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ABSTRACT

The subject of this research is ‘An Exegetical and Theological study of the Institution of the Lord’s Supper: Luke 22:7-23’. With a background of meals from the socio-cultural and religious perspectives, the dissertation talks about the social and religious significance of meals in both ancient and modern cultures. As one of the important institutions of Jesus before his demise, the Supper is affirmed to have been taken after the Jewish Passover meal. The thesis first investigates the understanding of Jesus’ institution narrative in the Gospel of Luke to find out what he intends to communicate to his disciples and how they understood his words in the observance of the Supper. It then contextualizes the study within the Ghanaian church. After an exegesis of Luke 22:7-23 within the context of the Lord’s Supper, the thesis discusses some major theological themes from the synthesis of the exegetical analysis. It then examines the relevance of the interpretation of the narrative account to the Ghanaian church after looking at how Ghanaians are celebrating the Supper today. This analysis will help us to engage the aspect of the Lord’s Supper that has direct correlation with the Ghanaian way of life.

The study was conducted using the narrative criticism in order to examine the effect of Jesus’ words on the disciples. Approaching it from the exegetical and theological perspectives, I analysed the compositional structural elements of the text to underscore what Luke intended to communicated to his readers. Themes such as regeneration, forgiveness and baptism are discussed as prerequisite for discipleship. It also discusses unity among believers, the new covenant and salvation in relation to the Supper. The thesis establishes that the Lord’s Supper was instituted precisely for the Disciples of Christ and that it is through faith that one can get the blessings associated with observing the Supper. It has also revealed that the supper represents both cooperate and individual family relation with God which must be emphasized in the Eucharistic celebration through a strong bond of unity. Again the death of Christ which is symbolically interpreted in the Lord’s Supper was sacrificial. This conclusion was arrived at from the Jewish understanding of vicarious death. In sacrifice, blood is always presented as symbolism of life and so Jesus’ death is to be understood from this background. The thesis also establishes that some of these important values been communicated through the Supper to the disciples are not alien to the Ghanaian traditional culture. Most of these values are practiced within the Ghanaian society. Therefore the celebration of the Supper helps Ghanaian Christians to better understand them as they appropriate the meaning of the Supper as interpreted in the Lucan account of the institution narrative. The thesis draws the conclusion that for the Ghanaian Christian, the Supper is a ritual that seeks to transform the believer. This transformation which occurs both in the way the Supper is observed and its meaning integrated into their daily relationship within the Christian community is what underlines the celebration of the Eucharist.
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CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The Lord’s Supper is one of the most important sacraments instituted by Jesus when he was approaching the climax of his ministry on earth. In the ancient world as everywhere else, people ate meals primarily for the sake of satisfying their hunger and enjoying the pleasure given by food. Food is often served at various occasions to be enjoyed with people, friends, family and strangers, as an expression of hospitality. In Ghana, for instance, meals are served at naming ceremonies, puberty rites, marriages, and even funerals where people are supposed to be mourning, because of its social significance. In some parts of the world, meals are used to seal reconciliatory activities between disputing factions. In the Old Testament when Jacob returned to Laban after his flight from Haran, the reconciliation was sealed with a meal (Gen 31:54). This goes a long way to express the importance of meals in the social setup of both ancient and modern cultures. In the New Testament, Jesus ate meals in the homes of some people during his ministry (Luke 7:34). Roger Bowen maintains that Jesus often enjoyed meals with his disciples and with ‘sinners’. He provided for the hungry, went to parties, and enjoyed eating and drinking often in bad company.¹ So did his disciples.

Meals also carry religious significance depending on how, where and why they are offered and eaten. According to Howard Ian Marshall, in ancient Israel, people went to the temple to offer animal sacrifices and to share in a common meal. Marshall posits that, ‘They could be said to be eating before the Lord,’² and the occasion was one of praise and rejoicing. Such meals could be regarded as communion between God and his people and

seen to be religious. Meanwhile, there were religious dimensions, expressed in thanksgiving to God, in ordinary Jewish meals which was different from the religious meals which had elements of sacrifice. This ascertain the fact that prior to Jesus’ era and that of the church, thanksgiving to God for what was eaten and drunk certainly existed.

There were other Jewish festal meals which were eaten by the people of Israel. One of such was the Passover, the context in which the Synoptic Gospels indicate Jesus’ Last Supper took place. This view has been challenged by some scholars on account of the time it was eaten and the elements used. Benjamin Wisner Bacon argues that the ritual observance that Jesus’ supper proceeds from was not the Passover, but the far simpler one of the Kiddush, a common Jewish ritual on the eve of every Sabbath and of every feast-day. Its name (Kiddush, ‘sanctification’) is derived from the fact that the day was made ‘holy’. In this ritual sanctification, the elements used are simply ‘a cup of wine and a loaf of leavened bread’ and the ministrant is the head of the family. In his view, Jesus, according to the Lucan account, employs this ritual of sanctification. By the time it was celebrated it could be understood as sanctification of Passover; making Luke’s chronology coincides with that of John’s Gospel. To him, there is no connection of the ceremony to Jesus’ death.

Meanwhile, J. Jeremias has listed and examined features in the same account that suggest that a Passover meal was held as cited by Marshall. Jeremias argues on this account using the twelve disciples that Jesus ate the Supper with as against the large crowd that Jesus sometimes ate with as remarkable of the number required for a Passover meal.

---

3 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 66.
4 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 66.
5 This is a common Jewish ritual performed on the eve of every Sabbath and of every feast-day in which a cup of wine and a loaf of leavened bread is used with the purpose of sanctifying the day. In this ritual the ministrant is the head of the family.
8 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 59.
This argument has, however, been refuted on the account that there is no proof that Jesus usually ate with a large company of people and also that there is the possibility of some of the women associated with Jesus’ followers being present at the Last Supper. A stronger argument put forth by Jeremias in support of the meal as a Passover one is the interpretation of the significance of the bread and wine by Jesus.\(^9\) He explains that Jesus was following the normal practice of the Passover.

In the article, ‘The Early History of the Lord’s Supper’, Hank Jan de Jonge also argues that the pattern of the Lord’s Supper conforms to that of normal Hellenistic Communal Supper, which consisted of a meal and ensuing symposium.\(^10\) He explains that such suppers were held periodically in all sorts of clubs, societies, associations, religious guilds and other groups, in which the members wanted to give shape to their ideal of unity, community, equality and brotherhood. In line with the various scholarly arguments on the Last Supper as a Passover meal, I agree with Marshall that the agreement of the Synoptic Gospels, with the paschal features in the account of the institution makes the Passover meal the most obvious background for the Last Supper of Jesus and his disciples.

The Lord’s Supper, κυρίακόν δείπνον, occurs once in the New Testament (I Cor. 11:20), but its institution is described in all the four gospels. Δείπνον most often designates the ordinary meal, to which guests could be invited.\(^11\) Nelson B. Baker defines it as the taking of bread and wine in accordance with Christ’s institution.\(^12\) Other meaningful names are the Holy Communion, the Eucharist, and Breaking of Bread. Scholars are of the view that the tradition concerning the institution of the Lord’s Supper by Jesus during the Last

---


Supper is most likely a Post-Easter etiology. Bacon affirming this view says that ‘the history of the Lord’s Supper goes back to the practice of one single group of Jewish followers of Jesus who remains faithful to him after his death’.13 This is because all early Christian witnesses of the weekly celebration of the Lord’s Supper agree that it was celebrated on Sunday evening.

In an attempt to resolve the dilemma as to whether the words of Jesus at the Last Supper should be taken as referring to the Lord’s Supper or to the heavenly banquet, Marshall discusses the argument by L. Goppelt that the Lord’s Supper can be regarded as the feast of fulfilment in the kingdom of God inasmuch as it is in anticipation of the heavenly banquet.14 He therefore establishes the fact that as the early church met to celebrate the rite; it came to be known as the Lord’s Supper. Though this idea is supported by most scholars, some prefer the use of other terminologies depending on their church’s tradition. The choice of Luke’s Gospel for this study is because of its comprehensive nature15 and the emphasis on special issues in the gospel. Beginning with the annunciations of John the Baptist and Jesus, he continues with the infant narratives and ends with the ascension; something which is not common to the other synoptic accounts. It has a longer account of the Lord’s Supper than its synoptic counterparts, and it is especially detailed in its account. In another respect, he alone presents two cups in his institution narrative, one before the bread and another one afterwards (Luke 22: 17 and 20).

14 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 80.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Due to the fact that the evangelists did not write a history or biography of Jesus but presented faith to the people, they composed their texts to suit their readers who obviously were from different cultural backgrounds.\(^{16}\) In view of this there are different accounts of the Lord’s Supper which differ from one another in some details. From this backdrop, one begins to wonder whether Christians today understands what the evangelists communicated to their readers. Some also wonder if what is done in the observance of the Supper is actually in consonance with the word of God. It is therefore important to study the gospel accounts individually to know what the authors aimed at communicating to their respective readers.

More important is such an approach because the interpretation of the different gospel accounts has influenced Christian thought including the understanding of the Lord’s Supper.\(^{17}\) David Steinmetz, in his article ‘Scripture and the Lord’s Supper in Luther’s Theology’ intimates that ‘the debate about the Eucharist between Luther and his Protestant opponents was in fact a struggle over the way to understand and appropriate Scripture’.\(^{18}\) Zwingli, for instance interpreted the words, “this is my body,” in line with certain exegetical suggestions made by Cornelius Hoen, a Dutch humanist.\(^{19}\) This makes biblical exegesis indispensable in theological thinking. But researchers seem to focus more on the historical and theological developments of the Lord’s Supper than exegetical studies of the texts.

Manfred Oeming has indicated that the text to be interpreted is that which partially carries the intention of the author, and interpretation is the process by which the reader

---


\(^{18}\) David C. Steinmetz, ‘Scripture and the Lord’s Supper in Luther’s Theology’ [http://int.sagepub.com/content/37/3/253], [accessed March 23 2012].

\(^{19}\) Steinmetz, ‘Scripture and the Lord’s Supper’, 255.
interacts with the text. That is, read the text, examines and listens to the words of the text as a medium of communicating the author’s message. Ossom-Batsa defines a text as ‘A structured event of communication between the subjects of the communication, where the subjects are the author and the reader’. Each of these subjects play significant roles to make communication occur because, meaning is an event that engages both the author and the reader. In the light of this, one may want to find out how unique Luke’s account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper is from the other gospel accounts; whether the interpretation of Luke’s account has informed the understanding and celebration of the Lord’s Supper, and whether the understanding of the institution has raised any theological issues in Christianity? The research examines these through an exegesis of Luke’s account of the Lord’s Supper because proper handling of a text is paramount to understanding the message communicated.

1.3 Research Questions

The main research question for this study is:

What message did Jesus intends to communicate to his readers in Luke’s account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper?

The Sub research question is:

How has the interpretation of Luke’s Gospel account informed the understanding and celebration of the institution of the Lord’s Supper among Christians in Ghana?

---

1.4 Aims and Objectives

The study sought to achieve the following objectives:

- To establish the message Luke intends to communicate to his readers to understand its uniqueness in order to enhance teaching and learning of the subject.
- To explore the major theological themes from the analysis for further understanding of the Supper among Christians.
- To underscore the relevance of the interpretation of Luke’s account of the Lord’s Supper for the celebration of the Supper among Christians in Ghana.

1.5 Methodology and Methods of Data Collection

The Literary Critical Method was used for this research. According to Randolph Tate, it is an explication of a text that attempts to understand the intention and accomplishment of the author by analysing the compositional structural element of the text.\(^{22}\) Under this method, I used Narrative Criticism which is the analysis of the narrative content within the context of relationship between author, text, and readers.\(^{23}\) This method was chosen because it is primarily oriented on the reader. It has in view the effect of the narrative on the readers and the way in which the text makes them cooperate in deciphering the meaning.\(^{24}\) The author of the gospel categorized it as a narrative or orderly account in the preface of the gospel. Therefore using this method helped to keep to order which is relevant in reading narratives and also in analysing the coordination between the compositional elements of the narrative.\(^{25}\)


\(^{24}\) Daniel Marguerat and Yvan Bourguin (eds), *How to Read Bible Stories* (London: SMC Press, 1999), 7.

I used primary and secondary sources for data collection. The primary sources include The Greek New Testament Bible and The New Revised Standard Version Bible. I used these sources because they are critical editions of the Bible required for scholarly work. The secondary sources I used were critical Bible commentaries on the Gospel of Luke and other critical Bible Commentaries, published books, journal articles and internet sources on the topic. In order to situate the work within the scholarly purview, The Speech Act theory has been used as the theoretical framework for the research. The theory contends that ‘verbal utterances not only say things; they also do things’. Eugene Botha also agrees that it is a theory of language use and its effect. J. L. Austin, the chief proponent of this theory as cited by Brown posits that an utterance has locution which is what the person said, an illocution which refers to what is accomplished by what the speaker said and the intended effect inherent in what is said as perlocution. The theory emphasizes the functional nature of language which both says and does things.

When Christians observe the Lord’s Supper, they participate in it in obedience to the command and example of Jesus; that is, what he said and did. There is therefore an intimate connection between the word and sacrament, and this affirms the actions of the words Jesus spoke in the Eucharistic narrative. This affirms that actions other than speaking can be performed in the act of speaking and by the act of speaking as Kevin Vanhoozer intimates in the work of Clarke. In effect, the Supper must be understood in the context of the gospel and its sacramental function should be explained to those participating in it.

28 Brown, Scripture as Communication, 32.
This theory was relevant for the study because it directs attention toward utterances and the effects achieved by these utterances in a particular speech context. It helped in analysing what Jesus said and did at the Last Supper and the resulting action of what was said by the disciples. Again, it was suitable for the study because it helps in analyzing a text at more than one level. In this speech context, the utterances of the characters and the communicative acts that took place were analyzed. As the biblical exegete seeks to comprehend meaning, his aim is to grasp the original intent of the author; and as Botha contends ‘language and words are not neutral careers of meaning but actually have effect and achieve’. This theory which focuses on the performative aspect of language is a relevant framework for the study because in an attempt to examine whether the disciples understood what Jesus said in the narrative and the influence this interpretation had on the disciples and in contemporary times. The theory helps to focus on the performative aspect of the text.

1.6 Scope of the Research

This study which concerns the analysis of scripture focuses on the Evangelist Luke’s account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper as found in Chapter 22:7-23 of the Gospel. The study is limited to the literary analysis of the institution of the Lord’s Supper in Luke. Though it forms part of a larger block of narratives, this passage presents the full account of the Supper. Again, the passage of institution in Luke is not a mere agglutination of unrelated fragments, but a closely connected whole, having its own very marked and distinctive character. The Gospel of Luke was selected because unlike the other Gospel Evangelists, Luke was quite early seen as the evangelist who wrote for Gentiles, and so

---

31 Botha, ‘Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation’, 282
his account is relevant for the context of the study. Holladay posits that Luke supplied an account that is comprehensive, coherent and well researched, and so was meaningful for this study. In addition, the style of Luke’s Gospel is very unique and he writes very good Greek which facilitates the analysis of the pericope. The chosen passage is a complete unit and so could be considered for the study.

I have also limited the contextualization of the text to the Church in Ghana with the Methodist Church Ghana as an example. The Methodist Church Ghana was chosen because apart from being in a gentile context like that of Luke’s readers, the observance of the Supper by this church is similar to Luke’s Eucharistic narrative and so studying the text in this context helps to ascertain the interpretation that guides their celebration.

1.7 Literature Review

There are a lot of scholarly works on the subject because of its importance in Christianity. However, only those relevant to the study were reviewed. Joseph A. Fitzmyer in his book, *The Gospel According to Luke: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* has done a very comprehensive work on the second part of the Gospel of Luke. He looked at the ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem, the various teachings and parables, healings which occurred etc. He indicates that as part of the passion narratives, the preparation for the Passover meal and the Last Supper comes after Judas’ agreement to betray Jesus and it is followed by Jesus foretelling his betrayal. To him though it seems to be a straightforward account, ‘The Lucan account of the Last Supper is a scholar’s paradise and a beginner’s nightmare’. The account is very different from that of John. He explains that though inspired by the Marcan account, Luke has transposed the mention of Judas’ betrayal slightly changing its order to create a better discourse after the meal itself. Fitzmyer also

establishes that apart from the meal proposed to be a *Kiddush* meal, it is also said to be a *hābūrāh* and an Essene meal.\(^{36}\) His analysis is very detailed and expounds on the words. The commentary also provides background understanding to the text. Alfred Plummer’s *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* also affirms the Last Supper as a Passover meal as he analyses the text. He adds that ἐπηζπκίᾳ ἐπεζύκεζα is a Hebraism common expression and its combination with τοῦ με παθεῖν is very remarkable;\(^{38}\) because Jesus’ knowledge of the intensity of the suffering did not cancel the intensity of his desire. His detailed word study gives in depth knowledge of the text.

Describing the nature of the Lord’s Supper, Philip Camp drew theological and ethical links between the New Testament texts on the subject and the Sabbath in his article ‘The Lord’s Supper as Sabbath Observance’. Camp indicated in his work that there is still enough theological links between the Lord’s Supper and the Sabbath commandments.\(^{39}\) Dwelling on the Old Testament texts in Exodus and Deuteronomy and some New Testaments texts on the Lord’s Supper, he posits that biblical commentators often draw their theological reflections of relationship between the Passover and Passion of Jesus as anticipated in the Last Supper.\(^{40}\) He argues that the meal was observed weekly by the Christians instead of annually, hence it is more linked to the Sabbath than the Passover.\(^{41}\) In his view, the link between the Lord’s Supper and Sabbath is not negated by the Passover because they are all connected to redemption so it could be the Lord’s Supper and Sabbath rather than the Passover and Lord’s Supper. He maintains that though the institutional narratives of the Synoptic accounts have peculiar redactional and theological emphases based on their readers and theology, they all share the ‘text in three tenses’ characteristics

\(^{36}\) It is a meal participated in by a company of friends or a fraternity of religious Jews.


\(^{40}\) Camp, ‘The Lord’s Supper as Sabbath Observance’, 85.

\(^{41}\) See Camp, ‘The Lord’s Supper as Sabbath Observance’ 85.
as proposed by Davies and Allison. They proposed that the Synoptic accounts, firstly reveals that the institution of the Eucharist from the ecclesiological perspective looks back to the redemptive work of God through the death and resurrection of Jesus. Secondly, it also looks at the present practice of the Eucharist and provides guidance as to how to practice it in at least two ways and thirdly, that the Supper looks forward to the Messianic banquet. 

Ian Howard Marshall in Last Supper and Lord’s Supper has provided a general account on the subject of the Lord’s Supper in the New Testament suggesting fresh understanding of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in the church today with a reminder of the New Testament basis of the Sacrament. With a survey of religious meals in Israel, he proceeds to discuss the Lord’s Supper as a Passover meal which was given a new significance and linked to the heavenly banquet. He explains that following Jesus’ intention, the early church met together for fellowship (Acts 2:42-47) which includes this rite known as Breaking of Bread. William J. Bausch refuted the debate by scholars that Jesus and his disciples celebrated the once-a-year Passover meal not the Weekly Friday evening thanksgiving meal because it was grounded in the Passover meal and had Passover connotations and ceremonies. It had a Paschal character and was understood as such. In his view this accounted for Paul’s saying that, ‘Christ our Passover has been sacrificed’ (I Cor. 5:7) and John seeing the crucified Jesus as the paschal lamb whose bones remain unbroken (John 19:36).

On the significance of the Lord’s Supper, Marshall agrees with G. Wainwright on the eschatological significance which believers have been neglecting. He therefore discusses three basic images which gives the Sacrament its eschatological dimension,

---

42 Camp, ‘The Lord’s Supper as Sabbath Observance’, 86.
43 See camp, ‘The Lord’s Supper as Sabbath Observance’, 86.
44 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 80.
45 Bausch, A New Look at the Sacraments, 133.
namely, the messianic feast, the advent of Christ, and the first fruits of the kingdom. Bowen also explains that it is a movement of grace from God to human beings and we are passive recipients. He identifies three significances of the Eucharist in present, past, and future terms. He argues that Jesus was made human, and instituted the Lord’s Supper so that everyone could see God and come to him. This suggests a soteriological significance. Nevertheless, though Marshall’s book is very relevant to the subject, his work did not address the study in Luke into detail because it was a survey of the New Testament. Also, his work seems to dwell more on the account of Paul. But a careful analysis of the Lucan account will enable us understand better, the message intended for the Gentile readers.

Relevant to this study also is Ralph F. Smith’s article ‘Eucharistic Faith and Practice’ published in the Journal of Bible and Theology. In this article, the author did a comparative study of three churches looking at who participates in the Eucharist, what is said and what is done. Smith provides the pre-requisites of these churches for partaking in the Eucharist in which all the churches he studied subscribe to baptism as a pre-requisite for Eucharistic participation with other few variations rooted in the traditions of those churches. He indicates that decisions regarding participation in the Eucharist reveal significant facets of the Eucharistic theology operative in congregations and denominations. He noted also that whether one sits, stands or kneels also has some impact on how the meal is experienced and interpreted. Such decisions may seem like small things and often they are; yet, even this brief sampling of the variety in ‘what is done’ reveals that the markers of Eucharistic celebrations are overwhelmingly complex and often quite subtle.

