SYNOPTIC PRESENTATION OF THE EUCHARIST AS COVENANT SACRIFICE

BERNARD COOKE, S.J.

Marquette University

In his book, *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, the Swedish theologian Gustaf Aulén attempts to show that Catholic and Protestant views on the Eucharist are slowly approaching one another.[1] There is, no doubt, some truth to this opinion; but recent studies of Jeremias, Higgins, Leenhardt, and Cullmann all manifest a constant, though subtle, adherence to the classic Protestant approach to the Eucharist.[2] These writers base their rejection of the Catholic view upon an analysis of the *NT* texts; hence, any furtherance of Catholic-Protestant understanding on the central issue of the Eucharist will be dependent upon Catholic study of these same *NT* passages.

Much important work in this area has been done in recent years by Catholic theologians such as Betz, Benoit, and Schürmann.[3] Building upon these studies, the present article attempts to examine the Synoptic teaching on the Eucharist from just one point of view: Do these Gospels present the Eucharist as a covenant sacrifice? For all its apparent delimitation, this question touches upon several of the key aspects of Christianity: the relation between Old and New Testament, the distinguishing nature of Christianity as a religion, the essence of Christian redemption, the nature of the Church—in short, the very issues that separate Catholic from Protestant, and Christian from Jew.

No attempt to study the Synoptic teaching on the Eucharist as covenant can prescind from the *OT* covenant and Christ's relation to it, since covenant dominated the religious history that is the Old Testament, and Christ is presented by the Synoptic writers as the

[1] Gustaf Aulén, *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, tr. Eric Wahlstrom (Philadelphia, 1958).

[2] Cf. J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London, 1955); A. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (London, 1952); F. Leenhardt, *Ceci est mon corps* (Neuchâtel, 1955); O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship* (London, 1953).

[3] Cf. J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter* 1 (Freiburg, 1955), devoted to a treatment of the *NT* teaching on the Eucharist; P. Benoit, "The Holy Eucharist," *Scripture* 8 (1956) 97–108, and 9 (1957) 1–14; H. Schürmann, *Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsbericht* (Münster, 1953–57).

fulfilment of that history. For that reason, the present study will approach an analysis of the Eucharistic texts by seeing how Jesus as depicted by the Synoptics recapitulates and fulfils, in their various stages of evolution, the priesthood, the Temple, and the sacrifices of Israel.

FULFILMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PRIESTHOOD

The primitive traditions underlying the Pentateuch point towards a certain universalism in the attitude towards sacrifice during the patriarchal period. Abraham and the other patriarchs are described as offering sacrifice that was acceptable to God; but so is Melchizedek, who was not an ancestor of the elected people. There was as yet no unification of cult, no official priesthood, no central shrine. With the Mosaic covenant began the movement towards nationalism and organization, the designation of a group specially set aside to provide for divine worship, and the beginnings of a prescribed religious ceremonial for Israel as a people—though there was not as yet any noticeable centralization.[4] This centralization received an important impetus with the Davidic dynasty, the building of the Temple, and the organization of a Temple priesthood and a Temple ceremonial; but this process of unification was quite slow and may not have been significantly achieved until the reform measures of Josiah in 622.[5] With the Exile and the postexilic restoration came the ascendancy of the priesthood, especially the rise to power of the high-priestly family and the final codification of a detailed religious ceremonial centered around the Temple sacrifices.[6]

Accompanying this progressive centralization was an evolution in the idea of the Israelitic priesthood. It would seem that the principal function of the Levites in the early stage of their history was connected with the communication of divine revelation rather than with sacrifice; theirs was the special care of the Ark and the Tabernacle,

[4] On the Israelitic priesthood and its relation to covenant, cf. W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des A.T.* 1 (Berlin, 1933) 209–35; A. Neher, *L'Essence du prophétisme* (Paris, 1955) pp. 293–304; G. Schrenk, in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (hereafter this will be referred to by *ThW*) 3, 259–62.

[5] Cf. Schrenk, *ThW* 3, 260–61.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 261; also T. Chary, *Les prophètes et le culte à partir de l'exil* (Paris, 1955).

from which God spoke and directed His people.[7] This oracular function of the Israelitic priesthood persisted throughout the coming centuries and was gradually concentrated in the office of the high priest (cf. Jn 11:51). However, with the increasing centralization of cult, the stabilizing of the Temple ceremonial, and the dominance of the Temple priesthood, the function of sacrifice began to take over as the principal, and finally almost exclusive, role of the priest and Levite; so much so, that another group, the scribes, took over the official interpretation of the Law (the oracular function of the priesthood) and thereby gained a certain priority over the priests.[8]

Christ's relationship to this Israelitic priesthood, as presented in the Synoptic Gospels, is not simple: He preserves and intensifies the development towards exclusiveness at the same time that He abolishes the national limitations of the Israelitic priesthood; His priesthood is completely sacrificial, but relinquishes none of its "prophetic" prerogatives; His priesthood involves opposition to and revocation of the Temple priesthood, yet He is ultimately the *raison d'être* of that priesthood and the only thing that gives the *OT* priesthood its full intelligibility.

At first sight, it is not too evident that the Synoptic writers think of Jesus as a priest. He is never referred to as *hiereus*; His lineage is not traced to Levi or Aaron but to David; He is never depicted as participating in the official Temple worship (though this is taken for granted), much less exercising any priestly function there. Yet all three Evangelists point to Christ as a priest, and Luke's Gospel might justifiably be called the Gospel of Christ's priesthood.

By beginning his Gospel narrative with a scene of Temple sacrifice, Luke places his history of Christ's life in a Temple framework that continues right up to the final verse of his Gospel, where he tells us

[7] Cf. Schrenk, *op. cit.*, p. 259: ". . . als die erste Funktion des Priesters steht ursprünglich nicht das Opfer im Vordergrund, sondern die Orakelweisung." So also Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 211. The exact relationship and distinction between priest and Levite in the pre-exilic (and especially pre-Davidic) period is far from clear. For a discussion of this problem, cf. Chary, *op. cit.*, pp. 33 ff. and 49 ff.

[8] Cf. Schrenk, *op. cit.*, pp. 261–62. As Chary (*op. cit.*, p. 61) points out, there is room for dispute as to the respective role of priest and Levite in the immolation of the sacrificial victim, but there is no question of the Levite sharing in what was "la fonction sacerdotale proprement dite, celle de l'offrande de la victime."

that the disciples returned from the Ascension to praise God in the Temple. The significant prominence of the *OT* priest, Zachary, at the beginning of the Gospel; the priestly meaning Zachary attaches to the promises of salvation and to their realization; the fact that John, the "greatest of the prophets," comes from a priestly family—all this quite clearly sets a sacerdotal tone for Luke's Gospel. A less evident indication of this priestly tone is the frequency of the word *hagios* in the early section of Lk:[9] Mary is told that the "holy" Spirit will overshadow her, and therefore her Son will be "holy";[10] in the Magnificat it is God's name that is called "holy"; in the Benedictus Zachary uses the word of the prophets and of the covenant; and in the scene of the Presentation, Luke indirectly applies it to the Christ child by citing the Law, according to which each first-born is "holy" to the Lord.[11]

Already in the infancy narrative we are presented with two scenes

[9] On priestly connotations of *hagios*, which, as Schrenk (*op. cit.*, pp. 225–26) points out, is much more common in the LXX as a translation for *qādôš* than is *hieros*, cf. O. Procksch, *ThW* 1, 112.

[10] Drawing attention to the priestly implications of *hagios* is not meant in any way to deny the primacy of the divine implications of the word when it is applied to Christ and the Holy Spirit; for there is no attribute that is more prominent and characteristic in the Hebrew idea of God than holiness (cf. Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, pp. 139–46). While the notion of majesty and transcendence and awesome unapproachability is prominent in the Hebrew idea of God's sanctity, this very otherness of God is based upon His inexplicable and irresistible might. Since it is this might that is creative and that is irreconcilably opposed to sin, the sanctity of God is intrinsically sanctifying. This sanctifying and dynamic aspect of *hagios* is certainly present in the term *pneuma hagion* of Lk 1:35, since the Holy Spirit is mentioned precisely as causing the human generation of Christ and thereby initiating the work of humanity's sanctification. It is not difficult, then, to see some of this same active connotation of the word *hagios* when it is applied to Christ in this same verse; that is to say, Christ will be called holy because He will sanctify men. Since it is a specifically priestly function to render the people holy, to consecrate the people to God, the *hagios* of Lk 1:35 points to the priestly mission of Christ; at the same time it indicates the fact that the Holy Spirit is the origin of this priestly sanctifying, just as He is the cause of the Incarnation from which the priesthood of Christ immediately results.

[11] This link of holiness with sacrifice indicates the extent to which the idea of "consecrated" dominates the *OT* and *NT* idea of holiness. Moreover, the offering of Jesus in the Temple actually points to His relation to *OT* Levitism: Yahweh had accepted the permanent service of the tribe of Levi in place of that of the first-born of all the tribes, and allowed the other tribes to redeem their first-born son by a symbolic sacrifice; but Christ's Presentation in the Temple was a manifestation of, not a deliverance from, the role of complete dedication to God as *the* first-born; and in that sense the Presentation indicates that there is no longer need for the substitutional function of the tribe of Levi.

that show the two sides of Jesus' fulfilment of the *OT* priesthood: at the Presentation there is a *sacrificial* action in which Christ, still utilizing the instrumentality of the official priesthood, manifests that dedication of will that is the kernel of His own priestly activity; and when, as a boy of twelve, Christ remained in the Temple to hear and question the doctors of the Law, we see Him again respecting the official *prophetic* function exercised by these scribes, but already displaying His ability to perform the same role.

In the public life of Christ the emphasis seems to be almost entirely upon the prophetic aspect; in this regard it does not seem to be accidental, nor due merely to reasons of practicality, that so much of Jesus' most important preaching was done in the Temple precincts. Of old, Yahweh had spoken from His Tabernacle through the mediation of Moses; now from His Temple the Father speaks through the mediation of His own Son become man.[12] Christ thus effects the perfect synthesis of the prophetic and priestly offices.

This apparent preponderance of the prophetic aspect is deceiving, however, because a closer examination reveals the fact that the structural events of the Synoptic narrative (baptism, temptation, Transfiguration) are fundamentally sacrificial, for they are "sacraments" of that acceptance of the priestly role of the Servant which is the essence of Christ's death itself. These focal events of the public life stress a continuity with Israel's religious past, and it is not unlikely that part of the significance of the appearance of Moses and Elias at the Transfiguration springs from the fact that one was the traditional founder of the Israelitic worship of Yahweh, and the other was the prophet who fought unremittingly for the establishment of that worship. Then, too, if one stops to think of it, there is deep significance in the fact to which the Synoptics scarcely draw attention: that Jesus participated

[12] In addition to this prophetic activity of Christ, there are several other facets of His priestly work that parallel the priestly role of Moses. As Moses shepherded the people and guided them to the conclusion of the covenant on Sinai, so Christ is the Good Shepherd who guides His "little flock" to the covenant that is achieved on Calvary. Moses concluded the Sinaitic covenant in the blood of sacrifice; so Christ concludes the new covenant in the Eucharistic blood "poured out for many unto the remission of sins." Moses prayed for the people, bore their sins, stood off the just wrath of God; Christ prays for His own, takes upon Himself the evils of mankind, reconciles mankind to God.—For an expansion of this parallelism between Christ and Moses, cf. J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum futuri* (Paris, 1950) pp. 135 ff.; L. Goppelt, *Typos* (Gütersloh, 1939) pp. 30 ff.

regularly in the Jewish feasts, and therefore in the Temple sacrifices. Obviously, Christ's compliance with the *OT* ceremonial laws gave to the Temple ritual a new dignity and perfection; but it also means that there was a certain absorption of the old sacrificial cult into the new priestly dispensation—all Christ's actions were part of His priestly activity in the new covenant, and among these actions was His participation in the Jewish ritual. Moreover, because of the commemorative element in the Temple ceremonial, each Jew entered into and relived Israel's religious past, shared in Israel's cumulative religious experience; so, too, Christ absorbed liturgically Israel's history of covenant relationship to God and incorporated it into that synthetic experience of His Father's covenant providence that guided His own priestly and redemptive action.

