

inversion early came to offend the sense of propriety, and so the order is restored by adding a second cup after the bread, the first being regarded as belonging to the preliminary passover supper. The words inserted are taken almost verbatim from Paul's account of the institution of the cup (1 Cor. xi., 25), and were probably put in by some early copyist for the very purpose of overcoming the difficulty. Some of the Syriac manuscripts which omit the passage, reach the same end by changing the order of the verses, putting v. 19 before v. 17. This is sufficient to justify us in concluding that both devices are intentional variations of the original text. Now, omitting the 20th verse of Luke's account the saying as to not drinking again the fruit of the vine falls into the same place as the corresponding one in Matthew and Mark, and may be identified with it. The earlier statement in Luke that He would not eat the passover again until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God is, of course, not identical with either, but is of the same purport.

The general meaning of the two-fold statement is plain enough. It is a warning to His disciples that He was then keeping His last passover, nay, that He was taking His last meal of any kind with them before the great crisis came that was to mean so much both for Him and for them. He would not again eat or drink with them, for His time had come and He must lay down His life for men. The separation which this would necessarily involve, however, was not to be forever. He holds out the expectation that He would again join them in another feast at some future time under happier circumstances. The dark cloud had a silver lining of hope that they might not despair.

So far all is clear. But what are we to understand by this future occasion?

In the various gospel reports of the saying we find the occasion defined in three different ways by as many *untils*: "Until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom;" "until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God;" "until the Kingdom of God shall come." The first of these is probably the one which the majority of readers find most perplexing, and if it stood alone might easily carry us off on a wrong track. But if, as we have seen, all three are probably only variant reports of the same saying, none of them perhaps giving the exact words, scientific exegesis must take them all into account in forming any opinion of the meaning, and endeavor to find out what the thought is that underlies them all. Only by doing so shall we discover what He really meant. Nor is there any great difficulty in arriving at a solution when once this comparative method is adopted. Though the forms of definition are so different in appearance, it is obvious that all three virtually come to the same thing. They are all eschatological