

The Meaning of συναλιζόμενος in Act 1, 4.

By Clayton Raymond Bowen, Meadville, Pennsylvania, U. S. A.

The meaning of this participle has been, as is well known, a matter of discussion for centuries. Luther rendered "Und als er sie versammelt hatte"; similarly Weizsäcker "Da er nun so mit ihnen zusammen war". But B. Weiß translates "Und als er mit ihnen aß". Over against the reading of the text of the English translation (A. V. and R. V.), "being assembled together with them", stands the marginal reading "eating together with them". These two possibilities have confronted readers from the days of the earliest circulation of this history of the apostles. What was the auctor ad Theophilum (let us call him Luke) meaning to say? Did he mean that assembling with his disciples, Jesus gave them bidding as to their future career? If so, the participle is without any special significance. Of course Jesus could not address the Twelve unless he and they were together; the word is therefore merely rhetorical and might be absent without injury to the meaning of the passage. Or did Luke mean that during the forty days Jesus shared the fellowship of the table with his disciples, and that this charge was uttered as they sat together about the common board? If so, the participle is of extreme significance, indeed, from one point of view, the important word of the whole sentence, for it illuminates greatly Luke's conception of the post-resurrection manifestations and the origins of the Christian community life.

It is worth while, then, to discuss once more the passage which has so often engaged the exegete. The fullest discussion hitherto seems to be that published by Theodore Dwight Woolsey (late President of Yale College) in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October 1882 (Vol. xxxix, pp. 602—618); this article offers the philological material in extenso, and is often cited in commentaries and lexicons. Very recently, in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1911, Part ii), Professor W. H. P. Hatch of the General Theological Seminary in New-York, has published, on the basis of Woolsey, a new discussion, agreeing with

Woolsey that the verb means "assemble with", but criticizing certain details of his predecessor's argument. Further, the present writer has briefly discussed the word's meaning in his book "The Resurrection in the New Testament" (Putnam's Crown Theological Library 1911), pp. 374—378. The following article would present the material afresh, with certain added considerations and some comment on the discussions of Woolsey and Hatch. Some material is offered by the commentaries ancient and modern, and the older lexical works, such as those of Alberti, Schleusner, Suicer, Wetstein and Wolfius, may be consulted with interest and profit.

The form συναλιζόμενος in Act 1, 4 is commonly taken (by Protestant scholars) as the present middle or passive participle of συναλίω (from 'άλῆς brought together). This verb, like its simple form 'αλίω, is not uncommon from Herodotus on. Another verb 'αλίω (from 'άλς) meaning: to salt, is also not uncommon, being found, for example, in Mc 9, 49 and Mt 5, 13. There is also a rare adjective σύναλος, consalineus, used to describe one who takes salt with another, that is, has table-fellowship with him. So there is undoubtedly a deponent συναλιζομαι, to partake of food with another. It may be used as the simple equivalent of "eat with", but its essential significance lies in the idea of fellowship in the partaking of common food, agreeable to its etymology. Of this verb, συναλιζόμενος in Act 1, 4 may be the present participle. We have thus the alternative possibilities συναλιζόμενος assembling, and συναλιζόμενος sharing food. Which was Luke's meaning?

For the latter alternative many of the early translators decided. Most notable is Jerome's Vulgate rendering *convescens*, which has naturally been normative for practically all Roman Catholic exegetes. But this is the rendering also of all the Eastern versions, the Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic. The Philoxenian Syriac has quite literally "taking salt together with them". Similarly certain of the post-Nicene Greek fathers understand the word. Chrysostom refers to the passage five times, always explaining it as having reference to eating together at table. It is noticeable that each time he uses the word τράπεζα, twice having the phrase κοινωνῶν (κοινωνοῦντες) τραπέζης, which brings out the literal force: having table-fellowship with one. Similarly Theophylact in his comment on this verse has συναλιζομαι κοινωνῶν ἄλων καὶ κοινωνῶν τραπέζης. Oecumenius, Epiphanius, Theodoret have the same rendering. (References in Tischendorf or Woolsey.) It looks not only as if the word συναλιζομαι, eat with, was known to all these writers and translators, but as if there was a rather

definite and widespread exegetical tradition that such was Luke's meaning in the present passage. Jerome himself, who was an editor rather than a translator, most probably found this rendering in earlier Latin versions or knew it in patristic comment.

