

# The Lord's Banquet: Resources, Problems and Perspectives from the New Testament

Edgar Krentz

The New Testament provides the fundamental basis for the church's celebration of the Lord's Supper and, at the same time, the major source from which to critique aspects of the church's Eucharistic practice today. It is important to hear the New Testament as carefully as possible, in all its variety, in order to understand the New Testament elements that go to make up contemporary Eucharistic practice and theology. In what I do today I will carry out my role as a New Testament scholar: to hear the New Testament in all its variety and diversity as an aid in understanding the earliest church and as a guide to appropriating that diversity today.

All of the texts upon which we draw for interpreting the earliest Christian "Lord's Supper" are written in Greek—though we all agree that the meal at which our Lord first hosted this supper was a Jerusalem Passover whose Haggadah was in Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> All our texts therefore run the risk of importing via translation verbal associations that drag with them elements of non-Hebraic culture, social customs, or cultic practices.

The Lord's Supper *did not originate as an act of public worship*—and was not celebrated as such, in our sense, anywhere in the earliest church. Here we need to be utterly precise in our language. By early church I mean the church between the resurrection and approximately the year 110, some eighty years of living the faith. The period after this is fundamentally different in many aspects. The church became a self-conscious social institution within the Early Roman Empire sometime after 70 CE, as 1 Peter, the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle of Diognetus bear witness. Some language and some customs might have come into the church from the growing desire to fit into the hierarchical structure of ancient society, e.g. the growing rejection of women in leadership roles and the hierarchical ordering of authority in the church. (MacDonald may be right when he suggests that the *Acta Paul et Thecae* show us the type of Christianity against which the Pastorals protest.<sup>2</sup>)

It is in this period that Judaism and Christianity sharply diverged from each other, the period of formative Judaism and formative Christianity. The growing separation from and apologetic argument with Rabbinic Judaism influenced the church in many ways, as the strong anti-Judaism of the Apocalypse of John, sections of Ignarius of Antioch, and Melito of Sardis, as well as Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew*, testify.

For the next 240 years opposition from the Roman authorities, growing in the second century and virulent under the Emperor Decius in the

third, also affected the church. Small wonder that mystagogical aspects grew (pace the mystery religions), that the fencing of the altar became important (the meal for initiates only), and that Christianity feels the need, as time goes on, to create the counterparts of pagan priests and the *pontifex maximus* and to replicate the power structure of the Late Roman Empire's government in its metropolitan churches. Read Ramsay MacMullen's description of bishops who operate much like their secular counterparts to appreciate the significance of this point.<sup>3</sup>

A final caveat: 312 CE brought a radical change into the life of the church. The change in status is symbolized by Constantine ordering fifty sumptuous copies of the New Testament to be prepared and placed in major urban churches of the empire—while his almost immediate predecessor had ordered New Testaments burned. However, one also should recall that it is only subsequent to Constantine that the New Testament canon as we know it was accepted. There was still some fluidity in the early fourth century.

We find no Christian art from the period of the New Testament. True Christian art does not antedate the third century—and is sparse even then. The two scenes from the Catacomb of St. Callixtus showing seven people seated behind an arc-shaped table with fish and baskets, formerly interpreted as the Lord's Supper, are now thought to represent funerary meals at the tomb of a family member.<sup>4</sup> The same is true of the similar scene in the Catacomb of Priscilla (the *capella Graeca*).<sup>5</sup> The banquet scene in the Catacomb of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter, where the diners call for two servants called Irene and Agape to serve the wine warm and mixed (*da calde, misce mi*), probably represents a similar scene or the heavenly banquet.<sup>6</sup> This interpretation is supported by the discovery of a martyrdom below the Münster in Bonn, Germany, equipped with two mensae and dining benches, and what Snyder calls "agape tables," funerary installations to serve as a mensa for the food in funerary installations.<sup>7</sup> We have no unambiguous early artistic evidence for the Lord's Supper at all.<sup>8</sup> In short, one must resist the temptation to retroject into the earliest church liturgical, artistic, cultic, and clerical aspects that first arise after the middle of the second century. Much as I like Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses* and read with delight Egeria's account of worship in the Constantinian church of Anastasis in Jerusalem or in the Eleona on the Mt. of Olives, I seek to avoid a form of the *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* type of reasoning to find later attitudes or forms prefigured or used in the New Testament.<sup>9</sup>

But enough of such clearing of the field's underbrush in order to get on with the excavation of this most important site, the meal traditions of the New Testament. And we immediately run into a significant fact that is often underplayed or overlooked: the paucity of New Testament texts relating to the Lord's Supper are rare: three accounts of the supper at the opening of Pesach before the crucifixion, two or three texts in Paul, some texts in Acts often held to be relevant, and (at best) references to agape feasts

in Jude and in other early Christian literature. There is no narrative account of anything remotely resembling an early Christian eucharistic ritual. We get bits and pieces that tantalize by their opacity. The holes in the evidence make the Lord's Supper look like a porous sponge.

*The Earliest Texts: Paul*

We begin, of course, with Paul, not the gospels, since 1 Corinthians antedates Mark, the earliest written gospel, by at least fifteen years. Paul has an extended discussion of Corinthian cultic practices in 1 Corinthians 8-14. The very strangeness of the topics Paul discusses is enough to alert us not to make hasty assumptions that the Corinthians celebrated anything externally similar to our liturgical celebration. Paul discusses eating meat offered to idols; freedom to accept a salary or, in his case, to refuse money; sacramental security; eating a cultic meal in a Corinthian temple; women leaders in prayer and prophecy; the Lord's Supper as division maker; endowment with the spirit; the more excellent way; and glossalalia. Why does this set of topics arise?

The situation in Corinth is relatively clear. The Corinthian church understood and interpreted Paul's proclamation within the context of their conceptual, cultural world. For them the primary sacrament was Baptism, not the Lord's Supper; what happened in baptism determined their overall understanding of Paul's message. Baptism moved them from the realm of death to the realm of life, from the realm of *σάρξ* to the realm of *πνεύμα*. They thus shared already in the heavenly life, as their ability to speak in the language of angels (1 Cor 13:1; 1 Corinthians 14 *passim*) demonstrated. This insight clarifies that enigmatic verse, 1 Cor 1:17: "For Christ did not send me out to baptize, but to proclaim good news, not in the wisdom of argumentation, in order that the cross of Christ not be nullified."

Baptism, the Corinthians apparently maintained, by the Spirit's power produced the freedom of the gospel. (Hence Paul's attention to freedom in 1 Corinthians 9.) They expressed their freedom practically in their lifestyle and in their worship—and that in two quite different ways. On the one hand some of them felt free to demonstrate their freedom from the realm of the body by downplaying the body in favor of pneumatic existence (1 Corinthians 7), while others showed their disdain for the body by exercising sexual freedom. The premier example of this is the case of the man living with his father's wife, a case of incest "in the name of the Lord," which leads the Corinthians to pride in this man's understanding of the spirit. Note the play between spirit and flesh as Paul discusses this case in 1 Cor 5:1-5.

On the other hand, Paul's remarks in 1 Corinthians 2 give us insight into the other result of this theology of baptismal resurrection. The Corinthians held that the gift of the Spirit in baptism gave them special knowledge of the one true God. They were the spiritual elite, the *τέλειοι* of 1 Cor 2:6, who know the *μυστήριον* of God, *τὰ βάρη τοῦ θεοῦ* (1 Cor 2:7, 10). The Spirit given in baptism taught them their baptismal acclamation

ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, κύριος Χριστός (1 Cor 12:1-3), which expressed their belief that they had moved from the realm of the body to the realm of the Spirit under the one Lord Christ. They already lived the life of heaven, speaking in the “tongues of angels” (1 Cor 13:1), ἐνγλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων. They were πνευματικοί (1 Cor 12:1)<sup>10</sup>, who ate spiritual food and drank spiritual drink, food and drink that conveyed to them Spirit and power (1 Cor 10:1-4).

Given their knowledge they now knew that the gods and lords of other religions were nothings, not really existent. (1 Cor 8:4) Hence without hesitation they could buy and eat meat that had been sacrificed to non-Christian deities and was now sold in the μακέλλον.<sup>11</sup> And they could participate in cultic meals within the temple precincts of these gods when invited by their friends. After all, food does not recommend us to God (1 Cor 8:8: βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν.)

Paul first mentions the Lord’s Supper within the context of Christian participation in cultic meals in the local Corinthian temples as an expression of Christian knowledge and freedom. We know such a first century cult center in the Corinthian Asklepieion for certain, whose dining rooms and benches are still partly in place. There are earlier cultic dining rooms in the precinct of Demeter on the north slope of Acro-Corinth and in the cultic dining caves slightly to the southeast of the theater at the Isthmia. 1 Cor 10:16-17, interpreted within that context, suggests a number of significant points about the Lord’s Supper. I provide a text with key phrases underscored: 10:14 Διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μοι, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας 15 ὡς φρονίμοις λέγω· κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὅ φημι. 16 τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; 17 ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. 18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα· οὐχ οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσιν; 19 τί οὖν φημι; ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστίν ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλόν τί ἐστίν; 20 ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἅ θύουσιν, δαιμονίος καὶ οὐ θεῷ [θύουσιν] οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι. 21 οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων, οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης δαιμονίων. 22 ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον; μὴ ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἔσομεν (1 Corinthians 10:14-22)

Paul sets the Lord’s Supper within the context of community defining meals. He understands the social function of meals within the religious culture of the time. Meals produce community by identifying one with the god under whose aegis they take place. Paul agrees with the Corinthians about a number of things in relation to the Eucharist. He does not dispute with them that the bread and wine convey power because they convey the Spirit. That is why he speaks of food and drink that is πνευματικός. However, he ties the food and drink directly to Christ—even in the Old Testament (1 Cor 10:1-5). He also agrees with them that food *per se* neither recommends us to God nor separates us from God. Buy and eat whatever

is sold in the *makellon*, 1 Cor 10:25, because you know who the creator God is (1 Cor 8:6, 10:26, citing Psalm 24:1).

Paul differs sharply from the Corinthians in his attitude toward the gods of Corinth.<sup>12</sup> The Corinthians deny their reality; Paul, surprisingly, affirms it (1 Cor 8:5 ὡς περ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί). That is essential to his argument in chapter ten about the effect of eating meals in Corinthian cult centers. The gods of Corinth are “godlets” (my translation of δαιμονία in Cor 10:21) with whom one can, but should not, establish community. In this context Paul apparently makes an implicit citation of a Corinthian Lord’s Supper tradition. He speaks of the “cup of blessing” and “the bread which we break” (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν;). This may be reference to a formula borrowed from the Passover Haggadah. Paul calls the cup the τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, which may reflect the traditional blessing over the cup:

בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ הֵן אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם בּוֹרֵא פְרֵי הַגֶּפֶן:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, creator of the fruit of the vine.<sup>13</sup>

Is it significant that Paul here uses εὐλογία (εὐλογεῖν), the translation of בְּרָכָה, not εὐχαριστία, the translation of הַדָּוָה. Opinions vary a good bit. Gustaf Dalman years ago argued that though the two terms reflect Hebrew words, both are appropriate to the blessing of food and drink.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, Lawrence Hoffman recently argued the reverse.<sup>15</sup> What of the fact that Paul does not speak of the blessing over the bread? Such a blessing, parallel to that over the cup, is used in the Passover Haggadah:

בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ הֵן אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם הַמּוֹצֵא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who produces bread from the earth.

