m. Ned. 7:8, 9; 8:2, cf. t. Ned. 4:7; m. B. Qam. 9:2; par t. B. Qam. 10:3; m. B. Meš. 8:6, cf. t. B. Meš. 8:27; m. Mak. 3:2; m. 'Ed. 2:10; 7:6; m. Menah. 8:2 par t. Menah. 9:3; 10:1, 3, 5, 7 par t. Menah. 10:23; m. Bek. 9:5; m. Arak. 2:3; m. Tem. 3:1; 7:5; m. Ker. 1:1; 3:8; m. Mid. 3:4. Within the tractate Pesachim pesah means the festival period in a few instances, such as m. Pesah. 2:3, 4, 5, 7; 3:1; Cf. t. Pesah. 2:1, 3-10, 15.

15 Outside of the tractate m. Pesah., cf. m. Ma'as. Š. 5:6; m. Šabb. 23:1; m. 'Ed. 5:2; m. Menah. 10:1, 3, par t. Menah. 10:23. Within the tractate m. Pesah. cf. m. Pesah. 4:1, 5, 6; 5:1; 8:8; 10:1; Cf. t. Pesah. 3:18; 10:1.

16 Cf. m. Beša. 2:7; m. Pesah. 4:4; m. 'Ed. 3:11

17 We should note that within the intertestamental period references to the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread are strangely absent, with the exception of the Book of Jubilees. There Passover means the meal held on the evening

of Nisan 15.

¹⁸ Billerbeck also quotes other instances of the use of Passover meaning the festival offerings in post-Tannaitic sources (St-B. II, p. 838).

¹⁹ Solomon Zeitlin, "The Last Supper as an Ordinary Meal in the Fourth Gospel," The Jewish Quarterly Review 42 (1951/52): 251-60. 256.

²⁰ Charles C. Torrey, "The Date of the Crucifixion According to the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature 50 (1931): 227-241. 228-30.

²¹ Jeremias, op. cit., p. 80; Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John, translated by R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), p. 463.

²² m. Ohol. 8:7; t. Ohol. 8:11

²³ The Old Testament forbids one affected by corpse uncleanness from eating either the Passover (Num 9:6ff.) or the hagiga (Lev 9:20f.)

²⁴ There were some cases where those who became disqualified from eating the Passover were exempt from offering the second Passover, while still nonetheless being unable to participate in the feast (m. Pesah. 8:2, 6; t. Pesah. 7:5, 7:6). The general principle seems to be that if one has had the blood tossed on one's behalf and then subsequently became disqualified from eating, one was exempt from offering the second Passover. On the other hand, according to the Mishna and the Tosepta, the Passover offering could be eaten in a state of uncleanness under certain conditions. If the entire congregation became unclean, or even the majority thereof, or if the Passover offering was made unclean by reason of the uncleanness of an officiating priest, then the group could eat the Passover in a state of uncleanness. Sipre Deut 16:5 (132) and t. Pesah. 6:2 quote R. Eliezer ben Matithiah as ruling that the majority has to be more than a majority of one. With respect to the uncleanness contracted by members of the congregation, a condition for the possibility of eating in a state of uncleanness seems to have been that the Passover offering be slaughtered before the act of becoming unclean occurred or was discovered (m. Pesah. 7:6; t. Pesah. 6:2). Also, if unknowingly the Passover offering was offered in uncleanness and then this fact subsequently came to light, the meal could be eaten in uncleanness (m. Pesah. 7:4, t. Pesah. 6:1). Neither of these provisions would apply, however, in the case of John 18:28, if we assume that the Passover referred to was the Passover of Nisan 14/15. Jesus' accusers would have become unclean prior to the slaughter of the lambs and would have known that they were unclean.

²⁵ C. K. Barrett in The Gospel According to St. John, 2nd. ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978), p. 532 and D. W. B. Robinson in "The Date and Significance of the Last Supper," The Evangelical Quarterly 23 (1951): 126-33. 130. wrongly interpret m. Pesah. 8:8 as saying that one defiled by corpse uncleanness could by bathing in the evening of the same day remove the uncleanness without waiting for the usual seven days, and thereby be able to eat the Passover meal. The passage in question, unparalleled in the Tosefta, states that the mourner (ḥannān), the one who learns of the death of a relative, or the one who has the bones of his parents gathered can eat the Passover after he has bathed in the evening. This mishna, however, contrary to the interpretation of Barrett and Robinson, does not concern the one who has contracted corpse uncleanness. In each case the person is required to be in mourning, and, therefore, not able to participate in any feast (Deut 26:14). The mourner is the one who is involved in the preparations for burial, but has not been made ritually unclean through contact with the dead. The one who hears of the death of a kinsman is not involved in the burial preparations owing to the distance between him and the dead, yet is still in mourning. In both of these cases the person is in the state of mourning until the burial, which usually took place the same day as death. After death one became a ḥabēl. In the case of the one who has the bones of his parents gathered, but does not come into contact with them himself, he is required to perform a second mourning on that day. In all three cases, the mourning is to come to an end at the end of the day, and the question that Mishnah addresses is whether people in these three classes can participate in the Passover meal, even though they were in mourning during the previous day. It is important to stress again that none had contracted corpse uncleanness. If they had become so ritually defiled, they would have had to wait the prescribed seven days. According to the Mishna, therefore, people who fall in one of these three classes need only bathe in the evening, and be able to participate in the Passover meal. The mourner cannot, however, eat the kadashim, other sacrificial offerings, whereas people in the other two classes can. (I owe my understanding of this material to Prof. Albert Baumgarten.)

²⁶ Cf. Mark 14:12 pars. Luke 22:11, Matt 26:17; Luke 22:15

²⁷ Cf. Torrey's articles

²⁸ Zeitlin, in his article "The Last Supper as an Ordinary Meal in the Fourth Gospel", p. 256, claimed that the Jews could have eaten festival offerings, in particular the festival offerings sacrificed on Nisan 15 (m. Hag. 1:3), even if they had contracted uncleanness. What they could not do was participate in the sacrifice of the animal at the temple, because they could not enter the temple in a state of uncleanness. As Zeitlin wrote, "Moreover, a Jew could join

friends in offering the chagiga by sharing the costs of the animal. Entrance into the Hall of Judgment would not prevent a Jew from eating the chagiga with his family." Zeitlin, however, is wrong in this. Lev 7:19-21 states explicitly that one cannot eat the thanksgiving offerings and the free will offerings (i.e., the festival offerings) in a state of ceremonial impurity (cf. St.B. II 839)

²⁹ Billerbeck (St-B. II 834-37) argued "so hat ein Jude unter 'ereb pesah nie etwas anders als den 14, Nisan verstanden." Zeitlin in his articles cited made the same point.

³⁰ Torrey, "In the Fourth Gospel the Last Supper was the Passover Meal", pp. 240-42.

³¹ Ibid, 239-40; Torrey, "The Date of the Crucifixion According to the Fourth Gospel", 232-37.

IV

A HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE LAST SUPPER

A. Introduction

The two versions of the words of institution that have come down to us agree that during a meal with his disciples, Jesus did two things and made two statements corresponding to the two actions. First, at some point during the meal he took bread, broke it, said the blessing over it, (Mark: distributed it), and, finally, said about it that it was his body. The Pauline account adds that Jesus' body, represented by the broken bread, would be (given) on behalf of the disciples. Then, at some other point during the meal, Jesus took a cup of wine, blessed it, passed it around, and said that the cup was the new covenant in his blood (Paul), or that the cup was his blood of the covenant (Mark). Whatever the original form, we find the ideas of the covenant and the shedding of blood connected with this gesture. In addition, the Markan version records that Jesus said of his blood that it would be shed on behalf of the disciples. The question that needs to be answered is what this combination of sayings and acts mean.

The unsolved tradition-historical problem of ascertaining which version of the words of institution is more original comes back to haunt us at this point. We

concluded that this problem was insoluble, given the present state of the evidence. It would make a historical reconstruction easier, if we could determine which version stood closest to the event itself, but this cannot be established with any certainty. So, because in practice it seems impossible to determine which form of the words of institution is more original, it is advisable to try another approach in an attempt at reconstructing the event of the Last Supper. It is our thesis that placed against a paschal background the differences between the two streams of tradition, the Markan and the Pauline, are minor in their significance for historical reconstruction. The Jewish Passover as a heuristic structure goes far in reconciling the differences between the accounts. This approach to the problem we shall term the synthetic approach. The larger claim that we are, in fact, making is that the situating of the words of institution against a paschal background is essential for the historical reconstruction of the event that they intend, contrary to what many historians claim. It is essential for a reconstruction of both the outside and the inside of the event.

We have already come across those who reject the paschal context of the Last Supper as secondary and, therefore, unhistorical. To such the Jewish Passover has no relevance for a reconstruction of either the outside or the inside of the event. Lohse, for example, argued that, since there was nothing in the words of institution that compelled one to assume a Passover framework, the Passover framework

was irrelevant to an understanding of the event that they intended.¹ This led him to conclude that Jesus conceived his death as structurally parallel to the expiatory death of the Isaian Servant. That is, Jesus' death was not a sacrifice (Opfer), but only a giving of life for many (Hingabe des Lebens fuer die Vielen). Only later, as the early church developed theologically, did Jesus' death become the death of a sacrificial victim and was interpreted as typologically parallel to the original Passover offerings. Leon-Dufour followed a similar procedure. He rejected Jeremias's arguments that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, and claimed that Jesus never intended his death to be understood as an expiation in any sense.²

Adrian Schenker likewise relegated the question of whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal to the status of an irrelevant question, i.e., irrelevant to an understanding of the event.³ The so-called double-origin theory represented by Lietzmann, Lohmeyer and Fuller methodologically eliminates the Passover context as historical. Although Hahn accepted the Jewish Passover tradition-historically as one background of the Last Supper narratives, but not the original and not even one of the earliest, he held that whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal was historically impossible to decide, although it was less likely that it was.⁴ Finally, Kertelge claimed that only Luke 22:15-18 presupposed a Passover meal, whereas the words of institution in Matthew, Mark, Luke and I Cor form-critically required no such background. According to him, Luke 22:15-18 and its parallel in Mark 14:25 were

secondary developments of the tradition, and originally the Last Supper was not a Passover meal.⁵ It is our contention, however, that these attempts to understand the event that the words of institution intend without a paschal context are fundamentally mistaken.

But even those who accept the Passover background for the reconstruction of the outside of the event often make little or no use of it for a reconstruction of the inside of the event. Patsch devoted a section of his book to argue that the Passover provided the only intelligible background to the Last Supper, but ironically eliminated this paschal background from his reconstruction of the inside of the event. Rather, Jesus understood his death in terms of the suffering Servant's death, and this was a natural continuation of his "service" (cf. Mark 10:45), of his "Umgang mit den Suendern".⁶ Schuermann likewise identified the Last Supper as a Passover meal, but, like Lohse and Patsch, limited Jesus' meaning to the motif of the suffering Servant, arguing that the later understanding of Jesus' death as a sacrifice (Opfer), as reflected in Mark and Matthew, was secondary.⁷ Merklein also restricted his interpretation of Jesus' understanding of his death to the expiatory death of the Servant of the Lord.⁸ Pesch⁹, and Marshall¹⁰, although each, like Patsch and Schuermann, accepted the historicity of the Passover context of the Last Supper, viewed the Old Testament background to the words of institution as Isa 53 and Exod 24:8. Finally, Schweizer stated that whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not was irrelevant to the

reconstruction of the inside of the event. Even if it was a Passover meal, paschal motifs played no role in defining the event, since Jesus would have infused the meal with an entirely new meaning.¹¹ This implies that Jesus did not parallel his approaching death with the sacrifice of the original Passover lambs. It is our position, however, that in the case of the Last Supper, context without a doubt determines the meaning of the inside of the event. Jesus' intent finds fragmentary expression at best so long as the Passover framework remains neglected and opaque.¹²

The first step in our historical reconstruction will be, therefore, to fill out the Last Supper narratives by situating the events described therein within a Passover framework. We shall, in other words, reconstruct the outside of the event. We are assuming that the units of tradition making up the Last Supper narratives are historically authentic. Then our task will be to determine the aims of Jesus at the Last Supper, the inside of the event. To this end, it is requisite that we correlate Jesus' words and actions with the theological significance of the Passover for first-century Judaism. In the last section of this chapter we shall deal extensively with objections to the authenticity of the Jesus' understanding of his death as expiatory.

B. The Outside of the Event

Jesus and his disciples came to Jerusalem for the purpose of celebrating the Passover in conformity with the prescriptions of the law. It was the duty of every male to visit Jerusalem three times a year, and as we saw, this was the actual practice of first-century Palestinian Jews. We can only assume that Jesus conformed to this practice. But was there a further reason for his coming? Did Jesus come to Jerusalem expecting to be put to death at this Passover? The gospel narratives clearly represent Jesus as knowing that he had been betrayed and was about to be executed. This is the presupposition behind the words of institution: Jesus was interpreting his approaching death for his disciples. If Jesus knew of his imminent death, then how did he learn of it and how could he be certain that his arrest and trial would indeed even end in death?¹³

This leads us to the question of Jesus' foreknowledge of his death. The New Testament presupposition is that Jesus' death was in accordance with God's saving plan. Normally, historians operate by means of the principle of analogy, whereby their own experience functions as a guide for their historical reconstruction. In the case of Jesus' death, they eliminate the notion that Jesus' death was in accordance with the will of God and that Jesus knew beforehand of the salvation-historical necessity of his own death, because, normally, people do not think in this

manner.¹⁴ But ought one to rule this out as an historical possibility? It is conceivable that Jesus did think of his death as part of his mission and not as the tragic aftermath of his own failure as the preacher of the Kingdom of God. He may have gone to Jerusalem to die. Jesus, upon realization of his ultimate failure, turned his mind to the salvation-historical meaning of his death. As Meyer put it, "Jesus did not aim to be repudiated and killed; he aimed to charge with meaning his being repudiated and killed."¹⁵ The question whether Jesus' death really was part of God's salvation-historical intention, of course, takes us outside the realm of history, but that Jesus saw it this way is by no means improbable.

Upon arriving in Judea, Jesus and his disciples resided in Bethany, which was lawful, since the cultic limits of the city had been enlarged to accommodate the festival crowds. It is likely that they had arrived a week earlier in order to purify themselves. But Jesus held the Passover meal in Jerusalem, again in conformity with the legal restrictions. On Nisan 14, he sent two disciples into the city to prepare the Passover meal. Luke identified these as Peter and John. They were to look for a man carrying a jar of water, follow him to his house, and ask him where was the upper room (kataluma) where Jesus and the twelve were to celebrate the Passover. They did just as Jesus said, and found everything as he had described it. It is obvious that the sources intend this to be understood as a display of Jesus' miraculous knowledge, similar to the finding of the

colt on which Jesus rode in his entry into Jerusalem.¹⁶ In accordance with the principle of analogy, however, it is usually assumed that at some point the tradition obscured what really happened and transformed the original account of the event from reverential motives into another instance of Jesus' miraculous knowledge. But again one must not be too hasty in judgement. Unless one rules out a priori the possibility of such an event ever taking place, one must allow for its possibility.

The two disciples whom Jesus sent were to spend the time making Passover preparations, which would include the many details that we outlined in Chapter One. They would ritually have to clean out the leaven (assuming that this had not already been done on Nisan 13 by the owner of the house in conformity with the stipulations set out in m. Pesah.), buy the necessary provisions, including the Passover lamb, and, finally, take the lamb as the representatives of the ḥăbûrâ, composed of Jesus and his disciples, to the temple at some time in the afternoon and have it slaughtered. When Jesus and the remaining ten disciples arrived, it was evening, and the lamb was probably already roasting, if the two had not returned to join Jesus and the rest of the disciples. It is also possible that Jesus and the disciples shared the Upper Room with another ḥăbûrâ.

When the incident concerning the foretelling of Jesus' betrayal took place is impossible to say with any exactitude. This question we shall leave as not satisfactorily answerable, since we saw that its position in

both the Markan and Lukan Last Supper narratives was secondary. Nevertheless, it seems preferable to have Judas out of the way for the words of institution. Luke's account, as we saw, was historically awkward, because he had Jesus identify the one who would betray him as one who was sharing table-fellowship after the Passover meal had ended. This was likely the result of Luke's interpolation of his mixed version of the words of institution into a Last Supper narrative taken from his special tradition. So, it is possible that Mark's account, wherein the first reference to the disciples eating could be interpreted as taking place during the course of appetizers and the second reference to eating could indicate the passage from the course of appetizers to the meal proper, in spite of our conclusion that tradition-historically the narrative sequence was composite, may reflect what actually happened. According to the Markan scheme, since Jesus announced his betrayal during the course of appetizers when the disciples and he had reclined, what they must have dipped together was lettuce (into the dressing), since no bread would have been eaten yet. But John's version of the foretelling of the betrayal says that Jesus dipped a psōmion, which could be interpreted as a piece of bread. This would contradict the reconstruction based on Mark. All we can say with any certainty, therefore, is that Jesus foretold his betrayal at some point during the Passover celebration. How Jesus knew of Judas' betrayal, and when his foretelling of his betrayal took place are obscure.

Contrary to the usual Jewish practice of eating the first course of a festival meal seated on stools in an antechamber before reclining to the main meal, it seems, as Billerbeck argued, that the course of appetizers was eaten in a reclining position in the main room. In fact, it is unlikely that there would have been more than one room in the upper room of a house, and, as we noted earlier, if there had been, it would probably have been used by another ḥābūrā, given the crowded conditions in Jerusalem at Passover. As we said, there may even have been another ḥābūrā sharing the room with Jesus and his disciples.

Before the meal, Jesus told his disciples that he would not eat the Passover again until it found fulfilment in the Kingdom of God (Luke 22:15f.). The Passover meal was seen by Jesus as a prefiguration of the messianic meal, to be held when the Kingdom of God had come to completion. What this means exactly, especially in relation to the words of institution, we shall consider later. Whether Luke 22:15 should be interpreted as a vow of abstinence is disputable.

Jesus and the disciples, in accordance with the Jewish custom, would then each have washed one hand. Since the group had already reclined and were, therefore, constituted as a unit, Jesus representatively took the first cup, and blessed the day and the wine. He also commanded that his disciples take the cup and divide its contents among themselves (Luke 22:17). The practice of passing around the first cup is not evidenced by any of our sources. There is, however, evidence for the passing around of the third cup.

What Jesus did likely departed from the usual practice. Jesus added that he would not drink again of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God came (Luke 22:18). Mark appended a version of this saying at the end of the Passover meal. The disciples likely drank from their own cups, in addition to the cup passed around by Jesus. Luke tells us nothing of what happened after the blessing over the first cup, but we are to assume that the meal proceeded as one would expect. This means that the ḥăbûrâ, with the possible exception of Jesus, ate the course of appetizers. This first course, as we said in Chapter One, may have been combined with or replaced by the consumption of a meal consisting of a festival offering (assuming that Jesus and the disciples had slaughtered one along with the Passover lamb), since m. Pesah. says nothing about a course of appetizers. Of whatever the first course consisted, Jesus probably also offered a representative blessing over it.

Then the second cup was mixed and the main course was brought out and laid before the group. Incidentally, who was serving the meal is not told. Each member of the group next washed both hands. Jesus as the paterfamilias would have said a blessing in common over the second cup. The Passover haggadah was then recited, and the first part of the hallel was sung. Jesus next said the blessing over the bread, broke it, distributed it, and unexpectedly interpreted it with reference to his own body. To interpret the foods eaten at Passover was not unusual; Jesus, as the acting paterfamilias, would have done something similar during the Passover

haggadah. But after the blessing of the bread and its distribution, normally, nothing would be said. Jesus departed from the usual routine, which certainly would have made an impression on those present. What he actually said about the bread with reference to his body and, more important, what he actually meant, we shall consider later. The meal was then eaten by the disciples. If they as yet had no inkling as to what Jesus was attempting to communicate concerning his imminent fate, then they must have eaten the meal in a state of ironic joyfulness, in accordance with the usual celebration of the meal, helped by the consumption of the wine, not suspecting what was to come. We are to assume that the cups were refilled during the meal and that each said his own blessing over his cup each time it was refilled.

Immediately after the meal the group would have washed their hands again, and the floor was likely swept. Jesus then took the third cup, the cup of blessing, gave thanks, passed it around, and again unexpectedly interpreted it in terms of the shedding of his own blood and the covenant.

After the third cup, presumably the fourth cup was poured and drunk, although we are not told this in the narratives. Perhaps incense was burned, but no dessert was served. We are told, however, that they sang a hymn, which would have been rest of the hallel, so we ought also to assume that the blessing over the song was recited. They then left for the Mount of Olives. It was permissible to leave the place where one ate the Passover after midnight,

and, since the meal was now completed, the requirement of staying within the walls of Jerusalem was no longer in effect. The Mount of Olives was still within the ritual limits of Jerusalem (not identical with its city limits), where the pilgrims had to spend the night. Luke places the dispute about the greatest, the announcement of Peter's threefold denial, and the tradition concerning the two swords between the completion of the meal and the departure to the Mount of Olives.

We ought to remember that what we have in the New Testament texts is liturgy converted into narrative form. This accounts for the sketchiness of the account as well as the lack of interest in historical detail. Nevertheless, liturgy does not preclude historicity. The words of institution are a reliable record of what Jesus said and did, even though they are also an accurate record of early liturgical practice. The gospel writers did not find it a problem to place liturgical formulas into a narrative context, because they knew that their liturgical formulas derived from what Jesus had actually said and done during the Last Supper.

Gordon Bahr suggested that historically the words of institution should be situated after the third Passover cup.¹⁷ The phrase meta to deipnēsai in Luke/1 Cor would mean, in this construal of the data, following the conclusion of the main course. According to Bahr's reading of the Lukan narrative, the consumption of the main course was described in Luke 22:15-18; he was working from the hypothesis that the

cup mentioned in Luke 22:17 was the third cup, not the first--since the members of the hăbûrâ would have recited individual blessings over the first cup--nor the second. Luke 22:17 represented, therefore, the completion of the meal, at which time Jesus recited the blessing over the third cup. In Bahr's view, Jesus' expression of his desire to eat the Passover (lamb) with the disciples and his subsequent statement that he would not eat again until it was fulfilled in the Kingdom of God (22:15f.) took place at the end of the meal, since the Passover lamb was eaten as the last item of the meal proper. Thus, since the cup in Luke 22:17 refers to the third cup, the eschatological saying in 22:18 was Jesus' statement that he would not eat another Passover again until it found fulfilment in the Kingdom of God. Bahr hypothesized that following the meal a course of bread was introduced along with the fourth cup in place of the dessert. These are the bread and the wine mentioned in the words of institution. This would mean that there was no meal separating the word over the bread and the cup but that they were contiguous. Jesus' words of interpretation were not, therefore, drawn together as a result of liturgical need, but were historically that way from the beginning.

There are three objections to Bahr's reconstruction. First, Bahr's hypothesis fits the data well, if we assume, as he did, that the hăbûrâ did not recline for the first course. We concluded, however, that this was not the case. But, even if Bahr were correct that the blessing over the first cup was said individually, his hypothesis is still not required by

the data. The cup in 22:17 could be the second cup, and, in fact, the context suggests that whatever cup it was it was unlikely to have been the third cup. Jesus' expression of his desire to eat the Passover with his disciples (22:16) and his statements that he would not eat the Passover again until it found fulfilment in the Kingdom of God are best situated before the main course began, contrary to Bahr's claim. Remarks of this sort are those that one would expect as an introduction to Jesus' last Passover, rather than as its conclusion.

Secondly, the Passover was to be that which satiates, and no dessert or other food was to be served after it. This suggests that bread was not eaten in place of the dessert, but simply that the fourth cup was drunk and the hallel sung. During a normal festive meal, however, bread would have been part of the dessert course; the bringing out of a new loaf of bread along with other foods was a sign to the guests that the last course was about to begin (t. Ber. 4:4, 14). Dessert was eliminated, however, as part of the Passover meal.

Thirdly, Paul's designation in 1 Cor 10:16 of the eucharistic cup as the cup of blessing, thus explicitly identifying it as the third Passover cup, further proves that in the memory of the early church the words of institution were said during the meal. This points to the conclusion that the cup identified by Jesus as the covenant in his blood was the third cup, and by extension the word over the bread would have been said during the main meal.