There is, then, an undeniable element of continuity between the Old and New Testament priesthood; but the Synoptic writers also indicate that Christ definitely broke with the *OT* priesthood. Jesus' parable of the good Samaritan indicates His estimate of many of the priests and Levites of His day; and His parable of the unjust custodians of the vineyard makes it clear that the priestly guardianship of Israel will be taken away from them, that the covenant with the family of Levi is revoked as Malachi had foretold (Mal 2:4–5).[13] Christ indicates that the *OT* ceremonial has been transcended when He states His superiority to the Sabbath and the Temple; and His assertion of authority over the Temple itself (by driving out the merchants) showed clearly the Messianic priesthood that was His. The constant and bitter opposition of the leaders of the Jewish priesthood is sufficient indication that they realized that Jesus challenged their very existence—in a sense, the prominence in the Synoptic narrative of this conflict between Jesus and the official priesthood is one of the clearest indications of the extent to which a sacerdotal point of view enters into these three Gospels.

FULFILMENT OF THE TEMPLE

Christ's rejection of the official Jewish priesthood was due to its failure to fulfil the pastoral obligation of caring for God's people; but there is not simply question of replacing them in an office that itself

[13] For discussion of controverted meaning of this text, as well as treatment of *OT* thought on a special Levitic covenant, cf. Chary, *op. cit.*, pp. 167 ff.

remains the same; the change is more profound, there is a new priesthood. The *OT* priesthood was unique in the sense that it was restricted to one nation and to one family within that nation. Christ's priesthood, though much more unique (since there is only one sacrificial action), is not limited by nation or family; His brethren are all those who do the will of the Father. This abolition of the nationalistic exclusivity of the Israelitic priesthood is perhaps best seen in Christ's relation to the Temple, the symbol of that exclusivity.

There is no need to dwell on the prominence in the *OT* of the idea of God dwelling with the chosen people, on its intimate connection with the idea of election and covenant, on its expression in the patriarchal shrine of Bethel, the Mosaic Tabernacle, and finally the Solomonic Temple. It represented a familiarity of God with men and a certain nationalistic limitation of God's relation with mankind. In the prophetic and postexilic periods there was a current of thought (best represented by Deutero-Isaiah) that tended towards a more spiritual and universal interpretation of this "dwelling of God"; but, at the same time, another current of thought concentrated attention upon Jerusalem and its Temple, and so emphasized the sacral and awesome aspect of God's Temple presence that the element of divine familiarity with men was greatly diminished.[14]

Christ Himself thought of the Temple as the place where God dwelt in a special way; for Him it was "the house of God" (Mt 12:4). Yet there are clear indications in the Synoptic Gospels that Jesus thought of Himself as the fulfilment of this "dwelling," and that He was just that—thus realizing in undreamed-of fashion the idea of God's familiarity with men. Joseph is told by the angel that Jesus will be called Emmanuel, and attention is drawn to the fact that this name means "God with us" (Mt 1:23). One feels that there is a certain continuation of this notion of Christ as Emmanuel, and a fulfilment of the prophecy that "God Himself will come to His Temple" (Mal 3:1), in the narration of the Presentation, when for the first time Christ comes to His Father's house. And if the words *en tois tou patros* of Lk 2:49 are to be translated "in the house of my Father,"[15] that would be a clear

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.

[15] Cf. F. Prat, *Jésus-Christ* 1, 128. Prat himself, however, seems to incline towards the translation "in the affairs of my Father," which is also the choice made by E. Osty in his translation of Luke in the *Bible de Jérusalem*.

forecast of the predilection He later shows for the Temple as a place of preaching. Christ is quite evidently troubled by the impending doom of the Temple, sorrowful because of the destruction of something He genuinely loves. There seems to be a reflection of this in Mk 11:11. It is Palm Sunday, Jesus had gone up to the Temple in triumph, and "when it was evening, after He had looked at everything (*periblepsamenos panta*), He departed for Bethany." The word *periblepō*, when used in the middle, has the meaning of "gaze carefully or lovingly at something";[16] and it would seem that Christ is described as looking fondly at all the details of the doomed structure. It was also on Palm Sunday that His love for the Temple impelled Him to drive the buyers and sellers from the Temple precincts, and it is interesting to note that Christ does not call the Temple His Father's house; He cites Is 56:7, where the Temple is called "*my* house," and it is not out of the question that Christ means this "my" to refer to Himself. Yet Christ foresaw the destruction of this Temple that no longer had any meaning; for He Himself was "greater than the Temple" (Mt 12:6); His body was the temple in which God dwelt hypostatically; henceforth His dwelling among men would not be determined by the limits of a building, but by the presence of His disciples: "Wherever two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in their midst" (Mt 18:20).

OT thought, particularly that in the priestly tradition, looked upon the Temple not only as the *dwelling* of God, but as the place where man could meet God, where God revealed to man His covenant will, where God ruled.[17] This idea extends back beyond the Solomonic Temple to the Ark and the Tabernacle of the Mosaic covenant. Many pages in the Gospel mention how Christ fulfilled this oracular function by His teaching of the new law of the Kingdom; we might simply recall Christ's words (Mt 11:25 ff.) telling His hearers that it is only through the Son that the Father is revealed to men, and that it is by coming to Him that men will find that peace and rest which *OT* thought had always looked for from Yahweh and of which the Sabbath was the symbol and the pledge.

Again, the Temple was the center of Israel's worship of Yahweh; it was the place par excellence of prayer and sacrifice. It was here that

[16] Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon.*

[17] Cf. Chary, *op. cit.*, p. 29; Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, pp. 227–29.

Israel, and each individual Israelite, renewed liturgically the covenant with Yahweh. In this respect, too, Christ was at once the fulfilment and the replacement of the Temple; this we can see more easily if we examine the Synoptic attitude towards the Temple sacrifices.

FULFILMENT OF THE TEMPLE SACRIFICE

Israel's oldest tradition of sacrifice is closely linked with the idea of covenant.[18] There is the element of acknowledgment of the sovereignty of the covenant God; there is thanksgiving for the freedom from enemies, for the salvation wrought by Yahweh; there is the aspect of communion with Yahweh that is especially noticeable in the "peace offerings" (*zebaḥ šᵉlāmîm*), for in these sacrifices there was the idea of a meal shared with God; there is the pledge of one's friendship and devotion to Yahweh signified by the offering of a gift.[19] Of these, the notion of communion is most intimately linked with covenant, for it is this communion that the covenant achieves; in a sense the covenant (as the enduring state consequent upon the contract) *is* this communion.[20] This communion with Yahweh both presupposed and helped to constitute a communion among the Israelites themselves. For this reason one could only participate in the sacrifices if one was a member of the covenant people; hence the need for admission to the people by circumcision, the need for reconciliation if one had been for some reason excluded from the sacrificing community, the need for reconsecration (since Israel was a consecrated, an elected, people) if one had been defiled.[21] However, it is interesting to note that it is by means of individual sacrifices (e.g., for cured lepers) that the final step is achieved in that reconciliation and reconsecration which allows the individual in question to rejoin the community sacrifices. Linked with these reconciling sacrifices is an aspect of the Israelitic sacrifices that gradually came to the fore with an increasing awareness of personal

[18] Cf. Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 ff.

[19] Cf. D. Schötz, *Schuld und Sündopfer im A.T.* (Breslau, 1930) pp. 77–79; also H. Cazelles, *Etudes sur le code de l'alliance* (Paris, 1946) p. 41, who inclines towards a certain element of expiation in these peace offerings; and R. Yerkes, *Le sacrifice* (Paris, 1955) pp. 184–86, who stresses the idea of a vowed gift.

[20] Schötz, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 80–87.

moral guilt: that of expiation.[22] This was particularly prominent in the postexilic Temple ceremonial and above all in the great annual feast of Atonement.

All these various aspects and functions of the *OT* sacrificial system are reflected in the Synoptic Gospels. Luke's Gospel opens with the scene of Zachary's incense offering, and the account points to the still-existent efficacy of the *OT* ritual; for there does seem to be a link between the sacrifice and God's first action in inaugurating the new covenant. Christ's circumcision and presentation, as described by Luke, signal Christ's legal incorporation into the chosen people, and the journey of the twelve-year-old Jesus to Jerusalem indicates the consummation of this incorporation that came with actual participation in the paschal feast.[23]

A second aspect of the Presentation was the purification of Mary. It is evident that there could be no question of a need for purification on Mary's part, and this very fact gives us an insight into the meaning of this Jewish rite: the period of "impurity" of a Jewish mother was not a matter of punishment for moral guilt, but rather a temporary semi-excommunication from the sacrificing community because of the loss of blood in her childbearing (cf. Lv 12); and the rite of purification accomplished a readmission to the consecrated community, a reconsecration of the mother.

These two elements of consecration to God and entrance into the sacred community, on the part of both child and mother, are admirably symbolized by the offering of two doves: the one offered in holocaust was a sign of the utter giving of one's self to God; the other, the sin offering, was a sign of communion and alliance with God through the mediation of the priest who ate of the offering and interceded with God for the offerer (cf. Lv 5:10; 7:6; 10:17).

[22] Cf. A. Médébielle, *Expiation dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament* (Rome, 1924) p. 288. "Ce symbolisme revivait dans les sacrifices, surtout dans les sacrifices d'expiation. On sentait le besoin, après une faute, de renouveler et de resserrer l'alliance plus ou moins compromise. . . ." Cf. also Chary, *op. cit.*, pp. 64–65, who attributes to Ezekiel the chief role in initiating this emphasis on expiation.

[23] The role of the Pasch in effecting this final incorporation can be seen in the rabbinic injunctions regarding the proselytic initiation rites (baptism, circumcision, sacrifice), which recommended baptism on the vigil of the Pasch and then participation in the Pasch. Cf. I. Abraham, *Studies in Phariseeism and the Gospels* 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1917) 37; also G. Moore, *Judaism* 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1930) notes 101–3.

A second example in the Synoptic Gospels of this element of admission (or readmission) to a consecrated people is furnished by the incident of the cure by Christ of the lepers and His injunction that they offer the appropriate Temple sacrifice (Mt 8:4). Here again we have a case where there was no question of moral cleansing, but where there was a form of excommunication from the ritual community, an excommunication that is terminated by a sacrifice of reconsecration and readmission to the people. The element of reconsecration is much clearer in this case than it was in Mary's purification: in the cleansing of a leper there is parallel offering of two doves, one for holocaust and the other as a trespass offering; but there is also a very interesting ceremonial attached to the offering of a lamb and of oil (or of flour mixed with oil). This ceremonial, which consists in a form of anointing with the oil and the blood of the lamb after they have been sanctified by offering them to God (Lv 14:14 ff.), is strikingly similar to that associated with the consecration of priests (Ex 19). It requires but little reflection to see the covenant connotations in the consecratory use of blood in this ceremony.[24]

There is an unquestionable prominence in the Synoptic Gospels of the annual feasts of Pasch and Tabernacles, in which (as is indicated by Dt 15:19; 16:17) the idea of covenant was focal and in which at least some of the sacrifices, perhaps even the Pasch itself,[25] fall in the category of peace offerings. It seems, too, that a peace offering is indirectly referred to in Mt 5:23, where Christ tells His auditors to be first reconciled with their brethren before offering their gift on the altar. The altar in question was the *mizbēaḥ*, and while it is true that the word had taken on a somewhat general tone, it is also probable that it kept a certain amount of the implication of *zebaḥ*; and so it may well be that the kind of sacrifice to which Christ referred is the *zebaḥ šᵉlāmîm*. This interpretation is certainly in accord with the context, for a disposition of discord with one's brother would be in direct conflict with the sacrifice which was an exterior symbol of a willingness to conform to the covenant with Yahweh.

[24] Cf. Schötz, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[25] "It [the Pasch] ranks with the *shelamim* or peace offerings, where the common meal is central, as the means of establishing or renewing the covenant with God and with one another." W. Moulton, "Passover," *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible* 3, 690. Cf. also Yerkes, *op. cit.*, pp. 184–85.

Strangely, there is no mention of the great public sacrifices of atonement; and, if we except the cases of Mary's purification and the cleansing of the leper (where, as we saw, there is no moral guilt involved), the Synoptic Gospels are silent on the expiatory aspect of the Temple sacrifices. This omission becomes significant in the light of the conflict over Christ's power to forgive sin. For the Jews of Christ's day the accepted means of being freed from moral guilt was the "sin offering," which had an intercessory power with God and won God's pardon for the sinner (cf. Lv 4–5). Christ's forgiveness of sin was a claim to a sanctifying power superior to that of the Temple sacrifices and priests —a power which, if made generally available to men, made the expiatory Temple sacrifices obsolete.

