

The New International Greek Testament Commentary

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

A Commentary on the Greek Text

by

I. HOWARD MARSHALL

*Reader in New Testament Exegesis
University of Aberdeen*

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
Grand Rapids, Michigan

is meant as in v. 20, the third cup is likely; if, however, two separate cups are meant, the first cup may be intended here.

εὐχαριστέω (17:16) also appears in connection with the cup in Mk. 14:23, and in connection with the bread in Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. The word is often thought to be Hellenistic, in contrast with the more Jewish *εὐλογέω* (Mk. 14:23; cf. Jeremias, *Words*, 175), but Schürmann, *Paschamahlerbericht*, 53–60, argues that the use without an object is not Greek, that the presence of the word here is not a late development, and that the choice of the less usual word, associated for Christians with the Lord's Supper, points up the unusual character of what was happening. The word refers to the normal thanksgiving or benediction spoken in connection with the drinking of wine. For Christian readers it would be an indication of the eucharistic character of the meal. *λάβετε* is found in the 'bread saying' in Mk. 14:22, but not in Lk. 22:19. Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 30f., 60–63, argues that Luke is unlikely to have transferred the word from Mk. 14:22, that it is more probably secondary in Mk. 14:22 (where it is unnecessary after *ἔδωκεν* and since it has no parallel in 1 Cor. 11:24), and that it was necessary in Lk. because the sharing of a common cup was unusual. But this last point is doubtful, Jeremias, *Words*, 69f., having assembled the evidence that a common cup was not unknown. *διαμερίζω* is Lucan (11:17; *et al.*), but could have replaced an original *μερίζω* (cf. 11:17f., diff. Mk. 3:24f.). For *εἰς ἑαυτούς* cf. 7:30; 15:17. The command corresponds to the narrative *καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, Mk. 14:23, but is unlikely to have been constructed from the latter by Luke. The whole action is unusual, since the cup was usually passed round in silence (Jeremias, *Words*, 208f.), and we have to inquire regarding its meaning for Jesus and for the disciples. In the case of Jesus the question is whether he himself partook of this cup. V. 18 is compatible with either partaking or not partaking. V. 17 would most naturally imply that Jesus told his disciples to share a cup of which he was not partaking (Jeremias, *Words*, 208f., listing other supporters of this view; L. Goppelt, TDNT VI, 141, 154). But Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 63–65, argues that it was customary for the host to partake first, and that there is nothing to suggest that Jesus departed from custom at this point. Luke's usage of *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* (v. 18) normally refers to what is going to happen subsequent to the moment of speaking and does not include what is happening at the precise moment (1:48; 5:10; 12:52; 22:69; Acts 18:6); this supports the second view. The interpretation of 22:16 and Mk. 14:25 also supports this view. If the cup here is different from that in v. 20, the implication is that Jesus did not partake of the later, eucharistic cup (J. Weiss, 509); if it is the same cup, he did partake of it.

As for the disciples, their sharing in the cup is usually said to represent a sharing in the blessing bestowed by Jesus (Jeremias, *Words*, 232f.; Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 60–63). This understanding is questionable. For the 'blessing' spoken over the cup is not a blessing of the contents, but a prayer of thanks to God: 'Blessed be thou, Lord our God, King of the

world, who hast created the fruit of the vine'. Rather, the act of drinking together unites the participants into a table fellowship with one another. And the significance of the action is that this is the last occasion on which they can do so with Jesus.