In the same vein, Rudolf Pesch¹⁸, drawing upon the work of Robert Eisler¹⁹, P. E. Lapidé²⁰ and David Daube²¹ argued that the bread over which Jesus spoke was a piece saved from the breaking of the bread to begin the meal--the ḥāpîkômān--and kept until the end, when it was distributed and eaten along with the drinking of the third cup. Again, this means that there was no meal separating the words over the bread and the cup. Pesch considered this to be evidence that the narrative was not full of lacunae resulting from liturgical abbreviation, but what was preserved in the Passion narrative was only the unusual aspects of the event, the regular features of the Passover meal being supplied by the reader. The unusual aspects of Jesus' last Passover were the words over the bread (the ḥāpîkômān) and wine. This reconstruction, however, does not seem supported by our sources. As far as I know, there is no evidence in the Tannaitic sources that a part of the bread broken at the beginning of the meal was kept and eaten at the end of the meal as the ḥāpîkômān. The ḥāpîkômān in t. Pesah. 10:11 and m. Pesah. 10:8 clearly means only dessert. We must conclude that the emergence of the custom of the ḥāpîkômān, understood as a piece of the bread blessed to begin the Passover meal, was later than the first century.

C. The Inside of the Event

We have sketched with the help of our earlier reconstruction of a typical, first-century Passover the outside of the Last Supper event. The more important question is what did Jesus intend by what he did and said. That is, what is the inside of the event.

Jesus took the unleavened bread, gave thanks, broke it, (Mark: distributed it), and unexpectedly said about it, "This is my body" (Mark: touto estin to sōma mou; 1 Cor: touto mou estin to sōma). In other words, he identified his body with the unleavened bread. This is given in all of our sources. But what did he mean by this? 1 Cor/Luke have interpretive phrases attached to the word over the bread; Luke has to hyper humōn didomenon, whereas 1 Cor has simply to hyper humōn. Luke, as we said, was dependent on the formula found in 1 Cor. Paul obviously understands the sōma represented by the bread as somehow yielded up in death for the benefit of the disciples.

Jesus also took the cup, corresponding to the cup of blessing, and did something similar, of which we have three versions. Mark has "This is my blood of the covenant poured out on behalf of many"; 1 Cor has "This cup is the new covenant in my blood". Luke has a mixed text composed of 1 Cor and Mark: "This cup (is) the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you." The two motifs that can be isolated from the two versions of the word over the cup are

the covenant, absent from the versions of the word over the bread, and Jesus' death, the pouring out of blood. According to the Markan version, the shedding of blood was for the benefit of many. This parallels the interpretation of the bread found in 1 Cor/Luke.

The historical task now is to make sense of these two interpretations that Jesus gave to the bread and the wine consumed during his last Passover meal. What we know is that Jesus understood his death as having some significance for his disciples, and that significance, according to the Markan word over the cup and the Pauline word over the bread was as representative, on behalf of others. Jesus' talk of the giving of his body and the pouring out of his blood naturally implied his own death. The eschatological outlook of Mark 14:25 = Luke 22:15-18 likewise implies that Jesus had his approaching death in view. It is also clear that somehow the covenant is related to Jesus' death. The two central concepts, therefore, that require investigation are representative death and covenant. Although we do not know in what sense these are to be understood, we know enough to know that these are the key ideas contained in Jesus' words of institution.

Many have felt the necessity, however, of choosing one of the themes of covenant and representative death on behalf of others as the more original, on the assumption that the two do not belong together. There is no necessary relationship between covenant and death on behalf of others, so it is deduced that at some point in the history of the

tradition the two were conjoined in a manner artificial enough to be recognized by careful analysis. Which of the two goes back to Jesus is disputed. E. Schweizer, for example, deemed it methodologically necessary to choose between three options with respect to the original form of the words of institution: a) nur der Gedanke des Bundes oder b) nur der der Stellvertretung oder c) keiner von beiden genannt. He opted for the original centrality of the covenant (hence Luke and 1 Cor as more original). Among other reasons, he argued that the more original separation of the words over the bread and the wine/cup by the entire meal, preserved by Luke and 1 Cor, would have precluded the possibility of interpreting body and blood as parallel sacrificial terms. Rather each statement would have to have been independently comprehensible.²²

Merklein, however, saw the new covenant motif of Jer 31:31 as a post-Easter extension of Jesus' eschatological saying in 14:25, which was, in his view, the original word over the cup, and Jesus' word over the bread, the Old Testament background for which was the suffering Servant of Isa 53. The existence of to haima mou tēs diathēkēs in Mark/Matt was the result of the even later influence of Exod 24:8 on the word over the cup.²³

Kutsch, similarly, argued that the connection between representative death and covenant was secondary. According to him, the original form of the word over the cup was "This is my blood, which for many is shed". Under the influence of Exod 24:8, this original formula was expanded to include the

blood of the covenant, as found in Mark and Matt. The result of this was the combining together of the two different statements concerning the blood: blood shed for many and the blood of the covenant. Both statements, however, reflected the same "Suehnebedeutung" of the blood. (According to Kutsch the central idea of Exod 24:8 was expiation not covenant.) The tradition found in Luke and Paul's version of the word over the cup was a further expansion of this original "Grundform", combining the concepts of the shedding of blood with the new covenant of Jeremiah. The new covenant of Jer 31:31, however, originally had nothing to do with the shedding of blood; forgiveness was granted with its realization, apart from sacrifice. In Kutsch's view, the connection between Jer 31:31ff. and the shedding of blood was, therefore, a secondary development of the tradition.²⁴

Some researchers, of course, see neither the covenant nor the idea of expiatory death as going back to the historical Jesus; nevertheless, they still posit separate origins for the two on the assumption that there is no necessary connection between the two concepts, and so their relationship needs to be explained in terms of developments in the history of the tradition.²⁵ As we saw, Bultmann viewed the words of institution as a cult aetiology in the form-critical sense, stemming from the Hellenistic church. The original form of the words of institution was "This is my body; This is my blood", and participation in the Lord's supper, during which these words were recited, meant participation in sacramental communion with the risen Lord.

The presence of the covenant and expiatory motifs in the present form of the words of institution was the result of secondary interpretation of the death of Jesus, which found its way into the liturgy.²⁶ Similarly, Fuller saw three lines of thought reflected in the liturgical tradition: 1. The blood of the covenant (Exod 24:8) 2. The new covenant of Jer 31:31 3. The idea of the suffering Servant (Isa 53). Each of these ideas represented a stage in the growth of the tradition of the Last Supper.²⁷ An earlier exponent of this view was Lohmeyer, who maintained the separate origins of the covenant and expiatory motifs of the words of institution.²⁸

But when placed against a Passover background, which for various reasons many are reluctant to do, the motifs of covenant and representative death correlate perfectly without any indication of artificiality.²⁹ In fact, they imply each other, as we shall see. The Passover context is, as we have said, the key to understanding Jesus' intentions at the Last Supper. The Passover festival was a remembrance of the exodus event, wherein God by means of the blood of the Passover lambs, understood as the blood of the covenant, put into effect the covenant established with Abraham. The exodus was the necessary first step to bringing the Israelites into their promised land. In the biblical texts and their subsequent interpretation, the concepts of sacrifice and covenant sum up the meaning of the original Passover.

It is this paschal theology that lay in the background of Jesus' own words and actions. Jesus understood

his own death as sacrificial, in typological correspondence to the sacrifice of the Passover lambs in Egypt. This is the sense in which his death was representative, for the benefit of others. The choice of the terms sōma and haima would have called to the minds of his hearers the idea of death, since they described the two component parts of a body that are separated when it is killed.^{30, 31} This is especially true of sacrificial animals. Furthermore, to speak of either his body or the shedding of his blood as being huper pollōn/humōn would have immediately suggested a sacrificial death. In addition, the use of the phrase ekchein haima denotes in the LXX, with a few irrelevant exceptions, the spilling of sacrificial blood.³² What type of sacrificial death was this? The Passover context allows for no other interpretation than that Jesus' death was the antitype of the sacrificial death of the original Passover lambs.³³

We must not forget that the Passover celebration was not simply a remembrance of the saving event performed by God on behalf of the Israelites in Egypt. It was also on a Passover night that the eschatological saving event would occur. Passover became an anticipation and guarantee of the hoped-for messianic deliverance for the Jewish people, and the exodus was a type of their future deliverance. Jesus, therefore, clearly intended his own death to be understood as part of that eschatological saving event, prefigured in the Passover. His death, typologically analogous to the death of the original Passover lambs, was the means by which the promised redemption would be brought about. It inaugurated

and made possible a second exodus, a greater saving event. Jesus' own sacrificial death, like the original Passover sacrifices, was sui generis, not classifiable within the Levitical scheme. The Passover sacrifices made possible the covenant, which made possible the Levitical sacrifices; it is plausible, therefore, that Jesus' considered his death as doing away with the Levitical sacrifices by fulfilling what the original Passover sacrifices typified.

We noted earlier that the midrash attributed to R. Meir in Exodus Rabbah specified that the blood of the Passover lambs made atonement for the Israelites in Egypt, and thereby granted forgiveness of sins. One can only assume that forgiveness was a condition of the redemption of the people from Egypt. The other sources simply made the less specific claim that the blood of the original Passover lambs was the means by which the first-born of Israel were protected and the redemption from Egypt took place. The exact nature of that redemption was left undefined. It seems like a logical movement from redemptive blood to expiatory blood, especially given the tradition that Israel was idolatrous in Egypt. Nevertheless, R. Meir is still only one interpreter, and we cannot justifiably conclude that his interpretation of the Passover sacrifices in Egypt as expiatory was a common tradition in Jesus' time. All that can be said, based on this tradition in Exodus Rabbah, is that there is some evidence that the original Passover offerings were viewed as expiatory in nature.

While entertaining the question of whether the

original Passover sacrifices were interpreted as expiatory in first-century Judaism, we ought not to leave out of consideration the tradition of the Binding of Isaac. It would seem that R. Meir's midrash, taken in conjunction with the connection made between Passover and the Binding of Isaac, makes it likely that the Passover offerings were understood as expiatory in first-century Judaism. Since Isaac's death was interpreted in expiatory terms and the Passover sacrifices looked back to the Binding of Isaac as their ground, the conclusion follows that the original Passover offerings were understood as making atonement for the sins of the Israelites in Egypt. So, when Jesus compared his death to the Passover sacrifices, he would probably have been understood as saying that his death was redemptive by being expiatory. As the original sacrifices, it was a kpr^{c1}.

Our discussion of the tradition of the Binding of Isaac and its relation to the Passover sacrifices leads to the question whether Jesus was influenced by the tradition of the Binding of Isaac in his understanding of his death as antitypical of the Passover sacrifices. It is probably impossible to know for certain whether this was the case, but it is reasonable to assume that Jesus knew this tradition, since it was so well represented in our sources, and that his own understanding of his death mirrored it. Jesus viewed his death as connected salvation-historically with the original Passover sacrifices, just as Isaac's death was understood. The difference was that the Binding of Isaac was anterior to

Passover, and grounded the Passover sacrifices, whereas Jesus' death would be subsequent to the Egyptian Passover, so that the Passover sacrifices typologically pointed forward to his death. But, given the eschatological dimension of the first-century Passover and Jesus' own preaching of the Kingdom of God, these differences are not significant. In one case, moreover, we saw that the blood of Isaac was to be the basis of the final, eschatological saving event. Like the actual shedding of blood or the willingness to shed it on the part of Isaac, to which the Passover sacrifices would look back at a later point in Israel's salvation-history, Jesus' death was expiatory, and gave the Passover sacrifices their true salvation-historical meaning. The tradition of the Binding of Isaac also would have made Jesus' communication to his disciples of his own understanding of his death as antitypical of the original Passover sacrifices quite simple. It was just a matter of replacing Isaac with himself, and making a few, necessary alterations.

The covenant motif in the accounts of the words of institution is also elucidated by Jewish paschal theology. The sacrifice of the Passover lambs was the means by which the covenant established with Abraham took effect. The covenant is the presupposition behind the entire exodus event. Without it, there would have been no Passover sacrifices, and therefore no redemption. There was nothing inappropriate, therefore, about Jesus' speaking of sacrifice and covenant in the same context, when that context was the Passover. Jesus' reference to the covenant, however, was not in the context of

the first Passover, but was connected with his imminent death, which, as we saw, he understood typologically as the eschatological paschal sacrifice.³⁴

A further examination of the versions of the word over the cup will prove fruitful in ascertaining Jesus' meaning. In Mark, Jesus says, "This is my blood of the covenant...", whereas 1 Cor/Luke reads "This cup (is) the new covenant in my blood..." Luke adds the participle phrase to hyper humōn ekchunnomenon, taken from Mark, to modify the cup. Whatever the cause in the history of the tradition of the different readings, there is no essential difference in their meanings.³⁵ Both assert that the cup, or more precisely its contents, represent the covenant established by Jesus' blood. Mark employs the double genitive to haima mou tēs diathēkēs. Despite common opinion, the phrase is neither clumsy nor unsemitic.³⁶ The Markan phrase denotes the covenant associated with, i.e., established by, Jesus' blood. In addition, according to the Markan version, the blood was shed hyper tōn pollōn. 1 Cor/Luke use en tō haimati causatively to modify the phrase to potērion hē kainē diathēkē. The point is that the new covenant, which the cup represents, is established by Jesus' blood, and according to Luke, who was likely following Mark, this was on behalf of others.

Jesus, therefore, in the interpretation of his own death was reworking the familiar connection in Jewish theology between blood and covenant. In the interpretation of the exodus, these two existed in a causal relationship.

The blood that made possible the actualization of the promises to Abraham was both the blood of circumcision and the blood of the Passover lambs. Jesus focused on the latter in the interpretation of his death. As the antitype of the original Passover lambs, by his death he brought into effect the new covenant. Although Mark does not specify that the covenant is new, this is certainly implied. Since a covenant was already in effect, what Jesus established by his blood must be something different from this, hence a new covenant.

More precisely it must be the new covenant foretold by Jeremiah (31:31-33) that Jesus had in mind. The idea of the new covenant in Jeremiah implies the idea of the eschaton, the new saving act of God. It is only a short step from the new covenant in Jeremiah 31:31, therefore, to the future eschatological saving event. We find, in fact, that before Jesus the Qumran community had taken that step. They understood themselves as standing on the threshold of the messianic age, and, consequently, themselves as the remnant of Israel with whom God had established the new covenant foretold by Jeremiah.³⁷

Jesus also took this step, but he brought paschal motifs to bear upon the eschatologically laden concept of the new covenant in Jeremiah. To do so was not, however, to impose something foreign on it. As we saw, it was commonly held in first-century Judaism that the eschatological saving act of God would take place on Nisan 15; the Passover celebration was an anticipation of this. Passover, the new covenant and the eschaton, therefore, were all conceptually

interrelated. In addition, Jeremiah himself sets the new covenant in contradistinction to the covenant established with the generation of the exodus. The old covenant was the one brought into effect with the Passover sacrifices, eventually culminating in the Sinaitic covenant, when the Israelites took upon themselves the Law; how the new covenant would be brought into effect is not said in Jeremiah, although Jesus made it clear. He said that, whereas the first covenant was brought into operation at the exodus by the blood of the Passover lambs, the new covenant came into effect at the eschaton, at the antitypical fulfilment of the Passover, by his own blood. Nowhere in our sources, to my knowledge, is Jer 31:31 interpreted by means of paschal theology, except, of course, the New Testament. But this seems accidental, because the move from one to other is natural.

We should add by way of a paranthetical remark that the Kingdom of God, which Jesus preached, ought to be taken as a correlative of the idea of the Jeremian new covenant. Both denote the eschatological salvation of God. In the face of the rejection of his message of the Kingdom of God, Jesus interpreted his impending death as the means by which the new covenant would be realized. In spite of his non-reception as the eschatological messenger of God, the Kingdom of God would still come.

What is the exact connection of Jesus' death with the bread and wine? It is one thing if Jesus simply said during his last Passover meal that his death was typologically to

fulfill the original Passover sacrifices, but he did more than this. He compared his sōma and haima, the two components of a body that are separated when it is killed, to the bread and the wine of the meal. What was the point of this? First, it seems that Jesus took advantage of the two blessings--the blessing over the bread and the blessing over the third cup--to speak about the significance of his own death. These were two places in the meal, apart from the Passover haggadah, when he would have had the attention of everyone present. At most other times, people would have been occupied with eating and drinking. Secondly, the bread and the wine were appropriate similes for his body and his blood, which as we saw, taken together signify his death. The tertium comparationis with respect to bread was the fact that it was broken. It is stated in each of our sources that Jesus took the bread and broke it. In the case of the wine, it was the fact that it was red; red wine appropriately enough was suggestive of blood.³⁸ Whether Jesus intended more than that these be taken as similes of his own impending death will be discussed later.

Whether or not Jesus spoke more explicitly about the typological correspondence between his death and that of the Passover sacrifices in Egypt is difficult to prove. Our sources are deficient in this regard. Certainly, if Jesus said nothing but his words of interpretation, it would have been difficult for his disciples to understand the typological connection between him and the sacrifice of the Passover lambs in Egypt. Added to this is the fact that the

word over the bread and the word over the cup were separated from each other by the entire meal, thus disrupting the continuity that we find in the later eucharistic formulas.

This is why it is often denied that the words over the bread and the wine were originally interdependent with respect to their meanings, but must have stood in independence of each other.³⁹ If the references to body and blood should not be taken to represent the two constituent parts of a sacrificial victim, then each must make a self-contained point.

Dalman, for example, rejected the suggestion that body and blood in the words of institution corresponded to the Hebrew pair of terms bāsar wadam. Rather, he interpreted the original word over the bread to mean that Jesus would give himself for the disciples. The phrase "my body" (Aramaic: gūfī) means "myself".⁴⁰ Schuermann made the same point: the pairing of the words over the bread and the wine should be interpreted as a "klimaktische Parallelismus". Each member was understandable in itself, but the second member furthered the meaning of the first. The phrase, "This is my body given on behalf of you" meant that Jesus was giving himself in death for the disciples. (Schuermann accepted the greater originality of Luke's version.) Sōma was a synonym for Jesus' self. Similarly, the word over the cup furthered the idea of Jesus' giving himself by connecting his death with the new covenant of Jer 31. The shedding of blood was another synonym for Jesus' death. The leading idea behind both words was the death of the Isaian Servant. Mark,

according to Schuermann, secondarily transformed these, the body and blood, into a "Begriffspaar", denoting the idea of a sacrificial victim, corresponding to the "Kultopfer" of Exod 24:8.^{41, 42, 43}

Jeremias suggested, however, that, during the Passover haggadah, Jesus spoke at length concerning himself as the eschatological Passover lamb.⁴⁴ During the Passover haggadah, the parts of the meal, including the Passover lamb, were interpreted as similes of some aspect of the experience of the generation of the exodus. Jesus took this opportunity to speak of his death in terms of the original Passover sacrifices. This point cannot be proven definitively, owing to the absence of all positive data, but it is at least likely and quite probable that Jesus did not restrict his comments concerning his death to the words of interpretation. Even on Schuermann's hypothesis that they were independent, the words over the bread and the wine both would require further elaboration to become intelligible to the disciples. So both views need to posit a time during the meal when Jesus enlarged on the meaning of his death. The words of interpretation were only reiterations of what Jesus had said earlier concerning the typological connection between his death and the Passover offerings in Egypt. This accounts for their brevity and their ambiguity of meaning.

This raises the related problem of why Jesus did not use the actual lamb roasted and sitting before the hăbûrâ to interpret his death. If he was the typological fulfilment of the Passover lambs sacrificed in Egypt, then why not use one

of the Passover lambs of subsequent generations to make this connection? Jewish tradition differentiated between the Passover offering in Egypt and subsequent Passover offerings (m. Pesah. 9:5). One such difference was that the latter were classified as non-expiatory, minor sacrifices, whereas the Passover offerings in Egypt were expiatory and sui generis with respect to their classification. Added to this is the fact that the roasted lamb ready to be eaten was scarcely an appropriate means by which to interpret such a solemn event as death. There would be a conflict between the tenor and vehicle. Instead, Jesus probably interpreted his imminent death by reference to the original Passover lamb remembered as part of the Passover haggadah, and then subsequently chose two appropriate times with their corresponding appropriate foods to function as similes for the meaning of his death for the purpose of reinforcing what he had said earlier.^{45, 46}

That Jesus did choose to do it this way suggests two things. First, the fact that he went to the trouble during the meal to associate the bread and the wine with his body and blood when he had fully explained his death earlier during the Passover haggadah could indicate that he intended to establish this as an institution to be repeated by his followers. The Pauline version certainly sees it this way. This would be another reason why the lamb would be an inappropriate simile. Practically Jesus' followers could not afford to buy and sacrifice a lamb very often. Bread and wine were more readily available. At any rate, this topic

would take us beyond the scope of this study. Secondly, the fact that Jesus spoke the words over the bread and the cup when it was not strictly necessary, since he had interpreted his death earlier, leads one to suspect that these words and acts were more than simply similes designed to reinforce his previous words. This question shall be taken up a little later.

Who exactly were the intended beneficiaries of Jesus' death? Mark has huper pollōn, whereas the Pauline version has huper humōn. Did Jesus, in other words, intend his death to be a sacrifice just for his disciples? The key to solving this problem is to recognize the representative significance of the twelve. That there were twelve disciples was no accident; Jesus deliberately chose this number to symbolize that they were the new Israel, the remnant-nucleus of the restoration of Israel at the eschaton. Given this representative dimension of the number twelve, it makes no difference whether Jesus said huper humōn or huper pollōn, because the former would not mean simply the disciples, but the disciples as the nucleus of the new Israel, i.e., for many. Jesus' intention was that his death would be sacrificial for the remnant of Israel.⁴⁷

We have attempted to understand Jesus' words of institution against a Passover background. Those who do not take the paschal nature of the Last Supper into account miss the point of Jesus' words and actions. As we have already seen, there is a tendency to restrict the background of the words of institution to the Isaian suffering Servant. The

idea of Jesus' death being antitypical of the Passover offering in Egypt is often seen as a later development in the history of the tradition. Neuenzeit, for instance, presented a tradition-historical reconstruction, wherein he traced the development of the words of institution from 1 Cor 11 the earliest stage represented by Mark 14:22-24 to its later stages as found in Mark 14:22-24 and Matt 26:26-28.⁴⁸ It was the development from an understanding of Jesus' death as interpreted against the background of the motif of the suffering Servant to that of a "Kultopfer". The later stages of the tradition transformed Jesus' death into the death of a sacrificial victim. But, if Jesus understood his own death as the typological fulfilment of the Passover sacrifices, then Neuenzeit's entire tradition-historical reconstruction ought to be turned on its head. Neuenzeit rejected as unnecessary the use of a Passover framework as determinative of the meaning of the words of institution.⁴⁹ This view we have shown to be completely erroneous: the Passover framework is essential to understanding the full meaning of the words of institution. It is the heuristic structure that makes possible a reconstruction of the Last Supper.⁵⁰

We argued that Jesus understood his death as a sacrifice huper pollōn/humōn, as antitypical of the original Passover sacrifices. The Old Testament is ambiguous about what exactly the sacrifice of the Passover lambs and the spreading of the blood on the door frames of the houses of the Israelites did, apart from causing the angel of death to pass over, sparing their first-born. Later interpretation,

however, understood the Passover sacrifices as having redemptive power, whereby God was able to redeem the Israelites from Egypt, thereby putting into effect the covenant, and as having an expiatory quality. Jesus, similarly, understood his own death as redemptive and as bringing about the new covenant foretold by Jeremiah and as an expiation for sin. Now, in order to specify further the sense in which his death was sacrificial, Jesus had recourse to the concept of the Servant of the Lord. We find echoes of the Suffering Servant motif in the words of institution.

This is not at all unexpected, since there is evidence that the Binding of Isaac was understood in terms of the Isaian Suffering Servant in the Targumic tradition.⁵¹ The two categories naturally flowed together, interpenetrating each other. Thus, since the Binding of Isaac was also brought into connection with the Passover, this means that in Jewish thought we find a triple complex of traditions: Passover, the Binding of Isaac, and the Suffering Servant. This is structurally similar to what we find in the words of institution.