46 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 146.
47 Bowen, ‘...So I Send You’, 49-50.
William J. Bausch’s *A New Look at the Sacraments* was also reviewed. The book gives a deeper understanding of the meaning of the sacraments as mysteries of salvation, their functions as community celebrations binding together the members of the church in a common purpose, and the intimate relationship that exist among the various sacraments. In chapter nine of the book titled ‘From Supper to Sacrifice,’ the author posits that we cannot understand the Last Supper without understanding the Jewish Passover meal, and we cannot understand the Passover meal unless we understand what is celebrated, namely the Exodus and deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian slavery.\(^{50}\) He continues that any discussion on the Lord’s Supper must respect the unalterable fact that what Jesus and his disciples were doing at the Last Supper was a celebration of a ritual meal. The Passover meal celebrated what God had done, could do, and would do.\(^{51}\) This view is affirmed by Bowen’s significance of the Eucharist in present, past, and future terms. He would lead his people everlastingly into freedom. So what Jesus was doing at the Last Supper, what he actually did was celebrating this liberation. The memorial meal had something to do with freedom.

In other words, the Last Supper was an acted-out parable. Through it Jesus was announcing his approaching sacrificial death. The close organization of this Supper with the passion narratives affirms the Supper as a paschal meal at which all thoughts centre upon liberation from the condition of slavery, liberation in time past and a still greater liberation to come as the synoptic gospels record. Every time believers celebrate the Eucharist, they enter into Jesus’ experience of death and of its meaning for him and for us.\(^{52}\) The Eucharistic meal is that by which believers enter, as a people, into the mystery of Christ’s sacrifice on the cross which reveals the Father’s liberating love.\(^{53}\) This work


\(^{52}\) Bausch, *A New Look at the Sacraments*, 131.

throws more light on the sacramental nature of the Eucharist and also help in examining the theological themes in the study.

Jonathan Brumberg-Kraus affirms that the Christian Eucharist is a ritual of both separation and re-integration. In his article ‘Not by Bread Alone’, he stressed that the rabbinic Seder is primarily a ritual of re-integration stressing the unbroken link between contemporary Jews and their ancestors despite the exile and the destruction of the temple. Brumberg-Kraus indicates that the Lord’s Supper and the Passover Seder are similar because they both belong to the same category of religious phenomena: meal ritual.54

In his view both the Lord’s Supper and Passover are rituals. He argues from the point of the projected significance and regularity as well as the three structured component of the things shown, things said, and things done in the ritual meal. To him, blessings, songs, words of institution are all examples of things said within a ritual.55 He indicates that a text may provide metaphors which can be acted out which in the case of the Eucharist the realization of the metaphor is in the church called the body of Christ. Again, he indicates that from the Lucan account, the gospel writer ritualizes Jesus’ meal by placing them in a major social drama.56 Brumberg-Kraus did a very good work in describing the ritual nature of the meal. However, his focus was on the ritual dimension of the meal so he dwelt much on the historical symbolism of the ritual components of the meal and did not do any analysis of the language and structure of the institution narrative in order to arrive at meaning.

Roger Bowen in his book, ‘...So I Send You’, devoted the fifth chapter for discussion on the Eucharist and Mission. He examines three aspects of the Eucharist in the New Testament and discusses ways in which the Eucharist can serve the church’s mission

---

54 Jonathan Brumberg-Kraus ‘Not by Bread Alone…’: The Ritualization of Food and Table Talk in the Passover Seder and in the Last Supper http://wheatoncollege.edu/academic/academicdept/religion/.../mm_chptvl.p [accessed 20 March 2012].
55 Brumberg-Kraus ‘Not by Bread Alone’, 169.
56 Brumberg-Kraus ‘Not by Bread Alone’, 169.
today. Bowen identified five resemblances of the Eucharist and the Passover and affirms that Christians receive the benefits of Christ’s death which sets them right with God. He, however, argues that the church has often made the Eucharist into a mystery which keeps ordinary people away from God. He says they do this to defend their own purity and holiness. But a table which is guarded so fiercely may not be the Lord’s Table but the church’s table.\footnote{Bowen, ‘…So I Send You’, 56.}

He critiqued the Eucharistic celebration of the church that mysterious dimension of it makes it difficult for people to understand and some denominations make it appear as if only some special people can understand it. But for him this was not what Jesus intended. He intended the Eucharist to be very simple, hence his usage of ordinary food and drink on the table in front of him as simple signs of the meaning of his death on the cross. This view is also shared by Howard Marshall as he indicates that Jesus did not touch on the important element of the Passover which is the lamb, but the bread and wine in the Last Supper.\footnote{Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 144.}

Ossom-Batsa’s article ‘Bread for the Broken: Pragmatic Meaning of Mark 14:22-25’ was also reviewed. The article deals with the institution of the Lord’s Supper in the Marcan account of the Gospel. The author analysed the institutional narrative from the communicative perspective. He indicates that ‘interpretation involves examining the linguistic elements, the relationship between them (syntax), and their semantic value in view of their communicative potentiality.\footnote{Ossom-Batsa, ‘Bread for the Broken’, 6.} In his view, the inclusion of the institution narrative when studied with this approach reveals that Mark did so primarily to explain the significance and effect of Jesus’ death to the reader. This approach also puts much emphasis on the communicative power of the Bible as a living word that always accomplishes its goal. His work therefore helps readers to understand the significance of
the death of Jesus and the effects it has on the readers. Though the author did the study with the Marcan account of the institution, his work is relevant to this study because he did a good analysis of the text from the communicative perspective to show the function of the institution. His work also gives a fair understanding of the methodology for biblical study research and various exegetical tasks that must be carried out in arriving at meaning.

In conclusion, from the review of these relevant literatures, it is obvious that much scholarly work has not been done on the subject from the exegetical point of view. Most of the literatures reviewed do not have a detailed analysis of the phrases, sentences, words, and syntactic arrangement of the Lucan account. This work concentrates on textual analysis of the passage to arrive at the intend meaning of the author which also makes the Lucan understanding stand out clearly. Also, most of the studies took place in churches outside Ghana with a comparative approach; therefore this study of the institution and how it has informed the celebration of the Eucharist in a Ghanaian church is relevant and will aid further study of the subject. It is in the light of this that I undertook this research so that it will augment the earlier studies on the topic from the other perspectives.

1.8 Relevance of the Study

It is hoped that this exegetical work will add up to the on-going academic study on the subject. As most research on the subject often focuses on the historical and theological perspectives, this exegetical study will provide some additional information for further research on the subject. It will also be relevant to the faith community since it gives deeper understanding to the institution in Luke’s gospel, so that it can influence the celebration of the Lord’s Supper positively.
1.9 Structure of the Work

The work is structured into five chapters with chapter one focusing on general introduction to the research. It covers the background to the Gospel of Luke and meals in ancient and modern cultures giving an overview to the topic, problem statement, objectives, and scope of the research, as well as methods and methodology for data collection among others. Chapter two is an exegesis of the text. It deals with the delimitation of the text as a unity for the study, structure of the text as well as a textual analysis of the pericope.

The textual analysis focuses on a detail analysis of words, phrases and sentences within the pericope. It also looks at how the compositional structure of the text forms in helping to arrive at the intended meaning of the author in this narrative.

The third chapter reflects upon some major theological themes from the analysis of the text. Themes of regeneration, salvation, sacrifice, covenant and new covenant, are discussed in this chapter as synthesis of the textual analysis in the second chapter.

The fourth chapter deals with the contextualization of the interpretation of the Lucan account in the Ghanaian context. The chapter discusses the relevance of the interpretation of the Supper to the contemporary Ghanaian Christian and how the understanding from this interpretation helps in addressing some pertinent issues in the contemporary church. The last chapter provides a general summary of the work, makes some recommendations for future study on the topic and conclusion.
CHAPTER TWO

EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS OF LUKE 22:7-23

2.1 Introduction

This second chapter focuses specifically on the analysis of the Lord’s Supper tradition in Luke 22:7-23. The passage forms part of the passion and resurrection narratives of Jesus which stretches from chapter 22:1 to 24:53. It deals with the preparation towards and eating the Passover, the institution of the Lord’s Supper and Jesus’ prediction of the betrayal of Judas. The exegesis of the passage begins with a delimitation of the text. This discusses the reason why the researcher considers the chosen passage (22:7-23) as a unit to be studied. It is followed by a workable structure of the text to facilitate the exegetical work. Then the analysis of the text follows suit. It finally concludes by establishing the fruitful insight revealed from the exercise.

The outline of Darrell L. Bock in the Baker’s Exegetical Commentary on Luke is adopted for the study. The preference for this outline is in view of the fact that Fitzmyer, Marshall and Gaebelein have very detailed, long and complex outlines. Plummer on the other hand apart from having a detailed and complex outline, the organization of his passion narrative and the institution is not very straight forward. This makes it very difficult to extract the themes from the various parts of the book. However, Bock presented a detail but succinct outline which is very easy to follow and also reveals the themes for the study very well. Bock in his outline divided the whole gospel into five major blocks with each block having a detailed subdivision of themes to be studied from the gospel. The fifth block which contains the passage for this study has five subdivisions of which the text understudy falls in the third subdivision with the title ‘Betrayal and farewell’. 60 This affirms that the institution narrative forms part of the farewell discourses of Jesus. Bock’s

outline breaks down the activities of the supper concisely that makes it easy to study unlike some other scholars who break down the event of the Lord’s Supper into smaller bits which makes their outlines long and complex. Bock combined some smaller bits into one making his outline simplified.

2.2 Delimitation

Luke 22:7-23 was chosen for the study because it constitutes a unit. Although scholars such as Marshall put the whole of the chapter into one block, in considering the narrative of the Lord’s Supper, this passage can be considered as a unit because of the following reasons.

Firstly, though the whole of the chapter forms part of the farewell narrative of Christ, because it begins with the plot to kill Jesus and other activities which culminated in the passion and resurrection in chapter 24, there are different characters at various stages of the narrative. The characters in vv. 1- 6 differ from those in vv. 7- 23. This condition suggests a movement in the story. In the preceding verses (vv. 1- 6), the discussion was among the Jewish leaders, the scribes and Judas discussing ways by which they could implement their plan of eliminating Jesus. But from the vv. 7-23 we are introduced to new characters which are made up of Jesus and the disciples. Therefore the discourse between them can be put into a unit for consideration on the basis of the characters present. This analysis applied to this text reveals it literary unity.

Secondly, the setting for the discourse in vv. 7- 23 is different from that of vv.1- 6 and from verses 39 to the end of the passion story. The use of this feature by biblical writers is to focus the attention of their readers on new ideas they are presenting.61 Luke records in vv. 1-2 that the leaders of the Jews were thinking about ways to get Jesus killed.

---

Though the author did not mention where the discussion took place, certainly once Judas went to them it presupposes that it was not at the place where Jesus and the disciples were. Perhaps it could be in the temple or synagogue, indicating a geographical movement. Marshall indicates that vv. 35-38 marks the final conversation between Jesus and the disciples at the Supper. From v. 39, there is a clear break in the session in the upper room, suggesting that the setting was different. Ones the narrative in the subsequent verses took place at a different setting, it constitute a unit.

Thirdly, the change of theme in the preceding and subsequent verses suggests that the passage could be considered as a unit for the study. Some scholars combine the whole of verses 7-38 as the Last Supper discourse; however, a closer look at the passage reveals that the subjects for discussion changed from one point to the other. From vv. 7 - 23, the theme for the discourse changed from the discussion about how to kill Jesus (vv. 1-6) to the Lord’s Supper as found in the preceding verses. Then from vv. 24 - 27, the theme changed to greatness. Some scholars further put vv. 21-23 together under one sub heading; however, the subject discussed was still in connection with the meal. Besides, in the Greek New Testament which is the primary source for the New Testament, the institution of the supper is recorded at vv. 14- 23 following the preparation for the Passover meal.

Again, vv. 14 - 20 is joined to vv. 21-23 with the adversative conjunction ‘but’ (παρευθεν), showing that it forms part of the discourse though what he was saying was not part of the words of institution. Therefore though the characters were the same, and the setting was also the same from vv.7 – 38, the change of theme is evidence that vv.7-23 can be put together as a unit. In the light of these observations, I consider the passage as a unit.

---

within the larger block of the passion and resurrection narrative of the Lukan account of the gospel.

2.3 Structure of Luke 22:7-23

This passage may be divided as follows:

Vv. 7 – 13: Preparation for the Passover Meal.

Vv. 14 – 23: The Passover Meal

vv. 14- 16: Narrative Introduction

vv. 17- 20: Thanksgiving over the Bread and Cup

vv.21 - 23 The Betrayal of Jesus

I came by this structure through the movement of the various activities that took place at various stages in the passage. From the text it may be observed that, the movement of activities in the passage was greatly informed by the various occurrences and the activities of the various characters in the passage. But in all Jesus was always at the forefront and his actions or statements generated a response from the disciples. From the v. 7 he initiated the preparation of the Passover by sending the two disciples who later asked where they should prepare for the Passover, and at the end of the passage, his woe declaration on the betrayal resulted in the disciples questioning themselves about who will betray him. Therefore base on the movements in the text, I came out with this structure so that the movement of the activities with Jesus always taking precedence at the Supper will be seen clearly from the Lucan account.
The events in 22:1 - 38 leading to Jesus’ arrest, trial and crucifixion provided him the final opportunity to share with his disciples before his departure.\(^\text{65}\) Having known Judas’ treachery to betray Jesus, Luke proceeds to mention Jesus’ plans to celebrate the Passover with the disciples for the last time. Vv. 7- 13 outlines the discourse between Jesus and his disciples on the preparation for the Passover. Fitzmyer indicates that Jesus took the initiative in Luke and commissioned two of his disciples to see to the preparation.\(^\text{66}\) Jesus took control of the event from this point and gave directives for the preparation as well as the place where the supper was to be held. According to R. C. H. Lenski, only Luke gives the names of the two disciples to be Peter and John. He indicated that Matthew had no need telling his readers there were two people as Mark did because it was a known tradition among Jewish readers that the lamb was to be brought into the temple by only two men.\(^\text{67}\) Luke alone goes further to tell who they were. The upper room which was in a second story under a flat roof was well furnished with the couches for reclining at a Passover meal and had all the necessary utensils for the celebration. They found everything just as Jesus described it to them before they set off.\(^\text{68}\) When all was set for the Supper to begin, Jesus sat at table with his disciples and declared his longing for eating the Supper with the disciples for the last time.

2.4 Textual Analysis of Luke 22:7-23

This section deals with the analysis of the compositional structural elements of the text following the structure of the text that I have provided. It examines how words, phrases,
clauses and sentences as well as the syntactic arrangement of the text reveal the intended meaning of the author. In this exercise, the Greek text was analysed following the structure that I provided in line with the various grammatical functions in the text to arrive at an informed understanding of the text.

2.4.1 Preparation for the Passover Meal (vv. 7-13)

7 Ἡλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἄζυμων, [ἐν] ἡ ἤδει θύσσαν τὸ πάσχα· 8 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην εἰπὼν, Πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν. 9 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὰδάτων βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οίκιαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπροέρχεται καὶ ἔρειτε τῷ οἰκοδομῷ τῆς οἰκίας. Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος, Ποῦ ἔστιν τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; 12 κάκειν ὑμῖν δεῖξε ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε· ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὑροῦν καθὼς εἴρηκε αὐτοῖς καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed. 8 So Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, "Go and prepare the Passover meal for us that we may eat it." 9 They asked him, "Where do you want us to make preparations for it?" 10 Listen, he said to them, when you have entered the city, a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him into the house he enters and say to the owner of the house, 'The teacher asks you, "Where is the guest room, where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?"' 12 He will show you a large room upstairs, already furnished. Make preparations for us there. 13 So they went and found everything as he had told them; and they prepared the Passover meal.

The passage opens with a discussion by Jesus and the disciples on where he wants the disciples to prepare for the Supper. At this point it examines vv. 7-9 which talks about the sending of Peter and John together, vv. 10-12; the direction to the upper room and v. 13; the preparations they made for the Passover.

a. Jesus sends Peter and John (vv. 7-9)

In 22:1, Luke records that the festival was approaching; and in these verses he indicates that the day had come. He clearly stated that the day was the day of sacrifice. ἡ ἡμέρα ‘the day’ according to Lenski was the 14th of Nisan which was counted in with the other
seven days and made it eight.\textsuperscript{69} Marshall affirms this suggesting that the day itself would mean Nisan 15; however, the addition of τῶν ἁζόμων to the phrase indicates that it meant Nisan 14.\textsuperscript{70} The reference of this phrase to the unleavened bread in Luke with the genitive plural article preceding the adjective makes it definite describing the particular day for the feast. Stressing on the nature of the day, Luke uses the imperfect tense of the verb ἔδει which gives it a kind of lawful nature and something that must be done at all cost. It therefore makes the practice statutory. The activity of the day is described by Luke in the infinitive indicative active tense θέσται τὸ πάσχα. The indeclinable neuter noun τὸ πάσχα though has a range of meaning, in Luke’s usage in this passage by metonymy refers to the lamb slain for the Passover meal or the paschal lamb.\textsuperscript{71} In view of this he introduces the resulting action ἀπέσταλεν Πέτρων καὶ Ἰωάννην of the preceding circumstance; ἣ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁζόμων; with the coordinating conjunction Καί. Luke makes a wider range of usage of this conjunction to connect several thoughts.

Luke mentions the names of the disciples Jesus sent but Mark records that Jesus sent two of his disciples (Mark 14:13). According to Fitzmyer, the mention of Peter and John forms part of the Lucan redaction of the passion story.\textsuperscript{72} Peter and John are two of the three disciples often mentioned in the Lucan story (Luke 8:51; 9:28; cf. Acts 3:1, 3, 4, 11; 4:13, 19; 8:14). In his view, they are the two most important disciples in the passion story and a lesson of servant leadership is taught as those who were to become leaders were made to serve. Luke indicates that Jesus sent them with precision. This is evidenced by the frequent use of the verb εἶπον in the gospel and Acts. In this construction, the Present indicative active εἶπον is used as the second aorist of λέγω. Its usage with the accusative Πέτρων καὶ Ἰωάννην means to tell something or speak absolutely. Also the use of

\textsuperscript{70} Marshall, \textit{Commentary on the Greek Text}, 791.  
\textsuperscript{72} Fitzmyer, the Gospel of Luke, 1382.
Πορευόνται supports this assertion. Luke often uses this participle in a command with an indication of destination. Here too the participle has no article preceding it showing that it is an adverbial participle modifying the verb ἐτοιμάζω. The participle then shows that the command he gave to Peter and John was absolute having a sense of mission. Luke followed the participle with ἐτοιμάσατε to give it an imperatival sense. Luke used this in his instruction to the two apostles on the preparation they were to make for the Passover. He was emphatic on the eating of the Passover. The conjunction subordinate ἵνα which introduces the clause that shows the purpose for which he sent them, together with the subjunctive aorist φάγομεν puts important emphasis on the eating of the Passover.

H. Chadwick is of the view that to ‘eat the pascha’ was an odd expression, because in the Septuagint the pascha is either sacrificed or done. However, this assertion has been challenged by C.K. Barret in his article ‘Luke XXII: 15 To Eat the Passover’ that ‘to eat’ the pascha is also a good ancient expression. Peter and John then asked Jesus of the place he wants them to prepare for the Passover. Luke presents the question of the disciples with ἐτοιμάζω. Fitzmyer maintains that the phrase ποι ὑλεῖς ἐτοιμάσωμεν; indicates that Luke picked up this traditional request from the Marcan source. Marshall adds that Luke employed the question of the disciples in Mark 14:12b to provide the introduction for the detailed instruction Jesus gave to the two disciples on their journey.

b. Jesus Directs them to the Upper Room (Vv. 10 – 12)

In response to the question of the disciples, Jesus gave a detailed instruction to them on how to locate the venue for the Passover. Luke uses the word ἴδον with an acute ascent as a demonstrative article to prompt attention. He follows it with a genitive case to designate

---

77 Marshall, *Commentary on the Greek Text*, 791.
what is being pointed out; that is to arouse the attention of Peter and John to what He was going to tell them so that they will listen well. A similar construction was used in 22:31 when Jesus drew Simon Peter’s attention to what Satan wanted to do to him and his intervention. He follows ἡδοὺ with a genitive absolute participle of εἰσερχόματι to show the disciples where they will find what he was telling them. Fitzmyer posits that the absolute character of the clause is not maintained in the sense that Luke follows it up with the dative pronoun ὑμῖν. However, a closer look at the original text from the Greek New Testament shows that Luke followed the genitive particle εἰσεξῆς with the second person genitive plural pronoun ὑμῶν thereby preserving the absolute character of the clause. Luke employs the εἰς + accusative construction to refer to where they will find what Jesus was telling them because it denotes motion or movement into a location. According to Daniel B. Wallace, the accusative case forms about 29% of the New Testament coming second to the nominative case which is 31%. He explains that the accusative was by far the most frequent of the oblique cases and was the least specific of them which allowed it to be used in a number of circumstances. The phrase indicates that they will only meet the man when they enter the city.

This is because the future indicative of the verb συναντάω used with the dative pronoun ὑμῖν facilitates the connection between the disciples and the man they will meet. It shows that the ἄνθρωπος will meet them as they enter the city. Marshall maintains that Luke uses συναντάω instead of ἀπαντάω as used by mark. This suggests that Luke prefers the use for σῶν compounds in his construction. Also a literal translation of ἄνθρωπος as human being would not make the understanding clear because a person with a jug of water

79 Fitzmyer, The Gospel of Luke,
81 Marshall, Commentary on the Greek Text, 791.
would not necessarily be out of the ordinary as the saying seems to imply a man. But he indicates that using the first translation of a man would be an unusual sight since men used to carry leather bottles while women carry jars or pitchers. In describing the man who will guide them to their location, Luke preserves more details of the man from Mark using the present active participle \( \beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{a}\zeta\omicron \nu \) for the two nouns. This is evident in Jesus’ foreknowledge. Scholars argue that the instruction sounds like a sign of a pre-arrangement between Jesus and the house holder and an assumption of the time the disciples were to enter the city. The disciples were then to follow the man to his house. The imperative aorist of \( \alpha\theta\nu\nu\nu\pi\zeta\omicron\varepsilon\omega \) was used to show the explicit command Jesus gave to the disciples when they locate the man. In comparison with the Marcan writing, Luke has improved his style of writing with his construction of the \( \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\iota\nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \) phrase.\(^{82}\) This phrase is also another \( \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \) + accusative construction suggesting ‘motion into’ which is a common expression in Luke, and It shows where they can locate the house holder.