It must be admitted, however, that the word is rare. The known instances of its use, omitting the present passage, are few. There is a clear case in an anonymous version of Psalm 141, 4 given in Origen's Hexapla, where the Hebrew *אֲנִי אֹכֵל*, let me eat, is rendered *συναλιθῶ*. The context is a protest against fellowship with the workers of iniquity. The writer is exclaiming, "Let me not partake of their unhallowed food". Here too, then, *συναλιζομαι* has its proper sense of: have table-fellowship with. Again, the word occurs in an astrological poem bearing Manetho's name, where a woman born under certain stars is said to be "a bane to her unhappy spouse *συναλιζόμενον*", as the companion of his table. This being a line of verse, prosody demands that the word have a short alpha, whereas *συνᾶλιζω* colligo has the vowel long.¹

More noteworthy is the use of the word in the Clementine Homilies. In Homily xiii, section 4, Peter is describing to Mattidia, the mother of Clement, the Christians' way of life. He depicts their worship and their ethics, then adds, "In addition to this, we do not live indiscriminately (with others); we do not partake of food from the table of Gentiles, nor indeed are we able to share their hospitality (*συνεστῆσθαι* to sit at their hearth), because they live uncleanly. But when we persuade them to mind the truth and do it, and have baptized them with the thrice-blessed invocation, then we have table-fellowship with them (*συναλιζόμεθα*). Otherwise, even if it be father or mother or wife or child or brother, or any other who by nature has our affection, we cannot dare to eat with him (*συνεστῆσθαι* as above). For by our religion we make this distinction. So do not take it as an insult that your son does not eat with you (*συνεστῆσθαι*) until you adopt his belief and practice."

I have quoted the context here in extenso, to show how strongly the idea of fellowship, an idea most important and dominant in ancient social relations, clings to the word *συνᾶλιζομαι*. It is not the mere partaking of food while others do the same; it is the partaking of common food as a bond of fellowship, a rite with sacred, even religious, significance. That is brought out, for example, by the use, as a syno-

¹ Against W. Brandt: *Die Evangelische Geschichte* 1893, p. 371, note.

nym here, of *συνεστῖσθαι*. In the context it refers to the common meals, but a word is chosen which expresses the most hallowed associations of fellowship, *ἐκτίσθω*, to take one's place at another's hearth. That *συναλιζόμεθα* here means: eat with, and not: gather with, is not open to question, as Woolsey shows, supported by Hatch. Rufinus' rendering *cum eis cibum sumimus*, in the parallel passage in the Recognitions (vii, 29), shows a correct understanding. The English translation by Rev. Thomas Smith D. D. in the Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. viii renders erroneously: we dwell with them.¹ Further on in this Homily we have similar phraseology with reference to Mattidia's desire of eating with her son. So in xiii, 8 (*κοινῇ ἄλων καὶ τραπέζης μεταλαβεῖν*), 9 (*συνεστῖσθαι bis*), and 10 (*ἄλων μεταλαβεῖν*). Thus the author himself, within the limits of this same thirteenth Homily explains his own word *συναλιζόμεθα* by *ἄλων μεταλαβεῖν*. This meaning is rarely questioned here, though the Dutch scholar Brandt (W. Brandt: *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums* 1893, p. 371, note) declares that both here and in the line of Manetho the meaning is colligo, assemble.

In the Epistle of Clement to James, prefixed to the Homilies, we find our word again. In sections 14 and 15 the author, in a very vivid and detailed figure, likens the Church to a ship on a stormy journey "over a great and troubled sea, the world". The Christians are the passengers, and in section 15 they are warned to expect the usual woes of such a voyage. "Sometimes disheartened, persecuted, scattered, hungry, thirsty, naked, straitened; and again sometimes united (*ἐνούμενοι*), *συναλιζόμενοι*, in quiet (*ἡσυχάζοντες*)". What is the meaning of *συναλιζόμενοι* here? Rufinus rendered *congregandos*, although he rendered the same word in Homily xiii, 4 by *cibum sumimus*. So the Latin version in Cotelerius has *congregati*. Both these translators, that is, take the word here as equivalent to colligo. So Thomas Smith's translation has "congregated", so Woolsey, so apparently Hatch and all other commentators on the passage known to me. None the less there is good reason for the view that the word here has the sense which it bears in Homily xiii, 4.