The Servant's death is sacrificial. But more than this, his death is expiatory. In the Hebrew text of Isa 53 the Servant is referred to as being an ḏāšām, which is translated as guilt offering, an offering made for the purpose of expiating sin (cf. Leviticus 5:14-6:7; 7:1-10). The ḏāšām was offered when an Israelite sinned inadvertently by failing to pay the dues required by God, thus incurring guilt. The guilt offering also covered any unintentional

breaking of the commandments of God. In addition, intentional sins against one's fellow Israelite, such as lying or theft, wherein some material loss resulted on the part of the victim, could also be expiated by a guilt offering. The sacrifice consisted of a ram or a male sheep without blemish. With respect to the non-payment of sacred dues, the one who had incurred guilt in this manner must not only pay the required dues, but also an added fifth. The same was true of the restoration of money or property gained illegally: the guilty party would restore the value thereof and pay an additional fifth (cf. I Sam. 6:3).

The Servant's death as an ḡāšām, therefore, denotes that he is the means by which guilt is removed from the guilty. Used metaphorically of the Servant, ḡāšām loses its strict Levitical meaning. Obviously, the Servant could not literally be an ḡāšām offering, since he is not a goat or ram. Nevertheless, metaphorically, the Servant is an ḡāšām, in that he removes guilt from the guilty by his suffering and the surrendering his life (cf. Mark 10:45). His death, in other words, is expiatory.

Other expiatory terminology is used to describe the death of the Servant in Isa 53. The Servant is said "to have been pierced for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities" (53:5). Also, the Lord "laid upon him the guilt (ḡāṣōn) of us all" (53:6). In addition, the Servant "bore (the penalty) of our guilt" (53:11), "poured out to death his soul (he'ērā lammāwet napšō)..., and "bore the sin of many" (53:12).

Returning to the words of institution, if the Pauline form of the word over the bread is the most original, the conceptual connections with the Isaian suffering servant are probable. Jesus' body is huper humōn, paralleling Isa 53:12, where the Servant likewise is said to be given unto death (LXX: paredothē eis thanaton). Luke's change of the Pauline tradition to to huper humōn didomenon renders it verbally parallel to LXX Isa 53. Luke, therefore, may have added the participle didomenon for this very reason. The Pauline version is also reminiscent of LXX Isa 53:6 (kai kurios paredōken auton tais hamartais humōn) and LXX Isa 53:12b (dia tas hamartias auton paredothē).

Mark, who was followed by Luke, includes a huper-formula in conjunction with the word over the cup (to ekchunnomenon huper pollōn). As with the Pauline word over the bread, it is probable that the idea of representative death is allusive to the suffering Servant.

Now the parallelism between the giving of Jesus' body and the vicarious death of the Servant breaks down because, as we have seen, Jesus' primary intention was to compare typologically his death with the sacrifice of the Passover offerings in Egypt. Sōma in Jesus' usage is to be understood as part of the dual concept of body/blood, which denotes the two component parts of an individual separated in death, especially applicable to a sacrificial victim. The description of the Servant's death in Isa 53, however, does not use such a conceptuality. The Servant gives himself unto suffering and death, or his life (psuchē; nepeś), but never

gives his body or blood in the sacrificial sense outlined above. So Jesus' giving of his body is not the same as the Servant's being given unto death. This makes the parallel somewhat awkward, because the dual concept body/blood is basic to Jesus' depiction of the expiatory meaning of his death. Nevertheless, the pairing of the motif of the Suffering Servant and paschal theology in this way is generally appropriate, for in both we have the description of a sacrifice with redemptive and expiatory force.⁵²

If Mark's huper polōn is more original than 1 Cor huper humōn, and goes back to Jesus, this is without a doubt an allusion to Isa 53:11, 12, where the Servant is said to justify many (pollois; rabbîm), and bear the sin of many (hamartias pollōn; hētēḡ rabbîm).⁵³ Like the Servant in Isa 53:10, Jesus made his life a guilt offering (ḡāšām). Matthew obviously sees it this way, because he interprets Jesus' sacrifice--in particular the pouring out of his blood--as for the forgiveness of sins, in conformity with the role of the Servant. Matthew, therefore, is only making explicit what was implicit.

Again, we must point out that the idea of Jesus' shedding his blood for many in the words of institution is not completely parallel to the expiatory death of the Servant. Blood in Jesus' use is the complement to body, understood as part of the dual concept of body/blood, denoting, as we said, the two component parts of a sacrificial victim separated in death. The Servant never pours out his blood in this sense. The parallel lies in the

Servant's death on behalf of many and Jesus' death functioning in the same capacity.

But even if Jesus originally used the Aramiac equivalent of huper humōn, and at some point in the tradition huper pollōn was substituted in dependence on and assimilation to Isa 53, it is still probable that Jesus expected his hearers to understand his statements about his own death in light of the suffering Servant motif. Jesus conceived his entire ministry in terms of the model of the Servant of the Lord, so it is likely that when Jesus spoke of his death in sacrificial terms, as he did in the words of institution, that this ought to be understood against the background of Isa 53.⁵⁴

We should add that the reference to the pouring out his blood may be allusive of Isa 53:12, wherein the Servant "pours out his soul (to death)", although this is not decisive.⁵⁵ The indecisiveness arises from the following observations. The LXX translates he ʿēṛâ as paredothē and Targum Isaiah, similarly, as mšr (to deliver up). In addition, nowhere does the LXX translate he ʿēṛâ as ekchunnein. The pouring out of one's soul appears in Ps 141:8 (cf. Is 53:12) (ʔal tē ʿar napšî) as a synonym for dying. But one does not pour out (he ʿēṛâ) one's blood in Hebrew as an idiom for dying, as we find in the words of institution. One could add to the argument against the identification by pointing out that ekchein (ekchunnein is not used) is used in the LXX to translate šāpak dam, and in the New Testament haima ekchein is used to denote bloodshed

and is the equivalent of the Hebrew šāpak dam. The linguistic evidence is decidedly too weak, therefore, to conclude that ekchunnein haima of the words of institution reflects he'ērâ napšô of Isa 53:12.

Lohse argued, however, that the two phrases are parallel, because "nach uralter Auffassung die Seele des Menschen im Blut ihren Sitz hat, fliessen mit dem Ausstoemen des Blutes Seele und Leben dahin."⁵⁶ He followed Dalman in this.⁵⁷ But again this observation only marginally increases the probability of the identification of the two clauses, and only at the conceptual level. At any rate, the idea of death on behalf (hyper) of others, which both versions of the words of institution contain, is indisputably conceptually parallel to the Servant's role as depicted throughout the entire chapter of Isa 53. If Jesus at other times had made explicit to the disciples the connection between himself and the Servant, he would be right in expecting them to understand the words of institution as being at least partially inspired by the figure of the suffering Servant. Jesus' reference to his death on behalf of others during the Last Supper would call to mind Jesus' previous statements about his death interpreted in light of Isa 53, and serve to make an association between the words of institution and the death of the Servant.

What Jesus did, therefore, was to bring the theme of the suffering Servant into relation with his eschatological paschal theology, in order to clarify further the latter. The commingling of related categories was not unknown in

Judaism, as we noted above, and what Jesus did was structurally similar to his bringing to bear of the new covenant passage of Jer 31:31 on his understanding of himself as the typological fulfilment of the Passover lambs slaughtered in Egypt. That is, just as Jer 31:31 further clarified the covenant idea inherent in the Passover theology by making the eschatological sense of the covenant explicit, so, likewise, the use of the Servant Songs allowed Jesus to clarify further in what sense his death was sacrificial. Thus, parallel to the death of the Servant, Jesus' death as the eschatological paschal offering was sacrificial in the sense of being expiatory. His death was representative, in that he, the guiltless, would bear the guilt of others. The motif of the expiatory death of the suffering Servant complemented Jesus' understanding of himself in paschal terms, although there are, as we noted, limitations to this synthesis. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that Jesus' primary emphasis in his interpretation of his death at the Last Supper was himself as the antitypical fulfilment of the Passover offerings in Egypt. The suffering Servant motifs were subservient to this end.^{58, 59}

We saw that Jesus' identification of the bread and the contents of the cup, the wine, and their distribution to the disciples was unnecessary, if Jesus simply wanted to make the point that his death was the antitype of the original Passover sacrifices. This purpose could have been accomplished during the Passover haggadah; there was no need for Jesus to speak the words over the bread and cup. This

raises the suspicion that Jesus intended more than simply the communication of his understanding of his death. It is this observation that has given rise to the hypothesis that Jesus intended that the disciples' participation in the eating and drinking of the wine and bread was a sacramental participation in the salvation-historical effects of his death.

Gustav Staehlin sought to understand Jesus, not only by his parabolic speech, but also his parabolic actions.⁶⁰ Jesus both spoke and acted, but often acted in such a way that his actions had a "Sinnueberschuss". That is, some of Jesus' acts pointed beyond the immediate context and intended a larger meaning. These acts were those "aus denen ein ueber das Einzelereignis hinausreichender, tiefer oder allgemeingueltiger Sinn abzulesen ist, um den Jesus wusste und auf den er hinzeilte..."⁶¹

Jesus used "Bildreden" in order to explain other-worldly realities, which he knew by virtue of his being sent from God, to people who could only understand such things in this-worldly terms. It was, in other words, a pedagogical device. But why did Jesus use "Bildtaten", i.e., parabolic actions? Again it was for pedagogical reasons. But more than this, in so doing Jesus placed himself in continuity with the Old Testament. According to Staehlin, one found in the Old Testament both prophetic symbolic acts and symbolic acts in the cultic activities of the priests. The key difference between Jesus and the Old Testament prophets, however, was that Jesus as part of his message

sought to make known his own consciousness of being sent from God, whereas the prophets had no such relation to God: "Waehrend die Propheten Gottes Tun dem Schicksal ihres Volkes darstellen, offenbart Jesus in seinen Gleichnishandlungen den Sinn seiner eigenen Sendung."⁶² Staehlin added that Jesus also made use of parabolic actions in order simply to make his teaching more memorable. The majority of Jesus' parabolic actions were in the service of the preaching that the eschaton had arrived.

The Last Supper, according to Staehlin, was one such parabolic action. In continuity with the Old Testament, Jesus represented himself as the fulfilment of what the Passover lambs symbolized. In other words, he saw his death as expiatory.⁶³ Later in the same essay, Staehlin explained the Last Supper as one of many fellowship meals symbolically pointing to the banquet in the Kingdom of God, which he defined as "die Herrlichkeit vollkommenen Gemeinschaft mit Gott in seiner ewigen Welt". But the Last Supper was more than simply another fellowship meal. At the Last Supper, the eschatological fellowship with God was realized, but more than this, Jesus became the meal itself. This meant that the disciples, by virtue of their participation in the meal, participated at the same time in the sacrifice that Jesus would offer on their behalf, in order to bring about the eschatological fellowship that the meal symbolized. "Mit dem gebrochene Brot und dem roten Wein bildet Jesus seinen Opfertod ab, und indem Jesus seinen Juengern Brot und Wein zu essen und zu trinken gibt, macht er sie zu Priestern und

Kultgenossen, denen in der Teilnahme am Opfermahl die Kraft des Opfersegens zuteil wird."⁶⁴

Jacques Dupont used the heuristic device of the symbolic acts of the Old Testament prophets to understand the words of institution.⁶⁵ The Old Testament prophets not only spoke, but also acted. Jeremiah, for example, bought a clay jar and after announcing the coming destruction upon Jerusalem, he broke the jar as a symbol of the way in which God would break the nation and the city. Ezekiel likewise was instructed to take a clay tablet and to draw the city of Jerusalem on it. Then he was to erect siege works against it, build ramp up to it, set up camps against it and put battering rams around it. Finally, he was to put an iron pan between himself and the besieged city. This was to be a sign (סֹמֶט) for the house of Israel that Jerusalem would be soon be under siege. Similarly, in Ezek 5:1-4, Ezekiel was told to cut off his hair and beard and divide it into three parts. The first third he was to burn inside the city; the second third he struck with a sword all around the city; the third third he was to scatter to the wind. The fate of Ezekiel's hair was to be the fate of Israel under siege. For other similar prophetic acts, see Ezek 6:11; 12:3-12; 37:16-20; 1 Kgs 11:29-33, 22:11; Is 20:2-4; Jer 13:1-14; 27:2-7; 28:10-14; 35:2-16; Acts 18:6, 21:10-14. According to Dupont, these prophetic actions were not simply illustrations of or elaborate object lessons for the prophetic word. The actions were efficacious: they effected what they symbolized.

Returning now to Jesus' actions at the Last Supper,

according to Dupont, we ought to understand them in the light of the prophetic symbolic acts. Jesus gave to his disciples bread and wine, while declaring that they represented his body and blood respectively. What was Jesus' intention in this? Dupont concluded that the disciples' participation in the meal, was a "signe efficace..., car en mangeant de ce pain et en buvant a cette coupe, les Apotres entrent réellement dans l'Alliance que le sacrifice du Calvaire va sceller."⁶⁶ The enabling of the disciples' real participation in the new covenant brought about by his death was the principal rationale behind Jesus' words and actions during the Last Supper.

Schuermann, similarly, argued that the Last Supper was to be understood on analogy to the symbolic acts of the prophets.⁶⁷ He began, however, as did Staehlin, with the premise that Jesus' symbolic acts were in the service of his preaching of the "erfuellten Eschata". Thus, he differentiated between Jesus' symbolic acts and those of the Old Testament prophets, despite the continuity. The former were promissory or predictive in nature; they pointed forward to what they symbolized. In addition, they took place in the time of the old covenant, before the advent of the new covenant in the eschaton. Jesus' symbolic acts, different from those of the Old Testament prophets, were better called "eschatologische Erfuellungszeichen", because they symbolized that Jesus' appearance was the dawn of the time of eschatological salvation. The central meaning of all of Jesus' symbolic acts was in every case was the eschatological

fulfilment of the promises of God in his very appearance. And, moreover, in continuity with the Old Testament prophets, Jesus' symbolic acts were more than just pedagogical devices, but were creative, in that they effected what they symbolized.⁶⁸ Schuermann stipulated, however, that those acts, the function of which was not primarily the communication of a "tiefere und allgemeingeltige Sinn", should not be counted among the symbolic acts of Jesus.

Not only, however, were Jesus' symbolic acts qualified by his consciousness of standing in the age of fulfilment, but by his expectation of a violent death. According to Schuermann, Jesus saw early that a violent death was the logical outcome of his ministry, since John the Baptist also was martyred, and Jesus, like him, received resistance to his message. Jesus assimilated his approaching death into his preaching of the Kingdom of God, the eschatological time of fulfilment; it is, accordingly, no surprise that his symbolic acts concerned both elements.

The Last Supper as Jesus' final symbolic act, according to Schuermann, was the culmination of all previous symbolic acts. In it both Jesus' consciousness of being the eschatological messenger of salvation and his expectation of rejection and death came together. Schuermann claimed that during the Last Supper Jesus interpreted his coming death as the means by which the eschatological salvation would be realized. His death became an essential part of the fulfilment of God's promise of salvation.

In Schuermann's view, Jesus' breaking of bread and

the unusual act of the offering of his cup to the disciples were intended to communicate a an eschatological "Heilsgabe", a participation in the eschaton: "Jesu Abendsmahlsgabe kuendet und gibt Anteil am Eschaton."⁶⁹ His death would be representative, and the benefits of this representative death were given proleptically to the disciples by virtue of their participation in the Last Supper.⁷⁰

How exactly did this come about in the context of the meal? Schuermann argued that it was customary for the paterfamilias to communicate his personal blessings to some present at the meal. Based on references in the Talmud (b. Ber. 46a), he claimed that during the blessing over the bread the paterfamilias often took this opportunity to give the "good eye", i.e., communicate a personal blessing, to some present. The blessing was literally transmitted as the bread was passed around. This is what Jesus did, according to Schuermann. Similarly, he argued that Jesus' choice to use a single cup for the blessing over the third cup, contrary to the usual practice, should be understood as Jesus' intention to communicate a blessing to all present. Again, according to Jewish practice, the paterfamilias could send his own cup of blessing to a particular person, in order to communicate a blessing to the recipient. Jesus sent his cup to all those present, thereby communicating a blessing to all.

Ben F. Meyer made essentially the same point. For him, Jesus' entire ministry was marked by a sequence of symbolic acts, which, taken together, formed a coherent picture of the aims of Jesus. Jesus' choosing of the twelve

disciples, his fellowship with sinners, the messianic entry into Jerusalem, the cleansing of the temple, and finally the Last Supper along with the words of Jesus all pointed to the idea of the restoration of Israel. This meant the establishment in the new covenant of the eschatological people of God, who had been made acceptable by the new means for the forgiveness of sins, Jesus' own death. The Last Supper as an esoteric symbolic act was the efficacious, symbolic participation of the twelve in the expiatory benefits of Jesus' coming death.⁷¹

Jeremias, also in continuity with Staehlin's programmatic essay, understood some of Jesus' acts as parabolic. These acts pointed beyond their immediate context, and were proclamations that the age of fulfilment, the Kingdom of God, had arrived. His most important parabolic act was his meal fellowship with the outcasts of Jewish society.⁷² Jesus also made the Last Supper into a parabolic act, inasmuch as he used the occasion to draw parallels between himself and the Passover sacrifices in Egypt. But more than this, according to Jeremias, Jesus also gave the twelve as the representatives of the new people of God a share in his expiatory death by their consumption of the bread and the wine. According to him, blessings offered during a meal were actually communicated to the participants of that meal. He took it as established that in Judaism divine gifts were communicated through eating and drinking. In the act of dining together, the group partook in the blessing offered to God by virtue of their existing in

solidarity as a table fellowship. So when Jesus, after the blessings over the bread and the cup, said to the disciples that the bread and cup were his body and the blood of the covenant/covenant in his blood what he was doing was making clear that they were actually receiving as their blessing the soteriological benefits of his death.⁷³

The question that needs to be answered is whether Jesus did intend by his disciples' eating and drinking that they participate in his expiatory death. There are some problems with this hypothesis.

First, the use of the symbolic acts of the Old Testament prophets as a heuristic device by which to understand the words of institution is unsatisfactory. The Old Testament prophetic symbolic acts, as Dupont, Staehlin, Shuermann and Meyer point out, were conceived as efficacious acts: they brought about what they symbolized. Now applying the concept of the efficacious symbolic act to Last Supper, Jesus, by representing his expiatory death by the breaking of the bread and the wine, would have been effecting his own death. Norman Beck recognized that this was the logical outcome of the application of the heuristic device of the symbolic acts of the Old Testament prophets to Jesus' words of institution, but did not find anything incoherent about this conclusion. He stated "...Jesus was, in a sense, becoming a more active participant in causing his own destruction. His act may be said to have brought his death one step closer to realization."⁷⁴ Beck saw the word over the cup as inauthentic, so Jesus only identified his destiny

with the broken bread. In causing his own death by the symbolic identification of himself with the bread, Jesus also enabled those who ate of the bread to become the beneficiaries of this redemptive event, although Beck qualified this by saying that these benefits were not given automatically.⁷⁵ He did not, unfortunately, expand on this qualification.

But to say that Jesus caused his own death and then allowed his disciples to participate in the benefits of that death by their participation in the meal goes contrary to every other statement made about his death. In the gospel record, Jesus' death has both an immediate cause and an ultimate cause. The immediate cause is the conspiracy of the leaders of the Jews (Mark 14:1-2 pars.). The ultimate cause is the will of God, who predestined that the Messiah must suffer at the hands of men (Mark 8:31 pars; 9:12 pars; 10:32-34 pars; Matt 26:1, 18). Jesus is portrayed as viewing his death as both divinely necessary and as the result of the hatred of his opponents. Hence, if Jesus' death was the result of a plot against his life, which ultimately was the outworking of the counsels of God, there is no room for Jesus' being the cause of his own death. In addition, historically it is incorrect to say that Jesus aimed at death; rather he aimed to incorporate his death into his proclamation of the Kingdom of God. For Beck's reconstruction of the meaning of the words of institution to be correct, one must hold that Jesus sought to bring about his own death, which is an untenable position. We must

reject the notion that the Last Supper can be illumined against the background of the symbolic acts of the Old Testament prophets.

We saw that the hypothesis that the disciples eating and drinking at the Last Supper was their participation in the expiatory death of Jesus was also defended by recourse to the concept of the communication of blessings during a Passover meal. Jeremias and Schuermann especially made use of this. Is it historically intelligible to interpret Jesus' as communicating as the paterfamilias the benefits of his expiatory death? We shall begin with Jeremias' arguments.

Jeremias overstated the case for the prevalence of the concept that divine gifts were communicated through eating and drinking. In the many passages from the Bible and non-biblical texts cited, he did not recognize the significance of the use of metaphorical language: food or drink represent the blessed time of the eschaton, but are not, as he suggested, the means whereby the blessings are received. Also, he mistakenly asserted that the messianic banquet imparted salvation, when, in fact, the messianic banquet was part of that salvation. The other examples that he offered do not support the view that divine gifts were given through eating and drinking.

But more significantly, Jeremias also confused the meaning of the representative blessings offered during the Passover meal. They were offered to God, and inasmuch as the group was rightly constituted as a ḥābūrâ, they all participated in the offering of the blessing by responding

with the customary amen and by eating the food or drinking from the cup over which blessings were recited. The blessing did not, however, bless those who offered it. So Jeremias' point that blessings were communicated to the disciples by Jesus is wrong. There is simply no basis to say that Jesus' blessings accompanying his words of interpretation communicated to the disciples a share in his expiatory death.

Schuermann corrected Jeremias' oversight by differentiating the blessings offered to God, as part of any meal, and the blessings offered by the paterfamilias to those present at the meal. But the question to put to Schuermann is whether there is any indication that Jesus offered blessings to the disciples after his words over the bread and cup. Obviously, there is no such evidence. Schuermann's argument is really an argument from silence.

Is there any further evidence that Jesus intended his disciples' eating of the bread and drinking of the wine to be their reception of the soteriological benefits of his death? Apart from the argument from analogy to the symbolic acts of the Old Testament prophets and that based on the idea of the communication of blessings at meals, there does not seem to be any justification for drawing such a conclusion, and, without justification, to hold this view is mere supposition. We should note that Staehlin unjustifiably drew the conclusion that the disciples participated in the "Opfersegen" as participants of the "Opfermahl", since he did not ground this conclusion on the notion of the efficacious symbolic act of the Old Testament prophets or on the idea of

the communication of blessings at meals. It seems to follow from what he said about parabolic actions that participation in the Last Supper ought not to have been interpreted as sacramental participation in the salvation-historical benefits of Jesus' approaching death.

We still, nevertheless, could call the Last Supper a symbolic act, if we define it as Maria Trautmann did, who preferred not to use the term "symbolisch", but "zeichenhafte Handlungen"⁷⁶, or as Staehlin did, who used the term parabolic actions ("Gleichnishandlungen") to denote any action performed by Jesus that had a surplus of meaning ("Sinueberschuss").⁷⁷ A symbolic act is one that reaches beyond its immediate context to make a point that in some way is analogous to the act. It is an acted metaphor. As an interpretive category this is still imprecise, in that it potentially includes many different types of actions, but it is still useful for the historian in reconstructing the aims of Jesus, since it focuses attention, not only on what Jesus said, but also on what he did.

In the case of the Last Supper, unlike other symbolic acts, such as the choosing of twelve disciples or the table-fellowship with the sinners, Jesus explicitly interpreted the meaning of his actions. He did not leave his disciples to make the connection between the Passover celebration and himself and, consequently, between the bread and wine and the meaning of his death, for the disciples could not have known that their celebration of Passover had, to Jesus' mind, a surplus of meaning. Rather, he made the

connection for them. The surplus of meaning was the typological connection that Jesus saw between the original Passover offerings and his own approaching death. The meal was, in other words, more than simply a Passover meal, or even a farewell meal. The Passover of subsequent generations was a memorial to the Passover in Egypt. Jesus intended that his death be understood as the antitype that fulfilled the same event. Naturally, he chose his last Passover meal to make this point. It became the occasion on which to make this connection. Jesus' handling of the bread and wine, therefore, took on symbolic proportions.

But the question still remains why Jesus would interpret the bread and the wine during the Passover meal. We still have not answered the question of the reason for Jesus' words and actions as depicted in the words institution. It is probable that he made the typological connection between his death and the death of the original Passover lambs during the Passover haggadah. So, if the words over the bread and wine were not intended to allow the disciples to partake of the benefits of his expiatory death, then what end did they serve? The best explanation is that Jesus intended to institute a liturgical practice for his disciples to be put into effect after his death, corresponding to the Passover, but being the typological fulfilment of the same. This hypothesis also explains the early celebration of the eucharist in the Christian community.