Allied to this conflict on Christ's forgiveness of sin, and like it colored by the idea of the advent of a new covenant dispensation, is the opposition of Jesus to the Pharisaic notions on ritual purification. There is, evidently, no opposition in principle to rites of purification; after all, Jesus Himself utilized baptism as an instrument of sanctification. What Christ opposed was a false concentration on the externals of Jewish purifications and a lack of attention to the corresponding internal dispositions. Actually, this viewpoint of Christ represented the truest tradition of Hebrew thought on sanctity; for without in any way denying the need for purity, it had accorded the primacy to consecration.[26] This balance of values had been upset by the Pharisaic and legalistic insistence on minute observance of the Jewish purification code; a large part of Christ's teaching is devoted to restoring the correct point of view.

This insistence of Jesus on internal dispositions characterizes the Synoptic theology of sacrifice, which continues and completes the prophetic emphasis on the moral and individual aspect of sacrifice. The frequent citation of Hos 6:6 shows that the continuity with the prophets was conscious and deliberate. One must be careful, however, not to exaggerate the opposition (either in the prophets or in the Synoptic Gospels) between cult and internal dispositions of soul.

It is true that in the Sermon on the Mount Christ inculcates justice

[26] Cf. Eichrodt, *op. cit.* 3, 18 ff., where he traces the roots and development of fear of God, faith, and love, and then proceeds (pp. 44 ff.) to show the orientation that was thereby given to the Hebrew ethical norms.

and mercy towards one's fellow men, and an attitude of open and trusting sincerity towards the Father, and says that this is the fulfilment of the "Law and the prophets" (Mt 7:12); and when one recalls that the *OT* sacrifices formed part of the Law, one can see in the teaching on the Mount a reflection of Christ's attitude towards the Temple sacrifice. This same attitude can be seen in Christ's words to the Pharisees: "On these two commands [i.e., the double law of love] depends the whole of the Law and the prophets" (Mt 22:40). In a way, an even more striking example is the text of Mk 12:33, where the young scribe says: "To love one's neighbor as oneself is better than holocausts or sacrifices"; and Jesus answers approvingly: "You are not far from the kingdom of God."[27]

Another text that merits attention is Mk 3:35: "He who does the will of my Father is my brother. . . ." On the surface, the text has nothing to do with sacrifice; yet the notion of covenant can serve as a middle term to join it to Christ's doctrine on sacrifice. In *OT* thought a bond of brotherhood was established between men by means of a *b'rît*. Actually, the text does not replace the idea of sacrifice with that of conformity to God's will; rather it points to the fact that this conformity is the essence of the sacrifice.

Granted that interior dispositions of soul are given the primacy, it is still true that for the Synoptics the Temple sacrifices had a genuine role in sanctifying men. The "trespass offering" made at the Presentation and at the healing of the leper must have had a real function and meaning; otherwise Jesus could not have sincerely participated in the one and enjoined the other. On neither of these occasions did the sacrifice change the interior dispositions of those making the offering; but the sacrifice did symbolize the interior disposition, and in this same act of offering it introduced (or reintroduced) the offerer into the realm

[27] This text makes one wonder to what extent sincere Jewish thought had progressed towards the idea of *agapē* prior to Christ. It also leads us to ask to what extent the statement of the young man reflects the attitude of some of Christ's contemporaries in giving fraternal love precedence over the Temple sacrifices. Another aspect of the young scribe's statement that merits attention is this: one of the *OT* passages that he is obviously citing is Dt 6:4, a passage that describes the alliance of Yahweh and Israel and that places love of God in the privileged place among the commands of this convenant; and one wonders how much of this same covenant connotation carries over into Mk 12:33, where Christ links this same commandment of love with the Kingdom.

of the consecrated, into alliance with God—the achievement of which consecration and covenant was itself symbolized by the participation, through the mediation of the priest, in the consecrated food.

This view of a sacrificial sanctification constituted by admission into the realm of the sacred—a view in which the only source of ontological sanctity involved seems to be God, and in which human sanctity seems to be a question of relationship to this divine holiness, is expressed several times in the Synoptic Gospels. For example, in Mt 23:19, Jesus upbraids the Pharisees for their perversion of the true meaning of God's law and their lack of comprehension of the Temple and its sacrifices, and He tells them, "It is the altar that sanctifies (*hagiazon*) the offering." In other words, the offering is not holy because of itself or because it fulfils the Law or even because it represents the good dispositions of the offerer, but it receives its holiness from a sharing in the divine holiness given to it by the altar that symbolizes God.[28]

An important element in the *OT* spiritualizing of the idea of Temple and sacrifice was the gradual realization of the role of the prayer that was always joined to sacrifice. There are rather clear indications that this prayer—above all, the internal dispositions of prayer—came to be looked upon as an integral part, perhaps even the most important part, of the sacrifice. This was probably due in considerable measure to the increased employment of the Psalms in the Temple ceremonial; but it was also grounded in the growing appreciation of the importance of individual morality and holiness.[29]

Such a view of the sacrificial prayers is reflected in Luke's account of the vision of Zachary, where attention is drawn to the people who were praying in the Temple court during the sacrifice. It also seems to be in the background of Christ's reference to the Temple as "a house of prayer" (Mt 21:13). But it is much more strikingly and significantly seen in Luke's use of *proseuchomai* when Christ is the subject. Mt and Mk quite frequently use the word of Christ; but what is notable about Lk is the introduction of *proseuchomai* in the account of the pivotal events of the Gospel: baptism, temptation, Transfiguration, the

[28] In view of this idea of the source of sacredness, it is interesting to reflect that the unclean spirits whom Christ exorcised called Christ *hagios*. Procksch, in *ThW* 1, 102, stresses the idea that Christ's holiness stemmed from His being the *Geistträger*, and that therefore there was the mortal opposition of the Spirit within Him to the unclean spirits.

[29] Cf. Eichrodt, *op. cit.* 3, 1–18.

Agony in Gethsemane—though in the account of the Last Supper it is replaced by *eucharisteō*. These are the same events that portray Christ as the Servant, in which the externals of the scene manifest Christ's acceptance of His Father's will; and it is *proseuchomai* that is used to indicate that inner disposition. In this way the whole development of Christ's ministry is placed in a sacrificial light; all is governed by His priestly prayer that reaches its climax in Gethsemane, where the word *proseuchomai* recurs like a refrain (Lk uses it five times in seven verses).

Thus, in the section of the Synoptic Gospels prior to the Passion narrative, there is a delicately balanced appraisal of the relative importance of the external and internal elements of the *OT* priesthood, Temple, and sacrifice; and this judgment is made in terms of the covenant function that these three were meant to serve. The Evangelists show that Jesus respected the validity of these institutions, which remained in force up to the establishment of the new dispensation in the Passion; but they also show how the replacement and revocation of these *OT* institutions began with Christ's public life, which is, as it were, an overlap period between the two covenants. Moreover, one finds the same notion of abrogation by way of fulfilment that is noticeable in Christ's realization of *OT* prophetism and kingship; but it seems that the idea of Christ as priest represents more of a break with the *OT* than does Christ as prophet or king.

THE LAST SUPPER

Any study of the Synoptic notion of covenant naturally centers around the text of the Last Supper, since it is for practical purposes the only direct use of *diathēkē* by the three Evangelists. Moreover, the institution of the Eucharist is unquestionably one of the key events in the Gospel narrative: it is the culmination of much of the teaching of the public life; it places the Passion in its true cultic setting; it, more than any other Gospel text, links the life of the early Christian community with the life of Christ. Thus, if this event is dominated by the idea of covenant—as we shall try to show—it indicates rather clearly the importance of covenant in the theology of the Synoptic Gospels. The following study will comprise three points: (*a*) the text itself, its origin, historicity, etc.; (*b*) the attendant circumstances of the Supper

that aid in interpreting the text; (*c*) the meaning of the Eucharistic text, and particularly of the word *diathēkē*.

The Text

Since it is practically impossible to discuss the Eucharistic texts of the three Synoptic Gospels without referring to the Pauline version in 1 Cor 11:23–25, all four texts will be utilized in our analysis.[30] Obviously, the four texts are not completely identical, and that leads to several questions. Which of them, if any, contains the actual words used by Christ? Which version is most original? To what extent did the liturgical practice of the primitive Church influence these Gospel texts?

There is no *NT* text that is so likely to have been influenced by the nascent Christian liturgy as that of the Last Supper, since it was precisely to Christ's action on the eve of His death that the origins of the Christian Eucharist were traced.[31] Then, too, the regular celebration of the Eucharist began immediately after Pentecost; and this would certainly have influenced the primitive catechesis of the Church and the Gospel narratives.[32] To say this is in no way to deny the historical authenticity of the Synoptic descriptions of the Last Supper: it is highly probable that the early liturgy would have respected the words used by Jesus Himself at the Supper and preferred them to any creation of the community itself; and this probability becomes a practical

[30] Because of its unequalled importance for the meaning of Christ and His mission on this earth, this text of the Last Supper has been the object of almost innumerable studies. Among the more recent (which in turn give bibliographical indications of earlier works) are: J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*; H. Schürmann, *op. cit.*; J. Betz, *op. cit.*; F. Leenhardt, *Le sacrement de la sainte Cène* (Neuchâtel, 1948); A. Higgins, *op. cit.*; R. Bultmann, *Theologie des NT* (3rd ed.; Tübingen, 1955). A. Arnold's *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls* is a bit older (Freiburg, 1937), but remains one of the best balanced studies of the Eucharistic text.

[31] It is worth noting the remark of Betz (*op. cit.*, p. 11) on the liturgy as the origin of the Eucharistic text. After showing that the text of 1 Cor 11 can be traced back historically to 40 A.D. or earlier, he concludes: ". . . für die These, die Einsetzungserzählung sei erst aus der Gemeinde herausgewachsen zur Begründung eines von ihr selbst geschaffen Kultbrauches, kein Raum mehr bleibt. Die schöpferische Religiosität der Gemeinde war nicht der Quellgrund, aus dem der Abendmahlsbericht entsprang; wohl aber war die Liturgie der Kirche der Ort, an dem dieser tradiert wurde."

[32] On primitive celebration of the Eucharist, cf. J. Brinktrine, *Die heilige Messe* (Paderborn, 1950) p. 15.

certainty when one reflects that the Eucharist was looked upon from the beginning as an *anamnēsis*, as the repetition or re-enactment of what Jesus Himself did in the Cenacle.[33]

Mt and Mk are quite evidently in the same textual tradition and bear more noticeable trace of liturgical influence: there is greater parallelism between the formulae for the bread and for the wine than is the case in Lk and Paul;[34] the two consecratory formulae are immediately joined, without the indication given by Lk/Paul that the two were separated at the Last Supper;[35] there is less trace of the original paschal setting in Mt and Mk than there is in Lk; and the absence of reference to the *anamnēsis* can itself indicate that the well-established practice of the Eucharist made this inclusion in the Cenacle narrative unimportant at the time when Mt and Mk were written.[36] On the other hand, if we take Lk 22:17–18 as referring to the Eucharistic chalice, the somewhat odd arrangement of Luke's text might be explained by his acquaintance with two accounts of the Cenacle: one contained in a primitive Passion narrative, the other enshrined in the Eucharistic liturgy.[37] So, without being able to determine the exact extent of liturgical influence on our texts, it is quite clear that there is some such influence; and this very fact is a precious indication of the meaning that the Synoptic writers attached to Christ's action in the Cenacle and of the connection that they saw between the Last Supper and the Christian celebration of the Eucharist.[38]

When we ask which text is the most original, we must be careful to circumscribe the question. There is, first of all, the special difficulty attached to the text of Lk: Is the "long" or the "short" version (i.e.,

[33] This is quite clear from 1 Cor 11:23 ff., which not only contains the *anamnēsis* command in the Eucharist text, but which also speaks of the Christian celebration of the Eucharist as the continuation of the historical action of Christ in the Cenacle.

[34] Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 107 ff. [35] Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 21–24. [36] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[37] Cf. P. Benoit, "Le récit de la Cène dans Lc. XXII, 15–20," *Revue biblique* 48 (1939) 357–93; he argues for literary dependence of Lk on Paul, but himself refers to "une tradition liturgique antérieure que Paul lui-même récite" (p. 361).