Upon reaching there, they were to deliver Jesus’ message to the house owner. Luke used the imperative aorist of \( \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron \) (\( \varepsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon \)) in his message to the \( \omicron \iota\kappa\omega\delta\varepsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta \). This is a polite imperative which Luke used in his writings cf. 19:31. The addition of \( \tau\iota\nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \) to the sentence was because \( \omicron \iota\kappa\omega\delta\varepsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta \) had lost its original force so Luke felt at liberty to add it to it.\(^{83}\) It also suggests that the person he sent the disciples to was someone of reputation in the society as the owner of the house and could be one of the secret disciples of Jesus in Jerusalem who for fear of their position always went to him in the quite. The description Jesus gave about himself to the house owner supports this assertion. \( \omicron \iota\kappa\omega\delta\varepsilon\pi\omicron\tau\eta \) is used in this context because the dative shows they were speaking to the one they were sent to.

\(^{82}\) Marshall, *Commentary on the Greek Text*, 792.

\(^{83}\) Marshall, *Commentary on the Greek Text*, 792.
Luke starts the message with λέγει to show that the message they brought was not their own words. It stresses the authoritative command of Jesus who described his identity to the house owner as ὁ διδάσκαλος. Hahn is of the view that Jesus’ description of himself was a formal Christological title of Palestinian Jewish origin, but it could also be that it was the term used by him and the disciples, presupposing that the house owner was a disciple.  

Lambda followed by the dative singular pronoun σοί makes it a direct address to the house owner who should have knowledge of the διδάσκαλος and the request he was putting before him.

The interrogative adverb of place ποῦ beginning the question ποῦ ἐστιν τὸ κατάλοιμα; is a polite way of asking to see the room in order for preparations to be made. The construction also suggests foreknowledge between the house owner and Jesus of the κατάλοιμα, hence the specific request. Scholars however do not agree on whether there was a pre-arrangement between them or Jesus was demonstrating supernatural knowledge in working out all the plans of the passion as ordained by God. Sometimes he uses ὑπερων in reference to the room upstairs in other Lucan writings. Marshall indicates that Luke drops Mark’s μου (Mark 14:14) in his redaction. Luke’s use of the διποὺ clause with the subjunctive φάγω is tantamount to a purpose clause. He uses the preposition μετὰ with the genitive τῶν μαθητῶν as a preposition of accompaniment which explains that the disciples will accompany him at the Passover.

Jesus assured them that in response to the disciple’s question ποῦ, as requested by Jesus, the house owner will show them an upper room. In Acts ὑπερων is used in reference to the room upstairs (1:13; 9:37, 39; 20:8, 11.) it is only in the context of the Passover that the adjective μεγά is added to ἀναγαμον. Perhaps it may be a deliberate construction by Luke to distinguish it from other upper rooms. Marshall describes

84 Marshall, *Commentary on the Greek Text*, 792
ἀναγγέλων as an extra room built unto the flat roof of a typical Palestinian house.86 The perfect participle ἐστρωμένον shows that the room was already furnished with what will be needed for the Passover. The disciples were to prepare the room they will be shown for the Passover. ἔτοιμασατε used here indicates a command to the disciples to what they must do next after they have found the place. The preparations for the Passover include purchasing the lamb, having it slaughtered and roasted, prepare the other cuisine and arranging the room for the number who will be at the table.87

c. Peter and John Prepares the Passover Meal (V. 13)

Luke uses ἀπελθόντες to demonstrate what the disciples did after receiving the instruction from Jesus. The participle form of ἀπερχόμαι is used very often in the writings of Luke. It is observed that ἀπερχόμαι though can be translated as ‘depart’, is not as strong and strict as ὑπάγω which also means ‘depart’ or ‘to lead away’. This accounts for its frequent usage. In this episode the participle was used instead of ὑπάγω may be because the disciples left by themselves and were not led away by anyone. Luke used εἰρήκει which is more appropriate than εἶπεν which is the aorist indicative of the verb λέγω used by Mark in reporting the findings of the disciples. This is because the pluperfect describes an action that has been completed and its result is been felt after a period of its completion.88 He also preceded it with the subordinate conjunction καθός which functions more as comparative conjunction in this context conjoining the vividness of what Jesus told the disciples in vv. 10 and 11 to what they found in v. 13. As they found the place, they bought the lamb and made sure that it had been slaughtered and roasted for the meal.89 They also arranged the

86 Marshall, Commentary on the Greek Text, 792.
room for the number that was to be at the table and ensured that the other cuisine were prepared in addition as was required for every Passover celebration.

2.4.2 The Passover Meal (vv. 14-23)

14 When the hour came, he took his place at the table, and the apostles with him. He said to them, "I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; 16 for I tell you, I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." 17 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." 19 Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 20 And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, "This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood. 21 But see, the one who betrayeth me is with me, and his hand is on the table. 22 For the Son of Man is going as it has been determined, but woe to that one by whom he is betrayed!" Then they began to ask one another, which one of them it could be who would do this.

After Peter and John finished the preparations for the Passover, Jesus and the disciples sat at table to eat the meal when it was time for the meal. V. 14 will be analysed from here because of its position in the text. It will be followed by the analysis of Jesus’ expression of intense desire to eat the supper with the apostles in vv. 15-16.

a. Narrative Introduction (vv. 14-16)

In vv. 14-16, Luke records His earnest desire to eat the Supper with the disciples though he knew what was ahead of him. Marshall concedes that Jesus’ words connotes the idea that it was going to be the last meal he was going to eat with them before his suffering
until this same meal finds fulfilment in the coming kingdom of God. The position of verse 14 in the narrative has generated a lot of scholarly argument among scholars. Scholars like Fitzmyer propose that it should be placed at the conclusion of the preparation for the Passover. This might be because in his view the meal started when Jesus spoke of his desire to eat the Passover, and so v. 14 can form part of the preparatory activities. However, I support the argument by Marshall that it should rather be made the introduction to the story of the Passover meal. This is because apart from the fact that the Greek New Testament Bible records it as such, Jesus reclining at table when the hour for the Passover was due sets a good introduction for the meal. Again the period for the preparation of the Passover which was before sundown on Nisan 14, is different from the hour of the meal which was about sundown which according to the solar calendar was Nisan 15, the same hour the meal is to take place. Therefore this verse serves as a good introductory background to the actual eating of the Passover meal.

ὁτε, though a temporal adverb is used here as a conjunction subordinate after the noun ἡ ὡρα denoting the actual time for the meal. ἡ ὡρα according to the solar calendar was about sundown of Nisan 14 which actually marks the beginning of Nisan 15. Scholars also maintain that this expression does not only denote the time for the Passover meal but makes allusions to God’s hour. Fitzmyer expressed the view that it carries the connotation of salvation history. Luke used ἀνέπεσεν to describe the posture of Jesus and the Apostles at the meal. He uses ἀνάπυτω which differs from ἀνάκειμαι used by Mark though they all possess a similar understanding of ‘to recline at table’. It describes the Roman style where couches were used at table. This however is different from contemporary observance of the Lord’s Supper where congregants are made to stand or kneel to dine with the Lord.

90 Marshall, Commentary on the Greek Text, 793.
91 Marshall, Commentary on the Greek Text, 794.
ἀνέπεσεν is also preferred to συνανάκειμαι which was used in the Mediterranean custom for guests to recline on couches around a table at meals.93 This in my opinion might be because to Luke, Jesus did not regard the apostles as guests but his companions therefore the use of the aorist indicative ἀνέπεσεν was appropriate.

b. Jesus Expresses His Desire to Eat the Passover (Vv. 15- 16)

At the Passover meal, Jesus again took control over activities there as the head to address them. The evangelist employed the πρὸς + accusative expression with the plural pronoun αὐτοῖς in describing whom the address of Jesus at the Passover was going to, because it can be used to show motion towards a person or thing. He very often used the plural noun in reference to the disciples as we have in this verse. It shows the object to which the message is addressed.

Luke expresses Jesus’ intense desire to eat the πάσχα with the dative of the cognate noun ἐπιθυμέω. Fitzmyer posits that the dative ἐπιθυμία is used to strengthen the verb. The same view is shared by Pfeiffer and Harrison.94 The addition of the aorist ἐπεζύκεζα has resulted in various interpretations of the expression. But according to J. M. Creed, the meaning is that Jesus had earnestly desired to eat this Passover and that this desire is fulfilled. It expresses an ardent, real, attainable wish now being accomplished or realized.95 This word occurs only once in the Lucan writing. He uses the aorist indicative of θέλω in expressing wish or desire in other references. This implies that ἐπιθυμία is used for expressing a strong impulse for something as Jesus had for that last Passover.

Jesus was emphatic about that particular Passover they were eating. This presupposes that Jesus had been eating this kind of meal with the disciples. Luke uses the
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demonstrative adjective τούτο to qualify that Passover from all others they had been eating because it was the farewell feast to which Jesus eagerly looked forward to and also had other significance. Τό πάσχα as used in this phrase can mean the paschal lamb or the Passover meal. In the work of Marshall, Schürmann argues that by this expression ‘Jesus was thinking more of the fellowship of the meal than the lamb that would not yet be on the table; the interest in general is in the meal not in the lamb as such.’

In the Lucan context, μεθ’ ὑμῶν establishes the fellowship that existed between Jesus and the apostles. The genitive plural ὑμῶν is more of an inclusive ‘you’ so that as Fitzmyer puts it, is in reference to the apostles as the nucleus of the new people with whom the ‘new covenant’ was to be established. To them he gave his body as food and his blood would be poured for them. This act is expressed with παθεῖν used in reference to the suffering of the Messiah which is an expression of suffering of death. In the phrase λέγω γάρ ὑμῖν, γάρ as a conjunction subordinate is used by Luke to provide explanation. It expresses the cause or reason for Jesus’ ardent desire for that Supper. The conjunction links v.15 to 16 and makes the reason clear to the readers. Λέγω ὑμῖν is a kind of direct address to the apostles with an authoritative voice. The use of the present indicative active gives the indication of one who has authority and knows what he is about. This phrase therefore sets the background for the introduction of the eschatological dimension of the Passover. Luke enjoys the use of this construction as evidenced by his several usages in both the gospel and Acts.

In the phrase ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω οὐτὸ, the usage of ὅτι shows that what Jesus said was a direct statement. Its use together with the negative particles and the subjunctive φάγω makes it clear that he was making an emphatic statement of fact because of the declarative
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function of the conjunction. The parallel form of this construction is found in v.18 which concerns drinking. According to J. W. Wenham, μὴ is used for assured hesitant denial; while οὐ denies the fact, μὴ denies the idea, therefore the use of both articles with the subjunctive φάγω attest to the fact that Jesus was making a declarative statement of fact into the future.

Also, the preposition ἐν with the adjective ὅτου links the event of Jesus’ desire in v. 16 to its fulfilment in the Kingdom of God. Fitzmyer posits that ὅτου is an unusual form of the genitive singular and it occurs as a variant in 15:8, 22:18. πληρῶ is common in Luke. Marshall, quoting J. Jeremiahs said ‘The passive is probably a circumlocution for an active verb with God as the subject, and the object of the verb is presumably the Passover lamb or festival. The thought is of the fulfilment of the Passover in heaven, or in the new age which is brought about by the death of Jesus. Jesus calls the banquet of the age of salvation a fulfilment of the Passover’.  

By this, Jesus gives a new eschatological dimension to the Passover meal he was eating with the apostles with πληρωτῇ followed by ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ. Jesus makes a connection between the newly interpreted Passover and the Kingdom of God in view of its final consummation and the messianic banquet. M. Black sought to give the passive verb πληρωτῇ an impersonal meaning so that the fulfilment would refer to the Kingdom but that seems to violate the grammar of the verse, in which something other than the Kingdom is the subject. The preposition ἐν + the dative support the fact that something finds fulfilment in the time of the Kingdom.
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2.4.3 Blessing over the Bread and Cup (Vv. 17-20)

This analysis deals with the institution of the Eucharist by Jesus while he was at the Passover meal with the disciples. The flow of Luke’s Passover narrative into the words of institution is significant in understanding what Jesus was referring to. I have analysed vv. 17 – 19a which deals specifically with the eating of the Passover then it follows with the words of institution in vv. 19b-20.

a. Thanksgiving over the Bread and Cup (V.17- 19a)

The use of δέχομαι in the sense of ‘to take hold of’ is found only here and 16:6 and 7 by Luke. Marshall has demonstrated the improbability that Luke is here dependent on Mark and claims that it is more likely that the tradition in Mark is indebted to that used by Luke.\(^{102}\) There are several scholarly arguments on the cup that Luke made reference to in the phrase δεξάμενος ποτήριον. With the assumption that the Passover meal is being described, scholars such as Schürmann, Graundmann, Daube and G. J. Bahr all argues for the third cup while J. Jeremias argues for the first cup basing his argument on his interpretation of the saying as a vow of abstinence from the meal. Since the text does not indicate clearly which of the four cups is meant, as in v. 20, then the third cup is likely; however, if two separate cups are meant, then the first cup may be intended here. Though Luke omits the article in this phrase to give any clue about the particular cup he meant here, the cup sayings helps to affirm it.

After taking the cup he gave thanks. The verb εὐχαριστέω occurs in Hellenistic Jewish literature and it designates thanksgiving rendered to God who is explicitly named as dative – object.\(^{103}\) The special meaning peculiar to the New Testament is to say the table

---
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benediction. In its absolute sense, it is a liturgical language in the Lord’s Supper and came to mean in the post Pauline period for the Eucharistic prayer.  

Scholars are of the view that εὐχαριστέω is a Hellenistic word compared to εὐλογέω which is more Jewish, but Schürmann argues that its use without an object is not Greek, not a later development and that the choice of it points to the unusual nature of what was happening there. Patsch submits that εὐχαριστέω without an object takes on the special meaning of saying the Eucharistic prayers. Its usage in Luke is in the sense of expressing gratitude to God especially at meals. This makes it more preferable to εὐλογέω which conveys the idea of calling down God’s gracious power on persons or things. The Christian name Eucharist for the carrying out of Jesus directives in v.19 stems from this word. Luke then uses the aorist imperative of λαβέτε to convey Jesus’ command to the apostles. Mark uses the same word in the ‘bread saying’ in Mark 14:22 but is not found in Luke 22:19. λαβέτε occurs once in Luke this is perhaps to initiate the command of the Passover celebration. λαβέτε τούτο with reference to the accusative singular demonstrative seems to talk about a common cup which they are to share. διαιρέω which is to ‘distribute’, ‘share’ or ‘divide up’ also supports this assertion. This is because it contradicts the normal observance where participants at the Passover meal usually drunk from their own cups. Jesus was by this word introducing a new element to the Passover. The Lucan Jesus invites the apostles by his directive to a communal sharing in this meal.

The use of ἀπό may be a Lucan alteration of Mark’s ἐκ + genitive construction. ἀποτοῦ νόν has the same understanding as οὐκέτι used in Mark. This ἀπό+ genitive + adjective is peculiar to Luke. It denotes a point from which something begins from. It shows that from that point something was about to happen which will not make him
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present at a Passover meal with the apostles any longer. Jesus declares his refusal to drink wine as he did in the parallel verse in 16. The aorist subjunctive πίω used with the negative particles οὐ and μή makes it an emphatic statement. The phrase γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλουν is said to occur in the Jewish prayer of thanksgiving for wine. According to Fitzmyer, the combination of πίνω with the ἀπὸ preposition is found in the LXX and it probably represents the partitive use of Hebrew or Aramaic. Scholars argue that the expression is a vow of abstinence but it should not be seen as such from the use of the subjunctive aorist. He however emphasizes the eschatological dimension of the supper with the clause ἐως ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. In this construction, he uses the aorist subjunctive of ἔρχομαι instead of πληροῦ (v. 16). This, however, like the former, expresses the eschatological dimension of the Passover meal in the Kingdom. The idea of ἔρχομαι is not too different from the παξ ποιεῖται which all connotes eschatological fulfilment. Therefore, ἐως + dative + aorist subjunctive reveals the expectation of a heavenly banquet in the Lord’s Supper.

Luke uses λαμβάνω instead of δέρχομαι as in v. 17. ἄρτον is used here too without the article as it was in the case of the cup in v. 17. It refers to the bread eaten at the beginning of the Passover meal and it was that over which the benediction was said. J. Wellhausen has argued that ἄρτος has to refer to leavened bread and concluded that the Last Supper could not have been a Passover. But this argument was questioned by scholars such as G. Beer and others that ἄρτον can mean unleavened bread. This is equivalent to the Hebrew (lehem massōt) which is translated unleavened bread or cake. ἐὐχαριστάω again is parallel to the phrase in v.17. It also occurs in I Cor. 11:24 in the Pauline Eucharistic narrative. Some scholars argue that Luke has changed the participle εὐλογήσας in Mark 14:22 but this might be due to the nuances in their meaning.
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After blessing it, he gave it out to them to share. The use of the verb κλάω has become the basis of a technical term for the Lord’s Supper. Marshall and Fitzmyer indicate that κλάω is used in the New Testament only in the context of breaking bread at meal. As the head of the supper, Jesus shares bread with the apostles to demonstrate his relation to them. ἐκλασεν ‘broken’, ἔδωκεν ‘gave’ has a theological meaning of sacrifice as a component of the significance of the Lord’s Supper.

b. The Words of Institution (vv. 19b-20)

The demonstrative pronoun τότε is used to call attention to the bread and cup which are given new meaning as σώμα with special emphasis. The phrase τότε ἐστιν introduces the relation which Luke draws between the bread on the table and σώμα which Jesus makes reference to. Some Scholars are of the view that ἐστιν can be interpreted as it ‘signifies’ rather than ‘it is identical with’. This, however, will depend on the individual’s theological position. Marshall maintains that σώμα can be assigned a meaning based on the underlining Aramaic word. There are varied opinions on the meaning of σώμα because of its constitutional components of flesh and blood. From the background of the Old Testament of the bread on the Passover, Jesus used σώμα in interpreting the bread linking it to himself. In Luke, Jesus was not giving just bread to the apostles but his own self. This might account for the reason Luke follows it with the ὑπέρ ὑμῶν phrase. All the occurrences of σώμα in the gospel have the same noun form with exception of 23:1 where the word is used as a group of people.

Luke identifies the people for whom the body is broken with the phrase ὑπέρ ὑμῶν ὀξόμενον. According to Petzer Kobus, this construction is not typical of the Lucan style though it has occurrences in Acts and again it is not used in the Lucan material in
connection with the atonement of Christ.\textsuperscript{110} The construction appears in Luke where there are parallel constructions in Mark (Mark 9: 40 and 14: 24). This shows that the construction occurs outside this passage where Luke agrees almost verbatim with Mark with the only difference being ἡκὼλ in Mark (9:10) and ὑκὼλ. Kobus concedes that from the viewpoint of source criticism, this can be due to the fact that Luke depended on Markan source, keeping somewhat close to the vocabulary and phraseology of Mark and changing only a minor aspect of the phrase.\textsuperscript{111} Marshall intoned that the phrase can be used in reference to sacrifice or martyrdom.\textsuperscript{112}

The word διδόκελνλ together with ὑπέξ ὑμὼν is not found in the parallel accounts of Mark and Matthew. The Pauline account also lacks this word though he has a simpler one τὸ ὑπέξ ὑμὼν, whereas the Lucan construction added the participle διδόμενον. The participial use of the word portrays the idea of what a person of a superior position shall give to one in a subordinate position. The present participle of δίδομι has a future sense. Implying that, at the time of the institution, the body had not yet been broken.

The possessive pronoun ἐμὸς occurs as an attribute in a similar grammatical expression in Luke 9:26. In 15:31, it is used in a different grammatical construction παντα τα ἐμι. Its usage in 15:31 can be attributed to it being in Lucan sondergut which might give rise to the differences in the grammatical application of the word, which is following the noun with an article.\textsuperscript{113} The accusative singular noun ἀνάμνησιν is connected with ἐμὸς here to clearly portray that it is possessive. It was a command to the apostles to keep doing it so that he will be remembered. The word anamnesis is a keyword in the Lucan and Pauline narratives. Its meaning is difficult to express in one English word, it means
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remembrance or recollection. Representation and experiencing anew are also weak approximations of the word. It is particularly the connecting point between the event of Christ and Christian practice. It expresses the idea that by continuous observance of these actions one experiences once again the reality of Jesus present himself. Ghislain is of the view that in order to imitate Jesus and to create a new praxis, similar to his, the Christian must remember the death and resurrection of Christ. ἐμός as possessive adjective is equivalent to μου. According to Marshall, there is no connection with meals to commemorate the dead in the Hellenistic culture. This then becomes a specific command for remembrance.