The use of formulaic expression is also supported by the phrase “participation in the blood of Christ” (κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ;). Paul almost never refers to the blood of Jesus in his own free composition.<sup>16</sup> The word αἷμα occurs ninety-seven times in the New Testament, twenty-two times in the Synoptic gospels, six in John, eleven in Acts, twenty-one times in Hebrews, two in 1 Peter, four in James, nineteen times in Revelation, and only twelve times in Paul.<sup>17</sup> It is clear that behind the formula lies both the Passover ritual and the understanding of the shedding of blood in sacrifice as removing sin.

The way in which Paul uses this tradition is surprising. He first calls attention to the formula over the cup, then speaks of “the bread we break” as a participation in the body of Christ. He makes no reference in 1 Cor 10:16 to a parallel blessing over the bread (though there is one in the Passover Haggadah and in 1 Corinthians 11), speaking instead of breaking the bread. This order—cup first, then bread—raises the question whether the tradition reflected in 1 Cor 10:16 differs from that in 1 Cor 11:23-25 and agrees with the account in Luke 22, about which we will have more to say later.<sup>18</sup>

Finally, most surprising of all, Paul appropriates only a part of the tradition he cites. He is concerned about combating the complacency and security that the Corinthians felt they obtained from their pneumatic meal, a meal that conveyed the Spirit and so offered power and security. He reminded them that Old Testament Israel had such pneumatic food and drink and yet were scattered as corpses through the wilderness. Therefore learn from that. There is no such thing as security without behavior that correlates with gift. 1 Cor 10:11-12: ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις, ἐγγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰῶνων κατήντηκεν. 12 ὥστε ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι βλεπέτω μὴ πέση.

Now it becomes clear. Paul cites the tradition for the sake of the κοινωνία motif: cultic meals mean participation in the “body.” Paul does not stress here the “broken for you” aspect; rather, the body he contemplated is the body of Christ. As Conzelmann says, we must not overlook the fact that at the Pauline level of interpretation the parallel (between body and blood) is modified: for Paul, “body” is not simply the correlate of “blood.” He is thinking already of the “body of Christ,” the church. . He is aiming at an interpretation of the community. “Body” as a designation of the church is not meant figuratively, but in the proper sense: the church is not “like” a body, but is “the” body of Christ; The sacramental participation in Christ’s body makes us into the body of Christ. The emphasis lies on unity. (Conzelmann, 172)

That participation in the body makes eating in a Corinthian cultic precinct impossible. One cannot be part of two bodies (1 Cor 10:21-22): οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων, οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης δαιμονίων. 22 ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον; μὴ ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἔσομεν. Paul uses the Lord’s Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 to preserve the unity of that body he first mentioned in 10:16-17. He begins his discussion by describing the situation he addresses in Corinth (1 Cor 11:17-22). There the “Lord’s Supper” was part of a community meal in which some Corinthians were well fed and drank to excess (1 Cor 11:21), while others went home hungry, put to shame by the more fortunate (ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε καὶ καταισχύνετε τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας; 1 Cor 11:22). That produced clefts (σχίσματα) in the community, which Paul interprets as “despising the assembly of God.”<sup>19</sup>

Paul next cites the tradition about the Lord’s Supper, 1 Cor 11:23-25, to which he adds an interpretive comment (11:26). There are a number of significant items in this account. It is clearly tradition that Paul cites, tradition received from the Lord. He uses the technical terms for receiving (παραλαμβάνω, לָקַח) and handing on of tradition (παραδίδωμι, רָמַז) in the introduction.<sup>21</sup> This dates the tradition back at least into the 40s CE, if not earlier. Jeremias points out that only here in Paul is εὐχαριστεῖν used absolutely. And only here is the phrase τὸ σῶμα used absolutely of Jesus’ physical body by Paul. That supports the interpretation that Paul is here citing an earlier tradition.

The tradition interprets both the bread (τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) and cup (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν τῷ ἔμφ' ἁίματι) against the background of sacrificial practice, while the "new covenant" recalls the promises in Jeremiah 31:31 and 32:40 and also makes reference to blood in relation to covenant in Zech 9:11. The meal is eschatological because it makes present the new covenant.

In 1 Cor 11:25 the covenant is not identified as giving the forgiveness of sins (as it also is not in Luke's longer text). That agrees with Paul's general theological position. He rarely speaks of the forgiveness of sins, since for him ἁμαρτία is a power that holds the human being in slavery, not an accumulation of misdeeds (for which he usually uses the term παράπτωμα).<sup>22</sup> See Paul's words in Rom 8:2 and 1 Cor 15:56 which tie law, sin and death together as forces from which the human being needs to be delivered.

Paul indicates where the stress lies in his use of this tradition in v.26. He ties the Lord's Supper to Jesus' death. Indeed, the ἀνάμνησις in this Pauline theologoumenon is the proclamation (καταγγέλλειν) of his death. Thus Phil 2:6-11 may be closer to the Pauline understanding of ἀνάμνησις than the recitation of the dominical words of institution, as sanctified by liturgical tradition.<sup>23</sup> Nils Dahl years ago investigated the use of ἀνάμνησις in the New Testament, especially Paul, to conclude that it is the proper term for preaching inside the Christian community.<sup>24</sup> He says the "for the early Christians knowledge was an anamnesis, a recollection of the gnosis given to all those who have believed in the gospel, received baptism, and been incorporated into the church" (Dahl 16). Paul reminds us that the anamnesis-proclamation tied to the Lord's Supper is the association of the supper with the death of Jesus. From the New Testament point of view, that is the essential in the sacrament, not the recitation of the dominical words.<sup>25</sup> So also Käsemann concludes (121):

... the command to repeat the actions does not merely bind the community to celebrate the Lord's Supper regularly and thus keep alive in a literalistic way the meaning of the death of Jesus, but places upon it at the same time the obligation to proclaim the redemptive meaning of this death, as Paul himself lays down in his concluding gloss. (v.26)

Note that Paul uses the verb of the action over the bread, but not over the cup. John Burkhardt called my attention to a number of significant articles related to this term and the term bless.<sup>26</sup> In one of them Thomas Tally commented "no, berakah is not the same as eucharistia, and we may hope that further studies will help us to understand the meaning and consequences of that, after all, rather odd fact." (168) I have not yet discovered that anyone has done that task for us.

In the third stage of his argument Paul interprets the significance of this tradition for the situation in the Corinthian assembly (1 Cor 11:27-33). Many terms in this passage have a legal sense: ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος, δοκιμαζέτω, κρίμα, διακρίνω, διεκρίνομεν, ἐκρινόμεθα, κρινόμενοι, παιδενόμεθα, κατακριθῶμεν, σθνερχόμενοι, κρίμα σθνέρχησθε.

Note a number of interesting facts about this Pauline interpretation. First, there is no suggestion of anything like a fixed liturgical form or formula for the meal. Indeed, the Corinthian meal must have looked to any non-Christian onlooker like a social occasion, since there is no mention of priest, ritual, or any of the circumstances that would normally surround cultic sacrifice. That is, of course, not surprising, since nothing in this meal would have appeared to any Corinthian like a sacrifice. And so a priest would not be necessary for the eating of this meal, since the function of the priest in the Greco-Roman world—and in the Jewish as well—was twofold: to insure that rituals of all kinds were done properly so that they would be effective; and to interpret auspices of various kinds so that people could face the future with confidence (shades of Urim and Thummim).<sup>27</sup>

Second, the structure of Paul's discussion of the sacrament, first taken up in 1 Cor 10:1-11:1 and a second time in 11:17-34, serves as a framework around the discussion of the role of women as leaders in prayer and prophecy. This suggests that Paul is still thinking in the framework of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11:2-16 and implies that women may also pray and prophesy in the Lord's Supper. The fact that it is not conceived of as a cultic act this early might be a supporting argument. (I should add that we know very little about early worship forms in the first century—and what we know makes us aware of what a thirsty sponge that knowledge is.)

Third, there is an amazing incidence of legal terminology in 1 Corinthians 11. At a minimum the following terms are drawn from legal vocabulary. *συνέρχεσθαι* is the proper term for the coming together of the assembly (*ἐκκλησία* cf. 14:4, 19, 33, 34) of the *δῆμος* in a Greek city (see vv.18, 20, 33-34: ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, σθνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε. 34 εἰ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα σθνερχησθε ; cf. 14:26). Paul warns them against turning their assembly (*ἐκκλησία*) into a judicial assembly. There is judgment tied into the assembly. Note the following terms *ἀναξίως*, *ἐνοχος* (v.27); *κρίμα*, *κρίνω* (vv.29, 32); *διακρίνω* (v.29); *δοκιμάζω* (to undergo public scrutiny, v.28); *δόκιμος* (v.19); *καταγγέλειν* (v.26); *διακρίνω* (v.25, in the sense of decree or ordinance).<sup>28</sup> To prevent the Lord's Supper becoming the basis for judicial process, Paul recommends that each Christian should undergo scrutiny (*δοκιμάζεται ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν*, 1 Cor 11:28) before eating together. Paul uses this legal terminology to condemn any divisive eating of the Lord's Supper.

But what is the basis of judgment that Paul suggests? *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα* (v.29) means not discerning the body that is the community. The legal terminology is also social terminology. Even Christ in the Lord's Supper is not individualistic! His body is the church (10:16, 12:27); therefore any eating of the meal that does not recognize the community as Christ's body denies the lordly character of the meal. The problem Paul deals with here is not "separation from the church, but dissensions within it."<sup>29</sup> "It is by failure here that the Corinthians profane the sacramental aspect of the supper—not by liturgical error or by under-valuing it (or by

not excluding those whose faith is in some sense aberrant—my addition), but by prefixing to it an unbrotherly act.”<sup>30</sup> When Paul says that one is “guilty of the body and blood of the Lord” (v.27), he suggests the decisive character of this social interpretation. Before this presence of Christ in the meal, there are only two possible stances. One either unites with Christ by expressing the unity of his body as it proclaims the death of Christ, or one belongs to those who have executed him. *Tertium non datur*. Paul then formulates a law in v.27, and its effect will become clear “when he comes” (v.26). Thus the meal has eschatological implications.<sup>31</sup> Some are legal and judicial, not joyful. The implications are clear from v.33: When you come together receive (accept) one another.<sup>32</sup>

One final comment deserves to be highlighted. Paul shares with the Corinthians the view that the Lords' Supper carries power in the Spirit. The bread and the cup are πνευματικά. But that carries profound implications. The power in the meal does not disappear when the meal is not celebrated as the Lord's meal. Rather it becomes a judging and punishing power. “That is why many are weak and sick and some have died” (v.30). This self examination that preserves the lordly character is what delivers us from judgment—though not from the Lord's discipline (παιδεία). Note how I just translated the Greek phrase —“lordly meal”! It is not “Lord's supper;” is not a possessive adjective; rather it denotes a supper whose actions correspond to the Lord whose death it proclaims.

