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The purpose of this thesis is to describe the cultic meal of primitive Christianity and its relation to the Last Supper of Jesus.

The first chapter seeks to determine what Jesus did and said at his Last Supper, and whether or not he intended to institute a sacramental rite. An analysis of the Last Supper accounts in the New Testament shows that Mark contains the most reliable version of the bread saying, whereas the Pauline-Lucan source is to be preferred for the wording of the cup saying; the "command to repeat" is however rejected. As for the vow of abstinence, the Marcan version is accepted over the more elaborate Lucan. Reasons are advanced for attributing these sayings to the historical Jesus.

It is argued that the historical context for Jesus' eucharistic words was not some type of established Jewish religious meal (e.g., Passover, kiddush) but rather an essential element of Jesus' own ministry, his regular table fellowship. This chapter concludes by affirming that at his Last Supper Jesus parabolically interpreted his impending death as a covenant sacrifice which would bring about the new eschatological order, and that he did not intend these particular words and gestures to be repeated.
The second chapter shows that during the greater part of the New Testament period there was no general uniformity in eucharistic practice and theology. The most primitive cultic meals were an outgrowth of Jesus' regular table fellowship, were characterised by a mood of eschatological joy, and were not directly connected with the Last Supper tradition or to a theology of Jesus' death. Out of this first type there developed two other basic types: 1) a bread and fish type, in which the dominant idea was eating with the resurrected Lord, and which referred back to the multiplication miracle as the moment of its institution; and 2) the classical bread and wine type, which was regarded as an anamnesis of Jesus' sacrificial death, and which referred back to the Last Supper as the moment of its institution. By an examination of the question of the influence of mystery religions, and by an analysis of the eucharistic theologies of Paul, the synoptic evangelists, the ecclesiastical redactor of the fourth gospel, Ignatius, and finally Justin, an attempt is made to explain the origins, evolution, standardisation and eventual domination of this classical type through the hellenisation, de-eschatologisation and institutionalisation of Christian theology. In addition to this, a brief account is given of the development of eucharistic liturgical prayers and of eucharistic ministry.

The study concludes with an appendix which seeks to demonstrate that in the New Testament and patristic periods the eu-
charist was conceived of not in a rational way, but mythologically, and that the language of the early eucharist exhibits the essential characteristics of mythological thought (mythical notions of causality, death, symbols, time, and space) which have been delineated by phenomenologists of myth.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to describe the cultic meal of the Christian community during the first century, seeking thereby to account for the existence of the classical type of eucharist, the essential characteristics of which appear in their developed form by the time of Justin Martyr (c. A.D. 150).

The complexity of the topic is such that our thesis might have been entitled, "The Problems of the Early Eucharist." Even a cursory examination of the material would introduce such general questions as the influence of the mystery cults on early Christian worship, or more specific ones such as the relative value of the different institution narratives, or whether or not the Last Supper was a Passover meal. For the purposes of this thesis, these various questions may be grouped into three fundamental concerns: that of the Last Supper and eucharistic origins, that of early eucharistic "types" and the eventual assimilation of these types into a prevailing sacrificial-sacramental model, and that of the canons of interpretation to be applied to the somewhat mystifying language of early eucharistic theology and worship. These three problems determine the basic structure of the thesis.
A superficial comparison of the Last Supper narratives in the New Testament with later descriptions of the eucharistic celebration might suggest that this ecclesiastical rite was "instituted" by Jesus of Nazareth on the occasion of the Last Supper. To test the validity of such a conclusion, the historian must ask two questions: 1) What was actually said and done by Jesus at the Last Supper and did he in any sense intend to institute a sacramental rite? and 2) What was the nature of the early cultic meals, and how did they evolve into the type of celebration that was standard in orthodox Gentile Christianity by the mid-second century? The two chapters of this thesis are devoted respectively to each of these questions. In addition, they offer a brief account of the development of eucharistic liturgical prayers and of eucharistic ministry. Appendix I, which deals with a somewhat broader period, attempts to provide a hermeneutical principle for our reading of early eucharistic texts.

Our analysis leads to the following conclusions. First, at Jesus' Last Supper he parabolically interpreted his impending death as a covenant sacrifice which would bring about the new eschatological order; his words and gestures are to be understood as the climax of his ministry, and he did not intend them to be repeated.

Secondly, during the greater part of the New Testament period there was no general uniformity in eucharistic prac-
The most primitive cultic meals were an outgrowth of Jesus' regular table-fellowship, and were not directly connected with the Last Supper tradition. Out of this first 'type' (and existing alongside it) there developed two other basic types (which in turn had their own variants): 1) a bread and fish type, in which the dominant idea was eating with the resurrected Lord, and which referred back to the multiplication miracle as the moment of its institution, and 2) the classical bread and wine type, which was regarded as a proclamation or memorial of Jesus' sacrificial death, in which the elements were offered to the believer as the body and blood of Christ, and which referred back to the Last Supper as the moment of its institution. An attempt is made to explain the origins, evolution, standardisation and eventual domination of this classical type through the Hellenisation, de-eschatologisation and institutionalisation of Christian theology.

To complete our description of the early eucharist, a brief examination is made of eucharistic liturgy and ministry (i.e., of what prayers were said at the celebration, and who officiated at it). The early eucharistic liturgies (of every type) are shown to have developed out of the Jewish berakoth or prayers of thanksgiving. The separation of the agape from the eucharist, and its eventual suppression, are discussed.
It is shown how, with the emergence of a formal, structured ministry in the latter part of the first and the beginning of the second century, the eucharistic celebration came to be placed under this ministry, and it is pointed out that the celebration may itself have contributed to the formation of this ministry. This section concludes with an examination of the first complete description of the eucharistic liturgy, which is found in Justin's Apology.

Our study concludes with an appendix which, chronologically, is much broader in scope than the thesis proper, but which is nevertheless pertinent to the questions already discussed. It seeks to demonstrate that in the New Testament and patristic periods the eucharist was conceived of not in a rational way, but mythologically, and that the language of the early Christian eucharist exhibits the essential characteristics of mythical thought which have been delineated by phenomenologists of myth.

In the thesis proper, our method is historico-textual, i.e., an attempt is made to reconstruct events and ideas of the past on the basis of analyses of documentary data. The method of the first Appendix is rather different; it might be described as "comparative hermeneutical." It seeks to demonstrate that the canons of interpretation applied to our documents are to be derived from the patterns of thought structure which have been extracted from different sources. Specifi-
fically it intends to show that the conceptual framework in which early Christians articulated the meaning of their cultic meals conforms to the conceptual framework which underlies the expression of myth.
CHAPTER I

THE LAST SUPPER AND EUCHARISTIC ORIGINS

The irony of Christianity, Loisy once remarked, was that Jesus preached the Kingdom, and the Church was the result.\(^1\) This aphorism succinctly illustrates the question which will be confronted in this chapter: what connection, if any, can be established between the Last Supper of Jesus, the eschatological prophet, and those sacramental rites of early Christianity which referred back to it as their aetiological foundation? Or, to phrase the question another way, what did Jesus do and say at the Last Supper, and did he intend these actions and sayings to be repeated by his followers? We can furnish an answer to this question only by a thorough comparative examination of the Supper narratives in the New Testament. We hope thereby to be able to reconstruct, as accurately as the texts will permit, the most original form of these narratives. It will then be necessary to determine whether or not one can reasonably maintain that the words and actions of the historical Jesus correspond substantially to what is reported in this original account. Finally, we must establish whether or not the Last Supper must be placed in the context of some specific type of Jewish religious meal. Only
then will it be possible to speculate on the meaning to Jesus of this final meal with his disciples.

Theoretically, there would seem to be only four possible explanations for the origin of the eucharist and its relation to the Last Supper tradition:

1) That it was an entirely new rite expressly created by Jesus, and bequeathed by him to the Church. This view was implied in many theological documents prior to the rise of critical biblical scholarship, though it was not, as Bouyer points out, the view expressed by the Fathers. This opinion cannot be ascribed to any modern students of early Christianity, even if Masure approaches it.

2) That it was the creation of Hellenistic Christianity, and was patterned after the rites of the mystery cults. According to this theory, the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper presuppose an identification of the food consumed in the ritual with a saviour god, and must therefore have been created to explain the ritual practice. This proposal enjoyed some currency around the beginning of the twentieth century, and was accepted by P. Gardner, E. Reuterskioeld, A. Loisy, and especially W. Heitmueller. Among contemporary critics it is supported only by Bultmann, and few modern studies bother even to refute it. The main desideratum of this thesis is a specific historical account of the origin and transmission of the eucharistic words attributed to Jesus. The most convincing evidence in its favour, viz., parallels in the Mithraic sacrament of
bread and water mixed with wine, can be found only in documents dating from the second century. Moreover, the dominant conception in the mysteries from which it is alleged the early eucharist took its birth was one of eating with the god, rather than eating the god.  

3) That it developed out of some current Jewish practice, such as a Passover, Kiddûsh, or Habûrah meal, to which Jesus gave a new meaning, thus paving the way for its adoption as a specifically Christian rite. Variants of this theory are maintained by perhaps most modern critics, and will be examined in detail below. Its supporters contend that although there were certainly Hellenistic influences on the diffusion and development of the eucharist, it must "in its beginnings at least be accounted for on purely Jewish presuppositions."  

4) Some scholars have suggested a double origin for the eucharist, and envisage more than one type of eucharist in the earliest period. This means that on the one hand the eucharistic meals ("breaking of the bread") described in Acts developed out of Jesus' daily fellowship with his disciples, and that on the other hand the eucharist described in 1 Corinthians 11, a memorial of Jesus' death, refers back to the Last Supper. This view implies, of course, that the earliest eucharists were not in direct linear descent to the Last Supper. Its probability therefore depends on two things: an explanation of the Last Supper narratives which discredits the likelihood of Jesus'
having enjoined his disciples to repeat his eucharistic words and actions, and a demonstration of the existence of more than one type of eucharistic meal in the earliest period. The discussion in this first chapter of the Supper narratives, and in the second chapter of eucharistic types, will show that this view has much to commend itself.

The Eucharist in the Context of Early Christian Worship

The term εὐχαριστία, "thanksgiving," does not appear as a designation for the Christian cultic meal before Ignatius. It is derived from berakah, the Jewish thanksgiving over meals out of which the early anaphora developed, and to which the references to Jesus' having "given thanks" at the Last Supper (1 Coî 11:24; Lk. 22:19; Mk. 14:23; Mt. 26:27) are probably an allusion. All the available evidence indicates that the eucharistic meal, in some form or other, was the Christian community's central act of worship from its outset. In its nascent stages, of course, Christianity was a phenomenon of Judaism, and the first Christians continued to participate in Jewish worship. It is generally agreed that Acts 2:22-47 gives a fairly accurate if somewhat idealised description of the worship of the Jerusalem church. The author of this passage reports that "they went as a body to the Temple every day but met in their houses for the breaking of the bread" (v. 46). Alongside the official Jewish worship, then, these first Christians
had their own distinctive form of worship: a eucharistic meal. There are also indications of informal gatherings for prayer (Acts 1:12-14; 12:12). The situation in the Pauline churches was more complex. While initially, it seems, the gentile Christians worshipped with the Jews (Acts 13:43f.; 14:1), the breach between the Synagogue and the Church soon made this impossible. In some cases the gentile Christians secured their own public places for meeting, as at Ephesus (Acts 19:8-10), but probably more often they combined the preaching of the word with eucharistic services in the home, as at Troas (Acts 20:7-11).

Apart from the initiatory rite of baptism, the New Testament (especially the Pauline corpus) depicts a variety of forms of worship which, in addition to the eucharistic meal, occurred on a regular basis. Some of these were charismatic and spontaneous, like the revelations, speaking in tongues, interpretation of tongues (1 Co. 14:26) and healing (1 Co. 12:28; Jas. 5:14ff.); other forms, like psalms, hymns (1 Co. 14:26; Col. 3: 16; Eph. 5:19) and doxologies (Rom. 1:25; 2 Co. 11:31; 2 Tim. 4:18; Eph. 1:3), were more fixed. It was once commonly believed (after Weizsaecker and Lietzmann) that these non-eucharistic forms of worship took place in their own setting, the so-called service of the word. Cullmann, however, has quite convincingly argued against the plausibility of this interpretation. He believes that Acts 2:42 and Acts 20:7ff. (where prayers and teaching are connected with the breaking of the bread) indicate
"that as a rule there was no gathering of the community without the breaking of bread and that, even if there had been a service which was exclusively a service of the Word, it would have been in any case an exception." Cullmann's reasoning is that the charismatic phenomena would scarcely have appeared in the synagogue atmosphere of a pure word service, and were much more likely to have occurred in a eucharistic context where the presence of the risen Christ was mysteriously experienced. The conclusion is that the service described by Justin, in which the proclamation of the word and the celebration of the eucharist are joined together, is not the result of the later fusion of what were originally two distinct services. The eucharistic fellowship is from the outset the fundamental constituent of Christian community life.

A word should be said about the practice of Sunday worship, which had established itself by the early second century. The observance of Sunday must have at first been only supplemental to observance of the Sabbath, and it is impossible to determine exactly when or how the change took place. There is no reason to suspect the explanation of Ignatius (Magn. 9:1) and the author of the Epistle of Barnabas (15:8), who both declare that Christians have supplanted the Sabbath with Sunday because (according to the tradition) on that day the Lord had risen. The New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse (1:10), supplies little evidence for regular Sunday
worship. According to Acts (2:46), the earliest breaking of the bread was daily. The reference to the Troas celebration having occurred "on the first day of the week" (Acts 20:7) may however indicate emergent Sunday worship in the community out of which the book of Acts itself came.

No description of worship in the primitive Church would be complete without the reminder that for these early Christians real worship was not to be found in external practices. Rather, it was their living in the world, their θυσιαστήρα which they were to present as "a living sacrifice holy and acceptable to God" and as "spiritual worship." Human redemption, they believed, came not as the result of a purely sacred offering, but from Jesus' suffering in a human, worldly situation. "For the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one has ever served at the altar" (Hb. 7:13). The believing community is now "a holy priesthood" (1 Pt. 2:5), faith is a "sacrificial offering (Phil. 2:17), and acts of love are "the sacrifice that God accepts and finds pleasing" (Phil. 4:18). As E. Schillebeeckx remarks,

This secular worship was, so to speak, the novelty of the New Testament, in which a criticism of the old Jewish sacrifices and of the Old Testament distinction between profane and sacred, clean and unclean, is clearly discernible. The attention of the early Christians was directed less towards the Church than towards the kingdom of God, in which the whole of the created world was included. 20
The eucharist, then, was the celebration of a secular reality, the redemption of the world, in the form of a common meal. For this reason the pre-Constantinian Christians were proud that they had no church buildings or altars. The pagan critic Celsus chastised them: "Your eyes cannot bear temples, altars and images of God," and Minucius Felix, a late second century Apologist, boasted, "We have no temples and no altars." "An absence of 'religion,'" says Schillebeeckx, "was the astonishing thing which particularly struck the pagans with regard to Christianity."

Jesus' Eucharistic Words: the Textual Data

It is clear from the New Testament that at least some circles in the early Church established a connection between the focal point of their community life, the eucharistic gathering, and the Last Supper of Jesus. This can be discerned from the four texts which report Jesus' institution of the eucharist: Mark 14:22-25, Matthew 26:26-29, Luke 22:15-20, and 1 Corinthians 11:23-26. We can distinguish two types of sayings in each of the first three texts: (1) an eschatological vow of abstinence (Mk. 14:25; Mt. 26:29; Lk. 22:15-18) and (2) Jesus' words of institution—words of interpretation—uttered over bread and wine (Mk. 14:22-24; Mt. 26:26-28; Lk. 22:19-20). Only the latter appear explicitly in Paul.
The eschatological saying appears in substantially the same form in Mark ("Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God," Αμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὕμνη πῶ ἐκ τοῦ γενέματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ), and Matthew ("I tell you I shall not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν οὕμνη πῶ ἀπ' ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ γενέματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου). In both cases the logion appears at the end of the pericope, following directly on the words of interpretation over the cup. Luke 22:18 is a variant of the same saying ("for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes," λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενέματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὡς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ). In this case, however, the saying does not attach itself to the words of interpretation, but concludes a separate unit of tradition which precedes those words. This unit contains considerable material peculiar to Luke: another eschatological saying ("I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer," ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τῇ πάσχᾳ φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με πάθειν [Lk. 22:15]), and, most surprisingly, an additional cup over
which Jesus gives thanks, invites his disciples to partake of
("Take this and divide it among yourselves"-- Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς, Lk. 22:17), and vows to ab­
stain from.

The words of interpretation over the bread and cup (for
Luke: the second cup) fall naturally into two groups, Mark/
Matthew and Luke/Paul. In Mark the bread saying reads, "Take;
this is my body," Λάβετε τοῦτο ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα μου (14:22),
and the cup saying, "This is my blood of the covenant, which
is poured out for many," τοῦτο ἔστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης
tὸ ἐκχυμόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (14:24). Matthew repeats Mark
almost verbatim, but there are a small number of significant
and chiefly theologically motivated additions or alterations:
an invitation to "eat" (φάγετε) is inserted into the first
saying (26:26), "for the forgiveness of sins," εἰς ἅφεσιν ἀμαρ-
tίαν is added to the second saying, and in v. 27 the narra-
tive style of Mark ("They all drank of it," καὶ ἐτύμω ἐξ αὐτοῦ
πάντες) is altered to a direct quotation ("Drink of it, all
of you" Νίπτε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες).

The Lucan and Pauline versions of the sayings are quite
different, and the former is complicated by an important tex-
tual variant. The so-called shorter text of Luke (Codex D)
eliminates the second cup and reproduces only the bread saying,
in exactly the same form as Mark. All other Greek manuscripts
of Luke have a bread and a wine saying, and in both instances they are very similar to the Pauline formulae. The bread saying differs from Mark in that they add an explanatory phrase and the "command to repeat" ("This is my body which is for [Lk.: given for] you. Do this in remembrance of me," τοῦτο μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου) τὸ ύπερ ἴμαν [Lk: ...διδύμενον]. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, Lk. 22:19, 1 Co. 11:24). The cup sayings differ from Mark not merely by way of addition, but in essential structure. In the Lucan form there is a second explanatory phrase ("This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood," Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καὶ νή διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἷματι μου, τὸ ύπερ ἴμαν ἐκχυμύμενον, Lk. 22:20), while in the Pauline form there is a second "command to repeat" ("This cup is the new covenant in my blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me," Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καὶ νή διαθήκη ἐστίν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἷματι. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὅσακις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, 1 Co. 11:25).

We must agree with MacGregor that the intentions of the writers of these four narratives was to describe not so much the Last Supper of Jesus as the first eucharist of the Church. But we cannot assume, as does Delling, that the early Christians would have been careful to align their eucharistic ritual as closely as possible to Jesus' last meal. All of the accounts display the parallelism characteristic of liturgical prayer:
in Luke the parallel construction of the two logia is more pronounced than in Paul, and although Mark shows even more symmetry, Matthew illustrates the most advanced stage of this tendency. Betz asserts that recognition of this fact does not mean impugning the essential historicity of the accounts. He supports this claim with the fact that the early Church consciously regarded the eucharist as anamnesis, and would not, therefore, have distorted the substance of the tradition.

There are, nevertheless, contradictions between the accounts which may be of decisive importance in the attempt to reconstruct Jesus' eucharistic sayings and actions. If, for example, the shorter text of Luke were primary, the account given there would be radically different from that in Paul, and we would have to choose between one or the other. Moreover, even if this difficulty were not present, we would be faced with others: the expression "my blood of the covenant," τὸ δῶρό μου τῆς διαθήκης, for example, in Mark (v. 24) and the expression "my body which is for you," μου...τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, in 1 Corinthians (v. 24), cannot (as will be shown later) be retranslated into Aramaic. This fact alone means that the original Aramaic form of the words of interpretation must have either (a) included only the notion of covenant, i.e., was essentially like the Pauline formula without the expression τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν: "This is my body; this
cup is the new covenant in my blood," or (b) included only the notion of atonement, i.e., was essentially like the Markan formula without τῆς διαονήσεως: "Take, this is my body; this is my blood, which is poured out for many."^28

Before there can be any discussion about the relative merits of these accounts it will be necessary to make a decision in favor of either the shorter or the longer text of Luke. Both of these texts appear peculiar when compared with the other institution narratives, the shorter because of its cup-bread order and abrupt ending, and the longer because of the presence of two cups. The shorter text is witnessed by the important Codex Bezae (D), and by a few Old Latin manuscripts.29 The longer text appears in all other Greek manuscripts and ancient versions. The chief difficulty with the longer text is that it is hard to imagine a scribe having abbreviated it by deleting the second rather than the first cup. Further, defenders of the shorter text reason that it is easier to suppose a later interpolation from 1 Corinthians than to explain how the tradition could originally have been transmitted in a form which mentioned the giving of the cup twice.30 The shorter text was therefore accepted by many earlier scholars, including Loisy,31 Lietzmann,32 and MacDonald,33 and among more recent scholars has had supporters in R.H. Fuller,34 F.C. Grant,35 and F.W. Beare.36 The shorter
text as it stands, however, leaves the bread saying as a mere isolated fragment with no apparent connection to what precedes or follows. For this reason Wellhausen, B. Bultmann, and H.N. Bate have excised verse 19a as well. This solution is perhaps the least acceptable, since there is no textual evidence whatever to support it, and since there are no other references to the Last Supper or the eucharist which do not mention bread.

The greater number of contemporary critics reject the shorter text on account of its awkwardness and weak textual support. We believe that this conclusion is justified. But if the longer text is accepted as primary, some explanation must be furnished for the existence of the shorter one. One such explanation is that vss. 19b-20 were dropped to avoid the inconsistency of having two cups (so MacGregor, Schuermann and Schweizer). This solution is improbable, though, because it is scarcely credible that the second cup should have been removed when it would have resulted in the suppression of Jesus' institutional words over the cup and the reversal of the normal order of the elements. According to another proposal, advanced by G. Kilpatrick and J. Jeremias, the lacunae of the shorter text were introduced as part of the disciplina arcani to avoid profanation of the eucharistic mystery. The obvious objection to this thesis is that vs. 19a would also have been
A third suggestion has been offered by A. Higgins, who interprets Luke's first cup as "non-eucharistic." Higgins believes that the evangelist combined two Last Supper traditions, one consisting of vss. 15-19a; and the other consisting of vss. 19a-20. The shorter text, he reasons, was the work of a circle which knew only the non-liturgical Last Supper tradition found in the first part of the Lucan narrative. This explanation too lacks plausibility; it presupposes the transmission of a Last Supper tradition quite independently of the eucharistic liturgy over a period of decades, something which is rather unlikely. It does not, moreover, account for the apparent awkwardness of the bread-saying in v. 19a.

Nevertheless, it is likely (as will be shown below) that Luke's eschatological and institutional sayings are drawn from different sources, and we do have one liturgical witness (the Didache) in which the emphasis is eschatological, the words of institution absent, and the prayer over the cup preceding that over the bread. We should like to propose, therefore, that the abbreviation of the longer text can be attributed to certain Christians, probably of the second century, who used a eucharistic liturgy of this type. There remains to be explained the anomaly of the two cups in the original Lucan text. Luke presented the Last Supper as a Passover meal (Lk. 22:7-14), and we can accept as reasonable MacGregor's inference that Luke included two cups in order to bring the procedure of the Supper more into line with the Passover ritual.
The Gospel of Matthew, as we have seen, reproduces Mark's Supper narrative with certain alterations and additions. We are left, then, with three key reports of Jesus' eucharistic words: Mark, the longer text of Luke, and Paul. Though the differences between these texts are irreconcilable, each has some factors in its favour: Mark, simplicity; Luke, an eschatological emphasis; and 1 Corinthians, the earliest date. Our problem is to construct an as authentic as possible version of Jesus' sayings from one or more of these sources.

1 Corinthians 11:23-25 deserves our initial consideration, since it is the oldest extant account, written in the spring of A.D. 54 or 55. Any evaluation of its reliability must begin with an attempt to determine the meaning of the opening phrase, "For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you...." Loisy believed that the reference must have been to a personal revelation or vision in which Paul received the accounts of institution. Lietzmann and MacDonald both agree with Loisy on the interpretation of vs. 23, but differ from him in regard to the supposed contents of the revelation. MacDonald points out that Paul could not have meant that he received the details of the Last Supper from a revelation: the Marcan account indicates that these were already part of an independent tradition (see below, p.35). The revelation, therefore, disclosed to Paul "that it was the exalted Lord's will that the Church should adopt the Last Supper as the model for her future celebration.
of the rite. In other words, the core of the revelation was "Do this in remembrance of me." According to Lietzmann and MacDonald, who reject the longer text of Luke, this interpretation explains why the injunction to repeat appears only in 1 Corinthians. Lietzmann suspects that Paul has been influenced by the contemporary Hellenistic practice of holding feasts in memory of the dead.

Critics of these views have, on the whole, responded to them with two main objections: (1) a comparison of 1 Co. 11:23 with other Pauline material makes it unlikely that Paul was alluding to a private revelation, and (2) the language of the eucharistic formulae, including the "command to repeat," is not characteristically Pauline. Higgins argues that if Paul were referring to a direct and immediate disclosure, the preposition in the phrase "from the Lord" would more naturally be παρὰ than ἀπὸ (as in Gal. 1:12, παρὰ ἀνθρώπου, "from man"). Moreover, we can see that Paul uses the same two verbs in v. 23 ("I received ... what also I delivered," ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ... ὦ καὶ παρέδωκα) as he does in 1 Co. 15:3 ("I delivered ... what also I received," Παρέδωκα γὰρ ... ὦ καὶ παρέλαβον), where he is unquestionably speaking of a tradition which he inherited from the Church. The term "the Lord," as Cullmann has shown, occupies the place of "tradition" in certain Pauline passages (1 Co. 7:10, 25; 9:14; 1 Th. 4:15). In these instances Paul sees the historical Jesus as the chronological source of the tradition, but the exalted Lord as operative in its trans-
mission. "Thus ἀνά τοῦ κυρίου can mean a direct receiving from the Lord, without it being necessary to think of a vision or of excluding middle members through whom the Lord Himself imparts the paradosis."  

Numerous critics have been sensitive to the generally un-Pauline tenor of the words of institution in 1 Corinthians. Against the theory that the words "Do this in remembrance of me" constitute a distinctively Pauline addition, E. Lohmeyer emphasises the fact that the word ἀνάμνησις is used nowhere else by Paul, and that the parallelism of vss. 24 and 25 indicates a liturgical source. Schuermann has listed seven other features of the pericope which are atypical of Paul's style: (1) the participle εὐχαριστήσας, which Paul normally uses with the dative, but which here is used absolutely; (2) the phrase καὶ εἶπεν, which he does not use elsewhere to introduce a quotation; (3) τὸ σῶμα, otherwise used by Paul only to refer to the community (with the exception of 1 Co. 10: 16, which is a eucharistic passage); (4) μετὰ with the infinitive, and the word ἃπνεῖν, found only here in the Pauline corpus; (5) ἀπαύγως καὶ, an indication of liturgical style; (6) the concept of new covenant, which Paul does not elsewhere connect with the death of Christ and (7) the association of "blood" with the covenant rather than with cultic sacrifice, as usual in Paul.

