

MISCELLANEOUS
BIBLICAL STUDIES

CHAPTER TEN

RECOVERING JESUS' WORDS
BY WHICH HE INITIATED
THE EUCHARIST

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.

©

2009

All Rights Reserved

X

RECOVERING JESUS' WORDS BY WHICH HE INITIATED THE EUCHARIST

The accounts of Jesus' instituting the Eucharist appear in Matt 26:26–27, Mark 14:22–24, Luke 22:19–20, and I Corinthians 11:23–24. In Greek the number of words in the direct quotations of Jesus' instructions vary widely. In Matthew 26, seven words were used for the bread and four for the cup; and in Mark 14, seven words were used for the bread and possibly five words for the cup. By contrast, in Luke 22 (including the variant readings) fifteen words were used for the bread and fourteen for the cup; whereas in I Cor 11, seventeen words were used for the bread and twenty words for the cup. With Matthew's eleven words total versus Corinthians' thirty-seven words total, it is not surprising that there is wide disagreement among scholars as to what Jesus actually said when he commanded the disciples "to eat . . . and drink in remembrance of me."

Not only are the direct quotations of Jesus' Eucharistic commands of varied length in the Synoptics and in I Corinthians, but the precise wording in the individual Gospel accounts—as well as in Paul's epistle—vary widely in the manuscripts, translations, and text traditions. The four passages mentioned are cited in full in the paragraphs below. The variant readings are highlighted in red font, with the four variants in I Corinthians 11 highlighted (in red) as four bullets.

Matthew 26:26–27

Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [τὸν]¹ ἄρτον,
καὶ εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς,
καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, φάγετε· **τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.**

152 BY WHICH HE INITIATED THE EUCHARIST

καὶ λαβὼν [τὸν]² ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· πίνετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.

And as they were eating, Jesus took [the]¹ bread, blessed and broke *it*, and gave *it* to the disciples and said, “Take, eat; **this is my body.**”

Then he took [the]² cup, and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, “Drink from it, all of you.”

Mark 14:22–24

Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, φάγετε· **τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.**

Καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου, τῆς [καλυῆς]³ διαθήκης, τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke *it*, and gave *it* to them and said, “Take, eat; **this is my body.**”

Then he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave *it* to them, and they all drank from it.

And he said to them, “This is my blood of the [new]³ covenant, which is shed for many.”

Luke 22:19–20⁴

καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων,
Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον·
τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων,
 Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου
 τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

And he took bread, gave thanks and broke it,
 and gave it to them, saying,
 “This is my body given for you;
 do this in remembrance of me.”

And likewise the cup after supper, saying,
 “This cup is the new covenant in My blood,
 which is shed for you.

I Cor 11:23–24

Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου,
 ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν,
 ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο
 ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν
 καὶ εἶπεν, **Τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα**

- τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν⁵
- τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον⁶
- τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον⁷
- τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν θρυπτόμενον⁸

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λέγων·
 τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη
 ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι·
 τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε,
 εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

For I received from the Lord
 what I also passed on to you:

The Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed,
 took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it

shifts to the other lexemes spelled פּוֹגַר, including

- פּוֹגַר/פּוֹגַר, stem I, “to split, to break up, to destroy,” which in the *ʿAph^{el}* means “to wound, to bruise” (Jastrow 1135, where he also noted the phrase מַפְגְּרֵי לֵבָא “those crushed at heart”). This פּוֹגַר is a cognate of the Arabic فجر (*fajara*) “to cleave, to brake open, to pour forth, to gush out . . . to make water, blood, or a fluid to flow” (Lane 2340; Wehr 816). This פּוֹגַר could well be translated by κλάω “to break” or θρούπτω “to break-into-pieces.”
- פּוֹגַר/פּוֹגַר, stem II, “to be exhausted, to be faint” (BDB 803); and Aramaic “to be lax, to faint” (Jastrow 1135).
- פּוֹגַר/פּוֹגַר stem IV, “to give,” the cognate of the Arabic فجر (*fajara*) “he made it to well forth, he made his gift large” (and in form 7, “he was profuse [in generosity, liberality, or beneficence]; “to show generosity, to act bountifully). The derivatives of فجر (*fajara*) include (a) فاجر (*fajar^{um}*) “donation, generosity, munificence, bounty beneficence”, and (b) فاجر (*fâjir*) “one having much wealth or property” (Lane 2341–2342; Hava 547). This פּוֹגַר could well be translated by δίδωμι “to give.”¹⁰
- פּוֹגַר stem V, “wicked, immoral,” which is the cognate of the Arabic فجر (*fajara*) “he committed a foul deed, he acted vitiously, immorally,” and فجرة (*fajrat*) “vice, immorality, wickedness” (Lane 2340–2341).