For Paul the stress of the sacrament clearly lies on the expression of unity. The implications of this passage are staggering. It calls into question any celebration of the Lord's Supper that is not open to all Christians. It gives no authority to keep any professed Christian from the table. It stands in judgment over any and all divisive Eucharistic celebrations that keep anyone who confesses “Jesus Christ is Lord” away from the meal. The profound significance of Paul's warning here ought to concern us all.

There are other Pauline texts that may impinge on our interpretation of the Corinthian Eucharist. One is 1 Cor. 5:6-8, which uses paschal imagery. Paul uses the *Bi'ur Hametz*, the ritual search through the house for yeast and all leavened foods on the evening before the Passover Seder, to urge that the incestuous son be disciplined. He bases his parenthesis on the fact that Christ, the Passover lamb (τὸ πάσχα), already has been sacrificed (5:7). The use of language is figurative, “of Christ and his bloody death;”<sup>33</sup> that is Paul is arguing that since the Passover lamb is already dead, the Corinthians should hurry to complete the cleansing of the house. There is no suggestion that 1 Cor 5:7 relates this to the Lord's Supper in any way—though Luther's “*Christ lag in Todesbanden*” and Bach's setting in Cantata 4 have accustomed us to think it obvious. A close examination of 1 Corinthians 10-11 shows that Paul does not stress this tie, since he identifies the bread, not the roasted lamb that must have been on the table, as his body—a curious fact that no one seems to discuss. Therefore we should not use 1 Cor 5:6-8 as a eucharistic passage without some qualms of conscience.

We are on firmer ground, though it is still a bit mushy, in the case of 1 Cor 16:20-23. In his essay "On the Understanding of Worship," Günther Bornkamm includes a section titled "The Anathema in the Early Christian Lord's Supper Liturgy" (169-176).<sup>34</sup> Following up on earlier suggestions by Reinhold Seeberg and Hans Lietzmann,<sup>35</sup> Bornkamm suggests that a form-critical analysis of 1 Cor 16:20-23 reveals a series of four liturgical formulae. After sending greetings from the churches of Asia, from Aquila, Priska, and the assembly in their house, and all the brothers, Paul uses these four formulaic elements: a summons to a holy kiss; an anathema on those who do not love the Lord; the Maranatha acclamation; and the promise of the grace of the Lord Jesus. Compared to the personal assurance of Paul's love, which follows immediately after them and concludes the letter, these four formulae are formal, impersonal, and cold. (Didache 10:6 is a parallel text). These texts may reflect an opening formula for the Lord's Supper. Lietzmann reconstructed a dialogue between host and community: L: Let grace come and this world pass. C: Hosanna to the Son of David. L: Invitation formula. C: Maranatha. In the 1 Cor text it proceeds in similar fashion. L: Holy kiss. Anathema saying, to hedge the altar. C: Maranatha. L: The grace of the Lord Jesus is with you. In both cases the Maranatha is an act of confession to Jesus as Lord.<sup>36</sup> Bornkamm finds an echo of this formula in Rev. 22:17-19. All scholars do not accept this interpretation (though I think it quite persuasive, personally). If it is eucharistic, it is important to observe that the exclusion or inclusion ("fencing of the altar") is in a sense self-imposed. If one cannot make the confession "Our Lord, come!" one did not participate in the meal. Note that the basis for self-exclusion is not aberrant faith, but the inability to make this early Aramaic eschatological acclamation.

How would the meal have looked to Christians in Corinth or Rome? Not as a religious observance! It did not take place in a cultic environment, since Christians had no cult centers—no temples, no sodalitas meeting rooms, no altars, no priests, and no cultic dining rooms, such as there were in Corinth at the Asklepieion, in the sanctuary of Demeter at the foot of Acro-Corinth, or in the dining caves (no longer in use at the time of Paul) near the theater at the Isthmia. The only true analogies by which Romans might look at such agape feasts<sup>37</sup> are meals in honor of some significant founder-figure, e.g. the annual meal celebrated on the birthday of Epicurus,<sup>38</sup> or the Roman collegium meal in which people gathered around a common goal. The parallels to these observances have been detailed a number of times in recent years, notably by H.J. Klauk and Peter Lampe.<sup>39</sup> The Greco-Roman dinner party plus symposium had two tables, with some guests only arriving for the second. After the actual meal it continued with drinking, conversation, and entertainment. Lampe points out that in an *ἔρανος*, a kind of pot-luck, each person brought his own meal (see τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον, 1 Cor 11:21). Lampe suggests that the Corinthians were using this form of meal. Paul found three problems with it: since the participants brought differing meals, quality and size differed; some began before the

entire community gathered; there was inadequate room in a triclinium for more than twelve.<sup>40</sup> Lampe provides a good social analysis of the problems at Corinth within the cultural world of a first century Roman city.

*Synoptic Gospels: The Markan/Matthean Tradition*

Mark wrote for the Roman church,<sup>41</sup> and Matthew probably wrote for a Syrian Jewish-Christian community (Antioch?) I treat them together because Matthew fundamentally follows Mark's account. This last meal is clearly a Passover celebration. Matthew and Mark present the same tradition. Both describe the identification of the betrayer just before the actions and words over bread and cup. Both present the actions and words over bread and cup as coming without interruption (no "In the same way after dining. . .," as in Paul). Both present the eschatological word of Jesus about not drinking the fruit of the vine again. In neither gospel does Jesus drink that wine new with them; it still lies in the future. In both, Jesus and the disciples next sing a hymn (Psalm?) and go to the Mount of Olives.

The background to the Markan/Matthean cup formula is Exod 24:6-8, where Moses ratifies the covenant with Yahweh by pouring blood on the altar of incense and scattering it over the people. Here is the tie between covenant and blood.<sup>42</sup> (Note that the bread is not related to the covenant!) Blood is the carrier of life in Judaism. It can both defile (think of the woman with the twelve-year menstrual period in Mark 5:25-34) and protect apotropically. The sacrificial system is based on the shedding of blood to atone and purify. Since the life is in the blood, consumption of blood is strictly forbidden (Gen 9:4; Lev 3:17; 7:26). One must slaughter animals in kosher fashion to avoid eating their blood (Deut 12:16, 23-24; Josephus, *Ant* 6.120-121). Therefore the command to drink the wine as blood, implicit in Mark and explicit in Matthew, is extremely surprising, since it would be unkosher! It is even more surprising when one recalls the letter of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15, which forbids eating animals choked to death and urges abstinence from blood. Rev. 16:4-7 shows that this aversion was deep-seated in the church. Can one infer from Mark how he might have worked out this aversion to drinking blood?

A number of things can be adduced. But we must say at once that much of this is speculative. Mark 7:19 reports that Jesus told his disciples that all foods were pure. Taken at face value, this removes the prohibitions of the Torah against blood. Mark reports the logion of Jesus about the "Son of man coming not to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45). As Walter Grundmann points out, this word identifies Jesus as the suffering servant of Isaiah 53, who gives his life as a ransom for many<sup>43</sup>— and the life is in the blood. We can add that Mark stresses that the forgiveness of sins is a prerogative of the Son of Man. Think of the word to the paralytic in 2:10: "The Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins." And all that is required is faith, as in the case of Jairus (5:36) and the woman (5:34).

There is, therefore, a sense in which Mark is the most Pauline gospel of the four. His stress on faith, as witnessed in the story of the woman with the issue of blood, and his stress on the gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) as the driving force in the life of Roman Christians is very Pauline. That makes his divergence from Paul in his account of the Lord's Supper even more significant than we at first may assume. Paul does not mention the Lord's Supper in his Romans but does stress the death of Jesus. Mark's text may represent the form of the Lord's Supper current in Rome after the observance has been severed from its Sitz-im-Leben, a community meal, since Mark has no reference to before or after dining and not one suggestion of a separation of bread and cup.

*Synoptic Gospels: The Matthean Interpretation of Mark in Matthew 26*

Matthew modifies the Markan text only slightly. He clarifies Mark's text by changing the report about the bread into direct quotation by Jesus and by inserting the word "eat" after "take" in the word over the bread. In Mark the disciples drink from the cup before Jesus interprets it. Matthew drops the report that they all drank and adds a specific interpretation of Mark's τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν by adding the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. In the eschatological interpretation he inserts the words "with you," making the disciples a part of the prediction. It reminds one of Matthew 19:28, a word of Jesus that is not in Mark. These additions and alterations do not change the significance of the scene at all. They may have arisen in the use of the words liturgically.<sup>44</sup>

Matthew's gospel stresses that his community is to be a community of the forgiven who forgive others. Matthew records Mark's description of the baptism of John: people come confessing their sins, the very thing that makes John hesitate about baptizing Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount includes the words about reconciliation taking precedence over sacrifice (Matt 5:23-26), and the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:12) interpreted in Matt 6:14-15. In Matt 9:8, the Gospeller writes a surprising conclusion to the healing of the paralytic, using the words τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. One expects the singular, referring to Jesus! The capstone to this motif comes in Matthew 18, where the question of the number of acts of forgiveness one should tender (Peter's question) gets the answer "seventy times seven" (18:22) illustrated by the parable of the slave whose master cancels a huge debt, then penalizes him for jailing a minor debtor of his own (18:23-35). Matthew's expansion of the dominical words over the cup in Mark, with the addition εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, correlates well with this motif.

*Luke and the Eschatological Meal—Luke 22:14-38*

Luke differs from the Markan outline and Markan theology in dramatic ways. One needs to set Luke's account of the upper room within the general framework of Lukan theology, since that theology is distinctive and so different from that in Matthew and Mark that some scholars feel it comes from a different source, and with good reason. There seem to be two edi-

tions of Luke-Acts, one represented by the text given in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  the great codices  $\aleph$  (Sinaiticus) and B (Vaticanus), and the MSS in that family (often called the Alexandrian text); the other in Codex Beza (D), the Syriac tradition, parts of the Old Latin tradition, and other witnesses (G, etc., often called the Western text). In Luke 22 there are a number of such differences.

The Lukan story is much longer than the Mark-Matthew version. Much more happens in the upper room. In addition to the last meal proper, Luke presents a rather long table conversation; that is, Luke presents us with a symposium<sup>45</sup> or a farewell meal. Note the topics that are discussed: the identification of the betrayer—after the blessing of the cups and bread, not before as in Mark; dispute as to the identity of the betrayer leading into a dispute over ranking; Jesus' words about their fidelity and their eschatological future; Peter's role in strengthening his brothers after his denial and the resurrection; proper outfitting for their life after the resurrection.