The command to repeat in 1 Cor/Luke is, therefore, probably historically genuine because it coheres with the hypothesis that Jesus intended the words of institution as the basis for the liturgy of the early church. (1 Cor has a second command to repeat, situated after word over the cup.)

Pesch argued for the subsequent, liturgical origin of the command to repeat in 1 Cor/Luke⁷⁸, while Schuermann argued for its originality against the Markan form.⁷⁹ The problem comes down to whether its absence from Mark is more intelligible as an omission or as more original, and this question, as we said earlier, cannot be satisfactorily answered from tradition-historical considerations. The data can be contrued to make a case for each hypothesis. Pesch said that the genre of the Markan account was narrative report and that, therefore, it was characterised by non-liturgical features, one of which was the absence the command to repeat. Later, when its genre became liturgy, the command to repeat was added in the service of the liturgical practice of the early community. Schuermann, similarly, viewed the genre of the Last Supper in Mark as narrative report, but argued that this was precisely why the command to repeat was omitted. Mark's concern was historical description, not to ground the liturgical practice of the community: "Die Tatsache, dass die richtige Art der Eucharistiefeier im Rahmen der Passionsgeschichte nicht mehr das Haupterzaehlungsinteresse abgab, kann den Ausfall des Wiederholungsbefehl bewirkt oder doch sehr erleichtert haben".⁸⁰ Benoit, on the other hand, argued that the lack of

a command to repeat in Mark was a result of the influence of the liturgy: "On ne recite pas une rubrique, on l'exécute."⁸¹

As we said, however, in continuity with the Passover, as the symbolic expression of his own understanding of his death as the typological fulfilment of the original Passover lambs, Jesus interpreted the bread and the wine in accordance with his approaching death as a paradigm for the later practice of his disciples. It is not surprising that he told the disciples explicitly of this intention. Why Mark would omit the command to repeat is a matter of conjecture. Among the possible explanations, Schuermann's is feasible. But so is the explanation of Benoit.

This conclusion presupposes that Jesus foresaw an interval of time between his death and the fulfilment of the Kingdom of God. Patsch pointed out that the eschatological outlook assumed a Zwischenzeit from Jesus' death to the time when he would participate again in the Passover/messianic banquet.⁸² Kuemmel also argued successfully that Jesus expected a period of time between his death and resurrection and the Kingdom of God.⁸³ During this intervening period Jesus expected his disciples to remember his death and its meaning in the eating of bread and in the drinking of wine.

We should also note in passing that Jesus connected his death as the typological fulfilment of the Passover lambs in Egypt with the future messianic meal, at which he and his disciples would be present (Mark 14:25 par Matt 25;; Luke 22:18). Although expecting to die, Jesus also expected to be

present at the messianic banquet, when the Kingdom of God would receive its fulfilment. But more than this, according to Jesus, the Passover meal, which commemorated the redemption of the Israelites out of Egypt, the same event which typified the new, eschatological saving event, also received its fulfilment in the Kingdom of God, at which Jesus would be present (Luke 22:16). We can only assume that the fulfilment of the Passover meal is a reference to the messianic banquet. Jesus saw his death as typified by the Passover sacrifices in Egypt; this much is clear. But, in addition, the complete fulfilment of what the Passover typified was identical with the full coming of the Kingdom of God. The Passover in Egypt pointed to the greater saving event of the eschaton; Jesus understood this greater eschatological saving event as the coming of the Kingdom of God, or, to return to the words of institution, the realization of the new covenant. So, just as the blood of the Passover lambs had made possible the putting into effect of the covenant promises to Abraham, the blood of the typological fulfilment of the Passover lambs made possible the putting into effect of the new covenant, the new saving event, the Kingdom of God. Passover, therefore, would have its fulfilment in the fulfilment of the Kingdom of God, represented by Jesus as the messianic banquet.

D. Objections to the Authenticity of the Words of Institution

The words of institution, in any of their present forms, have never been a strong candidate for authenticity. The foremost argument against their authenticity is that they do not meet the criterion of discontinuity.⁸⁴ The early church conceived Jesus' death as expiatory, and, as such, it was an indispensable part of salvation-history. Since, therefore, there is so much overlap between the Gemeindetheologie and how the gospels portray Jesus as understanding his death, the suspicion is aroused that the words of institution, as they stand, are the reading of the theology of the early church into the life of Jesus.

Eichhorn took it as given that the words of institution could be nothing other than the cult aetiology of the early church retrojected into the life of Jesus.⁸⁵ Bultmann likewise did not even consider the possibility that the words of institution could reach back to the historical Jesus. Their original Sitz-im-Leben was the early Christian cult, wherein one entered into sacramental communion with the Risen Lord.⁸⁶ E. P. Sanders viewed the synoptic portrayal of Jesus' understanding his death in expiatory term as originating from the early church. Although he recognized the limitations of the applicability of the criterion of discontinuity, in this instance, he held that its application was valid.⁸⁷ Hahn considered it overwhelmingly probable that

Jesus expected his death and expressed this at the Last Supper; nevertheless, he dismissed the possibility that Jesus could have understood his death as an expiation for sin. The idea that Jesus' death was expiatory was a later development in the history of the tradition.⁸⁸ In the same vein, Gerhard Friedrich held that the Last Supper was a farewell meal, during which Jesus announced his imminent death symbolically by referring to the bread and the wine. "This is my body" meant originally "This is me"; likewise, "This is my blood" meant "I must die".⁸⁹ Only in the early community when Jesus' followers began to reflect upon the "dunkle Folie" of the cross did meaning begin to be attached to Jesus' death.⁹⁰ The early church felt the need for a theological explanation of it. The Sitz-im-Leben of the development of the notion of Jesus' death as an expiation for sin as found in the Last Supper narratives was the early community's celebration of the Lord's Supper.⁹¹ It is clear that in reaching his conclusion Friedrich was employing the criterion of discontinuity, since he assumed that what was attributable to the early church, i.e., where there was an appropriate Sitz-im-Leben, must be so attributed.

The Passover framework, with its attendant implications for the understanding of Jesus' death is also said to be a later addition. We examined earlier attempts to prove the secondary, tradition-historical connection between Passover and the words of institution.⁹²

The eschatological prospect of Mark 14:25 = Luke 22:15-18 is often preferred as being representative of what

Jesus said, because it meets the criterion of discontinuity. It places Jesus' death in the light of the imminent coming of the Kingdom of God, which did not later become part of the church's theology and liturgy.⁹³

The criterion of discontinuity is, however, a very coarse methodological sieve. What it does retain as part of the authentic Jesus tradition is likely trustworthy, but what it allows through is not necessarily part of the later Gemeindetradition.⁹⁴ It might be said that the commonest error respecting non-historicity turns on a false analogy. It is the assumption that, since discontinuity with the transmitting church establishes historicity, continuity with the transmitting church establishes non-historicity. In the case of the Last Supper and Jesus' understanding of his death expressed therein, it is possible that the stress laid upon Jesus' expiatory death in the early tradition was a result of Jesus' own understanding of his death in similar terms. In fact, this is very probable, and is as viable an explanation as its contrary. One must avoid declaring any piece of tradition to be inauthentic solely on the grounds of the application of the criterion of discontinuity.

Schuermann rightly suggested that, rather than relying on the negative criterion of discontinuity, the New Testament scholar ought to employ positive criteria, which he attempted to do with respect to the Last Supper.⁹⁵ It should be stipulated that historical judgement pertaining to Jesus be based on the convergence of data on the historical Jesus, established by one or more indices to historicity, leading to

confirmed insights. Historical knowledge results from a series of inferences from the data, which converged towards historical fact.

Another major objection to the historicity of any of the forms of the words of institution is that they do not meet the criterion of coherence. That is, the hypothesis that Jesus understood his death as an expiation for sin runs contrary to what we know of him as the preacher of the Kingdom of God. Anton Voegtle argued that the paucity of references to Jesus' expiatory death in the gospels and the incompatibility of Jesus' understanding of his death as a condition of the forgiveness of sins with his preaching of the unconditional love of God told against accepting the view that Jesus interpreted his death as an expiation for sin. The idea of death as a "Loesegeld fuer die Vielen" did not cohere with Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom of God, wherein God freely forgave without requiring an atonement for sin. One of the two traditions, therefore, was inauthentic, and since the idea of Jesus' death was so poorly attested in the tradition, as compared with the Kingdom of God, Voegtle decided against it.⁹⁶ Peter Fiedler likewise held that Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom of God and the notion of his expiatory death were irreconcilable. The Kingdom was the preaching of the unconditional love and forgiveness of God to sinners. Jesus' expiatory death would become, then, a condition for the previously unconditional forgiveness of God.⁹⁷

Voegtle's application of the criterion of coherence,

however, is circular, since what he knew about Jesus was a function of what he had reconstructed about him from the "authentic" material. But is it not possible that, by excluding the idea of Jesus' understanding of his death as expiatory, Voegtle did not fully appreciate how Jesus interpreted his aims as the preacher of the Kingdom of God in the light of his approaching execution? We grant that, if one were to assume that Jesus' message and relation to Israel remained constant throughout his ministry, then Voegtle and Fiedler would be correct. But what they fail to take into account is the decisive shift in the orientation of Jesus' ministry, as a reaction to the resistance and ultimate rejection by Israel that he experienced.⁹⁸ Both Voegtle⁹⁹ and Fiedler¹⁰⁰ considered this possibility, but rejected it as a historical reality. Their objections are decidedly unconvincing. Voegtle argued that there was so little evidence in the gospel record of a turning-point ("Einschnitt") in Jesus' ministry, that historically it was unlikely to have occurred. But there is evidence of a shift in Jesus' career. The piecemeal character of the gospel tradition makes it more difficult to recognize, but the evidence for a reorientation in Jesus' ministry resulting from a rejection of his message is there.¹⁰¹ Fiedler argued that, even if Jesus did foresee his violent end, his interpretation of his death as an expiation would make the forgiveness of God conditional. What Fiedler failed to take into consideration, as Pesch pointed out, was that Israel's rejection of its final messenger of salvation placed it in

the perilous position of having rejected the very possibility of forgiveness offered by God through his eschatological messenger, Jesus. Israel, in other words, was throwing off the covenant.

It can be convincingly argued that Jesus' understanding of his death as an expiation was a response to his failure as the preacher of the Kingdom of God. According to Pesch, a crisis resulted from Israel's rejection of Jesus' message: the mediator of the eschatological salvation was about to become the means of the eschatological condemnation of Israel. In response to this, Jesus understood his role as the mediator of eschatological salvation as extending into death. He bore the guilt of Israel's rejection of God, thereby giving his people another opportunity to respond and become a part of the remnant of the true Israel, represented by the twelve apostles.¹⁰² Schuermann likewise argued that Jesus' unique status as the "[eschatologische] Heilsbringer" extended even into death, where he became the means by which Israel could share in that eschatological salvation even after the rejection of its messenger.¹⁰³

Franz-J. Leenhardt, similarly, argued that Jesus was fully aware of the fate that awaited him in Jerusalem, but went willingly, knowing that this was his destiny as the preacher of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom would come, regardless of whether it was accepted by Israel or not. But if it came in rejection, judgement would be a part of its manifestation. Jesus, therefore, saw his death as the means by which this judgement would be averted, at least for a

period of time, and those who rejected him as the messenger of the Kingdom of God would receive a second chance to respond favourably to him. Jesus' death expiated their sin of rejection; his death was an extension of his service.¹⁰⁴ Augustin George made the same point. According to him, Jesus expected his death, and interpreted it in light of Passover theology.¹⁰⁵ As we similarly argued, Jesus used paschal motifs to interpret the salvation-historical significance that he attributed to his death as the final, eschatological messenger.

That Jesus did not often speak of his death during his ministry should not be surprising, since it was well attested in the tradition that he did not disclose his purposes and message fully to his hearers, but was selective in his teaching, depending on his audience. It is conceivable that, when Jesus began to realize the inevitability of his rejection and death, he began to withdraw from the people, and did not disclose publicly how he had come to understand his inevitable death in light of his claim to be the eschatological bringer of salvation. It is also clear that Jesus' disciples, despite repeated attempts by Jesus, never fully appreciated that Jesus would be rejected and executed and that this had become to Jesus' mind a part of his mission as the preacher of the Kingdom of God. This lack of success in communicating to his disciples the significance of the crisis of rejection for his self-understanding would have further contributed to Jesus' reluctance to speak about how he had come to interpret his

death. In addition, the realization of the certainty of his death and his interpretation of it would only have become central nearer the end of his ministry. These factors, therefore, account for the the paucity of references to Jesus' understanding of his death as expiatory in the gospel record.

Apart from the application of the two criteria given above, it seems that in general scholars are predisposed against accepting the authenticity of the words of institution, because it is deemed impossible that Jesus could have theologized about the significance of his death. Their historical genuineness presupposes that Jesus had a high view of himself (an implicit christology), that he reflected extensively on his destiny in relation to salvation history. That Jesus saw his death as expiatory would also mean that the soteriology later developed by the early church was not so advanced as was thought, but was rooted in Jesus' own self-understanding. In short, the acceptance of the authenticity of the words of institution violates the common developmental view of the history of the early Christian tradition. But this view is clearly presuppositional, and ought not to be considered as a valid objection.

The arguments against the authenticity of the words of institution, as we have shown, are not as decisive as their proponents claim. Not only this, one can produce sufficient evidence in favour of viewing them as authentic. In spite of the liturgical influences upon their present forms, the words of institution accurately represent what

Jesus did and said at the Last Supper; they have their origin in the historical Jesus. To this end we shall present a two-tier argument. First, we shall consider the Last Supper as a theoretical possibility. If Jesus could have anticipated his death and if the idea of one dying for the sins of others was within his cultural/religious horizon, then nothing stands in the way of our consideration of the words of institution as authentic; for, if fulfilled, these conditions--that Jesus might have anticipated his death and that the idea of one dying for the sins of others was historically available to him--allow us to entertain the possibility that Jesus could have understood his death as expiatory. In the second tier of our argument we move to historical actuality. We shall consider positive evidence for the authenticity of the tradition contained in the various forms of the words of institution.

Could Jesus have anticipated his death? The gospels portray Jesus on many occasions as predicting his suffering, death and resurrection (e.g. Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33f.). Notker Fueglistner even found evidence in the gospel of John (cf. John 11:54-57) that Jesus deliberately delayed his execution to coincide with Passover.¹⁰⁶ Jesus is clearly portrayed as understanding his death as divinely ordained.

Now, even if one does not accept as genuine that Jesus understood his death as his salvation-historical destiny, there is sufficient evidence that Jesus could and even must have anticipated his violent end. Schuermann, in particular, made this point many times.¹⁰⁷ The execution of

John the Baptist and Jesus' own earlier association with his mission, in addition to the resistance that Jesus experienced to his own ministry, combined to make the probability of his own execution high. It would be surprising if Jesus had not foreseen his own death. We could add to the above evidence the fact that Jesus had a historical paradigm of the likelihood of his own rejection and execution. Jesus associated his destiny with that of the prophets: like them, it would be inappropriate for him to die outside of Jerusalem (Luke 13:33).¹⁰⁸

Voegtler's objection that Jesus had to be absolutely certain of his violent end in order to interpret his death theologically and integrate this interpretation into his understanding of his role as the preacher of the Kingdom of God does not overturn this conclusion. Voegtler is correct that, historically speaking, one cannot say that Jesus' death was inevitable. Many conditions had to be realized at a single point in time, and this did not occur until the Passion week.¹⁰⁹ If we restrict ourselves to a consideration of its historical conditions, we can only say that Jesus' death, even up to the very last, was only more or less probable. It does not follow from this, however, that Jesus could not have been certain that his destiny was to die at the hands of his own people. As we said, Jesus saw his death as foreordained by God. Although historically speaking his death was only probable, to Jesus' mind it was a divinely ordained certainty, and it even seems that during his last week Jesus even contributed to the historical process leading

to his death by his provocative entry and the temple incident.¹¹⁰

Secondly, was the notion of an expiatory death intelligible to a first-century Jew? Could Jesus have understood his own death in these terms? The data point to such a possibility. We find evidence in early rabbinic tradition and other Jewish literature that death and suffering was understood as a means by which guilt was removed. Even though most of these sources are post-Christian, it is safe to assume that the traditions contained therein reach back to the time of Jesus and earlier, given the conservative nature of rabbinic tradition. Marcel Bastin wrote, "...Ils [les textes rabbiniques] peuvent refléter une thématique antérieure à ceux car, dans une religion essentiellement traditionnelle, les croyances se perpétuent inchangées pendant des générations."¹¹¹ We shall first enumerate examples of suffering and death atoning for an individual's own sins, and then examples of death as expiatory for the sins of others.

In m. Sanh. 6:2, it is stated that, if a condemned person confesses his sin, his death will become an atonement (kpr) for all his sins. Also R. Akiba (c. 135), on the occasion of an illness of R. Eliezer, is reported to have said to him, "Master, precious are chastisements". He then recited the parallel illustration of the suffering of Manasseh, who, as a result of his suffering, was forgiven and restored as king of Judah. The point was that, like Manasseh, R. Eliezer was suffering for the expiation of his

sins. (Sipre Deut 6:5 (32); par Mek. 20:20 (Badhodesh 10:58-86) Along the same lines, on a midrash on Exod 20:23, R. Akiba is quoted as teaching that the Israelites were to accept misfortune from the hand of God, unlike the Gentiles, who curse their gods when their gods fail to provide their needs. God sends evil to His people in order to bring about the forgiveness of the sins of the righteous through suffering (Mek. 20:20 (Badhodesh 10:7-29). Then follows in the same context several quotations from other rabbinic authorities to reinforce R. Akiba's point. R. Nehemiah, for example, is reported to have taught, "And not only this, chastisements atone even more than sacrifices. For sacrifices affect one's money, while chastisements affect the body. As it says, 'Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life' (Job 2:4)". Finally, R. Ishmael, as recorded in several places in rabbinic literature, enumerated four types of sin and their expiation. For the more serious sins, the suffering or death of the sinner were a condition of forgiveness.¹¹²

Not only could an individual's sin be removed by his own death, but the death of a righteous individual could atone for the sins of others. In 4 Maccabees we find the often quoted example of Eliezer, who asked God that his death as a martyr would be accepted as an expiation for the sins of his people (cf. also 1:11; 17:20-22; 18:4).¹¹³ This work stems from Hellenistic Judaism, but, as Lohse argued, the ideas therein reach back to a Palestinian milieu.¹¹⁴ One should not look to the conceptual world of Hellenism for the

origin of the notion of a representative death.¹¹⁵

We can, however, only adduce a few examples from rabbinic sources of the Tannaitic period of an individual's death being understood as atoning for the sins of others; these do not exist in great abundance.¹¹⁶ As Lohse pointed out, the rabbis were reticent about attributing expiatory value to the death of the martyrs or the righteous.¹¹⁷ R. Jochanan is recorded to have said in the name of R. Simon ben Jochai (c. 150) that King Ahab's death on the battle field expiated the sins of Israel on that day.¹¹⁸ R. Sadok the Elder related a story, as found in Sipre Num 35:34 (161), wherein a man whose son had been found dead between two villages, of which the inhabitants of neither bothered to tend to the corpse in accordance with Deut. 21:1ff., was said to have declared to the villagers who had incurred guilt: "That I could be your expiation."¹¹⁹ This suggests that the bearing of the guilt of another was a conceptual possibility for a Jew living in for the first century. Similarly, R. Nathan, as recorded in Mek. 12:1 (Pisha 1:103-13), said that the fathers and the prophets--Moses and David--offered their lives on behalf of Israel, when the latter had incurred the wrath of God. His interpretation of these Old Testament passages in terms of the category of representative death again suggests that this category was available to the first-century Palestinian mind. The destruction of the Gentiles was also held to expiate the sins of Israel. In Mek. 21:30 (Nekikin 10:172-81), R. Ishmael, alluding to Isa 43:3 ("I will give Egypt for your ransom"), stated that God

would give the Gentiles as a ransom for the souls of Israel. This is not the death of the righteous for the unrighteous, but the more unrighteous for the less unrighteous. Nevertheless, the idea of representative death is clearly present. Finally, the death of an innocent child was believed to expiate the sins of its father.^{120, 121, 122}

In the Testament of Benjamin 3:8 the concept of expiatory death also comes to expression. In the Armenian version, which probably represents the state of the text prior to the later Christian interpolations, Jacob says to Joseph, "In you will the heavenly prophecy be fulfilled which says that the spotless one will be defiled by lawless men and the sinless one will die for the sake of impious men." The prophecy alluded to is likely Isa 53.

In the same vein, it must not be overlooked that the death of the Servant in Isa 53 is clearly expiatory. It has been argued that Isa 53 did play a role in influencing the inter-testamental development of the notion of representative death and that of a suffering Messiah.¹²³ Its lack of prominence in rabbinic literature is accounted for by early Jewish polemic against its use by Christian interpreters. It was simply dropped from the tradition, and only remnants of its previous prominence survives in Jewish religious literature. Others simply conclude that its absence is owing to the fact that it was not influential.¹²⁴ It is strange, however, that such a significant passage should not have been more theologically influential. In any case, whether messianically interpreted or not, it is clear that the death

of the Servant is expiatory. It is not inherently impossible, therefore, that Jesus should also have been influenced by Isa 53 in understanding his death as expiatory.

Finally, and most importantly, at some point in the development of Jewish haggadah, as we have discussed already, the Binding of Isaac was interpreted as having an expiatory value. In addition, the Binding of Isaac was brought into connection with the Passover. The merit resulting from Isaac's willingness to be sacrificed was what made the original Passover sacrifices efficacious. We find, therefore, an example in Jewish tradition of an expiatory death and Passover motifs brought to bear on a single individual, who was seen, as a consequence, as occupying a central place in salvation-history. As we have argued, this is structurally similar to how Jesus understood himself.

We conclude that there was nothing preventing Jesus from understanding his death in expiatory terms. The "constraints of history"¹²⁵, under which Jesus as a first-century, Palestinian Jew lived, allowed for this possibility.

Not only is Jesus' understanding of his death as expressed in the various forms of the words of institution merely a hypothetical possibility, but there is positive evidence pointing to its historical authenticity. There are several criteria of historicity the application of which to the words of institution points to their authenticity. First, Jeremias offered linguistic indices supporting the view that the words of institution and the eschatological

outlook reflect the ipsissima vox of Jesus.¹²⁶ Elsewhere, as we noted earlier, Jeremias also demonstrated the Aramaic or at least Semitic basis of the Markan words of institution, thereby suggesting their earliness in the history of the tradition. Fitzmyer, subsequently, showed that the Lukan and Markan versions of the words of institution were fully translatable into Aramaic.¹²⁷ This is the criterion of style. Secondly, that essentially the same tradition comes to us in two independent forms, Mark and 1 Cor--but each obviously originating from the same source and intending the same event--is further evidence of the genuineness of the tradition. This is the criterion of multiple attestation. Thirdly, the words of institution exist in two distinct forms, liturgical and historical. In 1 Cor 11 Paul is reiterating for the Corinthians a liturgical formula that he had previously passed unto them. In Mark the form is historical report, although it is likely that Mark's version is a piece of liturgy converted into narrative form. We also suggested that Luke's account probably represented the form of an original narrative unit describing the events of Jesus' last Passover meal. This is the criterion of diversity of form. The results of the application of these three criteria taken together converge towards the conclusion of the authenticity of the words of institution.

A further criterion could be adduced to support the authenticity of the words of institution, one, as we saw above, that has also been adduced against it. One can argue, contrary to Voegtle, that the criterion of coherence, in

fact, dictates that, since Jesus must have anticipated his death, he must also have reflected upon it in relation to his preaching of the Kingdom of God. For Jesus not to have done so would be historically unintelligible. In several places in the gospels, chief of which is the words of institution, Jesus is depicted as understanding his death as the means of the realization of the Kingdom of God in the face of his failure to bring about the repentance of Israel. (How Jesus would have understood things if his message had been received is historically inaccessible.) If we reject the authenticity of the words of institution and other similar units of tradition, then we find nothing in the tradition about how Jesus understood his death, which would be unexpected.^{128, 129, 130}

In fact, Voegtler's conception of the content of Jesus' preaching as the unconditional forgiveness of God would be foreign to the world-view of a first-century, Palestinian Jew. It would, therefore, fall under suspicion of being secondary in accordance with the "criterion of altered milieu"¹³¹ That is, one must judge Voegtler's reconstruction of Jesus' message from the gospel tradition to be historically inauthentic, because it is not at home in first-century Palestine. Judaism had evolved many means whereby sins could be forgiven, and certainly repentance was an important part of the process of the expiation of sin and could, according to R. Ishmael, even suffice to expiate some sins. But, on the whole, in Judaism there could not be forgiveness of a sin without the appropriate sacrifices, in

accordance with the regulations of the Torah. It is true that the place of the temple in the Qumran community appears to have been negligible, but their situation was peculiar. They did not reject the Levitical sacrificial system outright, but only full participation in it while it remained in a state of defilement. They awaited the eschatological war of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, as a result of which the temple would come under their control and be resanctified.¹³² John the Baptist likewise did not openly reject the Levitical sacrifices, but preached an eschatological baptism of forgiveness in preparation for the final visitation of God.¹³³ If Voegtle's reconstruction of the central message of Jesus were true, it would, ironically, have to be judged to be inauthentic according to the criterion of altered milieu. It would, however, meet the criterion of discontinuity, because unconditional forgiveness is discontinuous with both Judaism and early Christianity. But then again so would numerous other historically unlikely possibilities, such as that Jesus was really a follower of the Buddha.