(18) The saying corresponds closely in form and wording to Mk. 14:25 and Lk. 22:16. This has led to the suspicion that it is modelled on Mk. 14:25 (Schlatter, 137; Schenke, 303), but the case for independence is stronger (Schürmann, op. cit., 34–45). Nevertheless, the tradition in Mk. may be more primitive than that in Lk. The saying is regarded by Jeremias as the explanation for Jesus' abstention from the cup (implied in v. 17), and by Schürmann as the explanation for the command to the disciples to participate in the cup. In the introductory λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, Mark's ἀμήν is replaced by γάρ (cf. 22:16 note). It is not clear whether ὅτι should be read; p^{75 vid} B C D L fl¹ pc e; *Synopsis*; (UBS) omit it, and since the temptation to assimilation to Mk. 14:25 and Lk. 22:16 and to Lucan style was strong, the omission should probably be accepted. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν corresponds to Mk. οὐκέτι (contrast Lk. 22:16) and is probably Lucan; see 22:17 note on its significance. ἀπό may be a Lucan alteration of Mk. ἐκ. For γένημα cf. 12:18 v.1.; ἄμπελος is 'vine' (Jn. 15:1–5; Jas. 3:12; Rev. 14:18f.). The phrase 'the fruit of the vine' occurs in the Jewish prayer of thanksgiving for wine; cf. Is. 32:12. οὖ (p^{75 vid} ⚭ B C² L fl¹ 157 579 892 pc; om. C^{*vid}; *δοῦν* *rell*; TR; *Diglot*) is Lucan (12:50; *et al.*), diff. Mk. τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν, which is closer to an Aramaic formulation with its pleonastic demonstrative. The clause speaks of the coming of the kingdom, perhaps as a circumlocution for saying that God will establish the kingdom (Jeremias, *Words*, 210). There is an implicit reference to the thought of the banquet in the kingdom, perhaps to the anticipation of this banquet in the Lord's Supper. Schürmann, op. cit., 38–42, argues for the more primitive formulation in Mk. being original at this point, and this seems probable. Nevertheless, the occurrence of ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ in 1 Cor. 11:26 may be a pointer to the primitive character of Luke's formulation.

v. The Institution of the Lord's Supper 22:19–20

The interpretation of this section is closely linked with the problem of the establishment of the original text. Until about 1950 there was a strong tendency among scholars to adopt the shorter form of text, i.e. omitting vs. 19b–20, with D a d ff² i l sy^h (and possibly the archetypes of c r² δ; cf. G. D. Kilpatrick*; Jeremias, *Words*, 142 n. 6; M. Rese*, 15 n. 4). The existence of this text is further attested by various authorities which rearrange the verse order (15, 16, 19a, 17, 18: b e; 15, 16, 19a: sy^p bo^m; for details see Metzger, 174f.). It is accepted by WH App., 63f.; *Diglot*; RSV (earlier editions); NEB; Plummer, 496f.; Klostermann, 207f.; Creed, 263f.; Easton, 321; K. Th. Schäfer*; H. Chadwick*; Leaney, 72–75), and there has recently been some reaction in its favour (A.

Vööbus*; M. Rese*). In favour of this shorter text it can be argued: 1. It is briefer and more difficult than the longer text. 2. The longer text can be explained as due to assimilation to 1 Cor. 11:24 and Mk. 14:24b, whereas it is hard to see why an original long text should have been abbreviated. 3. The style of vs. 19b–20 is not Lucan. 4. Luke's aversion to 'ransom'-theology (cf. 22:27, diff. Mk. 10:45) precluded him from incorporating sacrificial ideas into his understanding of the death of Jesus. 5. Redactional study suggests that the shorter text can be explained in terms of Lucan editing of Mk. to change an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper into an account of Jesus' last Passover meal.

The case for the retention of the longer text has been put especially by Jeremias, *Words*, 139–159; Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 159–192; K. Aland*, 202f.; K. Snodgrass*; and it appears in *Synopsis*; UBS³; JB; and versions dependent on UBS. For a balanced discussion see Metzger, 173–177. In its favour may be argued: 1. The shorter text, supported as it is by only *one* Greek MS is extremely unlikely to be original. Only part of the western textual tradition supports the shorter text, and an interpolation throughout the rest of the entire textual tradition is highly improbable. 2. The longer text is not based on 1 Cor. 11. Linguistic analysis shows that it contains several differences from Paul's text. These are pre-Lucan in style, and they reflect a more primitive version of the text. (Hence the un-Lucan features of the text do not point to a late interpolation.) 3. The omission produces a difficult narrative: Lk. 22:19a can hardly have stood on its own. 4. The omission in the shorter text may have been due to an attempt to preserve the secrecy of the words of institution (Jeremias, *Words*, 156–169) – although it is hard to see why this motif did not affect the text of Mt. and Mk. Or it may reflect liturgical practice in the second century (Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 185–190). Or again confusion may have arisen as a result of Luke's earlier mention of a cup shared by the disciples. 5. Elsewhere Luke retains sacrificial ideas (Acts 20:28), and it is unlikely that 22:27 is due to theological editing of Mk. 10:45 to remove the 'ransom' element. The argument that the present text is due to redaction of Mk. fails to convince.