Jesus repeated the same thing for the cup. In 22: 42, τὸ ποτήριον is used idiomatically whiles 11:39 has reference to a real cup. The same applies to its usage in 22:17. It can be observed that 11:39 and 22:42, appears the same way as in this verse 20 with the article τὸ while it appears without the article in 22:17. The manner with which Luke introduces the sayings of the cup is almost similar to the Pauline account (I Cor. 11:25). The use of ὁσιώτατος points to the parallelism with v.19 in the bread saying. Kobus is of the view that the occurrence of the word in 13:5 stands in Lucan sondergut whiles the second usage in 20:31 shows dependence on Mark with regard to the context. In this sentence, ὁσιώτατος has replaced the detailed account of Mark making the Lucan account echoes John 6:11. τὸ ποτήριον is said to be the third cup in the Passover meal. This took place after eating. Luke used δειπνέω instead of ἐσθίω. It seems that the New Testament writers generally preferred the verb ἐσθίω because it occurs many times in various tense forms. Marshall posits that its usage in Rev 3: 20 has Eucharistic associations. He adds that the phrase μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαμεν brings separation between the two points of the new
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ritual from each other. This phrasal construction (preposition+ article + infinitive) is not rare in Luke.

Τούτο τὸ ποτήριον is similar to the verse 19a. The use of τούτο calls particular attention to the cup with special emphasis. Though the word τούτο is used also in the cup sayings in Mark, there is considerable difference between them. In Mark while ηνύην calls attention to the blood, as the component of the covenant, it refers to the cup in Luke as seen in the phrase ηνύην τὸ ποτήριον. This implies that as they were drinking from the cup of blessing, they were sharing in the new covenant which he was ratifying with his blood. Kobus maintains that Luke’s use of the word in Luke 5:36 and 5:38 have parallels in Mark 2:21-22 and though there are some verbal dissimilarities between the two authors narrative in this passage, there is so much agreement that the Lucan narrative could be seen as a rewriting of the Marcan passage. But White argues that the difference between the institution accounts may be explained by the theory that what we have in these texts was a description of what was being said and done by several local churches in different places in celebrating the Eucharist. They all understood themselves as following the intentions, words, and actions of Jesus at the Last supper.

Through this statement Jesus made the claim that as the body and blood of the lamb was instrumental in the redemption of Israel, his body and blood been offered in sacrifice in the enacting of the new covenant would perfect the redemption of humanity. The bread is to be understood to be bread from the desert to the promise land; from slavery to freedom and the lamb as that which has brought them out of bondage. By the new meaning given to the Passover, the Supper then becomes a covenant between him and those who partake in it. The nominative adjective καινὴ together with διωθήκῃ Seem to
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suggest that Jesus was not making reference to the repetition of what was done in every Passover. Marshall affirms this when he indicated that κανόνς with reference to the covenant ‘signifies not a temporal repetition but a new, eschatological beginning’. The expression κανὴ διαθήκη occurs five times in the New Testament in undisputed passages (Luke 22:20, 1 Corinthians 11:25, 2 Cor. 3:6, Hebrews 8:8; 9:15). The expression διαθήκη νεα is also translated New Covenant and is found in Hebrews 12:24, where it brings out the meaning that the new covenant is not only new in quality as contended in κανὴ but also that the covenant is recent in its beginning. Two references of the new covenant in Luke are in relation to the Lord’s Supper. As used in the Old Testament, διαθήκη reveals the declaration of God’s will concerning his self-commitment, promise and conditions by which he entered into relationship with man. The cup however was not the actual element for the covenant but the content of the cup as suggested by the phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματί. The phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματί is been translated by most scholars as ‘in my blood.’ But the preposition ἐν is used together with the dative αἵματί as a cause for the covenant and so can be translated as ‘with my blood.’ In this case the blood as an element of the covenant becomes the means by which the covenant is formulated. This can also be as a result of the value of blood in Jewish sacrifice and worship.

The use of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν seem to narrow the beneficiaries of the vicarious death by changing from ‘for many’ to ‘for you’. But ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is a plural pronoun which seems to be more inclusive than exclusive; with regards to the apostles. In my opinion, ὑμῶν still convey the meaning of πολλῶν in Mark because the apostles were the nucleus of the new people whom Jesus was entering into the new covenant with, and all others who will come after them will still share in the covenant as long as they believe in him and become his
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disciples too. Scholars argue that the phrase has been constructed in the nominative case. Korbus is of the view that because ἀἵκαηί is in the dative case, the participle ἐκχυννόμενον should have also be in the dative. This makes some feel it is not a Lucan expression because of this grammatical error.  

2.4.4 The Betrayal of Jesus (vv. 21-23)

Just after the bread and wine sayings which forms the institution narrative, Jesus quickly turn to the subject of his betrayal which came as a surprise to the disciples and so generated some discussion among them about who the betrayal could be. Vv. 21-23 will focus on Jesus’ prediction of the betrayer and the fate he would be bound to suffer for that action. The final verse 23 will examine the reaction of the disciples after he told them what was going to happen. This according to this study will conclude the discussion on the Lord’s Supper as the theme for the discussion will change from the subsequent verses.

a. Jesus Predicts Judas’ Betrayal (Vv. 21-22)

In Luke as in Mark and Matthew, Jesus goes on to tell his disciples that the Son of Man must suffer. In this gospel Jesus had already used this designation in 5:24, 6:5, 22 and 7:34 with reference to himself apparently as a human figure who is said to or is implied to have authority but who is also the object of scorn and opposition. In order to draw the distinction between what Jesus said earlier and what he was about to say, Luke uses the adversative conjunction πλην in his expression. πλην followed by the exclamation ἵδον draws attention to it as a demonstrative particle followed by a nominative case ἦ γείρο to show what is being pointed out. In the work of Marshall, Jeremias argues that the use of πλην is non-Lucan but this is scarcely correct. Marshall, however, is not certain about it
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being Lucan though he does not object to it. He maintains that the use of χεὶρ to denote a person is Semitic.\textsuperscript{125} The phrase ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδοσόντος in the view of Fitzmyer, shows an introduction of synecdoche in using the hand of the traitor to represent a person. However, some scholars are of the view that the writer might be making reference to the Old Testament notion of close fellowship. But it could also mean the real hand of the person used at meals since Judas may have sat close to Jesus at the meal because of his role among them. Luke uses ἐπί to express the idea that the betrayer was partaking in the meal they were eating. ἐπί τῆς τραπέζης could be appropriately interpreted as ‘at the table’ because ἐπί is making reference to an act which is taking place and not necessarily location. This therefore made it difficult for the disciples to know who among them he was referring to, hence their question among themselves of whom it could be. Fitzmyer further explains that the definite article τῆς carries a demonstrative force in this context demonstrating the presence of the betrayer at the meal.

Jesus then used one of his Christological titles in the clause ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἄνθρωπος to express what has been predestined for him. The title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος has theological implication of his suffering so he made reference to this title when he was talking about what he was going to suffer. This title occurs twenty-five times in the Gospel but once in Acts in Stephen’s vision when he was been stoned (Acts 7:56). From 12:8 onwards, the term is used with increasing frequency to refer to a specific figure who has a role at the last judgement and who will come to the earth to be revealed. In any case a second or subsequent reading of the gospel, readers would recognize that the use of the designation identified Jesus with this coming figure, and they would probably understand it in terms of the account in Daniel 7. In this context, the phrase is put in the nominative as the subject. Marshall argues that the position of μὲν in the clause after the article and noun
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is odd; attributing it to Lucan style yet to him it is difficult to see why he should change the order in Mark.126

Also in the clause κατά τό ὁρισμένον πορεύεται, the construction κατά τό, accusative as Luke presents gives the indication of a preconceived notion or plan. Luke uses the phrase κατά τό ὁρισμένον in place of Mark’s καθώς γέγραπται. However, both authors used tenses that suggest that there has been a foreordained arrangement for his death. Luke used the perfect passive participle of ὀρίζω, while Mark used the perfect passive of γράφω. The perfect passive tenses used by both authors suggest it was a completed action by someone else which was unfolding. This however did not exempt the betrayer of his duties.

Luke uses πορεύματι instead of Mark’s ὑπάγω perhaps not only because of his dislike for the latter and preference of the former, but may be because of the euphemistic and idiomatic meaning that πορεύματι carries which relate to ‘leaving this life’ instead of ὑπάγω ‘leaving a place’. This gives the meaning of Jesus’ statement better than ὑπάγω. The pre-determined death of Jesus by God as implied in the phrase κατά τό ὁρισμένον is a theological statement. According Fitzmyer, Luke employed the phrase to relate Judas’ betrayal of Jesus to God’s plan of salvation history.127 Luke illustrates Jesus’ extreme displeasure of what Judas was going to do by the use of πιήλ; an adversative conjunction with interjection particle νὐάι. Luke broke the discussion on Jesus’ pre-determined death and what would happen to the betrayer using πιήλ and continued with νὐάι to refer to the retributive pain the man will suffer for his action. The use of πιήλ makes the woe of Jesus emphatic. Scholars however suggest Luke has altered the Marcan version of the phrase by excluding the subject ὁ γιός του ἀνθρώπου and omitted Mark’s last clause ‘it were better
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for that man if he had not been born’. The word ἐκείνος portrays the exact character of the betrayer and what he will experience for his action.

b. The Reaction of the Apostles (V. 23)

Jesus’ emphatic declaration of woe on the betrayer generated a discussion among the apostles. Luke began the question with καὶ αὐτοί indicating that the question was not directed to Jesus but to the apostles themselves. This may seem to be because of the statement in v. 21 by Jesus and all of them were partaking at the table. The words μέλλων πρᾶσσειν shows that they went on to discuss the question among them to know who the betrayer might be. Marshall indicates that Luke’s use of an indirect question to begin this clause is Lucan and the whole construction is completely Lucan. He uses the article τὸ with an interrogative pronoun τίς to show how surprising it was to the apostles that one of them was going to betray Jesus despite the relationship between them.

2.5 Conclusion

From the analysis above it is clear that the Lord’s Supper tradition in the Gospel of Luke is very relevant for the understanding of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. The analysis has revealed that the Gospel of Luke is unique from the other gospels in terms of language and style. The orderly flow of his story is very distinct and makes the narratives of the Gospel easy to be understood. The exercise has again revealed that though there are a lot of stories put together under the passion and resurrection, factors such as the characters involved in the Lord’s Supper narrative, the setting of the events, and change of themes among others make the passage in 22:7-23 constitute a unit that can be studied.
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Through the analysis the researcher found out that Luke went beyond the number of the disciples whom Jesus sent to mention their names. It is observed that these two disciples were very prominent throughout the ministry of Jesus and by that assignment; they were being prepared for leadership among the disciples. The principle of servant leadership was taught by Jesus in sending those whom he knew were going to be leaders. It also revealed that Luke went forward to mention their names because unlike the Jews, his gentile readers were not familiar with the required number of people who should send the Passover lamb for slaughter. Luke used the participle and imperative tenses when sending the two disciples to go and make preparations for the Passover. This makes his statement an emphatic command as it was revealed in Luke that it was Jesus who took the initiative for the preparation of the Passover. The analysis has also revealed that the Lucan tradition underscores the eschatological dimension that Jesus took the Passover. Luke indicates that Jesus’ linking of the bread in the Passover to himself has both sacrificial and eschatological underpinnings. This is because the understanding we get from the interpretation of the bread which he referred to as his body transcends mere eating of bread. Luke indicates that Jesus was making reference to something more than the bread.

Again the new covenant which was established through the blood that was to be shared for the people has a theological and soteriological significance. Luke indicates that the cup which comprises of the cup and its content which he interpreted to be his blood signifies an offering that he was making for humanity. Blood as an element of worship is necessary for obtaining life and this was what Luke reveals Jesus did by the institution.

The next chapter focuses on discussing the synthesis of some major theological themes from the analysis of the text. It also looks at how these themes inform the understanding of the supper among Christians.
CHAPTER THREE

THEOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS OF MAJOR THEMES ON THE LORD’S SUPPER

3.1 Introduction

The Lord’s Supper has become a major subject for theological discussion among Christian scholars. This is due to the relevance of the Supper in the understanding of some important themes in Christianity. In the New Testament, the Eucharist takes on a theological significance and an eschatological image.\(^{129}\) The understanding of the Supper as a heavenly banquet of the last days in which the redeemed will take part with Christ sets the background for such theological reflections on the Supper. In the analysis of the institution narrative of the Lucan gospel account, certain major themes that are of theological significance deserve to be given some deeper reflection. This chapter discusses and synthesises these themes from the analysis to give an informed understanding of this subject from the Lucan perspective of the Lord’s Supper.

3.2 Regeneration

The subject of regeneration is very paramount in Christian theology. The phrase ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον in v. 19 and τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκφυσνόμενον in the Lucan institution narrative shows that the Supper was instituted for the disciples of Jesus and for that matter only Christians can experience the Lord’s Supper as communion. Jesus categorically gave the elements at the Supper and the command to keep doing it to the disciples who at the time of the institution constituted the nucleus of the new community who he was entering into covenant with.\(^{130}\) The use of the plural personal pronoun ὑμῶν by Luke suggests that the command to the apostles was not exclusively to them but was extended to all others who through the sacrifice of Jesus will become part of the disciples. In Acts, Luke expresses
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this idea in Peter’s response to the crowd on the day of Pentecost during his address on how the crowd must react to his message (Acts 2:38).

According to Bock, Acts 2:36 provides a theological conclusion of the address by Peter whiles v. 38 gives its application.131 The verse outlines the basic things that are necessary for regeneration – repentance, baptism and the Holy Spirit. Thus within Peter’s response, he presents forgiveness and the Spirit132 as the principal gifts of God which is made available through the death of Jesus on the cross; and they serve as the entryway into a life with God.133 This affirms Jesus’ teaching in John 3:5 in his discourse with Nichodemus about how one can enter the kingdom of God. Jesus’ answer to his question was in reference to regeneration as a pre-requisite for union with Christ. Raymond E. Brown commented on the answer of Jesus to Nicodemus that one takes on flesh and enters the kingdom of the world because his father gave birth to him; so a man can enter the kingdom of God only when he is born by the heavenly Father.134 That is, just as life comes to a man only from his father, so does eternal life come from the heavenly Father through the Son whom he has empowered to give life. He explains further that even in natural sense, life is attributed to God’s giving of Spirit to men; so everlasting life begins when God gives his Holy Spirit to men.135 Being born of the Spirit as mentioned in John 3:5; seems to be making reference to the torrent of the Spirit through Jesus when he has been crucified and comes back to life.

The aorist imperative κεηαλνήζαηε in this Lucan context means a conscious turn towards God and God’s action through Jesus. Bock indicates that it is one of Luke’s

favourite terms used in describing how one should respond to the offer of forgiveness as Peter did in his Pentecost address (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 8:22; 17:30; 5:31; 8:22, 26:18; Luke 3:3; 24:47).\textsuperscript{136} It can be seen from this context that repentance for the forgiveness of sin brings about faith in God which is essential for regeneration. Bock explains further that repentance emphasizes the preliminary stage of the need for forgiveness whereas faith is the out coming trust and the understanding that this forgiveness comes from God.\textsuperscript{137} The early church served as an example for this when only regenerated believers were associated with the local church as followers of Christ who shared in the new covenant Christ established through His blood and so were mandated to participate in the Supper Jesus commanded them to observe. In Acts 2:47, Luke records that it was only those who were saved that were added to the church each day and engaged in the community lifestyle which included the breaking of bread. It thus becomes obvious that church and fellowship within a local church are related to the Lord’s Supper. It was the saved people who gathered at the apostles’ feet who broke bread and shared fellowship. It is a fellowship with Christ in His presence and at his table and through it God gives grace to the Christian.

However Grudem expresses the view that the grace does not come by mere participation in the Supper but ‘when a person participates in faith, renewing and strengthening his or her own trust in Christ for salvation, and believing that the Holy Spirit will bring spiritual blessing through such participation, then additional blessing may be expected.’\textsuperscript{138} This implies that it is only those who participate in faith that can receive the blessings that come along with its participation, and this faith comes as a result of regeneration and constant trust in God. Faith is the underlying factor that keeps believers in the worship of God and that which characterizes their persistent worship in the church.

\textsuperscript{136}Bock, Acts, 142.
\textsuperscript{137}Bock, Acts, 142.
\textsuperscript{138}Wayne Grudem, Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 955.
Therefore those who are genuinely associated with the local church should partake in the Lord’s Supper because they represent the disciples of Christ on earth and are people who have exercised faith in Christ and so have been regenerated. Luke significantly refers to Christian believers as “disciples” thereby signifying that there is a basic connection between the followers of Jesus before Easter and the believers thereafter. In effect, the theological significance of regeneration and its association with the Lord’s Supper needs to be emphasized.

In his teaching on the Lord’s Supper, Zwingli maintained that the Supper was a memorial service in which Christ’s presence among his people manifests a real communion. This affirms the assertion that ‘…In the Eucharist, the memorial to Christ’s words and actions is kept alive’. The emphasis on the people of Christ affirms the importance of regeneration. Wayne Grudem has also expressed the view that most protestant Christians affirm the importance of regeneration to the Lord’s Supper agreeing that only those who believe in Christ should participate in it. This is because repentance leads to faith in God and that leads to the entry of the gift of the Spirit which brings regeneration.

3.2.1 Forgiveness

The theme of forgiveness is discussed in relation to the Supper in two dimensions from the understanding that the phrase ἐν ἡμῶν \( \alpha\imath\tau\alpha\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \\upsilon\pi\epsilon\ \iota\mu\omicron\omega\nu\) in vv. 19 and 20 means the Supper was instituted for the disciples of Jesus. First I looked at forgiveness received for regeneration and second forgiveness practised as disciples. The record of the Pentecost
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address by Luke emphasizes the role of forgiveness in regeneration. Peter indicated in his message that the proper way to respond to the call of salvation was to repent which is to be evidenced by a change of direction. This is by a conscious turn to God and identifying their need for Jesus which in turn leads to forgiveness of sin and receiving the gift of the Spirit resulting in regeneration. That is to say, regeneration can only occur when one receives forgiveness after repenting and receive the Holy Spirit who gives the new birth.

Regeneration must also reflect in the believer’s ability and willingness to forgive others who offend him or her. In Jesus teaching on coming to worship in Matthew 5:23-24, there is a connection between forgiveness for one another and worship. Commenting on this verse, R.T. France indicated that the importance of right relationships demands decisive action, an example being what Paul expressed in practical terms in Ephesians 4:6: ‘Do not let the sun go down on your anger’. As Jesus taught that one will have to leave the gift for offering at the altar and be reconciled first with the offended, so should one reconcile with all others before partaking in the Supper. In this way it will show that you are a regenerated person and a true disciple of Jesus. A follower of Christ must reflect His nature and character of forgiveness. In effect, salvation and regeneration can be summed up as new life lived in the context of forgiveness from God and the given of His Spirit.

3.2.2 Baptism

Baptism is also an essential component of the regeneration process. This might account for the reason why most scholars enlist it as a pre-requisite for partaking in the Lord’s
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Supper,\textsuperscript{145} though there is division among them on this view. Barackman argues that since the Supper was given to his disciples, it is obvious that one must be saved and baptized to qualify to partake of it.\textsuperscript{146} According to Grudem, many protestant Christians who uphold this view argue on the account that ‘baptism is so clearly a symbol of beginning the Christian life, while the Lord’s Supper is clearly a symbol of continuing the Christian life’.\textsuperscript{147} In view of this they argue that anyone partaking in the supper to show that he or she is continuing in the Christian life must first submit to baptism to show that he or she has begun the Christian life.

Grudem among others argue against this view that if a genuine believer who has not gone through baptism is denied participation in the Lord’s Supper when Christians assemble, his or her non-participation will amount to the person not being a member of the body of Christ which has come together to observe the Supper as one body.\textsuperscript{148} Quoting from 1Cor. 10:17, ‘Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread’, he argues that churches should permit non-baptized believers to partake in the Supper and encourage them to be baptized as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, from the Lucan gospel account, the only requirement the evangelist mentioned for participating in the Supper is to be a disciple inferring from the plural pronoun ὑμῶν. This implies that every requirement needed for one to be a disciple applies to participation in the Supper. In view of this the account in Acts where Luke expresses the need for baptism after repentance for forgiveness of sin seem to suggest that it is required for participating in the Supper since it is part of the means by which one becomes a disciple.


\textsuperscript{146} Barackman, \textit{Practical Christian Theology}, 389.

\textsuperscript{147} Grudem, \textit{Systematic Theology}, 997.

\textsuperscript{148} Grudem, \textit{Systematic Theology}, 997.
However, Bock indicates that God makes an unclean object clean by granting forgiveness so that indwelling and presence can become possible;¹⁴⁹ that is to say, the person can receive the Spirit. In addition, it can be construed from Acts 3:19 that it is repentance that leads to blotting out of sin and not baptism. The underlying factor of the gospel message is the offer of the gift of the Spirit and what the Spirit provides to the one who believes. This accounts for the reason why all references to gift in Acts have to do with giving the Holy Spirit to as many as possible who responds to the proclamation of the gospel message by the church.¹⁵⁰ It is important to note that it is the Spirit that gives enablement for new life. Luke records different occasions in which the Spirit and forgiveness were given prior to baptism (Luke 24:47; Acts 10:44, Acts 3:19, 26:18).

Primarily this indicates that it is the Spirit’s baptism that brings about washing and consequent presence. In other words, it is baptism in the Spirit that leads to regeneration and new life which flow forth from the cleansing. Luke therefore clearly associates forgiveness simply with repentance which is responding to Jesus as the most important point of becoming a disciple. It then leads to public participation in the representative rite of water baptism. Baptism is therefore to be associated with the picture of forgiveness. But from a careful examination of the Great Commission where Christian baptism was instituted,¹⁵¹ it is a complex sentence with different activities which must follow each other. The first part deals with making of disciples and the nominative participle πορευθέντας is used to express it after which he follows it with the imperative μαθεστέα. Then he starts another sentence with another nominative participle βαπτίζοντας which he followed with an accusative pronoun αὐτοῦ which makes it the object of the participle; then a third part with the nominative participle διδάσκοντας meaning to teach. This in my opinion implies that becoming a disciple is not just an

¹⁵⁰ See Also *Acts* 2:38; 8:30; 10:45; 11:17.
experience but a process. It does not end at the point of exercising faith in Jesus through repentance and forgiveness which qualifies one to enjoy all the graces of a disciple but actually goes beyond.