[38] One of the interesting features of the studies of A. Arnold and J. Betz is their attempt to exploit the doubly historical characters of the Eucharistic texts (i.e., they are historical documents of the Supper and of the Christian Eucharist) as a support for the *Mysterientheologie*. Dom Polycarp Wegenaer's monograph, *Heilsgegenwart* (Münster, 1958), is the most recent addition to this discussion, but it is devoted primarily to relating the views of Casel to the sacramental theology of St. Thomas Aquinas.

with or without vv. 19b–20) the authentic and original text? At present there seems to be a shift of scholarly opinion in favor of the long version, with the accompanying acknowledgment that the source of Lk may well be other than Pauline.[39] Secondly, if one asks which of the four versions can be pushed back the furthest historically, it would seem that this should be attributed to 1 Cor, because Paul had already preached to the Corinthians (probably around 50 A.D.) this Eucharistic doctrine that he had himself received earlier, very likely in his visit to Jerusalem (*ca.* 36–38; cf. Acts 9:26), when he would have come in contact with the primitive catechesis and liturgy.[40] Thirdly, as to which version most closely reflects the original Aramaic, the answer is most inconclusive: all four versions bear clear traces of the Aramaic substratum, though Mk and Lk seem to have a slight edge over Mt and Paul.[41] Fourthly, if one asks which version is least "liturgized" and presumably, therefore, a more exact mirror of the historical event itself, this would seem to be Lk.[42] Thus, though an apodictic answer is

[39] Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, who gives a list of the exegetes favoring the short form (p. 100) and those favoring the long version (p. 106). After listing and answering the objections against the long version, Jeremias chooses in favor of the long version, though in his first German edition (*Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, 1935) he had favored the short form. At the end of his own textual critique in the 1955 English edition, Jeremias concludes: "This result is a decisive argument in favour of the longer text of Luke's account of the Last Supper" (p. 99).

[40] It is altogether possible that Paul came in contact with the celebration of the Eucharist during his stay in Damascus; but the insistence in 1 Cor that his preaching forms part of the *paradosis* inclines one to seek the origins of Paul's doctrine on the Eucharist in the catechesis and practice of the Jerusalem community.—On the technical meaning of *paradosis* in St. Paul, cf. L. Cerfaux, "Die Tradition bei Paulus," *Catholica* 9 (1953) 94–104; J. Geiselmann, *Jesus der Christus* (Tübingen, 1939) pp. 66–78; L. Goppelt, "Tradition nach Paulus," *Kerygma und Dogma* 4 (1958) 213–33.

[41] Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 132, sees Mk as most Semitic: "Of the traditions which have come down to us, Mark's is the nearest to the primitive Aramaic account of the Last Supper. His wording is therefore earlier than the development and enlargement of the Aramaic original of the account of the Last Supper, which took place long before A.D. 49/50, the results of which are to be found in Paul." However, Jeremias' listing of the Semitisms in Mk has been questioned by other scholars, e.g., H. Schürmann, "Die Semitismen im Einsetzungsbericht bei Mk und Lk," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 73 (1951) 72–77; and Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–18, shows that Lk actually contains more Semitisms than does Mk.

[42] Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–24; he sees Paul as slightly less "liturgized" than Lk; but since Betz's own principle of judgment is that the more prominent the element of the Pasch that remains, the less is the influence of the liturgy, and since Lk seems to retain more of the atmosphere of the Pasch, it seems that Lk is at least as free from liturgical

impossible, it would seem that the version Lk/Paul furnishes us with an older form than does Mt/Mk; it is well-nigh impossible to choose between Lk and Paul.[43]

One conclusion emerges from any comparative study of the Eucharistic texts: it is impossible to reconstruct exactly and with certitude the words that Christ Himself used at the Supper; and while the elements common to all four versions enjoy the privileged position of most probably forming part of Christ's own words, there is no conclusive reason for rejecting as nonauthentic any of the elements mentioned in any of the Eucharistic texts.[44] For that reason, our explanation of the text will draw from the four texts in their entirety; it can be noted, however, that that which is essential to establishing the central role of the idea of covenant—namely, that Jesus spoke of His blood as the blood of a covenant—is from a textual point of view indubitable.

The Setting

In interpreting any of Christ's words it is important to consider the attendant circumstances; this is eminently true of His Eucharistic words, for the very reason that His action in the Supper was profoundly and intentionally sacramental. Though words provide the clearest and defining element in a sacramental action, it is the entire action, the "whole word," that forms the totality of the sacrament; therefore, each aspect of the action has its role in the sacramental influence of the action.[45] Five such aspects of the Supper will be briefly

---

influence as is Paul. On the other hand, Jeremias, proceeding from a somewhat different textual comparison, reconstructs what he believes is the earliest text of the words of institution; and this reconstructed text coincides exactly with the text of Mk (*op. cit.*, p. 115).

[43] For a listing of opinions for or against the priority of the Lk/Paul form, cf. J. Schürmann, *Der Einsetzungsbericht*, p. 95, note 324; he himself concludes: "Eine Summe von Gründen, wenn auch von verschiedener Gewichtigkeit, sprechen für die grössere Ursprünglichkeit der luk/paul Fassung."

[44] Some words, like Mk's *phagete*, are the type of word that would logically be introduced by liturgical practice as a means of clarifying and explicitating the Eucharistic action. However, all too many exegetico-liturgical studies seem to proceed on the principle that Christ Himself used nothing but the bare minimum of words, and that any explanatory words are a later clarification, and that, therefore, the most abbreviated and compressed form of the text is the most authentic.

[45] This has important implications for a study of the causality of the sacraments and of the nature of sacramental grace, because the sacraments cause precisely by their "meaning."

considered: it was a fraternal meal; it was a paschal meal; it was a Messianic action; it is related to the establishment of the Kingdom, and is therefore an eschatological action; it is a sacerdotal action. These five connect the present section to the preceding sections of this study, and each of the five points in its own way to the fact that the Last Supper was pre-eminently the establishment of a covenant.

That the Last Supper was a fraternal meal needs no proving. What is worth noting is the manner in which the Synoptic accounts draw attention to this brotherly aspect. All three Evangelists tell us expressly that it is with the intimate circle of the Twelve that Jesus spends this last evening; and Lk records the words of Jesus in which He tells His disciples how He has longed to share this last paschal dinner with them. But what highlights in poignant fashion the whole fraternal atmosphere of the Supper is the mention of Judas' betrayal. It is not simply that *someone* will betray Christ; what is tragic is that it is "one of you eating with me," that "the hand of him who will betray me rests with mine upon the table." Underlying the heinousness of Judas' treason as seen in the Synoptic accounts is the implicit connection of covenant with a common meal.

The identity of the Supper as a paschal meal is not quite so clear and has been the subject of almost endless dispute during the past hundred years.[46] Against the paschal character of the Supper it has been objected that the use of the word *artos* is incompatible with the fact that the bread used at a paschal meal must be unleavened, i.e., not *artos* but *azumos*.[47] But the LXX uses of *artos* in passages where there could be question only of unleavened bread destroys the validity of this objection.[48] Then, too, it is alleged that certain events that took place during the night and day after the Supper (in the Synoptic chronology of events) could not possibly have taken place on the paschal feast—such, for example, as the convocation of the Sanhedrin. However, each of these supposed impossibilities is capable of receiving a reasonable explanation, as J. Jeremias has showed.[49] What remains

[46] For an exhaustive bibliography on the subject, cf. J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 177–83.

[47] So, for example, J. Finegan, *Die Ueberlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu*, p. 62.

[48] Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 ff.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 42–53. On the positive side, Jeremias gives ten reasons to support his contention that the Supper was a paschal feast (pp. 14–37).

as the chief and almost insoluble difficulty is the disagreement in the chronology of the Synoptics and of John; numerous suggestions have been offered in answer to this problem, but none of them is completely satisfactory.[50]

On the other hand, the Synoptics speak with undeniable clarity of preparations for the Pasch; Jesus says that He has longed to "eat this Pasch with you"; and Luke's account situates the institution of the Eucharist in the framework of the paschal meal itself.[51] The fact that Mt and Mk do not refer to the paschal character of the Supper once they begin the account of the Eucharistic institution does not prove that they do not consider the Supper a paschal meal; rather, it indicates their consciousness that the Eucharist replaces the Pasch, which means that the Evangelists see an intrinsic link between the Eucharist and the Pasch.[52] Thus, it seems more likely that the Supper was a paschal meal; and this much is rather certain: even if the Supper was not itself the Pasch, it is considered by the Evangelists as having a paschal significance.[53] This is equivalent to saying that the Synoptics view the Eucharist as having a covenant significance, because the meaning of the Pasch was inseparably bound up with the events that led up to the Sinaitic covenant.[54]

[50] Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 54 ff. Strack-Billerbeck had attracted some adherents to their solution: that the Pasch could be celebrated according to either of two datings; but even these supporters (among them A. Arnold and F. Prat) admitted it as no more than a hypothesis. More recently, Mlle A. Jaubert has aroused considerable interest by her article, "La date de la dernière Cène," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 146 (1954) 140–73 (published in expanded monograph form under the title, *La date de la Cène* [Paris, 1957]). She defends the two datings for the Pasch and builds a rather convincing case for her contention that the Last Supper was actually celebrated on Tuesday.

[51] Cf. Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 112: "Die Einsetzung der Eucharistie erfolgte nicht am Ende des Passaritus, sondern war organisch in diesen eingebaut: Jesus benutzte das Tischsegensgebet über den ungesäuerten Brot und das Tischdankgebet beim 3. Passabecher nach den Passamahl zur Einsetzung des eucharistischen Brotes und Kelches."

[52] Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 23–24.

[53] Cf. Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 112: "... nicht nur dem äusseren Ritus nach sind Passamahl und Abendmahl eng miteinander verwoben, auch dem inneren Sinn nach ist der Zusammenhang der denkbar engste: das Abendmahl ist nicht anders als das Passamahl des Neuen Bundes." So also J. Brinktrine, *Der Messopferbegriff* (Freiburg, 1918) p. 31: "... nicht nur zeitlich war die Stiftung Jesu mit dem Passamahl verknüpft, sondern noch mehr symbolisch; denn aus den Berichten der Synoptiker folgt, dass Jesus seine Stiftung mit Absicht gerade mit dem Passah verband."

[54] It is true that the paschal celebration concentrated explicitly on the salvation from

The Supper was a Messianic action, indeed it was a step in the supreme Messianic action of Christ. A note of impending Messianic fulfilment is set by Christ's words to the apostles sent to prepare the Pasch: *ho kairos mou eggus estin* (Mt 26:18); and by Lk's words of introduction: *hote egeneto hē hōra* (22:14).[55] In the description of the Supper itself, there are references to practically all the important elements of *OT* Messianic thought: speaking of Judas' treason, Jesus refers to Himself by His favorite Messianic title, Son of Man, whereby one is reminded that it is the Son of Man who is gathered together with His disciples to share a last meal, and this introduces into the Eucharistic scene all the covenant and Messianic implications that are connected with this title.[56] Moreover, Jesus says that He "must go as it is written," which recalls Christ's basically prophetic mission of fulfilling the *OT*. Again, the mere fact that Christ in the Supper concludes a new testament by the blood of sacrifice, as we shall presently see, points to Him as the new Moses foretold by Deutero-Isaiah.[57] Lk 22:27 unmistakably introduces the Servant of Yahweh theme, but it does much more: the key Synoptic text in which Jesus identifies Himself as the Servant is Mt 20:28 (Mk 10:45), which seems to be situated by Mt and Mk in its natural position as a sequel to the petition of the sons of Zebedee. Lk's version of this same key text, however, is introduced into the account of the Supper, and it is slightly changed so that *the* action of service is Christ's Eucharistic feeding of the apostles. This, of course, sets up a certain identification between Christ's institution of the Eucharist and His death; it points to both events as expiatory sacrifice (cf. Is 53:10) and gives a basis for linking

---

Egypt and from the hand of the avenging angel; but it is scarcely true (as, for example, H. Huber maintains on p. 47 of his *Das Herrenmahl im N.T.* [Leipzig, 1929]) that the paschal feast had no covenant significance. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 146 ff., in speaking of the covenant implications of the Pasch, mentions that the blood of the paschal lamb was considered to be covenant blood. Cf. also Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

[55] Some support for interpreting *hē hōra* in a somewhat technical sense can be drawn from the use of the same term in Mk 14:35 (where it is equivalent to "the suffering and death") and in Lk 22:53 (where there is question of the temporary and apparent domination of the power of evil).

[56] On the use of "Son of man" in the Synoptic Gospels, cf. F. Tillmann, *Der Menschensohn* (Freiburg, 1907); V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (London, 1953) pp. 25–35; T. W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (London, 1948) pp. 113–20.