We may conclude, then, that Paul's account of the Last Supper, including the injunction to repeat, is an edited ver-
sion of a pre-Pauline liturgical source. Does this mean that of the three reports of Jesus' words of interpretation Paul's is the most original? A number of authorities, including Behm, Dix, and Leenhardt, believe that this is the case. In favour of this hypothesis are a number of difficulties connected with the cup saying in Mark. Mark's cup saying appears to have been made parallel to the bread saying, as a result of the liturgical tendency to symmetry. It seems also to have been assimilated to Ex. 24:8, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you." Particularly important is the fact that the Marcan expression \( \tau \delta \alpha \imath \mu \alpha \mu \nu \tau \eta \varsigma \ \delta \imath \alpha \sigma \theta \eta \eta \kappa \nu \) cannot be translated into Aramaic, since Aramaic does not allow the construct case to take a pronominal suffix. But this may indicate that only the genitival phrase "of the covenant" is secondary, and the objection can be applied with equal force to Paul's \( \mu \omicron \nu \ldots \tau \delta \sigma \alpha \mu \alpha \tau \delta \ \upsilon \pi \varepsilon \ \iota \mu \alpha \nu \) (1 Co. 11:24). All things considered, it is not likely that the present form of the Pauline text more accurately reproduces Jesus' words than the other witnesses. It is best understood as a "Rabbinisation of the tradition."
sible that the third evangelist was a companion of Paul, and was acquainted with the eucharistic practice of the Pauline churches, a number of considerations militate against Luke 22:19-20 having been derived from 1 Co. 11:24f. If this were the case, we should not have expected Luke to suppress the second "command to repeat." Furthermore, in several instances where Luke differs from Paul, the changes cannot be attributed to Luke's characteristic style. *καὶ ἠσαύτως* (22:20) is contrary to the Lucan word order (Luke places *καὶ* afterward, as in 20:31; cf. 5:10,33; 10:32; 22:36), and it is not usual for Luke to omit the copula (22:20) or use ἐμὸς in the attributive sense, as in ἐν τῷ αἷματι (22:20). The inference is that Luke has used the pre-Pauline liturgical source (or a very similar one), and in the cases cited, where Luke differs from Paul, Luke is to be preferred. On the other hand, the phrase "which is poured out for you" (Lk. 22:20) is not found in 1 Co. 11:25, and must depend on Mk. 14:24.

These observations might suggest that the oldest attainable form (Urbericht) of the words of interpretation, if not to be found in 1 Co. 11:24ff., is preserved in Lk. 22:19f., if we discount two corrections which are presumably Luke's (*λέγων* for *καὶ εἶπεν* in v. 19a, and the addition *τὸ ῥῆρ ἐμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* in v. 20b) and one which Luke has found in his version of the source (the transportation of ἀσκήσας in v. 20a).
Such is the conclusion of J. Betz and H. Schuermann. Betz conjectures that the source was derived from an early Antiochene liturgy, and that it originated in Palestine in the mid-forties. (This is not altogether improbable, and for lack of a better term, we shall designate this source as "Antiochene"). In this Antiochene source the parallel predicates are body and covenant, while in Mark they are body and blood. The former, Betz believes, is an indication of the earlier Suffering Servant christology, whereas the latter represents a shift to the conception of Christ's death as a Jewish cultic sacrifice.

A substantial proportion of scholars, however, believe that the Marcan report is more reliable because of its numerous Aramaisms (so Jeremias, Higgins, Taylor, Lietzmann, Fuller, Gaugler and Clark). Jeremias, who has investigated the question most thoroughly, detects no fewer than twenty-three Semitisms in the whole Marcan account (i.e., in the description of the setting, the words of interpretation, and the vow of abstinence). Among the more important which are peculiar to Mark are: the repetition of καὶ in 14:22-24, λαβὼν (14:23), which designates the elevation of the cup before benediction, πολλὰν without the article, meaning "all" (14:24), and ἀμὴν (14:25). If these considerations prove the priority of Mark and if, as we have shown, the expression "of the covenant" (Mk. 14:24) must be secondary, then the earliest at-
tainable form of the words of interpretation would be, "This is my body; this is my blood which is poured out for many."

In this case the concept of covenant would be absent, the parallel predicates would be body (probably = Aramaic bisra) and blood, and the predominating idea would be that of cultic sacrifice.

Against this conclusion we can advance the argument that the Aramaisms in Mark's account establish nothing because they occur throughout the gospel. 81 Even more persuasive is Kilmartin's objection: "The presupposition that the number of Semitisms would be drastically reduced through the constant use of the institutional account in a Hellenistic milieu is undermined by the fact that the Pauline formulation, written about ten years before Luke, has fewer 'Semitisms' than Luke." 82 In assessing the value of Mark, the decisive question is, as Schweizer observes, how could the parallelism of the Marcan sayings have been upset in favour of the non-parallel structure in Paul? 83

For this very reason we may conclude that the words of interpretation over the cup saying are more original in the "Antiochene" account than in Mark's. But we cannot be readily sure that the same is true for the bread saying, which in the Antiochene source has the addition "... which is [given] for you; Do this in remembrance of me." There is no reason to suppose that the word δίδομενος is not an addition of Luke's,
and, as we have seen, the Pauline wording of this ἐπέρ clause cannot be rendered in Aramaic. In addition, it is particularly difficult to imagine the ἐπέρ clause and the words "Do this in remembrance of me" having been deleted from the Marcan source if they formed part of the original Last Supper tradition. It is much easier to surmise that they originated in a liturgical context where the eucharistic meal was consciously connected to the Last Supper. Benoit's oft-repeated explanation for the omission of the injunction to repeat in Mark, "On ne récite pas une rubrique, on l'exécute," hardly settles the question. Even if, as Jeremias and Dix believe, the saying need not be interpreted as a request to repeat the Last Supper ritual as a new form of worship, we would need more evidence to establish conclusively that it goes back to Jesus. The most plausible solution is that the words over the bread have been more carefully preserved in the form recorded by Mark.

Our analysis of the two basic versions of the words of interpretation (i.e., the liturgical source used by Paul and Luke, and that used by Mark) thus yields the following result: the earliest attainable form of the bread saying is that found in Mark; the earliest attainable form of the cup saying is similar to that found in Luke, minus a number of additions or corrections, including the ἐπέρ clause (cf. our reconstruction below, p. 33).
There remains to be discussed Jesus' eschatological vow of abstinence, which appears in a twofold form in Luke (22:15-16) and as a single saying in Mark (14:25). The vow does not appear at all in 1 Corinthians 11, a fact which might lead us to call into question its authenticity. The Antiochene source, however, from which Paul drew his institutional narrative, included only the words of interpretation. Almost all scholars agree that Lk. 22:15-18 is "an independent unit of tradition, self-contained and internally consistent." 87

The problem of the eschatological vow can therefore be reduced to three questions: (1) whether it consisted of one or two sayings; (2) whether it preceded or followed the words of interpretation; and (3) whether Mark or Luke reports the more original form of the "fruit of the vine" saying.

To a large extent our answers to these questions will depend on our evaluation of the reliability of Lk. 22:15-18. According to the view adopted by Lietzmann, 88 MacDonald, 89 Benoit, 90 and Dibelius, 91 this passage constitutes a literary construction of the third evangelist in which Mark 14:25 has been transferred to the beginning of the meal, and to which a parallel eschatological saying referring to the meal as a whole has been added. There would thus have originally been only one eschatological saying, very similar to Mark's version in wording and placed immediately after the words of interpretation over the cup. But other authorities, such as MacGregor, 92
Jeremias, Higgins, Clark, and Schuermann are inclined to favour the witness of Luke, at least with regard to the first two of the three questions formulated above. MacGregor believes that the eschatological saying could not at first have been attached to the "covenant cup," because its symbolism was of quite a different order. The other critics mentioned here all point to the fact that Luke almost never transposes the Marcan order of events, and far from creating parallel constructions, he tends to eliminate them when he finds them in his sources. This, they believe, indicates that Luke is drawing from an independent, non-liturgical tradition of considerable intrinsic value. Schuermann even proposes that Mk. 14:25 is secondary to the Lucan version of the saying, although Jeremias, Higgins, and Clark are probably correct in preferring the less heavily graecised wording of Mark. It must be conceded that the arguments in favour of a pre-Lucan source for the twofold vow are more convincing than the a priori considerations advanced by those who believe that Lk. 22:15-18 is wholly dependent on Mk. 14:25.

Several of the critics who accept the twofold form of the vow of abstinence as pre-Lucan detect a certain inconsistency between these sayings and the words of interpretation. Loisy believes that the latter constitute "a highly distinct afterthought in the development of the Gospel catechesis," and that Jesus' original saying over the bread was something close to Lk. 22:16 ("I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God"). MacGregor, on the other hand, rejects
only the "covenant cup" and its saying, on the grounds that Jesus could not have enjoined the drinking of blood, and that the most significant variations in the institution accounts concern the "covenant cup." The original Last Supper narrative would, according to this view, be virtually identical with the shorter text of Luke. Schweizer feels that Lk. 22:15-18, 28-30 represents the same tradition of the Lord's Supper as Jn. 13-16, a tradition which portrays the Supper solely in terms of Jesus' serving and of the eschatological perspective, without any reference to the words of interpretation. Nevertheless, he believes that this tradition could have had its origins in a Jewish-Christian group which still celebrated the Passover (cf. Lk. 22:15), and that the Pauline account of the Last Supper is probably a more or less genuine report.

These theories rest on the rather unwarranted assumption that the authenticity of the eschatological vow is incompatible with the authenticity of one or both of the institutional sayings. Furthermore, each of the theories would be considerably weakened if Lk. 22:15-18 were not prior to Mk. 14:25. While, as we have said, the Lucan version of the vow of abstinence probably relies on a previous tradition, this does not in itself prove the originality of Lk. 22:15 (the vow to abstain from the Passover). Quite to the contrary, the absence of the saying in Mark impugns its originality, since there is no adequate reason why it should have been suppressed there. The
saying is best understood as having originated in the pre-Lucan oral tradition, perhaps to reinforce the conception of Jesus' Last Supper as a Passover meal. We have seen already that this conception may have led to the introduction of the first cup in Luke, and that the Lucan wording of the "fruit of the vine" saying is more heavily graecised than the Marcan.

We may therefore conclude that the single eschatological saying in Mark (without ἀληθινόν, the equivalent of which would be unusual in Aramaic, and which may thus be counted as an editorial addition) is the more original form of the vow, and that it was probably uttered by Jesus over the same cup as the words of interpretation.

We can now summarise the results of our search for the earliest attainable form of Jesus' eucharistic words. With regard to Jesus' words of interpretation over the bread and the wine, we have discerned two basic traditions: Mark, and the "Antiochene" source used by Paul and Luke. We have found that the bread saying is more accurately reproduced in Mark, because Mark would not have excised the additional words found in the Antiochene text. Yet for the cup saying we have preferred the Antiochene version, because it does not exhibit the liturgical symmetry of the cup saying in Mark. Finally, with regard to the eschatological vow of abstinence, we have suggested that although Luke is dependent on an earlier source, Mark's form of the saying is more original. We therefore arrive at the
following reconstruction of the earliest attainable form of Jesus' words at the Last Supper:

**Reconstructed Form**

Τούτο ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου.
This is my body.

Τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ διαθήκη ἐν τῇ δίματί μου.
This cup is the covenant in my blood.

**Summary of Reasons**

Attested in all accounts; simplest form in Mark.

"Covenant" included because it is mentioned in all accounts; "new" omitted because it is not found in Mark. The Pauline-Lucan construction is preferred to the Marcan, because Mark's phrase "blood of the covenant" cannot be retranslated into Aramaic, and because the Marcan form of the saying indicates the tendency to liturgical parallelism.

Mark's wording is more Semitic than Luke's. Luke's "Passover vow" is omitted, because it is easier to suppose certain Christians' having created it than to suppose Mark's having eliminated it.

 Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it in the kingdom of God.

We shall not here attempt to retranslate our reconstruction of these sayings into Aramaic. We have, on the one hand, already taken account of the Aramaic when it has been a pertinent factor in establishing the earliest attainable form of
the sayings. On the other hand, nothing would be thereby added to our knowledge of their content.

Can we be justified in believing that these sayings were uttered in some essentially similar form by the historical Jesus? Certain contemporary critics, such as Bornkamm, contend that any reference to the covenant must be attributed to "the creative faith of the worshipping community . . . which interprets Jesus' death retrospectively as the redemption of mankind." But there seems to be little doubt that Jesus in some way connected the coming of the Kingdom of God with his proclamation of it, and we cannot exclude the possibility that Jesus availed himself of the notion of covenant to express this connection. N. Perrin, in his recent study of the teaching of Jesus, summarises Jesus' message in this way: "Jesus taught the same thing both by proclamation and by simile: the decisive activity of God as king is now to be experienced by men confronted by his ministry in word and deed." It is true that the covenant motif is found only in Jesus' eucharistic words, but we must not reject it on purely a priori grounds. Given the fact that Jesus connected the coming of the Kingdom with his proclamation of it, it is not impossible that, in the crisis of his impending death, Jesus could have had recourse to the notion of covenant.
Possibility does not, of course, imply probability. If we wish to affirm that the eucharistic sayings go back to the historical Jesus, we must show that this is the most plausible explanation for their origin.

In favour of the authenticity of Jesus' eucharistic sayings is the fact that they meet the requirements of the two basic criteria used by gospel critics to ascertain the *ipsis-sima vox* of Jesus, the "criterion of multiple attestation" and the "criterion of dissimilarity." The first criterion constitutes a proposal to accept as authentic "material which is attested in all, or most, of the sources which can be discerned behind the synoptic gospels." Some scholars, particularly T.W. Manson, believe that this is the most valuable criterion for determining Jesus' actual words, but Perrin has pointed out that its usefulness is somewhat restricted, since a unit of the tradition may have multiple attestation only because of the role played by it in early Palestinian Christianity. The criterion, nevertheless, is undoubtedly helpful in establishing the older strata of the tradition, and may therefore be valuable when used in conjunction with the criterion of dissimilarity. It has been shown already that the New Testament versions of the words of interpretation are dependent upon two earlier sources, that used by Mark and that used by Paul and Luke. Since the former, with its omission of the injunction to repeat, could not have been a redaction of the Antiochene source, there must have been two independent traditions of the sayings
by the time 1 Corinthians was written (c. A.D. 55). There are probably no other sayings of Jesus in which we can find a specific double attestation at such an early date. Similarly, we have seen that there were, in all likelihood, two pre-synoptic traditions of the eschatological sayings, the pre-Marcan and the pre-Lucan. We may conclude, then, that Jesus' eucharistic words belong to the earlier strata of the synoptic tradition.

The criterion of dissimilarity is somewhat more rigorous. According to this criterion, a saying attributed to Jesus must be discredited if a plausible origin can be found for it in the practice of the early Church or in contemporary Judaism. As Bultmann formulates the criterion,

We can only count on possessing a genuine similarity of Jesus where, on the one hand, expression is given to the contrast between Jewish morality and piety and the distinctive eschatological temper which characterised the preaching of Jesus; and where on the other hand we find no specifically Christian features.\footnote{111}

With regard to Jesus' vow of abstinence, it is hard to conceive of a catechetical or liturgical Sitz im Leben out of which it could have been created. Even those critics who, like Loisy, reject the words of interpretation, are inclined to favour the authenticity of the vow. There would seem to be as much reason to accept this as any other of Jesus' sayings. Concerning the words of interpretation, we have found that liturgy provided a medium for their transmission, but this does not mean that a
liturgical situation was responsible for their origin. If this were the case, we should have to imagine a rather highly developed sacramental theology in the first decades of Christianity, for there are no other early Christian motifs which could account for their origin. Our reconstruction of the words of interpretation has eliminated those elements which can be accounted for strictly on the basis of Christian worship or catechesis, and there is nothing in it which could have been borrowed by the Church from Judaism. A *Sitz im Leben Jesu*, viz., Jesus' Last Supper before his death, provides a more plausible origin for the words of interpretation than would a *Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae*.

Finally, our reconstruction of the earliest attainable form of Jesus' eucharistic words contains some positive indications of the *ipsissima vox* of Jesus. For example, the introduction of the vow of abstinence, "Amen I say to you, . . . ." is a characteristic idiom of Jesus: in Judaism the word "Amen" was used only to assent to a prayer. Furthermore, the words of interpretation constitute a similitude or parabolic expression, and this manner of speaking is, in the words of Jeremias, "an express peculiarity of Jesus." The cumulative weight of the evidence indicates that we can affirm with reasonable certainty the authenticity of Jesus' eucharistic sayings.
What Type of Meal Was the Last Supper?

It is obvious that Jesus' eucharistic words were not uttered in isolation: they were said in the context of a meal, and were accompanied by specific actions related to the eating of that meal. There is no reason to doubt the unanimous affirmation of the tradition that this meal was held by Jesus with his disciples shortly before his death. Indeed, it is scarcely possible to imagine any other situation in which the sayings would make sense. But it is a question of primary importance for our understanding of these words whether or not the Supper was some particular type of Jewish religious meal, and especially whether or not it was a Passover supper. If the Last Supper were a Passover, then the words of interpretation would probably have been an elaboration on the Paschal haggadah. If on the other hand it were not, we should wonder whether the Last Supper was some other sort of solemn religious meal, and if our knowledge of such a meal could throw light on Jesus' eucharistic words. Several non-Paschal types of meals, usually varieties of the kiddush (feast day sanctification) or habūrah (fellowship of friends) repasts, have been suggested.

There has been much discussion of the relationship between Jesus' Last Supper and the annual Passover meal, but it has not yet yielded any definitive consensus. Critical scholar-
ship in the first four decades of this century was inclined to the view that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal, but since then the work of J. Jeremias has raised a strong dissenting voice. The problem here is not simply one of the reliability of the sources, but that of two conflicting chronologies found in the New Testament itself. While according to the witness of the synoptics the Last Supper was indeed a Passover meal (Mk. 14:12ff.; Mt. 26:17ff.; Lk. 22:7ff.), the Fourth Evangelist depicts the events of Passion Week in such a way that Passover falls on the next day, Jesus' crucifixion coinciding with the slaughter of the Paschal lambs (Jn. 13:1ff.; 18:28; 19:14; 19:31,42). The Pauline institution narrative makes no reference to the Last Supper as a Passover, and Paul's description of Christ as "our Passover" (1 Co. 5:7) has been used by defenders of both chronologies. Those who support the Johannine chronology believe that this allusion of Paul's implies that Jesus was sacrificed on the Day of Preparation. On the other hand, those who accept the synoptic view can claim that Paul's analogy goes back to Jesus himself, i.e., that Jesus, during the course of the Paschal meal, interpreted his death as the Paschal sacrifice. 113

Much of the debate on this question has centered on the consistency or inconsistency with the Passover ritual of certain details which the Gospels report in their accounts of the
events surrounding the Last Supper. Among those factors which have been brought against the Paschal interpretation of the Last Supper are the following:

1) The word used for bread in Mk. 14:22 par. is not ἀλογον, the normal word for unleavened bread, but ἔφος, which usually designates leavened bread. 114

2) According to some authorities, even in the time of Jesus individual cups were used in the Passover ritual; yet the New Testament indicates that a single common cup was used at the Last Supper. 115

3) As a rule women participate in the Passover meal, yet by all accounts only Jesus and the Twelve were present at the Last Supper. 116

4) The synoptic accounts of the Supper lack any specific reference to the peculiar features of the Passover ritual. There is no mention of the Paschal lamb, or of the bitter herbs; nor is there any allusion to the liberation of the People from Egypt. 117

5) There appears to be a contradiction between Mk. 14:1f. (and par. Mt. 26:1-5), which indicates that Jesus was not to be arrested "during the feast," ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, and the chronology represented in the rest of the Marcan Passion narrative. According to the latter, Jesus was arrested in the course of the feast, after the Passover Supper. 118

6) Finally, there are a number of incidents reported in Mk. 14:17-15:47 which, it is alleged, could not possibly have
taken place on the first day of the feast of Unleavened Bread. These include: Jesus’ leaving Jerusalem for Gethsemane during Passover night, the meeting of the Sanhedrin and the condemnation of Jesus during this night, the bearing of arms by the temple guards and Jesus’ disciples, the execution of Jesus on the high feast day, the purchase of linen by Joseph of Arimathea, and the taking down and burial of Jesus’ body.

Although not all of these objections are of equal force, thorough and systematic replies have been given to them by two of the most ardent defenders of a Paschal Last Supper, J. Jeremias and A.J.B. Higgins. According to these two scholars, the difficulties mentioned above can be discarded in light of the following considerations:

1) There are numerous instances in the LXX, Philo, and Josephus where the shewbread and other types of unleavened bread are designated as ἀρτος.\textsuperscript{119}

2) From the second century A.D. onwards, there are in Rabbinic sources hygienic objections to the practice of drinking from a single cup. These very objections point to the fact that it was not unusual for a common cup to be used at the Passover in the time of Jesus.\textsuperscript{120}

3) One must not, in Jeremias’ view, assume “that the women mentioned in Mark 15:40; Luke 23:49,55 were excluded; in Eastern texts the argument from silence is inadmissible in such cases.”\textsuperscript{121} The evangelical emphasis on the Twelve is,
he argues, an indication that only a small, intimate circle of Jesus' followers was present at the Supper, and is therefore evidence of the Paschal character of the meal. 122

4) The fourth objection—the absence of any reference to the most important features of the Paschal meal—is perhaps the most formidable. But Jeremias and Higgins argue that this fact causes a problem only if one expects to find a verbatim report of the Last Supper in the gospel narratives. Since these narratives are not an attempt to give a complete historical description of the event, but only portray those parts of it which were constitutive for the eucharistic celebration of the early Church, the omission of certain details is quite understandable. 123

5) The word ἐορτή can mean festal "assembly" or "crowd," as it does in John 7:11, "they were looking for him at the feast [ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ] ." Thus the expression μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ in Mk. 14:1 can be rendered, "not in the presence of the festal crowd," i.e., in secret. This interpretation would remove the discrepancy in the Marcan chronology. 124

6) It is argued that each of the incidents which supposedly could not have taken place during a feast day was, under the circumstances, entirely possible. As for Jesus' departure to Gethsemane during the night, it is claimed that Gethsemane, at the western foot of the Mount of Olives, "was reckoned within the confines of the city for the purposes of the Passover." 125
The trial and execution of Jesus during the feast is explained by reference to a Rabbinic statement which decrees that false prophets are to be tried and executed even during a feast. Further, it is pointed out that the bearing of arms on the Sabbath or other feast day was permitted by an earlier halakah which was in force at the time of Jesus. Finally, in cases of need, burial and the purchase of materials for burial were permitted on a feast day.

Those who support the view that the Last Supper was a Passover (who, in addition to Jeremias and Higgins, include Billerbeck, E. Gaugler, J. Klausner, M. Thurian, M. de la Taille, A. Jaubert, and N. Hook) have also advanced a number of positive arguments in defense of their thesis. They believe that the synoptic tradition, and even, in some cases, the Johannine, has preserved reminiscences of certain details which prove that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. The most important arguments adduced in favor of this view are as follows:

1) According to both the synoptics (Mk. 14:13 par., 14:26 par.) and John (18:1), the Last Supper took place in Jerusalem. At a time when the city itself would have been crowded with pilgrims, it is "by no means a matter of course" that this should have been the case. The synoptic gospels report that during his stay in Jerusalem Jesus regularly left the holy city in the evening (Mk. 11:11 par.; 11:19; 14:3 par.; Lk. 21:37;
22:39). On the other hand, it was laid down that the Paschal lamb had to be eaten within the gates of Jerusalem.  

2) The Last Supper took place in the evening and extended into the night (Mk. 14:17; 14:30 par.; Jn 13:30; 1 Co. 11:23). Usually the main meal of the day was taken in the late afternoon, but it was obligatory for the Passover supper to take place at night.

3) The synoptics and John also agree that Jesus and his disciples reclined at the Last Supper (Mk. 14:18; Mt. 26:20; Lk. 22:14; Jn. 13:12,23,25). Jeremias states flatly: "It is absolutely impossible that Jesus and his disciples should have reclined at table for their ordinary meals" (italics his). Except for the Passover—when Jews reclined as a sign of their liberty—the Jewish custom in Jesus' time was to sit for meals.

4) The drinking of wine at the meal is a further indication of its Paschal character, since, according to Jeremias, wine was drunk only on festive occasions. Moreover, red wine was drunk at the Passover, and Jesus' comparison of the wine with his blood suggests that it must have been red.

5) The tradition reports that Jesus broke bread during the course of the meal (Mk. 14:22 par.), whereas ordinary meals began with the breaking of bread. The Passover supper was the only meal of the year in which the serving of a dish preceded the breaking of bread.

6) The gospels say that the Last Supper concluded with the singing of a hymn (Mk. 14:26; Mt. 26:30). This must be a
reference to the Passover hallel, sung at the close of the meal. 141

7) After the meal, Jesus did not return to Bethany, as he had the previous nights (Mk. 11:11f.; Mt. 21:17), but stayed within the area of Jerusalem (Mk. 14:26 par.; 14:32 par.). According to contemporary regulations, pilgrims had to spend the night of Passover in the holy city. 142

8) One final consideration is for Jeremias "of absolutely decisive significance," and "the convincing argument for the paschal character of the Last Supper." This is nothing other than Jesus' speaking the words of interpretation over the bread and wine. This "altogether extraordinary manner of announcing his passion" can be understood only in light of the fact that interpretation of certain elements of the meal is a fixed part of the Passover ritual. 143

If these arguments were accepted as convincing, then we should naturally turn to Paschal conceptions in order to discern the meaning of Jesus' eucharistic words. An example of a rigorously Paschal interpretation of these sayings is that presented by A.J.B. Higgins. For Higgins the vow of abstinence simply expresses Jesus' looking forward to the time when the Passover promises of joy and redemption would be fulfilled. 144 The words of interpretation were, he believes, prompted by the Passover haggadah, and in fact by them Jesus compared himself to the Passover lamb. 145 The two sayings "This is my body"
and "This is my blood which is poured out for many" were interpolations into the Passover ritual at two vital points: at the eating of unleavened bread which began the central portion of the meal, and at the third Passover cup which concluded this portion. This writer also suggests that Jesus' sayings may have been intended to evoke the notion of the scapegoat, because it was possible to use a goat instead of a lamb at Passover. He points to the fact that 1 Peter (1:18-20) associates the scapegoat with the Passover lamb when describing the atoning work of Christ, and maintains that the association might have originated with Jesus. Through the words of interpretation, then, Jesus refers to his impending death as the true Paschal sacrifice, and perhaps makes a comparison between his death and the atoning death of the scapegoat. The word "is" in these sayings, which would have been only implied in Aramaic, must signify "means," or "represents." "The disciples at the Last Supper are not to be regarded as eating (symbolically) the flesh of Christ in partaking of the bread, and as drinking his blood in taking the wine, but as remembering his sacrificial act." The bread and wine, in other words, serve a function similar to that of the Paschal lamb: just as the latter represented the death of the lambs in Egypt without any inherent efficacy of their own, so do the bread and wine represent the atoning death of Christ. When, fi-
nally, Jesus says "Do this in remembrance of me" (a saying which Higgins regards as authentic), he is asking to be remembered annually in the Passover. 151

J. Jeremias' exegesis of Jesus' eucharistic words is similar, though somewhat less conjectural. This author, who also holds to the priority of Mark, reconstructs Jesus' words of interpretation as den bišri and den idmi in Aramaic, or zeh besari and zeh dami in Hebrew. Jesus thus has deliberately chosen the language of cultic sacrifice in using the parallel predicates "flesh" and "blood." By parabolically comparing himself to the broken bread and the red wine, Jesus speaks of himself as the sacrificial, eschatological Paschal lamb. 152 This is a statement about the saving power of his death: it is a vicarious death which will bring about the final deliverance. Further, Jesus speaks of his death as a death to ἐκκυννομενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. The word πολλῶν is a reference to the rabbim of Isaiah 53, which in pre-Christian Jewish exegesis (1 Enoch 46:4f.; Wisdom of Solomon 5:1-23) is understood as the Gentiles and the godless among the Jews and the Gentiles. By this phrase, then, Jesus claims to be the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, who offers his life as an atonement for the sins of the peoples of the world. 153 There are therefore three fundamental motifs in Jesus' eucharistic words: Passover, cultic sacrifice, and the Suffering Servant.
In Jeremias' estimation, Jesus' words "are not only parable and instruction." For, according to the Jewish thought of the time, the table fellowship is constituted by the rite of the breaking of the bread, and each of those who eat the bread thereby become recipients of the blessing. When, therefore, Jesus gives his disciples the bread and wine, "by eating and drinking he gives them a share in the atoning power of his death." Through their participation in this gift, the disciples become the redeemed community of the eschatological era. Thus Jesus' eucharistic sayings and actions have an eschatological significance: "As recipients of Jesus' gift the disciples are representatives of the new people of God" (Jeremias' italics). However, as we have seen, Jeremias does not interpret the saying "Do this . . ." as a command to repeat Jesus' words and actions or as the institution of a new rite. He believes, rather, that the earliest eucharistic meals grew out of Jesus' regular table fellowship with his disciples.

