

## THE JEWISH ANTECEDENTS OF THE EUCHARIST<sup>1</sup>.

THE importance of Jewish Archaeology for the study of Christian origins seems to have been strangely overlooked in some recent critical discussions of New Testament problems, and more especially in some of those which deal with the complicated questions raised by the analysis of the Gospels. In his preface to the third edition of the late Dr. Edersheim's *History of the Jewish Nation* (published 1896) Prof. Sanday laments that the brilliant group of Jewish-Christian scholars, represented by Edersheim and his contemporaries Franz Delitzsch<sup>2</sup>, Ferdinand Weber, Biesenthal, and Caspari, has left few successors.

Prof. Schechter, too, in a lecture delivered in London some three years ago at University College, deplored the neglect of Rabbinical studies in England, and invited Christian scholars to enter this field<sup>3</sup>. Happily we have still among us Dr. Charles Taylor, of Cambridge, while among foreign scholars the names of Strack and Dalman at once occur in this connexion. But it remains unfortunately true that there is a deplorable lack of representatives of Jewish scholarship among Christian scholars. As a consequence the importance of the subject is not adequately recognised throughout the ranks of the whole body of New Testament students, at any rate in England. And till Jewish scholarship has a larger voice in the counsels of criticism, critical results must necessarily, it would seem, be one-sided and tentative to a degree that is really unnecessary. Perhaps some improvement will take place when the English translation of the first instalment of Dr. Dalman's great work, *Die Worte Jesu*, appears. Till,

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, May 23, 1901.

<sup>2</sup> Delitzsch was not, however, of Jewish descent, as is often erroneously stated.

<sup>3</sup> The lecture has appeared, under the title *Some Rabbinic Parallels to the New Testament*, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, xii 415 ff. (April, 1900), and was reproduced recently in the *Homiletic Review* (May, 1901).

however, a larger number of New Testament scholars consents to give much closer attention to the relevant Jewish institutional and religious history than has been the case within recent years, we must resign ourselves to inconclusive and unconvincing critical results.

On what Prof. Schechter has called its 'halakhic' or legal and institutional side the New Testament offers no more fascinating and at the same time complex problem than the question of the real relation between the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover. Was the last Supper a Passover? If not, what account are we to give of the paschal features that undoubtedly exist in some of the New Testament accounts of the institution of the Rite?

When such an authority as Prof. Sanday, after a full review of the evidence and of recent theories on the subject, is obliged to confess that 'as the question at present stands we can only acknowledge our ignorance<sup>1</sup>,' it would be presumptuous to imagine that I can give an answer which will solve all difficulties. Yet there is one possibility which has been overlooked in all discussions of the subject that I have seen, and which I venture to put forward in the hope that it will be deemed at least worthy of consideration by those who have a right to pronounce judgement. If in my presentment of the hypothesis I traverse some well-known ground, this will, I hope, be pardoned in the interests of lucid statement.

### I.

(1) *First, then, was the Last Supper a Passover?* At first sight the Synoptic accounts appear imperatively to demand the identification. We are expressly told (Marc. xiv 12) that on 'the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover,' the disciples inquired where the Passover was to be eaten. The sacrifice of the Paschal lamb took place on the afternoon of Nisan 14. On the evening of that day, which from sunset onwards would according to Jewish reckoning be counted as the beginning of Nisan 15, it is implied in the Synoptic accounts that the Last Supper was eaten, and so would coincide with the Jewish Paschal meal. Thus the Crucifixion must have taken place the following day, viz. on the afternoon of Nisan 15.

<sup>1</sup> Art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, ii p. 634 b.

In the Fourth Gospel, however, the Crucifixion is clearly represented to have taken place on the afternoon of Nisan 14, when the Paschal lambs were sacrificed (cf. Jo. xiii 1, xviii 28, xix 14, 31). According to this representation the Last Supper must have been eaten a whole day before the regular Jewish Passover. However explained, there is here a direct conflict of evidence, and the question arises, which account has internal probability in its favour? It seems to the writer that a number of considerations converge in favour of the Johannine narrative.