The external evidence for the longer text is overwhelming. The weakness in the argument lies in accounting for the origin of the shorter text (Ellis, 255), but this may be due simply to some scribal idiosyncrasy. On balance the longer text is to be preferred.

The longer text is thus similar to Mk. 14:22 and 1 Cor. 11:23–25, but is sufficiently different from them to make it improbable that it is a literary derivation from them; on the contrary, it represents a more primitive form of text than 1 Cor. 11:23–26 and stands closer to Mk. 14:22–25. As for the differences between Lk. and Mk. at this point, it is not possible to affirm with certainty that one is more primitive than the other. The Marcan form is more Semitic, and Jeremias, *Words*, 189–191, claims that it stands closest to the original form. On the other

hand, the claims of the Lucan text to come closest to the original form have been defended by Schürmann, *Einsetzungsbericht*. Patsch, 87–89, confirms the view of Jeremias, but stresses that there can be no possibility of reconstructing ‘the oldest form’, and hence of regarding the sayings as *ipsissima verba* of Jesus. Nevertheless, the basic motifs expressed in the sayings can be shown to be in agreement with what we otherwise know of the teaching of Jesus (Patsch, 106ff.), and hence in our opinion a line can be drawn from the historical Last Supper to the sayings recorded here, even if it is impossible to be sure as to 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 (*pace* E. Schweizer*, 26). 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 (cf. J. Jeremias, TDNT V, 712–717; France, 110–135).

The fact that the institution narrative can be separated off from the tradition of the Passover meal does not lead to the conclusion that originally there was a report of the meal without the words of institution. It is more likely that the essential part of the story which related to the institution of the Lord’s Supper was separated off from its framework for cultic use, as 1 Cor. 11:23–26 would appear to indicate, and was then replaced in a Passover setting when the passion narrative was being put together.

In its Lucan form the narrative describes how Jesus linked his self-giving with the bread, thus giving a parallel with the pouring out of his blood. This takes place for the benefit of the persons present (‘you’) rather than the ‘many’ in general. If the allusion to Is. 53 is played down by this wording, the link with the new covenant in Je. 31 is strengthened over against Mk. The inclusion of the command to repeat the rite makes it clear that the account represents the foundation of the Lord’s Supper in the church.

See WH App., 63f.; G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, London, 1929, 86–184; J. Behm, TDNT III, 726–743; L. Goppelt, TDNT VI, 135–158; G. D. Kilpatrick, ‘Luke XXII.19b–20’, JTS 47, 1946, 49–56; Jeremias, *Words*; Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 159–192 (originally as ‘Lk. 22, 19b–20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung’, Bib. 32, 1951, 366–392, 522–541); id., *Einsetzungsbericht*; K. Th. Schäfer, ‘Zur Textgeschichte von Lk. 22, 19b.20’, Bib. 33, 1952, 237–239; D. Jones, ‘ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI.25’, JTS ns 6, 1955, 183–191; H. Chadwick, ‘The Shorter Text of Luke XXII.15–20’, HTR 50, 1957, 249–258; Leancy, 72–75; H. Kosmala, ‘Das Tut zu meinem Gedächtnis’, Nov.T 4, 1960, 81–94; Ellis, 249–256; A. Vööbus, ‘A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke’, NTS 15, 1968–69, 457–463; id., ‘Kritische Beobachtungen über die lukanische Darstellung des Herrenmahls’, ZNW 61, 1970, 102–110; A. R. Millard, ‘Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians’, in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, Exeter, 1970, 242–248; Patsch; K. Snodgrass, ‘Western Non-Interpolations’, JBL 91, 1972, 369–379; Metzger, 173–177; M. Rese, ‘Zur Problematik von Kurz- und Langtext in Luk. XXII. 17ff.’, NTS 22, 1975–76, 15–31; B. Klappert, in NIDNTT II, 520–538.