And there is still more positive evidence for the authenticity of the words of institution. Paul told the Corinthian church that he received from the Lord (parelabon apo tou kuriou) what he delivered (paredōkan) to them. We noted earlier that Paul meant by this that he received a tradition concerning the earthly Jesus and passed it on to the Corinthians, which, in his first epistle to them, he reiterated, owing to problems in the community. He likely

delivered the tradition during his first missionary journey (c. 51-52) (Acts 18), which means that he must have received the tradition either from the church at Antioch or perhaps from the Jerusalem community, which he had visited several times. In any case, where Paul received the tradition and how early we cannot say with any certainty, yet the terminus ad quem was the late forties, before his second missionary journey. This means, as Marxen puts it, "Die hinter der Paulustradition liegende Urform rueckt so nahe an das letzte Mahl Jesu heran, dass kein Platz mehr bleibt fuer eine (nun ja in der palaestinischen Urgemeinde) erfundene aetiologische Kultlegende zu einem dort entstandenden Ritus."¹³⁴ The earliness of the tradition of the words of institution makes it highly improbable that they are unhistorical. Such a tradition would need more time to develop, if it was purely the result of the historicizing impulse of the church seeking to ground its liturgical practice in the life of Jesus. This conclusion is further strengthened, if we take into consideration the unlikelihood of the form-critical hypothesis that there was no control over the early tradition, which would permit the creation of the words of institution to meet a need in the life of the community.

Now it is true that the words of institution are liturgical in their form and also functioned liturgically in the early church, but this is not proof that they are unhistorical. As we argued, the church's eucharistic celebration was a consequence of what Jesus himself instituted, not the creation of a cult aetiology by the early

community. The words of institution intend an historical event; their origin can be traced to Jesus' command to his disciples at the Last Supper to repeat what he had done. We conclude that it is unlikely that the Last Supper tradition in either of its formulations could have originated from the theology of the early community.

Pesch also argued convincingly that, if Jesus had not prepared his followers for the rejection of his message and his death, the post-Easter mission to Israel would be unintelligible. Jesus' expiatory death was the basis of the renewed mission. Similarly, it also explains the institution of a post-Easter baptism for the forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus.¹³⁵ We could add to Pesch's arguments that Jesus' understanding of his death in expiatory terms functions as the link between the early pre-Pauline confessional formulas and the historical Jesus (Cf. Excursus Two). If Jesus had not viewed his death in this way, a historically unintelligible gap would open between the pre- and post-Easter periods. One must postulate a creative theological imagination on part of early church in spite of the existence of eyewitnesses, who would have known differently. The hypothesis of the early church's not distinguishing between the earthly Jesus and the risen Lord, who revealed himself through the early Christian prophets, is unsatisfactory to explain the data.^{136, 137}

Finally, the difficulty of explaining the early existence of eucharistic practice in the church without tracing it back to the historical event described in our

sources tells against the hypothesis that what Jesus is reported to have done and said in the forms of the words of institution is unhistorical. The attempts to account for the eucharistic practice of the church by recourse to a two-source theory, whereby it was the result of the continuation of Jesus' eschatological meals and the early Christian Passover observance, is so hypothetical that one suspects that the proponents of such views mistrust the gospels as historical sources to the point that any explanation is seen as better than accepting the gospel accounts as genuine. The result that the eucharist was so early established needs an adequate cause as its explanation. The most likely cause is that it was instituted by Jesus at the Last Supper.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

¹ Eduard Lohse, Maertyrer und Gottesknecht, 2. Auflage (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 123.

² Xavier Leon-Dufour, Le partage du pain eucharistique selon le Nouveau Testament (Paris: Seuil, 1982).

³ Adrian Schenker, Das Abendmahl Jesu als Brennpunkt des Alten Testaments (Fribourg: Verlag Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977), pp. 67-75; Cf. also Friedrich Lang, "Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im Neuen Testament," Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 524-38, 530.

⁴ Ferdinand Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motiven in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung," Evangelische Theologie 27 (1967): 337-74, 343; id., "Zum Stand der Erforschung des urchristlichen Herrenmahls," Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 553-63, 563.

⁵ Karl Kertelge, "Die soteriologischen Aussagen in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung und ihre Beziehung zum geschichtlichen Jesus," Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift 81 (1972): 193-202, 197.

⁶ Cf. Hermann Patsch, Abendmahl und historischer Jesus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), pp. 151-58

⁷ Heinz Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22, 19-20, 3. Auflage (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970), pp. 94-112.

⁸ Helmut Merklein, "Erwaegungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahlstraditionen," Biblische Zeitschrift 21 (1977): 88-101, 235-44, 237-44.

⁹ Rudolf Pesch, Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverstaendnis (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1978), pp. 112-25

¹⁰ I. Howard Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter, England: The Paternoster Press, 1980).

¹¹ Eduard Schweizer, "Abendmahl" in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, erster Band (A-C), 3. Auflage, ed.

Kurt Gallig (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957), pp. 10-21, 18.

12 Cf. Notker Fueglistner's approach (Die Heilsbedeutung des Pascha (Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1963).

13 Cf. Voegtle's works.

14 Cf. the works of Kertelge and Voegtle.

15 Ben F. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus. (London: SCM Press, 1979), p. 218.

16 Cf. Ludger Schenke, Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus (Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971), pp. 181-98; Cf. in contrast Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed. (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1966), p. 536-38.

17 Gordon Bahr, "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words," Novum Testamentum 12 (1970): 181-202, 200f.

18 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 85-89; cf. also Georg Walther, Jesus, das Passalam des Neuen Bundes (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 52.

19 Robert Eisler "Das letzte Abendmahl" Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 24 (1925): 161-92.

20 Pinchas Lapide, "Der mysterioese Mazzabrocken. Ging der Eucharistiefeier ein Pessachritus voraus?" Lutherische Monatshefte 14 (1975): 120-24.

21 David Daube, "He That Cometh" St. Paul's Lecture, October, 1966 (Oxford); cf. also Schenker, op. cit., pp. 73-75.

22 Schweizer, op. cit., p. 13.

23 Merklein, op. cit.

24 Ernst Kutsch, "Von der Aktualitaet alttestamentlicher Aussagen fuer das Verstaendnis des Neuen Testaments" Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 74 (1977): 273-90; Cf. also, Lang, op. cit. and Volker Wagner, "Der Bedeutungswandel von berît hādāšā bei der Ausgestaltung der Abendmahlworte," Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 538-44.

25 Hahn likewise shared the view that one must choose between the covenant and expiatory death as the more original ("Die alttestamentlichen Motiven in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung", p. 343), although he did hold that the one implied the other.

26 Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1, trans. K Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 149.

27 Reginald Fuller, "The Double Origin of the Eucharist," Biblical Research 8 (1963): 60-72.

28 Ernst Lohmeyer, "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl," Theologische Rundschau n.F. 9 (1957): 168-227.

29 Cf. the works of Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus 2nd ed., trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1966); Fueglistler, op. cit.; Roger Le Déaut, La nuit pascale (Rome: Institut biblique pontifical, 1963).

30 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 221f.

31 Franz-J. Leenhardt in Le sacrement de la sainte cene (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1948), pp. 29-48, accepted the Passover framework of the Last Supper as historical, but differed in his interpretation of the meaning of the words over the bread and wine. He did not interpret the bread/body and cup/blood as a "Begriffspaar", signifying the death of a sacrificial victim, as Jeremias did.

The breaking of bread, Leenhardt stressed, was not a symbolic act depicting death, since the symbolizing of death by the breaking of bread was nowhere attested in the Old Testament and Judaism. Rather, Leenhardt held that the Passover foods had a double nature. They both were foods and representatives of some aspect of God's saving work in the exodus. The eating of the foods by the participants, moreover, was the actual participation in the original events. What Jesus did was to give another meaning to the bread, in conformity with God's new, saving event. Jesus, therefore, represented his body, which would soon be given over in death, by the unleavened bread, and the eating of the bread by the disciples was their participation in the benefits of Jesus' death.

The word over the cup, according to Leenhardt, ought to be understood as paralleling the word over the bread. In the Old Testament, a cup represented a destiny. To drink from a cup meant participation in the destiny represented by the cup. This was the background to Jesus' own use of the cup at the Last Supper. For Jesus, the cup represented his destiny of death, a death that would bring about the realization of the new covenant. The disciples' drinking from the cup, therefore, meant their participation in the new covenant established in Jesus' death; they, however, had to suffer as Jesus did, but would in the end receive the Kingdom.

Leenhardt's reconstruction is possible, but it seems that Jeremias' is to be preferred. It was customary for the paterfamilias to break the bread and pass it around on a platter to begin the meal. The broken bread, contrary to

Leenhardt's view, is a natural symbol of the destruction of a body. It need not be attested in the Old Testament and/or Jewish sources. Anything torn up into pieces, as the bread was, would suggest destruction, so, when Jesus identified the broken bread with his body, he was making the point that it would share the same fate as the unleavened bread. Likewise, red wine is naturally suggestive of blood, and we find wine used as a symbol of blood in the Old Testament. The wine in the cup symbolized Jesus' blood that would be shed. A broken body and shed blood together denote death. Jesus chose, in other words, the two foods from the Passover meal that best symbolized the body and blood of a sacrificial victim. In addition, these were the only two times during the meal that Jesus would have had the attention of everyone present.

32 Ibid., p. 222.

33 Cf. Leonhard Goppelt, Typos, trans. D. Madvig (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982), pp. 110-14.

34 Walther (op. cit., pp. 24-27) argued that the blood of the covenant consisted of three types of blood, each connected with a different phase of the unfolding of the covenant. The blood of circumcision connected with the promise of the covenant to Abraham. The blood of the Passover lambs connected with the exodus from Egypt, the realization of the promise to Abraham. The covenant blood at Sinai (Exod 24:8) connected with the sealing of the covenant and the taking on the yoke of the Law. Walther's hypothesis, however, founders on the complete lack of evidence in Judaism for the association of the blood of the covenant in Exod 24:8 with the blood of circumcision and the blood of the Passover lambs. Rather, the blood of the covenant in Jewish theology denotes only the latter two.

We should also note that it is often wrongly claimed that the background to the phrase "my blood of the covenant" in Mark is Exod 24:8. In this passage, Moses reconfirms the covenant with the Israelites by sacrificing burnt offerings and young bulls as fellowship offerings. With the blood, he then sprinkled half of it on the altar, while the other half he sprinkled on the people, saying, "This is the blood of the covenant that the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words." In Targum Onkelos and Targum Jerusalem I the sprinkling of the blood is interpreted as expiatory. This, in combination with the fact that the Hebrew dam b'riti is translated in the LXX as to haima tēs diathēkēs suggests that Mark's to haima mou tēs diathēkēs should be interpreted against the background of Exod 24:8. This is, however, misleading. Parallels do not always mean that one of the two was a source for the other. In this case, it seems that the similarity of language is accidental. The phrase the blood of the covenant, as we saw, also denotes in Jewish tradition circumcision and the sacrifice of the Passover lambs. This is the preferred option.

35 Cf. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 169

36 It has been argued that the Markan phrase to haima mou tēs diathēkēs is so awkward in a retranslated Aramaic that it must be composite. A noun with a pronominal suffix in Hebrew or Aramaic does not as a rule take a genitive. It is often assumed that the genitive phrase tēs diathēkēs was added in dependence on the reference to blood of the covenant in Exod 24:8. (Cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 146; Hans Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, trans. J. W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 200; Merklein, op. cit., p. 94f.; Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motiven in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung", p. 363; Schenke, op. cit., p. 321). But the retranslation of this Markan phrase into Aramaic is perfectly possible. Three options present themselves. First, to haima mou tēs diathēkēs could be a translation of dēn dēmī qēyāmā⁷. Similar constructions can be found in the Old Testament, where the pronominal suffix is attached to the first word of a phrase and the second word exists in a genitive relationship with the first (Jean-Eudes David, "To haima mou tēs diathēkēs Mt 26,28: Un faux problème" Biblica 48 (1967): 291-92). The pronominal suffix is to be taken to modify the entire phrase. Similarly, J. A. Emerton demonstrated that the same construction is found in Syriac, so, he concluded that it was rash to rule out its possibility in Aramaic ("The Aramaic Underlying to haima mou tēs diathēkēs in Mk. XIV. 24" Journal of Theological Studies, new series 6 (1955): 238-40). Secondly, as Jeremias (op. cit., p. 195) suggested, the Greek phrase could be a rendering of the Aramaic dēn ʾādām (or: dam) qēyāmī (or: qēyāmā⁸). In this case the pronominal suffix is attached to the genitive phrase and modifies the entire construction, covenant-blood. Thirdly, the Markan phrase could represent in Aramaic a noun modified by a pronominal suffix and by a relative clause functioning as a predicate nominative: dēn dēmī dī qēyāmā⁹ (hū¹⁰). (i.e., my blood which is the covenant) (Joseph Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1985), pp. 1394f.; cf. Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, trans. P. Levertoff (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), p. 160f.) Whichever option is the correct one, the point made in each is the same: that Jesus' blood is the means by which the (new) covenant is established.

37 E.g. The Rule of the Scroll

38 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 223f.

39 E.g., Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 94-130.

40 Dalman, op. cit., pp. 141-47.

41 Schuermann, op. cit.

42 Cf. also Schweizer, op. cit. and Paul Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl. (Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1960)

43 If Pesch were correct about the identification of the bread as the ᾀpikōmān, then Dalman's and Schuermann's objection that the meal separated the two words, thus rendering them unintelligible as a "Begriffspaar", would be overcome. But, as we said earlier, there is insufficient evidence to adopt Pesch's position. The same applies to Bahr's suggestion.

44 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 224f.; A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1952), pp. 45f.

45 Higgins, op. cit., pp. 50f.; Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 222f.; Dalman, op. cit., pp. 122f.

46 Jesus as the Passover lamb is a well established theme in the New Testament. In 1 Cor 5:7, Paul wrote, kai gar to pascha humōn etuthē Christos. There is no doubt that he understood Jesus' death as the typological fulfilment of the Passover sacrifices in Egypt. 1 Pet 1:19 says that the recipients of the letter were redeemed ...timiō haimati hos amnou amōmou kai aspilou Christou. This could only be a reference to Christ as the eschatological Passover lamb, who, like his counterpart, was without blemish. John 1:29, Ide ho amnos tou theou ho aipōn tēn hamartian tou kosmou (cf. John 1:36) also probably reflects an understanding of Jesus as the Passover lamb. Finally, repeatedly in the Apocalypse Jesus is given the designation to arnion, again with the implicit understanding of his death as the typological fulfilment of the Passover sacrifices in Egypt. If what we have said above about Jesus' understanding of his death against the background of the Passover sacrifices in Egypt is correct, then origin of the post-Easter understanding of Jesus as the Passover lamb can be traced to him.

47 Cf. Pesch, op. cit., p. 102.

48 Neuenzeit, op. cit., pp. 163-74.

49 Ibid., pp. 69f.

50 Rupert Feneberg in his book Christliche Passafeier und Abendmahl argued correctly that the connection between Passover and the eucharist was part of the tradition of the early church. The Last Supper was seen as the eschatological correspondent to and fulfilment of the Jewish Passover celebration. He did not, however, attempt to take his investigation backwards to the historical Jesus and his understanding of this, which seemed to be the logical step in his argument.

51 Geza Vermes, "Redemption and Genesis XXII," in

Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies
(Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), pp. 202-204.

52 If sōma means the person himself, as Schuermann (op. cit., p. 21) said, it coheres better with the Servant's giving of himself in Isa 53. We, however, rejected this interpretation.

53 Patsch claimed that as a rule most authors held that Mark's hyper pollōn was more original than Luke/1 Cor hyper humōn. This is true, but it is not a proof that pollōn is more original, as Patsch seemed to assume. Schuermann, for example, made a case for the contrary view (op. cit., p. 77).

54 Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, revised ed., trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), ch. 3; Richard France, Jesus and the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), pp. 110-32; Jeremias, "Das Loesegeld fuer Viele", in Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 216-29; Dalman, op. cit., p. 169.

55 Patsch (op. cit., p. 182) dismissed Jeremias' claim that ekchunnein was a translation of the Hebrew of he'ērā as unfounded speculation.

56 Lohse, op. cit., p. 124.

57 Dalman, op. cit., p. 159.

58 Jewish martyr theology did not seem to play a part in Jesus' understanding of his death. This is contrary to Gnilya's thesis (represented in his various works on the topic) that Jesus took over the martyr theology prevalent at that time, and understood his rejection, his death, and the future persecution of his disciples in these terms.

59 We should note that the concept of sacrificial death and covenant both appear in the Servant Songs, although not in the same context. The Servant is variously seen as re-establishing the covenant for Israel (42:6; 49:8) and dying an atoning death for many. His task, therefore, contains the two elements that Jesus predicated of his death as the antitypical fulfilment of the Passover sacrifices.

60 Gustav Staehlin, "Die Gleichnishandlungen Jesu," in Kosmos und Ekklesia Festschrift fuer Wilhelm Staehlin, ed. Heinz-Dietrich Wendland (Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1953), pp. 9-22.

61 Ibid., p. 11.

- 62 Ibid., p. 17.
- 63 Ibid., p. 15.
- 64 Ibid., p. 19.
- 65 Jacques Dupont, "Ceci est mon corps, Ceci est mon sang," Nouvelle Revue Theologique 10 (1958): 1025-1041.
- 66 Ibid., p. 1035.
- 67 Schuermann, "Die Symbolhandlungen Jesu als eschatologische Erfuellungszeichen" Bibel und Leben 11 (1970): 29-41, 73-78.
- 68 Cf. Georg Fohrer, Die Symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten, 2. Auflage (Zuerich: Zwingli Verlag, 1968), p. 33.
- 69 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 77.
- 70 Cf. also Schuermann, Gottes Reich-Jesu Geschichte (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1983); id., "Das Weiterleben der Sache Jesu im nachosterlichen Herrenmahl," Biblische Zeitschrift n.F. 16 (1972): 1-23.
- 71 Meyer, op. cit., p. 215-19.
- 72 Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, 2nd revised ed., trans. S. H. Hooke (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972), p. 227.
- 73 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 231-37.
- 74 Norman Beck, "The Last Supper as an Efficacious Symbolic Act", Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (1970): 192-98, 195.
- 75 Ibid., p. 197.
- 76 Maria Trautmann, Zeichenhafte Handlungen Jesu (Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1980), pp. 1-77.
- 77 Staehlin, op. cit.
- 78 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 49f.
- 79 Schuermann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22, 19-20, pp. 123-29.
- 80 Schuermann, op. cit., p. 125.
- 81 Pierre Benoit, "Le recit de la cene dans Lc. XXII, 15-20," Revue Biblique 48 (1939): 257-93, 386.

- 82 Patsch, op. cit., pp. 142-50.
- 83 Werner Kummel, Promise and Fulfilment, 3rd ed., trans. D. M. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1961).
- 84 Ernst Kaesemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus" in Essays on New Testament Themes, 2nd ed., trans. W. J. M. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).
- 85 Albert Eichhorn, Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament (Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1898).
- 86 Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 146f.
- 87 E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 332.
- 88 Ferdinand Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motiven in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung," 358-66; id., "Zum Stand der Erforschung des urchristlichen Herrenmahls," 559f.
- 89 Gerhard Friedrich, Die Verkuendigung des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament 2. Auflage (Duesseldorf: Neuenkirchener Verlag, 1985), p. 13.
- 90 Ibid., p. 31.
- 91 Ibid., p. 35.
- 92 Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 162.
- 93 Guenther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. I. and F. McLuskey (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975), p. 160; Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (London: Lutterwoth Press, 1965), p. 107; Anton Voegtle, "Todesankuendigungen und Todesverstaendnis Jesu," in Der Tod Jesu. Deutungen im Neuen Testament, ed. K. Kertelge (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder, 1976), pp. 88-90; Cf. Heinz Schuermann, "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?" in Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Fuer Josef Schmid, ed. P. Hoffmann, N. Brox, W. Pesch (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder, 1973): 325-63, 356f.
- 94 Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, trans. J. Bowden (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), pp. 1-3; Morna Hooker, "On Using the Wrong Tool," Theology 75 (1972): 570-81; Heinz Schuermann, "Kritische Jesuserkenntnis," Bibel und Liturgie 54 (1981): 17-26.
- 95 Schuermann, "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?"; id., "Kritische Jesuserkenntnis"

96 Voegtler, op. cit.; id., "Jesus von Nazareth," in Oekumenische Kirchengeschichte, Band 1, Alte Kirche und Ostkirche, ed. R. Kottje-B. Moeller (Mainz: Matthias-Gruenewald Verlag; Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1970).

97 Peter Fiedler, Jesus und die Suender (Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang; Bern: Herbert Lang, 1976), pp. 277-81.

98 Edward Schillebeeckx, Jesus: An Experiment in Christology, trans. H. Hoskins (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), pp. 310f.

99 Voegtler, "Todesankuendigungen und Todesverstaendnis Jesu," in Der Tod Jesu. Deutungen im Neuen Testament, pp. 76f.

100 Fiedler, op. cit., p. 281.

101 cf. Schillebeeckx, op. cit., pp. 294-312.

102 Pesch, op. cit., ch. 7.

103 Schuermann, "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?"

104 Leenhardt, op. cit., pp. 23-29.

105 Augustin George, "Comment Jesus a-t-il percue sa propre mort?," Lumiere et vie 101 (1971): 34-59, 49-52.

106 Fueglistter, op. cit., pp. 22f.

107 Schuermann, op. cit.; id., "Das Weiterleben der Sache Jesu im nachoesterlichen Herrenmahl"; id., "Die Symbolhandlungen Jesu als eschatologische Erfuellungszeichen"; id., Gottes Reich-Jesu Geschick; cf. also Pesch, op. cit.; Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 276-86; Leonhard Goppelt, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), pp. 234-47; Meyer, op. cit., pp. 215-19; Joachim Gnilka, "Martyriumsparaenese und Suehnetod in synoptischen und juedischen Traditionen," in Die Kirche des Anfangs. Fuer Heinz Schuermann, ed. R. Schnackenburg, Josef Ernst, Joachim Wanke (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1978), pp. 223-46; id., "Wie urteilte Jesus ueber seinen Tod?" in Der Tod Jesu. Deutungen im Neuen Testament, pp. 13-50; id., Jesu ipsissima mors. Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner Martyriumsparaenese. (Muenchen: Minerva Publikation, 1983).

108 Marcel Bastin, Jesus devant sa passion (Paris: Cerf, 1976), ch. 2; Paul Davies, "Did Jesus Die as a Martyr-Prophet?" Biblical Research 19 (1974): 37-47.