Luke 22:14-20 presents an extremely complicated problem of textual transmission. "Der Abschnitt von der Stiftung des Herrenmahles bei Lukas ist durch ein schwieriges textkritisches Problem belastet," as Walter Grundmann puts it.<sup>46</sup> The problem is raised by Luke's divergence from the other three accounts in having two cups, one before and one after the bread, a grammatically strong double denial (οὐ μὴ plus aorist subjunctive) that he will eat or drink again until the kingdom of God. Luke 22:15-17 is unique. And there is a grammatical peculiarity. In the word over the second cup (v.20), the word for blood is in the dative case (ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου), but has a neuter nominative or accusative (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον) in apposition to it, as Eduard Schweizer points out in his commentary on Luke.<sup>47</sup>

There are at least five different texts that can be reconstructed from the textual tradition. The longer text, as printed in Nestle-Aland, NTG<sup>26</sup>, that is the full text of vv.17-20, is supported in general by all Greek MSS, including the oldest surviving witness,  $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ , except representatives of the Western text. Codex Beza, supported by the Itala (the old, pre-Vulgate Latin text), and the Syriacur sin, drops vv.19b-20, beginning with τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. . ., a so-called western non-interpolation. This shortest text has no saying of Jesus identifying the body as offered sacrificially or the blood as inaugurating the new covenant (Markan-Matthean motifs) and no command to repeat the meal to remember Jesus. It is closer to the tradition handed on in 1 Cor 10:16-17 than to the other three accounts of the institution. The Syriac New Testament textual tradition recognizes the problems and solves them in a number of ways: The Syriac Curetonian text reorders the verses, placing v.19 before v.17. In almost identical fashion the Old Latin MSS b and e read v.19a before 17 and 18. The Syriac Sahidic is similar to the Curetonian, but joins v.19 with μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι (v.20a) and v.17 with τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη (v.20b), thus harmonizing the Lukan text to Matthew, Mark, and Paul. The Syriac Peshitta, supported by lectionary<sup>32</sup> and some mss of the Coptic Bohairic version, find another solution by

omitting vv.17-18. Grundmann argues that this Syriac tradition supports the Western text, since it is first in the Peshitta that the longer text appears. There is thus a very complicated text tradition for Luke 22:15-20 that calls for explanation. The problem is raised by the two cups and by the close parallel between Luke 22:19b-20 and 1 Cor 11:23-24. What should we read as Luke's original written text?

Several factors should play into the decision. The first is intrinsic probability. Text critics normally employ the following principles, all very important: Bengel's rule: *lectio brevior potior*, the shorter reading is to be preferred. Griesbach's rule, *lectio difficilior potior*, the more difficult reading is to be preferred. One does not count MSS to see which occurs most often. That reading is to be preferred from which one can infer the origins of the others. One rejects readings that smooth over agreements with other New Testament texts. When the MSS tradition is examined, the geographic spread, the number, and the age of the witnesses (Ⲑ<sup>72</sup>, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, supported by Alexandrinus and a multitude of other Greek MSS) appear to support the longer text. But that, as Evans points out makes the appearance of any other text even more surprising. The other factors listed above all support the shorter text! If it is thought to be an abbreviation of the longer text, it is difficult to see why they did not omit the first cup!

Of course, one can appeal to the fact that the Passover Haggadah has four cups of wine and argue that the Lukan text reproduces more of that liturgy than do the other three texts. But we have already seen that the Mark-Matthew version reflects liturgical smoothing out after the tie to the Haggadah has been lost. That is the situation already in Justin Martyr, Apol. 1.65-67. But the liturgical influence can be argued the other way with equal cogency. Luke 22:19b-20 may well have been added when the liturgical form of the account, as represented in Mark and Paul, makes its way into the worship of the Lukan communities and so into the Lukan Gospel.

There is another factor that plays into this textual decision, Lukan theology elsewhere in Luke-Acts. Here the most significant point is Luke's interpretation of Jesus' death. He stresses that it is the death of an innocent person. Pilate three times pronounces him innocent (Luke 23:4, 14, 22), as does Herod Antipas (23:15). The centurion at his death in Luke says "This man was actually righteous" (23:47). And that theme is carried forward throughout Acts. Peter accuses his hearers on Pentecost of causing Jesus' death: "you killed him through the hands of lawless men" (Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13-15: "you handed him over and denied. . . , you denied the holy and righteous one. . . , you killed the captain of life, whom God raised from the dead" Acts 4:10-11). "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know that God appointed him Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36). Luke does not record the great saying of Mark 10:45: "The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many." Nowhere does Luke interpret Jesus's death as a sacrifice for sin—unless it is in Luke 22:19b-20. Nor does Luke stress the new covenant elsewhere.

What does Jesus stress in the upper room, then? He stresses the farewell character of the meal; Jesus will not eat the Passover again with them until he eats it new in the kingdom of God. The farewell discourse form contains regularly the announcement of imminent departure, which may produce sorrow by recalling what has happened before; give instruction to obey God's commandments; urge fidelity, love, and unity; predict what might happen; remind them of their being outfitted for the future; and promise to come again.<sup>48</sup> Luke presents the upper room as a farewell meal in which Jesus gives instructions to the twelve. Twice he assures his disciples that he is eating this meal with them as the last one before the coming of the kingdom of God. Then, at the eschaton, he will eat it with them again. In the meantime he identifies the one who will betray him (i.e. cause him to leave), describes the proper relationship among them in response to their dispute about greatness, assures them as his testament that despite the coming persecution they will eat with him in his kingdom, and gives instructions for their life in his absence. Thus the meal eaten then is a foretaste and promise of the future.

Acts never presents us with a meal that is clearly like the one in Luke 22:14-20. What is the unique viewpoint of the Luke-Acts on the Lord's Supper? That question provokes a sharp division of opinion in New Testament scholarship.<sup>49</sup> The division is caused by the places where Acts presents church assemblies as "breaking bread" (Acts 2:42,46; 20:7,11). The current majority opinion holds that the meal with Cleopas and his wife (or woman companion) is the first Lord's Supper celebration after the resurrection, pointing to Jesus' taking the bread, blessing it, breaking it, and sharing it with them in Luke 24:30. The argument depends on the similarity of the language in Luke 22:19. The "breaking of the loaf" in Acts (2:42,46; cf. 20:7,11; 27:35) would also refer to the Lord's Supper. By synecdoche (συνεκδοχή), "when the whole is known from a small part or a part of the whole,"<sup>50</sup> the "breaking of bread" implies the entire action. Joseph Fitzmyer describes it as follows:

*Eucharistic*, a Lukan motif that begins here, but which will be picked up in Luke's second volume. For this scene with Christ reclining at table with the disciples of Emmaus, taking bread, uttering a blessing, breaking the bread, and offering it to them (v.30), not only recalls the Last Supper (22:19ab), but becomes the classic Lukan way of referring to the Eucharist. The lesson in the story is that henceforth the risen Christ will be present to his assembled disciples not visibly (after the ascension), but in the breaking of the bread. So they will know him and recognize him, because so he will be truly present among them. (This presence will be modified later, when one learns that it will not be its only mode, since he will also be present to them in "what my Father has promised" [24:49]—not yet identified; but see Acts 1:4-5.)<sup>51</sup>

Fitzmyer claims that the entire sacramental action was carried out—or that here was a kind of Lord's meal in one kind. And on that basis the passages

in Acts are accounted to speak of the Lord's Supper. Dubito! He reads Paul into Acts at this point.

So what is the unique viewpoint of Luke-Acts on the Lord's Supper? It is likely that Luke has a different view of events. Other voices have recently been raised that question Fitzmyer and the majority interpretation. C.F. Evans, in his recent commentary on Luke, calls attention to the unusual character of the Emmaus meal. Jesus takes on the role of host and in so doing takes on the role described in set terms in the thanksgiving before meals said by the head of a Jewish household.<sup>52</sup> Evans argues that at this point their eyes are opened—and the actual meal never takes place! He argues that the identification with the Lord's Supper does not go beyond the grace and so is far less secure than often supposed. Moreover, the two Emmaus disciples were not present in the upper room! Thus the historical presuppositions necessary for the eucharistic identification are not present.

As Powell points out, one of the strongest attacks on this eucharistic interpretation was written by James D.G. Dunn. He points out that the Gospels stress that Jesus in his ministry shared table fellowship with many (Mark 1:29-31, 14:3; Luke 7:36; 11:37; 14:1) and even entertained others himself (Mark 2:15; Luke 15:1-2). Opponents accused him of establishing table fellowship with *publicani* and sinners, a scandal, since the prayers uttered there made the table an altar!<sup>53</sup> This table fellowship was Jesus' way of proclaiming God's openness to and acceptance of sinners. Jesus' openness was an invitation to grace. It is these meals that are continued in Acts, by a church that is also presented as open to all on terms of equality. Dunn points out that only bread is mentioned, not wine, and that this was characteristic of ordinary meals. Acts 20:11 and 27:35-36 "can surely denote only an ordinary meal; and no words of institution or interpretation are mentioned, or even hinted at."<sup>54</sup>

There are other aspects of Luke-Acts that support Dunn's contention. Luke stresses more than the other synoptics the eschatological aspect of the meal. Jesus avers in two sayings that he will not eat bread again or drink wine again with them in such a Passover meal until he does it in the fulfilled Kingdom of God. That is, there are only two times when this Passover meal is so celebrated. In between there are fellowship meals of the kind that Jesus regularly ate in his ministry.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, the letter of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15:20, 29 expressly forbids Christians to eat animals that have been choked to death and admonishes Christians to avoid blood (*ἀπέχεσθαι ἐδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος πνικτῶν καὶ πορνείας*). Luke's inclusion of this decision argues that he does not envision the church as celebrating a meal in which the drinking of blood is done, whether actually or sacramentally.

The most significant conclusion to be drawn is that the synoptic gospels clearly identify the Lord's Supper as an interpretation of the Passover ritual. Recall that Paul did not mention the Passover at all. This has significant implications. Most obviously, it is very likely that the earli-

est Christians repeated it annually on the fourteenth day of Nisan. This became the standard practice in Asia Minor, leading to the later Quartadeciman controversy. When the observance in some parts of pre-Constantinian Christianity severed the tie to the Passover Seder, then the inference drawn from the Pauline "As often as . . ." (1 Cor 11:26) became significant, and the Lord's Supper became a frequently celebrated rite.

Matthew and Mark stress the tie to Jesus' atoning death as the key to interpreting the cup in Passover. The interpretation in terms of the sin or guilt offering loosens the tie to the Passover, since the function of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb was not done to effect forgiveness of sins. When the meal was still celebrated as part of the Passover Seder, then, as Paul suggests in 1 Corinthians 11, the bread and the cup were separated by the meal, and the parallelism between them is not nearly as clear.<sup>56</sup> The separation makes the parallel interpretation of bread and cup more easily possible. By the time that Mark (and Matthew) write, the Lord's Supper was no longer part of a Passover observance in their churches (Rome and Antioch, most likely). By that time the blessing of the bread and cup were done in close conjunction and the dominical words edited to make them closely parallel.

#### *Post-Synoptic Sacramental Theology*

The Gospel of John is a tantalizing document when one considers the Lord's Supper in the New Testament—and that for a number of reasons. The Upper Room and the Habburah Meal. In the first place, in John the last meal takes place "just before the Passover," as Raymond Brown translates John 13:1.<sup>57</sup> John does not present the meal before the crucifixion as a Passover meal, since Jesus in John dies on the day before the Passover, which in the Johannine chronology falls on Holy Saturday. The Jewish leaders, for example, do not want to enter the *praetorium* during Jesus' trial out of fear that they would be defiled and so not able to eat the Passover (John 18:28), which is why Pilate must shuttle in and out of the praetorium during the trial. There is no institution of the Lord's Supper in the upper room; rather Jesus gives a long farewell address to the disciples, after giving them the example of service to one another in the foot washing. John the Baptist describes Jesus as the one who removes the sin of the world, but the primary pattern for interpreting Jesus' death in John is that of exaltation and glorification (see John 17:1, *et passim*).