The פגָר (*pěgar*) in the Peshitta of Luke 22:19 undoubtedly retains the word from the original Aramaic/ Hebrew source, which became σῶμα in the Greek text tradition.¹¹ If so, the statement about the bread could have appeared in Hebrew as follows (with the lexemes spelled פגָר highlighted in red):¹²

לקח לחם ויברך ויפגָר ויאמר קחו אכלו
 זה פגָרי הפגָר הנפגָר בעדכם
 זאת עשו לזכרני

He took bread and blessed and **broke** [it] and said
 “Take and eat; this [is] **my body, the-broken-one,**¹³
the-one-given¹⁴ for your sake.
 This do in my remembrance.”

This reconstruction accommodates the variants κλώμενον “broken,” θρυπτόμενον “broken-in-pieces,” and διδόμενον “given.” The shortened form of the saying in Matt 26:26 and Mark 14:22 (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου) reflects a simple haplography of the הפגָר הנפגָר which followed the פגָרי in the Hebrew narrative. Similarly, in the Hebrew behind Luke 22:19, a haplography changed הפגָר הנפגָר to simply פגָרי הפגָר “my body broken.” And the variants in I Cor 11:23 (listed at notes 5–8) come from a haplography of

- the הפגָר הנפגָר, with only the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in Greek,
- the הפגָר, with only the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον or τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν θρυπτόμενον in Greek,
- the הפגָר, with only the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον in Greek.

Were the original source in Aramaic the haplographies involved the phrase פגָרי פגָרא מתפגָרא.

The reconstructed text, **זֶה פְּגִרִי הַפָּגוּר / הַנִּפְגָּר בְּעֲדֵיכֶם**, “this is my broken body/ given for you” (a composite of the variants in the Greek texts) recovers a pithy phrase marked by paranomasia and assonance—features which are unlikely the result of random editorial or liturgical interpolations. But the wordplay could well have been coined to emphasize the point being made. Moreover, the five words have the 3 + 2 *qinah* accent pattern characteristic of a lament. This 3 + 2 matches that in Mark 14:24, **זֶה דָּמִי דַם-הַבְּרִית / הַנִּגָּר לְרַבִּים**, “this is my blood, the blood of the covenant / shed for many.”¹⁵

This is not to suggest that Jesus was waxing poetic at the Last Supper. Rather it is to recognize that Jesus' mood at that table was somber enough to affect unconscious speech patterns which can be recovered by a careful philological analysis of variants in the Greek texts and their probable Semitic origin.

Many scholars have argued for the primacy of the shorter texts in Matt 26:26–27 and Mark 14:22–24.¹⁶ For example Frédéric Godet (1881: 290–291) argued

No doubt, in Paul [I Cor 11:24] this participle [κλώμενον ‘broken’] might be a gloss. But an interpolation would have been taken from Luke [22:19]; they would not have invented this *Hapax-legomenon* κλώμενον. . . . I think, therefore, that this participle of Paul, as well as the *given* of Luke, are in the Greek text the necessary paraphrase of the literal Aramaic form, *This is my body for you*, a form which the Greek ear could as little bear as ours. . . . As to the word *is* which has been so much insisted upon, it was not uttered by Jesus who must have said in Aramaic *Haggouschmi*, “*This here [behold] my body!*”¹⁷

Similarly, Alfred Plummer (1953: 497) concluded that “the κλώμενον, which many texts add to τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in I Cor

xi. 24, is not genuine.”