(a) The evidence of the Synoptic accounts is self-contradictory. As the veteran Dr. Chwolson—the last of the band of Jewish Christian scholars left to us—has pointed out in his monograph *Das letzte Passahmahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes*<sup>1</sup>, the expression *יום ראשון לחם המצות* i.e. *The first day of unleavened bread* has always been understood by Jewish writers—both ancient and modern—to refer to Nisan 15 not 14. On the other hand the Passover lamb was sacrificed on Nisan 14. Consequently the expression ‘On the first day of unleavened bread *when they sacrificed the Passover*’ involves a contradiction in terms. This argument seems to me to be absolutely decisive. In other respects also the Synoptic accounts are inconsistent with themselves and irreconcilable with Jewish usages, if the time of the Last Supper is made to synchronize with that of the Jewish Paschal meal.

(b) There is further the significant omission in all the accounts of any mention of the Paschal Lamb. If the sequence of events in the Fourth Gospel is correct, Christ was Himself the Paschal Lamb; and this representation is confirmed by the language of St. Paul (1 Cor. v 7), ‘Christ our Passover has been sacrificed.’

(c) In all the accounts it is noticeable that *one* Cup only is mentioned which was partaken of by *all*; whereas at the Passover a special point is made of each man having his own Cup to drink from. This is a point which is often overlooked, and to which it will be necessary to return.

(d) Lastly there is the discrepancy between the Lucan account and that in the other Synoptists, which must be reserved for fuller discussion below.

We may safely assume, then, that the Last Supper was cele-

<sup>1</sup> p. 3.

brated on the night of Nisan 14, that is, the night before the Jewish Passover; and that it is not to be identified with the Paschal meal of the Jews—for the theory that it was an *anticipatory* celebration of the Passover will not bear examination.

(2) *Can it, then, be connected with any other Jewish Ceremonial observance?* I believe the answer to this question to be in the affirmative, and the Jewish ceremony in question to be the weekly *Kiddûsh*.

The ceremony of Kiddûsh, or weekly Sanctification of the Sabbath, is an ancient Rabbinical observance, which undoubtedly goes back to pre-Christian times. This is proved by the fact that the order of the first two blessings—that over the wine, and that over the Day—was a subject of dispute between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, 100 years before the destruction of the Temple<sup>1</sup>. The traditional way of explaining the Mosaic command (Ex. xx 8) *Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy* (לקדשו) was, according to the Talmud, *Remember it over the wine* (זכרו על-היין) *Pesachim* 107a). Hence, of course, its special name of קדוש היום or קדוש היין i.e. *Sanctification* or *Sanctification of the Day*. This ancient ceremony is still largely observed in the Jewish Home, with much of its pristine simplicity. It is essentially a Home-observance, and according to the dicta of the Rabbis can only be properly celebrated in conjunction with, and as a prelude to, the Sabbath Evening meal.

Before sunset and darkness on Friday the Jewish wife lights in the dining-room extra candles or a special lamp in honour of the Sabbath, pronouncing over them as she does so the appropriate benediction. On the return of the father with his sons from the synagogue service (for the women rarely attend synagogue on Friday night) they find the table prepared, spread with a clean table-cloth, and at the head, where the father sits, two loaves of bread—which are usually specially baked for the occasion—in memory (so it is explained) of the double portion of manna which was gathered on Fridays. These are covered with a napkin. Near them stands an empty cup, and close to this a jug or bottle of wine to fill it. After chanting the praises of a virtuous wife

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in the Mishna *Berâkhôth*, ch. 8, § 1 (= Surenhusius i 38), for the weekly Kiddûsh; and for the Kiddûsh of Passover, *Pesâchim*, ch. 10, § 2 (= Surenhusius ii 173).

from Proverbs xxxi the husband begins the *Kiddûsh* proper. This is prefaced by the verses in Genesis relating the work of Creation on the sixth and the Rest on the seventh day. Then he fills the cup, and holding it up proceeds:—

‘Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, Creator of the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments, and wast pleased with us, and hast given us for a heritage, in love and favour, thy holy Sabbath, a memorial of the work of Creation. For it precedes all thy holy convocations, in memory of the going forth from Egypt. For thou hast chosen us, and hast hallowed us above all nations, and hast given us, in love and favour, thy holy Sabbath for a heritage. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hallowest the Sabbath<sup>1</sup>.’