[57] Cf. A. Feuillet, "Isaïe," *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément* 4, 713–14.

the *eis aphesin hamartiōn* of Mt 26:28 to Is 53:11–12. These various Messianic aspects of the Supper not only involve a certain covenant connotation, but point to the Supper as intimately connected with the establishment of the new covenant foretold by the *OT* prophets.[58]

The Supper is closely related to the establishment of the Kingdom. The first indication of this comes in Jesus' instructions to the two disciples sent to prepare the Supper, and specifically in His prediction that they would meet a man carrying a water pitcher. This passage is a parallel to Mt 21:1, where the two disciples are sent to prepare for Christ's entry into Jerusalem, and both passages seem to recall 1 S 10, where, as a sign of his election as king, Saul is told that he will meet men on their way to offer sacrifice of bread and wine. In itself, since it is a solemn and festive meal where Christ presides over and yet serves His disciples, the Supper is most reminiscent of the parables of Jesus that speak of the Kingdom as a meal. These parables seem to treat of the Kingdom in its eschatological stage, of a banquet held in heaven; and it is apparently of such a heavenly meal that Mt 26:29 (Mk 14:25) speaks: "I will not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the Kingdom of my Father." This would situate the Supper as a last act of Christ prior to the eschatological achievement, that it is the first step in the actual establishment of the Kingdom.[59] His use of *hē hōra* in the introductory phrase may already be an indication of this. However, it is the double prediction, "I will not eat . . . I will not drink . . . until the Kingdom of God," that is the key.

First, several clear facts: (*a*) Lk places the phrase, "I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine . . .," before the Eucharistic formula instead of afterwards as in Mt and Mk; (*b*) Lk has the two statements, "I will not eat . . ." and "I will not drink . . .," that are parallel to

[58] Then, too, the fact that the action of Christ is one of feeding those who had been committed to His charge relates us to the *OT* passages (e.g., Ez 34) that speak of a divine Messianism, of an era when God Himself will come to feed His own. It is true that the Last Supper texts do not of themselves draw attention to this aspect of God feeding men; but the two earlier Gospel scenes of Christ feeding the multitudes in the desert are clearly in such a Messianic context, and there are a number of textual parallels linking these two scenes to the Last Supper account. Again, the very fact that the wine played such a central role in this meal is not without Messianic connotations, and this connotation is considerably strengthened by Christ's speaking of drinking a new wine.

[59] Cf. Benoit, "Le récit," pp. 387 ff.

one another, and that are then set parallel to the two Eucharistic formulae; (*c*) the Pasch is to be fulfilled in the Kingdom,[60] and in view of Christ's parables on the Kingdom as a feast it seems quite possible to take v. 16 to mean that it is the Kingdom that is the fulfilment of the Pasch; (*d*) immediately after the institution of the Eucharist, Jesus tells His apostles that He gives (present tense) to them a kingdom as His Father had given to Him, and in this kingdom they will eat and drink at His table.

Secondly, some observations on these facts: (*a*) The fact that the double "I will not eat (drink) . . . until" is followed immediately by the Eucharistic paschal meal (*meta to deipnēsai*) suggests that the condition expressed by the *heōs* clause is realized, i.e., that the Kingdom has arrived. (*b*) It seems quite possible that the double parallel structure of Luke's account indicates that it is the bread become His body that is the fulfilment of the Pasch and that the consecrated chalice signifies the arrival of the Kingdom. (*c*) The identification in vv. 29–30 of "possessing the Kingdom" and "eating and drinking at my table" makes it practically certain that one can take v. 16 to mean that the Kingdom is the fulfilment of the Pasch; but, coming immediately after the institution of the Eucharist, and in view of the command of *anamnēsis* that Lk alone records, the "eating and drinking at my table" of v. 30 can scarcely be without Eucharistic meaning; therefore, the conclusion would seem to be that the Eucharist (both at the Supper and later) is the fulfilment of the Pasch and the advent of the Kingdom. This conclusion in no way denies the eschatological aspect of vv. 16–18 and 29–30; it only indicates that the eschatological era begins with the Supper, that the Supper is already a meal "in the Kingdom of God."

[60] This fulfilment takes place in (at least) two ways: (1) The original Pasch was a salvation from slavery and death; and the annual commemoration was a reminder of this historical salvation and, as the Messianic expectations of Israel gradually developed, a looking forward to some future definitive salvation. The Supper, which together with Calvary effects this definitive salvation, realizes this salvation aspect of the Pasch. (2) The Pasch as a religious feast was a perpetual covenant communion between Yahweh and the people whom He had led out of Egypt. This covenant communion aspect is eminently fulfilled by the Eucharist, if one takes the *anamnēsis* command in its literal and obvious sense.

The Supper is a sacerdotal action. This, of course, becomes quite clear in the light of the sacrificial character of Christ's Eucharistic action. Leaving aside, for a moment, that question, we can see one or two other indications of the fact that the Evangelists saw the Supper as sacerdotal. One thing is the use of *eucharistēsas*, which was most probably a well-established liturgical term by the time the Gospels were written. Another is the fact that Christ at the Supper evidently filled the position of head of the family at a paschal meal, and the role of the father at the Pasch had a priestly aspect.[61] Thus, it seems that the Synoptic writers saw Jesus at the moment of the Last Supper as the royal, priestly, and divine Messiah who shares with the heads of a new chosen people a meal that is at once the fulfilment of the Pasch and the beginnning of the Kingdom. These indications drawn from the textual elements immediately attached to the Eucharistic formulae are clarified and confirmed by the words of institution of the Eucharist.

The Meaning of the Eucharistic Text

In order to evaluate the extent to which the idea of covenant dominates the Eucharistic text, it is necessary to examine the four basic notions in the text: body, blood, the salvific idea attached to the words "given" and "poured out," and covenant itself. And the agreement of exegetes on the Aramaic substructure of the Supper narrative allows one to proceed immediately to the study of the *OT* Hebrew mentality on these four notions, and to appeal to it rather than to secular Greek usage in interpreting *sōma*, *haima*, and *diathēkē*.[62]

There is no generic Hebrew notion to correspond to *sōma*, which in the LXX translates eleven different Hebrew words; but the most frequent and most important *OT* concept connected with *sōma* is that of *bāśār*.[63] It is indicative of the meaning of *bāśār* that the LXX translates it by *sarx* much more often than it does by *sōma*; for *bāśār* does not signify a principle or element of a living being, but rather the entire being in its concrete individuality, with emphasis on its

[61] Cf. Yerkes, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[62] On the Aramaic words used by Christ, cf. J. Bonsirven, "Hoc est corpus meum," *Biblica* 29 (1948) 205–19; Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 ff.

[63] Cf. E. Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* (Tübingen, 1933) pp. 5 ff.; J. Robinson, *The Body* (London, 1951) pp. 11–17; Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 42 ff.

external manifestation.[64] One must be careful not to apply to Hebrew thought the Hellenistic dichotomy body–soul; for, in Pedersen's oft-quoted words, "Soul and body are so intimately united that a distinction cannot be made between them. They are more than 'united': the body is the soul in its outward form."[65] If one can speak at all of "a composite of elements" in the Hebrew view of man, it would be that between "the force of life" (*nepeš*) and "that which is living" (*bāśār*); for *bāśār* stresses the dynamic, creative power of life as manifested in the flesh.[66] At the same time, *bāśār* implies the creatureliness of man, for God is not *bāśār*; and the living force in man depends upon contact with God's creative word, a contact that is maintained by obedience to that word—hence the inevitable relation of death to sin.[67]

Thus, at the Supper, Christ's use of the word "body" signifies His entire self. He gives His disciples the concrete totality that is Himself, therefore all the divine power of life of which His body is the external manifestation. In this sense His body is the sacrament of that divine *dunamis* that is essentially opposed to sin and death and that is, therefore, essentially salvific; His body can truly be called the *doxa theou*.[68]

Important for a study of covenant is the connection of *bāśār* with the idea of relationship. Members of a family are thought of as having, in a sense, the same "flesh" (Gn 29:14); so, too, all Israelites share the same "flesh" (Is 58:7). This common flesh provides biologically what a covenant agreement does in a legal fashion: a brotherhood; and, as Quell points out,[69] a covenant finds its fullest expression when it builds upon this already existent natural covenant. It is not surprising, then, that the prophets used marriage as the symbol for the covenant with Yahweh, since husband and wife "become one flesh"

[64] Cf. Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 5–6. Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 44, stresses the fact that *bāśār* points to "die ganze Person in ihrer leiblichen Existenz" and to "die metaphysische und religiöse Situation des konkreten Menschen."

[65] J. Pedersen, *Israel* 1–2 (Copenhagen, 1954) p. 171.

[66] Cf. Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 12–13.

[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 10–15.

[68] This agrees perfectly with Christ's own comparison of His body to the Temple (Mt 26:61).

[69] G. Quell, *ThW* 2, 115–16.

(Gn 2:24). So, at the Supper, when Jesus gave His body to eat, He was performing what was essentially a covenant action. Actually, it involved three things intimately connected with the establishing of a covenant: a sharing of food, the giving of a gift, and the creating of a family tie.

More explicitly and intimately linked with covenant (both in the *OT* and the Eucharistic text) is the idea of *haima* (*dām*).[70] In Hebrew thought there is a very close relationship, almost an identity, between the blood and life; the life is in the blood; the blood carries that force that makes an animal live.[71] Thus, the blood is for practical purposes identical with the soul, the *nepeš*, in so far as this latter is contrasted to *bāśār*; "the blood is the soul" (Dt 12:23). It is easy, then, to see how blood was quite logically associated with a covenant: any group like a family or a people that had a common spirit, a common intention, was thought of as having a common soul and, in some way, a common blood;[72] hence, the constituting of a brotherhood through a covenant was not only symbolized, but actually effected, through some rite of sharing blood.[73] This ritual sharing of blood was closely related to the Sinaitic covenant, as is clear from Ex 24, where Moses, in concluding the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, poured half of the blood of the sacrificial victim upon the altar and sprinkled the other half upon the people. This covenant significance of pouring the blood upon the altar seems to have persisted to some extent in all the Jewish community sacrifices, even in the sacrifices of expiation that came into prominence after the Exile.[74] In these latter there was the notion of retribution but there was also the notion of reaffirming and strengthening the covenant link with God.[75]

Jesus' use of the word "blood" at the Supper must be taken in a concrete sense as referring to Himself in His totality as a living being,

[70] Cf. J. Behm, "*haima*," *ThW* 1, 171–75; Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 ff.; L. Dewar, "The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood,' " *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1953) 204–8.

[71] Cf. Pedersen, *op. cit.*, p. 172; Eichrodt, *op. cit.* 2, pp. 68–69.

[72] Cf. Pedersen, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

[73] On covenant significance and usage of blood, cf. Médébielle, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–30.

[74] Cf. Schötz, *op. cit.*, pp. 77–80.

[75] Cf. Schötz, *ibid.*, p. 124: "Einen Gottesbund, der einst in Opferblut besiegelt worden ist, immer wieder zu erneuern und zu stärken—das ist im letzten Grunde Sühne—dazu erscheint das Blut in vielgestaltiger ritueller Verwendung als treffliches Symbol."

but with the emphasis on the living force "within" Him.[76] At the same time, His act of sharing this blood means that He is sharing His soul, His spirit, that He is establishing a brotherhood based upon community of intention.[77] This essentially covenant action of the Supper is the realization, the effecting, of what Jesus had said earlier: "Whoever does the will of my Father, he is my brother. . . ."

The nature of that intention of will, of that common spirit, that Jesus transmits to His apostles along with His life, His blood, becomes clearer if one examines the words *didomenon* and *ekchunnomenon*: His will is sacrificial, just as the Eucharistic action of the Supper (which is animated by that will) is sacrificial. Despite the repeated attempts to discount the sacrificial character of the Supper,[78] it seems hard to deny that *didomenon* and *ekchunnomenon* represent two notions intimately bound up with the ideas of covenant and sacrifice.[79] Covenants were accompanied by an exchange of gifts, which continued even after the contracting of the covenant;[80] and this same notion is connected with the Hebrew idea of sacrifice, where man is

[76] Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 46: "Das Blut ist Lebensträger und Repräsentant der ganzen Person. Es wiederholt demnach die Bedeutung von baśar. Darüber hinaus spielt es eine Rolle im Opferwesen, wird es doch als Sühnemittel auf dem Altar verwendet. Darum ist das 'Blut' ein geeignetes Mittel, die Lebenshingabe Christi am Kreuz zu symbolisieren." It is also worth noting, as L. Dewar points out (*op. cit.*, p. 206), that in *OT* thought (particularly that attributed to P) "Power and virtue were believed to reside in the blood of the sacrificial victim. . . ."