Norval Geldenhuys (1979: 554, 559) concluded that Luke 22:19b and 19:20 did not belong to the original text of Luke. He stated:

If the supposition which is endorsed by the majority of expositors of the Bible (liberals as well as conservatives), namely, that 19b and 20 are later interpolations, is right, then Luke in verse 19 merely mentioned the fact in quite general terms that the Lord also broke bread and distributed it and taught the disciples that the broken bread is the symbol of his body (which for their sakes will be broken in his sacrificial death). . . . So nothing is lost by admitting that everything points to the fact that these words [in Luke 22:19b-20] are an interpolation of the words from 1 Corinthians xi in Luke’s original text.”

However, I. H. Marshall (1978: 800) preferred the longer text of Luke 22:19–20, arguing that “the external evidence for the longer text is overwhelming” and that the origin of the shorter text “may be due simply to some scribal idiosyncrasy.” That “idiosyncrasy” can now be identified as a haplography involving the consonant cluster **פגרי הפגור נפגר**.

Although **פגר**, stem V, the cognate of the Arabic **فجر** (*fajra*), “he acted immorally,” and **فجرة** (*fajrat*) “vice, immorality wickedness” (noted above) appears at first glance to be contextually irrelevant, it may actually be the missing link which can account for the shorter text (τοῦτὸ ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου, “this is my body”) in Matt 26:26 and Mark 14:22. The phrase **זה פגרי הפגר** (with defective spelling of the *Qal* passive participle) could be interpreted as either “this is my broken body” or as “this is my immoral body.” Given that ambiguity—whether to read the **הפגר** as **הפגור** or **הפגר**—the decision was made to drop the modifier(s) and retain only the

unambiguous subject-predicate **זה פגרי** “this is my body.”

A similar dynamic may well account for the absence of the participle ἐκχυσόμενος “poured out” in Matt 26:27 and in I Cor 11:24. If the verb in the Semitic source was **נָגַר** “to pour” (as in Psalm 75:9, **כִּי כֹס בְּיַד־יְהוָה . . . וַיִּזֶר מִזֶּה**, “for a cup is in the hand of Yahweh . . . and he pours from this”), the *Niph^cal* participle **נֹגֵר** (= **נָגַר**) “poured out” would match the *Niph^cal* participle **נֹגֵר** (= **נָגַר**) of **נָגַר**, stem II “to seduce, to have illegitimate intercourse” (Jastrow 226). In speech there is no similarity between **נָגַר** and **נֹגֵר**, but in writing **נֹגֵר** could be either. Once the oral tradition was written down in Aramaic or Hebrew someone decided it was better to remove the ambiguous modifier than to keep it and possibly distort the truth being affirmed. Thus, the shorter texts originated in the written Hebrew and Aramaic sources prior to their being translated into Greek, Latin, or other languages.

If the phrase “this is my body broken for you,” in I Cor 11:23 goes back to an original **זה פגרי הפגור** or **דנא פגרי פגירא**, there was no tension between Jesus’ speaking of his “broken body” and the narrative in John 19:34–36 (which alludes to restrictions dealing with the sacrificial paschal lamb),¹⁸

[the soldiers] came to Jesus and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. But one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once there came out blood and water. . . . For these things took place that the scripture might be fulfilled, “*Not a bone of him shall be broken.*” . . . And again another Scripture says, “They shall look on Him whom they pierced.”

When used with reference to the human body the verb פָּנַר / פָּנַר, stem I, “to break,” need not be read as a synonym of שָׁבַר “to fracture (bones).” As noted above, פָּנַר / פָּנַר can mean “to wound, to bruise, to brake open, to pour forth, to make water, blood, or a fluid to flow.” Thus, the פָּנַר could also reference the piercing (νύσσω) of Jesus’ side.