The father then drinks from the Cup, hands it to his wife, and she to the children and others at the table, all drinking from it. Then follows the ceremony of washing the hands. The husband thereupon utters the benediction for bread:—‘Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth,’ and he proceeds to cut one loaf, taking a piece for himself and distributing pieces to the others. If wine is not at hand, the washing of hands takes place first, and the benediction over bread is substituted for that over wine, the bread being cut and distributed at once. Then follows the Sabbath meal.

*Kiddûsh*, however, is not confined to the Sabbath. The great festivals are preceded in exactly the same way by a solemn ‘Sanctification.’ Thus there is a *Kiddûsh* for Passover, Pentecost (Feast of Weeks), Tabernacles, the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, &c. The ceremony is substantially the same in all cases—wine being used and a festive meal following, only the blessings being varied to suit the special character of the day. It should be noted that the *first* of the four Passover Cups is the Cup of the *Kiddûsh* for Passover.

The remarkable points of contact between this ceremony and the Christian Sacrament are at once apparent. Perhaps the most

<sup>1</sup> For the order of service, as now used, cf. Singer, *Authorized Daily Prayer Book* (Hebrew and English), p. 124 (published by Eyre and Spottiswoode).

striking is the distribution of the *one* Cup. Another noticeable point is the order in which the constituent parts of the ceremony are arranged, viz. :—

(i) *The Cup.* (ii) *The washing of hands* (for which, as Edersheim<sup>1</sup> has suggested, it is not improbable that our Lord deliberately substituted the feet-washing described in Jo. xiii). (iii) *The distribution of the bread.* Now this order—first the Cup, and then the Bread—is significant. It agrees with the Lucan account (Luc. xxii 14–20), where, as is now generally agreed, only one Cup (according to the true text) is mentioned, and this comes first<sup>2</sup>. Further, St. Paul twice mentions the Cup first (1 Cor. x 16, 21). It is true that in the former of these passages the expression used is ‘Cup of blessing’ (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας) which apparently exactly corresponds to the third of the Passover Cups, the technical name of this being ‘The Cup of blessing’ (כוס של ברכה). But the coincidence is, I believe, merely verbal. The full designation of the third Paschal Cup is כוס של ברכה המזון i. e. *The Cup of Blessing over meat.* ‘Blessing’ in this expression qualifies not the Cup, but ‘over meat’; whereas in the Pauline phrase ‘Cup of Blessing’ = the consecrated or blessed Cup; ‘for,’ as Grimm in Thayer remarks<sup>3</sup>, ‘that this is the meaning is evident from the explanatory adjunct δ εὐλογοῦμεν’—*The Cup of Blessing which we bless.* There is therefore no difficulty in identifying *the Cup of Blessing* in this passage with the *Kiddūsh* Cup.

A more serious difficulty remains, however, with regard to the detailed account of the Institution given in 1 Cor. xi 23–28, the passage beginning ‘For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread,’ &c. Here the usual order is followed, and paschal features are more marked. On further examination of this passage, however, the stereotyped character of the language—so unlike St. Paul’s usual manner—appeared very striking, and suggested the conclusion that it is in effect a citation by St. Paul of a liturgical formula already current

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus the Messiah*, ii 497.

<sup>2</sup> The textual phenomena of this passage are fully set forth by Prof. Sanday in the article cited above (*Hastings’ D. B.* vol. ii) p. 636.

<sup>3</sup> *Lexicon of the New Testament*, s.v. εὐλογία.

when he wrote<sup>1</sup>. On this hypothesis the discordance between St. Luke and St. Paul disappears.

One other venerable authority agrees with the Lucan account in placing the Cup before the Bread—and this is, perhaps, its most striking corroboration—I mean the *Didache*<sup>2</sup>. The passage in question is so remarkable that it is worth while to transcribe it in full: I quote from Dr. Taylor's translation<sup>3</sup>:—

'And as touching the feast of Thanksgiving [Eucharist], thus give ye thanks:

'First, concerning the Cup, We thank thee, O our Father, for the holy vine of David thy child, which thou hast made known to us by thy child Jesus. Thine be the glory for ever.

'And concerning the broken bread, We thank thee, O our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast made known to us by thy child Jesus. Thine be the glory for ever.