(19) The report commences in the same way as Mk., diff. Paul, but omitting Mark’s reference to the meal (ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν). For λαβῶν cf.

Mk. 6:41; 8:6; Lk. 24:30, 43; Acts 27:35; ἄρτος is a 'loaf', whether of leavened or unleavened bread. The reference is to the bread served at the beginning of the main course of the Passover meal, over which grace was said (Jeremias, *Words*, 86f.). For εὐχαριστέω cf. 22:17; Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:24; diff. Mk. 14:22 εὐλογέω; Schürmann, *Einsetzungsbericht*, 45–47, demonstrates that Luke can be using tradition here rather than editing Mk. κλάω, 'to break', is used in the NT solely of dividing up bread at a meal (24:30; Acts 2:46; 20:7, 11; 27:35; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:24; Mk. 8:6, 19; 14:22; Mt. 14:19; 15:36; 26:26**); J. Behm, TDNT III, 726–743). The action was a customary part of the preparation for eating; but this does not explain why it is specially mentioned here, and why it became the basis of a technical term for the Lord's Supper (cf. Schürmann, op. cit., 30). The element of distribution of one loaf among many was probably decisive (1 Cor. 10:16f.). ἔδωκεν is found in Mk. but not in Paul, possibly because the use of ἔκλασεν was felt to include the idea of distribution. In the word of interpretation which accompanies the action Luke does not have the initial λάβετε found in Mk. (contrast 22:17); it is an open question whether it belongs to the original form of the saying, and has not been introduced as a liturgical direction (Schürmann, op. cit., 113f.). τοῦτο, referring to the bread (masc.) is neuter by assimilation to the predicate (BD 132). There would be no Aramaic verb corresponding to ἐστίν (Jeremias, *Words*, 201); the verb can mean 'it signifies' rather than 'it is identical with'. The meaning assigned to σῶμα depends on the meaning of the underlying Aramaic word (cf. Schürmann, op. cit. 119 n. 416). Here opinion is divided. 1. G. Dalman*, 141–143, suggested *gupā* as equivalent, a word that means the person as a whole ('body' in contrast to 'soul'). He is followed by J. Behm; TDNT III, 736; Cranfield, 426; Kümmel, 119f.; E. Schweizer, TDNT VII, 1059. The phrase would then be reminiscent of 'the body of the Passover (lamb)' in Pes. 10:4 (cf. C. K. Barrett, *I Corinthians*, London, 1968, 266). Jeremias's objections to this parallel (*Words*, 198f.) do not seem cogent. 2. The other possibility is *bisrā*, 'flesh', championed by Jeremias, op. cit., 198–201, who argues that 'flesh and blood' form a pair, that Jn. 6:51 offers an independent parallel to the bread-word with σὰρξ instead of σῶμα, and that σῶμα can be used as a translation of *bāsār* in the LXX. In this way, we get a parallelism between the bread-word and the cup-word, and both sayings have a sacrificial sense, since they presuppose the separation of flesh and blood in death. The use of σῶμα rather than σὰρξ may have been for the benefit of gentiles, and possibly to gain assonance with αἷμα. This view is criticised by Schürmann, op. cit., 18f., 107–110. He argues that in Lk. we do not have synthetic parallelism between the two sayings (as in Mk.), and that the use of σῶμα as a translation for *bisrā* is unlikely; he also argues that originally the two sayings were separated by the meal, and therefore were not meant to be understood in the light of one another. These objections are not convincing. In particular the bringing together of the two

sayings in the narrative suggests that the early church regarded 'body and blood' as a pair and understood the two sayings in the light of each other. The evidence that at an earlier stage they were understood differently is not compelling. In either case, however, the thought is of the offering made by Jesus, whether of himself in the sense of Mk. 10:45 or of his flesh along with his blood in sacrificial death.