These interpretations of Higgins and Jeremias, while not devoid of valuable insights, are encumbered with certain formidable difficulties. One such difficulty is the lack of rigour with which they make use of the "criterion of dissimilarity." Is it not possible, or even likely, that the Suffering Servant motif found in the words of interpretation should be attributed to the Christological conceptions
of early Christianity? And cannot the same be said for the
notion of Jesus as the Paschal lamb or scapegoat? Both of
these authors' interpretations, moreover, presuppose the
validity of the arguments proposed to demonstrate that the
Last Supper was a Passover meal. Yet a critical examination
of these arguments will expose serious deficiencies in them.
As N. Clark has pointed out, the answers given by Jeremias
and Higgins to the objections to the thesis of a Paschal
Last Supper are not as conclusive as they might at first ap­
ppear. For example, Jeremias' explanation of the phrase μη
ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ as meaning "not in the presence of the festal
crowd" is "conjectural in the extreme."¹⁵⁹ Hardly more suc­
cessful is the attempt to explain the evangelical omission of
any reference to the Passover lamb or central Paschal concep­
tions. Is it likely that the tradition would preserve peri­
pheral indications of a Paschal meal and at the same time
allow the most important indications to fall into oblivion?
Nor are the positive arguments proposed by Jeremias and Hig­
gins much more persuasive. Such things as the time and place
of the Last Supper, the breaking of bread and drinking of red
wine during the meal, and the singing of a hymn, are in har­
mony with the Passover ritual, but not exclusive to it. Fur­
thermore, as C.W. Dugmore has shown,¹⁶⁰ Jeremias' claim that
it was not customary in Jesus' time to recline at ordinary
meals is false. Yet these arguments are susceptible to even
more damaging criticism: if we were to concede that the details cited point to a Paschal meal, what evidence is there for the authenticity of these details themselves? Since the Synoptic evangelists believed that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, those features of their accounts which are consistent with this view could very well have been added in the editorial reconstruction of the event.

A number of other scholars have attempted to resolve the issue through reconciling the Synoptic and Johannine chronologies. Thus Billerbeck proposes that, due to disputes about the date of the new moon, the Pharisees reckoned Passover a day earlier than the official date determined by the Sadducees. Jesus, in this view, celebrated the Pharisaic Passover, whereas the account of the fourth evangelist followed the official chronology. But this theory is highly conjectural, and would seem to raise more difficulties than it solves. The most celebrated attempt to reconcile the Johannine and synoptic chronologies in recent times is to be found in A. Jaubert's book, The Date of the Last Supper. Miss Jaubert bases her thesis on the existence of a solar calendar found in the Book of Jubilees. This calendar gives liturgical references to Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and prescribes that Passover must always fall on a Wednesday. The author believes that traces of this calendar have survived in a patristic tradition
represented by the Didascalia, Epiphanius, and Victor of Poetovio. This tradition places the Last Supper on Tuesday night of Holy Week, and sets aside Sunday, Wednesday and Friday for fasting. Miss Jaubert suggests that this tradition preserves an authentic reminiscence, and that Jesus and his followers used the Jubilees calendar. The apparent conflict in chronology stems from John's use of the official calendar.

Despite its ingenuity, this theory must also be rejected as simply imaginative conjecture. Jeremias is probably right in his assertion that the chronology in Jaubert's patristic sources is "secondary, and has developed out of the fasting praxis." P. Benoit objects that Jaubert has advanced no valid reason why Jesus and his apostles should have used the Jubilees calendar. Finally, G. Ogg has argued that the superimposing of the patristic chronology on Passion Week can serve little purpose unless it can be proved that Tuesday in Passion Week fell on Nisan 14th in that calendar.

With regard to this whole question, a number of authorities including F. Leenhardt, V. Taylor, and E. Kilmar-
equally well argue that even if the Last Supper were an official Passover, Jesus could have given the meal an entirely new meaning, devoid of traditional Paschal conceptions. Yet it would surely make a difference to our exegesis of Jesus' eucharistic sayings if, for example, a Paschal lamb was present at the Supper. The problem of whether or not the Supper was an official Passover cannot, then, be so easily avoided.

When all the evidence is considered, it would seem that we cannot turn to the Passover meal to discern the meaning of Jesus' sayings at the Last Supper. It is most probable that the conception of the Last Supper as a Passover goes back to the theology of the synoptic evangelists and the Christian groups behind them.

Among those scholars who agree that it is difficult to postulate a Paschal Last Supper, many have attempted to propose some alternative type of Jewish meal which Jesus could have celebrated with the apostles shortly before his death. The types of meals which have been proposed are as follows:

1) A Kiddush meal. This theory was first advanced by G. Box and was later taken up by W. Oesterly, G. MacGregor, and W. Frere. The word Kiddush means "sanctification," and it refers to the weekly blessing by which a Jewish family ushered in and sanctified the Sabbath. On Friday evening the blessing was said over a cup of wine by the head
of the household, at the conclusion of the meal. Those who accept the kiddush theory believe that in the case of the Last Supper the blessing was advanced twenty-four hours, and was used to sanctify the Passover. MacGregor suggests that the Christian tradition later confused this "Passover kiddush" with the Passover meal itself, and that this confusion resulted in the contradiction between the synoptic and Johannine chronologies. 179

One of the arguments for the kiddush hypothesis, first put forward by Oesterly, 180 is that there are certain parallels between the kiddush rite and Jesus' farewell discourse reported in John. The alleged parallels include: an allusion to creation (Jn. 17:4f.), the blessing over the wine (Jn. 15:1,8, 16), a reference to the notion of election (Jn. 13:18; 15:16, 19), and expressions of joy (Jn. 15:11; 16:22; 17:13) and freedom (Jn. 15:15).

If the view that the Last Supper was a Passover meal lacks persuasive evidence, this is all the more true for the thesis that the Supper was a "kiddush meal." The parallels drawn between the kiddush rite and the farewell discourse, tenuous as they are, hardly prove anything. At the most they might indicate that the author (or authors) of the Johannine discourse was influenced by the structure of the kiddush prayer. In addition to this, there is no evidence that the kiddush blessing could take place at any time other than Friday evening. 181
final objection to the theory is that the very notion of a "kiddush meal" is false. The kiddush was simply a Sabbath blessing, and in no sense a special type of meal.\textsuperscript{182}

2) A habūrah meal. This is a suggestion of Lietzmann's,\textsuperscript{183} subsequently adopted by A. MacDonald,\textsuperscript{184} F. Cirlot,\textsuperscript{185} J. Oulton,\textsuperscript{186} and G. Dix.\textsuperscript{187} A habūrah was a brotherhood of friends (haberim) devoted to the pursuit of piety. Lietzmann believed that these habūroth would have gathered, when they felt the need, but on a fairly regular basis, to celebrate common, solemn religious meals. The Last Supper was thus the final one in a series which Jesus had shared with his habūrah, the apostles, and the earliest eucharists were simply a continuation of this fellowship.

This theory is undoubtedly correct in stressing that the Last Supper was not an isolated phenomenon, but part of the regular table fellowship which Jesus and his followers shared. It is also likely that the earliest eucharistic meals grew out of this fellowship. At the same time, it is very questionable whether there is any advantage to invoking the notion of the habūrah brotherhood to explain this table fellowship. The idea of a special meal of religious solemnity, celebrated by these brotherhoods, is, in Jeremias' words, "an \textit{ad hoc} conjecture for which there is absolutely no evidence."\textsuperscript{188} The only information concerning the existence and practices of the habūroth comes from the Babylonian Talmud, and it suggests that the
main aim of these associations was strict observance of the Law.\textsuperscript{189} The meals in which these haburoth participated were exclusively duty meals, such as those held in connection with circumcisions, engagements, weddings, and funerals.\textsuperscript{190}

3) A Jewish mystery meal. G. Kilpatrick has suggested that the Jewish tract \textit{Joseph and Aseneth}, which he dates between 100 and 30 B.C., throws light on the question of the Last Supper and eucharistic origins.\textsuperscript{191} He contends that the claim that the Last Supper was a Passover rests largely on the elimination of alternatives (such as the kiddush or haburah), and that the references in this tract to "the bread of life" and "the cup of blessing" or "cup of immortality" attest to the existence of mystery-type meals in Judaism. "There is," he says, "evidence for the existence of a Jewish religious meal quite distinct from the Passover, and sufficiently similar to the Last Supper for these two to have a common origin independent of the Passover."\textsuperscript{192}

On examination, this theory does not seem to be any more helpful than the others. Even if \textit{Joseph and Aseneth} does point to the existence of pre-Christian Jewish "mystery" meals (there is considerable doubt that the document should be dated so early), the similarities are not so much with the Last Supper as with the later Christian eucharist. Kilpatrick, moreover, bases his theory on an unwarranted presupposition, \textit{viz.}, that if the Last Supper was not a Passover meal it must have been some other type of Jewish religious meal.
It does appear that all attempts to find a specific Jewish rite with which Jesus' Last Supper can be identified have failed. The consequence of this fact is that we must turn to the inner structure of Jesus' ministry in order to discern the significance of that Supper to Jesus.

We believe that the proper context of the Last Supper is not any contemporary Jewish rite, but an essential constituent of Jesus' own ministry, viz., a regular table-fellowship. In a recent study of the teaching of Jesus, N. Perrin has sought to demonstrate that Jesus' table-fellowship with tax-collectors and sinners was the central feature of his ministry. Perrin finds in the fact of the Cross itself evidence for this thesis. He argues that to make sense of the trial and execution of Jesus, we must posit a factor in the ministry of Jesus which gave grave offence to the Jewish authorities, and he suggests that Jesus' welcoming of outcasts into a regular table-fellowship, in the name of the Kingdom of God, constituted such a factor. Further evidence is found in the cultic meals of early Christianity, which, Perrin points out, existed before there was a specifically Christian theology to give them meaning. The Last Supper itself cannot have been the origin of these communal meals, because there is every indication that the theological emphasis associated with the Last Supper was not present in the Christian cultic meals at the outset. The most reasonable explanation for these meals
is that they are a continuation of a regular practice of the ministry of Jesus. 195

Perrin believes that we can find in the gospels a glimpse of this fellowship. In Mt. 11:19 Jesus is described as "a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners." This phrase is a Semitic parallelism implying a close relationship between each of its two terms: the first refers to Jesus' habit of holding a table-fellowship, and the second to the people with whom he held it. The words "glutton," "drunkard," and "friend" suggest that the fellowship was held in an atmosphere of joy. 196 Another logion which sheds light on the meaning of the fellowship to Jesus is Mt. 8:11: "I tell you, many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." Perrin contends that Jesus' table-fellowship is an apt setting for this saying, and that it is an authentic logion of Jesus. This saying is very important; alluding to the figure of the messianic banquet, "it tells us that the fellowship was an anticipation of that to be expected in the kingdom." 197

The table-fellowship was thus an acted parable through which Jesus radically called into question the patriotism, piety, and social structures of his contemporaries. It is entirely probable that much of Jesus' personal teaching to his disciples, including the Lord's Prayer, took place in the context of this
fellowship. The vividness of the memory of the pre-Easter fellowship provided the pattern for the sense of fellowship between the earliest Christians and their risen lord, and in fact the earliest eucharistic meals were simply the continuation of this table-fellowship.

There is a sense, then in which we can say that the eucharist was prior to the Last Supper, rather than vice versa. It is unnecessary to turn, as K. Kuhn has, to the ritual meals of the Qumran community in order to understand the regular cultic meals of early Christianity. It was Jesus himself who regarded his table-fellowship as a foretaste of the messianic banquet. The Last Supper was thus for Jesus (even if, in this case, only his disciples were present) the last in a series of meals which for him signaled the coming of the Kingdom of God.

The Last Supper was not the only one of these meals which acquired a special prominence. One other meal—the feeding of bread and fishes to the multitude—stands out in the evangelical tradition. The seemingly "sacramental" nature of this meal has been recognised by commentators for some time. For example, Albert Schweitzer wrote:

The feeding of the multitude was more than a love-feast, a fellowship meal. It was from the point of view of Jesus a sacrament of salvation, a veiled eschatological sacrament. This meal must have been transformed by tradition into a miracle, a result which may have been in part due to the references to the wonders of the Messianic feast which were doubtless contained in the prayers, not to speak of the eschatological enthusiasm which then prevailed universally.
In a similar vein, D.E. Nineham describes the event as

...an anticipation, more or less sacramental in character, of the Messianic Banquet, designed to communicate Jesus' conviction that he was the one whom men would soon see presiding over the Messianic Banquet, and perhaps also to consecrate those who shared the food as partakers in the coming messianic feast, and to give them a guarantee that they who had shared his table in the time of his obscurity would also share it in the time of his glory.²⁰²

While Jesus may not have been so certain of his role in the messianic drama, it does seem likely that he spoke of the meal in terms of the messianic feast. F.W. Beare agrees "that we must entertain the possibility that underneath the miracle story there may lay a non-miraculous account of a ritual meal, conceived of as a symbol and foretaste of the Messianic Banquet."²⁰³

What has been said of the feeding of the multitude can, in light of Perrin's conclusions, be said of Jesus' table-fellowship generally: it is a "sacrament" of the coming eschatological redemption. Further evidence for this can be found in the Lord's Prayer, which, as we have remarked, probably had its setting in the table-fellowship. The fourth petition of this prayer reads τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δός ἡμῖν σήμερον in Matthew, or τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν in Luke. The most plausible rendering of the word ἐπιούσιος, which appears only here in Greek, is "for the future," or "of the morrow."²⁰⁴ If this interpretation
is correct, then Jesus is describing the bread eaten in the table-fellowship as eschatological bread, bread of the heavenly banquet. The meals which Jesus shares with the publicans, sinners, and his disciples are a true anticipation of the feast in the Kingdom of God.

We therefore arrive at the point where we can picture the setting of the Last Supper: Jesus, aware that he is about to be betrayed and executed, is gathered for the last time with his closest disciples to share in that table-fellowship which has been at the very centre of his ministry, and which he regards as the foretaste of the messianic banquet. But, as we have seen, Jesus believed that the advent of the Kingdom was somehow connected with his proclamation of it. One thing we can be certain of, says Bornkamm, is that "Jesus celebrates the Supper with his disciples in the expectation of the approaching kingdom of God and of his parting from them."205 Faced with a desperate situation, Jesus turns to a radical solution: it will be through his death that the eschatological covenant will be ratified.

The accounts of the Last Supper indicate that it followed the regular pattern of a formal Jewish meal: blessing and distribution of bread at the beginning, followed by the meal itself, with a solemn blessing over the wine at the conclusion.206 Since, therefore, the bread and cup sayings were originally separated by an entire meal, each was a self-contained unit and must be interpreted as such.207
At this Last Supper, Jesus combined symbolic gestures with symbolic words. The evangelical tradition attests that parabolic actions as well as parabolic sayings and stories were not uncommon in Jesus' ministry: in addition to his extension of hospitality to outcasts, reference can be made to his healings, rejection of fasting (Mk. 2:19f., par.), and his setting a child in the midst of his disciples. At times Jesus also made use of some material object as the point of departure for a parabolic utterance, as when he cursed the fig tree (Mk. 11:13f.). Bearing this in mind, we may now examine each of Jesus' three eucharistic sayings, in their earliest attainable form as we have previously reconstructed them.

1) **This is my body.** Since Jesus uttered this saying at the beginning of the meal, when the bread was blessed and broken, its meaning cannot be discerned by considering it in connection with the cup saying. The words σῶμα and ἄμα are not, therefore, correlatives together referring to the whole person of Jesus, nor could they be the component terms of the language of cultic sacrifice. Most probably, then, the Aramaic word underlying the Greek σῶμα is qûph'a, the normal word for "body," rather than bišr'a, "flesh." If the Aramaic term had been "flesh," it would be quite inexplicable why the Greek translator should have chosen the word "body," which was not normally combined with "blood."
The word "this" refers to the broken bread. It is unlikely that it might refer also to the action of breaking the bread, since the saying was uttered after the breaking, at the distribution. The word "is," about which there has been so much controversy, would probably not have been expressed in Aramaic.

The logion is best understood as a simple parabolic analogy. Jesus speaks of the broken bread as his body, thereby announcing his Passion to the disciples. It is quite possible that, in distributing the broken bread to his disciples, Jesus is asking them to share with him in his sufferings. And since Jesus had in the Lord's Prayer spoken of the bread shared in the table-fellowship as the bread of the eschatological banquet, there may also be a hint in this saying of Jesus' belief that his death would bring about the Kingdom. But there is nothing in the saying which demands a sacrificial interpretation; still less is there, as Schweitzer, Schuermann, and Betz believe, a reference to the Suffering Servant. It is true that the Suffering Servant motif may be present in the later New Testament formulations of the words of institution, but that motif is undoubtedly attributable to the Servant christology of early Christianity.

2) This cup is the covenant in my blood. This saying is perhaps more difficult than the previous one, since the covenant theme is not characteristic of Jesus' proclamation. Neverthe-
less, the eschatological redemption to come was described in terms of a new covenant in Jeremiah (31:31ff.). The notion is in no way alien to the teaching of Jesus, particularly in view of the non-legalistic interpretation of covenant in Jeremiah. The word "covenant" in this saying can be regarded as synonymous with the coming of the Kingdom of God. It might also have here the connotation, which the word has in profane Greek literature, of a last will or testament.

The word "cup," in addition to referring to its contents (wine), is a symbol of suffering (Mk. 10:38; 14:36; Jn. 18:11). The use of the word "blood" here could not have been intended to evoke the notion of cultic sacrificial blood, since it is not paralleled with "flesh." Blood, however, was in Hebrew thought conceived of as the essential substance of life (Lev. 7:11,14; Deut. 12:23; cf. Ez. 35:6; Mt. 27:4), and it naturally brings to mind the idea of shedding blood, or death. Jesus, then, by parabolically using the (probably red) wine and the symbol of the cup, tells his disciples that his death will bring about the eschatological covenant.

We must, at this point, bear in mind an important distinction: "a sacrifice offered at the conclusion of a covenant is a very different thing from a sacrifice of propitiation. It has nothing to do with the cancelling of sins, but is only an act confirming the compact." Jesus' saying is thus to be
understood in light of Exodus 24:8-11, where the institution of the covenant is accompanied by a blood sacrifice and a heavenly meal:

And Moses took the blood and threw it upon the people, and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant which Yahweh has made with you in accordance with all these words." Then Moses and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel went up, and they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heaven for clearness. And...they beheld God, and ate and drank.

Viewed in the context of this passage, the cup saying affirms that Jesus' mission will not be a failure because of his death, but rather that his death will be the covenant sacrifice which will bring into operation the final eschatological drama.

In the case of the cup, Jesus' act of distribution is particularly significant. We should be reminded, though, that it is very unlikely that Jesus was asking his disciples to in some sense drink his "blood." Such an idea would have been quite repugnant to a Jew, and, as Klausner says, "even if it was meant symbolically, could only have aroused horror in the minds of Jesus' disciples." It was rather the action of giving that had important symbolic value. Schuermann points out that the giving of a single cup for all those present to partake of was contrary to the usual custom. Jesus' gesture helps us understand his words: it shows that he "proffered
eschatological salvation as the fruit of his death, and by doing so also represented it symbolically."218

3) **Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it in the kingdom of God.** This saying should be understood as a sequel to the previous one. Having stated, through parabolic word and action, that his death will bring about the Kingdom, Jesus tells his disciples that he will not again share with them in the table fellowship until the time of the true messianic banquet.

The solemn emphatic introduction, "**Truly [ἀμὴ] I say to you . . ."** has given rise to the description of the saying as a "vow" of abstinence. Jesus' statement, indeed, brings to mind the Nazirite vow of abstinence, and like the latter may be an affirmation of total consecration to God. A vow was also used to indicate an irrevocable decision, as in Acts 23:12, when Paul's Jewish opponents "made a vow not to eat or drink until they had killed Paul." Finally, a vow of abstinence or fasting was used to give prayer a special emphasis (Ps. 61:5; 2 Sam. 12:16; Mt. 17:21; Mk. 9:29; Lk. 2:37; Acts 14:23; 13: 2f.).219 Jesus' vow may therefore be interpreted as a statement of his determination to undertake suffering and death for the sake of the Kingdom, and as an emphatic repetition of his plea, "may your kingdom come." Jesus will not again partake in the table-fellowship, which resulted in his impending death, until he partakes in the Kingdom which that death will bring about.
Jesus' three eucharistic sayings are perfectly comprehensible in the context of his ministry, a ministry which proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom of God through parable and parabolic action, a ministry which Jesus believed was instrumental in the final, eschatological process, and in the context of the desperate situation in which they were uttered. Given the inevitable emotion and drama which must have accompanied Jesus' last meeting with his disciples in that fellowship which had been at the very core of his activity, and which he had considered as an anticipation of the Kingdom, they become even easier to understand.

There was nothing Jesus said or did at this Last Supper which could be construed as a request to repeat his actions. Jesus' sayings and actions were a response to a specific concrete situation, and though they were preserved by the tradition and later became central in the church's worship, it is difficult to imagine any reason why he should want them repeated. Nevertheless, it is clear that the table-fellowship did not end with Jesus' death. To the subsequent history of that fellowship, and to the development of the Christian cult, we now turn.
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Jews drinking wine that had been labeled as blood, the references to "breaking of bread" in Acts, "the distinctively theological nature of the cup formula compared to the simplicity of the words over the bread," and finally on account of the difficulties connected with the longer text of Luke (p. 196). Our assessment of these objections will be obvious from what has preceded in this chapter.

CHAPTER II

PRIMITIVE EUCHARISTIC TYPES AND THEIR ASSIMILATION INTO THE SACRIFICIAL-SACRAMENTAL TYPE

There are in the New Testament only two documents in which we find an explicit description of the Christian cultic meal, the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. We have in addition numerous texts which may contain allusions to the eucharistic practice and faith of early Christianity. Such texts include the Last Supper narratives, the Feeding of the Multitude narratives, the Resurrection-meal stories in Luke 24 and John 21, and the description of the Heavenly Liturgy in the Apocalypse. Our task at this point is to construct from this variety of sources some sort of coherent picture of the Christian table fellowship in its earliest stages. We shall then be prepared to discuss the relationship between this early fellowship and that type of celebration which one normally associates with the word "eucharist." The latter, standard from at least the end of the second century on, consists of a sacramental liturgy which is regarded as being in some sense a sacrifice, and in which the elements of bread and wine are believed to be in some sense converted into the body and blood of Christ.
The "Breaking of Bread"

Two texts from the book of Acts furnish us with brief, allusive descriptions of the cultic meal in the earliest period of Christianity:

Acts 2:42. And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers.

Acts 2:46f. And day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes, they partook of food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having favour with all the people.

The setting for these references is the early Jerusalem community of Jewish Christians, and there is a general scholarly consensus that the tradition preserved here by the author of Acts is reliable. In addition, the "we" source of Acts describes two incidents where Paul breaks bread, at Troas (Acts 20:7-12) and on the ship to Rome (Acts 27:33-36). But for the present we are concerned with the eucharistic meal in its earliest stage.

What strikes us immediately is the prima facie difference between these early eucharists described in Acts 2 on the one hand, and the Last Supper and the eucharist described in 1 Corinthians on the other. In particular, there is no mention of the cup, which is so central to both the Last Supper and Paul's eucharist, and there is nothing which indicates that there was any connection made between these early cultic meals and the death of Christ.
It is possible, of course, that the term "breaking of bread" is simply a *pars pro toto* for the type of eucharistic celebration described by Paul. This would seem to be the most plausible interpretation for those who hold to the authenticity of the command to repeat and believe that the earliest eucharists are in direct linear descent from the Last Supper. This view is fortified by the fact that in the two passages in Acts where Paul "breaks bread" there is no mention of the cup or of the death of Christ. On the other hand, we have seen in the previous chapter that the earliest cultic meals in the church were an outgrowth of Jesus' table fellowship with the publicans, sinners, and his disciples, and that there is no reason to believe that Jesus expected his followers to repeat the procedure of the Last Supper.

A number of authorities, notably Lietzmann, have argued that materials from a much later period can throw light on this question of the primitive "breaking of bread." Lietzmann's method is to work backward from the developed liturgies of the patristic period. He traces the Western liturgies back to the anaphora of Hippolytus, in which there is an emphasis on redemption and a memorial of Jesus' sacrifice, and in which the words of institution appear quite naturally. The Eastern liturgies, however, he shows to be rearrangements or revisions of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which, in turn, shares a basic structure with the Egyptian rite of Serapion. The primitive
Egyptian rite, when disengaged from the later elaborations in the euchology of Serapion, exhibits an eschatological emphasis and lacks both the words of institution and the element of anamnesis. It is thus related to the type of eucharistic prayer found in the Didache. The Didache, it will be remembered, places the cup before the bread, in contradistinction to both the Pauline and Hippolyto-Roman practice. "Thus," concludes Lietzmann, "we have here a type of the Lord's Supper with no reference to the tradition extant in Mark and Paul."2

In the Didache, the prayers over the bread are central. The cup portion of the celebration appears to have been added without yet being thoroughly incorporated into the liturgy.3

This is an indication that the liturgical tradition antecedent to the Didache may have consisted of a celebration with bread only. Moreover, there are several passages in the apocryphal writings which describe eucharists with only one element, bread (Acts of Thomas 29; 37; 49f.; Acts of John 85; Acts of Peter, Vercellie MS, 5; also Clem. Hom. 14).4 While these second and third century accounts are legendary, they may be accepted as witnesses to the popular practice of their time in at least some Christian circles. Being contrary to the official practice of orthodox, Gentile Christianity, they may be regarded as "a real deposit of very ancient traditions whose testimony holds up well."5

We must, therefore, in considering the import of the "breaking of bread" in Acts 2, bear in mind two important
facts: on the one hand there is no positive evidence whatever that this celebration was a memorial of Jesus' death, or made use of the cup, and on the other hand there is a later tradition of eucharistic meals celebrated sub una specie, without either words of institution or anamnesis.

These two facts would seem to imply the existence of a type of eucharistic meal quite different from that described by Paul in 1 Corinthians, a type which was used by the earliest Jewish Christians and which survived for some time, especially in Egypt, an area not proselytised by Paul. The word "type," when used in reference to the early eucharist, should not be confused with the word "rite." The latter suggests simply a liturgical variant of a specific eucharistic pattern, while "type" is used to distinguish between cultic meals which differ in fundamental structure and theological perspective.

What were the essential characteristics of this first type? To begin with, we can be certain that the celebration included the consummation of an actual meal (cf. "food," Acts 2:46). At the same time, there can be little doubt that the rite of breaking bread at the beginning of the meal acquired a special importance, and was regarded as the central part of the cultic meal. This conclusion can be deduced from three facts: first, the expression "breaking of bread" was never used in Jewish sources before the New Testament to denote a whole meal; second, in the later evolution of this type
(as attested in the apocryphal acts) the rite consisted of a bread eucharist alone, without the meal; and finally, the early Christian anaphoras can be considered a development of the prayer of thanksgiving over the bread.\(^7\) Since this first type of eucharist developed out of Jesus' regular table-fellowship (consisting of ordinary meals), it is impossible to say at what exact point the element of bread acquired this special significance. In any case, it was quite early, and may have in part been due to Jesus' own description of the bread of the table-fellowship as the eschatological bread of the Kingdom.