One variant in the Eucharist texts which has not been clarified by the פָּנַר lexemes and the נָגַר lexemes is the absence of the modifier καὶ νέης “new” in manuscripts א B C D^b L Θ Ψ in Mark 14:24 (see note 3). Most scholars think Jesus referenced the בְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה “new covenant” in Jer 31:31. If so, and if he spoke in Aramaic, the τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης “the new covenant” would have been קַיִמָּא חֲרֵתָא, two graphically dissimilar words unlikely to suffer a haplography. But if he spoke in Hebrew the “new covenant” may have been הַבְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה (with the adjective בְּרִיאָה being attested in Num 16:30, אִם־בְּרִיאָה יִבְרָא יְהוָה, “if Yahweh does something utterly new” [NJB]). The graphic similarity of the words הַבְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה “the new covenant” apparently contributed to a haplography of the הַבְּרִיאָה in the א B C D^b L Θ Ψ textual tradition.¹⁹

Marshall (1978: 801) cited Hermann Patsch (1972: 87–89) who “confirms the view of Jeremias [that the Marcan form stands closest to the original form] but stresses that there can be no possibility of reconstructing ‘the oldest form’ and hence of regarding the sayings as *ipsissima verba* of Jesus.” To the contrary, the reconstructions based upon the variants in the Greek presented in this study support Marshall’s opinion that:

the basic motifs expressed in the [Eucharistic] sayings can be shown to be in agreement with what we otherwise know of the teaching of Jesus . . . and hence in our opinion a line can be drawn from the historical Last Supper to the sayings recorded here [in Luke], even if it is impossible to be sure precisely what Jesus said. It is in our view less likely that the sayings represent the early church's interpretation of the meaning of the Supper. There is certainly nothing in the sayings that cannot go back to Jesus who viewed his ministry in terms of the suffering Servant and who expected to die as a martyr.

Once the τὸ ἐκχυσνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, “which is shed for many,” of Mark 14:24 (rather than the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυσνόμενον, “which is shed for you,” of Luke 22:20) is inserted into I Cor 11:23–27, the original Eucharistic text comes into focus. It can be reconstructed in Hebrew as follows (with vowels added to remove any ambiguity, and highlight in red what could be Jesus' *ipsissima verba*):

...הָאֲדוֹן יֵשׁוּעַ בַּלַּיְלָה אֲשֶׁר־סָנַר בּוֹ
 לָקַח לֶחֶם וַיְבָרֶךְ וַיִּפְגַּר וַיֵּאמֶר
 קְחוּ אֲכָלוּ זֶה פָּנֵי הַפָּגוּר הַנִּפְגָּר בְּעַדְכֶם
 זֹאת עֲשׂוּ לְזִכְרָנִי:²⁰
 וְכִמוֹכֵן אַחֲרֵי אֲכָלִים לָקַח אֶת־הַכּוֹס וַיֵּאמֶר
 הַכּוֹס הַזֹּאת הַבְּרִית הַבְּרִיאָה בְּדַמִּי הַנִּגָּר לְרַבִּים
 זֹאת עֲשׂוּ בְכָל־עֵת אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁתּוּ לְזִכְרָנִי:²⁰
 כִּי בְכָל־עֵת אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכְלוּ אֶת־הַלֶּחֶם הַזֶּה
 וְשָׂתוּ אֶת־הַכּוֹס הַזֹּאת
 תִּסְפְּרוּ מוֹת אֲדֹנָינוּ עַד כִּי יָבוֹא:

162 BY WHICH HE INITIATED THE EUCHARIST

. . . The Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread and blessed and broke it, and said,
“Take, eat, this is my broken body, given for you sakes.
Do this in remembrance of me.”²⁰

In the same way after their eating,
he took the cup and said,

“This cup is the new covenant in my blood, shed for many.
Do this, as often as you drink, in remembrance of me.”²⁰

For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup,
you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.

The twenty-four Hebrew words (or forty English words) highlighted in red—which can be quoted in less than thirty seconds—do not include all of Jesus' conversation at the Last Supper. But they may well reflect all that was recorded in the Hebrew source which Paul received. As long as there was an active oral tradition available to help interpret the inadvertently ambiguous consonantal Hebrew/Aramaic records, textual variants in Greek translations would be minimal. When the oral tradition became unavailable the variants multiplied and became inexplicable. As a result, the most frequent explanation for the Greek, Latin, and other textual variants was to identify them as puzzling interpolations. But, as demonstrated in this study and others, by reconstructing hypothetically the Aramaic/Hebrew *Vorlage* of a variant, a host of possible explanations appear. Such was the case with the phrase τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, “this is my body,” which led to the contextually relevant lexeme פֶּגֶר “body, corpse,” and this in turn led to all of the other פֶּגֶר lexemes which were a perfect match for the other variants cited in notes 2–8. The full quotations of Jesus, with variants included as evaluated above, appear to retain Jesus' own words, not later liturgical or editorial interpolations.