It is in the part of the verse which belongs to the 'longer text' that Luke's wording goes beyond that of Mk. The body of Jesus is *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον*; Paul lacks *διδόμενον*, but since his formulation is difficult in Aramaic, and since reasons can be adduced for regarding it as secondary, the Lucan tradition appears to be older at this point (Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 17–30; cf. Jeremias, *Words*, 104, 167). The present participle has a future sense (1:35 note); the passive may refer to a being given by Jesus (Is. 53:10) or by God (Is. 53:6, 12), and Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 20f., thinks that the former thought is uppermost (cf. Mk. 10:45). The phrase can be used with reference to sacrifice (Ex. 30:14; Lv. 22:14; cf. Lk. 2:24; Jn. 6:51) or to martyrdom (Is. 53:10). Similarly *ὑπὲρ* can be used with reference to the action of a martyr (2 Mac. 7:9; 8:21; 4 Mac. 1:8, 10) or to a sacrificial offering for guilt or sin (Lv. 5:7; 6:23; Ezk. 43:21); in the NT it is used with reference to redemption (Gal. 1:4; 3:13) and can express representative or substitutionary action. We should perhaps combine the sacrificial and martyrological motifs. In Mk. the same phrase, suitably adapted, appears in connection with the cup (*τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*), and this raises the questions whether the motif originally belonged to the bread or the cup sayings, and whether *ὑμῶν* or *πολλῶν* is original. Jeremias, *Words*, 166–168, holds that the phrase was formed on the analogy of the cup saying (cf. Patsch, 73–87), while Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 115–123 (cf. 65–69, 112f.) holds that it is original and the wording of the cup saying is secondary. Jeremias argues that the phrase in Paul is due to Paul himself, that the Lucan form is unsemitic in its word order, that the *πολλῶν* form is earlier than the *ὑμῶν* form, and that the brevity of the bread saying called for completion and the tendency to parallelism with the cup saying led to assimilation. Schürmann argues that the phrase is possible in Aramaic, and this seems to be right. He further claims that the saying understands Jesus' death martyrologically in the light of Is. 53, and not sacrificially in the sense of v. 20b, so that a climactic parallelism is given to v. 20a (the martyrological death of Jesus leads to the establishment of the new covenant); but this train of thought is lost if the participial phrase is lacking. Finally, it would be unlikely for the bread saying to contain no soteriological explanation, and no explanation could be read back from the cup saying which (originally) was separated from it by the whole meal: it was Mark, therefore, who transferred the phrase from the bread saying to the cup saying, although Schürmann finds it difficult to explain why he did so.

Jeremias's reasons are on the whole the less compelling. Paul's

phrase can be based on Luke's, which is not obviously non-semitic. The relative antiquity of *πολλῶν* and *ὑμῶν* is a separate issue. Jeremias's strongest point is that a brief saying was more likely to be given a soteriological explanation than a longer saying to be curtailed. The problem is whether this is less probable than that the saying originally contained no explanation. But the saying is so enigmatic without an explanation that it probably had one from the start. This does not necessarily commit us to Schürmann's view of the meaning of the saying, which we have already had reason to doubt, so far as the interpretation of *σῶμα* is concerned. But the idea of the self-giving of Jesus in death does make good sense in the context. If this reference to Is. 53 is present, then it becomes probable that Mark's *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* preserves the original wording, and Schürmann's arguments to the contrary (op. cit., 75–77) are unconvincing. But the whole problem is still *sub judice*.

Finally, there is the command to perform the action, found with both bread and cup sayings in Paul, only with the bread saying in Lk., and entirely omitted in Mk. The repetition of the command in Paul is generally thought to be secondary. Jeremias, *Words*, 168, holds that the command is not part of the oldest liturgical text; nevertheless, he claims that it is probably historical, having survived in a separate tradition, since its thought fits in with that of Jesus. This argument depends on Jeremias' unusual (and, in our opinion, untenable) interpretation of the phrase, and is therefore dubious. Schürmann, op. cit., 30–34, 123–128, presents a case for the wording forming part of the original text. He argues that Luke did not derive the phrase from Paul, since in Lk. it is primarily a command to repeat the rite in the future, whereas in Paul it has become primarily a command to remember Jesus. But this argument is weak, because the difference in meaning arises out of the different literary character of the two reports. More weight attaches to the fact that the account presupposes a continuance of the rite (22:16, 18), and that continuance demands a command of Jesus to this effect; the main argument against the authenticity of the command is that Jesus expected the parousia so soon that there would be no time for a repetition of the rite, but this is an improbable assumption (cf. Kümmel, 64–83; Patsch, 142–150). Finally, Schürmann offers reasons why Mark may have omitted the command, especially that once the Lord's Supper had become established custom a command to repeat it was less necessary; we should remember that Paul's account is concerned with the institution of the Lord's Supper, and Mark's with a description of the Last Supper. Accordingly the command may have belonged to the original form of the narrative, and may even be historical. Its original position is probably as in Lk., and it was repeated in Paul's formula for the sake of the parallelism. *τοῦτο* will refer to the action of sharing the bread, since the meal came to be known as 'the breaking of bread', perhaps together with the associated words. *ποιέω* is used of repeating rites (Ex. 29:35; Nu. 15:11–13; Dt. 25:9; 1QS 2:19; 1QSa 2:21; Jeremias, *Words*, 250f.).