Some passages in John apparently reflect knowledge of the Lord's Supper, chief among them John 6, especially verses 52-58, where Jesus speaks of "munching (in v.56 the verb is the unusual τρογείν) his flesh and drinking his blood," a phrase taken by many commentators to refer to the Lord's Supper.<sup>58</sup>

John 6 uses unique imagery about Jesus as the bread of life. It "comes down from heaven" (John 6:41, 51), is "living" (John 6:51), the "bread of life" (John 6:48). John sets the discussion within an Exodus framework, since the Jews ask for a sign (6:30) by referring to the manna that "our

father" ate in the wilderness (6:31), citing Psalm 78:24: ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν. They apparently interpreted the miraculous feeding of the five-thousand as a repristination of the giving of manna in the Exodus. Jesus' identification of himself as the heavenly bread thus discloses his close relation to God (the Father). He, Jesus, is not like the manna that disappeared after one day, but is the bread that "remains to eternal life." (John 6:27) Thus, while many scholars see direct Eucharistic allusions in this passage—and I sympathize with that view—the language is so freighted with Exodus allusions, with Johannine christological speech, that it is difficult to erect a large edifice of eucharistic interpretation on it that adds to the patterns we have seen above.<sup>59</sup> John's tie to eternal life may be one of the biblical starting points for the later description of the sacrament as "medicine of immortality," a concept that almost directly contradicts Paul's insights in 1 Corinthians 10.

#### *The Apostolic Fathers*

The *Didache*<sup>60</sup> adds some interesting details to what we have seen in the New Testament. *Didache* 9-10 contain instructions for celebration, including instructions for the following:

□ a prayer over the cup: "We thank you, our Father, for your holy grapevine of David, your servant, which you made known to us through Jesus, your servant";

□ a prayer over the broken bread: "We thank you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known to us through your son (servant, παιδός) Jesus; to you be glory forever. As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains and gathered into one, so let your church be gathered from the ends of the earth into your kingdom; for yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ into the ages";

□ a (much longer) concluding prayer for the Eucharist in chapter 10. In the process the *Didache* reminds us of several things: Luke also has cup before bread; Paul stresses that the Lord's Supper concerns the unity of the church (also found in the concluding prayer); it is not in the line of Matthew-Mark with their stress on forgiveness; that one is to admit only the baptized (9:5; cf. The fencing of the altar in 10:6); and it implies the tie to everyday meals (shades of Paul) when it prays "You Lord created all things for your name's sake, and gave food and drink to people for their enjoyment, that they might thank you, but to us you gave freely pneumatic food and drink and eternal life through your son" (10:3). This is not yet a fixed liturgy, however, since the *Didache* also says, "Let the prophets give thanks as they want" (10:7);

□ and finally, *Didache* 14:1 describes Sunday worship as follows: "On the Day of the Lord, when you come together, break bread and give thanks, after first confessing your transgressing, in order that your sacrifice might be pure." We may not overpass the use of θυσία in this passage to interpret the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, since the concern of the *Didache* is

for purity based on the citation of Mal 1:11, 14: ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαρὰν. ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμί, λέγει κύριος, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

I call attention to two studies of the sacramental theology of Ignatius of Antioch.<sup>61</sup> Cyril Richardson says that "The rite of the Christian Church which is most frequently mentioned in the Epistles of Ignatius is the Eucharist." While baptism is taken for granted even by his opponents, some neglect the Lord's Supper (see Eph 18:2; Smyr 7:1). Richardson says there are three key eucharistic passages in Ignatius: Eph 20:2, Phil 4:1, and Smyr 7:1 (and Rom 7:3?). Ignatius stresses a close relationship between the elements and the body and blood of Christ. Smyr 7:1 defined the bread as the σάρκα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν παθοῦσαν; those who deny it deny the "gift of God" (ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ θεοῦ). Thus, as Virginia Corwin says, since Ignatius identifies the flesh of Jesus with the gospel in Phld 5:1, he declares "that both the eucharist and the gospel are inextricably linked with the Lord as he is encountered by Christians."<sup>62</sup> Phil 4:1 implies that close connection.

In Rom 7:3, Ignatius says that he desires "the 'bread of God,' which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who was 'of the seed of David,' and for drink. . . his blood, which is incorruptible love" This passage raises two issues: First, is the last phrase an implied reference to the agape feast in which the eucharist is celebrated? Corwin (208-209) thinks not, citing Tral 7:2 against that view. Second, does that phrase also imply what Ignatius hints at when he calls it the φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός (Eph 20:2), using a phrase that some hold he borrowed from the mystery religions to describe the eucharist? Yet this is the only time he implies that participation in the eucharist results in immortality.

Ignatius stresses the relation of the eucharist to the unity of the church, its . A key passage here is Phld 4: Σπουδάσετε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἔνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ διακόνοις τοῖς σὺνδούλους μου· ἵνα, ὃ ἐὰν πράσσητε, κατὰ θεὸν πράσσητε. There is one flesh and one bread and one cup in the catholic church. Ignatius here extends a Pauline motif to include unity with the bishop.

Ignatius has clearly developed motifs known from New Testament texts (unity as in Paul, forgiveness of sins as in Matthew) and combined them with some adventuresome language with affinities to mystery cult and possible Gnostic echoes.<sup>63</sup> His thought is thus a landmark in eucharistic history. Curiously, however, he offers us almost no insight into the development of cultic practice as opposed to eucharistic theology. For that we need to look later in the second century.

Justin Martyr, native of Flavia Neapolis in Samaria, the city built by Hadrian to replace the destroyed city of Shechem, was martyred in Rome under Marcus Aurelius (161-180 CE), probably in 165 CE.<sup>64</sup> He converted to

Christianity, probably between 132-135 CE in Ephesus, after having been successively a Stoic, a Peripatetic, a Pythagorean, and a (Middle-)Platonist. About 150 CE he came to Rome during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161 CE) and founded a “philosophic” school there (one of his pupils was Tatian). His thinking thus may represent either Asian or Roman Christianity, or a combination of both.

Justin gives more than one account of the Lord’s Supper. The first, *Apology* 1.65.1-5, describes a baptismal-eucharist celebrated by the “leader of the brothers.” The text reads:<sup>65</sup>

1. Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λουσαι τὸν πεπεισμένοι καὶ συγκατατεθειμένων ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων εὐτόνως, ὅπως καταξιοθῶμεν τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες καὶ δι’ ἔργων ἀγαθοῖ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακας τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὐρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. 2. ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. 3. ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν οἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπερ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτῳ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὐδὲ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων Ἄμην. 4. τὸ δὲ Ἄμην τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ φωνῇ τὸ Γένοιτο σημαίνει. 5. εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ’ ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόνασιν ἐκάστω τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος κὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

Common prayer, exchange of a kiss, bread, and a cup of water and of wine mixed with water brought to “the ruler of the brothers,” a prayer of thanks to the Father through Son and Holy Spirit, “Amen” from the people, distribution of bread, wine and water, and taking these later to absent members constitute this eucharist. There are no presbyters or elders who function as leaders.

*Apology* 1.67 gives a similar account of a Eucharist, held each Sunday. Memoirs of the Apostles or writings of the prophets are read. After the ruler gives an exposition of the reading (λόγος τῆς νοουθεσίας), he says prayers while standing. Bread, wine and water are brought and the ruler offers prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability (ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει). Distribution is similar to the baptismal service, except that there is a collection of alms for the poor. *Apology* 1.66, between these two passages, explains the significance of the rite as the reception of the nourishing body and blood of the incarnate Jesus.<sup>66</sup>

Barnard (145-149) summarizes Justin’s view of the sacrament in a number of points: The Eucharist is the central act of Sunday worship, open only to the baptized; There is not yet a fixed liturgy or clerical celebration; Ignatius clearly holds that the bread, wine, and water are transformed into

the flesh and blood of the incarnate Christ—without developing a theory as to how that happens. Nor does he work out a fully orbited theory of Eucharist as sacrifice.

Melito of Sardis' *Paschal Homily* is the oldest Easter sermon outside the New Testament itself. It relates the death and resurrection of Jesus to the Passover, becomes quite anti-Jewish, but makes no certain reference to the Lord's supper.<sup>67</sup>

In the context of Epigraphic Texts, one very important inscription from this period is the inscription of Aberkios of Hieropolis. Known early from the life of Aberkios in the *Acta Sanctorum*, it was often regarded as a pious creation. The inscription was established as a reliable text when Sir William Ramsay discovered the actual epitaph of Aberkios on two fragments built into the wall of the public bath of Hieropolis in Asia Minor. The fragments, now joined, with the inscription restored, is in the Musea Pio Cristiano in the Vatican. The text reads as follows, with the possible Lord's Supper allusion underscored:

ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολεΐτης τοῦτ' ἐποίησα  
ξῶν ἴν' ἔχω καιρῶ σώματος ἔνθα θέσιν.  
οὐ νομ' Ἀβέρκιος ὢν ὁ μαθητῆς ποιμένος ἀγνοῦ  
ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας ὄρεσιν πεδίοπισ τε  
ὄφθαλμοὺς ὃς ἔχει, μεγάλους πάντη καθορώντας  
οὗτος γάρ μ' ἰδίδαξε τὰ ζωῆς γράμματα πιστά  
εἰς Ῥώμην ὃς ἐπεμψεν ἔμεν βασιλείαν ἀρθρῆσαι  
καὶ βασιλίσσαν ἰδεῖν χρυσότολον χρυσοπέδιλον  
λαὸν δ' εἶδεν ἐκεῖ λαμπὰν σφράγειδαν ἔχοντα  
καὶ Συρίας πέδον εἶδον καὶ ἄστεα παντὰ Νίσιβιν  
Εὐφράτην διαβάς πάντη δ' ἔσχον ὁμίλους  
Παῦλον ἔχων. . . πιστις πάντη δὲ προυῆγε  
καὶ παρέθηκε τροφὴν πάντη ἰχθὺν ἀπὸ πηγῆς  
πανμεγέθη, καθαρὸν δὲ ἐδράξατο παρθένος ἀγνή,  
καὶ τοῦτο ἐπέδωκε φίλοις ἐσθῆειν δια παντός  
οἶνον χρυστὸν ἔχουσα κέρασμα δίδουσα μετ' ἄρτου  
ταῦτα παρεστῶς εἶπον Ἀβέρκιος ὃδε γραφῆναι  
ἐβδομηκοστὸν ἔπος καὶ δεῦτερον ἦγον ἀλνθῶς  
ταῦθ' ὁ νοῶν εὐξαιτο ὑπὲρ Ἀβερκίου πᾶς ὁ συνωδός.  
οὐ μέντοι τύμβω τις ἐμῶ ἕτερόν τινα θήσει,  
εἴ δ' οὖν Ῥωμαίων ταμειῶ θήσει δισχίλιὰ χρυσά  
καὶ χρηστῆ πατρίδι Ἱεροπόλει χίλια χρυσά.