As in the prayers of the Didache, the dominant mood in this early breaking of bread was one of eschatological joy. This can be discerned from Acts 2:46, "breaking bread at home, they took their food with rejoicing" (ἐν ἀγαλλίασει). The word ἀγαλλίασις denoted the joy experienced in the hopeful expectation of the return of the Lord and the coming of the Kingdom:

1 Pet. 4:13. ...that you may also rejoice with exceeding joy (χαίτε ἀγαλλιασάντες) when his glory is revealed.

Jude 24. ...before the presence of his glory with rejoicing (ἐν ἀγαλλίασει).

Apoc. 19:7. Let us be glad and rejoice (ἀγαλλιασάς) and give honour to him, for the marriage of the lamb is come.
The same conception is found in the Aramaic liturgical formula *marana' tha'* ("Our Lord come!"), which is preserved in 1 Co. 16:22 and *Didache* 10:6, and in Greek translation in *Apoc.* 22:20.

It is sometimes stated that these earliest eucharists were considered by their participants as meals with the risen Christ. This theory is attractive, for it would provide a link between the table-fellowship of Jesus and the later notion of the presence of Christ in the elements. Unfortunately, however, there is absolutely no evidence that the passages adduced as evidence for this thesis belong to the earlier strata of the tradition. As Dodd has pointed out, the resurrection-meal stories in Luke 24 have all the appearance of a highly-polished literary composition. The earliest statement of the resurrection appearances (1 Co. 15:5-8) "makes no mention of anything like this story and has no place for it," and Mark and Matthew know nothing of resurrection-meals. Similar objections weigh against an early date for the relevant phrase in Acts 10:41 ("to us . . . who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead"). Part of a sophisticated and stylised speech attributed to Peter, this phrase may even have an anti-docetic intent. John 21, which contains a resurrection-meal story, is regarded by most authorities as an appendix to the original gospel, and is late to say the least. The other pertinent text, *Apoc.* 3:20 ("If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in
to him and eat with him, and he with me") is likewise too 
late to be applied to the earliest eucharistic meals.

Nevertheless, these texts do point to an understanding 
of the eucharist quite different from that found in 1 Corin-
thians. This leads us to consider another possibility: that 
there was a third "type" of eucharist, related to and growing 
out of the "breaking of bread," but in which the dominant 
conception was that of sharing a meal with the resurrected 
Christ. There is evidence that this meal usually consisted 
of bread and fish, and that those who celebrated it looked 
back to the feeding of the multitude as the moment of its 
"institution."

The basis of our argument is the long-established axiom 
of gospel criticism that each evangelical pericope has a par-
ticular ecclesiastical Sitz im Leben. As recent Traditions-
geschichte studies have shown, such a Sitz im Leben need not necessarily be that of the compiler of an individual gospel, but may belong in the oral or written tradition antecedent to the compilation of that gospel. It is obvious that the liturgy of a certain community might itself have been the life-situa-
tion for some passages. If this is true, it should be possible 
to reconstruct the outlines of the worship of these communities through a form-critical analysis of the relevant texts.

D.M. Stanley has shown that there are four different types 
of liturgical influence on the gospel narratives:
1. The practice of liturgical recital, evident in the passion narratives, especially in John.\(^{12}\)

2. The incorporation of liturgical formulae into the gospel narratives. An obvious instance is Mt. 28:19, "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."\(^{13}\) We have encountered the same phenomenon in our study of all four institution narratives.

3. The effect of cultic observances on the writing-up of certain episodes. Stanley feels that he can detect reflections of liturgical practice in a number of stories about Jesus. For example, two healing accounts, Mk. 7:31-37 (cure of a deaf man) and Mk. 8:22-26 (cure of a blind man), seem to exhibit a certain ritual pattern. In both cases Jesus applies his hand and some of his own saliva to the patient, and in the first case he utters the formula "Ephphatha."\(^{14}\)

4. The influence of the Israelite liturgical cycle. In the accounts of Jesus' transfiguration there appear to be references to the Feast of Tabernacles, and there is some indication that the whole framework of the fourth gospel is structured around the Israelite feast cycle.\(^{15}\)

If there were in fact early Christian eucharists at which bread and fish were consumed, then the traces left in the gospels would be of the second and third types suggested by Stanley. It may be that the conjunction of bread and fish in Matthew 7:9f. is an example of such a trace:
Or what man, if his son asks him for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish will give him a serpent?

This explanation of the text would be even more plausible if the original form of the saying included only a reference to the fish and serpent. That such was the case is suggested by the fact that only the "fish" saying appears in both Matthew and in the accepted reading of the Lucan parallel (11:10f.), and that moreover in this latter text it is the "fish" saying which precedes the saying which mentions an egg. Thus if the original logion referred only to the fish, the introduction of the "bread" saying immediately before it could be explained by the influence of a liturgical rite in which bread and fish were consumed (in that order).

Of greater importance for our argument are the accounts of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes (two each in Mark and Matthew, one each in Luke and John). The striking feature of these narratives is their similarity to the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper (see Appendix). The same ritual pattern appears throughout: Jesus takes (μανδάνω) the bread, says a blessing over it (Mk. 6:41f., Mt. 14:19f., Lk. 9:16f., Mk. 14:22f., Mt. 26:26f.: εὐλογεῖω; Mk. 8:6ff., Mt. 15:36f., Jn. 6:11f., Lk. 22:19f., 1 Co. 11:23f.: εὐχαριστεῖω), breaks it, and distributes it. In Mk. 6:41f., Mk. 8:6ff., Jn. 6:11f., Mk. 14:22f., Mt. 26:26f., Lk 22:19f., and 1 Co. 11:23f. it is specified that Jesus also blesses and distributes the second element—fish or wine.
We have already noted in our examination of the Last Supper tradition that this sort of language is characteristic of liturgical formulae. How then is its presence in the multiplication narratives to be accounted for? The accepted view is stated by R. Brown: "The most plausible explanation is that the wording of the multiplication accounts is coloured by the eucharistic liturgies familiar to the various communities."¹⁶

This view presupposes that the eucharistic liturgies were of the familiar bread and wine type, and that therefore only the Last Supper traditions could reveal the actual liturgical practice of the communities in which these stories were passed down. The reasoning is quite simple: in the history of the tradition, the Last Supper narratives incorporated the liturgical formulae of the worshipping community, and at the same time these formulae coloured the stories of the multiplication of loaves and fishes.

However, it has already been established that the bread and wine type of eucharist was not universal. This therefore undermines the presupposition of those who believe that the seemingly liturgical language of the multiplication narratives must have been drawn from a "Last Supper" type of eucharistic celebration. It must be stressed: there is no more reason to suppose that the Last Supper narratives have influenced the composition of the Multiplication narratives than vice versa. More precisely, there is no reason to doubt that each story has its own liturgical Sitz im Leben.
It is possible, then, that the stories of the meal of bread and fishes also reflect the actual worship of certain Christian communities. The fact that the synoptic tradition reports the multiplication story in two variant redactions—the feeding of the five thousand and the feeding of the four thousand—attests to its importance in early Christianity. The inclusion of two variants of a meal of bread and fish requires explanation. Could it be that the first narrative (feeding of five thousand with five loaves, with twelve baskets left over—which may symbolize the twelve tribes) is the product of a Jewish-Christian community using bread and fish eucharists, and that the second narrative (feeding of four thousand with seven loaves, with seven baskets left over—which could perhaps symbolize the seventy gentile nations) represents a revision undertaken by gentile Christians who adopted the same practice? It is noteworthy in this connection that the word for basket in the first account (κόφινος Mk. 6:43) denotes a distinctively Jewish type of basket, whereas the term ὀμυρίς in the second account (Mk. 8:8) refers to an ordinary fish basket.

The suggestion that the multiplication narratives are reflections of actual liturgical practice moves from the realm of possibility to that of probability when they are considered in conjunction with the resurrection-meal narratives in Luke 24 and John 21. There is, as we have seen, in Apoc. 3:20 a preservation of the notion that the eucharist consisted of
supping with the Lord. The resurrection accounts in Luke and the appendix to John present evidence that those meals in which Christians believed they were eating with Christ were primarily meals of bread and fish:

When he was at table with them, he took the bread and blessed and broke it, and gave it to them. And their eyes were opened and they recognised him; and he vanished out of their sight.... And they rose that same hour and returned to Jerusalem; and they found the eleven gathered together and those who were with them.... Then they told what had happened on the road, and how he was known to them in the breaking of the bread. As they were saying this, Jesus himself stood among them.... And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said to them, "Have you anything here to eat?" They gave him a piece of broiled fish, and he took it and ate before them. (Lk. 24:30f., 33, 36, 41-43)

When they got out on land, they saw a charcoal fire there, with a fish lying on it, and bread. Jesus said to them, "Bring some fish that you have just caught." ...Jesus said to them, "Come and have breakfast." None of the disciples dared ask him, "Who are you?" They knew it was the Lord. Jesus came and took the bread and gave it to them, and so with the fish. (Jn. 21:9f., 12f.)

In both instances there is a repetition of the familiar liturgical pattern found in the stories of feeding the multitude (in Luke "took . . . blessed . . . broke . . . gave," in John 21 "took . . . gave . . . and so with the fish," cf. Jn. 6:11, "he distributed them to those who were seated, and so also with the fish.") It is significant that in the New Testament this liturgical pattern appears in eight accounts
where bread and fish are mentioned, as opposed to only four where the elements are bread and wine.

The use of fish as a component of certain cultic meals would have been quite appropriate in early Christianity. E. Goodenough's survey of Rabbinic literature has disclosed that in Palestinian Judaism the defeat and physical consumption of the great fish Leviathan was expected in the messianic era. Fish was also a symbol of the resurrection of the dead. Thus it would have been quite natural for early Christians to consume fish in a meal they believed to be sharing with their resurrected Lord. Goodenough is also of the opinion that the Sabbath evening meal, the cena pura, was "pre-eminently a fish meal," and that it may have been a symbolic prefiguration of the messianic age to come.

It is impossible to determine whether the synoptic evangelists were themselves familiar with the practice of bread and fish eucharists. It could be that the multiplication and resurrection-meal stories acquired their present form at an earlier point in the history of the tradition. The situation is particularly confusing in the case of Luke-Acts, where traces of all three of the eucharistic types we have discerned have survived.

In the case of John, however, a reasonable argument can be advanced that the bread and fish cultic meal was the only one known to the evangelist and the tradition behind him. To begin with, the Fourth Gospel presents an obvious difficulty
for the traditional view that there was only one type of eucharistic service in the primitive church, viz., the absence of an institution narrative in John's account of the Last Supper. Moreover, unless we could establish on the basis of some other evidence that John was familiar with the bread and wine eucharist, we could not follow Cullmann and Barrett and others in finding symbolic references to this type in such passages as the marriage at Cana (Jn. 2:1-11), the cleansing of the Temple (Jn. 2:13-22) where Cullmann finds an allusion to Jesus' eucharistic body), and the allegory of the vine (Jn. 15:1-8). Similarly, we would have to be suspicious of the authenticity of that one passage in which virtually all critics detect a symbolic reference to this type: the issue of blood and water from the wound in Jesus' side (Jn. 19:34).

There remains in John only one text with an apparent allusion to the "Pauline" type of eucharist: John 6:51-58. There is, however, as Bultmann, Bornkamm, and Lohse have recognised, good reason to call into question the authenticity of this passage. The chief difficulty is that this section of the Bread of Life discourse is incongruous with the preceding section (6:35-50), which in turn seems to be more characteristically Johannine. In the first part of the discourse, there is no reference to "flesh" or "blood"; the theme here is sapiential rather than eucharistic. The "bread of life" is Christ,
as the heavenly messenger sent by the Father, and the fundamental response to Jesus' presentation of himself as "bread" is to be belief (6:35,36,40,47). The use of the word "bread" here is reminiscent of its use as a symbol for wisdom in Proverbs 9:5 and Sirach 15:3. This non-eucharistic interpretation of the bread of life is confirmed by John 6:27, "Do not labour for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life." In addition, as Bornkamm has shown, John 6:60ff. refers back to vss. 35-50 rather than vss. 51-58. Here the themes are belief (64), coming to Jesus (65), and the words of eternal life (68). John 6:63 ("It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life") stands in contradiction to 6:51-58. The natural conclusion is that John 6:51-58, with its emphasis on eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, is the insertion of a later redactor.

It is highly unlikely that there was no cultic meal in the Christian circle from which the fourth gospel emanated, and we may suppose that the "sign" (Jn. 6:14) of the feeding of the multitude points to a bread and fish type. There are several features of the Johannine multiplication narrative which have parallels in the Didache and which might, therefore, be echoes of a eucharistic liturgy. For instance, John's phrase "When they had enough" (ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν), is
similar to the beginning of the thanksgiving, immediately after the prayer of the bread, in Didache 10:1: "After you have had enough" (Μετὰ δὲ εἵματος ὑμῶν). Perhaps an even more striking parallel is that between John 6:12, "Gather up the fragments κλάσμα left over, that nothing may be lost," and parts of the Didache's prayer over the bread which read, "Concerning the fragmented bread κλάσμα, 'We give you thanks, our Father . . . . As this fragmented bread was scattered upon the mountains and became one, so let your church be gathered up from the four corners of the earth into your kingdom.'" In addition to using the words εὐχαριστεῖω, συνάγω, and κλάσμα, the Johannine multiplication narrative states that the meal took place on a mountain (Jn. 6:3), and makes reference to the notion of Jesus as king (6:15).

Another interesting possibility concerns the story of Jesus walking on the water, which in all three versions (Mk. 6:45-52; Mt. 14:22-33; Jn. 16-21) is placed immediately after the multiplication narrative. This pericope (which is probably presented in a more original form by John) has all the appearances of a post-resurrectional story: Jesus' body is not confined to the normal exigencies of space and time, and there is an emphasis on Jesus' calming the fear of his disciples when they evidently do not recognise him. If the original form of this story was indeed of the post-resurrectional genre, the transposition of it to its present place in the tradition might
have been due to an association between the bread and fish meal and the resurrectional Christophany.

John 6 and 21 attest to the presence of bread and fish eucharists in the late first century. This type of eucharist may have persisted well into the second century, although supplanted by the Pauline usage in those communities which were beginning to enforce organisational and liturgical unity. Ignatius of Antioch hints that he might be aware of more than one type of eucharist. When he cautions the Philadelphians to use only "one eucharist," he may have in mind not simply a separate celebration, but the use of a separate type of meal by certain Christians. This may be why he stresses so forcefully, "For there is one flesh of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and one cup of his blood that makes us one, and one altar" (Phil. 4:1). Since he nowhere specifies that the "cup" contains wine, he could not have had in mind eucharists which used some other liquid. If he were polemicising against some other "types" of eucharist, it must have been one in which solid food only was consumed.

It is well known that from the late second century the fish appeared as a symbol for Christ. An early example is furnished by Tertullian: "We little fish, like our Fish Jesus Christ, were born in the water, and only by living in the water are we saved" (De bapt. 1).\(^32\) Clement of Alexandria\(^33\) and Origen\(^34\) are also familiar with the symbolism of the fish.
The origin of this symbolism cannot, as many Christians since Optatus (De schism. Donat. 3:2) have supposed, be found in the Greek acrostic for "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour": the acrostic itself presupposes the symbol. If the hypothesis of a eucharistic meal using fish is correct; there can be no doubt that here lies the source of the symbol. It would also lead us to consider whether the appearance of fish in certain early Christian archaeological materials is in fact, as has been generally thought, merely symbolic. Two inscriptions, usually dated from around the end of the second century, allude to the consumption of sacred fish. The first, the Epitaph of Pectorios, found in a cemetery at Antum, evidently describes baptism and a meal of fish:

O race divine of the celestial Fish, Guard your heart pure among men, for you have received An immortal source of wondrous water. And so, My friend, warm your soul in the everlasting waters Of copious wisdom. Take the honey-sweet food That the Saviour gives his holy ones. Sate Your hunger, holding the fish in your hands.

Lord and Saviour, feed us then, I beg, With this fish. We beg you, Light of the deceased, May my mother sleep in peace. Aschandios, father So dear to my heart, together with my sweet mother And my brothers, remember Pectorios in the peace of the Fish.

The first five lines of this poem form the acrostic IXΟΥC.

The second monument, the Abercios Inscription, contains references to fish, wine, and bread:
The faith led me everywhere; everywhere
It offered me as food a fish from the spring,
Large and pure, caught by a pure virgin.
And she constantly gives it to her own dear ones
To eat. She has an excellent wine
To drink, which she offers with the bread. 38

C. Vogel points out that "It is here a question of two types
of meal . . . . It would do violence to the text to suppose
that it is a matter of one and the same meal." 39 The mention
of bread and wine is an obvious allusion to the classical
type of eucharist using those elements, and "it would unduly
simplify matters to suppose that the fish meal is a simple
figure for the traditional eucharistic meal: the text forces
us to admit two types of meal, one as 'real' as the other." 40
There is one further funerary inscription dating from the same
period, that of Licinia Amias, found on the Vatican hill. In
addition to the image of two fish separated by an anchor, it
contains the words ΙΧΘΥΣ ΖΑΝΤΑΝ, "the fish of the living."
Vogel believes that the meaning of this text is "fish of the
Christians." 41

These inscriptions, then, furnish us with evidence of the
continuation of a cultic fish meal well after the New Testament
period. In this case, it is most likely a question of the re-
frigerium, or sacred funerary meal. The same conclusion may
be reached concerning the representations of fish in early Chris-
tian art, of which one of the first examples is the Last Supper
(?) scene from the catacomb of Callistus in Rome, showing Jesus
and his apostles consuming bread and fish rather than bread and wine. For some time archaeologists had attempted to classify such scenes as representations of varying types: funerary meals, the heavenly banquet, the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, and the eucharist (of which the fish was a supposed symbol). Vogel, however, points out that the current trend among Christian archaeologists is to see in these various representations the depicting of an actual meal: "In reality, it seems, the meal scenes in cimemorial iconography are all realistic (i.e., non-symbolic) representations of refrigera or funereal banquets, celebrated down here by the living, and not in the next world by the blessed."

The cumulative evidence of the pertinent New Testament and epigraphical data thus leads us to the conclusion that in addition to the "Pauline" bread and wine type of eucharist, and the bread-only type distinguished by Lietzmann, there existed in early Christianity a third type of eucharistic meal, consisting of bread and fish. This type no doubt grew out of the primitive "breaking of bread" (in which the meal section would probably have sometimes consisted of fish), and was conceived of as a meal with the risen Christ. As the bread and wine type looked back to the Last Supper as its "institution," so this type looked back to Jesus' feeding of the multitude (transformed by tradition into a miracle). During
the second century, this type was either suppressed and replaced by the eucharistic model commended by the Apostle, assimilated into the Agape, or, as the archaeological evidence appears to suggest, in certain circles transformed into a funerary meal which existed side by side with the classical type of eucharist. These funerary meals would have been the natural outgrowth of a rite in which the dominant idea was that of eating with the resurrected Lord, and indeed such a conception may well have persisted in them.

The Formation and Early Development of the Classical Type

Our investigations to this point have led us to distinguish three types of eucharistic meals in the first Christian century. The earliest, the "breaking of the bread" in the primitive Jerusalem community was a direct descendant of Jesus' regular table-fellowship, and was celebrated in conjunction with an actual meal. It was an expression of communion among the first Christians, and its dominant theme was one of eschatological joy in the hope of an imminent return of the Lord. Out of it developed a second type, which reflected a more advanced stage in the Church's self-consciousness. Normally consisting of a meal of bread and fish, its celebrants believed themselves to be sharing the meal with the resurrected Christ, and found a dominical foundation for their rite in the multiplication of the loaves and fishes. Neither of these rites, we have found, was related to Jesus' Last Supper or to a
theology of Jesus' death.

Having digressed somewhat in order to distinguish these two types of early eucharistic meals, we must now return to the Last Supper tradition and to the development of the classical or "Pauline" eucharistic type. In the first chapter we have found that while Jesus did not intend to institute any rite at his Last Supper, it seems that before Paul there was a liturgy (attested in at least two traditions) which was regarded as being in some sense a repetition of the Last Supper. Bread and a cup of wine (or possibly water) constituted the special elements; over them were repeated Jesus' words of institution.

Since, as we have seen, early Jewish Christianity celebrated a "breaking of the bread" type eucharist, we may suppose with Bultmann that his Last Supper type originated in pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity. Using Mark and the Antiochene liturgy as our sources, we can distinguish five theological motifs in this pre-Pauline Hellenistic eucharist. First, there are the words "of the covenant," which interpret Jesus' death as the sacrifice upon which the new covenant is founded. It has been shown above that this conception may be reasonably attributed to Jesus himself. The doctrine of a covenant sacrifice is essentially eschatological: the idea is that just as Yahweh's first covenant with Israel was ratified by a bloody sacrifice (Ex. 24:8-11), so the new covenant, the new eschatological order (Jer. 31:31ff.), is brought into
being through the death of Christ. Secondly, there is the doctrine of expiatory sacrifice for sins, represented by the words "for you" (1 Co. 11:24) or "poured out for many" (Mk. 14:24). There are allusions here to both the cultic sacrifices of propitiation in the Old Testament, and to the Suffering Servant motif. The body and blood of Christ have been offered as a sacrifice to atone for man's sin; Christ is the Suffering Servant who freely gave himself for the multitude. Thirdly, there is what Bultmann calls the "sacramental interpretation of the act," i.e., the idea that the bread and wine are offered to the partakers of the meal as the body and blood of Jesus. This notion was almost certainly pre-Pauline; in fact, Bultmann, who does not accept that the Last Supper tradition goes back to Jesus, believes that the idea of communion in the body and blood of Christ was the original and dominant eucharistic motif. The rhetorical question in 1 Co. 10:16 suggests that this conception was well known to Paul's readers, and Goguel contends that even the rhythmic form of the verse indicates a liturgical formula:

The cup of blessing which we bless,
is it not a participation in the blood of Christ?
The bread which we break,
is it not a participation in the body of Christ?

To these three motifs distinguished by Bultmann we may add another: the preservation of the eschatological vow of absti-
nence in the three synoptic gospels, as well as Paul's declaration that the eucharistic celebration proclaims the Lord's death "until he comes" (1 Co. 11:26), indicates that the celebration was considered an anticipation of the messianic banquet. Finally, in the Antiochene liturgy a specifically aetiological motif was introduced in the form of the injunction to repeat. This injunction gives a formal validity to the cultic action: it is now a form of sacred law, and through it the saving act of Christ is made present by anamnesis.

In addition to these motifs which have been discerned from the institution narratives, another aspect of this primitive classical type eucharist may be determined from an examination of a different liturgical formula, namely the Marantha. The presence of this formula in the liturgy of the Didache (10:6) suggests that even in the period we are considering now it belonged to the eucharistic celebration. The fact that the expression is Aramaic is proof of its antiquity, and, as was noted in the first section of this chapter, it was originally used in the earliest continuation of Jesus' table-fellowship, in which the disciples confidently expected the imminent return of the Lord. However, Paul's citation of the same formula (1 Co. 16:22) attests to the fact that it was carried over into the "sacramental" celebrations of Hellenistic Christianity. Its very presence in these celebrations is
an indication that here the formula should not be interpreted in a purely futuristic-eschatological sense, and that it is a sort of proto-epiclesis, invoking the presence of the Lord in the meal. The interesting feature of this invocation is that in all three instances of its appearance in early Christian literature (1 Co. 16:22; Apoc. 22:20; Did. 10:6) it is immediately preceded by an anathematisation of or call to repentance of unfaithful Christians. This fact leads us to deduce the presence of a further theological motif in the pre-Pauline Hellenistic eucharist; that of Christ's judgement. It appears that there was a transition from the conception of Christ's future judgement at the parousia, a conception to which expression was given in the earliest breaking of the bread rite, to the conception of Christ's present judgement of the participants in the eucharistic meal. This transition would have occurred with the carrying over of the Anathema-Maranatha formulae from the earlier, eschatologically-oriented bread fellowship to the Hellenistic rite which was conceived of as a communion with the Lord. This process constitutes an important link between the earliest cultic meals and the eucharist of Paul, for whom the eucharist was an occasion of judgement (1 Co. 11:28-30; this aspect of Paul's theology is discussed below).

One further observation concerning the eucharistic rite inherited by Paul is appropriate at this point. In a recent
article, H. Schuermann has pointed out that in spite of the difference in ideas at the verbal level between Jesus' Last Supper and the early Christian eucharist, there is a fundamental unity of conception at the level of action. The two-fold action of offering the bread and the cup—which was without parallel in contemporary Jewish custom insofar as this action was accompanied by words of interpretation, and insofar as a single cup was shared by all present—signified at both the Last Supper and in the later eucharistic meals the offering of a gift of blessing (Segensgabe); in both cases this blessing can be understood as a participation in the new eschatological order.

We thus have before A.D. 55 or 56 an established rite in which we find the essential elements of the "classical" type of eucharistic celebration. This rite is very different from either of the first two types which we have examined. It does share with the bread and fish type a notion of communion with Christ, but this is conceived of in a very different way. At the same time, it too must have developed out of the original breaking of the bread. Our problem at this point is to determine how this original celebration was transformed into a rite which was closely connected with Jesus' death and which offered its participants communion in the body and blood of Christ.

To confront this problem, we must consider the difficult and complicated question of the influence of Greek mystery
religions on the sacramental theology of early Hellenistic Christianity. There are some, like Albert Schweitzer, who believe that the type of celebration which Paul took over from primitive Christianity was essentially an eschatological meal, thoroughly Jewish in its conceptions and devoid of Hellenistic influence. However, when one examines the theological motifs of this celebration, and contrasts them with the dominant mood of the Judaeo-Christian breaking of the bread rite, it seems impossible to deny their affinity with the mysteries. "In Hellenistic Christianity the Lord's Supper, like baptism, is understood as a sacrament in the sense of the mystery religions," argues Bultmann. Paul himself hints that he is aware of this affinity, by his use of the expression "the table of the Lord," a Hellenistic term for cultic banquets, and by the way in which he contrasts the cup and table of the Lord with heathen sacrificial meals (1 Co. 10:21).

The term "mystery religions" refers to those Greek religious fellowships which were characterised by secret rites of initiation and sacred meals in which the faithful communicated with the deity. Odo Casel defines them thus:

Mysterion, or more usually the plural mysteria, is the Greek designation for the ancient Hellenic and later Hellenistic secret cults which are unlike the cults of the Polis; they give to the worshippers of a god, who have been specially initiated and thereby joined to the god, a closer and more personal union with him; this union reaches beyond death and promises a happy existence in the next world.
In classical Greece, the best known mysteries are those of Demeter and Persephone celebrated at Eleusis. In the Hellenistic period they were chiefly of eastern origin, coming from Anatolia (Cybele-Attis), Egypt (Isis-Osiris), Syria (Aphrodite-Adonis), and Persia (Mithras). While the mythological basis of these mysteries differed, each of them had a sacred meal (in the cult of Mithras, the priest uttered a formula over a piece of bread and a cup of water; in that of Osiris, the faithful ate and drank Osiris in the form of bread and water). In the rites of Cybele and Attis the initiate was believed to be reborn through baptism in the blood of a bull (taurobolium) or ram (criobolium). The purpose of these initiatory rites and sacred meals was to renew the believer and bring him into a mystic union with the deity. Through the sacred ritual the primordial saving deed of the god was believed to be made present; the congregation, by performing the rite, took part in the saving act and thereby won salvation. 

"The members of the cult present again in a ritual, symbolic fashion, that primeval act; in holy words and rites of priest and faithful the reality is there once more. The celebrant community is united in the deepest fashion with the Lord they worship."

Many of these mystery rites celebrated a redemption prof­fered by a dying and resurrecting god. As an example, we can
cite the observations of Lucian (De Dea Syria 6) concerning the Aphrodite cult:

And I saw in Byblos a great shrine of the Aphrodite of Byblos in which they also carry out the Orgia of Adonis. For they say that the downfall of Adonis was brought about in their land by the wild boar. In memory of his suffering they strike themselves each year and mourn. They carry out the mysteries (Syria) and they carry out great mourning feasts throughout the land. But when they have struck themselves enough and have wept enough they sacrifice to Adonis; first a sacrifice of the dead, as to one who is dead; then, on the next day, they recite the myth that he is alive, and they send him up into the air.