ἀνάμνησις (1 Cor. 11:24, 25; Heb. 10:3**) is 'remembrance', and the whole phrase is usually understood to mean, 'Do this so that you will remember me'; *ἐμός* is equivalent to *μου*. There is no connection with Hellenistic commemorative meals for the dead (see the study of the evidence by Jeremias, *Words*, 238–243). Jeremias himself, *Words* 244–255, understands the saying as a request that God will remember Jesus by causing the kingdom to come at the parousia (cf. 1 Cor. 11:26 with *ἄχρι οὗ* understood as an expression of purpose; Did. 10:5f.). Cf. Lv. 24:7; Pss. 69:1 LXX.; 37:1 LXX.; Sir. 45:9, 11, 16; 50:16; 1 Es. 99:3; 97:7; 103:4; cf. H. Kosmala*; Grundmann, 398. But this interpretation is unlikely. Paul understood the action in terms of proclaiming the death of Jesus, i.e. to men and not to God. Moreover, the Jewish background adduced by Jeremias should be differently interpreted (E. Jones*; A. R. Millard*). We therefore prefer the view that the action is to remind the disciples of Jesus and of the significance of his death.

(20) Luke's introduction to the cup saying is almost identical with that in Paul. Paul's word-order *ὡσαύτως καί* is probably original, and Luke's is secondary (but pre-Lucan), giving parallelism with v. 19a and reflecting the later practice of placing both bread and cup after the church meal; Luke himself dislikes the present word-order (cf. 20:31 diff. Mk. 12:21; Schürmann, op. cit., 34–36; Jeremias, *Words*, 122–154). Schürmann, op. cit., 83–85, further argues that this brief description, with *ὡσαύτως* replacing Mark's more detailed account, is more primitive, since Mark appears to be filled out liturgically, while Luke's wording is asymmetrical and has echoes in Jn. 6:11 and Mk. 8:7. The cup (diff. Mk. which is anarthrous) is the third cup in the Passover ritual which followed the meal, the so-called cup of blessing (1 Cor. 10:16; S I IV:2, 628, 630f.; IV:1, 58, 72; L. Goppelt, TDNT VI, 154–156; but see above on v. 17). The phrase *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* separates the two parts of the new ritual from each other by the Passover meal; this may have been reflected in church practice by inserting a common meal between the two parts of the action, but the tendency was certainly to draw the two sayings together, as is seen in the omission of the phrase in Mk. For *δειπνῶ* cf. 17:8; 1 Cor. 11:25 and Rev. 3:20**; the use of the word suggests that Rev. 3:20 has eucharistic associations. Both Luke and Paul omit Mark's note that all the disciples drank from the cup, which would seem an unnecessary statement of the obvious (see Schürmann op. cit., 87f.). It may have been meant to justify the unusual action involved in sharing a common cup. The omission means that Mark's *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς* (which implies that the cup saying followed the act of drinking) is unnecessary, and a simple participle suffices.

The wording of the cup saying differs considerably from Mk. In Mk. *τοῦτο* refers to the wine in the cup which represents the blood of Jesus, understood as the blood of a covenant-inaugurating sacrifice (Ex 24:8), poured out for the benefit of many. In Lk. and Paul *τοῦτο* is explained as referring to the cup, and it is the cup (with its contents) which