NOTES

1. Tischendorf (1877: 104) noted that the definite article τὸν is attested in mss A Γ Δ H.
2. Tischendorf (1877: 104) noted that the definite article τὸν is attested in mss ACDHKMSUVΓΠ. Aland (1968:102) noted in addition $\mathfrak{p}^{37 \text{ vid}, 43} f^{13}$ 565 1009 1010 1071 1079 1195 1216 1230 1241 1242 1253 1344 1365 1546 1646 2148 2174 *Byz Lect* Justin Diatessaron^{i, n}.
3. Aland (1968: 184) noted that the τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης appears in manuscripts AKPΔ $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 700 892 1009 1010 1071 1079 1195 12161230 1241 1253 1365 1546 1646 2148 2174 *Byz Lect* it^{b, i, r1}. But τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης (without the τὸ) appears in X 1242 1344 it^{a, aur, c, f, l, q} vg syr^{s, p, h} cop^{sa, bo^{mss}} arm eth geo² Diatessaron. The τῆς διαθήκης without a modifier appears in \aleph B CD^b LΘ Ψ 565 it^k cop^{sa^{ms}, bo}.
4. Aland (1968: 302–303) cited the variant order of verses in Luke 22: 17–20 as follows:
 - {B} verses 17, 18, 19a (omitting 19b–20: τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν...ἐκχυννόμενον) D it^{a, d, ff2 i, l}
 - verses 17, 18, 19 20 \mathfrak{p}^{75} \aleph A B C K L T^{vid} W X Δ Θ Π Ψ 063 $f^1 f^{13}$ 565 700 892 1009 1010 1071 1079 1195 1216 1230 1241 1242 1253 1344 1365 1546 1646 2148 1274 *Byz Lect* it^{aur, c, f, q, r1} vg syr^{h, pal} cop^{sa, bo} arm geo
 - verses 19a (καὶ λαβῶν...σῶμά μου), 17, 18 it^{b, c}
 - verses 19, 17, 18 syr^c
 - verses 19, 20 l^{32} syr^p cop^{bo^{ms}}.

164 BY WHICH HE INITIATED THE EUCHARIST

5. The pronoun ὑμῶν alone appears in $\text{p}^{46} \mathfrak{N}^* \text{A B C}^* 33 1739^*$ arm Origen Cyprian Athanasius^{acc.} to Theodoret Pelagius Cyril Fulgentius (Aland, 1968: 604).
6. The pronoun ὑμῶν plus the participle κλώμενον appears in $\mathfrak{N}^c \text{C}^3 \text{D}^{b,c} \text{G K P } \Psi 81 88 104 181 326 330 436 451 614 629 630 1241 1739^{\text{mg}} 1877 1881 1962 1984 1985 2127 2492 2495 \text{ Byz Lect}$ it^{d, e, g.} syr^{p, h.} goth Ambrosiasterr Basil Chrysostom Euthalius Theodoret John-Damascus (see Aland, 1968: 604).
7. Aland (1968: 604) cited the pronoun ὑμῶν plus the participle διδόμενον, with the following notation: “(see Lk 22:19) (it^{c, dem, f, t, x, xc} vg *tradetur* it^{ar} *quod tradidi pro vobis*, it^{z*} *quod pro vobis traditur*) cop^{sa, bo} eth Euthalius.”
8. The pronoun ὑμῶν plus the participle θρυπτόμενον appears in D^{gr*} (see Aland, 1968: 604).
9. In the Septuagint פָּנֶה was translated by σῶμα in Gen 15: 11, II Kings 19:35, and Isa 37:36.
10. Note Castell’s (1669: 2959) detailed citations of the varied פָּנֶה lexemes, especially the Arabic فاجر (*fajr*) for the *dos* and *dotale*, the giving of the dowry.
11. I. H. Marshall (1978: 802) cited Dalman, Behm, Cranfield, Kümmel, and Schweizer among those who thought that Jesus used גוּפָא “body, person, self, substance” (Jastrow 225). But J. Jeremias (1966: 198–199) argued for בָּשָׂר “flesh,” as did R. Brown in his comments on John 6:51 (1966: 284–285,

291) and J. Fitzmyer (1985: 1400).