In such a rite, just as in the bread and cup type eucharist of Hellenistic Christianity, there is an emphasis on the redeeming efficacy of the god's death. "The Kyrios of a mystery is a god who has entered into human misery and struggle, has made his appearance on earth (epiphany) and fought here, suffered, even been defeated; the whole sorrow of mankind in pain is brought together in a mourning for the god who must die."67

From even this cursory glance at the ideas and rites of the mystery religions, it will be obvious that there are many striking parallels with early Hellenistic and Pauline Christianity, and in particular with the eucharistic celebration taken over by Paul from the earlier Gentile church. The question of the relationship between Christianity and the mysteries is not, as we have said, simple, and it is not within
the scope of this essay to discuss it in great detail. At one time Richard Reitzenstein could confidently proclaim that he had found the source of Christian doctrine in the Iranian mysteries, and Wilhelm Bousset could find in the mysteries' cultic imitation of the death and resurrection of the god the basis for the Pauline doctrine of participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. For a number of reasons, few scholars today would hold to a direct genetic dependence of early Christianity upon the mystery religions. In the case of the eucharist, we have seen in the first chapter that the eucharist and the Last Supper tradition could not, as believed by Heitmueller and others, have been created by Hellenistic Christianity out of pre-existent mystery conceptions. Some scholars, especially those influenced by the Barthian notion of the incomparable nature of the Gospel, go so far as to deny any influence of the mysteries on the primitive Christian message. They stress that Christianity, unlike the mysteries, derives from a specific historical personnage, and they contend that one can adequately explain the theology of early Christianity--its doctrines of the resurrection, of redemption, and even of the sacraments--in terms of Jewish categories, and without recourse to Greek mysteries.

A different approach is that of Arthur Darby Nock, who rejects a relationship between early Christianity and the
mysteries on the grounds of linguistic evidence. He finds that the characteristic vocabulary of the mystery rites—
teleutē̂ (initiation), μνέω (initiate), μυστήριον (mystery)—do not form part of the language of early Christianity, at least in the sense which these words had in the mysteries. John uses none of these words; Paul never uses teleutē̂; he uses μνέω only once to describe what life had taught him (Phil. 4:12), and though he uses μυστήριον often, it is only in the LXX sense of "secret." With respect to Christian worship, Nock argues that its vocabulary, words such as "blessing" and "thanksgiving," are typically Jewish. Nock recognised that "the Eucharist regarded as the actualisation of a soteriological drama is in a line with contemporary mysteries," yet he does not believe that it is the case of one influencing the other, but rather "one of the clearest cases of convergent religious development."

Nevertheless, we must recognise that mystery conceptions represent something more than simple technical vocabulary, and that the mystery religions may have provided for early Gentile Christianity a kind of spiritual atmosphere which may have made possible the development of Christian ideas in a certain direction. This implies not so much a simple borrowing of mystery conceptions as an unconscious assimilation of the type of religious experience presented by the mysteries. This is the position of Odo Casel and his disciples among the
monks of Maria Laach. Arguing from a theological point of view, Casel believes that the mysteries furnished a providential foreshadowing of Christianity. Although, he says, Christianity has rejected these heathen mysteries because of God's unique revelation in Christ, "at the same time it has used their language in order to clarify for the faithful the essence of revelation and the religion of the next world, and especially the interior meaning of its own ritual and worship which makes present and permits participation in God's saving work in Christ." For Christianity, the fundamental mystery is that of Christ himself, as is suggested by Paul in 1 Co. 2:1: "When I came to you, brethren, I did not come proclaiming to you the mystery of God in lofty words or wisdom. For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified." And it is in the mystery of worship that this first and fundamental mystery is continually made present to the community of believers.

An admission of some kind of influence of the Greek mysteries upon early Christianity must be qualified by the recognition of two factors. The first is that the mysteries were probably not the only form of Hellenistic religious expression which exercised an influence upon early Greek Christianity. Bultmann and Kaesemann maintain that an early form of Gnosticism with a heavenly redeemer myth also exercised a decisive influence on the theology of primitive Christianity.
The second is that one must distinguish between the type of influence exercised by the mysteries on the Christianity of the New Testament period and that type which appears in a later period. Hugo Rahner distinguishes three stages in this process. First, in the New Testament period and especially with Paul, there was an unconscious assimilation of certain mystery conceptions; yet Christianity remained quite a different sort of religious phenomenon, still strongly eschatological and expressing itself chiefly within a framework of Jewish ideas. Then in the second and third centuries, when the mysteries themselves took on a neo-Platonic character, we find on the one hand a Christian polemic against mysteries, and on the other hand the application of mystery-religion vocabulary (such as μυστήριον and sacramentum) to Christian worship. Finally, in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the pagan mysteries were drawing to an end and had ceased to be a serious threat to Christianity, one finds in the church the full application of what Rahner calls "a mannered mystery terminology," as well as such mystery practices as the disciplina arcana. "It was," Nock observes, "a matter of diplomatic and paedogogic technique, and involved a fairly conscious effort."

The early history of the classical type of eucharist can be understood as an element in the gradual process of the Hellenisation and de-eschatologisation of the theology and practice
of the primitive Christian Church. An important factor in this process was the influence, even if at first only indirect, of the Greek mystery religions. There can be little doubt that this factor was decisive in the transformation of the Judaeo-Christian breaking of the bread into the Hellenistic Christian rite which actualised the Christian soteriological drama and which brought the believers into a direct communion with their Lord. Early Gentile Christianity had inherited both the fellowship meal and the oral tradition concerning Jesus' Last Supper. With the aid of those mystery conceptions which formed part of the common cultural heritage of the Hellenistic world, it was a simple matter to combine these two traditions and thereby create the sacramental celebration which was to become the basic eucharistic model. Naturally, mystery conceptions were not the only ones which contributed to this development. For early Christians--Greek as well as Jewish--the Old Testament served as a source-book from which they could draw what they believed to be divinely revealed ideas to interpret the saving act of Christ. Thus the motifs of cultic sacrifice, of the Suffering Servant, and, by the time of the synoptic gospels, of the Passover, could easily be introduced into the eucharistic celebration.

Thus the type of eucharist which Paul took over from the Hellenistic church was already, in a sense, a "mystery."
Paul's understanding of the sacred meal can be viewed as an interpretation in the light of his own view of the salvation occurrence of the sacrament which he inherited. On the one hand, Paul assimilated from the Hellenistic church both the eucharistic celebration (specifically, in the form of that Antiochene liturgy which was also used by Luke) and the conception of it as a sacrament which effects communion with the crucified and risen Christ. On the other hand, as Kaesemann has pointed out, "almost the whole of Paul's interpretation of the primitive eucharistic tradition bears the mark of the fact that he has adopted and adapted the gnostic myth of an Archetypal Man who is also the Redeemer." Thus Paul closely relates the eucharistic body of Christ to the mystical body of Christ, as well as to the proclamation of the Gospel as a present reality.

Paul speaks of the eucharist on only two occasions, in chapter ten and in chapter eleven of 1 Corinthians. In chapter ten Paul alludes to the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist in connection with a discussion of Christian ethical responsibility. In the first thirteen verses of this chapter, the Apostle is attempting to correct any false confidence which might arise out of participation in these sacraments. This he does by reference to the fate of the unfaithful Israelites at the time of the Exodus:
I want you to know, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all ate the same spiritual food and drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual rock which followed them, and the rock was Christ. Nevertheless, with most of them God was not pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness (1 Co. 10:1-5).

In this passage, Paul is seeking to establish not merely the similarities, but the identity of the old and the new saving events: it is Christ himself which was the rock accompanying the wanderings of the Jews. The passing through the Red Sea and journeying beneath the pillar of cloud corresponds to baptism; the eating of manna and drinking of the water of the rock to the eucharist. As the Israelites were the chosen people who were called to take possession of the Promised Land, so Christians are now those "upon whom the end of the ages has come" (1 Co. 10:11), those who are the heirs of the messianic kingdom. Paul's purpose in thus portraying Israel as the first recipient of the Christian sacraments was to refute the opinion of certain Corinthians that their sacraments were in themselves a guarantee of salvation: if those who were baptised in the cloud and the sea, who consumed the first spiritual food and drink, were not secure from punishment, neither are those in the church who receive baptism and participate in the eucharistic meal. The source of the Corinthian misconception was, as Kaesemann points out, the Hellenistic (Gnostic) view of πνεῦμα as a heavenly substance which
can invade man's earthly nature (σάρξ) and recapture him for the heavenly world.

Yet Paul himself makes use of this same conception of πνεῦμα to expound his own sacramental doctrine. Human existence is not for him autonomous; rather it is determined by its involvement in the universe, and is the object of strife between the earthly and heavenly powers. Within the context of this anthropological view, the divine πνεῦμα is for Paul "the substance of resurrection corporeality and the dimension in which the Risen One exists." Thus, according to the interpretation of Kaesemann, the meaning of many passages where Paul speaks of Christ "in us" or us "in Christ" is that Christ enters into us as πνεῦμα, while we are members of Christ as his body. For Paul, both baptism and the eucharist are means by which we are incorporated into the body of Christ, and both are the work of the one Spirit. In 1 Co. 12:13 Paul declares that "by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body," and in the passage cited above the same conception of Spirit is applied to the eucharist. Here βρῶμα πνευματικὸν and πόμα πνευματικὸν mean food and drink which convey πνεῦμα. But for Paul, unlike the Corinthian enthusiasts, this does not result in any automatic salvation; rather it gives man the possibility to participate in the new life provided by Christ.
In the second part of chapter ten (vss. 14-22), Paul moves on to warn the Corinthians against the worship of idols. He recalls to his readers two acknowledged facts: that the eucharistic cup and bread are a participation in the blood and body of Christ, and that participation in heathen cultic meals involves a fellowship with devils. To understand Paul's argument here, we must realise that for him pagan gods were not merely creations of men's imagination, but were actual demons. In the pagan sacrificial ritual to which Paul is referring, the flesh of the slain animal was divided into three parts after having been offered to the god. One part was burnt on the altar, and was supposed to be eaten by the god. The second part was given to the temple, and if the temple did not need it, it could be sold in the market. The third part belonged to the person who provided the offering, to be used by him for a meal which took place at the table of the god in the temple. By means of this meal, the host and his guests entered into communion with the god. With regard to meat sold in the market, Paul says simply that the Christian should not bother himself enquiring as to whether it has been sacrificed (10:25). But with regard to the cultic meal, he states quite flatly, "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons" (10:20f.).
We have seen already how Paul's comparison of the eucharistic cup and table with Hellenistic sacrificial meals throws light on the meaning of the formulae κοινωνία τοῦ ἁίματος and κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ κριστοῦ (10:16), and that the idea, and perhaps even the formulae themselves, were inherited from the pre-Pauline Hellenistic church. It is, moreover, interesting to note in this verse the emphasis placed on the blessing of the cup ("the cup of blessing which we bless") and the breaking of the bread ("the bread which we break"); it appears that the blessing of the cup and the breaking of the bread give to the elements of the meal their special character. Goguel comments: "It would be premature to talk here of a consecration of the elements, but the idea is here in embryo."93

In the following verse, there is a transition from a conception of the body of Christ in which we are participants to a conception of the body of Christ which we ourselves constitute, and to make this transition, Paul reverses the normal order of the bread and the cup in v. 16.94 It is in verse 17 that Paul's thought advances upon the eucharistic theology which he inherited. He declares, "Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one body." There is a clear parallel between this verse and 1 Co. 12:13, "For by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body."95 A like power is predicated of the "one Spirit" and the "one
bread." Indeed, as has been remarked in connection with verse 10:3, the eucharistic food and drink itself conveys πνεῦμα. It is thus precisely by giving himself to us as πνεῦμα, that Christ, the Archetypal Man, gathers us together and incorporates us into his body.96

The second passage where Paul speaks of the eucharist is 1 Co. 11:17-34. The Apostle's primary concern in this passage is to rebuke the Corinthian Christians for their uncharitable conduct at the community meals. The term "Lord's Supper" (11:20), which Paul uses to describe these meals, evidently refers to a single community feast, comprising both what will later be called the "agape" and the "eucharist" (cf. 11:24). In fact it is likely that in the Corinthian celebration the "eucharistic" elements (i.e., the bread and the cup) were separated by the meal proper. The words "after supper" (11:25), written in reference to the cup, suggest that it was distributed after the meal. We may therefore conjecture that the rite opened with the distribution of the bread, was followed by the consumption of the "agape," and was concluded with the blessing and distribution of the cup.97 It seems Paul desired to minimize the actual meal (10:22, "Do you not have your own houses to eat and drink in?" and 10:34, "if any one is hungry, let him eat at home"), though it is not likely, as Delling believes,98 that he wished to forbid all eating and drinking apart from the bread and cup. The "agape" was
not to be a real dinner to satisfy hunger, but rather a ritual table fellowship. We might point out that Paul nowhere specifies that the cup contained wine, and that it is possible in the light of Ro. 14:21 ("it is right not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that makes your brother stumble"), and of the practice of bread and water eucharists by the Marcionites and other second century groups, that Paul preferred the use of water in the cup.

Ideally, this "Lord's Supper" (the name indicates an evening meal) was supposed to begin when all were present, and the food was to be shared in common. But apparently the rich Christians (10:22b) were inconsiderate towards the poorer ones, and started before the others (10:21, 34). Instead of being the common, solemn celebration which Paul desired, the Supper had degenerated into a number of private parties. It is against this background that Paul quotes and comments upon Jesus' words of interpretation.

Kaesemann has drawn attention to the number of legal terms which appear in this passage: συνήχεσθαι (11:27), ἀναδίκως (11:27), and ἔνοχος (11:27), and διαθήκη (11:25). "Here," Kaesemann says, "there is being handed on to the community an obligatory formula of sacred law, the unimpeachable validity of which corresponds to its content and to the sacred nature of the action set in motion by this content." The sacrament is no longer primarily an anticipation of the eschatological
banquet, but rather an ordinance tied to the time of the church, i.e., from the death of Christ to the parousia. The celebration of the Lord's Supper—and in particular the "eucharistic" parts, the blessing and consumption of the bread and the cup—brings present here and now Christ in his redeeming death, and thereby brings the believers into communion with their Kyrios. The eucharist is a "remembrance" (10:24, 25) of the Cross, conceived of not as a simple remembering, but rather as "objectively recalling the past so that it is again present and living." Behm explains that the early Christians commemorate not merely in such sort that they simply remember, but rather in accordance with the active sense of ἀνάμνησις. The making present by the later community of the Lord who instituted the Supper, and who put a new διάθηκη into effect by his death, is the goal and content of their action, in which they repeat what was done by Jesus and his Disciples on the eve of his crucifixion.

In this sense, one can speak of a "real presence" of Christ in the eucharist, and it is in this context that we must understand the meaning of the words of interpretation for Paul. There is a clear connection between these sayings and the making present of Christ—the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup is a proclamation of the Lord's death (10:26). Thus this presence is in some way mediated by the elements themselves. Here the body and blood of Christ and the death of Christ are one and the same. The words of interpretation tell exactly what the elements are for the participants in the
celebration—the sacrificed body of Christ and the covenant in his blood. And it is this body and blood which is profaned in the unworthy consumption of the bread and cup (10: 27). It is pointless to ask whether for Paul (and other early Christians) the eucharistic presence is literal or symbolic, since for Paul, and in antiquity generally, that which represents actually brings the presence of what is represented and mediates participation in it. This "mythological" character of the early understanding of eucharistic presence will be further explored in the appendix.

It will be noticed that words of interpretation in the liturgy cited by Paul present us with two different but related conceptions. According to the bread formula, the sacramental gift is participation in the crucified body of Christ (i.e., the death of Christ), and according to the cup formula, it is a participation in the "new covenant." The word καινός in the latter saying is to be understood eschatologically, as referring to that which is final. The "new covenant" here means Christ's actualising of the eschatological order, his making it an already present reality. The connection between the two sayings is that the death of Jesus establishes the new covenant. The eucharistic cup mediates participation in the new divine order because it mediates participation in the death of Christ ("the covenant in my blood"), on which
this order is founded. "The eucharist gives salvation here and now by putting believers in communion with Christ and making them members of his body, beings who henceforth belong to the world of Spirit." 

After having warned the Corinthian Christians against unworthy reception of the eucharistic elements, Paul goes on to admonish his Corinthian readers thus:

Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgement upon himself. That is why many of you are weak and ill, and some have fallen asleep (11:28-30).

This text, and particularly the phrase μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα (v.29), has been much disputed. Does the word "body" in the words "without discerning the body" refer to the eucharistic body or to the body of Christ as the church? The normal Pauline meaning of the term body of Christ is indeed the Christian community. The fact that the context of the passage as a whole is disorder in the church, and the fact that Paul speaks only of discerning the "body" and not "the body and blood," lead many authorities to believe that Paul must have here in mind the church. If this were the case, then eating and drinking without discerning the body would refer to conduct at the Lord's Supper arising out of a failure to recognise the church for what it is, and the judgement inflicted upon the unworthy in v.30 would not at all be connected with any power
in the elements themselves. On the other hand, one could argue that the words "without discerning the body" must be understood in relation to the two previous verses, and therefore must refer to the sacramental element of the bread. It would thus be the sacramental body of Christ which moves us to judge ourselves, and brings upon us the judgement of God. Yet in interpreting this text, we must bear in mind that for Paul there are not two bodies of Christ. Paul says, "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many are one body, so it is with Christ" (1 Co. 12:12), and "Because there is one bread which is the body of Christ, we who are many are one body" (10:17). For Paul, the body which is given to us in the eucharist is that same body which we ourselves are, and by eating the body of Christ we become it. We do not then, in 10:29, have to set up an opposition between the eucharistic and the mystical body of Christ. "Without discerning the body" means failing to recognise that corporeal self-manifestation of Christ through which we are constituted as his body. This does not mean, however, that the eucharistic elements contain some magical property which averts the sickness and death referred to in v.30:

The apostle does not...mean to imply that the worthy reception of the Eucharist prevents
sickness and death. He is simply observing that the seemingly uncommon experience of sickness and death ought to be attributed to a visible judgement of God on the unworthy reception of the Eucharist. For the unworthy, the Eucharist becomes a medicine of death in the sense that it becomes the occasion of the judgement of God.

It is possible now to summarise the understanding of the classical type of eucharist as formulated in the thought of Paul. The eucharist for Paul, as for the pre-Pauline Hellenistic church, was a "mystery" type of sacrament instituted by Christ to bring believers into direct communion with him during "the time of the church." In this sacrament the sacrifice of Christ is made present. Christ offers himself—his redeeming body and blood—to the believers as τέλειον. Through this offering the believers are given the possibility of a new life in the eschatological order, and through it they are constituted as the mystical body of Christ. But this sacrament is by no means an automatic guarantee of salvation, and uncharitable conduct is a profamation of the body of Christ—the one body of Christ which is manifested both in the eucharistic celebration and as the community itself—and provokes the judgement of God.

After Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, the next sources which we have concerning the classical type of eucharist are the Last Supper narratives in the synoptic gospels. These narratives do not reveal any startling advance over the eucharistic theology of Paul, and indeed they lack the indivi-
duality and subtlety of the Apostle's thought. They represent rather an accentuation of certain themes in the Hellenistic eucharist which existed already before Paul. As we have noted in the beginning of this section, this pre-Pauline eucharist of the classical type already contained the characteristic themes of covenant, expiatory sacrifice, communion, and institution of the rite by Christ. The most striking development evident in the synoptic evangelists is the stress on the idea of atonement, a phenomenon which can be interpreted as a step in the evolution of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. Luke, who reproduces a variant of the liturgy used by Paul, has the words "given for you" and "which is poured out for you" added to the bread and cup sayings (22:19f.). In Mark (who is here followed by Matthew) the cup saying is brought into line with the bread saying, thus emphasising the notion of cultic sacrifice by making "body" and "blood" parallel predicates. In Mark, the blood "is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (26:28). Further, all three synoptics portray the Last Supper as a Passover meal (Mk. 14:12ff.; Mt. 26:17ff.; Lk. 22:7ff.), thereby suggesting that the body and blood offered in the eucharist replace the pascal lamb.

To be sure, the Last Supper accounts of each gospel reflect to some degree the particular theological perspective
of its evangelist (or of the community which he represents), and these particular concerns are not without importance for the later history of this eucharistic type. Thus Matthew, which has been described as the "ecclesiastical gospel," emphasises that Jesus gave the bread "to the disciples" (as opposed to a simple "them" in Mark; Mt. 26:26, Mk. 14:22). The notion of the eucharist as a corporate act founded by Christ's command is accentuated by Matthew's changing of Mark's "they all drank of it" (14:23) to the imperative "Drink of it, all of you" (Mt. 26:27), and by his addition of "with you" to the vow of abstinence (26:29). Moreover, Matthew's important addition of "for the forgiveness of sins" to the cup saying also has an ecclesiological significance: for Matthew, the authority to forgive sins had become the possession of the community--this most probably is the point he wishes to make in the story of the forgiving and healing of the paralytic (Mt. 9:2-8). Thus until the coming of the parousia the eucharist is celebrated so that men may be freed from their sins.

Luke's Last Supper narrative is perhaps even more revealing of the theological perspective of the author than those of the other two synoptic evangelists. As Voobus has pointed out, Luke is the only synoptic evangelist who really integrates organically the Last Supper account into the larger literary structure of the passion narrative. His additions to and alterations of the tradition which he received are indi-
cative of his theological position, and in particular his conception of sacred history. This conception, which has been explored in the well-known work of Hans Conzelmann, was Luke's response to the problem of the delay of the parousia and the continuing existence of the church; it was marked by an understanding of human history being divided into three stages, that of "the law and the prophets... until John" (Lk. 16:16), that of Jesus' ministry, and that of the period from the ascension to the parousia ("the time of the church"). While, as was remarked in our first chapter, the twofold form of the vow of abstinence was in all probability drawn from a pre-Lucan source, there are nevertheless indications that this source has been retouched by Luke to bring it into line with his own theological convictions. Thus in the vow concerning the cup, where Mark (followed quite closely by Matthew) has Jesus renouncing the fruit of the vine "until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mk. 14:25; cf. Mt. 26:29), Luke's wording is "until the kingdom of God comes" (Lk. 22:18), a formula which emphasises the period of waiting between the end of Jesus' ministry and the parousia.

Similarly, in Luke 22:27-30 (which is an integral part of Luke's Last Supper narrative), the present role of the disciples, who may be here understood as representing the church, on the one hand looks back to the ministry of Jesus (v.28:
"You are those who have continued with me in my trials") and on the other hand looks forward to the eschatological banquet and judgement at the time of the **parousia** (v. 30). For those who are **presently** sitting at table (v. 27)--we may suppose here that Luke has in mind the community celebrating the eucharist--Jesus is said to "appoint" (v. 29) a kingdom, or make a covenant (**διατίθημι**). Furthermore, Luke's choice of the Antiochene liturgical source over Mark for his form of the words of interpretation was no doubt motivated by the same conception of sacred history: the command "Do this in remembrance of me" (Lk. 22:19) authenticated the celebration of the eucharistic meal during the interim period of the church.

It is certainly within this same context that we must consider Luke's reports of sacred meals in primitive Christianity. For Luke, the breaking of the bread (Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7,11; 27:35) was a rite celebrated in the time when the Spirit had been given to the community which was awaiting the consummation (cf. Acts 1:6ff.; 2:1ff.). In this respect, it is important to note Luke's report that Paul, immediately after his conversion, "was baptised and took food and was strengthened" (Acts 9:19). The reference to taking food is doubtless for the evangelist an allusion to the eucharist; elsewhere this expression is connected with the breaking of the bread (Acts 2:46, 27:36). Such is probably also the case in Luke's story of the conversion of Paul's and Silas' gaoler: a meal follows immediately upon the baptism of the gaoler and his family (Acts 16:
The sacred meal is thus for Luke closely linked to baptism (cf. also Acts 2:41f.); the two rites are the continuing signs of faith (cf. Acts 16:31f.) and of the presence of Christ (Lk. 24:35, Acts 2:38) after his ascension and during the reign of the Spirit in the community (Acts 1:5; 2:38; 9:17).

The Development of the Classical Type of Eucharist in Deutero-John and Ignatius of Antioch

Toward the close of the New Testament period the theology of the eucharist of the classical type underwent a further development which was to be of decisive importance for the future of eucharistic theology. This development is summarised in Ignatius' description of the sacrament as "the medicine of immortality" (Eph. 20:2), and it may be interpreted as the result of the increasing Hellenisation and deseschatologisation of the Christian faith. In addition to the notion of a communal participation in the body and blood of Christ, there was now added an emphasis on the eucharist as a guarantee of salvation for the individual. This aspect of eucharistic theology was to be reinforced by an increasing accentuation of the sacrificial motif: in both John 6 and Ignatius the eucharistic bread is designated as the "flesh" of Christ, a term which, when used in conjunction with "blood," is essentially sacrificial.

This trend does not represent a contradiction of the earlier understanding of the eucharist, but rather a develop-
ment out of it. We have seen that for Paul the eucharistic celebration constituted a sharing in Christ's resurrection form of being, a notion which was associated with the idea of the eucharist as an anticipation of the messianic banquet. However, with the continuing delay of the parousia, this primitive eschatological sense of imminence gave way to the conception of the eucharist as a present guarantee for the future resurrection.

We should note here that this new emphasis is closely connected with a shift in christological and soteriological theory, a shift which may also be related to a lessening interest in eschatology and to the further borrowing of Hellenistic ideas. In an earlier period, Christ was seen as living within the church itself, and his presence was considered as the power which sustains its members. It is thus that Paul speaks of the Christian life as a life "in Christ" and the Fourth Evangelist speaks of an "abiding in Christ," a relationship which for him is analogous to that existing between the vine and its branches. But we find within the New Testament itself the appearance of a new tendency, namely to place Christ in the transcendental sphere. This tendency is clear in such credal formulations as "who has gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God, with angels, authorities, and powers subject to him" (1 Pet. 5:22), and "we have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven" (Hb. 8:1). Such
a conception gave rise to the belief that the apotheosis which Christ had gained through his death and resurrection could be transferred to individual believers by means of sacramental mediation, i.e., that the sacrament could serve as a bridge between the believer and the transcendent world.

At the same time, the Deutero-Johannine and Ignatian understanding of the eucharist represents an interpretation of the sacrament in terms of the Logos theory. The use of the word σῶς by these authors in connection with the eucharist indicates that they understand it in terms of the Hellenistic doctrine of redemption as a unification of flesh and spirit (καὶ πνευματικῆ, Ignatius, AdMagn. 13:2). Thus in the eucharistic celebration there is a continuation of that union of Logos-Spirit and matter which began with Christ. This theory ultimately led to the replacement of the prayer for the return of Christ by the epiclesis prayer for the Logos-Spirit to descend and unite itself with the elements.

We shall turn now to examine more closely the eucharistic theology presented in John 6. Earlier in this chapter we have argued that the Fourth Evangelist himself was not familiar with the classical bread and wine type of eucharist, but instead with a rather different sort of cultic meal in which
bread and fish were consumed. Few scholars, however, have made this distinction, and most of them have assumed the essential integrity and unity of the Gospel. With this assumption, exegetes have meticulously searched in John for symbolic allusions to the classical eucharist. The result of these labours has been a eucharistic interpretation of such passages as the marriage at Cana, the cleansing of the Temple, the allegory of the vine, and Christ's washing of the disciples' feet.\(^\text{128}\)

The same assumption has led to considerable complication in the interpretation of the Bread of Life discourse in John 6. The apparent contradictions in the discourse were already noted by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who maintained that the whole of the discourse referred to the nourishment of man's soul with the word of Christ. This interpretation was revived in the sixteenth century by the Protestant Reformers and by Cajetan (who used it in order to defend communion under one kind).\(^\text{129}\) R. Brown has distinguished five theories concerning the meaning and composition of the discourse which have attracted modern scholars:

1) That the whole discourse (Jn. 6:35-59) refers to the revelation in Jesus and his teaching (Godet, Weiss, Bornhauesser, Odeberg, Schlatter).