"Faith led him everywhere and laid before him everywhere fish from a fountain—the very great, the pure—which a holy virgin seized and gave to friends to eat forever, having a goodly wine, giving it mixed with water, together with bread." So Aberkios describes the Lord's Supper as gift of the virgin church, wine mixed with water and bread. This is the first pre-Constantinian document to use the fish as a symbol of Jesus Christ.<sup>68</sup> The inscription of Pectorius, dating from about 210 CE, was found at in the

cemetery of S. Pierre l'Estrier near Autun, France, in 1839 and may also be eucharistic text.<sup>69</sup>

Hippolytos of Rome has left us the earliest surviving full eucharist prayer in his *Apostolic Tradition*, written about 217 CE (some date it as early as 150 CE). Composed in Hippolytos' native Greek, the work survives only in ancient versions: Latin, Coptic (Sahidic), Arabic, and Ethiopic—and in a fragmented condition at that.<sup>70</sup> At the ordination of a bishop, Hippolytos says, the newly ordained bishop leads the assembled presbyters in the preface and then proceeds immediately to the prayer (Latin 4). The anamnesis is restricted to the mention of Jesus' death and resurrection. Immediately after the prayer Hippolytos offers directives for a eucharistic prayer over oil (whether to be tasted or used for chrism) and cheese and olives (Latin 5-6). In his commentary Easton comments:

This blessing at the Eucharist of food other than the bread and wine is a remnant of the primitive custom when the rite included a meal; in Hippolytus's day, presumably, the cheese and olives were eaten at the service and part of the oil was sipped, the remaining being reserved for anointing the sick. Perhaps only Hippolytus's exaggerated reverence for the past preserved the usage, which at any rate soon disappeared.<sup>71</sup>

While we Lutherans in the *Lutheran Book of Worship* have recovered the use of Hippolytos' prayer, so fitting for the Easter season and properly used without the proper preface and Sanctus, we have not yet had the liturgical courage to recall the full meal symbolism implied in the blessing and consuming of the oil, cheese, and olives—foods typical of the average person's diet in the first centuries of our era.<sup>72</sup> Easton's rather patronizing attitude toward Hippolytos' "exaggerated reverence for the past" should not obscure the long tradition represented in Hippolytos' canon.<sup>73</sup>

#### *The New Testament and the Quartadeciman Controversy*

Eusebius, the Bishop of Caesarea, informs us that the date of Easter became a problem in the second century church. Aniketos, Bishop of Rome, held that Easter should always be celebrated on Sunday to commemorate the resurrection of Jesus. Polycarp of Smyrna, who traveled to Rome about 155 CE to discuss the issue, represented Christians in the province of Asia, who celebrated the death of Jesus on the fourteenth day of the month of Nisan (the lunar month), that is, according to the Jewish date for Passover. Hence the name Quartadecimans (i.e. "fourteeners"). The Asian churches probably celebrated the Lord's Supper annually, holding that it was the Christian counterpart to the Pesach, taking seriously its origins as a dominical reinterpretation of the Passover and therefore using the Jewish calendar as a determining factor. After discussion, Aniketos and Polykarp agreed to disagree and so preserved peace among "those who kept the day (τῶν τηρούντων) and those who did not" (τῶν μὴ τηρούντων) keep, presumably, the Quartadeciman Easter (Eusebius *H.E.* 5.24.17).<sup>74</sup>

The agreement between Aniketos and Polykarp did not last. Victor succeeded Eleutheros as Bishop of Rome "in the tenth year of Commodus's reign" (i.e., 189 CE; Eusebius *H.E.* 5.22). The Easter controversy heated up as Victor pressed for uniformity. Irenaeus of Lyon used the agreement of Aniketos and Polykarp in an attempt to persuade Victor, Bishop of Rome, to allow such variety in the church to continue—unsuccessfully! Eusebius summarizes the progress of the controversy in *H.E.* 5.23-25, giving large credit to his own see, Caesarea, for the resolution of the controversy. Polykrates wrote a letter to the Victor of Rome on behalf of the Asian bishops. He traced their Quartadeciman observance back to the Apostle John and Philip the Evangelist, a tradition maintained by Polycarp of Smyrna, Melito of Sardis, and others (Eusebius *H.E.* 5.24). Polykrates thus claimed apostolic authority and venerable, unbroken tradition for the Asian observance. Stress was placed on the death of Jesus. The majority of Christians, however, in agreement with Rome, observed a fast on Friday in Holy Week and celebrated Christ's resurrection on the succeeding Sunday. That calendar made every Sunday an observance of the resurrection and allowed for very frequent observances of the Lord's Supper. Victor responded to Polykrates with an attempt to excommunicate the Asian Christians. Neither Irenaeus' attempt to preserve allowable variety or Polykrates' appeal to apostolic tradition were persuasive.

Regional or provincial councils or synods were held in Caesarea, Rome, Pontos, Gaul, and Osroene in an attempt to resolve the controversy (Eusebius, *H.E.* 5.23-24). The eastern bishops—Theophilus of Caesarea, Narcissus of Jerusalem, Demetrius of Alexandria, and Serapion of Antioch—took action. Bishops Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem convened a council at Caesarea in Palestine. (Note the order, Caesarea before Jerusalem.) Bishops Cassius of Tyre and Clarus of Ptolemais also attended. Eusebius mentions this council first in his list of councils and summarizes its work in *H.E.* 5.25. The Caesarea council wrote a lengthy review of the Easter tradition handed down to them from the Apostles, deciding in favor of celebrating the resurrection always on the "Lord's Day," and appealed to churches everywhere to follow this tradition:

Try to send a copy of our letter to every diocese, so that we may not fail in our duty to those who readily deceive their own souls. We may point out to you that in Alexandria they keep the feast on the same day as we do, for we send letters to them and they to us, to ensure that we keep the holy day in harmony and at the same time. (Eusebius *H.E.* 5.25)

I agree with Ringel,<sup>75</sup> who suggests that this decision reflects a conscious turning away from Jewish-Christian customs in the wake of the Jewish-Roman War of 132-135 CE. The bishops of the Province of Palestine sought unity in the church catholic around the non-Jewish form of Easter observance. They elevated the resurrection of Jesus over his death as Passover lamb and over the Pauline stress on the proclamation of the death of Jesus. Later the Council of Nicea excommunicated as Judaizers those who con-

tinued to observe the old date—though observance continued down into the fifth century in places. The triumph of Victor's position was one factor leading to the stress on Jesus' resurrection in eastern theology; to this day western Christians call the Jerusalem church the church of the Holy Sepulcher, while eastern Christians name it the Church of the Resurrection.

Was this an example of anti-Semitism in the patristic church? It would be overly simplistic to simply answer "Yes." The controversy took place at a time when the church was emerging as a separate social institution, while Judaism was also engaged in a process of self-definition. Somewhere in the first half of the second century the "curse against the minnim" entered the Shemoneh Esreh in the synagogue liturgy, making it impossible for Christian Jews to lead synagogue worship any longer. At the same time Christian Jews were made to think through their distance from their Jewish origins. Melito of Sardis, a Quartadeciman, spoke some very vitriolic lines against Judaism in his Paschal Homily. One can reconstruct the social matrix that led to this division. However, the decisions taken in this controversy did open the church to an anti-Judaism that eventually did become anti-Semitic.

Both sides in the controversy were struggling to preserve emphases that came to them from the New Testament churches. The Quartadecimans preserved the Markan/Matthean stress on the Lord's Supper as a renovated Passover. Victor and his supporters gave primary stress to the resurrection of Jesus—and so determined that the Sunday observance took priority and dated the celebration of the Lord's Supper—and found support for this in Paul's suggestion that it took place often in Corinth.

#### *The Lord's Supper and the Catholic Creeds*

It is surprising, when one stops to think about it, that none of the catholic creeds mentions the Lord's Supper—while both the Nicene and Apostolic Creeds affirm baptism for the forgiveness of sins. The Nicene Creed grows out of the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. At its core, apparently, is the creed of Eusebius of Caesarea. Both creeds originally had an extremely brief third article: [Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς [ἐν] Πνεῦμα Ἁγίον.<sup>76</sup> The fuller Constantinopolitan creed that we use entered the church either at or shortly after the Council of Chalcedon. But at no time does it contain a clause about the Lord's Supper.<sup>77</sup> The case is more complicated with the Apostle's Creed, the *Symbolum Apostolorum*, to give it the traditional name. Some may ask, what about the *sanctorum communionem* in the Apostles' Creed. As Theodor Zahn said, "Dunkel ist noch immer der Ursprung und der ursprüngliche Sinn des Zusatzes *sanctorum communio*."<sup>78</sup> Two things need to be said: First, it is a late addition to the creed, probably not used universally before the eighth century!<sup>79</sup> The first person to mention it is Nicetas [of Remesiana?], about 400 CE.<sup>80</sup> Second, *Sanctorum* is possibly a masculine noun, referring to participation in the one body of the church rather than to the Lord's Supper.<sup>81</sup> Zahn

championed the alternative view that the term *sanctorum* is neuter and meant "holy things."<sup>82</sup> Ultimately the matter is insoluble. The phrase may mean "participation in holy things"—which might include both sacraments and other *acta sancta* of the church. In no case did it originally refer to the Lord's Supper exclusively. If we interpret it so, we do so out of our need to find the Lord's Supper in the creed, not because of the original sense. In short, the history of the creeds suggests what our examination of selected post-New Testament texts did, that it took some hundreds of years for the Lord's Supper to achieve central significance for the church, certainly more than four centuries for it to become part of the creedal statements of faith.

*The New Testament and the Eucharist today: Problem and Promise*

The New Testament bears witness to a wide variety in the celebration or observance of the Lord's Supper—a variety that perdures through at least the first two centuries of the Christian church. The theological stress placed on the significance of the meal varies. The stress on the tie to the Passover, leading later to the annual observance on the fourteenth day of Nisan in Asia Minor, characterizes Mark and Matthew, who do not report the command to celebrate the meal (frequently, often). The Corinthians, apparently with Pauline approval, celebrate the meal, but without the Passover associations. Luke does not even conceive of the Lord's Supper as an ecclesial activity—if my reading of his Passover meal and Acts is correct. Furthermore, there is no trace of a uniform cultic liturgy.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, one must ask if early Christians conceived of the Lord's Supper as cultic at all. We need to recognize this disjunction with our practice. Let me be clear. I am not suggesting that we should not do what we do liturgically, only that we should not falsely claim comprehensive cultic continuity with the New Testament.

It is not mere antiquarianism that leads me to say that I have never participated in a New Testament Lord's Supper—nor have you. Only once in my lifetime have I been to a Christian Seder, which assumed that early Christians used a modified form of the Pesach Haggadah. And that was the only time I celebrated (note the non-liturgical use of the term) the Lord's Supper within the context of a meal. Our liturgical observance bears little resemblance to early Christian practice. Our talk of banquet, meal, table-fellowship, and the like diverges so widely from New Testament practice that one can only understand it allegorically. A bit of bread, often tasteless and brittle, a poor imitation of *matzo*, and a sip of wine are not a banquet or a meal, while the use of the shot glasses or little silver chalices scarcely keeps the symbolism of the shared single cup. (Or was it a single cup? It is certainly not in contemporary Passover observance.) While we have interpreted the Dominical words literally, we have not taken the meal setting seriously, let alone literally. Paul's "This do, as often as you do it, for remembrance of me" has been restricted so as to no longer refer to a meal, but a liturgical act.

We use a great deal of non-Biblical language about the sacrament. Indeed, if my reading of Acts is correct—and I obviously think it is—there is not yet a technical cultic name for this meal in the New Testament. The closest we come to it is Paul's κυριακὸν δεῖπνον in 1 Cor 11, though it is clear that it is not yet a technical term. Our use of the terms "Holy Communion" and "Eucharist" as names for the Sacrament at best have starting points in the New Testament, while "Mass" (*Ite, missa est*) has no biblical roots at all. Communion, κοινωνία, draws on Paul's words in 1 Cor 10:16-17, while "Eucharist" can claim what is at best only a possibility from the book of Acts.