'As this broken bread was once scattered in grains upon the mountains, and being gathered together became one; so let thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth unto thy kingdom. For thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever.'

I venture to suggest, then, that the real Jewish antecedent of the Lord's Supper was the weekly *Kiddûsh*. We may suppose that the *Kiddûsh* was often celebrated by our Lord before His Death with His Disciples. The evidence of Acts xx 7 ('upon the first day of the week, when they were gathered together to break bread') suggests that a *weekly* Eucharist was the common custom of the primitive Church, at any rate outside Jerusalem: and in this it is not difficult to see a reflexion of our Lord's earliest and normal practice. At the same time we must suppose that the celebration of *Kiddûsh*, under the influence of the high spiritual ideas with which it was infused, gradually emancipated itself from its formal connexion with the weekly sabbath. For the idea of a spiritual

<sup>1</sup> For further discussion of the order of the Bread and Cup given in this passage, see below, p. 365 f. I had at one time thought the passage might even be an interpolation, a theory held also, I find, by Straatman (see J. M. S. Baljon, *Novum Testamentum Græce*, Groningæ, 1898, *ad loc.*); but it would be very difficult to account for the absence of any trace of disturbance in the MSS, and the view expressed in the text appears to me on all grounds more satisfactory.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. ix.

<sup>3</sup> *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 128 f.

sabbath, as the sabbath which is binding on Christians, which is reflected in the second of the so-called *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ*, 'Except ye keep the sabbath, ye shall not see the Father,' and in the earliest post-apostolic literature, doubtless goes back to the personal teaching of Christ. The spiritual sabbath—i. e. the sabbath-rest from sin attained by leading the new life—was not a matter of one day in seven, but of every day. The Christian *Kiddush* might thus become a matter of frequent celebration. According to this view it must be conceived as a spiritualization of the old Jewish ceremony, which was thus made the vehicle of higher and deeper teaching by our Lord. Its frequent celebration constituted at once a parable, a bond, and a pledge of union between the Master and His followers, endeared more and more as time went on by the tenderest recollections and associations, until it culminated in the last great celebration before the Death. Is it fanciful to see in the great discourse on the True Vine, given in St. John xv, a summary of the Saviour's teaching for which the earlier celebrations of this simple Rite had at once furnished the occasion and prepared the way?

There is some support in the Gospels for thinking that such celebrations would have been frequent. Thus in the journey to Emmaus the two disciples recognise the Lord in 'the breaking of bread.' Though they had not been present at the Last Supper, yet they understood the act. There is also the discourse in St. John vi, which (especially such verses as *v. 53* 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in yourselves') seems to imply earlier eucharistic teaching. On this point Mr. Arthur Wright remarks<sup>1</sup>, 'If we understand the Eucharist as originally a covenant of personal allegiance, there is reason to think that it was frequently celebrated during our Lord's ministry.' If the 'breaking of bread' at home, mentioned in Acts ii 46, was of daily occurrence, another corroboration would seem to be furnished for the frequency of the earlier celebrations. The earlier makes the later usage at once natural and intelligible, and explains the double practice of *daily* eucharists within the great central church of Jerusalem, coexisting with *weekly* celebrations elsewhere.

At this point it should, perhaps, be noted that according to the

<sup>1</sup> *New Testament Problems*, 180 f.

view here advocated, the Institution took place at the beginning—not the end—of the meal.

## II.

But how, it will be asked, are the other Synoptic accounts and the account in 1 Corinthians xi to be explained? Here we have the order of the elements reversed—first the bread, and then the cup—while the narrative has received a Paschal setting. The paschal features are pronounced, even in the Corinthian epistle. Some great influence must have operated to produce these phenomena. What was it?

The answer is, I think, that the paschal features must have been developed very early under the influence of the symbolism of the Passion. Christ being the Christian's true paschal lamb (1 Cor. v 7), the memorial of the Last Supper naturally developed into the Christian Haggādā—the 'showing' (A.V.) or 'proclaiming' (R.V.) of the Lord's death till He come (1 Cor. xi 26<sup>1</sup>). This development, it may be supposed, was assisted by and partially coincided with the liturgical development, which ultimately issued in the severance of the Sacrament from the common meal. Practically the common meal of this earliest form of the Eucharist is identical with the *agape*. What part in the evolutionary process is to be assigned to the latter?