2) That only the first part (vss. 35-50 or 35-51a) has this "sapiential" theme, vss. 51(b)-58 referring to the eu-
charistic flesh of Jesus (Lagrange, Schweizer, Menoud, Mollat, Mussner, Bultmann, Dodd, Barrett).

3) That the whole discourse refers to the eucharistic bread (Loisy, Togac, Cullmann, van den Bussche).

4) That the whole refers to both Christ's revelation and the eucharist (Léon-Dufour).

5) That the first part refers primarily to revelation, and secondarily to the eucharist; the second part to the eucharist only (Feuillet, R. Brown).

We have argued above for the second theory, on the grounds of certain contradictions between the first and second parts of the discourse and because of our analysis of other Johannine texts which point to a different type of eucharistic meal than that referred to in Jn. 6:51b-58. In addition to these reasons, we may, with Bultmann, point out that the notion of the "medicine of immortality" found in Jn. 6:51b-58 is inconsistent with John's realised eschatology, and that the offence which the Jews are said to take at Jesus' offer of his flesh and blood is of quite a different sort than the skandala which arises from the peculiar Johannine dualism, which is missing here.

The second part of the Bread of Life discourse is, then, in all probability an insertion by a later ecclesiastical redactor, probably from the early second century. This redac-
tor found in the Johannine discourse a convenient model for an exposition of his eucharistic theology, a theology which was strikingly similar to that of Ignatius, and which, as we have remarked, reflected different christological and soteriological conceptions than those of John.

The type of eucharistic celebration referred to in this passage is essentially the same type as that referred to in the Pauline and synoptic institution narratives. Yet this observation reveals immediately a striking difference: it is not an institution narrative, and it is not inserted into the context of the Last Supper. It may well be that in the celebration which the redactor here had in mind the words of institution were recited in some form close to the Pauline-synoptic formulae—Jn. 6:51, "The bread that I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world," resembles the Lucan formula "This is my body which is given for you," and could be a reworking of such a formula—but the redactor has no interest in relating the celebration back to the Last Supper. The reason for this is that he has no concern for the historical Jesus; what concerns him is the redemptive power of Jesus' death. The gift of immortality was won through Christ's death, and thus the means of communicating this gift, the sacraments, are also founded on this death. This idea is contained in the report of blood and water coming from Jesus' side (Jn. 19:34b).
Here blood and water have a different meaning than in the more properly Johannine passage 1 Jn. 5:6, where the water and blood denote points of time in Christ's ministry (his baptism and death) and are of primarily anti-docetic intent, affirming that Christ came "not only with water, but with water and blood," i.e., that he suffered a real death. Jn. 19:34b is therefore doubtlessly an addition of the same ecclesiastical redactor who inserted Jn. 6:51b-58 and Jn. 3:5 ("Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God"), and, as Bultmann says, "Its meaning can hardly be other than that in Jesus' death on the cross, the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper have their foundation." Such, indeed, was the way in which the Fathers interpreted this text.

The author of Jn. 6:51b-59 does not then see the eucharist as anamnesis so much as a channel through which "eternal life" is bestowed, a mediatory rite founded on Jesus' death. The importance of Jesus' death is implied in the very vocabulary which the redactor chooses. As Dodd points out, "the expression δούνα τὴν σάρκα ... 6:52 can hardly fail to suggest the idea of death. And the expression πίνειν τὸ αἷμα 6:54,56 , again, can hardly fail to suggest shed blood, and therefore violent death." The terms σάρξ and αἷμα are correlatives which correspond to the Hebrew terms בָּשָׂר and דָם, together constituting the material of sacrifice (Ez. 39:
17). The eucharistic bread is Jesus' flesh Ἰπέρ . . . (v. 51), i.e., Jesus' flesh as a sacrifice offered for the redemption of man.

The use of the word σάρξ has also christological connotations. The christology underlying this passage is the same as that of the prologue of John: the redeemer came as a union of λόγος and σάρξ. The function of the eucharist is to perpetuate this redeeming union for the benefit of the believer. Thus those who reject the incarnation—the "Jews" of v. 52 as well as Docetics (cf. the use of the word σάρξ in the probably anti-docetic text 1 Jn. 4:2: "Every spirit that acknowledges Jesus Christ come in the flesh is of God")—are scandalised by the eucharist.

The redactor's response to this skandalon is to affirm in unconditional terms the reality of the eucharistic flesh and blood. He stresses that partaking of the eucharist is a prerequisite to salvation (v. 53) and that Christ's flesh and blood constitute real food and drink (v. 55). The author of this passage puts particular emphasis on the material aspect of the eucharist; this is especially clear in his choice of the verb τρώγειν, which means to masticate or chew to pieces, in vss. 54, 56, and 57. He repeatedly connects the consumption of the eucharistic elements with salvation: vss. 53, 54, 56, 57, 58. It should be noted that whereas in v. 51b it is a question of the salvation of mankind, in the rest of the passage the principal concern is the salvation of individual
believers. In the New Testament writings, this emphasis on the efficacy of the eucharist for the individual is unique to Deutero-John.

The salvation which is offered the believer in the eucharist is the same salvation which Christ obtained through his death: eternal life (v. 58), specifically the resurrection of the body (v. 54). It is thus a salvation which will be fully realised only in the future, on "the last day" (v. 54). In this respect the eschatology of the redactor differs from that of the evangelist proper. To be sure, the believer is already assured of his salvation—he "has eternal life"—but this only in so far as he is promised the gift of resurrection. The eucharist nevertheless is a present communion between the believer and the Lord: the redactor borrows the Johannine notion of "abiding" (μένειν) in the Lord, which John uses to describe the intimate relationship between the believer and Christ the revealer (Jn. 15:4f.; 17:21-23), and applies it to the sacramental communion. The intimacy of this sacramental relationship is compared to the intimacy shared between Christ and the Father (v. 57). The eucharist is thus both a guarantee of the future salvation and an anticipation of it through the communion of the Lord and the believer.

In our general remarks on the eucharistic theology represented by Deutero-John and Ignatius, we have suggested that the particular features of this theology were associated with
eschatological and christological factors: the sacrament is related to the future resurrection, and it is a means of bridging the gap between Christ in heaven and the believers on earth. We should like to suggest now that this latter association is made explicit by the ecclesiastical redactor himself.

It is obvious that after the redactor had inserted 6:51b-58 he considered Jn. 6:60f. ("This is a hard saying"—"Do you take offence at this?") as referring back to his insertion, and not to the first part of the discourse. Moreover, if one takes John 6 as it originally stood, v. 62 ("Then what if you see the Son of man ascending where he was before") seems rather irrelevant to the general development of the passage. One can, however, relate it theologically to v. 58 ("This is the bread which came down from heaven"): the bread that "comes down" from heaven is the flesh of him who has ascended. In this case we could paraphrase v. 62 as follows: do you not believe that if Christ has ascended that he would provide for his followers by giving them his flesh, the bread from heaven? If this interpretation is correct, then we must attribute v. 62 as well to the redactor. Such a hypothesis is reinforced by what seems to be a similar addition in John 3. In the verses following the baptismal text Jn. 3:5 (which we, following Bultmann, have attributed to the redactor, along with the two other sacramental texts of the Gospel, 6:51b-58 and 19:34b)
we find the statement, "No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man" (3:13). The sentence appears quite parenthetical, and, remarkably, is in the perfect tense. In adding v. 3:5, the redactor clearly intended to transform the whole dialogue with Nicodemus into a baptismal text. Thus 3:13 was probably also an addition, and an elaboration of v. 14 motivated by the redactor's soteriological-sacramental theory. To summarise our argument here, we propose that the ecclesiastical redactor viewed the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist as rites of mediation between Christ ascended into heaven and the believer on earth, and he made this point by inserting the ascension-texts vss. 3:13 and 6:32 into the dialogues which followed his sacramental additions to John.

We can see, then, that Deutero-John presents a rather special form of the theology of the classical type eucharist. The eucharist is detached from the Last Supper tradition and made dependent exclusively on Jesus' death. Yet it is not a "memorial" of this death so much as an actualisation of its redemptive power. The covenant motif is absent, and gives way to an accentuation on the saving power of Jesus' sacrificial flesh for the individual. The communion aspect of the rite is given a much greater place than in Paul or the synoptics. The eucharist, together with baptism, is seen as a sacramental act which brings the believer into union with the
Christ who has ascended into heaven, and as a means of communicating to the believer the flesh of Christ which will guarantee his own resurrection on the Last Day.

We have seen that from the outset the classical type of eucharist was associated with a theology of sacrifice. Towards the end of the first century, it seems that the celebration itself came to be designated as a sacrifice, and compared to the sacrificial rites of the old covenant. Apparently such was not the case at an earlier time: the author of Hebrews (c. A.D. 80-90) in his whole discussion of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ and their superiority over those of the old covenant, nowhere refers explicitly to the eucharist. There is no reason to suppose, as do Betz and Sandvik, that behind this discussion there lies a eucharistic Sitz im Leben; on the contrary, the notable absence of any eucharistic allusions in Hebrews leads us to wonder if the author was even familiar with the classical type celebration. Certainly the "altar" of Hb. 13:10 does not refer to a eucharistic altar; it is the sacrificial system as in Hb. 7:13. For the author of this Epistle, the Christian sacrifice is praise, belief, and charity (Hb. 13:15f.).

On the other hand, it is probable that Clement of Rome (c. A.D. 96) has the eucharistic celebration in mind when he speaks of sacrificial rites. Clement declares:
He commanded us to celebrate sacrifices (προσφοράς) and services (κεισταιρίας), and that it should not be thoughtlessly or disorderly, but at fixed times and hours. He has himself fixed by his supreme will the places and persons whom he desires for these celebrations, in order that all things may be done piously according to his good pleasure, and be acceptable to his will († Clem. 40:2f.).

Commenting on Clement's choice of the word προσφορά, Goguel writes:

It is difficult to suppose it to be a symbolic designation for prayers, to understand how, in fact, offerings which are purely spiritual could be made subject to the exact regulations of which Clement is speaking with reference to the Levitical cult. It can only be here a question of sacrifice, and that sacrifice cannot be anything else but the eucharist.

Thus we may suppose that at the turn of the century, in certain circles at least, the eucharistic celebration was seen as a sacrificial rite analogous to those of the Old Testament.

This idea is certainly present in the eucharistic theology of Ignatius of Antioch, even if he does not label the sacrament precisely as a "sacrifice." We cannot interpret in any other way Ignatius' references to the eucharistic Θυσίας-τήρων, "altar" or "sanctuary" (Eph. 5:2; Phil. 7:2). There are, furthermore, definite sacrificial implications in Ignatius' exclusive choice of the word σάρξ over σῶμα as a designation for the sacramental bread.
Here, as elsewhere, Ignatius' theological interests are very close to those of the Johannine redactor. Like the latter, he nowhere refers to the Last Supper or to Jesus' words of institution. Yet he does connect the sacrament to Jesus' death: "the eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ who suffered for our sins" (Smyrn. 7:1). It is likewise the flesh of him "which the Father raised up by his goodness" (loc. cit.), and the means by which this act of glorification is transferred to the believer: the eucharist is "the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Jesus Christ" (Eph. 20:2). Thus those (Docetics) who abstain from the eucharist would do better to "have love" (here probably a symbol for the eucharist or the eucharistic blood, as in Smyrn. 8:2, Trall. 8:1, Rom. 7:3), so that "they also might attain to the resurrection" (Smyrn. 7:1). Just as for Deutero-John the sacramental bread is the "bread of heaven," for Ignatius it is "the bread of God" (Rom. 7:3); the elements constitute an "incorruptible" food (loc. cit.) which convey to the believer on earth the resurrection-substance which Christ possesses in heaven. As in Jn. 6:56, the partaking of these elements leads to an intimate union (Philad. 4, Smyrn. 7:1) with Christ.

Moreover, like the Johannine redactor, Ignatius implies a logical connection between the incarnation and the eucharist:
he mentions that certain heretics, without any doubt Docetics who deny the reality of the incarnation, abstain from the eucharist because they do not confess that it is the flesh of Christ (*Smyrn.* 7:1). The idea underlying this statement is that the eucharist is a perpetuation of the incarnation. We can see, then, that the eucharistic theology of Ignatius, even if it is presented in a very different way from that of Jn. 6:51b-58 (Ignatius does not discuss the eucharist at any length, but makes brief allusions to it when discussing other things), contains substantially the same ideas. The celebration is rendered ahistorical; the understanding of it as a repetition of the Last Supper and an *anamnesis* of the Cross yields to an understanding which emphasises the communion aspect; the eucharist is especially an offering to the believer of the sacrificial flesh of the incarnate Lord as a guarantee for his future resurrection.

On the other hand, Ignatius is less preoccupied with the individual believer than Deutero-John. Indeed, perhaps more than any previous writer, he stresses the relation between the sacrament and the ecclesial community. The eucharist is for him both a manifestation of the Church's unity, and the means of realising it. He urges the Ephesians to gather more frequently for the eucharist, so that in the unity of their faith "the powers of Satan" may be destroyed (*Eph.* 13:1). Ignatius cannot conceive of the eucharist outside of the official struc-
tures of the church. He **strongly** affirms that there is only one eucharist (Eph. 20:2, Phil. 4:1),\(^{159}\) and repeatedly connects it with the bishops, presbyters, and deacons (Eph. 20:2, Trall. 7:2, Phil. 4:1, Smyrn. 8:1).\(^{160}\) The eucharist is only valid when celebrated by the bishop or by someone whom he appoints (Smyrn. 8:1). Hence the ecclesiological dimension of the eucharist, important for Paul, is taken up by Ignatius and integrated into his theology of ecclesiastical structures and authorities.

Ignatius is thus an important witness to the increasing standardisation of eucharistic faith and practice. (It is interesting in this respect to note that he is the first to use the designation *ἐὐχαριστία* as a technical term to describe the cultic meal [Phil. 4:1, Smyrn. 7:1, 8:1],\(^{161}\) though it seems that he also uses the term *ἀγάπη* synonymously).\(^{162}\) To be sure, the general uniformity of this faith and practice was not yet attained. Ignatius himself, with Deutero-John, presents a eucharistic theology which is somewhat deviant from the main stream of the classical type, and the very fact that he is so insistent on there being "one eucharist" suggests that in some circles altogether different types of cultic meals were being celebrated. The *Didache*, a second century document but probably written after the time of Ignatius, offers us a eucharistic liturgy, which, even if it uses bread and wine, clearly belongs to a different eucharistic tradition than the classical type.
In the eucharistic prayer\textsuperscript{163} of the Didache the distinctive motifs of this latter type are missing; in particular, there is no reference whatever to the death of Christ nor to communion in his body and blood.\textsuperscript{164} It is true that the elements are regarded as "spiritual food and drink" (10:3),\textsuperscript{165} and must be given only to the baptised; they are "holy," not to be given to the "dogs" (Mt. 7:6) (9:5).\textsuperscript{166} Yet this is only because they are created things which have been set aside for the cultic meal (10:3),\textsuperscript{167} and not because they are in any way identified with Christ's body and blood.\textsuperscript{168} The eucharistic bread is rather a symbol for the establishment of the messianic kingdom to the ends of the earth (9:4).\textsuperscript{169} The eucharist here is essentially κυριακόσια in the literal sense: thanksgiving for creation (10:3),\textsuperscript{170} for God's revelation in Christ (9:2,3; 10:2),\textsuperscript{171} for the mightiness of God (10:4).\textsuperscript{172} It is a common prayer that the church may be gathered into the kingdom (9:4; 10:5).\textsuperscript{173} This latter motif is indicative of the eschatological tenor of the liturgy, an aspect which comes to the fore at the end of chapter 10: "Let grace come and let this world pass away . . . Maranatha" (10:6).\textsuperscript{174} Interestingly, the Didache describes the eucharist as a sacrifice (Θυσία, 14:3),\textsuperscript{175} but this sacrifice has nothing to do with that of the Cross.\textsuperscript{176} The emphasis on a "pure sacrifice" (loc. cit.) and the suggestion that the confession of sins makes the offering pure (14:1)\textsuperscript{177} indicate that the sacrifice consists of the praise and thanksgiving that flow from a holy life.
In short, the eucharist of the Didache is representative of a type which did not undergo the transformation which created the "classical" type exemplified in Paul, the Synoptic Gospels, Deutero-John and Ignatius. Its theology is more conservative, and it must be understood as belonging to a eucharistic tradition which developed out of the original "breaking of the bread" rite, quite independently of the parallel development of the classical type. Indeed, it is possible that this liturgy was the property of a sect of Jewish Christians, probably living in Egypt. 178

The survival of types other than the classical was, however, becoming increasingly rare in the second century. The classical type of eucharist was the central act of worship in mainstream "orthodox" Christianity, and we may consider that by the time of Justin this type achieved its completion. That is to say, by this time there existed within orthodox Christianity a general uniformity of eucharistic faith and practice: the Pauline-Synoptic and Deutero-Johannine-Ignatian perspectives were synthesised; the eucharist was seen as a sacrificial rite instituted by Jesus at the Last Supper, and as both an anamnesis of the Cross and communion in the body and blood of Christ offered for the salvation of the believer.

The starting point of Justin's interpretation of the eucharist is the doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos. 179 The eucharist is for this author an extension of the incarnation:
For we do not receive these things as common bread or common drink; but as Jesus Christ our Savior being incarnate by God's word took flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food consecrated (εὐχαριστηθέντος) by the word of prayer which comes from him, from which our flesh and blood are nourished by transformation, is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus (1 Απολ. 66). 180

This passage is interesting in several respects. It is, first of all, a witness to the emergent doctrine of the consecration of the elements. Furthermore, it makes explicit the connection between the eucharist and the incarnation implied in Deutero-John and Ignatius. Like these latter two, Justin here speaks of the eucharistic σῶμα. But in what follows immediately, the links are rather with the Pauline-Synoptic conception of the classical type: the sacrament was "commanded" by Jesus (i.e., instituted at his Last Supper) as an anamnesis; the words of institution designate the elements as Christ's σῶμα and σῶμα.

In addition, Justin exhibits a more developed theology of eucharistic sacrifice than any previous writer. The eucharist is the actualisation (anamnesis) of the Cross 181 which replaces the bloody sacrifices of the Old Covenant. Justin speaks of the "sacrifices [θυσίαι] which [Christians] offer as an anamnesis of the Passion" (Dial. 117:3); 182 God no longer accepts the sacrifices offered in Jerusalem: now these "εὐξαι καὶ εὐχαριστίαι... are the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to God" (Dial. 117:2). 183 The eucharist is the reali-
sation of the prophecy of Malachi (1:10-12) for a pure oblation (Dial. 41:2-3; 117:1-2).

Bearing in mind that Justin was attempting to give an account of the Christian faith for the pagan reader, we may suppose that his understanding of the eucharist reflects the common Christian belief of his period. With Justin, then, the development of this classical type is complete, and our attempt to chart its origins and evolution from Jesus' table-fellowship and the Last Supper tradition may come to a close. Within orthodox Christianity, the understanding of the eucharist attested to by Justin will henceforth be presupposed, and the eucharistic theology of the later Fathers will be reflection and elaboration on this understanding.

Eucharistic Liturgy and Eucharistic Ministry

In the preceding sections of this chapter we have distinguished three types of eucharistic meals in primitive Christianity and have shown how one of these established itself in orthodox Gentile Christianity and evolved into that sacramental rite which was to be the cultic meal of the patristic and mediaeval church. Thus far our observations have been concerned principally with eucharistic "faith," i.e., how early Christians understood their sacred meal, and in particular how they interpreted the Last Supper tradition examined in the first chapter. We wish now to discuss briefly (since the sources at our disposal provide us with material for only
brief discussion) eucharistic "practice," i.e., the prayers that were said at the celebration, and who officiated at it, during the period under consideration.

The earliest cultic meals of Christianity were, as has been shown, a continuation of Jesus' regular table-fellowship. These first eucharists consisted of a real meal, though at a very early point in their history the breaking of the bread came to be distinguished as the most sacred part of this meal. It must be remembered that these meals did not constitute for the first Christians formal public worship: for this they continued to worship as Jews. The eucharist was simply a gathering of Christians to share a meal in a believer's home (Acts 2:46). Like all Jewish meals, these were accompanied by prayers of thanksgiving (berakoth), particularly when the bread was broken at the beginning of the meal. Neither the Mishnah nor the Toseftah preserves the complete text of these Jewish thanksgiving prayers for meals, though from allusions which they make we may presume that they were substantially the same prayers still in use today. The three meal berakoth used in first century Palestine give us some idea of what the earliest eucharistic prayers must have been like. These prayers were doubtless extemporaneous, but following a set pattern established by Jewish custom.

In the first meal berakah, praise is given to God for the food which is given to man and to all creatures. The same
theme appears in Did. 10:2. In the second, thanksgiving is given for the Promised Land, for the covenant, and for the Torah, in short, for the great events of the history of salvation. The Didache presents a christianised parallel of this motif in the form of thanksgiving for revelation and redemption in Christ (9:2-3; 10:2). The third petition asks for the Lord's mercy upon Israel and implores God to establish his messianic kingdom. This eschatological theme plays an important role in the eucharist of the Didache (9:4; 10:5-6). These Jewish table prayers, together with the survival of their dominant ideas in the Didache (which belongs to the eucharistic tradition emanating from the earliest "breaking of the bread") show us what the general structure of the earliest eucharistic prayers must have been. The emphasis was on thanksgiving for creation (and for food in particular), for redemption, and on the final coming of the kingdom. For the early Christians, of course, these prayers of thanksgiving would have been reworked in such a way as to give a central place to their faith in the redemptive act accomplished in Christ. The great thanksgiving texts Col. 1:3-23 and Eph. 1:3-2:10 give us some indication of how the berakoth would have been christianised.

Who would have presided over these earliest eucharistic meals? The New Testament itself contains no evidence which would permit a clear answer to this question. According to
Jewish custom, one man broke the bread and recited the berak'ah on behalf of those present: this was normally the father of the household. We may conjecture that if an apostle were present at the cultic meal he would be invited to preside; otherwise we may presume that the host would break the bread and recite the prayers.

Out of these earliest Christian meals there developed the two later eucharistic types which we have distinguished, the bread and fish type and the classical bread and wine type. In both cases the liturgical prayers must have continued to be modelled on the Jewish berakōth. This is indicated by the emphasis on thanksgiving (or blessing) in the liturgical sources which underlie the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper, the miracle of the loaves and fishes, and the resurrection meals, as well as by the fact that later (Ignatius) the cultic meal is called eucharistia. However, in both cases a specific aetiological narrative was inserted. In the bread and fish type, this narrative would have resembled Mk. 6:41-42 or Mk. 8:6-8; in the bread and wine type it would have been some form of the institution accounts preserved by Paul and the synoptic evangelists. These liturgical narratives—which no doubt appeared within the first two decades of Christianity—were constructed out of recollections concerning two special meals of Jesus' table fellowship, recollections which had been preserved in the earliest stages of the tradition concerning Jesus.
By the very nature of the elements used, the bread and the fish type maintained the character of a real meal. In the bread and cup type, however, there was a gradual disengagement of the sacred elements from the meal proper. The celebration in Corinth—and presumably in the other churches founded during the Pauline missions—apparently opened with the prayers at the breaking of the bread (including the first part of the institution account), continued with an actual but rather formalised meal, and was concluded with the blessing (including the second part of the institution account) and distribution of the cup. Such also was the pattern of the Antiochene liturgy taken over by Luke. In Mark, however, followed by Matthew, the institution narratives seem to be drawn from a liturgy in which the bread and cup sayings were no longer separated by a meal. This is indicated by the absence of the rubric "after supper" (1 Co. 11:25; Lk. 22:20) and by the parallelism of the bread and cup sayings. In all probability, the meal proper had simply been dropped, perhaps because of abuses associated with it. Thus in the latter half of the first century liturgies which retained the ordinary meal existed side by side with those which had dropped it.

The Deutero-Johannine redactor, with his emphasis on communion in Jesus' flesh and blood, probably knows a liturgy without a real meal. It is impossible to say whether the term agape or "love feast," which is used by Ignatius synonymously
with "eucharist" to designate the cultic meal, referred to a celebration which included the consumption of food other than the elements. However, Ignatius' silence concerning a real meal suggests that it was not present. The use of the term agape by later writers (Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 3: 2; Tertullian, Apol. 39) in reference to a common ordinary meal of Christians does not mean that the word had this sense a century earlier. Similarly, we cannot determine whether the "love feasts" (the usual rendering of ἀγάπης) of Jude 12 included such a meal. Neither Justin nor Irenaeus know the agape, but it does appear later in Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Cyprian. We may suppose here this common meal is a survival of the actual meal which was earlier conjoined to the eucharist, and which had persisted in certain circles (perhaps in Alexandria, for example) through the second century. The Didache 10:1, "But after you are satisfied with food, thus give thanks") apparently provides for such a meal after the blessing of the cup and bread and before the final prayers of thanksgiving. The remarks of Pliny (Ep. 10: 96) to Trajan, A.D. 112, imply the consumption of a substantial meal, but the repressive measures against Christian assemblies to which he attests may have contributed to the disappearance of such a meal in most Christian communities.

With the emergence of a formal, structured ministry in the latter part of the first and the beginning of the second cen-
tury, the eucharistic celebration came to be placed under the jurisdiction of this ministry. The New Testament nowhere speaks of a eucharistic ministry; in early Gentile Christianity, as in early Jewish Christianity, the meal was probably presided over by the host, or by an eminent personality if present (e.g. Paul, in Acts 20:11). When the local Christian communities developed colleges of elders, modelled on those of the synagogue, these elders would have been natural hosts for the eucharistic meal. The eucharist was soon considered the prerogative of the official ministry, which was, in Clement of Rome at least, compared to the priestly ministry of the Old Testament:

He has himself fixed by his supreme will...the persons whom he desires for these celebrations....For to the High Priest his proper ministrations are allotted, and to the priests the proper place has been appointed, and on Levites their proper services have been imposed. The layman is bound by the ordinances for the laity (1 Clem. 40:3,5).

In those communities which by the turn of the century had developed a monarchical episcopate (in Syria, Asia Minor), the bishop was established as the eucharistic celebrant par excellence. Indeed, Dix may be right in suggesting that the development of the episcopate was itself influenced by the eucharistic worship: the tradition (inherited from Judaism) of having a single leader preside over the common meal on behalf of those present may have contributed to the emergence of the episcopal
office, which from the outset (cf. Ignatius) was connected to the eucharistic celebration. Similarly, the diaconate may have grown out of the functions of the attendants who in Jewish meals assisted the leader.204

The vision of the heavenly liturgy in the Apocalypse (4ff.) gives us a glimpse of eucharistic worship in Asia Minor at the end of the first century; it serves "to show us what the real earthly liturgy is, or should be made to be."205 The vision—in spite of its precisely apocalyptic character—has as a model contemporary eucharistic worship. In Apoc. 3:20, the writer has Christ inviting the believer for a meal: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and eat with him, and he with me." The writer then finds an open door in heaven and is invited to witness the heavenly liturgy (4:1). He sees twenty-four elders grouped around the throne of God (4:4). This image without any doubt corresponds to the earthly liturgy of those communities which had developed a monarchical episcopate: the prebyterium grouped around the bishop who presided over the eucharistic celebration. Several texts of the Apocalypse seem to be direct borrowings or deliberate imitations of this liturgy:

Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come (4:8).
Worthy art thou, our Lord and God,
to receive glory and honour and power,
for thou didst create all things,
and by thy will they existed and were created (4:11).

We give thanks to thee, Lord God Almighty,
who art and who wast,
that thou hast taken thy great power and begun to reign
(11:7).

Fear God and give him glory, for the hour of
his judgement has come; and worship him who made
heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of water
(14:7).