Berkhof explains that by this authoritative commission Jesus meant that,

(a) The disciples were to go out into the whole world and preach the gospel to all nations in order to bring people into repentance and to the acknowledgement of Jesus as the promised saviour. (b) They who accepted Christ by faith were to be baptized in the name of the triune God, as a sign and a seal of the fact that they had entered into a new relation to God and as such were obliged to live according to the laws of the kingdom of God. (c) They were to be brought under the ministry of the word, not merely as proclamation of the good news, but as exposition of the mysteries, the privileges, and the duties of the new covenant.\(^{152}\)

This means that to be a disciple includes baptism and submitting to the teachings of Christ after accepting Jesus as the promised saviour. True discipleship must be an embodiment of these three basic components of the Great Commission.

In the light of the above discussion, it can be inferred that one can be a true believer of Christ before submitting to baptism as Berkhof argues since the Spirit and forgiveness which brings new life can be distributed before baptism. However, this alone does not qualify one to be a disciple. In view of this the researcher proposes that anyone who accepts Jesus in faith but has not been baptized but nothing prevents him or her from doing as such, should not be allowed to participate in the Lord’s Supper until baptism. On the other hand, anyone who is a true believer, submitting to the ministry of the word and laws of the kingdom but has not been baptised for reasons beyond his/her control, can and should be allowed to partake of the Supper. Nevertheless, the church must emulate the example of the early church by baptizing the saved members immediately they are saved so that they will satisfy all conditions required to participate in the Lord’s Supper.

\(^{152}\) Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 624.
3. 3 Unity among Believers

The subject of unity is another significant theme that evolves from the analysis of the Lord’s Supper tradition in Luke. The idea of unity among the partakers of the Supper is implicit in the institution narrative. The Eucharist symbolizes unity in the church and unity of humanity as a whole. It symbolizes the dimension of hope and the full stature of the body of Christ.153 Eucharistic liturgy and practices presupposes the doctrinal importance of unity in the church which is the custodian of this ordinance because of the statement made by Paul in 1 Cor. 11: 16 and 17.154 In the same vein, a study of the Lucan narrative also reveals this truth. Unity among Christians is taught in several portions of the Bible and Jesus through the Eucharist emphasized it in a practical way to his followers. They were therefore to maintain this unity among them as they continually observe the Supper.

Participation in the Lord’s Supper is seen in Christianity as an act of faith which unites the believer to Christ and symbolizes the union of believers with one another.155 In the words of institution, the Lucan Jesus upon inviting the disciples to the Supper made them eat of the same bread and drink of the same cup instead of their individual cups as it were at every Passover. Accordingly, the elements of the Supper shared at fellowship table first for the Christian community and for humanity as a whole, serve as the foretaste and the precursor, symbols that emphasizes the gathering together in celebration of the kingdom being proclaimed and anticipated in the Lord’s Supper.156 In this sense, Christ functions as the climactic central mystery who releases a power of attraction operating permanently to draw human beings to him, making this union the enlarged mystery of the

155 Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 650.
156 Boné, Eucharistic Community and The Renewal of Human Community’, 87.
church. Through this bond of unity from the power that comes from Christ, believers enter into a life of complete communion inspired more and more by the Holy Spirit and spiritually united with one another as members of his body. All who enter into communion with Christ as divine human person become in an enlarged sense his body or his members. He is the source of this power and those who receive his power are increasingly united both to him and with one another. By this act of faith, the disciples and for that matter all those who will later partake of the Supper as members of the mystical body of Christ continue in a spiritual unity. The one bread they shared and the one cup they all drunk from were to be a sign of unity among them. In this way the communion which Christ shared with his disciples at the Passover is passed on to the church as they continue to practice the Lord’s Supper. As they received the elements at the Supper, the one from the other, they exercised intimate communion with one another. In the same way Christians are also expected to share intimate communion at the table fellowship of the Lord’s Supper.

According to Barackman, this ordinance affords believers the opportunity to fellowship with him and with one another. They share both physical and divine communion with the Lord and other believers. He maintains that as the one bread at the Supper, he is the spiritual nourishment of his people, and as the one body believers bear testimony to their having partaken of him. Paul mentioned the inaptness of eating idolatrous feasts and being at the Lord’s Supper since the latter involved partaking in the body and blood of Christ, and unites the participants one with another as one body (1Cor 10: 16 -17). To this he explains that some people observed the Super unworthily where the
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unworthiness lies palpably in the behaviour that accompanies the meal whose sacred character underlies the absurdity of acting sinfully at the table. He mentions that the unworthiness arose from their failure to recognize the body. This could connote failure to identify that the bread represents the body of Christ dying on the cross.\textsuperscript{163} It could also stand for a failure to recognize that the church gathered together is the body of Christ.\textsuperscript{164}

From this background Paul develops a concept of believers being the body of Christ. He states that the individual bodies of Christians are members of Christ; the underlying assumption is that Christ has a body composed of different parts. The same imagery is employed in 1 Corinthians 10:17, where the fact that believers share together in one loaf at the Lord’s Supper is symbolical of their constituting one body.\textsuperscript{165} Thus unity and diversity are both emphasized, but the diversity is in the service of the unity.\textsuperscript{166}

In his teaching on the Lord’s Supper, Martin Luther viewed it as a sacrament of fellowship and mutual love.\textsuperscript{167} He found the basis of it decisively in the self – giving love of the Lord. He indicates that at the Supper, the living and exalted Lord, crucified and raised again for humanity is truly among us and takes us into fellowship with himself and thus liberates us for true human fellowship in responsibility to the world.

Roger Bowen also adds that the disciples common life in Acts 2:42-47 came out of their breaking bread together.\textsuperscript{168} It is in line with this that Paul criticized the Corinthian church for their wrong observance of the Supper. This was because their breaking of bread instead of fostering unity and fellowship among them rather brought social and class

\textsuperscript{165} Marshall, \textit{New Testament Theology}, 274.
divisions’ right into the heart of the fellowship and so destroyed it. But the Lord’s Supper, like the Passover represents both collective and individual, personal relationship with God and also a corporate, family relationship with him. In Luke this unity is further exemplified at the Passover by the manner in which Christ reclined at table with the disciples, even with his betrayer in their midst. Though he disliked what Judas was about to do, yet he shared fellowship with them and maintained the good relationship he had with them. Luke further indicates how the early church emulated this fellowship from the apostles as they exhibited it in their community life. It must be iterated that unity among participants of the Lord’s Supper must be strengthened each time they partake in the Supper.

3.4 Sacrifice

All the synoptic evangelists record the Last Supper at which Jesus symbolically interpreted his impending death as a sacrificial action related to the establishment of the covenant. Evangelist Luke clarified that it was the new covenant by introducing the adjective θαηλόο. He affirms that the death of Jesus is seen as sacrificial and redemptive. The death is understood to be for the benefit of many people, including the disciples of Jesus; and Matthew adds that it was for the forgiveness of sin. Within a similar context in Matthew, Jesus refers to drinking the cup of divine wrath, and he uses the same metaphor in Gethsemane. To be linked with this are the words spoken at the Last Supper about his body and the pouring out of his blood, like the sacrifice that inaugurated the old covenant at Sinai (Exodus 24). All of these add up to a clear understanding of the death of Jesus as the means by which people are delivered from sin and its dreadful consequence.
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In addition to the various discussions on this subject, in the Lord’s Supper tradition as presented by Luke, the following elements mentioned in the narrative suggests a sacrificial interpretation. Firstly, in the Lucan tradition as in the other synoptic accounts, the Lord’s Supper is situated in the context of the Passover, and in Judaism the Passover had a sacrificial undertone because of the slaughtering of the lambs in the temple and the shedding of blood which accompanied it. So the idea of Jesus pouring out his blood for others during a Passover meal brings to mind the sacrificial tone of the Lord’s Supper.

Secondly, in the cup saying, Luke includes the phrase ‘this cup is the new covenant in my blood which is poured out for you’ (v.20b). This makes reference to the covenant sacrifice and also to the sacrificial meal in which it culminated (Exodus 24:1-10). Since in Israel blood was offered to God only in sacrifice as evidenced in the prohibition on blood (Lev. 17:1-12), because of its purpose among them, Jesus pouring his blood for the same purpose which God had set for blood emphasizes the sacrificial nature of his death.

Thirdly, in the same cup saying, the phrase ‘for you’ is a recollection of Isaiah 53:12. Here there is a link connecting it to the martyrlogical interpretation of the Servant Song. This connection is seen in the fact that Jesus was ready to die as a martyr in effecting redemption. As in the servant song Isaiah indicated the suffering that awaited the saviour (Isaiah 53:1-10), it was only martyrs who will be willing to die such deaths. Yet in the Institution narrative he still expressed intense desire to eat the Supper. In effect, by giving his body and blood to humanity, he was sacrificing on their behalf.

The Jewish ethos with it sacrificially based worship indicates that the offering of sacrifice was necessary for the removal of sin and for the inauguration of a covenant. Hence the interpretation by Jesus of his death as a sacrifice on behalf of many is appropriate.\footnote{Marshall, \textit{New Testament Theology}, 196.} During the theocratic period of Israel’s history, their worship was

\footnote{Marshall, \textit{New Testament Theology}, 196.}
characterized by cooperative and ritualistic concept after Moses made all the institutions which catered for formal and public worship. Sacrifices and offerings were key aspects of this worship as indicated in Leviticus chap. 1-7. This included a high importance placed on blood because of its value as that which bears the life of animals and man.

Surprisingly there is very little about the actual offering of sacrifices in the Jesus tradition. Perhaps this may be because of the holiness in everyday life in worship in the synagogue which provided a substitute for the sacrifice system of Israel. And also the strong tradition in Greek philosophy which campaigned for a more suitable view of God and humanity gave rise to a polemic against blood sacrifice. Nevertheless, from the background of the death of the Maccabees in the Maccabean revolt which was believed to be a means of atonement for the sins of the people, the Jews considered vicarious surrender of life to have sacrificial significance. This opens up the way as far as it goes to the interpretation of Jesus’ death as a fulfilment of Old Testament sacrifices and their atoning effect. Also, sacrificial imagery is picked up in the very narrative of the institution of the Lord’s Supper and recurs throughout the New Testament especially in Hebrews. The words of institution use the language of sacrifice in recalling the covenant established by the pouring out of blood.

Joyce Ann Zimmerman in *The Cambridge Dictionary of Christianity* describes blood as a symbol of life, sacrifice and salvation with rich layers of meaning. Therefore Jesus’ pouring of his blood as mentioned in the institution narrative is sacrificial. In the Old Testament blood is understood to be the principle of life (Exod. 17:14). In her view,
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all other blood symbolism derive from this basic meaning; the saving blood of the Passover lamb (Exod. 12:7, 13), and during sacrifice to evoke the redeeming and atoning of life giving union with God (Lev 1:1-14’16; 17:3-8). This also includes that of Jesus which affirms that the offering of his blood was a sacrifice he made. On this account, the synoptic writers treat the Last Supper as strongly sacrificial. Jesus’ words “This cup is the New Covenant in my blood which is poured for you” clearly suggests an atoning sacrifice. On the part of Jesus who suffered out of love, it was sacrificial and this account for the reason why Jesus is said to have offered a sacrifice.

Barackman expresses the view that the sacrifice of Jesus was substitutionary. He commented that in the Lucan institution narrative, Jesus said ‘this is my body which is broken for you’. The preposition ‘for’ means ‘on behalf of’; Jesus’ offering of his body and blood was a sacrifice which he made on behalf of humanity. The sacrificial aspect of his offering is expressed by the use of the word παζεὶλ by Luke. The sacrificial nature is again seen in his given of his all of himself for humanity. He laid aside his visible glory, came down from heaven to earth, assumed a nature lower than his servants the angels and became poor.

Again, sacrifice unequivocally comes out in Christian interpretations of Jesus’ death, and more largely in understanding of the roles that Christ plays in the life of the believers. Jesus’ death occurred in the context of the Passover celebration with its lamb offerings. Some New Testament writers regard Christ as a sacrificial victim; an interpretation consistent with the words of Christ at the Last Supper regarding his death and being offered for the sake of others as presented by the synoptic evangelists. Bradley observes that Jesus’ message in the Eucharist emphasized that the only way to glory and
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fulfilment was through sacrifice and surrender and the only way to the kingdom of eternal life was through death understood spiritually in terms of dying to self as well as physically.\textsuperscript{183} The Eucharist was called sacrifice in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century church based on its character as a representation of Jesus’ death and as a functional substitute for sacrificial rites in other traditions.\textsuperscript{184}

Keith F. Pecklers submits that though there were varied approaches that undergirded the meaning and definition of the Eucharist, there was substantial harmony among them that the Eucharist was seen as a sacrificial act of the whole Christian community made in union with Christ. It provided the sustenance for the community’s own self recognition as Christ’s body.\textsuperscript{185} He explains that even during the middle Ages and the Reformation when the debate became very intense, the focus was always on sacrifice and presence. They sought to establish the relationship between the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary and the Eucharist; thus how Christ was present in the Eucharistic elements.\textsuperscript{186}

3.4.1 Christ’s Suffering as Sacrifice
Luke indicates that as part of Jesus’ sacrifice, he suffered many things on behalf of humanity. The understanding of the Lord’s Supper as sacrifice became dominant in the early church and even penetrated into the Orthodox Church. In the West, the sacrificial emphasis prevailed for a longer period. The understanding of the Lord’s Supper as a true atoning sacrifice was that, in addition to Christ’s one self-offering on the cross, grace is dispensed and is thus to be done as often as possible. At the Passover meal in Luke (v. 15), Jesus expressed his earnest desire to eat the Supper before he suffers. This is in line with the sacrifice that he was going to offer for humanity. Luke records in the passion narrative

\textsuperscript{184} Heim, ‘Sacrifice’, 1122.
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the things that Jesus went through before his crucifixion (Luke 23). Therefore the death of Jesus, which is also seen as a form of suffering, was sacrificial. John Oswalt submits in the fourth servant song that the servant was submissive, innocent but was treated unjustly. Though he was oppressed, he was submissive. Oppressed carries the understanding of harsh physical treatment from the hands of others. But the servant does not fight for his fate; rather he gives himself willingly to it. V. 5 of the servant song highlights what he went through. He was pierced not for his own sins but that of others, crashed and bored the punishment that brought peace to the people. 187

D. A. Carson is of the opinion that there is a certain kind of maturity that can be attained only through the discipline of suffering. 188 He explains that ‘during the days of Jesus’ life on earth, he offered up prayers and petitions with loud cries and tears to the one who could save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission. Although he was the Son of God, he learned obedience from what he suffered and ones made perfect he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him. This does not imply that Jesus suffered because he was disobedient, but that by his incarnate state he had to learn some lessons of obedience, levels of obedience that could only be attained through suffering. In view of this Apostle Paul taught that knowledge about Christ must not be limited to his glorious side. He writes: ‘I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of sharing in his suffering, becoming like him in his death, and so somehow to attain to the resurrection from the dead’ (Phil. 3: 10-11). It must be noted that the way the suffering of testing and discipline is handled, to a large extent, depends on what one focuses on. In the Lord’s Supper, Jesus focused on the work that he was going to do for humanity and so the suffering he was to endure did not deter him.

Luke indicated that he knew of his imminent suffering in his sacrifice for humanity, yet he stayed focused and still expressed great desire to eat the Passover with the disciples.

The Lord’s Supper also reveals another dimension of the suffering that Christ endured. Carson describes it as suffering that people endure because they are the people of God.\textsuperscript{189} Who we are can also necessitate some particular kinds of suffering. In the case of Jesus, his identity as the Son of God amounted to the suffering he endured for the sake of humanity. This is because; it is revealed from the new covenant theology that in order for the covenant to be ratified, there must be condescension of God that will make him the right person to inaugurate the covenant which was prophesied long ago.\textsuperscript{190} In view of this, the Son of God was incarnated to take the form of man and lived a life lower than his servants in order to fulfil all the requirements for his assignment. Therefore the suffering he went through in his sacrifice was because he was the Son of God.

This view is echoed in the servant song of the prophet Isaiah. Isaiah 53:2 suggests the servant would be faced with adverse conditions from his youth, and this applied to Jesus considering the legalistic Judaism environment in which he grew up and the various oppositions that confronted him. The suffering he went through as the wise servant of God was very appalling though he deserved none of it.\textsuperscript{191} Meekly and without protest he accepts sentence to death and suffers crucifixion. In this regard, we see the servant going down to the lowest depth in order to fulfil the Father’s will to the last degree in faithfulness to him. Though it is not always possible to distinguish between suffering that comes as discipline and suffering from opposition and persecution, we should be encouraged to think along that line so that we can have array of perspectives as we grapple with suffering in the Christian life.

\textsuperscript{189} Carson, \textit{How Long O Lord?}, 81.
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Oswalt argued further along this same line that suffering sometimes comes in line with the purpose of God. He cited that the coming of Assyria and then Babylon was not an accident of history: it was the unfolding of the just purpose of God.\textsuperscript{192} He however admitted that multitudes have suffered unjustly across the centuries. The reason for the suffering he admits was often because of the will of oppressors who made the processes of justice miscarry. But that of Jesus is different. He explains that he was not taken because of a corrupt legal system; though scholars posit there were some traces of unfair judgement. It is not legal injustice that condemned him but the transgression of his people. If he is treated unjustly, he is, the author wants us to know that this injustice is not an expression of that all-too-common custom of mistreating innocent people but the servant was doing his purpose.\textsuperscript{193}

The theme of suffering people of God came into fruition under the new covenant. This is in view of the fact that the church no longer constitutes a nation so opposing them can no longer be seen to be political. Besides, the object of the Christian faith is the crucified messiah who has created the path for his disciples to follow suit. Suffering which is seen as a source of shame for the world is bound up with what it means to be a Christian.\textsuperscript{194} This is because it stems from Christ’s sacrificial suffering wrought out in the enactment of the new covenant.

**3.4.2 Blood as Life in Sacrifice**

Christopher J. H. Wright indicates that the shed blood of an animal meant its life had been given up in death and thus, in the context of sacrifice, its life had been ransomed and
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cleansed the life of the sinful human being on whose behalf it has been slain.\footnote{Christopher J.H. Wright, ‘Leviticus’ in D.A Carson et al (eds), \textit{New Bible Commentary 4th ed.} (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press 1994), 145.} In his commentary on the Book of Leviticus 17, Jacob Milgrom commented on the v.11 which says ‘For the life of the flesh is in the blood and have assigned it to you for expiation for your lives upon the altar. It is the blood as life that effects expiation’. He explains that this text follows the strict prohibition of ingesting blood in v.10 because due to the value of blood, it has been set aside for a unique purpose of atonement than eating.\footnote{Jacob Milgrom, \textit{The Anchor Bible Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary} (New York: Doubleday 1991), 1469-70.} The text gives the rationale for the prohibition; the life of the flesh is in the blood and it is given for expiation. Birch et al affirms that the proscription regarding blood stands as sharp reminder that killing of animals must not be taken lightly for God is the source of their life.\footnote{Bruce C. Birch et al (eds), \textit{Theological introduction to the Old Testament}, 2nd edition (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005) et’al 56} In view of this, the Jews and aliens were forbidden of eating blood but must be offered back to God in sacrifice which forms the basis of worship. The text raises the physiological understanding that blood carries life to all parts of the sentient body and that serious loss of blood is followed by death to a moral and spiritual principle as well.\footnote{Wright, ‘Leviticus’, 145.} This accounts for the strict prohibition on its ingestion.

From this background it can be seen that the Sanctity of blood is greatly emphasized. Blood, so obviously necessary to life, plays the major role in the sacrificial system because of the notion that the sanctity of blood is found in the fact that it stands for the life of the creature.\footnote{R. Laird Harris ‘Leviticus’ in Frank E. Gaeblein (ed.), \textit{The Expositor’s Bible Commentary with the NIV: Genesis – Numbers Vol. 2} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1990), 520.} This idea was evident in the first sacrifice of Abel (Gen. 4:1-5). God also explicitly told Noah that man’s blood was sacred, for it stands for the life of man made in God’s image (Gen 9:4-6), thereby emphasizing the sanctity of human blood.
According to Morris, there are some passages in which blood and life are connected, principally in the prohibition of eating meat with blood still in it (Gen 9:4-6; Lev 17:11). This association has led scholars to conclude that ‘in the offering of sacrifice, the death of the victim is unimportant in sacrificial atonement or any animal dying in place of the worshiper but rather one life set free from the body and offered to God’. Similarly in the New Testament, it is not the death of Jesus that is the atonement but his life which is given through the shedding of his blood. That account for the reason why Jesus said this cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood. This implies that in every sacrifice, it is life which is lost through blood, so once blood goes out, life is given. Also the vital power of blood serves to explain its related ritual uses in purification and consecration.

Morris further argues that Leviticus 17:11 and similar passages are to be understood in the sense that ‘as blood is offered in sacrifice, it is life given up in death, rather than the life set free from the flesh that is the atonement.’ This implies that blood offered in sacrifice normally points to the undergoing of death rather than to the release of life. From this understanding, it can be construed that the offering of blood to God on the altar for the atonement of sin in worship amounts to accessing life from the life giver. Similarly, in the New Testament justified by his blood is parallel to reconciled to God through the death of his Son (Rom 5:9-10).