Nor are there titles, criteria for selection, or qualifications listed for any person who remotely resembles a "presider" or "celebrant" in the New Testament. (We should, if we were to follow New Testament terminology, probably have to call him or her a "proto-recliner"!) The Synoptic texts do not identify apostles or their successors as the only fit hosts for a continued observance. Paul's discussion assumes, I think, that the *paterfamilias* in whatever villa (house church) or insula<sup>84</sup> the meal is eaten will serve as host and pronounce the blessings. Our use of the term "fraction" for a liturgical act is based on terminology that has no direct New Testament basis, since the κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου in Acts 2:42 probably has nothing to do with the Lord's Supper in the New Testament does not use cultic terminology. "Breaking bread" is not an alternative way of referring to the Passover, but simply a way of referring to a meal. Nor does it refer to the Lord's Supper.

The Lord's Supper does not have the prominence in the New Testament that the church assigned to it beginning in the second century. The New Testament evidence is really quite spotty. And it took some time for the Lord's Supper to make its way into a central position in the church as a constitutive element of its existence.

What the New Testament shows us is a variety of modes of eating together, without a fixed liturgy, with value apparently placed on variety, not uniformity. The church in subsequent ages drew on aspects of early Christian observance of the Lord's Supper to craft a cultic meal with rich associations to Biblical motifs, but without direct lineal descendancy with much of the new Testament. Moreover, to a large degree we have lost the Pauline stress on σῶμα as a symbol of unity in our divisive celebrations. Does anyone really take seriously the powerful judgment implicit in Paul's discussion of the Lordly Supper of unity in 1 Corinthians 11? I doubt it—even though I can affirm the sentence that a German theologian is supposed to have uttered: "Eine Kirche die nicht pfluchen kann, kann auch nicht segnen." We have much, from a New Testament point of view, of which to repent—and much for which to thank God as we celebrate "to proclaim the Lord's death till he come." "If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be anathema. *Marana Tha!*" E'en so, Lord Jesus, Quickly Come—a Eucharistic motif, even if Paul Manz did not at first intend it that way.

*A Post-Institute Postscript*

The discussion at Valparaiso prompts me to add a few comments to clarify one or two things I said at the institute. I was delighted to hear Mary Vance Welsh's strong plea for the communion table open to all Christians because it reinforced from Luther and the Symbols what I see as the Pauline stress. This Pauline insight has profound implications for our life in the church catholic.

I was struck by how little the New Testament was reflected in subsequent papers. To put it another way: while I did not expect later speakers to engage what I said, it appeared to me that many assumed that what they were saying simply reflected the New Testament on the Lord's Supper. Just as Frank Senn called for sober rethinking of what is essential to the worship of the church, so I was trying to review the witness of the early church of the first two centuries to ask whether we reflect the motifs given there in a faithful way in our cultic practice and theological interpretation.

To be certain that I am not misunderstood, I was not urging a return to an artificially recreated New Testament agape meal. I was asking that we make our rhetoric and our sacramental actions truly authentic and authentically true to the New Testament texts. To call the sacrament "a foretaste of the things to come" (a Lukan motif) is much better than to call it a meal or a banquet, since the physical elements and the liturgical practice all scream that it is not really either.

The church has legitimately combined elements scattered in the New Testament in forging something new. That is not a problem. But our practices need, like the church, to be *semper reformanda*. And when we do that reformation, we need to pay as much attention to the texts of the New Testament as to some period in the patristic (fourth century) or medieval church that we regard as exemplary in liturgy and cult. And all—as Bach put in some of his manuscripts—*soli deo gloria*.

notes

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed examination of the Passover as the matrix for understanding the Lord's Supper see Norman Theiss, "The Passover Feast of the New Covenant," *Interpretation* 48. 1994:17-35. Theiss bases his argument on the early elements in the printed Haggadah—though it is not certain that the Haggadah was written down this early.

<sup>2</sup> Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983:54-77.

<sup>3</sup> Ramsey MacMullen, *Corruption and the Decline of Rome*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

<sup>4</sup> See plates 9 (p.6) and 46 (p.24) in Fabrizio Mancinelli, *Catacombs and Basilicas: The Early Christians in Rome*, with an introduction by Umbero M. Fasola, Scala Books, San Francisco: Harper, 1981, together with the discussion on p.23. The frontispiece, also from St. Callixtus, shows two fish supporting a basket with bread and a cup of wine inside and is also not unambiguously eucharistic—though the cup of wine may indicate an interpretation of the feeding of the 5000 as eucharistic on the basis of John 6. Mancinelli is more careful in his formulation here than is James Stevenson, *The Catacombs: Life and Death in Early Christianity*, New York: Thomas Nelson, 1985:89-90.

<sup>5</sup> Plate 70 in Stevenson, who calls it "the most striking example of a eucharistic pic-

ture" on p.94.

<sup>6</sup> Stevenson, 96-97, with plate 71.

<sup>7</sup> Graydon Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine*, Mercer University Press, 1985:88-92.

<sup>8</sup> Snyder, p.167, observes that there is "no way to determine by archaeology the nature of any meal in the house church." All the evidence we have suggests only the practice of funerary or memorial meals.

<sup>9</sup> The standard works on early Christian art are A. Grabar, *The Beginnings of Christian Art, 200-3395*, London, 1967, and Robert Milburn, *Early Christian Art and Architecture*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988. Two useful introductions are Michael Gough, *The Origins of Christian Art*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1973, and Jean Lassus, *The Early Christian and Byzantine World*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

<sup>10</sup> πνευματικοί should certainly be understood as masculine, not neuter, in 1 Cor 12:1.

<sup>11</sup> The American excavators found a fragmentary inscription referring to the macellum at Corinth. The term is actually a loan word from Latin into Greek, a reflection of Corinth's status as a Roman colony.

<sup>12</sup> Within the context θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ (1 Cor 8:5-6) must refer to the gods to whom sacrifices were made (Apollo, etc). And those in whose precincts Corinthians celebrated cultic meals. See Bruce Winter, "Theological and Ethical Responses to Religious Pluralism—1 Corinthians 8-10," *Tyndale Bulletin* 41, 1990:209-226.

<sup>13</sup> For text and some useful commentary see *The Passover Haggadah*, ed. Hahum N. Glotzer with Introduction and Commentary based on the studies of E.D. Goldschmidt, New York: Schocken Books, 1989, 1953:18, 65, 77, 95. Since the blessing accompanies each of the four cups of wine drunk in the Passover seder, the reference to blessing (εὐλογία) in 1 Cor 10:16 and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστεῖν) in the synoptic texts (Matt 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 24:30) cannot be used to argue for which of the Passover cups is singled out in the Lord's Supper. Norman Theiss (note 1) argues that the cup in 1 Cor 11 and the synoptic accounts is the third cup.

<sup>14</sup> Gustaf Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels*. Tr. Paul P. Levertoff, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929:133-134.

<sup>15</sup> Lawrence A. Hoffman, "Blessings and Their Translation in current Jewish Liturgies," *Worship* 60, 1986:134-161. See also Thomas J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research," *Studia Liturgica* 11, 1976:138-158.

<sup>16</sup> There is an analogous citation of tradition in Rom 3:24-26, which refers to faith in his blood. See Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1980:95-101; J.G.D. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, Word Biblical commentary 38A. Dallas: Word books, 1988:171-174. O. Böcher, "αἷμα, -ατος, τό *haima* blood," *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, 3 vol. Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1990-93:1.37-39.

<sup>17</sup> The term occurs in Rom 3:15 (OT citation) 3:25, 5:9; 1 Cor 10:16, 11:25, 27, 15:50 ("flesh & blood"); Gal 1:16 ["flesh and blood"]; Eph 1:7, 2:13, 6:12 ("flesh and blood"); Col 1:14 (variant reading), 20. In the authentic Pauline letters (excluding Ephesians and Colossians) the term always occurs either in a citation of the OT or earlier Christian tradition. The statistics are taken from Kurt Aland, *Vollständige Konkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978:2.8-9.

<sup>18</sup> See the discussion in Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

<sup>19</sup> Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, Good News Studies 6, Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1983:153-161, provides an interesting historical and archaeological reconstruction that may lie behind this social problem. The average villa, which wealthier members may have made available for such community meals, could accommodate at most twelve people in the triclinia; others would need to use the atrium. In addition, the disparity in diet and wine between wealthy and poor is known from Pliny, Ep 2.6, martial 3.60 and 4.85.

<sup>20</sup> Note that the term here is εὐχαριστεῖν and not εὐλογεῖν (1 Cor 10:16). Note a significant point: The blessing or the thanksgiving is directed to God. Many years

ago Gustaf Dalman wrote (*Jesus-Jeshua*, 134): "It is in any case to be borne in mind that it is not the elements of food and drink that were blest; these are not changed by the blessing into something new, to which the Divine now becomes somehow attached: the object of the benediction is God Himself, who is the Creator and distributor of all good things." I owe this citation to John Burkhardt, "Reshaping Table Blessings." *Interpretation* 48, 1994:59, n.9.

<sup>21</sup> J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, London: SCM Press, 1966:101, points to 1 Cor 15:3 and Pirke Avot 1.1 for the use of this vocabulary.

<sup>22</sup> Paul uses ἀμαρτία some sixty times, forty-eight times in Romans, always in the singular except in Rom 4:7 (citation of Ps. 31:1-2), 1 Cor 15:3 (citation of earlier tradition?) and 15:17, a reference back to the tradition, and 1 Thess 2:16 (an interpretation?). Elsewhere the plural occurs in Eph 2:1, Col 1:14 and 2:11, 1 Tim 5:22, 24 and 2 Tim 3:6, one indication among others of the deuterio-Pauline origins of these letters.

<sup>23</sup> E. Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," pp.108-135 in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982:120-121, points to parallel in Mark 14:9 (ἐξ μνημόσηνον αὐτῆς) and to the parallel expressions ἐξομολόγησις and μνησίων ποιεῖν in Ps 110:3-4 to state that anamnesis is only complete when it issues in a confession of faith.

<sup>24</sup> Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Anmnesis: Memory and commemoration in Early Christianity," pp.11-29 in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church: Essays*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976. This inaugural lecture appeared first in the *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 47, 1946 and then in *Studia Theologica* 1, 1948.

<sup>25</sup> The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytos recalls this when it says "In remembering his death and resurrection, we offer. . ."

<sup>26</sup> Burkhardt, 59-60, n.13, referring to Lawrence A. Hoffman, "Blessings and Their Translation in Current Jewish Liturgies," *Worship* 60, 1986:134-161; Thomas J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research," *Studia Liturgica* 11, 1976:138-158.

<sup>27</sup> See Mary Beard, "Priesthood in the Roman Republic," pp.17-29, and Richard Gordon, "The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers and Benefactors," pp.201-231 in *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. Mary Beard and John North, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

<sup>28</sup> See Käsemann, 119-127.

<sup>29</sup> Robertson-Plummer, ICC, Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 19:239.

<sup>30</sup> So C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York: Harper & Row, 1968:263-64.