[77] It is interesting to consider the link between this gift of His spirit that Jesus makes in giving His blood and the gift of the Holy Spirit that plays such a prominent role in John's account of the Last Supper. This opens up the whole subject of the Holy Spirit's relation to the new covenant.

[78] So, e.g., J. Behm, *ThW* 1, 174, who says that use of sacrificial terms regarding Christ's blood does not mean "dass kultische Opfergedanken mit dem Blute Christi verbunden sind. . . . so ist die urchristliche Vorstellung vom Blute Christi als Opferblut nur bildische Einkleidung für den Gedanken der Selbsthingabe, des vollendeten Gehorsam gegen Gott, den Christus im Kreuzestode bewies." On the contrary, Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 144, defends the sacrificial meaning of Christ's words: "Therefore when Jesus speaks of 'His flesh' and 'His blood,' He is applying to Himself terms from the language of sacrifice."

[79] It is also possible, as some have suggested, that the breaking of the bread and the separate species have a sacrificial and covenant significance; but it is somewhat difficult to establish this, since the very nature of a meal makes both features practically unavoidable.

[80] This continued giving of gifts was a pledge of that peace which resulted from the covenant agreement. Cf. Pedersen, *op. cit.*, pp. 296 ff.

thought of as offering a gift to God as pledge of his good will.[81] This view of the Temple sacrifices is clearly reflected in Synoptic passages like Mt 5:23–24; 8:4; 23:18, where the word used for the sacrificial offering is *dōron*; and the *didomenon* of Lk 22:19 can, without any straining of the text, be taken to mean that Jesus is offering Himself as a sacrificial gift, especially since the *huper humōn* points to Christ as a vicarious victim. The use of *ekchunnomenon*, common to the three Synoptics, is even clearer in its sacrificial and covenant connotations. It immediately recalls the special blood rites attached to some of the Jewish sacrifices, particularly the sin offerings;[82] and this impression is strengthened, not only by the *peri* (*huper*) *pollōn*, but also by Mt's *eis aphesin hamartiōn*. It is also reminiscent of Moses' action of sprinkling the sacrificial blood upon the people; though it would be pushing the point a bit to see in the *huper* of Mk and Lk the meaning "upon" as well as that of "for the sake of."

A significant point about *didomenon* and *ekchunnomenon* is that they indicate the divine and human aspects of Christ's covenant action in the Supper. In so far as He is giving Himself to His apostles, He is acting as the divine initiator of the new covenant with men; in so far as He gives Himself as vicarious victim for the redemption of man, He is acting above all as a priestly mediator, and this giving of Himself for His brethren is at the same time a sacrificial gift to His Father, a perfect compliance with the Father's will to redeem mankind.

The conclusive argument, however, for the sacrificial character of the Supper is the fact that it is the establishment of a covenant and that the blood of which Christ speaks is the blood of the covenant.[83]

Upon the interpretation of *diathēkē* in the Supper account depends one's understanding of Christianity; for the idea that one has of the redemption, of grace, of the Church, of a sacramental system, will necessarily be conditioned by the meaning one attaches to Christ's

[81] Cf. Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, pp. 66 ff.

[82] Cf. Schötz, *op. cit.*, pp. 77–80. Concerning the covenant implication of these blood ceremonies, Schötz says: "... die Zeremonie des Blutausgiessens auf den Altar immer wieder den Gedanken der Bundesschliessung erneuerte und den Gläubigen in eben diesem Gedanken der Bundesvereinigung vor Jahwe fröhlich sein liess" (p. 80).

[83] Cf. Brinktrine, *Der Messopferbegriff*, pp. 21–25; e.g., p. 24: "Bundesblut und Opferblut nach alttestamentlicher Auffassung identische Begriffe sind."

new covenant. For that reason, there has been no lack of controversy regarding the Synoptic (and Pauline) use of *diathēkē*.[84] Towards the end of the last century and the beginning of the twentieth century, a good number of German Protestant theologians (Baur, Brandt, Bousset, Eickhorn, etc.) refused to consider *diathēkē* as an original element in the Supper and attributed to Pauline influence its introduction into the text.[85] This position, based chiefly upon dogmatic reasons, was continued by the works of K. Goetz, which ostensibly appealed to textual argumentation in refusing to consider *diathēkē* as pre-Pauline.[86] The past thirty years, however, have seen an increasingly widespread acceptance of the claim of *diathēkē* as a primitive element in the Supper account.[87]

The contention that St. Paul is the source of the *diathēkē* idea in the Supper is scarcely tenable in the light of the Apostle's insistence that his teaching on the Eucharist forms part of the *paradosis*.[88] As for Goetz's objection that Christ nowhere else in the Gospels uses *diathēkē*,[89] the mentality of covenant is to be found throughout the Synoptic Gospels, even though the word *diathēkē* occurs only in the

[84] On *NT* use of *diathēkē*, besides more general works on the Eucharist which include a discussion of *diathēkē* (cf. supra n. 30), cf. J. Behm, "*diatheke*," *ThW* 2, 132–37 (his bibliography stresses the works published around 1920 by Lohmeyer, Deissmann, Goetz, and Behm himself). There seems to be only one Catholic monograph on *diathēkē*, the series of articles published by L. da Fonseca under the title, "Diathēkē—Foedus an Testamentum?", *Biblica* 8 (1927) 31–50, 161–81, 290–319, 418–41, and 9 (1928) 26–40, 143–60.

[85] For review of these early positions, cf. H. Huber, *op. cit.*, pp. 5–23; also K. Goetz, *Das Abendmahl, eine Diatheke* . . . (Leipzig, 1920) pp. 52–53.

[86] See especially his *Die Abendmahlfrage in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Leipzig, 1919) and *Das Abendmahl, eine Diatheke Jesu oder sein letztes Gleichnis* (Leipzig, 1920).

[87] That is not to say that present-day exegetes are agreed that Christ Himself actually used the word. Jeremias, for example, has no hesitation in including *diathēkē* in the original primitive text that he reconstructs, but he is doubtful about attributing the use of *diathēkē* to Christ; cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 134–35.

[88] Because of the already existent technical meaning for *paradosis* that is reflected in texts like Lk 1:2; Mt 15:2; and even in 1 Cor 11:2, it seems quite reasonable to take Paul's words in 1 Cor 11:23, "that which I received from the Lord," as meaning that Paul had received this tradition from the apostles, but that Jesus Himself was the source of the tradition. So L. Cerfaux in *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York, 1959) pp. 257–58. For a contrary explanation, cf. F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul* 1 (New York, 1926) 124–25. In his *La tradition* (Neuchâtel, 1953) pp. 12 ff., O. Cullmann has an interesting discussion on the interpretation of the *paradosis* in 1 Cor 11:25; his appeal to the idea of Christ as Kyrios opens up a promising perspective.

[89] *Die Abendmahlfrage*, p. 140.

text of the Supper. Moreover, in the text of the Supper, the word *diathēkē* is entirely in accord with the rest of the text and context, so much so, that the text would clearly describe the making of a new covenant, even if the word *diathēkē* were omitted. Finally, the fact that the word *diathēkē* was preserved, despite the grammatico-liturgical evolution of the Eucharistic text to which Mt and Mk testify, points to its being a primitive element in the Eucharistic formula.[90]

Even more disputed than the authenticity and origin of *diathēkē* has been its meaning. Perhaps influenced by the centuries-old translation of *diathēkē* by *testamentum*, and by the fact that the LXX employed *diathēkē* rather than *sunthēkē* to translate *b'rît*, a number of scholars insisted upon "testament" as the one and only meaning of *diathēkē* in the text of the Supper.[91] More recent studies, however, have showed the profundity and flexibility of the *OT* idea of *b'rît*, and made it impossible to take *b'rît* in a rigidly limited and exclusive meaning of "reciprocal contract."[92] At the same time, philological studies on *diathēkē* made it clear that it was not only capable of carrying the *OT* meaning of *b'rît*, but that it was the ideal word to signify a covenant in which the initiative was taken by the more powerful party;[93] hence, the justification for retaining in LXX usage of *diathēkē* all the implications of the Hebrew *b'rît*. As a result, the meaning

[90] Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

[91] So A. Deissmann in his *Licht von Osten* (Tübingen, 1923) pp. 271, 286–87; R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (London, 1938) pp. 291–95; H. Huber, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

[92] Particularly Eichrodt's *Theologie des A.T.* (this classic work on *OT* biblical theology, first published 1933–39, is presently appearing in a reworked fifth edition), the book of Procksch which has the same title and appeared in 1950 (Gütersloh), and the two works of A. Neher, *Amos* (Paris, 1950) and *L'Essence du prophétisme* (Paris, 1955).

[93] Cf. Moulton–Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London, 1929) p. 148: "Any thought of some special 'Hebraic' flavour about the use of *diathēkē* for *covenant* is excluded by the isolated but absolutely clear passage in Aristophanes (*Birds* 439), where *compact* is the unmistakeable meaning. This passage is enough to prove that *diathēkē* is properly *dispositio*, an 'arrangement' made by one party with plenary power, which the other party may accept or reject, but cannot alter. A will is simply the most conspicuous example of such an instrument, which ultimately monopolized the word just because it suited its differentia so completely. But it is entirely natural to assume that in the period of the LXX this monopoly was not established, and the translators were free to apply the general meaning as a rendering of *b'rît*. For this course there was an obvious motive. A covenant offered by God to man was no 'compact' between two parties coming together on equal terms. *Diathēkē* in its primary sense, as described above, was exactly the needed word."

"covenant" for *diathēkē* in the text of the Last Supper has won fairly common acceptance.[94]

This rather wide agreement on translating *diathēkē* by "covenant" does not imply agreement as to what is meant by this "covenant." There is, among most non-Catholic exegetes, an aversion to considering the Eucharist symbolism in its ontological fulness as actually embracing the reality that is sacramentally signified, and a tendency to consider the Supper as a metaphor rather than as a symbol and to avoid the literal meaning of the Eucharistic formulae.[95] Goetz presented this position bluntly when he asked the question: "The Supper, a *diathēkē* or Christ's last parable?", and chose the second alternative.[96] Not many have followed him in this clear-cut option (which led him logically to deny the originality of *diathēkē*), but the tendency to deny or de-emphasize the institutional aspect of the Last Supper covenant and to concentrate on the spiritual (i.e., representational, exemplary) force it contains is still noticeable in recent works like those of Leenhardt and Jeremias.[97]

Diathēkē as used by Christ in the Last Supper signifies both a pact and the permanent relationship constituted by that pact. It is a pact, because it is the meeting and agreement of two wills: Christ, as God, makes the covenant with mankind through the mediation of His own human nature; Christ, as man and as the priest who is vicar for mankind, makes the covenant with His Father. In a sense, the covenant as pact is reducible to the congruence of the divine and human wills

[94] Among those in favor of the meaning "covenant" are E. Gaugler, "La Sainte-Cène" (pp. 53–89 in *La Sainte-Cène* of Deluz, Ramseyer, and Gaugler [Neuchâtel, 1945]) pp. 74–79; Brinktrine, *Der Messopferbegriff*, pp. 21–25; Arnold, *op. cit.*, pp. 181–83; Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 134–35; F. Leenhardt, *Le sacrement de la sainte Cène*, p. 47; J. Behm in *ThW* 2, 136; L. da Fonseca, *art. cit.* in *Biblica* 9 (1928) 158; V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London, 1948) pp. 136–39.

[95] Without entering into a complicated analysis of image, symbol, metaphor, etc., we can simply note that in a symbol there is an ontologically existent relationship between sign and signified, whereas in a metaphor such a relationship exists only in a somewhat arbitrary cognition of similarity.

[96] In *Das Abendmahl, eine Diatheke Jesu*, p. 86, he says: "Vielmehr zwingt gerade die aufmerksame Beobachtung aller Umstände zu der Einsicht, dass Jesus selber im Abendmahl weder Sakraments- noch Opfergedanken gehabt haben kann, sondern nur den Gedanken an eine Gleichnishandlung und -worte."