In the first place, we must remember the figure. We are speaking of passengers on a ship on a stormy sea, and that a small ship with modest equipment and appliances such as was common on the Mediterranean seventeen centuries ago. The descriptive adjectives must

¹ Following Dressel's mistaken reading *συναλιζόμεθα*.

not be taken in such sense as to fall out of the scene, and to depict the experiences of Christians in the world. The persecution and the scattering are simply the work of the violence of the gale, hurling the unhappy seafarers about the ship, preventing their coming together in any place of shelter or partaking of any meals (πεινῶντες, διψῶντες), their garments torn from their backs (γυμνευτεύοντες), penned in the narrow confines of the boat with no opportunity for escape (στενοχωρούμενοι). The scene is extremely vivid, and suggests the fine account in Acts 27. The other series of adjectives depicts the situation when the storm has gone down. The passengers can assemble again, can once more gather about the table for food, can return to calm and quiet. In this second series there are but three adjectives as contrasted with seven in the first series. The later ones are of course intended as the opposite or reverse of the others; each of the three must therefore correspond to more than one of the seven. The correspondence is indeed not exact; ἀθυμοῦντες and διωκόμενοι are fairly well balanced by ἡσυχάζοντες, as is σκορπιζόμενοι by ἡνούμενοι, but γυμνευτεύοντες and στενοχωρούμενοι have no very close counterpart. The remaining word of the second series, συναλιζόμενοι, would find its antecedent in πεινῶντες and διψῶντες, if such correspondence were in the writer's mind at all. That such is the case the whole context seems to indicate. Why duplicate the statement of reassembling by saying ἡνούμενοι and συναλιζόμενοι (adunati and congregati in the Latin)? There is no point in this juxtaposition of synonyms. Obviously the first object of thus gathering after the storm is to break their enforced fast. As "hungering and thirsting" stands in the middle of the series of words depicting the distress of the storm, so "taking food together" has the central place in the picture of the scene following the calm. Congregati adds nothing to ἡνούμενοι; convalescentes adds to it just the needed and natural complement. Compare the statement in Hom. xi, 34 that Peter συνήθως ἄλων cὺν τοῖς φιλιτάτοις μεταλαβῶν ἡσύχαεν, which means that Peter supped in customary fashion with his friends and then went to bed. So in the passage we have been discussing, συναλιζόμενοι, ἡσυχάζοντες means the return of the common meal and the quiet rest.

It must be noticed that in the epistle under consideration there is further and emphatic reference to table-fellowship as the expression of intimacy. So in section I, Peter is praised as "the called and chosen and συνέτιος (of Christ)." The word συνέτιος (literally, the companion of the hearth), has reference, like its cognates, primarily to

table-fellowship. The Latin here has *convictor*; Thomas Smith renders: associate at table. Again, in section 9, in the midst of an emphatic exhortation to brotherly love and fellowship, we read, "But I know that you will do this, if you fix love in your mind; and for its entrance there is one sufficient occasion, the common partaking of food" (κοινή μετάληψις τῶν ἄλῶν). The literal rendering, "the common partaking of salt" (ἄλῶν; the Latin has: *mensae et salis in commune perceptio*) suggests at once the desired thought of fellowship and the root meaning of *συναλιζομαι*.

Not only in the Epistle of Clement to James do we find this phraseology and the emphatic reference to table-fellowship in the partaking of salt. It runs through all the Clementina, though the word *συναλιζομαι* apparently does not occur again. In the *Διαμαρτυρία περὶ τῶν τοῦ βιβλίου λαμβανόντων* (*Contestatio pro iis qui librum accipiunt*) which is appended to the Epistle of Peter to James (in Smith's translation it forms the last two chapters, the fourth and fifth, of that Epistle) we have, at the end of section 4, the sacramental partaking of bread and salt as the binding covenant between the recipient of the secret literature and him who transmits it (ἄρτου καὶ ἁλατος μετὰ τοῦ παραδιδόντος μεταλαβέτω). By this rite they are bound in a fellowship which the recent recipient will not dare to violate.