<sup>31</sup> Behind this may lie the eschatological banquet of the OT expectations: Isa 25:6, 34:6ff; Jer 46:10; Zeph 1:7; 1 Enoch 62:4, etc.

<sup>32</sup> This is not the only context in which Paul stresses the mutual acceptance of diverse Christians. In Rom 15:7 he says, "Accept one another, just as Christ also accepted you to the glory of God." Paul uses the "brother for whom Christ died" as the limit of freedom in 1 Cor. 8:11.

<sup>33</sup> The citation is from BAGD, s.v. "πάσχα, τό" 2, with a reference to Eduard Lohse's 1955 monograph *Martyrer und Gottesknecht*. The idiom is used literally in Mark 14:12a, Luke 22:7, as it is in Exod 12:21, Deut 15:2, 6 LXX.

<sup>34</sup> In *Early Christian Experience*, New York: Harper & Row, 1969:161-179; Bornkamm's essay "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul," is pp.123-176 in the same volume.

<sup>35</sup> *Mass and the Lord's Supper*, tr. Dorothea H.G. Reeve, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979:186.

<sup>36</sup> Bornkamm calls attention to a parallel in Lucian's *Alexander the False Prophet* 38, which describes a mystery cult ritual. It began with a proclamation: "If any atheist or Christian or Epicurean has come to spy upon the rites, let him be off, and let those who believe in the god perform the mysteries, under the blessing of Heaven." Then at the very outset, there was an "expulsion" (ἐξέλασις), in which he took the lead, saying "Out with the Christians," and the whole multitude chanted in response, "Out with the Epicureans!" Translation from Lucian, vol.4, tr. A.M. Harmon, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969, 1925.

<sup>37</sup> Note that the use of the term ἀγάπη, for such meals may post-date the New Testament. Jude is scarcely evidence for the Lord's Supper, since the term is undefined in the context.

- <sup>38</sup> It is significant that Paul, who has the command to remember, did not conceive of the Lord's supper as a simple commemorative meal. See Eduard Schweizer, *The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament*, Facet Books 18, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967:1. (This is the translation of the article from RGC<sup>3</sup>).
- <sup>39</sup> H.J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, N.F.15. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982. Peter Lampe, "Das korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistischer-römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11, 17-34)," *ZNW*82, 1991:183-213 and, in lesser detail, "The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross," *Interpretation* 48, 1994:36-49.
- <sup>40</sup> Lampe, *Eucharist*, 39.
- <sup>41</sup> That is the traditional position. My colleague David Rhoads, a Markan specialist, is certain that the Gospel originated in rural Palestine, probably Galilee.
- <sup>42</sup> See the article on blood by O. Böcher in *EDNT* 1.37-39.
- <sup>43</sup> Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, THKNT 2. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962:219-20.
- <sup>44</sup> So Schweizer, 11. Matthew does not seem to follow liturgical usage elsewhere, e.g. in the longer version of the Lord's Prayer.
- <sup>45</sup> John Chrysostom calls it the "symposium of faith" in one of his Easter sermons.
- <sup>46</sup> Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, THKNT 3.2. Aufl. Berlin: Evangelisches Verlagsanstalt, 1962:395.
- <sup>47</sup> Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke*, Atlanta: John Knox, 1984:332.
- <sup>48</sup> I take this description from Raymond Brown's analysis in *The Gospel According to John*, The Anchor Bible 29 and 29A, Garden City: Doubleday, 1970:597-601.
- <sup>49</sup> Mark Allan Powell, *What Are They Saying About Acts?*, New York: Paulist Press, 1991:75-77, gives a terse summary of current exegetical opinion.
- <sup>50</sup> Synecdoche is a form of metonymy. The definition given above is from (Cicero.) *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, ed. Harry Caplan, Cambridge: Harvard, 1943:4.33.44: *Intellectio est cum res tota parve de parte cognoscitur aut de toto pars*. Cf. Quintilian 8..6.19: *synecdoches. . . variore sermonem potest, ut ex uno plures intellegamus, parte totum, specie genus, praecedentibus sequentis, vel omnia haec contra; liberior poetis quam oratoribus*. For a fuller discussion see Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1960:1.295-298.
- <sup>51</sup> Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, Anchor Bible 28 and 28A. New York: Doubleday, 1985:1559. Fitzmyer later (note 30, pp.1567, 1568) notes that Jesus assumes the role of the host or paterfamilias. His final comment is that "No words of interpretation, however, are pronounced over the bread." For a somewhat similar view see B.S. Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, New York: Charles Scribners, 1926:362-363.
- <sup>52</sup> C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke TPI New Testament Commentaries*, Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990:912, citing Jeremias, 109 and 174-75.
- <sup>53</sup> The implications of this for table fellowship are described in Israel Abrahams, "Publicans and Sinners," pp.54-61 in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, First Series, Cambridge: University Press, 1917; reprinted New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1967.
- <sup>54</sup> James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990:163.
- <sup>55</sup> Dunn, 163.
- <sup>56</sup> See Dunn, 166. Luther attempted to recover this chronological distance of bread and cup in his *Deutsche Messe*. Practicalities in administering the rite to many people in a cultic room led to his suggestion never achieving any regular application.
- <sup>57</sup> Raymond Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, The Anchor Bible 29 and 29A, Garden City: Doubleday, 1970:548.
- <sup>58</sup> Perhaps the strongest exponent of the presence of the Lord's Supper in John's Gospel is Oscar Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1950:67-72 (on John 2:1-11), 89-99 (John 6:1-13, 26-65) and 111-113 (John 19:34). For a summary account of the present state of research see Robert Kysar, *John the Maverick Gospel*, rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993:122-126.

- <sup>59</sup> Brown, 284-294, for extensive discussion of the basis for a eucharistic interpretation.
- <sup>60</sup> See most recently John E. Burkhardt, "Reshaping Table Blessings. 'Blessing. . . and thanksgiving. . . to our God' (Rev. 7:12)," *Interpretation* 48, 1994:54-55, and John W. Riggs, "From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of Didache 9 and 10," *The Second Century* 4, 1984:83-101.
- <sup>61</sup> Cyril Charles Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1935:55. The other, by Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. Yale Publications in Religion 1, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960:207-217, is more extensive.
- <sup>62</sup> Corwin, 208.
- <sup>63</sup> These associations were stressed by Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Leipzig: B.C. Teubner, 1927:83; Heinrich Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen*, Beiheft ZNW 8 Giessen: A. Töpelmann Verlag, 1929; and Hans-Werner Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien*, BFChTh, Reihe 2; Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien 44, Gütersloh: Werner, 1940. Corwin, 211-213, gives a useful evaluation of this view.
- <sup>64</sup> L.W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought*, Cambridge: University Press, 1967, is a trustworthy guide to his life and thought. See also Johannes Quasten, *Patrology, I: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1950:196-219.
- <sup>65</sup> The text is most easily available in E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914:74.
- <sup>66</sup> Barnard, 142-144, calls attention to three other passages: *Dialogue with Trypho* 41.1-3; 70.3-4; 97.1. These point out that the Eucharist is the antitype of the offering of flour for the purification of lepers, the pure sacrifice of which Malachi 1:10-11 speaks (cf. Isa 33:16), and is a sacrifice offered by Christians everywhere.
- <sup>67</sup> A useful text is *Die Passa-Homilie des Bischofs Meliton von Sardes*, ed. Bernhard Lohse, *Textus Minores* 24, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958.
- <sup>68</sup> Snyder, 139-140. He examines the fish motif earlier on pp.24-26. The master work on this symbol is Franz Dölger, *IXΘΥΣ*, Münster Aschendorff, 1928. The text with Romanist commentary is available in Orazio Marucchi, *Christian Epigraphy: An Elementary Treatise*, Tr. J. Armine Willis, Cambridge: University Press, 1912:126-135, and H.P.V. Nunn, *Christian Inscriptions*, Eton: The Savile Press, 1951:28-30.
- <sup>69</sup> Text and translation in Marucchi, 125-126, and Nunn, 31-32.
- <sup>70</sup> See Burton Scott Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, Translated into English with Introduction and Notes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934; reprint by Archon Books, 1962:27-32. Other useful editions include Dom Gregory Dix, *The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. with preface and corrections by Henry Chadwick, London: S.P.C.K., 1968, and Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *Hippolytus: A Text for Students*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grove Liturgical Study No.8. Bramcote, Nottinghamshire: Grove Books Limited, 1987.
- <sup>71</sup> Easton, 74.
- <sup>72</sup> Luther made a symbolic step in that direction in the *Deutsche Messe*, when he directed that the distribution of bread and cup should be separate actions.
- <sup>73</sup> I have not included in this survey a discussion of the Eastern Syriac tradition. The most convenient English edition is Brian Spinks, ed., *Addai and Mari—the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students*, Grove Liturgical Study No.24. Bramcote, Nottinghamshire: Grove Books, 1980. Spinks includes a very useful bibliography.
- <sup>74</sup> I cite the Greek text from Eusebius, *Kirchengeschichte*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Eduard Schwartz, Kleine Ausgabe, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1952.
- <sup>75</sup> Josef Ringel, *Césarée de Palestine*, Paris: Association des Publications près les Universités de Strasbourg, Editions Ophrys, 1975:129.
- <sup>76</sup> So F.J. Badcock, *The History of the Creeds*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938:181-182.
- <sup>77</sup> On the fuller creed see J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London: Longmans, 1960:296-331.
- <sup>78</sup> Theodor Zahn, *Das Apostolische Symbolum*, 2. Aufl. Erlangen und Leipzig: Andr. Deicher'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, (Georg Böhme), 1893:88.

<sup>79</sup> See Badcock, appendix. Among the earliest to contain the phrase are the Mozarabic Liturgy (Hahn §58) and the Gallic Creed (Hahn §61). It is not found in the Roman creed, the church order of Hippolytos, the Milan creed, the Ambrosian Manual, or the Creeds of Aquileia, Ravenna, Turin, Carthage, etc.

<sup>80</sup> Badcock, 261-262, gives the relevant Latin text. It is ambiguous so far as the sense is concerned. Nicetas early on says that *Ecclesia quid est aliud quam sanctorum omnium congregatio?*

<sup>81</sup> Kelly, 390: "The traditional interpretation, if it may for convenience be so described, is that it means 'fellowship with holy persons', the word *sanctorum* being taken either in a narrow sense of the saints proper and martyrs, or in the broader, more primitive sense of the faithful generally, living as well as departed." The best collection of early Christian creeds is that of A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln*, 3. Aufl. by L. Hahn. 1897. Hans Lietzmann provides a useful selection in *Symbole der alten Kirche*, Kleine Texte 17.18, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961.

<sup>82</sup> Zahn, 88.

<sup>83</sup> Easton, p.7, n.4, argues the "Even in the third century liturgical prayers were still normally extempore, and use of a fixed form was regarded as a weakness on the part of the officiant." Evidently the prophetic freedoms of the Didache was still in force.

<sup>84</sup> Robert Jewett recently gathered the evidence to support his suggestion that some early Christians lived in the high-rise insulae in Rome and, probably, also in other cities. Such insulae provided the housing for people on the lower levels of ancient society, e.g. in the Subura in Rome. See Robert Jewett, "Tenement Churches and Communal Meals in the Early Church: The Implications of a Form-Critical Analysis of 2 Thessalonians 3:10," *Biblical Research* 38, 1993:23-43.