David S. Sperling contends that according to Avishur, blood and life are attested as lexical pairs in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Akkadian poetry. Sperling maintains that according to P, the atoning value of the blood accounts for the efficacy of the sacrificial system. This value placed on the blood is due to the life contained in it. Even in animal
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sacrifice, by placing a hand on the animal during sacrifice, sinners passed their essence on to it. Once the blood of the victim had been dashed on the side of the altar and the fat of the victim turned into smoke, substitution was effected for the two vital substances of the human sinner. The animal’s death had brought life to the sinner. This is because the blood dashed on the side of the altar in sacrifice is giving of life for life which has been lost in death through sin.

In the New Testament, blood is a symbol of the redemptive sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ on the cross and of entrance into a new and eternal covenant with God (1Cor 10:4, 16-22). This is what he meant in the institution narrative when he mentioned his blood which he was pouring for the new covenant. R. Laird Harris posits that, the historic view of the Old Testament sacrifice is that the death of the sacrificial victim is the God-given type of the death of Jesus Christ and that Christ by his death paid the penalty for sins. The sacrifice was in type and symbol substitutionary.\(^\text{203}\) Life was for life and the one who trusted in God’s substitute for sin was freed from penalty. (Hebrew 10:14; 19-20 and Romans3:25-26). Theologically, death comes as a result of sin, so blood is always needed to bring back the life which is lost through sin. The writer of Hebrews said that without the shedding of blood, there would be no forgiveness of sin (Hebrews 9:22). This implies that without the given of life (blood) to God, there cannot be restoration of life (forgiveness). In effect, the death of Christ through the pouring of his blood was the life of the world.\(^\text{204}\)

3.5 Covenant

The theme of covenant has major theological inference from several teachings of the Bible which the Lord’s Supper tradition forms part of. As an agreement enacted between two parties in which one or both make promises under oath to perform or refrain from certain

\(^{203}\) Harris ‘Leviticus’, 520.

actions stipulated in advance, scholars have indicated that in both the Old and New Testament, covenant in the Bible is the major metaphor used to describe the relation between God and Israel: the people of God. Hence it is the instrument constituting the rule of God, and so it is a valuable lens through which one can recognize and appreciate the biblical ideal of a religious community.

Scott, J. Hafemann expressed the view that, at its most fundamental level, the subject matter of biblical theology is the Bible understanding of God’s character and purpose; this is displayed in the developing relationship between God and his people. This relationship is what was seen among Jesus and his disciples and was to be realized in the enactment of the new covenant (v. 20). This implies that God’s relationship to the world is not a theological abstraction nor is it fundamentally a subjective experience. With salvation history as its framework, it is expressed and defined by the interrelated covenants that exist throughout the history of redemption. Rolf Rendtorff puts it that “Covenant is the most comprehensive and the most theologically weighty term for God’s attention to humans in the Hebrew Bible”, and John Waltson concludes that covenant is the ‘single most important theological structure in the Old Testament.’ Covenants were enacted with some personalities in the Old Testament and Israel as a nation. Eventually Israel incorporates the Gentiles and finds her own final redemption through the new covenant established by the Messiah in fulfilment of this same promise to the Patriarchs.

Although there are various individual covenants throughout the scriptures, it is significant to note that the term for covenant in the Old Testament (bĕrît) never occurs in the plural when describing God’s covenant with Israel, rather the biblical writers refer either to a specific covenant or to the covenant between God and His people. This is
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because the covenants of the Bible all embody the same fundamental covenant relationship. In view of this, covenant is seen as the biblical theological concept used to explain the essential character of God as king or Sovereign ruler, the election of a people under His rule who, as His adopted children live in dependence upon Him and the correspondent nature of God’s bond with those under the new covenant as their sovereign saviour. From this perspective, the commands of the covenants set forth the conditions by which the relationship with God will continue, by indicating the ways through which His acts of grace are to be honoured. In so doing, God’s commands describe the effects of that grace itself; since to be brought into a relationship with God is to be transformed by it.

Mendenhall and Herion assert that the phenomena of covenant may be roughly classified as treaties, loyalty oaths and charters; especially in the latter periods of biblical history and in connection with the subsequent utilization of covenant imagery within early Judaism and Christianity. Some scholars argue that biblical covenant originated later under the influence of loyalty treat claiming that it was actually created in the historical context of the Assyrian Empire and derived from its loyalty oaths. But according to Mendenhall and Herion, this cannot be accepted because there are some treaty elements in the biblical tradition which are not present in the Assyrian loyalty oaths and also there are some matrix of covenant ideas that are not reflected in the Assyrian loyalty oath which would raise the question of their origin and date. On the average more difficulties are resolved and fewer ones caused when we acknowledge that the Hebrew covenant ideas emerged with the formation of the society itself in the pre-monarchic period and were adaptations of patterns of thought that even then were centuries old.

Berkhof is of the view that in any covenant, God and man never emerge as equals. All God’s covenants are in the nature of sovereign dispositions imposed on man. God is
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absolutely sovereign in His dealing with humanity and has the absolute right to lay down the conditions which man must meet in order to benefit from his favour.\textsuperscript{211} When entering into covenant relations with man, it is God who always lays down the terms and they are very gracious terms, which He has on that account, a perfect right to anticipate that man will ascent to them.\textsuperscript{212} In an acceptance of the covenant principle there must be a special condescension of God. In this way, God revealed himself not only as an absolute sovereign and lawgiver, but also as a loving Father seeking the welfare and happiness of His dependent creatures. He condescended to come down to the level of man to reveal Himself as a friend, and to enable man to improve his condition in the way of obedience.\textsuperscript{213} This accounts for the reason why Jesus came down to the level of man and instituted the Lord’s Supper so that the New Covenant could be inaugurated.

Covenants played very significant roles in the social and political life of the people of Israel. It is attested that the large number of international treaties preserved in texts from all the Ancient Near East world is a dramatic witness to the importance of covenants in ancient social and political life.\textsuperscript{214} Even the Greek historian Herodatus regarded the forms by which a society established binding covenants as an important element in the description of that culture. Since covenants are typically between parties to create relationships that did not exist previously, both the substance and the form of the covenant must be valid and meaningful to both parties.\textsuperscript{215} In the institution of the Lord’s Supper, Jesus indicated that the substance of the covenant was His body and blood poured in covenant for His disciples, whilst in form it was to be a new covenant which is different from the old one; ratified not with the blood of animals but with His own blood. Christ is the key to understanding the biblical covenants. However, one legitimate issue in the study
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of biblical covenant must be the extent to which modern and Western students of the Bible can conceive and imagine relationships built on promises reliably made and honourably kept due to the problem of sociology of knowledge and the extent to which the English word ‘covenant’ has fallen into disuse in social life and in marriages.  

By their very nature, covenants are complex enactments which combine several complex acts which includes always some rituals that are essential to the ratification of the binding promise. Luke in his account of the Lord’s Supper indicates that Jesus used the Passover ritual as a symbolism of the ritual sacrifice of himself to satisfy this dimension of covenant ratification. The acts that are put together to form the covenant includes a prologue. By implication, the common decency of gratitude would place the vassal under obligation to comply with the wishes of the benefactor. In the institutional narrative Jesus is presented as the prologue of the covenant. He demands obedience from His disciples on whose behalf he enacted the covenant by observing the Supper in remembrance of him.

Again it is valid that the ratification of the covenant was frequently associated with the sacrifice of an animal. This significance of animal sacrifice is a complex and intractable subject, and even more when it occurs in the context of a covenant relation. But according to an Iron Age Assyrian treaty, the sacrificed animal represented and was identified with the vassal who was being placed under oath. Similar situations occur in the earliest Roman covenant traditions and so can be assumed that this sacrificial identification was widespread in both time and space.  

It is in this regard that Jesus identified Himself with the bread and wine on the table as the elements to be sacrificed. Theologically, Christ is always identified with the Passover lamb; so that by His sacrifice, the new covenant would be perfect to meet all its significance.
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Also associated with sacrificial ritual as an enactment ceremony, is the well attested fact that covenants were often officially ratified by a common meal. The social and religious significance of meals are so emphasized that it is not common to see them appearing frequently in connection with the creation of covenants both in the Ancient Near East and in the biblical narratives as enshrined in the Lucan institution narrative. In the Mari documents of the Assyrians, there is the specific mention of partaking bread and drinking presumably wine as we have in the biblical narrative as symbolic acts sealing important legal transactions.  

In Genesis 14, the King of Salem brought forth bread and wine and again the covenant with the Gibeonites narrated in Joshua 9:11-15, they offered mouldy bread and old wine which the Israelites accepted and the eating and drinking sort of ratified that peace covenant.

A final element in the entire covenant complex is often the delicate problem of imprecations and curses which are sometimes in an oath formula but not provided in the treaty text but implied in the text of other parallels. Though there are no imprecations outlined in the Lucan account of the supper, the Pauline account indicates that these are implied when he said anyone who partakes in the supper unworthily will incur God’s wrath for not considering the body of Christ. The Lord’s Supper puts believers under covenant relations with God as they carefully obey the command He gave to them on the eve of His death.

3.5.1 The New Covenant

The new Covenant as mentioned in the Eucharistic narrative has its origin from the prophecy of Jeremiah in the Old Testament (Jer. 31:31). Though some scholars have
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challenged its date and authorship, it is attributed to him.²¹⁹ At the Last Supper, Jesus mentioned that the covenant He was ratifying with His blood was the new covenant. The context and content of the prophecy by Jeremiah suggests that it was to be an entirely new one which was to establish the new covenant relationship because there was no body politic holding on to the covenant theoretically. This was in view of the fact that the Old covenant has been abrogated. It is noteworthy that in the ancient concepts of covenant the ultimate curse for breach of covenant was the destruction and scattering of the body politic with which the covenant was made initially. This was what took place in the exile. Therefore there was the need for enacting a new covenant with the people in order to continue the relationship between Yahweh and the old members of the body politic.²²⁰

The use of the term in Luke meant that a new age of relationship between God and His chosen people was about to begin after the pouring of the blood of Christ. The expression is therefore significant to the fulfilment of the salvation plan of God which was to be climaxed in the death of Christ. The substance of the prophecy clearly emphasized the discontinuity of the Old covenant traditions and the only benefit was forgiveness; the restoration of the relationship to God. In view of this, the only element of the Sinai covenant retained in the new one is simply the stipulation which is described by a complete internalization of the divine will rendering unnecessary the entire machinery of external efforts in keeping them.²²¹ He indicates that instead of the deposit and periodic reading of the covenant text, the knowledge of the divine will is deposited within the conscience of the members of the community. With that there would be no need for any special training in theology and doctrine. The New Covenant really is a new covenant, not
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a renewal of the old covenant. Jeremiah states that it will not be like the Mosaic Covenant (Jer. 31:31). Describing the nature of the new covenant, Gerhard von Rad writes:

What then is important and towers right above any previous prediction lies in the prophecy of a new covenant which Jahweh intends to make with Israel. This is clearly something quite different from Jahveh’s saying that days were coming when he would again remember his covenant which he made with Israel. No, the old covenant is broken, and in Jeremiah’s view Israel is altogether without one. What is all important is that there is no attempt here—as there was, for example, in Deuteronomy—to re-establish Israel on the old bases. The new covenant is entirely new, and in one essential feature it is to surpass the old.  

Bernhard Anderson adds, “But Jeremiah’s oracle cannot be understood as reactualization of the past sacred history. He speaks of a new covenant, not a covenant renewal, and thereby assumes a radical break with the Mosaic tradition.”

On the question of whether the old covenant saints were regenerated because of Moses’ statement in Deut 30:11-14, Homer Kent answers these questions well by saying

This does not mean that no Jew under the Mosaic Covenant had a transformed heart. What is being stated is that the New Covenant itself would provide this for every participant. Such was not the case with the Mosaic Covenant. Even though it was obviously possible to know God and have a transformed heart during OT times, the old covenant itself did not provide this. Many Jews lived under the provisions of the Mosaic Covenant and still died in unbelief. The New Covenant, however, guarantees regeneration to its beneficiaries.

Accordingly, Steven K. Stanley asserted that the author of Hebrews plainly and categorically stated that the Old Covenant is obsolete and that its readers are no longer under its authority. At the same time he confidently applies Old covenant scripture to his readers and their new covenant situation emphasizing the understanding that the Old covenant is fulfilled in the New Covenant and the Christ
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event and the Old Covenant scripture is fulfilled in the age of the New Covenant.\textsuperscript{226} These assertions clearly emphasize the uniqueness of the new covenant from the old one in terms of its establishment. It shows that there was a clear break from the old covenant tradition to an entirely new one which is made possible through the shedding of the blood of Christ. Contrasting between the old and new covenant with regards to membership, unlike the old covenant where entrance into the community was by physical birth, the new covenant community was to be formed by spiritual birth.\textsuperscript{227}

In the New Testament the covenant idea is recounted primarily in the Last Supper where Jesus through the words of institution identified it as the new covenant. In this account, there is a deliberate and conscious connection by the New Testament tradition to older covenant traditions of Jeremiah (Jeremiah 31:31-34). And from there the celebration of the Lord’s Supper became a fundamental feature of the early Christian assemblies. By this institution, anytime Christians partake in the Lord’s Supper it is an indication that they are under a new covenant relation with God. In doing this, Jesus ensured that the new covenant had key connections to the old one in relation to the acts for the enactment of covenants.

Mendenhall and Herion identified formal similarities and three major connections of the new covenant with other Ancient Near East covenant motifs which are of theological significance to the Lord’s Supper.

Firstly, they observed that the use of bread and wine was relevant not just because of its association with the imagery of covenant banquet but they connected with the resolution of enmity, restoration of personal relationships and internalization of a vassal’s obligation in the Assyrian loyalty oaths. In the Lord’s Supper, Jesus was restoring the
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broken relationship between man and God through the establishment of the new covenant so there was a meal and bread and wine were shared.

Secondly, they observed that the use of Semitic terminologies in the Last Supper narrative as shown in the Greek manuscripts betrays patterns of thoughts attested in early biblical and Ancient Near East sources. Specifically mentioned is the use of the word ‘remembrance’ in the institution narrative which has Semitic significance that is lacking in the Greek. They explain that the verb ‘to remember’ in the context of the new covenant implies recalling some benefits received which forms the basis for some further actions or decision making.

The third similarity has to do with the identification of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Jesus. In the Lucan narrative Jesus said ‘this is my body which is broken for you and this cup is the new covenant in my blood…’, an expression which sought to identify the disciples who partake in the bread and wine with the sacrificial victim. They are of the view that this was clearly connected with Iron Age treaty where the sacrificed animal is specifically stated not to be a sacrificial animal but the vassal being placed under the loyalty oath.\footnote{Mendenhall and Herion, ‘Covenant’, 1198.} In relation to this it is established that the basis of every covenant relationship is the grateful recognition and receipt of an undeserved favourable dispositions.

While some scholars argue that the church cannot relate with a covenant that was not made with her because to them Jeremiah prophesied about the new covenant when the church had not been born; some traditional dispensationalist theologians teach that union with Christ solves the problem of how the church relates to a covenant not made with her. John Master in the article by Pettegrew concludes his discussion on the New Covenant by making this very point:
What then is a suggested relationship of the church to the new covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-34? The church is united to the mediator of the new covenant. The new covenant has been cut. The actualization of the new covenant in the lives of believers, however, is yet future, when Christ returns and the house of Israel and the house of Judah are transformed by God’s grace to obey completely the commands of God.\footnote{Pettegrew, ‘The New Covenant’, 252.}

It can be construed that just as the Sinaitic covenant was mediated by Moses between God and Israel his chosen nation (Acts 7:37-38; Gal. 3:19), the same way the new covenant was enacted between God and a redeemed people, with Jesus Christ the Son as mediator (1Timothy 2:5; Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24). According to the prophecy of Jeremiah, about the new covenant, God would be their God, He will put His laws in their hearts and all will know God and He will forgive their sins. Jesus made it known that the new covenant must be started through His blood (Luke 22:19-20), since covenants in Israel are known to be inaugurated by blood. This was in order to make it superior to the old covenant. Through the death of Christ the new covenant was inaugurated because it was through his blood and so he called the wine which was shared at the Last Supper ‘Blood of the new covenant’ (v20). This implies that Christ’s pouring of His blood for humanity marks the beginning of the new covenant relationship. This act affirmed Christ as the mediator of the new covenant and the sole mediator between God and man (1Tim 2: 5-6).

There are two basic theological significances of Christ’s mediatorship. Firstly, the covenant was necessary for the cleansing of sin through the shed blood. So in the new covenant there was the need for the blood that could effect this cleansing better than the old order. In view of this, all those under the new covenant are under the mediatorship of Christ and His blood forgives their sins. Secondly, the new covenant renders the former obsolete (Hebrews 8:13).
3.6 Salvation

Salvation is the most widely used term in Christian theology to express the provision of God for the predicament of mankind. Frank Matera postulates that no writer of the New Testament presents a more complete redemptive history than Luke.\footnote{Frank Matera, \textit{New Testament Theology: Exploring Diversity and Unity} (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 95.} His account of the redemptive history finds its climax in the passion death and resurrection which Christ associated the Lord’s Supper with. This redemptive history is to convey the message of God’s salvation to the world. This means the Eucharistic celebration informs the doctrine of salvation in the church as it forms part of the activities that climaxed this important history of humanity. The noun can refer positively to the resulting state of well being and is not confined to the negative idea of escape from danger. In the Old Testament the verb ‘save’ expresses particularly God’s action in delivering His people and the name Jesus is etymologically ‘Yahweh is salvation’,\footnote{Ian Howard Marshall, ‘Salvation’ in Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright (eds), \textit{New Dictionary of Theology} (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1988), 610.} this might have been known by the early Christians.

In the New Testament, however, the word is given a new understanding. The notion of rescue or deliverance is still upheld, but the reference is to deliverance from sin and from the wrath of God as the ultimate fate that awaits the sinner.\footnote{Marshall, ‘Salvation’, 610.} The use of the term in itself indicates that the thought is of an action from the outside by God who is the saviour; implying that man by no means can save himself. Thus salvation is dependent on the grace of God and achieved through the action of Jesus Christ whose incarnation and atoning death took place in order that He will save sinners. Technically, the word is used in New Testament theology to describe God’s feat in rescuing people from their sins and their consequences and in bringing them into a
situation where they can access the blessings of God.\textsuperscript{233} Implying that Salvation is to be understood comprehensively as the sum total of the benefits God bestows on believers. This includes the grace that disciples share in partaking in the Lord’s Supper as humble obedience to the commands of Jesus Christ at the Last Supper.

Killen and Rea are of the notion that biblical covenants are important keys to two great facets of truth: Salvation (Soteriology) which reveals how God’s plan through Jesus Christ to redeem his elect is unfolded in an ever-widening and deepening manner in the successive covenants and Prophecy which also shows that the Abrahamic, Palestinian, Davidic and the new covenant open up the whole scenery concerning Christ’s first and second advents and his millennial reign on earth.\textsuperscript{234} It can be inferred from these that closely linked to the act of covenants is the idea of salvation. Most of the great covenants in the Bible reveal facts concerning both the suffering, sacrificial, the ruling and reigning messiah. In these covenants God always took the initiative in entering into covenant with the people with salvation being the backdrop of these covenant relations. There is therefore a great link between the biblical covenants and salvation. In the same way the new covenant which Jesus inaugurated at the Passover has salvation as a key element. Again what is indubitable in the Lucan gospel is that in every reference to δηαζήθε, God’s saving work is prominent. Luke uses δηαζή θε for the old order of salvation in Luke 1:72; Acts 3:25 and Acts 7:8; covenant of circumcision where the meaning might well be covenant.\textsuperscript{235} So with the reference to the new covenant in His blood in the institution narrative, salvation is implied.

In looking at the theme of salvation from the point of view of the Eucharist, Hubner asserts that the distinction between the covenant of works and the covenant of
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nature which God made with Adam before the fall and the covenant of grace which is to be found in Jesus Christ must be considered.\textsuperscript{236} He intoned that as Christ took upon himself the penalty of death, which was necessarily imposed when the covenant of works was broken; he made possible a new covenant whereby the elect again achieved salvation on the condition of faith and repentance. Heron also expressed the view that the covenant of grace rest on a covenant of redemption made in eternity between God the Father and his Son.\textsuperscript{237} There is in view of this a large scale of theology of salvation history in which God’s whole action towards humanity is characterized by the contrast between the covenant of works and covenant of grace and by the successive cancellation of the former in favour of the latter.

Furthermore, the interrelationship between the biblical covenants and the Lord’s Supper builds up in establishing the salvational role of the new covenant which Christ announced in the institution of the Lord’s Supper. Killen and Rea indicate that though the covenant of works was broken by Adam and its consequence came upon the whole of humanity, it was taken up by Christ, born of woman under the law to redeem those under the law and kept perfectly in the stead of humanity which culminated in the salvation of the world under the new covenant.\textsuperscript{238} The Lord’s Supper declared Browne,

\begin{quote}
is a sacrament or mark of the apparent church, sealing unto us by the breaking and eating of bread and drinking the cup in one holy communion, and by the word accordingly preached, that we are happily redeemed by the breaking of the body and shedding of the blood of Christ Jesus, and we thereby grow into one body, and church, in one communion of graces, whereof Christ is the head, to keep and seek agreement under one law and government in all thankfulness and holy obedience.\textsuperscript{239}
\end{quote}
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\textsuperscript{239} Robert S. Paul, The Atonement and the Sacraments: The Relation of the Atonement to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper (Nashville: Abingdon Press, N/A), 359-60.
This is to say the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is not a dispensable rite but was an essential mark of the church. By this view it also shows that there is an obvious relationship between the supper, the preaching of God’s word and to the life and discipline of the church which is very essential. Browne points out that there is an unmistakable relationship between the action within the sacrament and the action of Christ in the redemption of humanity. He maintains that the Supper, ‘by the breaking and eating of bread and drinking the cup’ seals the fact that believers are happily redeemed by the breaking of the body and shedding of the blood of Christ Jesus.  