In the Homilies this language is frequent; table-fellowship is a dominant conception. So iv, 6 (ἄλῶν μεταλαβόντες) and vi, 26 (ἄλῶν μεταλαβῶν), of supping together. So in Homily viii of the dangerous fellowship with demons (19 τῆς ὑμετέρας μεταλαμβάνων τραπέζης, 20 τραπέζης αὐτοῖς κοινωνῶν, αὐτοῖς ὁμοδαίτος, 23 μῆτε τραπέζης αὐτοῖς κοινωνεῖτε), expanded in section 22 into connection with the parable of the marriage-supper of the king's son. In xi, 34 we have already noticed *συνήθως ἄλῶν σὺν τοῖς φιλόστοιχοις μεταλαβῶν*. In xiv, 1 salt is added to the Eucharist bread at Mattidia's first communion (τὸν ἄρτον ἐπ' εὐχαριστία κλάσας καὶ ἐπιθεὶς ἅλας), which the others eat with her (αὐτῇ σὺνεστιάθημεν). Thus the conception of salt-fellowship suggested by *συναλιζομαι* is here connected with the Eucharist, a point to be recalled in dealing with Acts 1, 4. Compare further xiv, 8 (ἄλῶν κοινωνία, ἄλῶν μεταλαβεῖν) and 9 (τροφῆς μεταλαμβάνομεν), and xv, 11 (τῶν σὺνηθετέρων ἄλῶν μεταλαβῶν). Similarly in xix, 25 and xx, 6. I have not searched the Recognitions for this language and have looked only cursorily through the Homilies. Doubtless there are other similar passages. My only purpose in citing these references is to indicate how important for this writer was the idea of table-fellowship, and

how naturally it expresses itself in a verbal form having to do with salt. Thus may be found some confirmation of this meaning for συναλιζόμενοι in Clement's Epistle to James, which in turn adds something to the probability of that rendering in Act I, 4.

Incidentally, this excursus into the language of the Homilies may help to suggest an answer to an objection raised by Hatch (pp. 125 f.). He alludes to the rarity of our word and remarks, "Luke uses the unambiguous *convecthō* three times in the Gospel and the Acts, and there seems to be no reason why he should not have used the same word here if he had wished to express the idea of eating with." This question I had not considered when I commented on this word in my book "The Resurrection in the New Testament", but I think I have there suggested its answer. "Luke's precise point is to present those days as a time of most intimate fellowship and solemn converse . . . Fellowship in the flesh is what he is urgent to convey" (pp. 377 f.). To bring out that idea, as the language of the Homilies suggests, and on grounds of etymology, he must use, not the perfectly neutral *convecthō*, but the word of fellowship, the expression of the symbolic common partaking of salt. To this point we shall return later.

But further, this objection is almost as forceful against the word when used in the meaning: assemble. In either case it is a hapax legomenon in the NT and the LXX.¹ One might reply to Hatch, "Luke uses the unambiguous *convāgw* seventeen times in Gospel and Acts, and alone of NT writers uses *convathroizō* (Act 12, 2 and 19, 25), and has *convēρχομαι* nineteen times (of which seventeen are in Acts). There seems to be no reason why he should not have used one of these words here if he had wished to express the idea of assembling with." Woolsey is sensible of this aspect of the matter (p. 616). "But why did he use *convālizόμενος*, assembling with, when the verb occurs nowhere else in his writings or in the NT, and so many synonyms were at hand? I am unable to give an answer; unless, possibly, it was associated in the evangelist's mind with the collecting or mustering of the apostles — a sense which it has in the classics. But no answer is due to those who would discover in this form a word of the very greatest rarity" (i. e. *convālizομαι* eat together). This last clause abandons argument.

¹ The simple form *convālizō* to salt is found repeatedly in LXX and NT, but *convālizō* to gather in neither.