- 109 Voegtle, op. cit., pp. 53-58.
- 110 Meyer, op. cit., pp. 168-70; Schuermann, "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?", pp. 341-43, 353-58.
- 111 Bastin, op. cit., p. 99.
- 112 Eduard Lohse, op. cit., pp. 34-37; Bastin, op. cit., p. 95.; contrary to Hermann Patsch, op. cit., pp. 156-58.
- 113 Jeremias, "Das Loesegeld fuer Viele,", p. 221.
- 114 Lohse, op. cit., p. 71.
- 115 Cf. also Gnilka, "Martyriumsparaenese und Suehnetod in synoptischen und juedischen Traditionen," in Die Kirche des Anfangs. Fuer Heinz Schuermann, pp. 236-39.
- 116 Lohse, op. cit., chs. 1-3, and Jeremias, op. cit. include examples from periods subsequent to the Tannaitic.
- 117 Gnilka, op. cit., p. 229.
- 118 Wilhelm Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, zweiter Band (Strasburg: Karl F. Truebner, 1890), p. 124; Lohse, op. cit., p. 79.
- 119 Bastin, op. cit., pp. 96f.
- 120 Lohse, op. cit., pp. 92-94.
- 121 For a more detailed study of the theme of death and expiation in Judaism, cf. Schuermann, Gottes Reich-Jesu Geschick, ch. 5; Jeremias, op. cit.; Bastin, op. cit., ch. 3; Gnilka, "Martyriumsparaenese und Suehnetod in synoptischen und juedischen Traditionen," in Die Kirche des Anfangs. Fuer Heinz Schuermann; id., "Wie urteilte Jesus ueber seinen Tod?" in Der Tod Jesu. Deutungen im Neuen Testament, id., Jesu ipsissima mors. Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner Martyriumsparaenese.
- 122 In Das Herrenmahl, Neuenzeit distinguished between sacrifice (Opfer) and expiation (Suehne) as applied to the interpretation of the death of Jesus in early Christian tradition. He claimed that the concept of Jesus' death as a sacrifice was the latest stage in the history of the tradition and that prior to this Jesus' death was understood simply as an expiation for sin along the lines of the representative death of the suffering Servant. What Neuenzeit did not notice, however, is that the suffering Servant motif of Isa 53, is not devoid of cultic-sacrificial connotations. The designation of the Servant as an ḥāsām

conceptually places it against the background of the Levitical sacrifices, contrary to Neuenzeit's view.

Likewise, Hermann Patsch (op. cit., pp. 151-58) wrongly held that the idea of a representative death was foreign to first-century, Palestinian Judaism.

123 Joachim Jeremias and Walter Zimmerli, "The Servant of the Lord" TDNT v. 654-717; Bastin, op. cit., ch. 1; Gnilka, op. cit.

124 Martin Rese, "Ueberpruefung einiger Thesen von Joachim Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknechtes im Judentum," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 60 (1963): 21-41; Lohse, op. cit., pp. 104-10; Patsch, op. cit.

125 A. E. Harvey, Jesus and the Constraints of History (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1982).

126 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 201f.

127 Joseph Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 1394.

128 Schuermann attempted to use the principle of discontinuity to prove the authenticity of Jesus' actions--and then by extension Jesus' words--at the Last Supper. Jesus' act of distributing the cup was discontinuous with what was the common practice. Normally, each participant had his own cup. This departure from procedure, according to Schuermann, must have had some significance. And, if Jesus intended something distinctive by the passing around of his cup, the same is likely the case for his blessing and distributing the bread. What Jesus was doing by these gestures of donation, according to Schuermann, was communicating to his disciples the salvific effects of his death. (The passing around of the cup and bread were, in Jewish tradition, a means of communicating blessing; Jesus' blessing to his disciples, therefore, was the benefits of his death.) Schuermann sought to ground the authenticity of the words of institution on Jesus' departures from the normal procedure at a festival meal.

Two problems arise, however, from Schuermann's effort. First, as we saw earlier, it is unlikely that Jesus' distribution of his cup was all that unusual. Secondly, even if it were an unusual procedure, it is also unlikely that one could read so much into Jesus' act of passing around his cup at the Last Supper. One suspects that the words of institution were guiding Schuermann in his reconstruction of the significance of this action.

129 Voegtle, op. cit., pp. 75f.

130 Cf. also in this regard, Schuermann, "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?", pp. 345f.; Gnilka, Jesu ipsissima mors. Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner

Martyriumsparaenese.; Helmut Merklein, "Erwaegungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahlstraditionen," Biblische Zeitschrift 21 (1977): 88-101, 235-44, 237-44; Pesch, op. cit., ch. 7.

131 Stephen Westerholm, Jesus and Scribal Authority (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978), p. 8.

132 Geza Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 2nd ed. (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1975), pp. 45f.

133 Meyer, op. cit., pp. 115-22.

134 Willi Marxen, "Der Ursprung des Abendmahls" Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952-53): 293-303, 303.

135 Pesch, op. cit., pp. 112-25.

136 Cf. Voegtle, "Jesus von Nazareth," in Oekumenische Kirchengeschichte, Band 1, Alte Kirche und Ostkirche, ed. R. Kottje-B. Moeller, p. 6.

137 Pesch held that the Ueberlieferungsqualitaet of Mark 14:22-25 was that of an early and reliable eyewitness account. His principal evidence for this was the literary smoothness of the Last Supper narrative and its coherence with the Markan Passion narrative as a whole. Since it was an eyewitness account, it became the basis for his historical reconstruction of Jesus' understanding of his death. It is doubtful, however, as we saw, that the Markan narrative of the Last Supper is as smooth as an eyewitness account should be; but even assuming that it was, it is still a big step from this conclusion to the conclusion that it actually is an eyewitness account. One cannot draw many definitive conclusions for historicity from a literary or tradition-historical analysis, only permissive ones. The fact that a narrative proves to be an organic unity does not prove that it is an eyewitness account and, therefore, historically reliable, but only permits such a conclusion. (Cf. Robert J. Daly, "The Eucharist and Redemption: The Last Supper and Jesus' Understanding of His Death", Biblical Theological Bulletin 11 (1981): 21-27, 26.)

EXCURSUS TWO: JESUS AND THE SERVANT

Whether the suffering Servant motif plays a significant role in the New Testament and formed the Old Testament background to Jesus' own self-understanding has often been disputed, particularly in the wake of the work of Joachim Jeremias.¹ There are few significant verbal parallels between the New Testament and Isa 53, which gives rise to the suspicion that Isa 53 occupies a peripheral place in the theology of the New Testament. The position presented here, however, is that the suffering Servant motif is central to the New Testament and was central to Jesus' own self-understanding.²

It is clear that the early church understood Jesus' death as expiatory. The question is whether it interpreted Jesus' death as expiatory in the light of Isa 53 and whether Jesus also made use of Isa 53. For the sake of simplicity, we shall consider the synoptic material separately from the rest of the New Testament.

We begin with the non-synoptic material. In I Cor 15:3-5, Paul quoted the tradition that he had received that Christos apethanen huper tōn hamartiōn hēmōn kata tas graphas. The tradition quoted by Paul is a confessional and kerygmatic formula (cf. I Cor. 11:23).³ The exact Old Testament reference is not cited, but the leading candidate

for a scripture that concerns the death of an individual for the sin of others is Isa 53. The phrase huper tōn hamartiōn hēmōn evokes Is. 53:5 in the Hebrew or Aramaic text. (LXX Isa 53 has dia tas hamartias hēmōn in 53:5; peri hamartias in 53:10; paredōken auton tais hamartiais hēmōn in 53:6, but never huper ton hamartiōn humōn.) It is not uncommon for Old Testament citations in Paul's epistles to be given in a non-LXX forms.⁴

In several other places in his epistles, Paul interpreted the death of Jesus by means of the formula connecting paradidonai heauton with huper + gen. These instances parallel the tradition that Paul quoted in I Cor. 15:3, and could be either reflections of similar, early traditions also based on Isa 53 or the result of the influence of the tradition quoted in I Cor 15:3 on Paul's own theologizing. We find the following examples in Paul's epistles: ...paradontos heauton huper mou... Gal 2:20; paredoken heauton huper hēmōn... Eph 5:2; ...kai heauton paredoken huper autēs Eph 5:20. If these formulas are traditional, they more than likely reflect Targum Isa 53:5, 12 or LXX Isa 53:6, 12. Targum Isa 53:5 translates the Hebrew mēdukkā' mē'āwonotēnū as ʔtmšr b' wytnʔ. Similarly, Targum Isa 53:12 translates the Hebrew taḥat ʔāšer hē' ērā lammāwet napšō as dmšr lmwt npsyh. The Aramaic mšr, meaning to surrender, deliver, which translates freely two different Hebrew verbs, could have given rise to the Greek paradidonai, used in these formulas, since they are equivalent in meaning. Or the key phrase paradidonai could be derived from the LXX

Isa 53:6 which translates the Hebrew as kai kurios paredōken auton tais hamartiais hēmōn or from LXX Isa 53:12b, where the Hebrew is translated as anth' on paredothē eis thanaton hē psuchē autou or from LXX Isa 53:12c where the Hebrew is rendered dia tas hamartias auton paredothē. At any rate, the idea of representation denoted by the Greek huper + gen. in the formulas in the Pauline writings is undoubtedly present in the entire chapter of Isa 53. We conclude that whatever the particulars of the tradition-history of the formula paradidonai with huper + gen, its roots are in the depiction of the suffering Servant of Isa 53.⁵

The closely related formulas of Rm 4:25 ...hos paredothē dia ta paraptōmata hēmōn kai ēgerthē dia dikaiōsin hēmōn and Rm 8:32 ...alla huper hēmōn pantōn paredōken auton... are also rooted in Isa 53, again probably reflecting early tradition. In Rm 4:25, the passive voice (paredothē) is used, so that Christ is delivered up by God (the divine passive), rather than delivering himself up. Rm 4:25 is almost verbally identical to the clause applied to the Servant in LXX Isa 53:12: kai dia tas hamartias autōn paredothē. It also parallels Isa 53:12b anth' hōn paredothē eis thanaton hē psuchē autou. We should note that dia + acc is used in Rm 4:25, instead of huper + gen, to express the idea of representation, which conforms to one of the LXX choices of translation for the same. (We can compare this to another linguistic variant used by Paul in Rm 8:3--peri hamartias--to express the idea of representation, which, like dia + acc, is also found in LXX Isa 53.) The use of the

passive paredothe could also correspond to the Aramaic mšr in the ithpeel form found in Targum Isa 53:5 (ʔtmsr) , which translates the Hebrew mēdukkāʔ. Rm 4:25 could, therefore, reflect Targum Isa 53:5 ʔ tmsr b ʕwyt : the Servant is delivered up for our iniquity. The use of the paredoken in Rm 8:32 reflects the LXX use of the same in 53:12c or in LXX Isa 53:6 kai kurios paredoken auton tais hamartais hemon. There can be little doubt, in conclusion, that Rm 5:25 and Rm 8:32 hearken back verbally and conceptually to Isa 53.

We also find the formula didonai heauton with huper + gen. in Paul's writings: Gal. 1:4 ...dontos heauton huper tōn hamartiōn hēmōn...; 1 Tim 2:6 ...ho dous heauton antilutron huper pantōn...; Titus 2:14 ...hos edōken heauton huper hēmōn. These appear to be simply variants on some of the formulas we have already examined, which were rooted in the phraseology and conceptuality of Isa 53. The only difference is that didonai is used rather than its cognate paradidonai; in both cases the idea expressed is the same.

Finally, we find in Paul's letters the use of apothanein or pathein with huper + gen (Rm 5:6,8; 2 Cor 5:14-15). These by themselves could only be used as weak evidence for dependence on Isa 53, since there are only conceptual parallels between them and Isa 53. But taken in conjunction with the other examples cited as reflecting Isa 53, they certainly belong to the class of formulas that are tradition-historically rooted in a christological exegesis of the Servant Songs by the early church.⁶

Leaving the Pauline corpus, we find in 1 Pet 2:21-25

a collection of quotations from Isa 53 more or less faithful to the LXX set within a christological framework. In 1 Pet 1:11, the author wrote that the Old Testament prophets had predicted the sufferings of Christ. It is clear from what is written in 2:21-24 that one of these prophets was Isaiah. The verbal parallels between it and Isa 53 are undeniable. It also seems likely that this unit partially incorporates an early testimonium collection or at least has been influenced by one. The entire second chapter of 1 Pet, in fact, is full of allusions to or quotations from the Old Testament, which further confirms this hypothesis. In 2:21-24 the author was, therefore, quoting firmly established interpretations of Isa 53. 1 Pet 2:22 is a quotation from Isa 53:9, and is almost verbally identical to the LXX version: hos hamartian (LXX: anomia) ouk epoiēsen, oude heurethē dolos en tō stomati autou. 1 Pet 2:24a hos tas hamartias hēmōn autos anēnegken en tō sōmati autou epi to xulon parallels LXX Isa 53:12b, where the Servant hamartias pollōn anēnegken. 1 Pet 2:24b ...hou to mōlōpi iathēte alludes to LXX Isa 53:5 ...to mōlōpi autou hemeis iathēmen. We might add that Isa 53 also seems to be the inspiration behind 1 Pet 3:18 where the author states that Christ hapax peri hamartiōn epāthen, dikaios huper adikōn... (cf. Isa 53:10 peri hamartias).

Paul, as we saw, wrote that according to the tradition that he had received Christ died for our sins according to scripture, which is a christological reading of the suffering Servant passages of Isaiah. The tradition quoted by Paul about the atoning efficacy of the death of

Christ appears, then, to be tradition-historically identical with that represented in 1 Pet 2:21-24. 1 Pet offers further proof, if more was needed, that the Old Testament scripture behind the tradition quoted by Paul is Isa 53. The author, like Paul, did not cite Old Testament references for his statements concerning the death of Christ, but from a tradition-historical point of view this is unnecessary, since there is no doubt that these verses are derived from Isa 53.

In the book of Acts, there are three places in which Jesus is referred to as the Servant (pais), but none of these connects Jesus' servanthood with suffering or death (Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27-30). In Acts 8:32f., we find a direct quotation from Isa 53:7-8, which is interpreted as applying prophetically to Jesus' own suffering and death. The Ethiopian eunuch was reading this passage when Philip met him and interpreted it for him. Nothing is said, however, of Jesus' suffering on behalf of others or on behalf of their sins, but, given the place that Isa 53 has as an interpretation of Jesus' death in other places in New Testament interpretation, it is justifiable to assume that this was part of the fuller explanation of the passage.

We might also add to this list Hebrews 9:28, which has certain verbal similarities to Isa 53:12. The clause houtōs kai ho Christos, hapax prosenechtheis eis to pollōn anenegkein hamartias... parallels the use of the verb anenegkein with the object hamartias and the use of pollōn to designate the recipients of the act in the LXX Isaian text. The author of Hebrews, however, unexpectedly made no use of

the motif of the suffering Servant to understand the death of Christ, but preferred to concentrate on the typological significance of the Levitical sacrifices. So, if 9:28 is an allusion to Isa 53, the suffering Servant plays only a peripheral role in the epistle's argumentation. This suggests that 9:28 is the result of the influence of the language of the earlier tradition, which connected Jesus' death with the death of the Servant.

There have been many attempts to find further echoes of Isa 53 in the New Testament writings outside of the synoptic gospels, but these are not as convincing.⁷ The list given above exhausts for the most part the references that one may reasonably trace to the influence of Isa 53.

What fuels the argument that the suffering Servant motif played no significant role in the early church's christology is its noticable absence from many of the New Testament epistles and the fewness of its occurrences in the remaining. How could a theological motif be so central, and yet not find its way into every stage and component of the New Testament record? These observations have given rise to tradition-historical attempts to relegate the suffering Servant motif to a late and non-influential stage of the tradition.

Morna Hooker in her much quoted book, Jesus and the Servant⁸, argued that there was not sufficient evidence to connect the development of the early church's christology with the influence of Isa 53. 1 Cor 15:3-5, for example, she did not accept as an ancient kerygmatic formula, contrary to

Paul's own claim. By comparing it to similar early kerygmatic formulas in Acts (2:22-39; 3:12-21; 13:26-41), she concluded that the connection between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins was a Pauline theological idiosyncrasy, since it was not present in these passages. Hooker also dismissed many of the other verbal and conceptual allusions to Isa 53 enumerated above on the grounds of insufficient evidence, although she exempted a few from this judgement, such as Hebrews 9:28, Acts 8, and 1 Pet 2:21-5. Her overall conclusion was that Isa 53 had at best only a peripheral influence on the development of the church's christology and soteriology.

Patsch held that it was not until the latter stages of the development of the tradition that the motif of the suffering Servant gained a place in the church's christology, although Jesus himself made use of it, which left its influence on the tradition of the Last Supper, which in turn influenced the development of the hyper-formula in early christological reflection.⁹ He argued that, in the earliest stages of the church's christology, the church simply made the claim that the entire Old Testament testified of the messiahship of Jesus. 1 Cor 15:3, as a demonstrably ancient, traditional kerygmatic and confessional formula, was a case in point. According to Patsch, the phrase kata tas graphas was a later addition to the formula. Originally the formula did not refer to any particular Old Testament text. This was confirmed by the fact that the same process was observable in the Passion narrative, where likewise no particular Old

Testament texts were cited, but only general references to the Old Testament as a whole were made. (The exception to this is Luke 22:37, which according to Patsch, was a later addition also.)

The verbal and conceptual parallels to the LXX Isa 53 and Targum Isa 53 did not convince Patsch. He regarded the arguments from Targum Isaiah as circular, and pointed out that the key word huper was not to be found in the LXX. The notion of a sacrificial death for others was as derivable from Jewish martyr theology as from Isa 53. There was no reason, therefore, to posit Isa 53 as the source for the New Testament's huper-formulas.

Only gradually, according to Patsch, did the church begin to put together a testimonium of the scriptures from the Old Testament that were directly predictive or typological of Jesus' Passion, which more than likely contained Isa 53. Isa 53, however, did not play a significant role in defining the church's christology and soteriology, as is evidenced by the few explicit references to it. Its role was limited to a general sort of contribution, because it remained embedded in the testimonium, and was not used in isolation from it. In short, according to Patsch, Isa 53 had a limited role in defining the church's soteriology and christology, and its contribution as an individual Old Testament text was late and, therefore, peripheral.

The huper-formula found in the earliest stages of the tradition was, therefore, in Patsch's view, not based on a

christological reading of Isa 53, but on the practice of the Lord's Supper. This was the starting point from which the church developed the idea that Jesus' death was on behalf of others. It later became a bridge by which the movement to the individual use of Isa 53 could take place. Its non-use in the early tradition did not mean, however, that Isa 53 did not have an influence on Jesus' own self-understanding. Rather, Patsch argued that the Lord's Supper with its huper-formula could be traced back to the historical Jesus, who in the interpretation of his death took for his point of departure the depiction of the suffering Servant in Isa 53. He isolated two pericopes that reasonably could be said to contain authentic sayings of Jesus: Mark 10:45 par; Mark 14:24 pars. The concept of a representative death for many present in these two pericopes was as distinct from Judaism, which eschewed the idea of a universal sacrifice for sin, as the early church's theological tendencies. We shall return to these a little later.

Hahn likewise argued that the kerygmatic formula in I Cor 15:3-5 did not originally allude to Isa 53 or to any scripture for that matter. The phrase kata tas graphas was a later addition to the formula, designed to make the connection between "Suehneaussage" and "Schriftmotiv". Tradition-historically, the formula derived from Jewish martyr theology, which was the means by which the early church understood Jesus' death.¹⁰ (The expiation of sin effected by the death of the Jewish martyrs and the righteous did not have the inclusive, universalist sense of "for all"

that Isa 53 had.) Only in a few passages in the New Testament could the hyper-formula be traced definitely to Isa 53. Hahn concluded that Isa 53 played a relatively minor role in the development of the early church's christology and soteriology. He was followed in this by Fuller, who also viewed the incorporation of Isa 53 into the church's soteriology as a late stage in the development of the tradition.¹¹

These objections put forward by Hooker, Patsch, and Hahn, however, do not overturn the hypothesis of the centrality of Isa 53 in the development of the christology and soteriology of the early church. On the contrary, they are subject to refutation. Their method of insisting on strict verbal identification before the conclusion of any positive influence of Isa 53 can be reached errs by excess. A lesser verbal exactness in quotation, with the resulting differences in the key words of the formulas, indicates the more surely how deeply rooted and early the christological use of Isa 53 was. One would expect such diversity and freedom in the use of Isa 53 at the early stages of the tradition, before the natural movement towards conceptual and formulaic standardization arose. The differences between formulas could be the result of free quotation of or the use of a different textual basis for translation (the Hebrew text, the Aramaic Targum, the LXX, or another Greek translation). At any rate, a condition for the possibility of such a variety of formulas was the great familiarity that the early church had with this passage as an interpretation

of the death of Jesus. Such familiarity resulted in their ability to recognize allusions to Isa 53 despite the differences in their linguistic form. This argument, to be sure, is circular, as Patsch pointed out, but it is a justifiable circularity, because, if Isa 53 was central in the formation of the soteriology and christology of the early church, one would not expect to find verbal exactness in its citation.

The deep rootedness of Isa 53 in the early development of the tradition is further evidenced by the implicit nature of the allusions to Isa 53. One can only conclude that the christological interpretation of Isa 53 was so well known that a merely implicit allusion to it was sufficient to indicate its source.

Hooker, Patsch, and Hahn erred methodologically in opposing the influence of Isa 53 on the early stages of New Testament christology and soteriology. Their mistake consisted in ignoring the convergence of data. There are enough instances with sufficient verbal and conceptual allusions to Isa 53 to conclude that Isa 53 played a central role in the early tradition.

1 Cor 15:3-5, moreover, proves that Isa 53 was central to the early church's christology and soteriology. Despite attempts to the contrary, it is clear that this passage is a pre-Pauline confessional and kerygmatic formula and reflects the phraseology and conceptuality of Isa 53. Hooker's argument that, contrary to Paul's own claim, Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins were not connected in the

pre-Pauline tradition, because they do not appear together in similar pre-Pauline material in Acts, suffers from apriorism.

Equally weak is Patsch's and Hahn's claim that the phrase kata tas graphas is secondary. Patsch's view of the development of the church's christology/soteriology is highly questionable. The early Christians certainly viewed the Old Testament as predictive of the Jesus' Passion. But it is doubtful that they held this without having specific references in mind, and only later began to isolate passages, re-contextualize them into a testimonium, and eventually began to consider these passages in isolation. This hypothesis runs counter to what is probably the nearest parallel to New Testament exegesis, the biblical exegesis found in the Dead Sea scrolls. The Qumran covenanters did atomistic exegesis, so why not the early Christians? In addition, if Jesus applied Isa 53 to himself, as Patsch said, then all the more reason why the early church ought to have.¹² To posit Jewish martyr theology as the basis for the hyper-formulas in the New Testament, as Hahn did, likewise is gratuitous and conjectural. There is no indication in the sources that this was the case.

The suffering Servant motif of Isa 53, as we noted, is completely absent from some books, while in others it is only occasionally represented. Paul's epistles are the best example of the latter. Unexpectedly, Paul did not develop the motif in his own theological reflection on the death of Christ. But rather than conclude from this that the motif of the suffering Servant played only a peripheral role in the

development of the church's soteriology and christology, one ought to conclude that its influence appears to be central only in the earliest period, and for some reason dropped from prominence. Allusions to Isa 53 often occur in formulas from the early stratum of the church's theological enterprise and in statements that appear to be influenced by these formulas. They also occur, as in the case of 1 Pet 2, in passages that resemble testimonia collections or appear to be influenced by them. (Testimonia belong to an early stage of the process of the church's theological development.) They are absent, however, from the later stages of the church's theological reflection, as represented by the epistles. (We find a parallel situation in the use of the term Son of Man as a christological title.) This hypothesis both explains its presence in the early formulas and its testimonium character, as well as its notable lack of centrality in the New Testament.

If the motif of the suffering Servant did influence the early Christian reflection on the significance of the death of Jesus, as we have argued, the question that arises now is whether this can be traced back to Jesus himself. At this point, we turn to the gospel material. We shall omit the gospel of John from consideration, because we find no positive evidence of the influence of the suffering Servant motif on Jesus' sayings, although the predictive use of Isa 53 occurs once (John 12:38). Rather, we shall concentrate on the synoptic gospels. The most likely hypothesis is that the early church initially used the suffering Servant to

interpret Jesus' death because Jesus himself did. Later it came to abandon it for some probably undeterminable reason.¹³

We have already argued that the words of institution reflect Jesus' self-understanding as the suffering Servant. We shall not repeat the arguments. Our concern will be with additional material supportive of the conclusion that the influence of Isa 53 is present in the gospel tradition.

We should begin with the observation that Jesus is represented in the synoptic gospels as predicting his own suffering and death at the hands of the Jewish authorities (cf. Mark 8:31 = Matt 16:21 = Luke 9:22; Mark 9:12 = Matt 17:12; Mark 9:31 = Matt 17:22f. = Luke 9:44; Mark 10:33f. = Matt 20:18f. = Luke 18:31-33). Not only did Jesus predict his future suffering and death, however, but also stated that it was necessary that he suffer and die (dei in Mark 8:31; Matt 26:54; Luke 13:33; 17:25; ...kata to hōrismenon poreuetai Luke 22:22). We also find the theme of the necessity of Jesus' death throughout John's gospel (cf. 6:33ff.; 8:28; 12:23ff.; 13-17). There is no reason to doubt the possibility of Jesus' predicting his own rejection and eventual execution, as we have argued elsewhere. The portrayal of Jesus as one expecting to be put to death ought to be accepted as historically accurate. If Jesus predicted his suffering, then perhaps he understood it at least partially in terms of the model of the suffering Servant.