Pettegrew indicates that at the Last Supper, it was time that the servant, as a mediator was to deliver Israel from bondage and mediate the new covenant which was to be established between the Lord and his people (Isaiah 54:1, 55:3, 59:21, 61:8).  

It was a move towards the final stage of God’s salvation plan for humanity. On this account Apostle Paul restated Jesus’ teaching about the blood of the new covenant as enshrined in the gospel’s account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper in his instruction to the local church at Corinth on the communion.

Commenting on the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, Neville Clark said ‘both are concerned with incorporation into Christ, with death and resurrection; both are made powerful by the operation of the Holy Spirit; both stand under the sign of the cross; both are sacraments of inaugurated eschatology’.  

This view is affirmed by Pettegrew when he construed that after his ascension, Christ inaugurated the new covenant by pouring out the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Baptism and the Lord’s Supper bring believers sacramentally in deeds to God’s action in Christ for the redemption of man. This means that through the agency of the sacrament, the Risen Lord takes Christians to the centre of his act of redemption and makes known its meaning in the action of his sacred

---

death. Robert Browne in view of this went on to express the notion that ‘the spiritual use and feeding of the body and blood of Christ, is an applying of his whole work of our redemption by that outward sign, to feel effectually the remedy of our miseries by that partaking and growing together in the body of Christ and spiritual communion’. Therefore within the sacrament the meaning of a Christian’s salvation is mediated by Christ in and through the corporate action of the church. This mediation of the Lord’s Supper has accorded it a special place making it the centre of the Christian worship.

Luke affirms Jesus’ salvation role in the Acts account when Peter and John were called before the Sanhedrin upon healing the man at the beautiful gate. Peter in his address pointed out in Acts 4:12 that Jesus is the only means for salvation. This emphasize the fact that the climax of Jesus’ activities which is seen in his given of himself to man was aimed at salvation. It would seem quite clear, therefore that to catch Peter’s meaning in this great declaration, one must take the concept of salvation in the most comprehensive sense possible for it to bear, and that we must give to his restriction of this salvation to Jesus and his mighty name, the strictest and the most stringent interpretation.245

In Peter’s address, there is the ascent of necessity. He noted that it is not merely that man may be saved by Jesus or that we can be saved by Jesus but that if we must be saved at all, it must be in him that we are saved.246 By this we see Jesus as the sole Lord of salvation, holding in his hands the keys of life and dividing to each as he wills. Jesus, the only name given among men whereby men must be saved, to sin-stricken and despairing men, is good news. However, it is worthy of mention that this exaltation came only after he gave his body and blood in sacrifice on behalf of humanity. The Bible shows that the Lord’s Supper speaks about God’s action in redemption. The gospel account affirms the

importance of the Supper to the evangelists and for the ministry of the Lord. Again in looking at the words of institution, it cannot be considered independently of the crucifixion, for that which provides it the elementary significance is its intimate relation to the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ which is also the foundational element for salvation. In view of this in looking at salvation from the theological perspective, the Lord’s Supper is very significant because it is in it that Jesus announced the redemptive work which he was going to do for the salvation of the world. Again it must be emphasized that because at the last supper Jesus was making reference to an expiation which was to be done through his blood as an offering brought to God on the merit of sinners, it merits salvation.

3.7 Conclusion

To conclude, the Lord’s Supper is very important in the theological discussions of the church. It has very close links with some major theological themes that are very relevant to the church. The place of the Lord’s Supper in Christian worship demands that deeper reflection is made on the various subjects that are connected to the subject so that the understanding of these, can further improve the understanding of its place in theology of the church.

In this chapter the theme of regeneration has been discussed as a requirement for one to be a disciple of Christ in order to partake in the supper. Regeneration is an important theological theme because it is that which gives the Christian the new identity in Christ. Since Jesus gave the command for the observance of the supper to the disciples, it is mandatory that all those who partake of the supper must be Disciples of Christ. Close to the subject of regeneration is baptism and forgiveness which according scholars are basic essentials for regeneration. From the discussion, it became evident that through
repentance, there can be forgiveness of sin which makes way for the entrance of the Holy Spirit who brings regeneration. This action can indeed take place before one is baptized. This means that one can be a true believer before being baptized. However, since discipleship is more than just accepting Jesus Christ through faith for forgiveness of sin but requires that one submits to baptism and the ministry of the word, as Jesus outlined in the Great Commission, a Christian can only partake in the Lord’s Supper when he satisfy all these requirements. Nevertheless if someone is a true believer but for some reasons beyond his reach has not been baptized but submits to the teachings of Christ, he should not be denied participation of the supper.

The Lord’s Supper also teaches that Christians must be united. This chapter has established that the Lord’s Supper emphasizes the biblical teaching of unity among believers. This is because participation in the supper is seen as an act of faith which unites Christians with Christ and with one another. The supper represents both individual and corporate family relation with the Lord. This must be emphasized as often as Christians observe the supper in obedience to Christ’s command at the Last supper.

Again it has also discussed the theological dimension of sacrifice in relation to the Lord’s Supper. It has been found that the death of Jesus which he symbolically interpreted in the Lord’s Supper was sacrificial. It is to be noted that with the Jewish understanding of vicarious surrender of life to have sacrificial significance, the death of Jesus could be classified the same way. Therefore by the breaking of his body and pouring his blood for many, he was offering sacrifice for the redemption of humanity. In view of this the Eucharist was called sacrifice by the early church because to them it represents Jesus death and served as a functional substitute for sacrificial rites in other traditions. As part of his sacrifice he also endured suffering of various forms. Luke records that though Jesus was aware of the suffering that awaits him in his sacrifice, but because he saw it as part of his
sacrifice; he was not deterred by them. We see here that suffering must not always be seen from the negative sense but also as part of fulfilling the will of God.

In sacrifice, blood is offered to God as symbolism of given life for life lost in sin. So when Jesus was offering his blood in sacrifice for humanity, he was given his life for the salvation of the world. As we know from Christian theology that death comes as a result of sin, blood is always needed to restore the life which is lost. It is established from the discussion that the death of Christ through the shedding of his blood is in effect the life of the world.

Finally, study of the Lord’s Supper reveals the theme of covenant which is known to be the major metaphor used to describe the relation between God and his chosen people. Because of the socio-political importance of covenants, they are widely spoken of in the Bible and Jesus used the occasion of the Last Supper to inaugurate the new covenant which God promised his people. Jesus condescended to ratify the new covenant with his blood as the perfect mediator of the new covenant so that by participating in the supper, Christians would be under the lordship of Christ’s mediatorship and be part of the new covenant to enjoy the grace associated with it. It is concluded that the Lord’s Supper serves as an outward evidence of continuing in the new covenant with God.

Associated with covenant from the perspective of the Lord’s Supper is the theme of salvation which is widely used in expressing the provision of God for human’s plight. It is affirmed that at the bottom of every covenant relation is the idea of salvation. So when Jesus was inaugurating the new covenant, he had salvation embodied in it. The work has emphasized that in view of the fact that Jesus was making reference to expiation which was to be done through his blood in the institution narrative, his action merits salvation.

The next chapter of the work looks at the relevance of the study of the Lucan account of the Lord’s Supper to Ghanaian Christianity. It attempts establishing the
relationship between the intended meaning of the author and how the text is applied in the contemporary observance of the Lord’s Supper among Ghanaian Christians.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE LORD’S SUPPER AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR CONTEMPORARY GHANAIAN CHRISTIANITY

4.1 Introduction

The discussion in this chapter focuses on how the tradition of the Lord’s Supper can be contextualized within the perspective of the Ghanaian church using the Methodist Church Ghana as an Example for this study. As a central practice in Christian worship, some of the themes discussed in the synthesis of this work may be evident in the church, but this chapter discusses how the Supper is celebrated by Christians in recent times. It also looks at how the interpretation of the Lord’s Supper could help in addressing some of the issues confronting the churches today due to their understanding of the Supper. This has been done through a discussion of the relevance of some of the major themes from the Ghanaian perspective.

4.2 The Celebration of the Lord’s Supper by Ghanaian Christians

In Ghana, the Lord’s Supper as a distinctive structure of the Christian worship is celebrated daily, or weekly or monthly by various Christian congregations. This is based on the various doctrinal positions of the churches. In the Methodist Church for instance, participation in the Supper is a constitutional right for the members which the minister must ensure he fulfils it.247 In spite of the diversity in the practice by the various church traditions, there is remarkable consistency in the form the sacrament takes. All church traditions affirm allegiance to observing how the authors of the New Testament interpreted the words, actions and intentions of Jesus at the Last Supper. It therefore serves as the

background against which the Supper is observed. In view of this, it is seen to be the most distinctive form of Christian worship bearing the authority of direct connection with Christ himself.  

The celebration of this sacrament has been a central and identifying characteristic of the Christian worship. In Ghana, most Eucharistic liturgies have the first section which deals with the ministry of the word and preparatory service for the Supper. This is in view of the relationship that exists between the sacrament and proclamation. This also accounts for the reason why S. W. Sykes argued that sacraments without narratives are exceedingly precarious because they could be easily distorted and misinterpreted. Though some churches do not have written down liturgy for the celebration, the aspect of service of the word is never left out because it forms the first part of the Eucharistic service. David S. Kirkwood expressed the notion that contemporary celebration of the Supper should be eaten as a full meal because the rite has its roots in the Passover meal which was part of a full meal and the early church did observe it as such.

Among the various church traditions in Ghana, there are variations to the frequency with which the Supper is observed. In the Presbyterian Church, for instance, the Lord’s Supper is celebrated at the end of the month and also on important occasions such as Palm Sunday, Christmas, Easter, Holy Friday, unlike the Roman Catholics who celebrate it at every Mass. The Methodist Church Ghana have it at regularly appointed times which is often on the first Sunday of the month and other important occasions.

---

constitution, Standing Order 709 enjoins all members, catechumens and adherents to use the means of Grace as regular as possible; publicly and privately.\textsuperscript{254}

However, most Pentecostal and Charismatic churches celebrate it monthly. Though scripture is not explicit on how often the Supper is to be observed, it was done regularly by the early church (1 Cor. 11:20-34), and we see a similar picture among these Christian groups. Meanwhile, the frequency with which the Supper is celebrated has been resisted by some church leaders and pastors in the mainline and protestant churches. Some argue that if it is celebrated too often, it will lose its meaning. Others also express the view that observing it weekly is too Catholic; while some think it makes the service too long.\textsuperscript{255} Nevertheless, the most discerning issue regarding this is how well the congregational worship operates ritually in transforming and expressing their identity as a church.

In the Methodist church, the Supper is celebrated as part of the service on the designated times so everyone witnesses it, but it is only the communicants as stated by the constitution that can receive the bread and wine. Frimpong has indicated that formerly in the Presbyterian church of Ghana, the non-communicants were asked to leave the auditorium after preaching, and so did not know what went on in the room,\textsuperscript{256} but in recent times the Supper is observed in the presence of the entire congregation while only communicants are invited to the Holy Table of the Lord just as the Methodist do.\textsuperscript{257} This is the manner in which most churches celebrate it.

The elements used are made up of bread and wine as the Bible indicates. The use of ordinary food as elements for the Supper is very sensitive to the celebration of the Eucharist. Christ did not use any other food in the institution than bread and wine. In view

\textsuperscript{255}J. Frederick Holper, ‘As often as you Eat this Bread and Drink the Cup’, Journal of Bible and Theology Vol. XLVIII, (1994):61-73, 62.
\textsuperscript{256}Frempong, ‘The Polygynist and the Lord’s Supper’, 22.
\textsuperscript{257}Presbyterian Church of Ghana Worship Book Ordinances (Accra: A-riis Company Limited, 2010), 80- 4.
of this, the elements for the Supper are not anything fake but real food. The bread is not of any nature than what it appears, tastes and smells.\textsuperscript{258} The bread used is that which can be broken easily; neither too fresh nor too stale.\textsuperscript{259} In contemporary celebrations wafers are used for the bread, but at places where the wafers are difficult to come by, a loaf of bread is used as substitute.\textsuperscript{260} Non alcoholic wines are available for use in the celebration. However, the Methodist church accepts the use of only communion wines for the celebration.\textsuperscript{261} This may be is to emphasize that a fruit from the vine must be used. Meanwhile, some others use any soft drink with red colour as symbolism of the colour of blood. Drinks such as Vimto, Coca Cola are used by some churches as a result of cost and also because of the understanding that it is symbolic.

It is of great importance to note that the breaking and giving of the bread and wine are very significant in the celebration. In the Methodist Church Ghana, the administration of the Eucharist is a strict duty of an ordained minister basing on the charge laid upon them at ordination, ‘Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and His Holy Sacraments’.\textsuperscript{262} It is required that communion is offered to the sick and people under conditions where a full service is impracticable. However, particular problems occur in the giving of the cup because of health related issues. White indicates that some churches dip the bread in the cup and give it to the participants while others mix the wine in one cup and pour it out into smaller individual cups as is the case of the Methodist church or give the wine already poured into individual cups to each person.\textsuperscript{263} This practice is not different from the most churches case in Ghana.

\textsuperscript{258}White, \textit{Introduction to Christian Worship}, 261.
\textsuperscript{259}White, \textit{Introduction to Christian Worship}, 261.
\textsuperscript{260}Methodist Liturgy and Book of Worship, 11.
\textsuperscript{261}Methodist Liturgy and Book of Worship (Accra: Wesley House, 2000), 11.
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In the Methodist church, the elements are served to participants either while kneeling in front of the Lord’s Table, standing or sitting in the pews depending on the circumstances of the time. However, some Charismatic and Pentecostal churches call the communicants to the table to pick the elements themselves while some also follow the traditional order of giving them out whiles standing. This posture for receiving the sacrament is different from the Lucan account where the disciples reclined at table for the Supper (Luke 22:14). Communion for the sick, aged and invalids is as an extension of the congregational communion service or when it is specially asked for by a sick person in the hospital or at home. This offers them the opportunity to strengthen their fellowship with other believers and Christ and also to access the grace of God which is dispensed through the Supper.

Another important characteristic of the observance by Ghanaian Christians is the joyous nature of the celebration. White shares this view when he said ‘Eucharistic celebrations need to include both joy and penitence’. He explained that a standard interpretation of the New Testament teaching on the Lord’s Supper is that in the early period, the churches celebration were characterized by ecstasy and joy. They did emphasize the majestic presence of Christ which gave them so much joy even in the midst of persecution. In the early days of the church in Ghana, the Supper was observed in a solemn manner because of its sacrificial understanding and the view that it commemorates the death of Jesus. The case is however different today. In contemporary times, the Supper is celebrated amidst singing and dancing with both local and foreign gospel music and instrumentation which affords them the opportunity to portray their Ghanaian identity.
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the Eucharistic liturgies, the worshipers are offered the opportunity to sing and dance as part of their thanksgiving to God. In the Methodist liturgy, there is a part of the service where worshipers are allowed to sing hallelujah hymns and choruses as part of expressing their joy for what the Lord has done. This joyous celebration is characteristic of the early church where Luke indicated that they ate their meals with the gladness of heart (Acts 2: 46).

In addition, Ghanaian Christians contextualize the celebration of the Supper by using local equipment and vestment such as calabash for the cup and wearing traditional cloths in officiating the Supper as was exemplified by Archbishop Emeritus Akwasi Sarpong of the Kumasi Archdiocese of the Catholic Church and The Most Reverend Dr. Robert Aboagye-Mensah, the former Presiding Bishop of the Methodist Church Ghana respectively. Some ministers also use local fabrics to sew the official vestments used by the clergy on festive occasions and for celebrating the Lord’s Supper. These coupled with the local music and instrument used makes the people appropriate the supper and understand it better in their context as African Christians.

4.3 Communalism in Ghanaian Societies

In verses 14 and 15 of the text, Jesus communicated the idea of community life to his disciples. Communalism is one important value that is been propagated in all Ghanaian as well as African communities. Kwame Gyekye asserts that to be born into the African community is to be born into a culture that is intensely and perversely religious, and that means and requires participating in the religious beliefs and rituals of the community. In view of this one cannot detach him or herself from the community, for to do so is to be
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isolated from the group and to disrupt one’s sense of communal membership.\textsuperscript{270} Mbiti observes that in Africa one owes his existence to other people including those of past generations. African life is therefore said not to be individual but a communal affair. This virtue is integrated into the culture of the people. The communal structure of Ghanaian society has created a sense of community that characterizes the social relations among members of the society.

Africans and for that matter Ghanaians recognize the dignity of the human being, and in consequence, hold a deep and unrelenting concern for human welfare and happiness.\textsuperscript{271} The great value placed on human beings is best demonstrated by their response to the death of a member of the community. For this reason the thoughts, actions, art and institutions of Ghanaians are filled with expressions of concern for human welfare and the importance of the being. For this reason a great deal of emphasis is placed on communal values that make life meaningful for the people within the community. Gyekye observes that the sense of community is an enduring feature of the Ghanaian social life. Such values like sharing, mutual aid, caring for others, interdependency, solidarity and social harmony which underpins and guides the type of social relationships, attitudes and behaviours that must exist between individuals within the community are implicitly communicated in the Lord’s Supper.

In defining community, Gyekye said ‘it is a group of persons linked by interpersonal bonds, which are not necessarily biological, who share common values, interests, and goals’.\textsuperscript{272} This community life is similar to that which Luke talks about in the enactment of the new covenant in the prophecy of Jeremiah which was enacted through the blood of Christ in the Eucharistic narrative. In Acts 2:42, the disciples exhibited communalism through the breaking of bread (Acts 2:42-47). This served as a strong bond
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between them. Nash mentions that the mere act of eating together is a universal symbol of hospitality and acceptance which transcends culture. In Ghana, there are different forms of communal meals that people participate in as a symbol of communality and a sense of belongingness. During festivals and other festive occasions, Ghanaians come together to share food and drink with others. People from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds interact with one another by shaking hands and embracing one another during social occasions. These acts do not only bring peace among them but strengthen their communalism. The Methodists in Ghana demonstrate this value in their celebration through the singing of shalom just after taking the bread and wine. During this, the members exchange greetings of peace with one another and strengthen the bond between them.

4.3.1 Sharing from the Ghanaian Perspective

In verse 17 of the text, Jesus gave the bread to the disciples to share it among themselves. Sharing is one value that distinguishes a community from an association of individual person in Ghanaian communities. Members of Ghanaian societies demonstrate concern for the well being of others by doing what they can in advancing the common good of the members in the society. In his work *The Institution of the Eucharist in the Gospel of Mark: A Study of the Function of Mark 14:22-25 within the Gospel Narrative*, Ossom-Batsa postulates that the Semantic relations established between the cup and blood leads to the conclusion that to drink of the cup in Mark 14:22-24 is a primary metaphor for sharing in the life of Jesus as the source of life. This further affirms the fact that sharing is an

---
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important component of communalism. This is because as Christians share in the life of Christ, they are required to share it with their fellow believers.

Ghanaian Christians demonstrate the act of sharing at different levels of their social life. The Akan maxim ‘A human being needs help’ underscores the fact that human beings deserves, and therefore ought to be helped. During festivals and rites of passage, they give gifts to people which express the value attached to sharing in Ghanaian communities. In Ghana, funerals are regarded as a duty, and no pains may be spared to make them memorable. This is seen in the concern they show for the attendance at every funeral. When close relatives are lost in death, the family members leave their homes to live with the bereaved family member till the dead person is buried, and the entire community also go to assist the family during the funeral. When the deceased is laid in state, sympathizers living far and near go to have a last look at the dead person and give out gifts. The relatives of the deceased also give gifts of money, clothing, ring and toiletries to the dead person when placed in the coffin for burial. Also on the funeral day donations are given to the relatives of the deceased to support them in the celebration. The same sharing occur at all other social celebrations such as marriage, naming ceremony, puberty rites among others. They also visit the sick among them on regular basis and give them aids of diverse forms. This sharing is exemplified in the Methodist church as they present food items, money, medicine, clothes when they go out to give communion to the sick and invalids. This is to support them physically as they share divine grace with them.

During festivals, Chiefs receive gifts from their subjects as a form of support for the celebration. Individuals also share gifts for other members of the society. Quarcoopome has hinted that such occasions virtually bring together the whole community
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and provide an occasion for renewal of fellowship between members of the same clan or lineage to strengthen the communalism between them. Mbiti affirmed that such occasions unite the people as a group; thus strengthening their unity and cohesion, and such occasions are always celebrated amidst eating and drinking. On such occasions members of the family who are well to do living in the cities go home and share what they brought home with the poor in the family. This idea which is reiterated in the Eucharist makes Ghanaian Christians appreciate Christ teachings in the understanding of their own communal ideals. These actions portray the supportive nature Ghanaians are towards one another. Anyone who absents him or herself from such occasions is seen to be unpatriotic and sometimes penalized by the leaders of community.

4.3.2 Service

Jesus drew the attention of the disciples to the idea of service as an important value in community life (v. 26). Asante in his work intimates that service to the Lord is to serve in his church and to serve the world. The Ghanaian culture has some support mechanisms to elevate the pain of those suffering in the community. Ghanaians demonstrate service through the use of their professional skills in serving people. In the hospitals, schools, offices, prisons and various work places, people are willing to endure any suffering in offering support to their neighbours as a form of service to their fellowmen and the community at large.

In Ghana as in all other African communities children have as an obligation to serve their parents at home and in the field. They render services to the elderly by

running errands for them and assisting them in doing house chores. They are required to help other people, be hospitable and considerate. There are morals regarding hospitality to relatives, friends and strangers. When people break these moral laws, they suffer shame in the society.283 These are all aimed at enforcing the virtue of service. This is because of the belief that the ancestors and spirits visit the community at any time and they must be served as members of the community.