[97] Cf. Leenhardt's *Ceci est mon corps*, which defends a representative interpretation of the words of Eucharistic institution, and Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 139–59.

in Christ. Taken as a pact, the Supper covenant implies not only *a* law but the most basic law, the divine will. The Sinaitic covenant provided an expression of the divine will as a guide for human life;[98] in the Supper, the expression of the divine will which is to guide men is Christ Himself *as offered* to His Father; and Christ formalizes this "law" when He gives the command: "Do this in memory of me." Henceforth, the fulfilment of the divine will can be achieved only through imitation of *and* union with Christ's own sacrificial offering. Lk 22:24–27, interpreting Christ's offering as the sacrifice of the Servant of Yahweh on behalf of His brethren, explicitly introduces the element of fraternal love into the law of the new covenant: that divine will whose acceptance constitutes the heart of Christ's sacrificial offering is the will that all men be saved; thus the covenant of the Last Supper has at once a cultic and a missionary orientation.

Christ's action of instituting the new covenant seems to be rather clearly related by the Synoptic accounts to the action of Moses in concluding the covenant of Sinai; and it is more than likely that Christ Himself wished to indicate this link.[99] To a group of Jews gathered together for the paschal dinner that commemorated the Exodus, the words "blood of the covenant" could not but recall the blood that Moses poured upon the altar and sprinkled over the people to signify and effect the divine-human brotherhood of the covenant.[100] This is the crowning aspect of the comparison of Jesus to Moses, which runs throughout the Synoptic Gospels; and it points, at the same time, to the profound continuity between the actions of Sinai and the Cenacle and to the transcendent superiority of the latter.

[98] Cf. Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 26: ". . . die ganze Folgezeit [i.e., after Moses] lebt von dem Bewusstsein, dass ihre Rechtsordnung auf der Willensoffenbarung des Bundesgottes beruhe."

[99] Cf. Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 182; Brinktrine, *Der Messopferbegriff*, p. 25.

[100] There is another, less evident, parallel with the events of Sinai: the apostles, who will be the "elders" of the new covenant people, are gathered to eat a covenant meal with God, just as the elders of Israel (according to the J tradition) were called up onto the mountain to eat with God when the Sinaitic covenant was concluded (Ex 24:9–11).—It has been objected that the common meaning of the term "covenant blood" was "the blood of circumcision." However, Jeremias (*op. cit.*, p. 147, n. 1) shows that "The blood of the Passover and the blood of circumcision are both 'the blood of the covenant' for the sake of which the deliverance out of Egypt." Cf. also W. Moulton, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible* 3, 689.

The Eucharistic action of Christ continues and fulfils, however, much more than the individual action of Moses on Sinai; it continues the whole *OT* history that was dominated by this Sinaitic covenant. This is clear from the fact that the Supper is the fulfilment of the Pasch. The annual feast of the Pasch was itself a continuation, a commemoration that was also a renewal, of the pact of Sinai;[101] in a sense it subsumed all time under the dominant event of the covenant. In replacing the Pasch, the covenant action of the Supper takes over this role of orientating history in function of a controlling attitude of will. Hence, the importance of the *anamnēsis* command of the Supper: the covenant action of the Cenacle, like that of Sinai, is to be extended in time so that each succeeding generation may have a contact point with this central finality of human history, may be guided by this concrete theology of history. While the Eucharist is in this way the continuation of the *OT* cult in its most basic outlook, it is radically superior: it is a covenant meal in the fullest sense, for God is actually present with men and actually sharing His divine life with them; it is not only commemorative, for it is the continued presence of Christ, who is the concrete embodiment and realization of that relation between God and men which is the covenant, and it is the continued enactment of that action by which Christ constitutes the new covenant.

In the Lucan (and Pauline) text, the unique and definitive nature of the Supper is indicated by the word *kainē*. The absence of this word in Mt and Mk need not argue against its claim to be part of the original words of the Supper, because the newness of the Supper (i.e., its replacement of the old dispensation) is indicated in these two Gospels by the way in which the paschal aspect of the Supper almost completely disappears with the mention of the institution of the Eucharist.[102] As the text stands, the absence of *kainē* in Mt and Mk tends to emphasize the continuity of the two covenants, the use of it in Lk and Paul points rather to a break with the Mosaic covenant. However, the *kainē* of Luke's version is ambivalent and implies that this new covenant is, in a sense, not new at all: for *kainē* is a link with the whole *OT* doctrine regarding a new and definitive covenant.[103]

[101] Cf. Moulton, *ibid.*, p. 687. [102] Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[103] On the *OT* idea of a new covenant, cf. M. Hoepers, *Der neue Bund bei den Propheten*

There seems no convincing reason why the *kainē diathēkē* of Lk 22:20 is not a reference to Jer 31:31;[104] but even if it was not intended formally as such by either Jesus or the Evangelist, it is still true that the action of the Supper fulfils the *OT* notion of the new covenant that is so well summed up in the classic text of Jeremiah. It is an act of salvation that consists essentially in remission of sin (*eis aphesin hamartiōn*; cf. Jer 31:34); it is a royal and Israelitic covenant (Jer 31:31), but it is not the previous covenant (31:32), for it is made with a new dynasty and a new people (Lk 22:29–30). In identifying Himself as the Son of Man and the Servant of Yahweh, as the Davidic Messiah and a new Moses, Jesus made it clear that His work marked the inauguration of the eschatological era foreseen somewhat vaguely by the prophets, that it was the definitive intervention of divine power in human history for which the entire religious development of the old dispensation was a preparation. Thus, the Eucharist terminates and gives full realization to the *OT* evolution of religious thought; it preserves, explains, and transmits that *OT* heritage at the same time that it transcends it.

Two steps still remain in a study of *diathēkē*. First of all, the *diathēkē*

(Freiburg, 1933); W. Gronkowski, *La messianisme d'Ezéchiel* (Paris, 1930) pp. 178–79; Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, pp. 255–78.

[104] E. Gaugler, *La Sainte-Cène*, p. 57, argues against the parallel with Jer 31: "Du fait que cette alliance est fondée, tout comme celle du Sinaï, sur le sang, nous ne pouvons de façon aussi certain qu'on l'admet ordinairement penser à la promesse de l' 'alliance nouvelle' chez Jérémie 31; 31 sq. A supposer même que Luc et Paul, en enrichissant la tradition de la sorte, aient eu la parole du prophète présente à l'esprit, il serait contestable que *Jésus* ait compris la nouvelle institution de cette manière. Car Jérémie évite précisément de faire reposer la fondation de cette alliance sur le sacrifice sanglant. En outre cette promesse n'est pas messianique, c'est Dieu lui-même qui accomplit le renouvellement du peuple, rénovation intérieure des coeurs."—It is true that Jeremiah is the prophet who, probably in the most extreme form, reacts against a false reliance on the externals of a sacrificial ceremonial (which does not mean that he is opposed to the true practice of sacrifice) and so naturally stresses the interior change of heart that will mark the new covenant; and it is also true that Jer 31:31 is an example of what we might call "divine Messianism" (i.e., the idea that God Himself will act as savior of Israel at some great future occasion). But, it is the characteristic of Christ's fulfilment of *OT* prophecy to realize that which is valid in each of the various streams of *OT* religious thought; therefore, Christ's fulfilment of Jer 31:31 does not have to include the negative aspects of Jeremiah's position. Christ's new covenant is sacrificial at the same time that it is founded on sincere conformity to God's will; and since Christ is a divine Messiah, His Eucharistic action is certainly a fulfilment of Jeremiah's divine Messianism.

is identified with the blood, that is, with Christ Himself. Textually, this is seen most clearly in Lk, but a moment's reflection upon the version of Mt and Mk reveals the same identity: Jesus *is* the *diathēkē*.[105] So, there is summarized in this one key usage of *diathēke* all Christ's relationships to the covenant: Jesus is source, recipient, mediator of the covenant. He is Emmanuel, the covenant presence of God with men; He is the supreme revelation of the covenant God; He is the indissoluble union of man with God, the ultimate sharing of divinity with humanity. At the same time, Christ is the supreme attachment of man to God, the complete conformity of human volition to the divine will; and this devotedness to the Father's will that could be said to exist already in a substantial and inchoative form in the hypostatic union itself, finds its full actuation in the sacrificial self-offering of the Supper. In this way Christ is most completely the Servant of Yahweh, who in the day of salvation is to be given as a covenant for the people (Is 49:8–9).

However—and this is the second step—it is not simply Christ in Himself, considered statically as it were, who is the new covenant. Jesus spoke the words, "This is the blood of the new covenant," as He gave the cup to the disciples; that is to say that the new covenant relationship is constituted by Christ as sharing Himself, as continuing Himself sacramentally and mystically.[106] The relationship between God and men in the new dispensation is not simply a relation consequent upon the salvific action of Christ; it is a continued mediation by Christ, an active relating of God to men and men to God effected sacramentally in the Eucharist. In this context the truth of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist not only seems logical, it is the only thing that gives full meaning and actuality to the new covenant dispensation that is Christianity. If the Eucharist as celebrated by the Church is merely representative, if it contains only the influence of Christ's example, even if it implies a certain moral and religious

[105] Cf. J. Bonsirven, *Théologie du N.T.* (Paris, 1951) p. 103: "... le Christ n'est pas seulement 'le Médiateur de la nouvelle alliance', il est, par sa personne de médiateur, cette alliance même, comme il est lui-même le Règne."

[106] For lack of another word, "mystically" is used here, not in the sense of some vague spiritual bond linking Christ and His followers, but in the sense that is conveyed by the term "Mystical Body"; perhaps the word "ecclesiastically" would be clearer, except that this word tends to denote only the externals of the Church.

efficacy that somehow emanates from Christ but is not really Christ present and acting as He did at the Supper, then the true dynamism of Christianity in its historic existence is destroyed. The text of the Supper, however, is explicit on Christ's real presence: "this *is* my blood"; "do this in commemoration of me."[107] Jesus replaces the Temple as the center of true cult; henceforth it is in and with Him that men will encounter and worship God. Jesus constitutes a new chosen people whose religious life will be centered around and spring from the covenant meal, and who will find communion with God and with one another in the re-enactment of Jesus' unique sacrifice.

Further light is cast upon the Synoptic meaning of *diathēkē* by Lk 22:24–30.[108] As we have already seen, this passage explicitly links the Supper to the mission of the Servant of Yahweh and connects fraternal love with sacrifice. It also establishes formally the identity between the new covenant and the Kingdom, for that which is the object of *diatithemai* is the Kingdom.[109] It points to Christ as the primary recipient of the covenant, which is then extended to the disciples; and since the position of these latter in the Kingdom is paralleled to the heads of the twelve tribes, Christ is implicitly compared to Jacob as the head of a new covenant people. Moreover, *kathōs* in v. 29 seems to confirm what we have seen regarding the essentially Eucharistic nature of the covenant: Jesus extends to His disciples the Kingdom *as* His Father had given it to Him; but the Father's grant of the Kingdom

[107] There is little to be gained here from reviewing the whole controversy on the Synoptic use of *estin* in the Eucharistic formulae; nor is there any point in arguing about the genuinity and meaning of the *anamnēsis* command. The object of our discussion is to show that the new covenant established by Christ is deprived of its true significance if one does not admit the real presence of Christ in the Church's continuation of Christ's Eucharistic action.—For a very fine and technical study of the question of the "real presence" significance of the Eucharistic formulae, cf. the book of J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie* . . . , to which our present study is greatly indebted.

[108] L. da Fonseca, *art. cit.*, p. 439, says that one cannot validly use this passage to help interpret the meaning of *diathēkē*, since Lk 22:29–30 "cum institutione Eucharistica non connectuntur." However, we have tried to show that the very fact of the artificial position in the text of this episode is a clear indication that Luke is using it to give a theological interpretation of the Supper.

[109] On *diatithemai*, cf. J. Behm, *ThW* 2, 105–6. In his article on *diathēkē* (where, however, he is drawing on the entire *NT* teaching on *diathēkē*, and not merely on the Synoptics), Behm says (*ThW* 2, 136) that the *kainē diathēkē* is a correlative concept to *basileia tou theou*.

to Christ had been by way of communicating Himself; so, too, Christ's gift of the Kingdom is effected by the gift of Himself. Since this gift is given on the eve of His death, the word *diatithemai* can carry the implication of a testament, though here as in the Eucharistic text proper the meaning "institution, relationship" seems to be primary.[110] Actually, because of the unique nature of Christ's action at the Supper, the two meanings of *diathēkē* coincide in the concrete reality that is the new covenant.

THE PASSION

As is indicated by *didomenon* and *ekchunnomenon*, the offering of Christ at the Last Supper cannot be separated from His passion; and the covenant action of the Supper has no meaning if it does not embrace Christ's suffering and death on Calvary. For that reason it is important to see to what extent the Synoptic writers view the suffering and death of Jesus as a covenant sacrifice.