On the subject of the place of the *agape* in the early history of the Eucharist it is extremely difficult to arrive at any certain conclusion, owing to the obscurity with which it is surrounded. The following suggestions are only put forward tentatively, and with some misgiving.

The *agape* seems to have existed in two forms in the early Church, viz. (a) a native Jewish, and (b) a later Graecised form.

I conjecture that the ordinary meal which followed *Kiddūsh* became the earliest form of the common meal in the Church of Jerusalem. In this case the Eucharist must have *preceded* the common meal. But gradually this common meal became charged with Passover associations under the influences explained above.

<sup>1</sup> The Greek word in 1 Cor. xi 26 is *καταγγέλλειν* = Heb. *הַגִּיד*, 'to narrate, tell,' whence *הַגְּדָה*, *Haggādā*, 'the telling,' the technical name of the Jewish home-service for the first two nights of Passover, 'which consists mainly of a *telling* of the story of the Exodus.'

It is possible that the change in the *order* of the elements took place as the result of paschal influence. As the common meal became assimilated to the Passover meal the tendency would be, perhaps, to identify the Eucharistic Cup with one of the more important of the four Passover Cups—probably the second, the ‘Cup of the Haggādā’<sup>1</sup>. How influential the later liturgical development became is seen (a) in the liturgical citation in Corinthians (1 Cor. xi 23–28)<sup>2</sup>, and (b) in the Synoptic accounts, which seem to me to reflect the influence of the early liturgical spirit. If the Synoptic Gospels in their present form are to be regarded as Church manuals rather than the individual productions of single writers, this is natural enough. This liturgical development will have been early enough to influence both St. Paul’s citation of the ‘tradition’ in 1 Cor. xi and also the account of the Institution in the first two Synoptic Gospels. We may suppose, however, that the earlier tradition lingered on and has survived to us in the intensely Jewish *Didache*, which seems to me to support the *Kiddūsh* order, viz. (1) Communion and (2) common meal. Chap. ix of this venerable document gives the forms of thanksgiving already cited (‘And as touching the feast of thanksgiving [Eucharist], thus give ye thanks. First concerning the cup, &c., . . . And concerning the broken bread,’ &c.). Then, in chap. x immediately following we have, ‘And after being filled, thus give ye thanks: We thank thee, holy Father, for thy holy name which thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which thou hast made known to us by thy child Jesus. Thine be the glory for ever. Thou, O Almighty Sovereign, didst create all things for thy name’s sake, and gavest men food and drink to enjoy, that they might give thanks unto thee; but to us thou didst graciously give spiritual food and drink and life eternal,

<sup>1</sup> At the same time another possibility must be allowed for. It is possible that the Christian agape in the Dispersion became assimilated to some extent to the Greek club and guild feasts, which are said to have *terminated* in a solemn religious celebration. Under this influence the Eucharist would be placed at the *end* of the common meal, and perhaps the Cup was placed last as being more directly suggestive of sacrifice (cf. especially ‘This is my blood of the covenant,’ &c., Marc. xiv 24, Matt. xxvi 28), and so appropriate as the culminating religious act (cf. 1 Cor. xi 25, ‘In like manner also the cup, *after* supper,’ &c.).

<sup>2</sup> It is significant that the early Liturgies, in reciting the Institution, largely follow the Corinthians account, though not without exception.

through thy child. . . . If any is holy, let him come ; if any is not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen.'

As I understand this, chap. ix refers to the actual communion, *which is followed by the common meal, or agape*. The latter, it seems to me, is implied by the words at the beginning of ch. x 'And after being filled,' which mean '*after having partaken of the agape or common meal*.' In other words we have here (1) the Communion proper, and (2) the common meal. The words 'If any is holy, let him come ; if any is not, let him repent' (ch. x) will in that case have a retrospective force, covering the combined celebration of Eucharist and Agape.