There is one passage that could be interpreted as representing Jesus as alluding to Isa 53 with respect to his suffering and death.¹⁵ In Mark 9:12 Jesus asked ...kai pōs

gegraptai epi ton huion tou anthrōpou hina polla pathē kai exoudenēthē. The scriptural necessity of the suffering of the Son of Man could in itself reflect the amalgamation of a Son of Man conceptuality with that of the suffering Servant, as in Manson's hypothesis. There is, however, more than this to the argument. Exoudenēthē could be a translation of the Hebrew word nibzeh in Isa 53:3 (Aramaic: yhy lbwšrn). The LXX translates the Hebrew as to eidos autou atimion, but, as Cranfield pointed out, exoudenēthē was often used as a translation in other Greek versions of the Old Testament.¹⁶ If the use of exoudenēthē represents an allusion to Isa 53, and if the passage is genuine, then Jesus understood his destiny in terms of the suffering Servant.

A particularly important parallel to the words of institution that likewise is possibly influenced by the conceptuality of the Isaian suffering Servant is Mark 10:45. A number of questions for investigation present themselves. First, literarily did 10:45 originally belong to the saying in 10:43-44, and what is the relation between Mark 10:45 = Matt 20:28 and an apparent parallel in Luke 22:27? Secondly, is the tradition-historical background of Mark 10:45 the Servant Songs of Isaiah, and, if so, which one(s)? The answer to this question will affect the interpretation of the saying. Thirdly, historically does the saying go back to Jesus?

We shall begin with the literary questions. On internal literary grounds, it is held that Mark 10:45 is a secondary addition, made possible through

"Stichwortanschluss" (diakonos 10:43/diakonēthēnai and diakonēsai 10:45).¹⁷ Patsch argued, in fact, that 10:43b-44 was a "Wanderlogion", which in different forms had parallels in Mark 9:35; Matt 23:11 (MattS); Luke 9:48c (LukeS?); Luke 22:26 (LukeS), and that 10:42a was a Markan redaction. This was confirmed for him by the parallelism exhibited by 10:43b-44.¹⁸ It has also been argued, most notably by Wellhausen, that 10:45 does not belong to the context of 10:42-44, because the transition from the theme of service to that of the giving of one's life as a ransom is incongruent, a metabasis eis allo genos.¹⁹ The conceptual link, in other words, between the two traditions must be redactional.

Hahn, similarly, saw the connection of Mark 10:45 to 10:42-44 as secondary, and argued that it was the result of the addition of two traditional units to 10:42-44 in two different stages: first the Son of Man saying (10:45a) was added and then later the lutron-saying interpreting the death of Jesus was appended to 10:45a.²⁰ Patsch likewise viewed the phrase "to give his life a ransom for many" as originally not belonging to what preceded it.²¹ Again he resorted to the argument from literary parallelism to prove that the second half of 10:45 was secondary. Since 10:45a was set in antithetical parallelism ("not to be served but to serve"), then it followed that the original form lacked 10:45b, since the latter destroyed the parallelism of the former. Finally, that a Greek version of the same saying appears in 1 Tim 2:6 could be contrued as evidence that 10:45b circulated as an isolated saying.²²

Markan redaction is difficult to prove, since one cannot compare the text of Mark with his sources, as one can with Matthew and Luke. In order to differentiate between Markan redaction and pre-Markan tradition, one can only rely on obvious indications of the existence of literary seams. The arguments given above do not all necessarily point to the conclusion that Mark 10:42-45 is a redactional composition. The case for "Stichwortanschluss" is feasible, but is by no means certain. It is equally possible that the connection between servant (diakonos) in 10:43 and Jesus' not coming to be served (diakonēthēnai) but to serve (diakonēsai) is original. Similarly, the connection between 10:43-44 and 10:45 is not purely of a verbal nature, as in the case with other of Mark's collections of sayings. Rather, there is a logical continuity from the one to the other, contrary to Wellhausen's claim that the transition represented a metabasis eis allo genos. The saying about the Son of Man's giving his life as a ransom for many is a logical expansion of the idea of service to include self-sacrifice.²³ Patsch's argument that the parallelism of 10:43b-44 was proof that it circulated as an isolated unit has some validity. But it is still not certain that originally the lutron-saying could not have been joined to 10:43-44, even going back to Jesus himself, since, as we noted, 10:45 develops and transforms the theme of service.²⁴

The two-stage theory of the origin of Mark 10:45 represented by Hahn and Patsch is possible. Patsch's argument from the parallelism of 10:45a commends itself, but

is not wholly compelling, since he assumed that non-parallel sayings indicated the presence of redaction. This methodological assumption should not be transformed into a universal principle governing the laws of the transmission of the gospel material. The argument that 1 Tim 2:6 represented a different version of the tradition of 10:45b has some force also.

We conclude that on literary grounds there is some evidence to hold that 10:45 is a secondary addition to 10:42-44, although the evidence is not compelling. Moreover, there is justification to hold that 10:45 is itself composite, that 10:45b, the *lutron*-saying, does not originally belong to 10:45a.

There exists a partial parallel to Mark 10:42-45 in Luke 22:24-27. The notable feature of the Lukan passage is the absence of the *lutron*-saying. Instead the Lukan version concludes with tis gar meizōn, ho anakeimenos ē ho diakonōn. Do these facts have any bearing on an inquiry into the authenticity of Mark 10:45?

A detailed study of the literary relationship between Mark 10:42-45 and Luke 22:24-27 is unnecessary for our purposes. Suffice it to say that the verbal parallels between Luke and Mark are not numerous enough to posit a direct literary dependence. Rather, it is most likely that Luke 22:24-27 and Mark 10:42-45 are related tradition-historically as doublets of the same tradition.²⁵ In addition, Luke would not transpose his Markan source in this manner.²⁶ Luke, apparently, when confronted with two

versions of the same tradition, gave preference to his non-Markan source.²⁷ Matthew, differently, followed Mark. We are left with two tradition-historically related sayings in Mark 10:42-45 and Luke 22:24-27.

It has been argued that Luke's version is more tradition-historically original than Mark's and, therefore, that where Mark differs from Luke these differences represent secondary additions or omissions.²⁸ Grundmann attempted to establish that, since Luke's version neither had the lutron-saying nor was connected with the request of James and John, Mark must have been responsible for joining these three units of tradition together to create Mark 10:35-45.²⁹ If this is true, then Mark may also have been responsible for redacting the original saying represented by Luke so that it included the lutron-saying found in Mark 10:45b. Bultmann, for example, held that Mark 10:45 may have represented the dogmatic transformation--stemming from Hellenistic Christianity--of a more original saying preserved in Luke 22:27.²⁹

But when one notices that linguistically Mark 10:45 is more Semitic in character than Luke 22:27, it becomes apparent that the saying originated from a Palestinian milieu, as opposed to Bultmann's claim that it reflected the theology of the Hellenistic church.³⁰ Since Luke's version is linguistically more Hellenistic than Mark's,³¹ if one of the two versions of the tradition represented in Mark and Luke is more original, it is probably the Markan. Now we have not solved the problem of the exact relationship between

the Markan and Lukan versions. They are independent literarily; the question of their respective tradition histories, however, is probably unanswerable, as many of these questions are. We have at least proven that Mark 10:45 is not secondary tradition-historically to Luke 22:27. Nevertheless, it is still possible that Mark 10:45 was at one time an isolated saying that was added to Mark 10:42-44 at some point in the history of the tradition.

What is the tradition-historical background of the saying in Mark 10:45 = Matt 20:28? The case has been made that Mark 10:45 reflects the Hebrew text of Isa 53:10-12³²: dounai tēn psuchēn = im-taśīm napso (53:10); polloi = rabbīm (53:11, 12); diakonēsai = general reference to the Servant; lutron = a translation of ḏāśām (53:10). We should note, however, that ḏāśām in its Levitical meaning is guilt offering, and is translated in LXX Lev 5:14-6:7; 7:1-10 as plemmeleia. In its other occurrences it is rendered as agnoia, adikia, hamartia, basanos, katharismos, or a cognate of plemmeleia.³³ Nowhere in the LXX is ḏāśām translated by lutron or its cognates. Rather lutron and its cognates are used to translate kipper, gāʿal, pādā, and their cognates.³⁴ In Isa 53:10 the phrase im-taśīm ḏāśām is rendered in the LXX as ean dote peri hamartias. Jeremias suggested that lutron, nevertheless, was a free translation of asam in the general meaning of compensation³⁵ (Ersatzzahlung³⁶) (eg. I Sam. 6:3f., 8, 17). According to him, lutron in the LXX has the narrow meaning of ransom money, but also the broader meaning of representative or atonement offering, so that, in

fact, the meanings of the terms lutron and ḏāšām overlap. France pointed out that the idea of substitution is not foreign to the ḏāšām, since in some cases the offender must give an added fifth along with his ḏāšām as compensation to the wronged party.³⁷

The identification of lutron in Mark 10:45 with ḏāšām in Isa 53:10, however, has not convinced everyone.³⁸ It has been argued that lutron and ḏāšām have two different meanings; this is suggested by the linguistic data examined above, wherein lutron or its cognates never translate ḏāšām. The central meaning of ḏāšām is guilt; the ḏāšām offering is made to remove the guilt of the offerer. Lutron, on the other hand, has the sense of equivalence and substitution. It denotes the giving of something of equivalent value in exchange for something else. Where lutron is used with anti in LXX Num 3:12, as we find it in Mark 10:45, the meaning is clearly substitutionary: the Levites are to be taken as the substitute for every first-born, male Israelite. It is true that the idea of compensation is conjoined with the ḏāšām, but as Barrett showed, the act of restoration with the added fifth was distinct from the offering of the ḏāšām. If this is correct, then it seems unlikely that lutron could be a translation for ḏāšām in Isa 53, although there are other linguistic parallels between Mark 10:45 and Isa 53:10-12.³⁹

Grimm's conclusion was that lutron anti in Mark 10:45 must correspond to the Hebrew kāpar/taḥat, which is nowhere to be found in Isa 53.⁴⁰ The pollōn in Mark 10:45 lutron anti pollōn, however, does reflect the several

occurrences of rabbîm in Isa 53. According to Grimm, the Old Testament passage that Jesus had in mind when he called the giving of his soul a lutron anti was Isa 43:3f. (cf. Proverbs 21:18), rather than Isa 53:10-12. This passage promises that God will give certain nations as a ransom for (kāpar/taḥat) Israel. The evil die in the place of the righteous, and their death makes life possible for the righteous. This representative event (Stellvertretungsgeschehen) will issue from God alone, and is motivated by God's passionate love for Israel. According to Grimm, Mark 10:45 corresponded far better to Isa 43:3f. than to any other Old Testament passage.

We have already noted that lutron anti is equivalent in meaning to kāpar/taḥat in Isa 43:3. Grimm, however, also found a correspondence between ho huios tou anthrōpou in Mark 10:45 and this passage. The meaning of ʔādām in Isa 43:4 was far from unified in Jewish exegesis. Some interpreted ʔādām as meaning men, parallel to the peoples in 43:3. It was also interpreted as ʔedom. QIs-a ab, rather than ʔādām, has ha-ʔādām. There is even late evidence that ʔādām was read as bēnē-ʔādām. Grimm postulated that Jesus could have read bēnē-ʔādām, corresponding to huios tou anthrōpou in Mark 10:45 or have simply interpreted the passage in this way. The pollōn is, however, as we said, a reflection of Isa 53, so according to Grimm, it was probable that Jesus had both Isa 43 and Isa 53 in view.

Grimm's position would be feasible on one condition. It would have to be proven that lutron could not be equivalent in meaning to ʔāšām in Isa 53:10. It is doubtful that this

condition can be fulfilled. Certainly, lutron cannot mean ḏāšām in its strict Levitical sense of guilt-offering. Barrett and others were correct in pointing this out. But should ḏāšām in Isa 53:10 be interpreted literally as a guilt-offering? In Isa 53 we have an example of the metaphorical use of ḏāšām, since, according to the Levitical law, a person could not offer himself as a guilt-offering. If the use of ḏāšām is metaphorical, then we ought not to delineate its meaning as applied to the Servant strictly in accordance with its Levitical denotations. When interpreted in its Isaian context, ḏāšām in Isa 53:10, used as a metaphor, has the sense of the means of the removal of guilt through representative suffering and death. The meaning of ḏāšām in Isa 53:10 is, it appears, not essentially different from kēpar/taḥat = LXX lutron anti in Isa 43:3, wherein a people die as the means by which Israel is redeemed. It is implicitly assumed in Isa 43:3 that Israel's redemption is made necessary by their guilt. Lutron anti in Mark 10:45, therefore, roughly expresses the same thing as ḏāšām metaphorically applied to the Servant.

Jeremias' point that we ought to take ḏāšām in the broader sense of compensation is correct. A parallel to the non-literal use of ḏāšām is I Sam 6:3, wherein the sense is compensation for guilt incurred. In a similar manner, the Servant offers himself as the representative of the guilty. The linguistic arguments of Barrett and others are deceptive, since they assume that ḏāšām in every one of its occurrences must mean guilt or guilt-offering and lutron must mean

equivalence or substitution. This is not the case, as we have seen. In addition, that lutron is never used to translate ḡāšām in the LXX is really inconsequential, because the correspondence at the conceptual level between Mark 10:45 and Isa 53 is substantial, despite the lack of verbal correspondence at points.⁴⁰

The question now is whether the lutron-saying goes back to Jesus himself. We have seen that its linguistic origin is Palestinian. This does not prove the authenticity of the passage, but it at least allows for this possibility. Really the only criterion to which one can appeal is the criterion of coherence. If this passage coheres with what we find in demonstrably authentic sayings of Jesus, then it is authentic by inference. As we have argued, it is likely that Jesus predicted his own execution, and naturally would have reflected on this theologically. We have also presented evidence that Jesus understood his death as sacrificial in the light of the original Passover offerings and the suffering Servant. It follows that there is no reason why Jesus could not also have uttered the lutron-saying in Mark 10:45.⁴¹

The only explicit reference to the Servant Songs in the gospel tradition is found in Luke 22:37: legō gar humin hoti touto to gegrammenon dei telesthēnai en emoi, to Kai meta anomōn elogisthē... (Isa 53:12). This saying occurs in the context of Jesus' explanation to the disciples after the Last Supper of how things had changed on the eve of his execution.⁴² Contrary to his previous teaching when he sent

them out to preach and heal, he told them now to carry a purse and a bag, and even to buy a sword. The point was that his ministry, at least from one perspective, had been a failure, that his message had not been received, and now all that he said previously was, at least for the time being, no longer valid. He was warning the disciples, in other words, that their position after his death would be perilous, different from when they travelled about as preachers of the Kingdom of God. In 22:37, Jesus then explained that he was about to be killed by referring to Isa 53 as predictive of his own fate: like the Servant, he would be reckoned among the lawless. The disciples, however, misunderstood the point, and Jesus cut short the conversation.

Hooker said of this quotation from Isa 53 that "unfortunately it occurs in a very obscure passage, of which both the meaning and genuineness are doubtful".⁴³ The meaning of the passage is not as obscure as Hooker suggested, but it does take some effort on the part of the exegete to catch the irony of Jesus' words. The genuineness of this unit, however, is another question. For this passage to be genuine, it first must be shown that Luke 22:35-38 is not a Lukan redaction, but is pre-Lukan tradition.

There is little doubt that Luke did not create this unit of tradition; it is not a Lukan redactional product. Rather, the unit belongs to the Lukan special tradition. This is not difficult to prove. Schuermann⁴⁴ and Jeremias⁴⁵ isolated a sufficient number of examples of non-Lukan linguistic usage to prove that Luke found this material in

his special source. Kai eipen autois (22:35) is non-Lukan, since Luke prefers the use of de rather than kai and pros autous rather than the dative autois. Luke avoided the use of a simple hote (22:35), preferring de hote. The use of alla nun (22:36) is also avoided by Luke, who prefers kai nun. The use of the verb agorazō (22:36 agorasato) is not typical of the Lukan style. The formula legō gar humin hoti (22:37) is not Lukan. The quotation from Isa 53 (meta anomōn) appears to be taken from the Hebrew text rather than the LXX (Hebrew ʾet pēšēʿīm; LXX en tois anomois), which is uncommon for Luke, who generally quotes from the latter. There are other more debatable examples that one could adduce, but the above are the least likely to be Lukan redaction.

There is, however, a sufficient number of examples of Lukan vocabulary and style to conclude that Luke redacted this unit to some extent. The literary question, given our conclusion that 22:35-38 represents a Lukan redaction of traditional material, is whether Luke was responsible for unit's arrangement as it now stands, or whether he inherited it from the tradition. This question is difficult to answer satisfactorily.

Hahn attempted to provide a detailed reconstruction of the Lukan redactional process. Luke 22:35 was taken from material related to Luke 10:4a. Luke 22:36a was a product of the Lukan redaction of traditional material, and 22:36b did not originally stand in relation to 22:36a. Luke 22:36b had no tradition-historical connection with the sending out of

the disciples on their missionary journeys. The connection was Luke's doing. It originally belonged to the apocalyptic tradition: consistent with apocalyptic motifs the disciples were warned in 22:36b of the evil times that were to come, and encouraged to take measures to protect themselves.⁴⁶ According to Hahn, the quotation from Isa 53:12 in 22:37a, on account of its divergence from the LXX, must have been taken from an often quoted Old Testament text of the community tradition, and 22:37b was a Lukan redaction. Fitzmyer agreed that 22:25-38 was a composite discourse constructed by Luke from traditional material.⁴⁷

Patsch, similarly, argued that there was originally no explicit reference to Isa 53 in 22:37. He reasoned that the reference to the fulfilment of scripture (...to gegrammenon dei telesthēnai...) and the quotation from Isaiah (...to kai meta anomōn elogisthē) represented a duplication of forms, ("Koppelung der Formeln"), which in turn could be interpreted as the presence of "eine fortgeschrittene Reflexion am Werk". That is to say, the second reference (to Isa 53) was a later addition to an original text that merely referred to the Old Testament as a whole.⁴⁸

Any traditional-historical reconstruction is, however, bound to be highly speculative. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine on purely internal grounds the origin and history of Luke 22:35-38.⁴⁹ In addition, Patsch's argument founders on his erroneous presupposition that the early church did not concern itself with individual texts from the Old Testament to serve as proof for the events in

the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

Nevertheless, two considerations suggest that Luke took over the unit largely as it stands. First, that there is a certain amount of obscurity in the text tells against its being a Lukan creation from traditional material. If Luke had been responsible for the bringing together of these individual units into a whole, one would expect a greater perspicuity of meaning.⁵¹ Secondly, the manner of Luke's handling of the sources that he had in common with Matthew indicates that he was not inclined to create new units from disparate traditional material.

The question whether Luke took over the tradition found in 22:35-38 as a unit is, however, not as important for our purposes as determining whether Jesus applied to himself what was said of the Servant in Isa 53:12. The citation from the Servant Songs is not a Lukan innovation, and, therefore, goes back to the pre-synoptic tradition. Does it go all the way back to Jesus himself? We have no reason to say that it does not. If Jesus foresaw his death and reflected upon it, why would he not also interpret his death in light of Isa 53?

If Jesus applied to himself the clause kai meta anomōn elogisthē from Isa 53:12, then it is likely that he intended his disciples to extend the comparison to include other features of the Servant in the same passage.⁵¹ It is possible that Jesus had already made the comparison between himself and the Servant and so he only needed to quote a fragment of the verse, parallel to the method of rabbinic exegesis, in order to make his point. In any case, it is

hard to believe that Jesus would say something pertaining to the Servant's suffering that must be fulfilled of him without also intending that his hearers understand that he is to be identified with the Servant in other respects.

We conclude that the apostolic church understood Jesus' death in terms of the suffering Servant, but did not continue with this line of theological interpretation. Jesus also understood his death against the background of Isa 53, which more than likely influenced the early church to do likewise. The restriction of Jesus' teaching about his death to the esoteric tradition accounts for the relative paucity of references to Isa 53 as interpretive of his death.⁵²

NOTES TO EXCURSUS TWO

¹ Cf. Martin Rese, "Ueberpruefung einiger Thesen von Joachim Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknecht im Judentum," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 60 (1963): 21-41; Morna Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London: S.P.C.K., 1959); Charles K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 1-18.

² We must distinguish between the use of the suffering Servant motif and the Servant in his other related but different capacities. These are two separate questions. For our purposes we shall concentrate on the suffering Servant.

³ Cf. Walter Zimmerli and Joachim Jeremias, The Servant of God, revised ed. (London: SCM Press, 1965); Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, revised 2nd ed., trans. B. L. Woolf (Cambridge, England: James Clark and Co., Ltd., 1982), pp. 18-23; Peter Stuhlmacher, "Jesus als Versoehner" in Versoehnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), pp. 9-26, 13-17; C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), ch. 1; Guenther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971), pp. 113f.; Ben F. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1979), p. 62.

⁴ Cf. E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1981), pp. 150-52.

⁵ Although Targum Isa 53 deliberately obscures the motif of suffering in relation to the Servant, it is likely that this distortion was the result of an anti-Christian apologetic and that at an earlier period it was more faithful to the Hebrew text.

⁶ We could add to this the numerous instances where Paul used the hyper-formula in his epistles (Jeremias, op. cit., p. 95, especially footnote 435). If Paul took over a suffering Servant theology from the tradition, these references could be traced to the inspiration of Isa 53.

⁷ Jeremias, op. cit.

8 Hooker, op. cit.

9 Hermann Patsch, Abendmahl und historischer Jesus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), ch. 4.

10 Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, 4. Auflage (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), pp. 54-66.

11 Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (London: Lutterworth Press, 1965), pp. 151-54.

12 The case is further confirmed when one takes into consideration the many applications of the Servant used in the New Testament that do not directly relate to the Servant's suffering and expiatory death (cf. C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1952), pp. 88-96). These are so numerous that one must conclude that the Servant Songs formed an important set of Old Testament scriptures understood by the early Christians as referring predictively to the ministry of Jesus and the life of the church.

13 Cf. C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the New Testament, 3rd. ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1981), p. 83.

14 Cf. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, revised ed., trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. H. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 51-82; T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

15 R. T. France, Jesus and the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), pp. 123-25.

16 C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 298.

17 Peter Stuhlmacher, "Existenzstellvertretung fuer die Viele" in Versoehnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), pp. 27-42, 29; Rudolf Pesch, Das Markusevangelium II. Teil (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1977), pp. 162-67; Patsch, op. cit., p. 172.

18 Patsch, op. cit., p. 172.

19 Cited in Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed. (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1966), p. 445.

20 Hahn, op. cit., pp. 45, 57.

- 21 Patsch, op. cit., p. 176.
- 22 Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, trans. J. Bowden (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), p. 294.
- 23 Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed., pp. 445f.
- 24 Cf. Hooker, op. cit., p. 75.
- 25 Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "Das Loesegeld fuer Viele (Mk. 10, 45)", in Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 216-29; Heinz Schuermann, Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk 22, 21-38, 2. Auflage (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1977), pp. 64-79; I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 810-14; A. Feuillet, "Le logion sur la rançon," Revue des sciences philosophique et théologiques 51 (1967): 365-402; Patsch, op. cit., p. 172.
- 26 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 225.
- 27 B. F. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (London: MacMillan and Co., 1924), p. 210.
- 28 Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Markus, 9. Auflage (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1984), pp. 290f.
- 29 Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, revised ed., trans. J. Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976), pp. 93, 144.
- 30 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 225-27; Feuillet, op. cit., pp. 373-79; Patsch, op. cit., p. 174; Eduard Lohse, Maertyer und Gottesknecht, 2. Auflage (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 118.
- 31 Lohse, op. cit., p. 119; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 226.
- 32 Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 227-29; Cranfield, op. cit., pp. 342-44; Meyer, op. cit., pp. 217f.; Lohse, op. cit., p. 119; France, op. cit., pp. 116-21
- 33 Barrett, op. cit., p. 5.
- 34 Werner Grimm, Weil Ich dich liebe. Die Verkuengigung Jesu und Deuterojesaja (Bern: Herbert Lang; Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 1976), p. 235; Barrett, op. cit., p. 5.
- 35 Jeremias, op. cit., p. 228.