Great and wonderful are thy deeds,
0 Lord God the Almighty,
Just and true are thy ways,
0 King of the Ages (15:3).

Come, Lord Jesus! (22:20)

Ignatius of Antioch is a further witness to the celebration
of the eucharist by a monarchical bishop, with the probable assistance of the elders and deacons. He declares that
a eucharist is valid only when celebrated "by the bishop, or
by one whom he appoints" (Smyrn. 8:1). The "one eucharist"
is connected to "the one bishop with the presbytery and the
deacons" (Phil. 4), as is the "sanctuary" (Trall. 7:2).
Such was the case in Syria and Asia Minor, but this practice
was not uniform. For Clement of Rome there seems to be a two-
fold ministry of "bishops and deacons" (1 Clem. 42:5), and
the bishops seem to be identical with the πρεσβύτεροι (44:
4f.). These presbyter-bishops are responsible for the eucharistic celebration (loc. cit.: . . . τοιχ ἀμέμπτως καὶ δοκίμω
προσευχήκοινας τὰ διάφως ), though the deacons (the
"Levites" of 40:5?) no doubt have also a liturgical role. There appears to have been a similar arrangement in the Alexandrian circle for which the Didache was intended. After speaking of the Sunday eucharist, the Didache continues immediately: "Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons" (Did. 51:1).\(^{212}\) But the Didache attests also to an itinerant, charismatic ministry of "apostles and prophets" (Did. 11).\(^{213}\) These have the right to celebrate the eucharist, and are not as bound to the established customs as are the local, official ministers ("But suffer the prophets to hold eucharist as they will," Did. 10:7).\(^{214}\)

The first complete description of the eucharistic celebration which has come down to us is to be found in the First Apology of Justin. It gives us a picture of worship in Rome c. A.D. 150, yet it is general enough to be valid for other Christian centres (Justin had travelled extensively in the Empire). Justin gives two brief accounts of the liturgy, one in reference to the celebration which followed immediately after the baptism of a convert, and the other in reference to the regular Sunday celebration. The first begins thus:

We, after thus washing the one who has been convinced and signified his assent, lead him to those who are called brethren where they are assembled. They then earnestly offer common prayers for themselves and the one who has been illuminated and all others everywhere....On finishing the prayers we greet each other with a kiss (I Apol. 65).\(^{215}\)
Here there are two preparatory acts. First, there is the common prayer of the "brethren." This is the "Prayer of the Faithful" in which only the baptised are permitted to participate; it is thus for the neophyte the first time that he is allowed to say this prayer with the faithful. Secondly, there is the Kiss of Peace; it appears here as a seal on the common prayer which has preceded it. 216

Justin's second account, that of the Sunday eucharist, begins with a description of the liturgy of the word which preceded the Prayer of the Faithful and the eucharistic prayer:

And on the day called Sunday there is a meeting in one place of those who live in the cities or the country, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. When the reader has finished, the president in a discourse urges and invites us to the imitation of these noble things. Then we all stand up together and offer prayers (I Apol. 67). 217

The regular Sunday service thus begins with lessons from the Old Testament (τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν) 218 and the gospels (τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων). The reading continues "as long as time permits," which suggests the system of lectio continua rather than one of independent selected passages. 219 These readings are followed by a homily from the "president." Justin does not identify this προεστώς as the bishop; we may assume if there was a monarchical bishop in Rome at this time, he would have presided over the eucharist.
In cases of meetings by small groups, the "president" would probably have been a presbyter.²²⁰

Both of Justin's accounts then describe the eucharistic prayer:

Then the bread and a cup of water and mixed wine are brought to the president of the brethren and he, taking them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and offers thanksgiving at some length that we have been deemed worthy to receive these things from him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, the whole congregation present assents, saying, "Amen."...When the president has given thanks and the whole congregation has assented, those whom we call deacons give to each of those present a portion of the consecrated bread and wine and water, and they take it to the absent (I Apol. 65).²²¹

And, as said before, when we have finished the prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water, and the president similarly sends up prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the congregation assents, saying the Amen; the distribution, and reception of the consecrated elements by each one, takes place and they are sent to the absent by the deacons. Those who prosper, and who so wish, contribute, each one as much as he chooses to. What is collected is deposited with the president, and he takes care of orphans and widows, and those who are in want on account of sickness or any other cause...(I Apol. 67).²²²

The eucharist proper therefore begins with a bringing of the gifts to the celebrant, probably by the deacons. This is the beginning of the later offertory rite, but Justin places no special emphasis on it. The reference in the first account to a προτεστάτων υδάτων καὶ κρύσταλλος is somewhat puzzling:
it seems to mean that two separate cups were used, one containing water and one containing wine and water mixed. A certain confusion in the manuscript tradition led Harnack to postulate that for Justin the elements were simply bread and water, and although this is not impossible (bread and water were used by certain second century groups, and perhaps even in New Testament times), Jungmann's explanation that the cup of water was a special cup to be given to the neophyte as a token of his interior cleansing is simpler and more convincing.

After the presentation of the gifts, the celebrant proceeds immediately with the eucharistic prayer, which is extemporaneous (σὴ σὺναμεί σὺνῷ, c. 67). This indicates that in Rome there were not yet fixed liturgical texts, and that the celebrant simply improvised in accordance with a certain established pattern. Justin's emphasis on the thanksgiving character of the celebrant's utterances suggests a continuation of the themes of the berakah. The reference to the πατὴρ τῶν δόξων (c. 65) implies that thanksgiving was given for creation. Other themes which may have appeared in the improvised anaphora can be discerned from a comparison between Justin's remarks and the anaphora of Hippolytus, a Roman liturgy from a half a century later (Apost. Trad. 1:4). Justin's reference to "thanksgiving...that we have been deemed worthy to receive these things from him" (c. 65) is in harmony with the
first part of Hippolytus' canon, in which thanksgiving is
given for the incarnation and redemption. The quotation of
the words of institution in Justin's explanation of the euchar-
rist which is inserted between the two descriptions of the
liturgy (c. 66) show that for him these formed part of the
anaphora. In Hippolytus an anamnesis of Christ's death and
resurrection follows immediately upon the words of institu-
tion. There was doubtless such a prayer in the extempora-
neous canon described by Justin: this prayer is probably at
the basis of Justin's interpretation of the eucharist as a
memorial of the Passion (Dial. 117:3). Finally, Justin's
reference to the Holy Spirit (c. 65) may be an allusion to the
invocation of the Holy Spirit which follows the anamnesis in
the canon of Hippolytus. In any event, these motifs appear in
subsequent liturgies, both eastern and western, and we may sup-
pose they reflect the general content of eucharistic prayers in
the latter half of the second century.

The liturgy concludes with a solemn "Amen," by which the
assembly expresses its assent to the prayer of the celebrant.
Then communion is distributed by the deacons. After this an
offering is taken for those who are in need (c. 67). Portions
of the consecrated elements are taken to the absent by the
deacons; Justin is the first witness to this practice.

With this description by Justin of the liturgy in the mid-
second century we may conclude our outline of the early develop-
ment of eucharistic worship. As the main features of "classical" eucharistic theology had achieved their evolution by the time of Justin, so had the eucharistic liturgy attained the fundamental structure which was to be canonised in the formal liturgical texts of the patristic period.

Addendum: The Eucharist and the Temple Texts

Mention should be made of an important recent study of primitive eucharistic theology by Bjørn Sandvik\(^{229}\) in which the author develops a thesis concerning the primitive eucharist which, although not entirely in contradiction with the views outlined in the preceding pages of this chapter, is not to us convincing.

The methodological procedure of this work is interesting, since it takes as its point of departure not the Last Supper narratives nor any other explicit references to cultic meals in the New Testament, but rather the two Aramaic formulae found in the Didache. The author attempts to show that these formulae are connected with a set of ideas in the New Testament which constitute an important element of the early Christian understanding of the eucharist. But unlike the analysis which we have presented, that of Sandvik fails to distinguish different eucharistic types in the period under consideration, and the author finds the same motifs in a large variety of sources, including Paul, Hebrews, the synoptic gospels, John, and the Didache.
The author begins his thesis with the observation that the formula *Hosanna* in *Did. 10:6* must, like *Maranatha*, ultimately be derived from the earliest eucharistic liturgies. Specifically, it is a free citation of Ps. 118:25, and serves as a "collective acclamation, a call to assembly," preceding in the liturgy the invitation, anathema, and *Maranatha* formulae. The eucharistic celebration thus constitutes the *Sitz im Leben* which furnished this formula to the evangelists in their construction of the story of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and which also stands behind the Greek translation of the formula in *Apoc. 7:10*. These observations lead Sandvik to postulate that Ps. 118, a Hallel psalm, had been taken over by the early church as a eucharistic liturgical hymn, and he in fact identifies the hymn referred to in the Last Supper accounts as this psalm. Advancing from this hypothesis, the author develops the central thesis of his book, namely that the Temple theme in this psalm is constitutive of the eucharistic theology of the primitive church.

The key to this theme is to be found in the expression "the rejected stone" of Ps. 118:22, which Sandvik believes the early Christian community associated with the notion of the church as the New Temple. Thus, according to the author, the citation of Ps. 118:22 at the end of the parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard (Mk. 12:1-2 and par.) demonstrates that the
meaning of this parable is that Christ is the cornerstone of the New Temple which replaces the old. He finds, moreover, a link between this parable and the eucharistic prayers of Did. 1-10, particularly the vine image of Did. 9:2, which he interprets as also being a symbol for the Temple. These observations, it is concluded, are evidence that the eucharist was considered by early Christians as replacing the cult of the Old Temple, and as being in itself the cult of, and the primary means of constructing the New Temple, i.e., the church.

Sandvik believes that he can find traces of a close association between this "Temple-complex" and the eucharistic celebration throughout the New Testament. Thus in 1 Pet. 2:4-8 the citation of Ps. 118:22 follows upon a reference to the offering of "spiritual sacrifices" by those who are "like living stone [to] be...built into a spiritual house;" the author interprets these "spiritual sacrifices" as the offerings of praise in the context of the eucharistic celebration. Similarly, a eucharistic background for four Pauline "Temple texts" is suggested. The judgement motif in 1 Co. 3:16-17, it is argued, is derived from the same eucharistic liturgical element as that of 1 Co. 16:22, and the point of the text is that Christians must work towards the building-up of the community as the New Temple in order not to incur the judgement of God in the eucharistic celebration. 1 Co. 6:19-20 is associated with the eucharist, because, according to the author,
Paul's concept of the collective body as the Temple is determinative for his statements here concerning the individual body, and because "interventions against unchastity were often a part of the eucharistic paraenesis." The Temple-text of 2 Co. 16-18 is connected with the eucharist on account of its close parallelism with 1 Co. 10:14ff., an explicitly eucharistic text. Finally, Eph. 2:20-22 is said to reveal a eucharistic basis through its emphasis on the soteriological work of Christ and through the preceding allusions to his blood (v. 13) and to "one body" (v. 16). The author's conclusion is that Paul uses not only the concept of "body," but also that of "temple," in order to relate the eucharist to the church.

Sandvik finds a similar theological link in the epistle to the Hebrews. Although the symbol of the Temple serves a different function in this book--the community is not itself the Temple, rather through its worship it enters into the heavenly Temple--there is still a close association between the Temple and the eucharist. In Heb. 10:19ff., for example, the way into the sanctuary is opened by the "flesh" (v. 20) and "blood" (v. 19) of Jesus; these are interpreted as allusions to the eucharist. In Heb. 12:18-29 the Temple-theme is alluded to indirectly by the expressions "Mount Zion," "the city of the living God," and "the heavenly Jerusalem" (v. 22). The reference to the "assembly" (v. 23) is an indication, our author
believes, that the whole passage is "a description of primitive Christian worship." The judgement motif, which he associates with the Temple theme in the "eucharistic paraenesis," is dominant (vss. 23,25ff.).

In the Gospel of John, the Temple text Jn 2:21 is interpreted in the light of Jn. 14:2 and 14:23, notably because of the similarity between the words μονή (abode, related to the μένειν of 6:56) used in these two verses and the word ναός (dwelling, temple) used in 2:21. Sandvik asserts that the reference to the "temple of his body" is thus an allusion to the notion of Christians living in Christ. Moreover, the same theology is expressed in the discourse of the vine-branch (Jn. 15:1ff.), the vine branch being a symbol of the Temple (as in Did. 9:2). The connection of this set of symbols with the eucharist is established with the claim that it is "obvious" that references to the coming of Christ in Jn. 14 (vss. 3,18, 23,28) "concern above all the coming of Jesus in the church and especially in the eucharist." The eucharistic basis of the vine-branch discourse is postulated on account of the similarity between Jn. 15:4 and Jn. 6:56, and because of the use of the symbol of the vine in the eucharistic prayer of the Didache.

The author briefly treats a number of other texts, namely Apoc. 3:12 and 7:9ff., Clem. 48:2f., several passages
in Ignatius (Eph. 5:2; Trall. 7:2; Magn. 7:2; Pilad. 4,7; Eph. 15:3),247 and Barn. 16:9,248 in a similar manner, attempting to demonstrate the appearance of the same fundamental motif. In a concluding chapter Sandvik asserts the use of the Temple as a symbol for the community is without parallel in contemporary literature, and suggests that it originates with Jesus himself.

The originality of this work lies in the fact that the author has attempted to lay bare an important element of primitive eucharistic theology by the analysis of a host of texts which have not traditionally been associated with the eucharist. Its chief weakness is the presupposed unity of eucharistic faith and practice over the whole of the New Testament and post-Apostolic periods. While one must give credit to the author for building up a rather neat system, one has at the same time the impression that it is a bit too coherent, and that the author has imposed highly speculative interpretations on a large number of texts so that they will support his thesis. While the author is no doubt right in his suggestion that Hosanna was a primitive liturgical formula, and that as such was utilised in the story of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and in Apoc. 7:10, this is in itself by no means proof that the whole of Ps. 118 was used as a eucharistic hymn. Once this foundation for Sandvik's thesis is called into question, so is his eucharis-
tic interpretation of the New Testament Temple-texts. It is to say the least a dubious procedure to detect eucharistic allusions in any reference to "body" or "blood." At times the author's criteria for determining the eucharistic basis of a text are so general that they cease to have any validity, as, for example, when speaking of Eph. 2:20-22 he declares, "The close association between christology and ecclesiology here betrays the eucharistic background." Moreover, his explanation for the lack of any specific statement in the New Testament to the effect that the eucharist constitutes the community as the Temple, namely that for the reader of early Christian literature the notion formed part of his elementary instruction, and therefore needed only to be alluded to, is hardly satisfactory. In conclusion, we do not feel the author has succeeded in establishing the importance of the ecclesiological Temple idea for our understanding of the primitive Eucharist.
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APPENDIX I

THE EUCHARIST AND MYTH

Introduction

We wish in this appendix to raise a general question about the interpretation of the eucharist in the early church. This question concerns our apprehension of the mode of thought which underlies the texts at our disposal. It is our conviction that we can consistently discern in these texts one specific expression of human thought, namely the mythological. We shall argue that the liturgy and theology of the eucharist, in the varying forms in which it manifested itself during the New Testament and patristic periods, exhibited the essential characteristics of mythopoeic action (ritual) and thought, respectively. In other words, the eucharist of this period may not be interpreted, without distortion, in categories drawn from reflection of a rationalistic or philosophical nature.

We may speak of the early eucharist as a "rite," not in the sterile sense of the repetition of rigid forms, but in the dynamic sense of the symbolic acting out of fundamental values, the celebrated sharing of basic convictions by a group of men and women bound together in a common fellowship. When such a ritual action is projected to the plane of language, freely and spontaneously, and without the interjection of categories
foreign to its structure, myth is created.¹

There may appear to be, _prima facie_, some difficulty in giving to the eucharist a myth and ritual interpretation. We are accustomed, for one thing, to viewing myths as the symbolic paradigm of some form of natural change (such as the rhythm of the seasons or the daily passage of the luminaries) or as the objectification of the concerns and conflicts of daily life (the struggle against nature, sexual and blood relationships, etc.). Yet the eucharist is quite clearly rooted in history. It appears to be historical in both origin and meaning. Both of the second two eucharistic types we have distinguished were believed to have been "instituted" by Jesus on a specific historical occasion, and the "classical" type was believed to be the representation of a specific historical event, _viz._, the Cross. This consideration should not, however, constitute a decisive objection to our thesis. While it is common to place myth and history in contradistinction, it is nonetheless possible for a historical situation or even to be given a radically mythologised interpretation. This occurred, for example, in post-exilic Judaism, when the essentially political and historical eschatology of the earlier prophets was mythologised into apocalyptic. We might take note here of Cassirer's comment that "there is no natural phenomenon and no phenomenon of human life that is not capable of a mythical interpretation, and which does not call for such an interpretation."²
A second apparent difficulty is that myths are typically the common property of an independent cultural unit or society such as a Melanesian tribe, Ancient Egypt, Greece or India, and act as an embracing arch of symbols expressing the fundamental concerns of the whole society. Yet early Christianity was neither confined to a single culture, nor was it the particular religion of any culture. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to speak of myth, in the sense of a certain type of human reasoning, within the context of early Christianity. New Testament exegetes have done so for a century, and the form critics have succeeded in isolating myth as one literary genre of the New Testament. It would be a mistake, then, to confine our understanding of myth solely to the interpretation of natural phenomena in a primitive or ancient culture. Rather we should, following the analysis of such scholars as Cassirer and Malinowski, recognize it as a certain form of human expression distinguished by a particular "pre-rational" mode of articulation.

Christian theology has always prized the eucharist as the sacrament of unity, and has taught that this unity is a consequence of some form of encounter with Christ in the celebration of the cultic act. Yet it was not until the Carolingian period that there was any systematic attempt to rationalize the mode of Christ's eucharistic presence. It is true that there were theological discussions of the eucharist, and it is even true that the language of elemental change appears as early as Justin, but there was no systematic attempt to evaluate philoso-
philically the language of eucharistic theology and worship.

Since the ninth century, however, and the disagreement between Radbertus and Ratramnus on whether or not Christ was present in veritate after the consecration, it has been one of the most vigorously debated problems of Christian theology. The terms of reference for this discussion have consistently been a contrast between the figurative or symbolic and the realistic. Right down to the present day there have been certain scholars who have tried to show that the New Testament writers or the Fathers held either a "realistic" or a "figurative" understanding of the eucharist. Certainly it is possible to cite patristic texts, even from the same writer, favourable to both views. But if our interpretation of the material is correct, it is inadmissible to apply these particular categories to the biblical and patristic understandings of this sacrament. For if the logic of early eucharistic theology is mythopoetic, then any distinction between figure or image and reality is extraneous to its intellectual presuppositions.

To show that this is indeed the case, it will be necessary for us to establish that the language which early Christianity used in reference to its sacred meal is in some way comparable to that of primitive and classical mythologies. Our method will not be to make direct comparisons, but rather to take as our point of departure the results of studies by phenomenologists of myth, and then to show that the language of the early
Christian eucharist exhibits those essential characteristics of mythical thought delineated in these studies.

The Logic of Myth

For the purposes of this appendix we shall use the term "myth" to designate a pre-scientific and pre-philosophical form of expression through which the human mind articulates its most fundamental values, and which it recites through ritual action. We do not, of course, accept any of those older interpretations of myth which would reduce the phenomenon to a single natural principle, whether solar, lunar, seasonal or meteorological. Nor do we accept Mircea Eliade's premise that all myth is essentially aetiological, and that the reality that myth expresses is the fact which it explains. Myth is rather the formulation of certain basic convictions about the meaning of human life. Malinowski writes:

Myth fulfills in primitive culture an indispensible function: it expresses, enhances, and codifies belief; it safeguards and enforces morality; it vouches for the efficiency of ritual and contains practical rules for the guidance of man. Myth is thus a vital ingredient of human civilization; it is not an idle tale but a hard-worked active force; it is not an intellectual explanation or an artistic imagery, but a pragmatic charter of primitive faith and moral wisdom.

Malinowski found the aetiological theory of myth quite foreign to the experience of his Melanesian subjects. "They do not want," he says, "to 'explain,' to make 'intelligible' anything which happens in their myths--above all not an abstract idea."
Myth, then, is particularised not so much by its content as by its logic. Its method of reasoning is *sui generis*, and it cannot, therefore, as Schelling observed already in the last century, be interpreted allegorically. It is, as Cassirer observes, an autonomous form of the human spirit, which must be evaluated on its own terms. Whether or not we can consider myth as "true" (Frankfort, Eliade), or as an unconscious fiction (Cassirer), or, as in the view of Erich Dardel, as neither true nor false, is not a question which we shall decide here. What is of greater concern to us are the particularities of mythical language and action, the determinative features of mythical articulation. In the second volume of his *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, Cassirer's primary aim is to differentiate sharply the logic of myth from scientific, empirical, or philosophical logic. In a more concise form, Henri and H.A. Frankfort have undertaken a similar study in the introduction to *Before Philosophy*. The essential difference between mythical and non-mythical logic can be summarised in the following statement by Cassirer:

...a mere glance at the facts of mythical consciousness shows that it knows nothing of certain distinctions which seem absolutely necessary to empirical-scientific thinking. Above all, it lacks any fixed dividing line between mere "representation" and "real" perception, between wish and fulfillment, between image and thing.
Mythical thinking, Cassirer argues, lacks the category of the ideal. Or, as van der Leeuw says, it "constitutes the most extreme antithesis conceivable to pure theory." In order to apprehend a symbol, mythical thinking must transpose it into something substantial. This is especially true in the case of mythical action. But this does not mean that the mythical mind is simply incapable of making the most elementary observations about the world; it means, rather, that in myth certain things are charged with significance, and that the significance is not differentiated from the thing. Suzanne Langer, in commenting on Maori lunar mythology, puts the matter this way:

The savage does not, in his innocence, "think" the moon is a woman because he cannot tell the difference; he "thinks" it is a round fire, a shining disk; but he sees Woman in it, and names it Woman, and all its acts and relationships that interest him are those which carry out that significance.\textsuperscript{13}

The Egyptologist Rudolf Anthes makes a similar observation with regard to Egyptian mythology:

A [mythological] symbol is a manifestation of a human attempt to make an element of the divine world conceivable in human terms, that is, in terms of logic and sensuous perception, although these do not necessarily conform with the laws of nature.\textsuperscript{14}

The fundamental mode of the mythical apprehension of reality, i.e., non-differentiation and substantialisation, operates in a number of different spheres of conception, including
space, time, and causality. In each of these spheres, a conceptual evaluation is made, not by any objective measurement, but by an emotional recognition of values.\textsuperscript{15} In each the fundamental contrast is not between large or small, between real or unreal, but between sacred and profane. As Cassirer writes,

\begin{quote}
The mythical consciousness arrives at an articulation of space and time not by stabilising the fluctuation of sensuous phenomena but by introducing its specific opposition—the opposition of sacred and profane—into spatial and temporal reality.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

With respect to the question of causality, all interpreters agree that the mythopoetic mind seems to explain something, and that it does so with a multiplicity of approaches. While empirical thinking posits a relation of specific causes to specific effects, mythical thinking, where it raises the question of origins, has a free selection of causes and effects at its disposal. Rudolf Anthes points out that in Egypt, for example, "... a single entity of what we have called the divine world can be conceived in various incompatible concepts by the same theologians."\textsuperscript{17}

This mythopoetic mode of apprehension is applied not only to space, time, and causality, but to life and death itself. That is to say, these two notions are substantialised, on the one hand, and on the other hand, no sharp demarcation is made between the living and the dead. Thus Cassirer writes in his
Essay on Man: "In a certain sense the whole of mythical thought may be interpreted as a constant and obstinate negation of the phenomenon of death."  

Myth describes itself in action. Or, to put it the other way around, myth represents a linguistic projection of the basic values acted out in ritual. Ritual is prior to myth, both psychologically and historically. A living rite is not the expression of intellectualised religious conceptions, but rather "an immediate, primordial creation of religiously-minded men." In ritual myth is realised, in the literal sense of being made real. To cite only one example, in the Babylonian akītu or enthronement and New Year's festival, it was believed that with the recitation of the Enuma Elish creation actually took place. Theodore Gaster summarises in this way the relation between myth and ritual:

The function of myth is...to bring out in articulate fashion the inherent durative significance of the ritual program. Its method is to construe the punctual order of ceremonies in terms of an ideal situation involving "gods" or similar transcendent and preterpunctual beings. Its effect is to turn presentation into representation, to introduce the element of mimesis and to confer upon the participants the added and parallel role of actors, so that they are at one and the same time both protagonists of a direct experience and impersonators of characters other than their own.

It is our wish to show that when early Christians described or alluded to their own fundamental rite, the eucharistic meal, the language which they used betrays this mythopoeic logic,
and that certain themes in early eucharistic theology correspond precisely to mythical conceptions of causality, life and death, symbol and reality, time and space.

The Eucharist and the Mythical View of Causality

We have already noted that when mythopoeic logic deals with the question of causality, it sees no contradiction in applying a multiplicity of causal explanations to the same phenomenon. We shall illustrate the application of this approach in early eucharistic theology with two examples.

The first example is the notion of the institution of the sacrament. Whereas generally in the early church the synoptic view of the institution of the classical type at the Last Supper was predominant, this was not always to the exclusion of the deuto-Johannine view of its institution by the death of Jesus, even in the same writer. Thus, if the interpretation of Werner is correct, when Irenaeus relates the "fruit of the vine" to the saying about the corn of wheat which had to die in the earth in order to produce abundant fruit (Jn. 12:24), he is alluding to the institution of the eucharist through the death of Christ (Adv. Haer. 5:2:3). Yet it is also clear that Irenaeus refers the eucharist back to the Last Supper when he speaks of "the oblation which the Church offers according to the commandment of the Lord" (Adv. Haer. 4:18:1) and when he cites the words of interpretation to show that the apostles and
the church have received "the sacrifice of the New Covenant" (Adv. Haer. 4:17:5). Similarly, Cyprian, who also quotes the words of interpretation as a "command" (Ep. 63:10), reveals his belief in the institution of the sacrament by Christ's death when he declares, "just as one could not drink the wine if the grapes had not first been pressed and crushed, so we could not drink the blood of Christ, if Christ had not first been pressed and crushed" (Ep. 63:7).

The deutero-Johannine notion that the sacraments are founded on the death of Christ exists side by side with the notion of the institution at the Last Supper in Augustine too. He declares: "When Adam sleeps, Eve is formed from his side; when Christ is dead, the spear pierces his side so that the mysteries by which the church is formed may flow forth" (In Johann. 9:10). This same theme is developed by John Chrysostom:

In this deed [the spear-thrust] there was, moreover, fulfilled a deep mystery. For water and blood flowed from the wound. These streams sprang forth not by chance, not without purpose. From both the church was to be created....Through the water we are reborn, through the blood and flesh we are nourished. The holy mysteries had their origin on the Cross. Therefore, we set the blessed chalice to our lips as though we drank from the side of the Crucified himself. (In Joh. hom. 85:8).

Elsewhere Chrysostom states that it was at the "mystery" of the Last Supper that Jesus abolished the old Pasch and established the new, i.e., the eucharist (In Matt. hom. 82:1), and refers
to the occasion as "the same night on which Christ gave his great mysteries" (In 1 Cor. hom. 27:2). He says in addition that the eucharist is "the same banquet as that in which Christ sat at table, and that this banquet is in no way different than that" (In Matt. hom. 50:3).

A second example of where the question of causality was raised concerns the attempt of certain patristic authors, particularly from the fourth century on, to explain how the eucharistic elements were converted into the body and blood of Christ. It has not been uncommon for modern interpreters to maintain that one or another of the Fathers held to a theory of consecration either by the words of institution or by the epiclesis prayer, and to imply that the one theory excluded the other. It is our belief, however, that the Fathers did not have any rigid causal explanation for the conversion of the elements, and that here too they reasoned rather in a mythopoetic manner.

Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, who states that the church calls the Holy Spirit upon the gifts so that the eucharistic change might take place (Cat. myst. 5:7), and who affirms that the elements "before the invocation of the holy and adorable Trinity were simply bread and wine, while after the epiclesis the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ" (Cat. myst. 1:7), nevertheless connects the conversion
with the words of institution when he asks: "Since then he himself has affirmed and said of the bread, 'This is my body,' who shall have to doubt any longer? And since he has affirmed and said, 'This is my blood,' who shall ever hesitate, saying that this is not his blood?" (Cat. myst. 4:1).

The same apparent contradiction may be found in Gregory of Nyssa. While Gregory on the one hand can say that the bread "is at once changed into the body by means of the Word, as the Word itself said, 'This is my body,'" (Orat. cat. 37:10), on the other hand he does not differentiate the action of the Word from that of the Spirit when he compares the blessing of the eucharistic bread and wine with the blessing of the chrismatic oil:

The bread again is at first common bread, but when the sacramental action μυστηρίων consecrates it, it is called and becomes the body of Christ. So with the sacramental oil, so with the wine: though before the blessing they are of little value, after the sanctification bestowed by the Spirit each functions in a marvelous way (in diem luminem).

John Chrysostom is a witness to the same ambiguity. On occasion, he attaches the transformation quite clearly to the words of institution. Thus he writes:

For it is not man who brings it about that the gifts which are set forth become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ himself who was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling a role and saying these words, but the power and
grace are of God. "This is my body," he says; this word changes the things that lie before us. (Hom. de prod. Jud. 1:6). 

This declaration does not, however, prevent Chrysostom from speaking of the priest's calling upon the Holy Spirit to descend upon and touch the eucharistic elements (Hom. in coem. app. 3), a clear allusion to the epiclesis.

Texts such as these should lead us, in our opinion, to be hesitant in attributing to other authors who seem to be less ambiguous precise theories concerning the consecration. Thus we should not think that for Theodore of Mopsuestia—who appears as the champion of the epiclesis-theory—that the words of institution were not of importance in making Christ present in the liturgy. Conversely, we should not suppose that for Ambrose (who states in apparently clear terms that before the words "this is my body," "another reality is designated, but after the consecration, it is the body which is signified") and for the Western Church in general that the invocation of the Spirit was not also instrumental in the conversion of the elements.

In conclusion, we find in these two examples evidence that when early Christians raised the question of causality in reference to their cultic meal, as is the case in general for the mythological mind, they saw no fundamental contradiction in attributing more than one cause to a specific effect.
The Eucharist and the Mythical View of Death

In the second chapter of this thesis we have found that there existed in the New Testament period a conception of eating with the resurrected Christ, a conception which we have associated with a particular type of eucharist, namely the bread and fish type. In our opinion this conception exemplifies Cassirer's notion of myth as the "obstinate negation of the phenomenon of death." It is a manifestation of the typically mythical non-discrimination between the real and the ideal. The notion affirms in effect that the Lord who presided over the table fellowship during his public ministry continues to do so after his death; that he is in fact not "really" dead. We would go so far as to venture that it is not altogether improbable that the resurrection experience was itself rooted in the mythologisation of the table fellowship. The tradition gives a hint of this possibility in Lk. 24:35, where it is said that the resurrected Christ "was known to them in the breaking of bread." The distinctions between life and death, between past, present, and future, are effectively effaced in the cultic celebration. In Cullmann's words, "The Lord appeared to his disciples after his death; He appears now in the cultic meal of the community; He will appear soon for the messianic banquet."43 (cf. below, Section 6). We might add that this is the same Lord who "appeared" during his ministry, i.e., that the early community did not discriminate at
all between the historical Jesus on the one hand and the resurrected and glorified Christ on the other.\footnote{44}

In the classical type of eucharist, the death of Christ is an important theological motif. Here the death of Christ is both substantialised (though not of course personified) and negated. It is substantialised in so far as it is made present in eating and drinking (1 Co. 11:26). If there is a participation in the body and blood of Christ (1 Co. 10:16), it is not a question of his body and blood \textit{per se}, but his body and blood in so far as these concepts are a substantialisation of Jesus' sacrificial death. That such was the understanding during the patristic period is clear from Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on the liturgy. He asserts that the two elements "both constitute the \textit{anamnesis} of that Passion and death which the body of Christ underwent."\footnote{45} Explaining the formulae "This is my body, etc." and "This is my blood, etc.," he says: "The first saying refers to his Passion, the second to the horrible cruelty of this Passion in which much blood was spilled."\footnote{46}

Yet at the same time Christ's death is negated in the classical eucharist, for it is also the \textit{living} Christ who is offered to the believer. We have seen above that for Paul Christ offers in the sacrament his body and blood as \textit{πνεύμα}, a term which refers to the resurrectional sphere of existence.\footnote{47}
A related notion is found in Jn. 6:53ff. and in the Ignatian concept of "the medicine of immortality"; here it is the eucharistic flesh and blood which makes possible an abiding in the resurrected Christ and the resurrection of the believer himself. Similarly, Clement of Alexandria can declare, "To drink the blood of Jesus is to participate in his incorruption" (Paed. 2:2). This idea is developed more fully in Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nyssa, who both present the theory that we become partakers of the divine nature when the glorified and incorruptible body of Christ is disseminated through our members after communion.

The notion of death in the early eucharist is thus like that which scholars have found in myth. Death is not simply an absence of life, but a concrete reality which presents itself even physically. It is thus like life, and in fact finally presents itself as an affirmation of life.

The Eucharist and the Mythical View of Symbol

We have seen that from the outset the classical type of eucharist contained the idea that the sacramental bread and wine are offered to the partakers as the body and blood of Christ. This affirmation has provided Christian theologians with a much-disputed hermeneutical question: was the identification of the eucharistic elements with the body and blood of Christ understood by the New Testament and patristic writers in a literal sense or in a figurative sense?
Many scholars have attributed one or another of these views either to the period as a whole or to different individual writers within it. Others have sought to avoid the problem (at least for the New Testament) by affirming that for the New Testament writers the eucharistic presence of Christ is identical with the presence of Christ in the proclamation of the word. Eduard Schweizer, for example, says:

There is a partaking of the body and blood of Christ, that is, of Christ crucified for our sake, only in the sense of a partaking of Christ in the word: a man whom the proclaimed Christ has encountered has become thereby a different man, whether he responds in faith or in rejection...the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is exactly the same as his presence in the word—nothing more, nothing less.51

In a similar vein, Bultmann says that for Paul the Lord's Supper is "coordinate with the word-proclamation and ultimately only a special mode of it."52 Such an interpretation does not, however, for us resolve the problem; it seems more congenial to the Protestant doctrine of the preached word than to the cultural presuppositions of primitive Christianity.

It is our belief that the solution is to be found rather in the mythological conception of symbol or image. A step in this direction was already taken by Harnack, who recognised that in early Christianity the symbolic "is not to be considered as the opposite of the objectively real, but as the mysterious, the God produced, as contrasted to the natural, the profanely clear."53 In the logical structure of myth, there
is no differentiation between an image, picture or figure and the reality which it symbolises. A man's image, or even his shadow, is his alter ego; it might even be subject to injury as a real part of him. "The 'image,'" writes Cassirer, "does not represent the 'thing'; it is the thing; it does not merely stand for the object, but has the same actuality, so that it replaces the thing's immediate presence."

Since it lacks the category of the ideal, mythical thinking must transpose a symbol into something substantial in order to apprehend it. It is precisely in this context that we must understand the words of interpretation in the New Testament and the later patristic doctrine of elemental change. This latter doctrine should not be understood as an attempted philosophical justification for the real presence; it is an articulation of the cultic transition from the profane to the sacred, employing the mythical device of substantiation.

Mythical thinking is not necessarily unaware of the existence of symbols (no less than it is of the existence of a man's shadow), but it does identify the symbol with the symbolised. Thus in the language of the early church we find the eucharistic elements described by such terms as figura, similitudo, τύπος, εἰκών, σύμβολον, ἑμοίωμα, yet it is equally clear that for the writers concerned they are identical with the real body and blood of Christ.
We find this apparent contradiction first of all in the early liturgies. The *Apostolic Tradition*, in its rubrics concerning the first communion of the newly baptised, says that the bishop consecrates the bread ("gratias agat panem") into the "exemplum . . . corporis Christi," and then describes the wine as the antitypus or similitudo of the blood of Christ (Trad. apost. 21). But Hippolytus also warns that great care must be taken to respect the consecrated elements, that no fragments of the bread fall to rats or other animals, or get lost, "because it is the body of Christ to be eaten by the faithful, and must not be deprecated" (Trad. apost. 37). The *Apostolic Constitutions* similarly describes the eucharistic elements as "antitypes [αντίτυπα] of his precious body and blood" (5:14:7), and speaks of commemorating Christ's death "by virtue of the symbols [συμβόλων] of his body and blood" (6:23:5). Yet in the epiclesis (8:12:38) and the communion (8:13:15) prayers the elements are designated simply as "the body of Christ" and "the blood of Christ." In the *Euchology of Sera- pion*, the celebrant prays, "To thee we have offered this bread, the likeness [ομοιωμα] of the body of the only-begotten . . . . We have offered also the cup, the likeness of his blood" (13:12). In the epiclesis of the same liturgy, it is a matter of simple identification of the bread and wine with Christ's body and blood: "O God of truth, let they holy Word come upon this bread that it may become the body of the Word, and upon this cup
that it may become the blood of truth" (13:15). An ancient form of the Roman Canon, portions of which are preserved in Ambrose, exhibits the same use of "symbolical" and "realistic" language. The prayer immediately before the consecration reads: "Grant us that this oblation be suitable, spiritual, and acceptable, because it is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" (De sac. 4:21). But at communion, the priest says simply "The body of Christ," to which the communicant responds, "Amen" (De sac. 4:25). These examples drawn from early Christian worship reveal a common idea: that through the liturgical prayer and action, the signs become what they signify.

The same idea is no less present in the commentaries and references made by the Fathers to the central cultic act of the early Christian community. Tertullian, for example, has a quite clear doctrine of the real presence, and more than once refers to the eucharistic bread as simply "the body of the Lord." He says that as in baptism the body is washed in water, so in the eucharist "the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, so that the soul may be filled with God" (De res. mort. 8). J.N.D. Kelly remarks, "Clearly his assumption is that the Saviour's body and blood are as real as the baptismal water." Yet Tertullian does not hesitate to affirm that Christ called "the bread his body in order that you might understand that he gave to the bread the figure of his
body \[\textit{ut et hinc iam eum intellegas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse}\], which the prophet had previously represented \[\textit{figuravit}\] by the bread" (Adv. Marc. 3:19). In another text Tertullian juxtaposes literal and figurative language:

"Having taken the bread, and having distributed it to his disciples, he made it his body \[\textit{corpus suum illum fecit}\] saying, 'This is my body,' i.e., the figure \[\textit{figura}\] of my body" (Adv. Marc. 4:40). Elsewhere, when reproaching Christian craftsmen who dare to make idols in their workshops, he asks, "These hands which have given bodies to demons—will they touch the body of the Lord?" (De idol. 7:1). This text is a perfect illustration of the mythological view of symbol: the idol—the image—becomes, according to this metality, the real body of what it represents (for the early Christian): a demon. In a like manner the sacramental bread becomes what it represents, the body of Christ.

Examples of this twofold language can be multiplied. Origen refers to the "typical and symbolic body" (τυπικός καὶ συμβολικός σώμα) of Christ in the eucharist (In Matt. 11:14), and yet speaks of the simple "body of the Lord" with which the faithful must take great care lest particles fall to the ground (In Ex. hom. 13:13). Eusebius of Caesarea, who asserts that "we continually feed on the Saviour's body and continually participate in the Lamb's blood" (De solemn. pasch. 7:7), also says that we celebrate "the memory of this sacrifice by means
of symbols \[\delta\iota\upsilon\sigma\mu\upsilon\beta\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\] of his body and blood" (Dem. ev. 1:10:39)\(^{75}\) and refers to the bread as an image (\(\epsilon\iota\kappa\iota\omega\nu\)) of Christ's body (Dem. ev. 8:1:380).\(^{76}\) For Ambrose the communicant receives Christ's body and blood in \(\text{similitudem}\) (De sac. 6:1:3),\(^{77}\) and "after the consecration the body is signified \(\text{significatur}\)" (De myst. 9:54).\(^{78}\) On the other hand, "in that sacrament is Christ, because it is the body of Christ" (De myst. 9:58).\(^{79}\) The word of Christ, which can create \(\text{ex nihilo}\), can no less "change the things that are into that which was not": there is an actual change in the elements which is analogous to the miracles of the Bible (De myst. 9:51ff.).\(^{80}\)

Augustine too speaks of the \(\text{figura}\) or the \(\text{signum}\) of Christ's body and blood,\(^{81}\) and at the same time regularly speaks without qualification of the presence of this body and blood in the eucharistic celebration.\(^{82}\)

All of these examples are proof that when early Christians identified the eucharistic symbols—the bread and wine—with the body and blood of their Lord, they were convinced that the symbol was the thing itself. The image was substantialised. The contrast between figure and reality did not exist for them. In short, their conception of symbol was a mythological one.\(^{83}\)

**The Eucharist and the Mythical View of Time**

It has long been recognised that the "memorial" dimension of the early eucharistic celebration was not understood as a
mere recollection of past events, but as a making present of events which in their significance transcended the confines of historical time. We find, in fact, that early Christian writers considered the eucharistic sacrifice as identical with the sacrifice of Christ. This apparent effacing of time, or rather absence of a linear view of time in favour of a sacred, transcendent view of time, is characteristic of mythical thought. There are, according to Mircea Eliade, two marks of mythical time:

...(1) its repeatability (in the sense that every significant action reproduces it); and (2) the fact that, though it is looked upon as transhistoric, beyond all succession, and in a sense in eternity, this sacred time has, in history, a "beginning."

When the eucharistic celebration is seen to coincide with the one sacrifice of Christ, the empirical conception of the flow of time is discarded. Myth, as van der Leeuw says, "arrests time." "Thus the even becomes 'eternal': it happens now and always, and operates as a type." Cassirer puts the matter this way:

The stages of time—past, present, future—do not remain distinct; over and over again the mythical consciousness succumbs to the tendency and temptation to level the differences and ultimately transform them into pure identity.

For early Christians, the great salutary events of the Cross and the Resurrection were not simply past events remembered: they were archetypal events of cosmic proportions made real
again in the celebration of the liturgy. In myth, 

Every ritual has the character of happening now. The time of the event that the ritual commemorates or re-enacts is made present, "re-presented" so to speak, however far back it may have been in ordinary reckoning.87

In our discussion of St. Paul's eucharistic theology, we have seen that it was exactly in this sense that the New Testament uses the word ἀνάμνησις. This is no less true of the Fathers, and indeed it is this notion which is at the base of their description of the eucharist as a sacrifice. When Tertullian speaks of the eucharist as a "sacrifice," he means, if the interpretation of Kelly is correct,88 the same thing as when he says that the sacrificed body of Christ is rendered present (repraesentat, Contr. Marc. 1:14)89 in the celebration. In Cyprian the identification of the eucharistic sacrifice with the Passion of Christ is quite explicit: "And because we remember [mentionem facimus] his Passion in our sacrifices--the Passion of the Lord being the same sacrifice that we offer--we must do nothing other than he himself did" (Ep. 63:17).90 And Ambrose states, "Each time that the sacrifice is offered, the death of the Lord, the resurrection of the Lord, the ascension of the Lord, as well as the remission of sins, is signified" (De sac. 5:4:25).91 Commenting on this text, Danielou writes, "To signify does not here mean only to recall. The word also intends to state that the sacrifice offered is not a new sacrifice, but the one sacrifice of Christ rendered present."92
This conception of the coalescence of the eucharistic sacrifice with the one sacrifice of the Cross is equally present in the Greek Fathers. In this sense Theodore of Mopsuestia declares,

“All the priests of the new covenant continually offer the same sacrifice in every place and time, because that sacrifice is unique which was offered for us by Christ our Lord, who accepted death for us, and who purchased perfection for us through the offering of that sacrifice (Hom. cat. 15:19).”

John Chrysostom erases the temporal distinction not only between the eucharist and the Last Supper (see above, pp. 197-201), but also between the eucharist and the Cross:

“There is one Christ everywhere, who is both in this world and in the other, one body. As then Christ, who offers himself in many places is only one body, so there is only one sacrifice....We do not then offer a different sacrifice from the one formerly offered by the High Priest, but always the same, i.e., we celebrate an anamnesis of this sacrifice (In Heb. hom. 7:3).”

We can see from this text that the common assertion of the later Fathers—e.g. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. myst. 5:10), or Augustine (Civ. dei 10:20)—that Christ himself is the sacrificial victim offered in the eucharistic celebration must be understood in the context of a particular view of sacred time. Commenting on the doctrine of the Fathers, Odo Casel summarises succinctly this view of time:
Christian worship is no longer bound to time but to eternity; it does not have to keep days and hours; it is always in the new age, the aion. When we worship we step out of time.

The Eucharist and the Mythical View of Space

Mythical space, like mythical time, is demarcated by the opposition between the sacred and the profane, and not by abstract measurement. In myth,

Position is not something that can be detached from content or contrasted with it as an element of independent significance; it "is" only insofar as it is filled with a definite, individual sensuous or intuitive content.

In other words, myth obliterates the physical gap between the sphere of human activity and the sphere of divine activity. The place of the sacred ritual coincides with the habitat of the gods. Where there are sacred buildings, sanctuaries, or altars, these are intended to be real copies of archetypes existing in the realm of the divine.

In early Christianity this mythological view of space is found in the conception of the eucharist as precisely a heavenly meal. This conception is implicit in the New Testament insofar as the Christ with whom the believer communicates is the glorified Christ at the right hand of the Father. It becomes explicit in the commentaries of the later patristic writers on the sacred liturgy. For these writers the liturgy of the eucharist and the liturgy of heaven are one and the same. The eucha-
ristic sacrifice removes the "space" between heaven and earth, or, more precisely, it transfers the believer into heaven.

The whole of the eucharistic liturgy is interpreted by the later Fathers as a passage from earth to heaven. Ambrose says that the newly baptised, on entering the church for their first eucharist, "hasten to go to the heavenly banquet" (De myst. 43). "What we should notice," remarks Daniélou, "is that the Eucharist is shown from the beginning to be the heavenly banquet. It is the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary which is prefigured by the entrance into the earthly church." Similarly, for Gregory of Nazianzen, all of the details of the entrance rite—the psalms, the procession, the candles—are connected to the liturgy in heaven.

In a like manner, these Fathers interpret the second part of the liturgy, the preparation of the offerings on the altar by the deacons, as a celestial event. For Theodore of Mopsuestia, the deacons are figures of the angels at the offertory: "By means of the deacons who do the serving for that which is performed, we can follow in our understanding the invisible powers in their service of officiating at this ineffable liturgy" (Hom. cat. 15:24). John Chrysostom comments: "The angels surround the priest. The whole sanctuary and the space around the altar are filled with the heavenly powers to honour him who is present on the altar" (De sacerd. 6:4).

The theme of the heavenly liturgy is continued in the commentaries on the *Sursum Corda* and the Trisagion, which together
constitute an introduction to the Canon. Cyril of Jerusalem declares that at the call of the priest, "Lift up your hearts," we are "filled with holy fear" because we raise our hearts to God in heaven and are no longer turned towards earthly things (Cat. myst. 5:4). The Trisagion is in fact the hymn of the Seraphim in heaven. Speaking of this moment in the liturgy, Chrysostom writes, "Man is as it were transported into heaven itself. He stands near the throne of glory. He flies with the Seraphim" (De incomp. dei 4:5). Cyril of Jerusalem explains that the assembly recites this hymn "so that we may take part in the hymn of praise with the hosts above the cosmos" (Cat. myst. 5:6). Theodore of Mopsuestia relates the Trisagion to the spirit of fear and awe which precedes acting out the archetypal events which take place in heaven:

We use the awe-inspiring words of the invisible powers to show the greatness of the mercy which is freely lavished on us. Fear fills our conscience throughout the whole course of the liturgy, both before we cry out "Holy!" and afterwards: we look down at the ground, because of the greatness of what is being done, manifesting this same fear (Hom. cat. 16:9).

The anaphora, the central part of the liturgy which sets before the believers God's redemptive history and in particular the mystery of the Cross, likewise bridges the gap between heaven and earth. The Holy Spirit "descends" on to the elements and on to the congregation itself. The glorified body of Christ becomes present on the altar. But if there is a "descent" of
heavenly realities into the assembly, there is no less an "ascent" of the believer into heaven. Chrysostom writes:

For when you see the Lord sanctified, and laid upon the altar, and the priest standing and praying over the victim, and all the worshippers empurpled with that precious blood, can you think then that you are still among men, and standing on earth? Do you not pass over immediately into heaven? (De sacerd. 3:4)

The communion, finally, is, in an expression which appears constantly in the writings of the Fathers and in the early liturgies, a receiving of the "bread of heaven" (e.g. Tertullian, De pud. 9; Apost. Trad. 21; Cyprian, De dom. orat. 18; Hilary, Tract. in psalm. 9; Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. myst. 4:5; Ambrose, Hom. 18:27; John Chrysostom, In Matt. hom. 49:3; Augustine, Tract. 26:11). As Jerome puts it, "we eat the bread of the angels" (Ep. 120:2). In the culmination of the ritual act, the believer partakes himself of a heavenly substance. Thereby he is no longer tied to earth; as Theodore of Mopsuestia says,

By it, we who are mortal by nature expect to receive immortality; corruptible, we become incorruptible; from the earth and earthly evils, we pass to all the blessings and delights of heaven. By means of these kinds of figures, we have faith that we possess the realities themselves (Hom. cat. 15:12).

We may conclude that for the Fathers of the early church, the act of eucharistic worship was not viewed as an act of men on earth praying to God in heaven, as a means of communication
between one place and another. It was rather seen as a pas­sage from earth to heaven itself; it was an acting out by means of "figures" of the archetypal liturgy in heaven, the figures, in this mythological way of thinking, corresponding to the reality itself.

Conclusion

Our examination of the pertinent texts has shown that the cult and theology of the early Christian eucharist can be understood in terms of a myth and ritual pattern. The myth of the classical type eucharist may be summarised as follows: the redemptive act of Christ, which took place on the Cross and which Christ explained at his Last Supper, is a supra-historical and supra-temporal event which is revealed at each eucharistic celebration, and by it the believer in some sense leaves "earthly" time and space to participate in and bear the fruits of this sacred event.

Our intention in this appendix has simply been to point out the kind of logic which early Christian writers used when speaking of their sacred meal. Further enquiry might lead to an explanation of the myth, i.e., a demythologisation or transposition of myth into empirical language. Such enquiry could well proceed by utilising the structural method proposed by Claude Lévi-Strauss; this would require a detailed comparison of the various liturgies and liturgical commentaries, and a careful breaking down of these into specific idea-components.
While such an undertaking is beyond the scope of this study, we would like, by way of conclusion, to raise two other questions which our interpretation may have posed for the reader. The first is: why does rational and philosophical reasoning play an important role in patristic discussion of other central doctrines, such as the Incarnation or Trinity, if eucharistic theology remains essentially mythological? And the second is: why is it that there was a transition from a mythopoetic to a rationalistic reflection concerning the eucharist in the period of the Carolingian Renaissance?

The answer to the first question lies in what we have already said about the nature of myth. Myth is above all the verbalisation of ritual. Eucharistic theology, unlike Christology or trinitarian theology, constituted an attempt to articulate the meaning of the fundamental Christian ritual. Ritual, as it were, explains itself, and this self-explanation is myth. When praying or describing their liturgy, early Christians were not dealing with abstract doctrine, but with their everyday cultic action.

The second question requires a somewhat more elaborate answer. We must observe, to begin with, that all of the mythic features of eucharistic theology were not expunged in the rationalising process. We find elements of the mythical apprehension even in contemporary eucharistic theology, and this apprehension has remained particularly strong in Eastern Christendom.
There were undoubtedly several factors which contributed to the rationalising of eucharistic doctrine in the ninth century West. One such factor was the introduction of the Irish penitential system into continental Europe. This led to less frequent lay communion, which in turn resulted in an increasing preoccupation with the significance of the elements themselves. Yet the most important factor was the very nature of the Carolingian intellectual revival. That is to say, there was a conscious effort on the part of Charlemagne and his court to promote systematic and rational thinking, and in particular there was an attempt to systematise and standardise the liturgy.

Myth is destroyed when it ceases to be the spontaneous articulation of ritual and when foreign categories are introduced into it. Cassirer has observed that the prophets of Israel could combat idolatry (myth) only by injecting "into the mythical consciousness an alien tension, an opposition it does not know as such," viz., the opposition between the image of the divine and the divine itself. Similarly, the application of a systematic, rational, and non-mythical type of thought to the theory and practice of the eucharistic liturgy seems to have been a deliberate enterprise on the part of the Carolingian scholars. These scholars were encouraged to study the profane sciences and to apply the results of their research to revealed truth. Thus Alcuin is heard declaring to his monarch, "A new Athens will be created in France, nay, an Athens finer than the old, for ours, ennobled by the teachings of Christ,
All of the great Carolingian theologians—Alcuin, Raban Maur, Radbertus, Ratramnus, Prudentius, Lupus of Ferrieres—wrote treatises on philology and other scientific subjects. Whereas in myth we find a movement from action to knowledge, Charlemagne decreed that knowledge must be prior to action:

Even as the monastic rule directs purity of conduct, so practice in teaching and learning directs and orders the composition of words, to the end that those who strive to please God by right living may not omit to please him also by right speaking... and though it is better to do what is right than to know it, yet knowledge must precede action.

In this spirit, Charlemagne undertook the standardisation of the liturgy throughout his empire. Liturgy was now something prescribed, rather than the spontaneous creation of the community. At the same time, theologians began to publish the first systematic treatises devoted to the eucharist. The eucharist—like the virgin birth—was no longer to remain a mystery: the presence of Christ in the sacrament was to be explained. This was the beginning of a whole process of rational thinking concerning the eucharist which continued down through the Middle Ages, which provided a topic for sharp controversy during the Reformation, and which continues today to colour our interpretation of the eucharist in the period of the early church.
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APPENDIX II:

A. Mk. 6:41f.

And taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and blessed and broke the loaves, and gave them to the disciples to set before the people; and he divided the two fish among them all. And they all ate and were satisfied.

B. Mt. 14:19f.

And taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and blessed and broke the loaves and gave them to his disciples to set before the people; and they all ate and were satisfied.

C. Lk. 9:16f.

And taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and blessed and broke the loaves, and gave them to the disciples to set before the people; and he divided the two fish among them all. And they all ate and were satisfied.

D. Mk. 8:6ff.

And he took the seven loaves, and having given thanks he broke them, and gave them to his disciples to set before the people; and they set them before the crowd. And they had a few small fish; and having blessed them, he commanded that these should also be set before them, and they ate, etc.
He took the seven loaves and the fish, and having given thanks he broke them and gave them to the disciples, and the disciples gave them to the crowds. And they all ate and were satisfied.

Jesus then took the loaves, and when he had given thanks, he distributed them to those who were seated; so also the fish, as much as they wanted. And when they had eaten their fill, he told the disciples, "Gather up the fragments left over that nothing may be lost."
He (Mt.: Jesus) took bread and blessed and broke it, and gave it to them (Mt.: the disciples), and said, "Take, (eat), this is my body." And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them.

Mk.: and they all drank of it.

And he said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many.

Mt.: saying, "Drink of it all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins."

I. Jn. 6:51-58.

(And) he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, saying (Lk.: and gave it to them, saying), "This is my body which is (Lk.: is given) for you. Do this in remembrance of me." In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, "This cup (which is poured out for you) is the new covenant in my blood.

Pl. only: Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me."

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any one eats of this bread, he will live for ever; and the bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh."

The Jews then disputed among themselves, saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" So Jesus said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me. This is the bread which came down from heaven, not such as the fathers ate and died; he who eats this bread will live for ever."
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