### III.

It remains to add a word about the formula of Institution. The words 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood,' or 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood,' are guaranteed as the genuine words of our Lord by the combined testimony of the four New Testament accounts. They are also confirmed—and this perhaps is the most notable testimony of all—by the author of the Fourth Gospel, in his own striking way. It seems to be his manner tacitly—and sometimes in a curiously indirect way—either to correct or to confirm by fuller explanation what is set forth in the First Three Gospels. Thus instead of repeating the formula of Institution he gives us the Lord's teaching which forms its background and explanation. *I am the true vine* (John xv) is the Johannine equivalent of *This is my blood*. Indeed this great discourse with its context (John ch. xiii ff.), as it seems to the present writer, represents a summary of the Lord's Eucharistic teaching which culminated in the solemn celebration of the night before the Death.

It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the words of Institution are entirely absent from the *Didache*. How is this to be accounted for? The explanation is, I think, simple. The fact that no account whatever of the Institution is given in the *Didache* ought to put us on our guard. It is obviously implied. The character of the manual also explains this. It is written with a view to the practical needs of the congregation *as a whole*, not of its officers. Hence the section on the Eucharist supplies merely forms of thanksgiving for the use of the recipient, not a formula

of consecration for the celebrant. Further, as Dr. Charles Taylor has pointed out, its 'meagreness' in many details 'is proof that the *Didache* must have been supplemented by oral teaching<sup>1</sup>.'

## IV.

To sum up the main points briefly. It seems to the present writer that the true Jewish antecedent of the Christian Eucharist is not the Passover, but *Kiddush*; that this is confirmed by the negative testimony of the Fourth Gospel (that the Last Supper was not a Passover), and positively by the order of the elements in the true text of St. Luke's account (ch. xxii<sup>2</sup>), and in St. Paul's indirect allusions; that further strong confirmation is to be found in the *Didache*, which also supports the view that the Eucharist first of all preceded the common meal or agape; and that the combined celebration became gradually assimilated to the Passover, under the influence of the symbolism of the Passion.

In conclusion, I would venture to quote some words of Prof. Sanday's, which have an apposite application to the points that have been discussed. 'We are reminded,' he says<sup>3</sup>, 'that the phrase κλᾶν (κατακλᾶν) ἄρτον is repeatedly used of a solemn act of our Lord independently of the Eucharist (Marc. vi 41, viii 6, 19, Luc. xxiv 30). We are reminded also of the many instances in which attention is specially called to the "blessing" (εὐλογεῖν or εὐχαριστεῖν) of food by our Lord. They are the same words which are used in connexion with the sacramental Bread and the sacramental Cup. There is something in these facts which is not quite fully explained. There are *lacunae* in our knowledge which we would fain fill up if we could. The institution of the Eucharist appears to have connexions both backwards and forwards—backwards with other meals which our Lord ate together with His disciples, forwards with those common meals which very early came into existence in the

<sup>1</sup> *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 59; cf. also the important remarks on p. 50 f. of the same work.

<sup>2</sup> Though St. Luke preserves a reminiscence of the earlier usage in the order given of the elements, his account as a whole pronouncedly reflects the paschal features of the other Synoptists. In the received text, also, a desperate attempt has been made to harmonise St. Luke's order with that of the first two Gospels.

<sup>3</sup> Art. 'Jesus Christ,' Hastings' *D. B.* iii 637.

Apostolic Church. But the exact nature and method of these connexions our materials are not sufficient to make clear to us.' It is in the hope that one such clue as is here desiderated will be recognised in the venerable Jewish ceremony above described that the present paper has been written.

G. H. Box.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Since the above article was written, Dr. F. J. Keating's important work *The Agape and the Eucharist in the Early Church* has been published. The relation of the Agape to the Eucharist is there fully discussed. In Appendix I (pp. 165 ff.) the question as to whether the Eucharist originally preceded or followed the Agape is dealt with. Though the writer inclines to Bishop Lightfoot's opinion that 'the celebration of the Eucharist came, as it naturally would, at a later stage in the entertainment,' he admits that this statement is 'at variance' with St. Chrysostom's comment in 1 Cor. Homil. xxvii, where it is explicitly said that 'when the solemn service (*τῆς συνάξεως*) was completed, after the communion of the mysteries, they all went to a common entertainment,' &c. On one other point Dr. Keating agrees with the present writer, viz. in interpreting the expression in the *Didache* (ch. x) 'after being filled' (*μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι*) as = after having partaken of the Agape (p. 53).

G. H. B.