- 36 Cf. Lohse, op. cit., p. 119.
- 37 France, op. cit., pp. 118-20; Cf. Lohse, op. cit., p. 119.
- 38 Barrett, op. cit., pp. 5-7; Hooker, op. cit., pp. 74-78; Grimm, op. cit., pp. 234-36; Stuhlmacher, op. cit., pp. 31f.
- 39 Grimm, op. cit., p. 236.
- 40 Cf. Feuillet, op. cit., p. 394.
- 41 Patsch rightly contrasted the universalism of the anti pollōn in Mark 10:45 with the exclusive nature of Jewish martyr theology in order to prove, in accordance with the criterion of discontinuity, that 10:45 was not derivable from Judaism. The inspiration for the inclusiveness of the lutron-saying is Isa 53, which Judaism never or rarely used in the formulations of its martyr theology (Patsch, op. cit., pp. 170-80). He argued wrongly, as we noted earlier, that the early church did not use Isa 53 to interpret the death of Jesus. In addition, it is still possible that the use of Isa 53 with its universalism was suppressed by later, post-second-temple Judaism. Patsch's appeal to the criterion of discontinuity is, therefore, only partially successful at best.
- 42 Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1957), pp. 340-42.
- 43 Hooker, op. cit., p. 86.
- 44 Schuermann, op. cit., pp. 116-39.
- 45 Joachim Jeremias, Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), pp. 292-93.
- 46 Hahn, op. cit., pp. 166-70.
- 47 Joseph Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke, X-XXIV (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1985), p. 1429.
- 48 Patsch, op. cit., p. 162.
- 49 Cf. Marshall, op. cit., p. 824.
- 50 Grimm, op. cit., p. 227.
- 51 France, op. cit., p. 116; contrary to Hooker, op. cit., p. 86, who argued that the absence of any explicit mention of expiatory death meant that none was intended.

104. 52 Jeremias, The Servant of God, revised ed., p.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Texts and Translations

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. I-II. Edited by R. H. Charles. London: Oxford University Press, 1913.

The Apostolic Fathers. Two volumes. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. The Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1912.

Das Fragmententhargum (Thargum jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch). Edited by Moses Ginsburger. Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1899.

Exodus Rabbah. Translated by S. H. Lehrman. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

The Works of Josephus. Translated and Edited by H. StJ. Thackeray [vols. 1-5], Ralph Marcus [vols. 5-8] and Louis Feldman [vols. 9 and 10]. The Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1926-65.

Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. Edited by J. Lauterbach. I-III. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976.

Mishnayoth, I-VII, 2nd edition. Edited by Philip Blackman. New York: The Judaica Press, 1983.

Neophyti I. Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana, Tomo II, Exodo Edited by Alejandro Diez Macho. English Translation by Martin McNamara. Madrid-Barcelona, 1970.

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer Translated by Gerald Friedlander. New York: Hermon Press,

Sifre Deuteronomy Translated by Reuven Hammer. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Targum Jonathan. Edited by Alexander Sperber. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.

The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments from the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee. Genesis and Exodus. Translated by J. W.

Etheridge. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1968.

The Tosefta I-III. Edited by S. Lieberman. New York, 1955-67.

The Tosefta I-VI. Translated by J. Neusner. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1981.

B. Literature

AALLEN, Sverre. "Das Abendmahl als Opfermahl im Neuen Testament." Novum Testamentum 6 (1963): 128-52

AMPHOUX, Christian-Bernard. "Le dernier repas de Jesus". Étude théologique et religieuse 56 (1981): 449-54.

AUDET, Jean-Paul. "Esquisse historique du genre littéraire de la 'bénédiction' juive et de l'eucharistie chrétienne." Revue Biblique 65 (1958): 371-99

BACON, Benjamin W. "The Lukan Tradition of the Lord's Supper." Harvard Theological Review 5 (1912): 322-48.

BAHR, Gordon J. "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words." Novum Testamentum 12 (1970): 181-202.

BARRETT, Charles K. "Luke XXII. 15: To Eat the Passover." The Journal of Theological Studies New series. 9 (1958): 305-307.

-----, "The Background of Mark 10:45." in New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 1-18.

-----, "The Lamb of God." New Testament Studies 1 (1954): 210-18.

BARTSCH, H.-W. "Jesu Schertwort, Lukas XXII 35-38. Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studie" New Testament Studies 20 (1973/74) 190-203.

BASTIN, Marcel. Jesus devant sa passion. Paris: Cerf, 1976.

BATE, H. N. "The 'Shorter Text' of St. Luke XXii 15-20." The Journal of Theological Studies 28 (1926-27): 362-68.

BECK, Norman. "The Last Supper as an Efficacious Symbolic Act." Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (1970): 192-98.

BENOIT, Pierre. "Le recit de la cene dans Lc. XXII, 15-20." Revue Biblique 48 (1939): 357-93.

-----". "Luc XXII 19b-20." The Journal of Theological Studies 49 (1948): 145-47.

BONSIRVEN, Joseph. "Hoc est corpus meum: Recherches sur l'original arameen." Biblica 29 (1948): 205-19.

BORNKAMM, Guenther. "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus." Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 53 (1956): 312-49.

-----". Jesus of Nazareth. 3rd ed. Translated by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975.

-----". Paul. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971.

BOX, G. H. "The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist." The Journal of Theological Studies 3 (1902): 357-69.

BRUCE, F. F. "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 43 (1960/61): 336-53.

BULTMANN, Rudolf. History of the Synoptic Tradition. Revised ed. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976

-----". Jesus and the Word. Translated by Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

-----". Theology of the New Testament. Volumes 1 and 2. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951, 1955.

BURKITT, F. C. "St. Luke XXII 15, 16: What is the General Meaning?" The Journal of Theological Studies 9 (1908): 569-71.

CADBURY, Henry J. The Style and Literary Method of Luke. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920.

CHADWICK, Henry. "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII. 15-20." Harvard Theological Review 50 (1957): 249-58.

CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians. Translated by James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

-----". Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments. 3. Auflage. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag,

1976.

----- . Jesus. Translated by J. Raymond Lloyd. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.

CRANFIELD, C. E. B. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

CULLMANN, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Revised ed. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

DAHL, N. A. "Die Passionsgeschichte bei Matthaeus." New Testament Studies 2 (1955/56): 17-32

DALMAN, Gustaf. Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Translated by Paul P. Levertoff. London: S.P.C.K., 1929.

DALY, Robert J. "The Eucharist and Redemption: The Last Supper and Jesus' Understanding of His Death." Biblical Theological Bulletin 11 (1981): 21-27.

DAVID, Jean-Eudes. "To haima mou tēs diathēkēs: Mt 26, 28: Un faux problème." Biblica 48 (1967): 291-92.

DAVIES, Paul E. "Did Jesus Die as a Martyr-Prophet?" Biblical Research 19 (1974): 37-47.

DENNEY, James. The Death of Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.

DIBELIUS, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. 2nd ed. Translated by Bertram L. Woolf. London: James Clarke and Co., reprinted, 1982.

DOCKX, S. "Le recit du repas pascal: Marc 14, 17-26." Biblica 46 (1965): 445-53.

DODD, C. H. The Founder of Christianity. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1970.

----- . The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980.

----- . According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1952.

DOEVE, J. W. "Purification du temple et dessèchement du figuier." New Testament Studies 1 (1954/55): 297-308.

DORMEYER, Detlev. Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell. Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974.

DOWNING, John. "Jesus and Martyrdom." The Journal of Theological Studies, new series 14 (1963): 279-93.

DUPONT, Jacques. "‘Ceci est mon corps’, ‘Ceci est mon sang’." Nouvelle revue théologique 80 (1958): 1025-1041.

----- . "Il n'en sera pas laissé pierre sur pierre (Marc 13,2; Luc 19,44)." Biblica 52 (1971): 301-20

EICHHORN, Albert. Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1898.

EISLER, Robert. "Das letzte Abendmahl." Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 24 (1925): 161-92.

ELLIS, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982.

EMERTON, J. A. "The Aramaic Underlying to haima mou tēs diathēkēs in Mk XIV. 24." The Journal of Theological Studies, new series 6 (1955): 238-40.

FENEBERG, Rupert. Christliche Passafeier und Abendmahl. Eine biblisch-hermeneutische Untersuchung der neutestamentlichen Einsetzungsberichte. Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1971.

FEUILLET, A. "Le logion sur la rançon." Revue de sciences philosophique et théologique 51 (1967): 365-402.

FIEDLER, Peter. Jesus und die Suender. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang; Bern: Herbert Lang, 1976.

FINKELSTEIN, Louis. "The Birkat Ha-Mazon." Jewish Quarterly Review 19 (1928-29): 211-55.

FITZER, Gottfried. "Der Ort der Versoehnung Paulus." Theologische Zeitschrift 22 (1966): 161-83

FITZMYER, Joseph. The Gospel According to Luke. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1985.

----- . "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." New Testament Studies 20 (1973-74): 382-407.

FOHRER, Georg. Die symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten. 2. Auflage. Zuerich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1968.

FRANCE, R. T. Jesus and the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982.

FRIEDRICH, Gerhard. Die Verkuendigung des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament. 2. Auflage. Duesseldorf: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.

FUEGLISTER, Notker. Die Heilsbedeutung des Pascha. Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1963.

FULLER, Reginald. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.

-----". "The Double Origin of the Eucharist." Biblical Research 8 (1963): 60-72.

GAUGLER, Ernst. Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament. Basel: Majer, 1943.

GEORGE, Augustin. "Comment Jesus a-t-il perçu sa propre mort?" Lumiere et vie 101 (1971): 34-59.

GESE, Hartmut. Zur biblischen Theologie. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

GNILKA, Joachim. Jesu ipsissima mors. Der Tod Jesu im Lichte seiner Martyriumsparaenese. Muenchen: Minerva Publikation, 1983.

-----". "Martyriumparaenese und Suehntod in synoptischen und juedischen Traditionen." in Die Kirche des Anfangs. Edited by Rudolf Schnackenburg, Josef Ernst, Joachim Wanke. Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1978.

-----". "Wie urteilte Jesus ueber seinen Tod?" in Kertelge, Karl, ed. Der Tod Jesu. Deutungen im Neuen Testament. Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1976.

GOGUEL, Maurice. "La relation du dernier repas de Jesus dans I Cor., 11, et la tradition historique chez l'apotre Paul." Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 10 (1930): 61-89.

GOPPELT, Leonhard. Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmann Publishing Co., 1982.

-----". Theologie des Neuen Testaments. I-II. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1976.

GRUNDMANN, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Markus. 9. Auflage. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1977.

GRIMM, Walter. Weil Ich dich liebe. Die Verkuendigung Jesu und Deuterojesaja. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 1976

HAAG, Herbert. Vom alten zum neuen Pascha. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1971.

HAHN, Ferdinand. "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung." Evangelische Theologie 27 (1967): 337-74.

-----. Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im fruehen Christentum. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974.

-----. "Zum Stand der Erforschung des urchristlichen Herrenmahls." Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 553-63.

HARVEY, A. E. Jesus and the Constraints of History. London: Duckworth, 1982.

HENGEL, Martin. The Charismatic Leader and His Followers. Translated by James Greig. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1981.

HIGGINS, A. J. B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1952.

-----. "The Origins of the Eucharist." New Testament Studies 1 (1954-55): 200-209.

HOOKE, Morna. Jesus and the Servant. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.

-----. "On Using the Wrong Tool." Theology 75 (1972): 570-81.

HORSLEY, Richard. "Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 46 (1984): 471-95.

-----. "Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 43 (1981): 409-32.

HRUBY, K. "La paque juive du temps du Christ à la lumière des documents de la littérature rabbinique." L'Orient Syrien 6 (1961): 81-94.

JEREMIAS, Joachim. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. 3rd ed. Translated by Norman Perrin. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1966.

-----. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. 3rd ed. Translated by F. H. and C. H. Cave. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1969.

----- . The Parables of Jesus. "2nd revised ed.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.

----- . "Perikopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?"
Journal of Theological Studies 4 (1957/58): 115-19.

----- . "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im
Spaetjudentum und in der Verkuendigung Jesu." Zeitschrift
fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des
Urchristentums 42 (1949): 184-94.

----- . "Das Loesegeld fuer Viele." in Abba.
Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte.
Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

----- . Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums.
Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980.

----- . Die Passafeier der Samaritaner. Giessen:
Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1932.

----- . "The Last Supper." The Expository Times 64
(1952-53): 91-2.

JUEL, Donald. Messiah and Temple: The Trial of
Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. Missoula, Montana: Scholar's
Press, 1977.

KAESEMANN, Ernst. "Anliegen und Eigenart der
paulinischen Abendmahlslehre." Evangelische Theologie 7
(1947-48): 263-83.

KERTELGE, Karl. "Die soteriologischen Aussagen in
der urchristlichen Abendmahlsueberlieferung und ihre
Beziehung zum geschichtlichen Jesus." Trierer Theologische
Zeitschrift 81 (1972): 193-202.

KILPATRICK, G. D. "The Last Supper." The Expository
Times 64 (1952-53): 4-8.

----- . "L'eucharistie dans le Nouveau Testament."
Revue de théologie et philosophie, 3rd series. 14 (1964):
193-204.

----- . "Luke XXII. 19b-20." The Journal of
Theological Studies. 47 (1946): 49-56.

KLAUSNER, Jesus of Nazareth. Translated by Herbert
Danby. New York: Menorah Publishing Co., 1979.

KOSMALA, Hans. "Das tut zu meinem Gedaechnis."
Novum Testamentum 4 (1960): 81-94

KUEMMEL, Werner. Promise and Fulfilment. 2nd ed.

Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961.

KUHN, Karl Georg. "Die Abendmahlsworte." Theologische Literaturzeitung 75 (1950): 399-408.

-----". "Ueber die urspruenglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhaeltnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift." Evangelische Theologie 10 (1950-51): 508-27.

KUTSCH, Ernst. "Von der Aktualitaet alttestamentlicher Aussagen fuer das Verstaendnis des Neuen Testaments." Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 74 (1977): 273-90.

-----". "Das sog. 'Bundesblut' in Ex XXIV 8 und Sach IX 11." Vetus Testamentum 23 (1973): 25-30.

LANG, Friedrich. "Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im Neuen Testament." Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 524-38.

LAPIDE, Pinchas E. "Der mysterioese Mazzabrocken. Ging der Eucharistiefeier ein Pessachritus voraus?" Lutherische Monatshefte 14 (1975): 120-24.

LEENHARDT, Franz-J. Le sacrement de la sainte cène. Paris: Delachaux and Niestle S.A., 1948.

Le DEAUT, Roger. La nuit pascale. Rome: Institut biblique pontifical, 1963.

-----". "The Current State of Targumic Studies." Biblical Theology Bulletin 4 (1974): 3-32.

LEON-DUFOUR, Xavier. Le partage du pain eucharistique selon le Nouveau Testament. Paris: Seuil, 1982.

-----". "Le signe du temple selon Saint Jean." Recherches de science religieuse 39 (1951): 155-75.

LOHMEYER, Ernst. "Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl." Theologische Rundschau N.F. 9 (1937): 168-227, 273-312.

-----". "Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde." Journal of Biblical Literature 56 (1937): 217-52.

LOHSE, Eduard. Maertyrer und Gottesknecht. 2. Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

MACGREGOR, G. H. C. "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel." New Testament Studies 9 (1962-63): 111-19.

MANSON, T. W. The Teaching of Jesus. London:

Cambridge University Press, 1959.

----- . "The Cleansing of the Temple." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 33 (1950-51): 271-82.

----- . The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

MARSHALL, I. Howard. Last Supper and Lord's Supper. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1980.

----- . The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

MARXEN, Willi. "Der Ursprung des Abendmahls." Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952-53): 293-303.

MERKLEIN, Helmut. "Erwaegungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahltraditionen." Biblische Zeitschrift 21 (1977): 88-101, 235-44.

----- . Jesu Botschaft von der Gottesherrschaft. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.

MEYER, Ben F. The Aims of Jesus. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1979.

----- . "Jesus and the Remnant of Israel." Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965): 123-30.

----- . "The Expiatory Motif in the Eucharistic Words: A Key to the History of Jesus?" Gregorianum, 1988.

MORRIS, Leon. "The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'." New Testament Studies, new series 3 (1952): 216-27.

----- . "The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'." The Journal of Theological Studies, new series. 6 (1955): 77-82.

NEIRYNCK, Frans. "The Argument From Order and St. Luke's Transpositions." Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 49 (1973): 784-815.

NEUENZEIT, Paul. Das Herrenmahl. Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung. Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1960.

PATSCH, Hermann. Abendmahl und historischer Jesus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972.

----- . "Abendsmahlterminologie ausserhalb der Einsetzungberichte." Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche

Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 62 (1971): 210-31.

PERRIN, Norman. Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

----- . Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976.

PESCH, Rudolf. Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverstaendnis. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1978.

----- . Das Evangelium der Urgemeinde. 3. Auflage. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1984.

----- . Das Markusevangelium, II Teil. Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1977.

PETERSEN, Karl. "Zu den Speisungs- und Abendmahlsberichten." Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 32 (1933): 217-18.

PETZER J. H. "Luke 22:19b-20 and the Structure of the Passage." Novum Testamentum 26 (1984): 249-52.

PREISS, Theo. "Le dernier repas de Jesus fût-il un repas pascal?" Theologische Zeitschrift 4 (1948): 81-101.

RAWLINSON, A. E. J. St. Mark. 5th ed. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1942.

REHKOPF, Friedrich. Die lukanische Sonderquelle. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959.

RESE, Martin. "Zur Problematik von Kurz- und Langtext in Luk XXII. lff." New Testament Studies 22 (1975/76): 15-31.

----- . "Ueberpruefung einiger Thesen von Joachim Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknechtes im Judentum." Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche 60 (1963): 21-41.

RIESNER, Rainer. Jesus als Lehrer. 2. Auflage. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1984.

ROBINSON, D. W. B. "The Date and Significance of the Last Supper." The Evangelical Quarterly 23 (1951): 126-33.

ROBINSON, James M. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1959.

ROLOFF, Juergen. "Anfaenge der soteriologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu (Mk. x. 45 und Lk. xxii. 27)." New Testament Studies 19 (1972/73): 38-64

ROSENBERG, Roy. "Jesus, Isaac, and the Suffering Servant." Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965): 381-88.

SANDERS, E. P. Jesus and Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

SCHENK, Wolfgang. Der Passionsbericht nach Markus. Leipzig: Guetersloher Verlagshaus, 1974.

SCHENKE, Ludger. Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus. Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971.

SCHENKER, Adrian. Das Abendmahl Jesu als Brennpunkt des Alten Testaments. Fribourg: Verlag Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977.

SCHILLEBEECKX, Edward. Jesus: An Experiment in Christology. Translated by Hubert Hoskins. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.

SCHOEPS, H. J. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

SCHRAMM, Tim. Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas. London: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

SCHUERMAN, Heinz, Der Paschamahlbericht. Lk 22, (7-14.) 15-18. Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1968.

-----. Der Einsetzungsbericht. Lk 22, 19-29. 3. Auflage. Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1970.

-----. Jesu Abschiedsrede. Lk 22, 21-38. 2. Auflage. Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957.

-----. Gottes Reich-Jesu Geschichte. Jesu ureigener Tod im Licht seiner Basileia-Verkuendigung. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1983.

-----. "Die Symbolhandlungen Jesu als eschatologische Erfuellungszeichen." Bibel und Leben 11 (1970): 29-41; 73-78.

-----. "Kritische Jesuserkenntnis: Zur kritischen Handhabung des 'Unaenlichkeits-Kriterium'." Bibel und Liturgie 54 (1981): 17-26.

-----. "Lk 22, 19b-20 als urspruengliche Textueberlieferung." in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien. Duesseldorf:

Patmos-Verlag, 1968, pp. 159-92.

-----". "Die Dubletten im Lukasevangelium." in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien. Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968, pp. 272-89.

-----". "Jesus' Words in the Light of His Actions at the Last Supper." Concilium 40 (1969): 119-41.

-----". "Das Weiterleben der Sache Jesu im nachoesterlichen Herrenmahl." Biblische Zeitschrift, neue Folge 16 (1972): 1-23.

-----". "Wie hat Jesus seinen Tod bestanden und verstanden?" in Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie des Synoptics fuer Josef Schmid. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, Norbert Brox, and Wilhelm Pesch. Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1973, pp. 325-363.

SCHWEIZER, Eduard. "Das Herrenmahl im Neuen Testament." Theologische Literaturzeitung 79 (1954): 577-92.

-----". "Abendmahl I. Im NT." in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3. Auflage. Erster Band. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957.

SEGAL, J. B. The Hebrew Passover From the Earliest Times to A. D. 70. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

SENIOR, Donald. The Passion Narrative According to St. Matthew: A Redactional Study. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1975.

SMITH, Morton. Jesus the Magician. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1981.

SPARKS, H. F. D. "St. Luke's Transpositions." New Testament Studies. 3 (1956-57): 219-23.

STAEHLIN, Gustav. "Die Gleichnishandlungen Jesu." Festschrift fuer Wilhelm Staehlin zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1953.

STRACK, Hermann, and BILLERBECK, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 4 vols. Muenchen: C. H. Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924.

STREETER, B. F. The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins. London: MacMillan and Co., 1927

STROBEL, August. Die Stunde der Wahrheit. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.

STUHLMACHER, Peter. Versoehnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

STUERMER, Karl. "Das Abendmahl bei Paulus." Evangelische Theologie 7 (1947-48): 50-59.

SUNDKLER, Bengt. "Jesus et les paiens." Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses (1936): 462-99.

TAYLOR, Vincent. Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: MacMillan and Co., 1959.

----- . The Passion Narrative of St. Luke. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

----- . The Gospel According to St. Mark. 2nd ed. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1966.

THEISSEN, Gerd. "Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde." Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 65 (1974): 232-72.

----- . "Soziale Integration und sakramentales Handeln." Novum Testamentum 16 (1974): 179-206.

TORREY, Charles. "In the Fourth Gospel the Last Supper was the Paschal Meal." The Jewish Quarterly Review 42 (1951-52): 237-60.

----- . "The Date of the Crucifixion According to the Fourth Gospel." Journal of Biblical Literature 50 (1931): 16-241.

TRAUTMANN, Maria. Zeichenhafte Handlungen Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem geschichtlichen Jesus. Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1980.

TURNER, Nigel. "The Style of St. Mark's Eucharistic Words." The Journal of theological Studies, new series 8 (1957): 108-11.

VERMES, Geza. Jesus the Jew. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

----- . The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 2nd ed. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1975.

----- . Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggagic Studies. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

VOEGTLE, Anton. "Todesankuendigungen und Todesverstaendnis Jesu." in Kertelge, Karl, ed. Der Tod Jesu. Deutungen im Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Verlage Herder, 1976, pp. 51-113.

----- . "Jesus von Nazareth." in Oekumenische

Kirchengeschichte, Band 1, Alte Kirche und Ostkirche. Edited by Kottje, R. and Moeller, B. Mainz: Matthias-Gruenewald-Verlag; Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1970, pp. 3-24.

VON MEDING, Wichmann. "1 Korinther 11,26: Vom geschichtlichen Grund des Abendmahls." Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 544-52.

VOOBUS, Arthur. "Kritische Beobachtungen ueber die lukanische Darstellung des Herrenmahls." Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums 61 (1970): 102-10.

------. "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke." New Testament Studies 15 (1968-69): 457-63.

WAGNER, Volker. "Der Bedeutungswandel von berit hadasa bei der Ausgestaltung der Abendmahlsworte." Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975): 538-44.

WALTHER, Georg. Jesus, das Passalamn des Neuen Bundes. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950.

WANKE, Joachim. Beobachtungen zum Eucharistieverstaendnis des Lukas auf Grund der lukanischen Mahlberichte. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1973.

WESTERHOLM, Stephen. Jesus and Scribal Authority. Lund: GWK Gleerup, 1978.

WOOD, J. Edwin. "Isaac Typology in the New Testament." New Testament Studies 14 (1968): 583-89.

ZEITLIN, Solomon. "The Time of the Passover Meal." The Jewish Quarterly Review 42 (1951-52): 45-50.

------. "The Date of the Crucifixion According to the Fourth Gospel." Journal of Biblical Literature 51 (1932): 263-71.

ZIMMERLI, Walter and JEREMIAS, Joachim. The Servant of God., revised ed. London: SCM Press, 1965.