4.3.3 Interdependence/ Mutual Support

Ghanaians emphasize the need for interdependency among members in the social life. They teach the essence of social relationship for every human person because of the notion that no one is self-sufficient. They believe that one cannot function adequately when he/she lives in isolation in a social context. This notion is expressed in the maxim ‘a person is not a palm-tree that he should be self-complete’.284 This therefore makes interdependence a very essential value in Ghanaian societies. As human beings, there are limitations to their individual capabilities and talents. One may have need of some assistance for the fulfilment of basic needs. The individual inevitably needs the cooperation and assistance of others. This accounts for their emphasis on communal living, mutual aid and cooperation. This same virtue is underscored by the Akan maxim ‘The left arm washes the right arm and the right arm washes the left arm.’285 This implies that it is when two arms wash each other that they become clean. There is the need for collective action among members of the community. The Methodist church ensures that always an offering is taken for the poor and needy each time the Supper is observed.286 This is in
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response to the subject of communalism, hospitality and interdependence which is taught by the Eucharist so that by this the poor and needy in the society can be supported.

4.4 Concept of Blood from the Ghanaian Perspective

In v. 20, Jesus announced that the new covenant which he was enacting in the institution narrative was through the pouring of his blood. The sanctity and value of human blood is greatly emphasized in all Ghanaian and African societies. Peter Sarpong observes that the Akans of Ghana for instance believe that blood ‘bogya’ forms part of the four elements that comes together to constitute a human being.²⁸⁷ He explains that without anyone of these elements, the person will be an animal or something else. Kofi Asare Poku also submits that blood is received from the mother and it is that which establishes the physiological bond between them and makes them part of the family (abusua).²⁸⁸ Ghanaians are of the view that blood gives membership and status in the clan. It also spells out ones obligation as a citizen in a matrilineal society. Because of these importance attached to blood, it is held in high esteem. The sanctity of human blood is greatly preserved in Ghana because of the notion that blood is a constituent of life. For this reason the concept ‘waka mogya agu’ in Akan is taken to mean that one has taken life.

The phrase ‘my blood which is poured for you’ in the institution narrative connotes the idea of death and has some implications of sacrifice which is a special component in Ghanaian culture in their conception of blood. Quarcoopome contends that human sacrifice is a long established practice in West Africa because of the belief that it is the highest and the most potent form of sacrifice.²⁸⁹ Ghanaians understand that the rituals performed with blood are that which leads to the attainment of power, peace, protection
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and prosperity because of the potency of blood. Laud Abban Brown postulates that all blood sacrifices are graded depending on the victims that are offered with that of human being the highest.²⁹⁰ For instance the history of the Ashanti people mentions the sacrifice of Nana Tweneboah Kodua who offered himself for them to emerge victorious in their war against the Denkyira’s in 1701 CE which affirms this. His blood is known to have purified and kept the Ashanti state together just as the blood of Christ redeems the believer and unite them under the new covenant. His sacrifice is one event in their history that has served as a symbol of unity even till today. In view of this, comparing the benefits derived from blood sacrifices by Ghanaians to the benefits Christians get from the death of Christ, it reveals some compelling similarities which are of great significance to Ghanaian Christians in their understanding of the Lord’s Supper.

According to Brown, Ghanaian Christians understand holistic salvation to be an embodiment of peace, protection, prosperity and wellbeing over the works of evil.²⁹¹ This salvation is that which is attained through blood sacrifice. This holistic view of salvation could be seen in terms of blessings of peace, protection, prosperity and power when the Ghanaian ritual sacrifice of blood is compared with the blood of Christ poured on behalf of humanity. We see here that just as the blood of Christ puts believers under a new covenant relation which is better off than the Old covenant, the same manner the blood sacrifice of Ghanaians also give them holistic salvation. Therefore Ghanaian Christians conceive blood as that which gives life and puts man in holistic salvation and not death.

4.4.1 Blood as an Element of Purification

Like the biblical communities, Ghanaians and all Africans use blood for purification in various cultures. There are taboos which govern the life of the people in the community, when these taboos are broken or not properly observed, they are regarded as sin. Most of the sins that fall under taboos are listed in the Bible in the Book of Leviticus and other parts of the Old Testament. In the Ghanaian culture, purification rites are always performed for such people who break the taboos to restore them to their normal state. Most of these purifications are carried out using blood. In the olden days some offences attracted death penalties, heavy fines or been banished perpetually from the community, while some offenders were made to appease the gods, ancestors and the Supreme being with the sacrifice of sheep before their trials begun. So that as Jesus poured his blood for the redemption of humanity in the Eucharistic narrative, the blood of the sheep offered will be a ransom for the offender so that he/she could obtain pardon from these spirit beings.

The effects of sin are obvious to all from various religious backgrounds; African traditional religion, Christian faith as well as those of other faiths, that the punishment for sin is death. Therefore in order to do away with this death; Ghanaians offer sacrifice so that the blood used will purify the offender. Sometimes during the purification rite, the blood of the animal is poured on the feet of the offender. At certain times it is poured on the head, while at other times, the offender is made to dip his/her hand in the blood and apply it on the forehead. This sometimes depends on the gravity of the offence or the particular deity that has been offended. More so, the type of animal and the quantity required for the rites is also determined by similar factors.

Again, Ghanaians use blood in the purification of ancestral stools. During installation of chiefs as well as festivals, blood is used to purify the stools of the ancestors.

---
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This practice is common in Ghana because of the understanding that blood cleanses guilt and dirt. Therefore before any of these activities animals are slaughtered and their blood smeared on the stools to purify them. In some communities, the stools of great chiefs are purified with human blood. This is in order for that stool to regain the full power of the chief who sat on that stool all because of the power that blood carries.

From this we see that the ideas expressed in the Lord’s Supper are not alien to the Ghanaian because they are found in the daily life of the people. However, the understanding of the Lucan interpretation helps to understand these ideals in the Ghanaian culture as they are been taught by Jesus through the institution of the Eucharist.

4.5 The Lord’s Supper and Discipleship from the Ghanaian Perspective

Discipleship is a multidimensional lifestyle and a combination of several elements which basically includes worship, faith, obedience and hope in the object of faith. In v.19 of the institution narrative, the phrase ὑπεξ ὑκώλ δηδόκελνλ and ηὸ ὑπεξ ὑκώλ ἐθρπλλόκελνλ underscores the essentiality of discipleship.

Discipleship is practiced in Ghana by several individuals only that this catchword is often not used because of its close association to Christianity. In every Ghanaian cultural society, people are made disciples in several ways to ensure that they become responsible members of the community. The essence of customs, norms and taboos are all geared towards ensuring that members of the community live in conformity to the lifestyle required by members of the society. Ghanaians are required to live a life that is characterized by obedience and observing what is upheld by the community. There are rewards for people who present themselves as true disciples of the community by obeying the traditionally sanctioned codes, while they frown upon any act that contravenes the

accepted behaviour pattern of the society.\(^{294}\) Just as at the Eucharist, believers are taught to understand that they are called to live a life of obedience to the teachings of Christ, the same way Ghanaians emphasize that to be a true member of the society one must adhere to the norms of the society in making life meaningful for all. Ghanaian Christians are expected to manifest lifestyles that are in consistency with the teachings of Christ, as Joel B. Green indicates that discipleship entails radical self-denial, daily cross bearing and following Jesus.\(^{295}\)

Again, in Ghana the traditional deities have disciples who pledge allegiance to them and make sure they live by the orders of these deities. Some of them have traditional priests and priestesses who are called by the deities as Christ appointed his disciples through the medium of spirit possession. Others are set apart from birth. Quarcoopome describes the traditional priest as servant of the gods;\(^{296}\) a term which is synonymous to discipleship. Their close contact with the spiritual world places them in an extraordinary position which requires proper training and discipline to occupy it. These chosen people are initiated and undergo several years and months of training to be the custodians of the deity.\(^{297}\) Ekm affirms that those possessed by a deity are normally instructed in the ways of the deity and equipped for effective service to their communities during their training.\(^{298}\) The duration of training varies from place to place, ranging from six months to four years or more depending mainly on the trainee’s submissiveness and ability to learn.\(^{299}\) The elaborate nature of the training as Opoku indicates call for a total break from the family during the period. This is similar to the Christian view of self-denial in discipleship. These


\(^{296}\) Quarcoopome, *West African Traditional Religion*, 74.

\(^{297}\) Opoku, *West African Traditional Religion*, 74.


\(^{299}\) Ekm, *Priesthood in Context*, 49.
people are required to propagate the activities of the deities and teach others to observe their orders; serving as mediators. Training for the traditional priesthood therefore prepares one to function diversely and effectively in society.  

Also people who patronize the services of these deities through priests and priestesses become disciples of the deities they serve. Sarkodie Agyemang asserts that the worshippers of deities are referred to as children of the deity because they are the devotees and custodians of the deity. In some Ghanaian communities, people born through the assistance of a deity are also called their children. Such people are sometimes given specific names to show their relationship with the deity. Some are also given some marks on their body, forbidden of eating certain foods and other specific rules which they must obey which are exclusive to each particular deity.  

Moreover, chiefs are taken through discipleship training before they are installed. In the work of A. K. Awedoba, he explains that from the past chiefs are viewed as priest of their communities. They are symbols of their people’s health and welfare wielding both political and religious power to exercise both duties. They are responsible for the people’s unity and wellbeing, security and safety. In view of this, successors of chiefs are

Ekem, Priesthood in Context, 52.


In the training of the priestess of the Akonnedi shrine, there are ten fundamental rules that must be obeyed during the training period which ranges from food prohibitions, sex, and menstrual prohibitions. See also Quarcoopome West African Traditional Religion, 76-9.


taught personal attributes such as personal appearance, leadership skills, capacity to empathise, character, customs and traditions after the will of the gods and the ancestors have been sought. Some are given this discipleship right from childhood when they are noted to be heirs to the throne. This is to ensure that they are well prepared for the position they are to occupy with its accompanying roles. It is by these means that the Ghanaian cultural, religious traditions and values have been preserved and perpetuated till today. The resilience nature of Ghanaian culture makes room for such training which in turn help to improve the ideals of discipleship in Ghana.

4.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, in a very broad look at the Lord’s Supper as Luke presents, our attention is drawn to the fact that it draws believers closer to God and to other members of the church. It makes believers feel part of the body of Christ and reminds them of the need to care for each other. This can be seen in the various ways in which it is appropriated by them through the communal life of those who participate in it. Communalism is practiced in Ghanaian communities through sharing, service and interdependence or mutual support which the Lord’s Supper gives deeper meaning to them.

This chapter of the work has revealed that the Supper which Jesus instituted is that which gives foundation to the celebration in Ghana. However there are certain features which have been brought into their celebration which makes it look more Ghanaian as they contextualize it. Paramount among these is the joy they attach to their celebration as evidenced through the use of local music and instruments. The joyous manner in which they celebrate the supper helps to express their true African ideals and also serves as an opportunity to show their appreciation and offer thanksgiving to God for what has done for

\[305\text{Awedoba, ‘Mode of Succession in the Upper East’, 412.}\]
them in worship. It has also shown that community life such as sharing, service, interdependence or mutual support, discipleship which are embodied in the Eucharistic celebration and so is required that they are practiced among Christians are being practiced in Ghanaian communities. It has been revealed that these values are well treasured by Ghanaians and so they reward those who practice them while those adamant to them are dealt with by the leaders of the community as well as the divinities.

The chapter has also underscored the fact that the concept of blood among Ghanaians is not that different from that of the biblical communities. Blood is believed to be of high potency because it constitutes part of the life forming components of the human being. It been part of the formation of life gives the implication that it can be offered for the removal of death which may come through breaking taboos or offending the ancestors or any of the deities. Blood is therefore used as element of purification and something that brings holistic salvation evidenced by blessings of peace protection and prosperity which is similar to the Christian understanding of redemption. It is expected that the understanding of the Supper will help shape the attitudes of Ghanaian believers towards God and their fellowmen as they appropriate the complete meaning of these values within the society for it is by this that the relevance of the supper as Luke presents and is been celebrated today would be felt and appreciated.

The next chapter will be a summary of the whole work. It will also give some recommendations for consideration for future research on the subject. It will also make general conclusions on the issues discussed in the work as the major findings of the study are outlined.
5.1 Summary

In summary, this research establishes that the evidence from the Greek New Testament, the characters, setting and change of subject matter for discussion in the text justifies why the passage forms a unit that could be studied together. In it the Lucan Jesus was not passive in the events that was climaxed in his crucifixion but rather was very active. From v. 7, he was always taking initiatives in the activities to be carried out and initiated most of the discourses as Fitzmyer indicates. Even at the meal, though he knew what awaited him, he functioned as the head with much desire and invited the disciples to the Supper in which he enacted the new covenant.

The imperfect tense ἐδεη in verse 7 affirms the statutory nature of the day for the sacrifice and so the lamb had to be prepared, hence Peter and John were sent to carry out this responsibility. They were given an absolute command from the participial usage in v.8 which also supports the importance that was attached to the eating of the Passover. They were given an explicit command from the use of the aorist imperative of ἀθνινπζέω (v.10) when the man to help them identify the house was found. Verse 14 is affirmed to serve as good introduction to the eating of the Passover because of the differences in the time for preparation and actual eating of the meal. Creed and Fitzmyer in their interpretation of Jesus’ desire for the supper expressed that the dative cognate now ἐπηζπκίᾳ strengthens the verb ἐπεζύκεζα which is used to express strong desires as Jesus had for the supper, together with the adjective ηνύην making it to be of special significance to Jesus.

The chapter also reveals that though Luke presents two cups in the words of institution, it was only one cup that was shared in the enactment of the new covenant. The word διαμέριζω in v.19 portrays the contradiction between the sharing of that same cup
instead of the individual cups in the Passover. The cup shared is seen to be the third cup in the Passover observance, but the phrase ἐν τῷ οίῳ αἷματι gives the inclination that the Lucan Jesus was making reference to the content of the cup which is interpreted to be his blood (v.20).

Chapter three of the study has discussed some major themes on the subject through the synthesis of the analysis. It is revealed in this chapter that regeneration is associated with the Lord’s Supper, because repentance for the forgiveness of sin is obtained through faith, and Bock explains that faith is the trust that forgiveness comes from God, hence through faith in Christ a person is regenerated and put into union with God. This is described as an important step for participating in the Supper because it was a command given to the disciples who Luke affirms that they were regenerated or saved (Acts 2:47). Regeneration is to be reflected in the disciples’ way of life in the ability to forgive which will in turn facilitate the communal lifestyle which is expected from the disciples. Since regeneration and baptism are all part of the process of discipleship, they must be taken serious because of their theological significance when celebrating the supper.

The chapter also makes it clear that the subject of unity among the faith community is giving a practical emphasis through the action of Christ in the Eucharist. By faith the believers are seen to be united to the mystical body of Christ as they all eat the same bread and drink from the same cup. This undergirds the unity that prevails within the body of Christ and with Christ himself. It shows that though there are diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, there is unity in diversity among believers because of the unifying factor of the Eucharist. The theme of sacrifice is also highlighted with the understanding of Christ’s death as sacrificial, redemptive and substitutionary. This is from the Old Testament understanding of blood as life. By Jesus pouring out his blood for his disciples, he gave his
life for the life of sinners which has very important connotation for the doctrine of salvation.

It has again reveal the covenant dimension of the Supper with much discussion on the new covenant as Luke indicates. Tracing the its origin to the prophecy of Jeremiah and its application to the event of Christ, the chapter establishes the fact that it is new in terms of quality and establishment compared to the Old covenant. And that through the enactment of the covenant through the pouring of his blood as exemplified in the Lord’s Supper, those who partake in the supper are under the new covenant relationship. Through this new covenant, there is salvation which is effected through the incarnation and death of Christ which forms the basis for the institution of the Supper. It is revealed that the subversive and anti-temple character of Jesus’ sacrifice should not be underestimated. It is an act which stands against institutional monopoly of access to God, as Busey said ‘Jesus’ sacrificial death suggests immediacy of access to God and unconditional grace to the sinful human race’.  

The fourth chapter contextualizes the Lucan account in 22:7-23 in the Ghanaian context to make Christianity relevant and authentic. Ghanaians have some festive meals which they partake at communal levels to strengthen their ethnic and family ties. Such meals are always eaten at occasions of celebration and help to portray the self-identity of the people. Through this, important virtues such as unity, communalism and hospitality are impacted to the members of the community. The Lord’s Supper is understood to perpetuate some of such values within the Ghanaian Christian community because biblical interpretation must always reflect the concrete life of a people in a particular context.

The chapter has discussed how Ghanaian Christians celebrate the supper. It has revealed the form the Supper takes today with regard to the joyful celebration. In partaking of the supper as Disciples of Christ within the Ghanaian context, believers are taught to actualize the gospel of Christ through practical application of the gospel narrative. In view of this the values that the Eucharist teaches them that are found within the Ghanaian community must be strengthened and effectively practised.

5.2 Recommendations

From the foregoing discussion, I would like to make these few recommendations for future study or research on the subject of the Lord’s Supper in Luke. It has been made clear in the third chapter that the Lord’s Supper was instituted for disciples and so it is required that those who partake in the supper must submit to the teaching of Jesus and actualize the gospel narrative in their bid to remember him. There are polygamous families in the church who are not allowed to partake of the supper though they see themselves as disciples of Christ. If the Eucharist is bread for the broken, then why are the broken denied accesses to it? A study to investigate why this is occurring among Christians would be very relevant.

From the background of Luke’s gospel, it can be seen that the author presents an orderly account dwelling on the available materials. He therefore wrote a narrative that has great precision regarding its literary form. With his gentile readers in mind, he composed his gospel to address the purpose of God in saving the whole of humanity which includes a mission to the gentiles; a new covenant relationship which he enacted through his blood. It would therefore be interesting to have a comparative study of the institution accounts of Luke and John because of the philosophical nature of John’s gospel and also as one that
stands unique from the synoptic traditions. This study could help readers to see how the understanding of these accounts informs the celebration of the supper in the church today.

5.3 Conclusion

It can be seen from this study that throughout Luke’s work there is a sense of a divine plan being put into effect, prophesied in the scriptures and involving Jesus’ obedience to a destiny that he must fulfil. In view of this his account of the Lord’s Supper differs from that of Matthew and Mark in three main respects. First, Matthew and Mark present that it was the disciples of Jesus who asked Jesus about the place where he would like to eat the Passover in order for preparations to be made. This differs from that of Luke where Jesus took the initiative in sending Peter and John to prepare the Passover. This shows that he was working out the plans towards the fulfilment of the divine plan of God. In view of this he ensured that he enacted the new covenant through the institution of the Lord’s Supper, which the other synoptist indicated it was just a covenant but in reality, it was a new covenant. The adjective θαίλε Luke used to qualify the covenant points to this distinction.

Second, there is the double saying before the sharing of the two breads and the cup in which Jesus states that he will not drink again until the Passover finds fulfilment in the kingdom of God and the kingdom of God comes. These sayings presuppose that the kingdom of God is not yet present and it is debated whether Jesus is referring to a new state of affairs brought about after his death or to some fulfilment in the kingdom. However, from the understanding of the Supper as something to start a new relationship between God and humanity under the new covenant, it presupposes that Jesus was referring to the new state of life which was required of the people he had come to save as

---

people of the inaugurated kingdom, which was also to find its climax in the final fulfilment in the kingdom at the eschatological banquet.

Third, there is rather lengthy set of statements after the meal by Jesus (Lk. 22:1-38) that is concerned largely with the status of the disciples: they are not to seek greatness but to be content with humble service and yet they are promised that in the coming kingdom of Jesus they will sit at his table and judge the tribes of Israel.\(^\text{309}\) Luke adds these sayings perhaps to teach his readers of the need to serve as disciples in their participation of the Supper. It was to instruct them to understand how unique they were to live as compared to the known gentile form, so that by this way of life they can get access to the kingdom to judge the tribes of Israel though they were not Jews.

From this study, it can be concluded that Luke presents that Jesus wanted his disciples to live a transformed life through the observance of the Lord’s Supper. As gentile readers, he wanted them to understand the need to conform to the lifestyle of the family into which they have been incorporated. From the study it can be inferred that key issues that stems from the analysis and synthesis calls believers to a new way of life which is made possible through the sacrifice of Jesus and one consistent with the gospel message as narrated by Christ. Therefore as Christians celebrate the Supper, the various activities they engage in and the lessons that are taught through the Supper aims at ensuring that Christians will live a transformed life. By the Eucharist, they were to be like Christ through the actualization of the gospel.

It is observed from the study also that some Churches in Ghana uses the Lucan institution narrative in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper but the distribution of the elements especially the cup differs from the account since instead of sharing the same cup,

\(^{309}\) Marshall, New Testament Theology, 139.
they use individual cups in distributing the wine.\textsuperscript{310} The research established that this deviation from the Lucan presentation is as a result of contemporary health problems. However, this does not change the significance of the Supper ones all lessons associated with it are taught and lived out among Christians.

The research has again established that it is to be appreciated that the Eucharist transcends the classroom for studies and in the church as a mere ritual but that the Eucharist must always touch the very life of Christians and must be made a living reality. In contemporary times, the supper is to be understood in the context of what is required of the partaker in terms of practical life as taught by Jesus. This implies that contemporary celebration must communicate practical Christian activities which must be carried out in fulfilment of the gospel message. It is hoped that even in the midst of great denial, and disloyalty among believers, in the future through the understanding of the Lord’s Supper, there will be no more alienation within the community of faith.

\textsuperscript{310} Presbyterian Church of Ghana Worship Book Ordinances (Accra: A-riis Company Limited, 2010), 80.
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