Actually, there are a considerable number of elements in the Passion account that place the events of Good Friday in a sacrificial and covenant context; for example, all the details of Christ's suffering that point to Him as the Servant of Yahweh.[111] Three episodes, however, seem particularly significant: the Agony in Gethsemane, Pilate's condemnation of Jesus, and the actual death of Christ.

Gethsemane

There are several aspects of the Synoptic description of the Agony in Gethsemane that remind one of the scene of Christ's temptation. It is very closely linked to the scene of the Cenacle, as was the temptation to the baptism; in both Gethsemane and the temptation, angelic comfort is sent to Jesus; in both, Christ asserts His determination to accept the role of suffering Messiah. One could say that the Agony in the Garden is the nonsymbolic assertion of that sacrificial act of

[110] Cf. Behm, *ThW* 2, 105–6. However, Behm interprets Lk 22:29 as "... eine eschatologische Verheissung des scheidenden Jesus an die Jünger, wie der Vater ihm die Königsherrschaft bestimmt hat, so bestimmt er den Jüngern Anteil an seiner künftigen Herrschaft. . . ."

[111] V. Taylor, in his *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, makes much of this point as indicating the sacrificial nature of Christ's death; cf. especially p. 48.

will that is sacramentally expressed in the Supper, just as the temptation was the explicit statement of the sacrificial will which the baptism symbolically expressed. The difference is that baptism-temptation are the inchoative form of what is fully realized in Cenacle and Gethsemane.

An interesting bond between Supper and Gethsemane is established by the usage of *hē hōra*. Lk uses it to introduce the scene of the Cenacle, in which case it is clearly Christ's "hour" that is in question; but in the Garden it is the Passion that is signified by *hē hōra*, since *hōra* is equivalent to *potērion* (Mt 26:39; Mk 14:35). Moreover, the phrase, "this is your hour and the power of darkness" (Lk 22:53), seems to indicate that the active part of Christ's redemptive work, the self-offering of Cenacle and Gethsemane, is finished and that the last episode in the redemption will be constituted by Christ's submission to the power of evil.

Another link is provided by the word *potērion*. It is true that among the Jews of Christ's time the word "cup" was an accepted figure of speech for "suffering,"[112] and that Christ's use of the word to signify His approaching passion is not, therefore, strange. At the same time it seems hard to say that there is no link with the use of the word *potērion* in the Supper narrative. If the new covenant was instituted by the sharing of *to potērion tou haimatos tēs diathēkēs*, its effective consummation was dependent upon Christ's drinking of that *potērion* that was His suffering and death, upon the shedding of His blood that began in the Garden and ended on Golgotha. When one pushes the analysis, it becomes clear that the two chalices merge, because the cup given at the Supper is actually Christ as accepting the cup of the Passion, as is clear from the word *ekchunnomenon*; and to drink of the chalice of the Supper is to share in the suffering of Christ. Thus, Cenacle and Calvary form one action of establishing the new covenant in Christ's blood. The role of Gethsemane in this essentially priestly action is emphasized by the repeated use of *proseuchomai* to which attention has already been drawn.

Supper and Gethsemane are further bound together by the account

[112] Cf. F. Prat, *Jésus Christ* 2 (Milwaukee, 1950) pp. 170–71; V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 98–99.

of Judas' treason.[113] Christ's prediction of this treason opens the narrative of the Supper, and the scene in the Garden ends with the fulfilment of this prophecy. Here, again, one encounters an essentially covenant notion, that of infidelity, which forms the structural theme of the Passion narrative; for the account of the Passion, like so much of the *OT* covenant history, is the record of infidelity to God's covenant initiative. In addition to the infidelity of Judas, there is that of Peter, of the Sanhedrin, and of the people.

Christ Condemned by Pilate

Climax of this series of betrayals is the scene of Christ's condemnation by Pilate. Both the essence of the action involved and the way in which the Synoptics recount it place the episode in a covenant and sacrificial light.

First, there is the preference of Barabbas to Christ. Barabbas, as Mk tells us, was imprisoned because of sedition in which he had committed murder. Barabbas and Christ are thus pictured as offering two radically opposed ways of saving Israel from her enemies: Barabbas represented the way of reliance upon human and violent means in order to regain earthly political freedom; Christ was a spiritual savior whose objective and procedure were peaceful and who advocated patient reliance upon the paternal providence of God.[114] This Messianic opposition between Barabbas and Jesus seems well founded because of Mt's version of Pilate's words: "Barabbas or Jesus *who is called Christ*" (27:17). In responding to Pilate's alternative, the people were faced with the same choice that had dominated their history: to trust in the covenant God or to seek for salvation in other covenants. And their rejection of Christ marks the definitive rejection of the covenant God by the people of Israel—all the blood of the just will be demanded of this generation (Mt 23:35).

[113] P. Benoit, on pp. 6–7 of his study, "La mort de Judas," *Synoptische Studien* (Munich, 1953), draws attention to the interesting parallel between Judas and Achitophel (cf. 2 S 17:23; 1 Chr 27:33), which, of course, strengthens the comparison of Jesus to David. Another thing that strengthens the Messianic coloration of both Supper and Passion is the link that the Synoptics make between the treason of Judas and the prophecies of Zechariah. On this latter, cf. J. Kremer, *Die Hirtenallegorie im Buche Zacharias* (Münster, 1930) pp. 22–27.

[114] Cf. W. Foerster, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Berlin, 1940) p. 110, who sees Barabbas as representing the messianic appeal of the Zealots.

Secondly, the Synoptics, particularly Mt, point to Christ as the fulfilment of Is 53. Attention is drawn to the way in which Jesus answered nothing to the charges made by the Jewish leaders, "so that Pilate was amazed," thus realizing the words of Is 53:7: "Like a sheep led to slaughter . . . he is silent and does not open his mouth." Again, by the way in which he introduces the episode of the dream of Pilate's wife, Mt points to the fact that at this crucial moment there is divine confirmation of Christ's role as the Just (Is 53:11). This is reiterated in Pilate's words: "I am innocent of the blood of this just man."

Thirdly, when one reflects upon the fact that Pilate in condemning Jesus effects the immolatory aspect of Christ's sacrificial death, Pilate's action of washing his hands before passing sentence is most reminiscent of the purificatory actions that the Jewish ceremonial prescribed as preliminary to the action of sacrifice.[115] Opposed to Pilate's attempt to free himself of the guilt of shedding innocent blood is the cry of the people: "His blood be upon us . . . ." One is instantly shocked by this cry, because of the horror of bloodguilt that is so prominent in the *OT*. At the same time one is unavoidably reminded of the scene of Sinai where the blood of the covenant victim was sprinkled upon the people. If we then refer to this scene what we already know from the analysis of the text of the Supper, we are confronted with the paradoxical irony of divine mercy: the people deliberately incur the guilt of shedding innocent blood, blood that not only "belongs to God" in the *OT* sense of passages like Lv 17, but that is truly the blood of God; yet this very blood that they call down upon themselves and their posterity is the blood that is destined to save men, it is shed *eis aphesin hamartiōn*, even of the sin of deicide.

The Death of Christ

In the scene of Christ's death there are two factors that intimately relate the event to all that we have seen regarding the establishment of the new and priestly covenant. There is the constant and pointed reference to the Messianic role of Christ, and there is the striking relationship between the death of Jesus and the end of the Temple worship.

It has already been remarked—and the fact is too obvious to need any amplification—how the details of Christ's suffering are explicitly

[115] Cf. J. Bonsirven, *Textes rabbiniques* (Rome, 1955) nos. 1110–15, 2100.

paralleled to Ps 22, which leaves no doubt but that the Synoptic writers see the death of Jesus as the vicarious sacrificial death of the Servant of Yahweh. But it is important to note the almost equal prominence of the kingship of Jesus. The title that Pilate has placed above the head of the crucified Christ bears the civil charge that explains His crucifixion: He is king of the Jews; and it is with this title that the soldiers around the cross mock Him. There is also blasphemous mockery of Christ's kingship by the Jews, leaders and people, but now the taunts take on a religious tone: reference is made to Christ's claim to be king of Israel, that is, to be leader of the people in so far as it is a covenant people. It is thus indicated that the real ground for Christ's condemnation is not any claim He made to political power, but rather the fact that He is a challenge to the existing spiritual leadership of Israel. An indication of the basically religious and Messianic significance of the term "king of Israel" is the fact that, while Mt has the simple expression "the king of Israel," Mk adds "the Christ, the king of Israel," and Lk substitutes the expression "the Christ of God, the elect."

However, it is in the relationship of Christ's death to the Temple that the opposition between Jesus and the existent priestly order is most sharply drawn. It is clear from the account of Christ's trial before Caiphas that the Synoptic writers see some special link between Christ's death and the cessation of the Temple worship, because of all the many charges brought against Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Mt 26:60) only one is recorded: "He said that He was able to destroy the Temple of God and in three days rebuild it." Besides, Caiphas immediately proceeds from this charge to his question regarding Christ's divinity—which seems to indicate that he saw in the claim of power over the Temple a claim to divinity. At the foot of the cross the same two claims of Christ are repeated tauntingly by His enemies, and the two are even more intimately joined: "You, who can destroy the Temple and in three days rebuild it, save yourself, if you are the Son of God. . ." (Mt 27:40).

One might be tempted to say that this prominence in the Passion narrative of Christ's claim, "Destroy this Temple . . .," is due to Christian emphasis on the fact of Christ's resurrection. This may well be a contributing factor, but it does not suffice to explain why this

claim of Jesus is given as the cause of His condemnation. Nor, above all, does it explain why all three Gospels draw attention to the rending of the Temple veil at the very instant of Christ's death. More probably, the veil in question was that which hid the Holy of Holies,[116] and there can be only one meaning in the fact that the Synoptics record: the death of Christ marks the rejection of the Temple worship and the end of the old covenant. Under the old dispensation, the innermost Temple sanctuary, set apart as the most sacred part of the Temple area and hidden from the gaze of men, was the permanent symbol of Yahweh's covenant dwelling with and protection of Israel.[117] Now, there is no reason why the great curtain continues to separate this room from the rest of "profane space"; it is no longer the dwelling of the covenant God, for outside the Holy City the sacrifice of the new covenant has been consummated and the dead body of Christ is the sign of God's new covenant will to abide with men. Thus, while the account of the Supper seems to indicate the continuity of the two covenants and the fulfilment of the old in the new, the Passion narrative stresses rather the opposition and rejection—Israel's rejection of the new covenant and God's rejection of the old. Perhaps the key to reconciling these somewhat conflicting views of the relation between old and new covenant is to be found in Christ's parable about the unjust guardians of the vineyard; for the vineyard remains the prized possession of the master, but it is the unjust caretakers who are rejected.[118]

CONCLUSION

Christ is, then, the fulfilment of the *OT* Temple and its priesthood. He is not only the perfect ontological mediator; He also effected the perfect and unique redemptive sacrifice. His priesthood is at the very

[116] Cf. V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London, 1952) p. 596; G. Schrenk, *ThW* 3, 236.

[117] Cf. T. Chary, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 ff., who traces the genesis of the Hebrew idea of God dwelling in a sanctuary.

[118] To complete a study of the Synoptic presentation of the Eucharist as covenant, one should discuss Lk's account of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, their recognition of Christ "in the breaking of the bread," and the whole question of the relation between the Resurrection and the Eucharist. But since such a discussion would depend so heavily on a simultaneous study of the presentation of the primitive Eucharist in the Acts of the Apostles, no attempt is made here to delve into this very challenging question.

heart of the new covenant, for it is exercised in the Supper and the Passion when He instituted this new covenant. Moreover, the full meaning of the new covenant is seen only when one realizes that it is Christ as priest, as offering Himself to men and to His Father on behalf of men, that *is* the new covenant.

For that reason, *diathēkē* is so focal a word in the Eucharistic text that its interpretation is the key to interpreting the meaning of the Supper, and with it the meaning of Christianity. In studying *diathēkē* we saw that Christ, eating the final Pasch with His "brethren," instituted the new covenant in His own blood offered in redemptive sacrifice. There is question of a new relationship between God and men, of which Christ is the essential realization and in which other men participate by sharing His body and blood. It is this relationship, continually dynamic because it involves man's sacrificial submission to God's will, sacramental because it is expressed in the *anamnēsis* of Christ's own Eucharistic action, that dominates Christian history from its beginning in the Incarnation to its consummation in eternity. It is this idea of covenant, formally identical with the idea of kingdom, that dominates the thought of the Synoptic Gospels, even though the word *diathēkē* itself is confined to the text of the Supper.