12. With vocalization this reconstruction would read

לָקַח לֶחֶם וַיְבָרֶךְ וַיִּפְגַּר
וַיֹּאמֶר קָחוּ אֲכֹלוּ זֶה פִּגְרֵי הַפָּגוּר
הַנִּפְגָּר בְּעֵדְכֶם זֹאת עָשׂוּ לְזִכְרָנִי:

13. This appositional modifier reflects a *Qal* passive participle.

14. This translates the definite *Niph^cal* participle. It should be noted that the *Niph^cal* form was used “too express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself, or to have an effect upon himself” (GKC 51^c).

15. The parallel text in Luke 22:20 would yield a 2 + 3 + 2:
הַפֹּסֵם הַזֹּאת / הַבְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה בְּדָמַי / הַשְּׂפוּךְ בְּעֵדְכֶם.
The first five words in I Cor 11:25a would match the first five words here, but the *אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁתּוּ לְזִכְרָנִי* which would be the reconstruction of 11:26b has no metrical pattern.

16. See I. H. Marshall (1978: 799–802) for a good summary of the varied scholarly arguments about the primacy of the shorter or longer texts.

17. See Jastrow 228, 274 for the Aramaic *גּוּשְׁמָא, גּוּשְׁמָא*, and the Hebrew *גּוּשָׁם* “body, self.” Godet’s retroversion of *σωμα* to the Aramaic *Haggouschmi* can be faulted because the initial *Hag* reflects the *Hebrew* definite article *הַ* and a noun would not have the definite article *and* a possessive suffix.

166 BY WHICH HE INITIATED THE EUCHARIST

18. The relevant texts include Exod 12:10 (LXX), 46; Num 9:1, **לֹא תִשְׁבְּרוּ בוֹ, וְעֵצָם** (καὶ ὅστοῦν οὐ συντριψετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ) “and a bone of it ye shall not break”; Psalm 34:20 (MT 21) **שָׁמַר כָּל-עַצְמוֹתָיו אַחַת מֵהֵנָּה לֹא נִשְׁבְּרָהּ** (κύριος φυλάσσει πάντα τὰ ὀστά αὐτῶν ἐν ἑξ αὐτῶν οὐ συντριβήσεται) “He [the Lord] keeps all their bones: not one of them shall be broken”; and Zech 12:10, **וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלַי אֵת, אֲשֶׁר-דָּקְרוּ**, “and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced.” The LXX of Zech 12:10 reads, καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με ἀνθ’ ὧν κατωρχήσαντό, “they shall look upon me, because they have mocked,” which reflects a misreading of the **דָּקְרוּ** as **דָּקְרוּ** “they danced insultingly [= mocked]” (Brown, 1970: 938).

19. The difference between the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον “which is shed for you” (= **נָגַר בְּעַדְכֶם**) (Luke 22:20) and the τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (= **נָגַר בְּעַד רַבִּים**) (Mark 14:24) “which is shed for many,” can be recognized as a case of a defective spelling of the **רַבִּים** “many” as **רַבִּם**, which when joined with **בְּעַד** became **בְּעַדְרַבִּם**—the **רַר** of which was reduced to just a single **ר** and the **בִּם** was misread as the plural suffix **כִּם**. For other examples of the confusion of the **ר** and **רַ**, see Delitzsch (1920: 105–107, §104^{a-c}) and note 18 above with the misreading of the **דָּקְרוּ** as **דָּקְרוּ**

20. The **τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν** (= **זֵאת עֲשׂוּ לְזִכְרֹנִי**) became in the *NJB* “do this in remembrance of me” (11:24) and as “do this as a memorial of me” (11:25).