Most commentators who argue for the meaning: eating, point out the obvious and extreme awkwardness in the other meaning when used of a single person. One man cannot easily assemble or collect, or be assembled. I can gather a crowd, but I cannot myself gather. Hatch replies to this objection with a citation from a fragment of the philosopher Proclus, commenting on the Egyptian Petosiris, who, he says, is capable in certain matters "because he has foregathered with gods and angels" (θεῶν τε καὶ ἀγγέλων συναλιθεῖς, literally, was gathered with them). But here we have an aorist and not a present as in Act 1, 4. An aorist reading in the latter passage would have been much more favorable to Mr. Hatch's meaning. Both Woolsey and Hatch cite as a further parallel John 18, 2 *συνήχθη Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ*. Woolsey says "It seems harsh in English to speak of a single person being assembled, or having been assembled, with others. But this need not trouble us in Greek, at least in the Greek of the New Testament" (p. 616). But this phrase has again the aorist verb; without asking whether *συνάγω* is a perfect synonym of *συναλίζω* in meaning and use, we may ask whether *συναγόμενος* would have been equally feasible in John 18, 2, especially *συναγόμενος* without the explanatory phrase *μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ*.

But not alone is the verb "assembling" awkward when used of a single person; it is exceedingly awkward here in the present tense conjoined with the aorist *παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ.* Hatch explains the participle as iterative and the aorist as complexive, translating as follows, "And meeting with them (from time to time) he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem". We may admit the use of the iterative present participle with the complexive aorist, and yet not feel sure that this is what Luke is here meaning to say. This translation unconsciously evades the difficulty instead of resolving it. If we substitute in it the word's other meaning, the point will be clear. "And eating with them (from time to time) he charged them" etc. Here the charge is given while he is eating, during the meal; in the other reading it is not given while he is meeting, i. e., while he is gathering or assembling, but after he has met, when the company is actually gathered together. The Greek present participle of course indicates that the action implied in the verb is actually going on; with an aorist principle verb it tells what was in process when the action of that principle verb took place. Thus "meeting with them from time to time" does not really correspond to the Greek *συναλιζόμενος*. The English phrase is of course present in form, but it does not mean what a Greek present means.

The action going on when the charge was given was not meeting, whatever else it was. Even if Jesus could be said to "assemble", he could not give his charge until he has assembled and is present with those whom he charges. "Meeting with them", in Mr. Hatch's translation, is really equivalent to "being present with them". It might render συναλιθεῖς or συναλιζόμενος, but not συναλιζόμενος here. Hatch very properly criticizes Woolsey (p. 616) for making the present equal to a perfect, but he himself does not avoid the same confusion. The English rendering (A. V. and R. V.) "being assembled together with them", as well as the German of Luther (als er sie versammelt hatte) or of Weizsäcker (da er mit ihnen zusammen war), would demand the perfect or aorist participle. It is significant that Hesychius explains συναλιζόμενος by the aorists συναλιθεῖς, συναθροισθεῖς, and συναχθεῖς. In truth, every reader and commentator who takes the word to mean: assemble, consciously or unconsciously takes it as if it were aorist or perfect.¹

Lexically, therefore, there is no valid argument against the correctness of the rendering *convescens*, and the use of the present tense, referring to one person, makes that rendering the overwhelmingly probable one. We see its influence in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (ca. 1000?), where συναλιζόμενοι is explained as meaning either συναθροιζόμενοι or συνεσθίοντες παρά τοὺς ἄλλας. Some Catholics, like Laurentius Valla and Erasmus, ventured to differ from the Vulgate rendering, and most Protestant exegetes have done the same. So, among moderns, H. J. Holtzmann (since 1901, the third edition of his *Hand-Commentar*),² Brandt, Schmiedel, Knopf, Knowling, and most others. Frederic Field (*Notes on the Translation of the NT. 1899 ad loc.*) is practically the only commentator I know holding this view who is true to the grammar of the passage. He takes the bull by the horns and renders quite literally: "As he was on the way to meet them (some of them being in the same company with him) he gave them this charge. Then it follows v. 6: 'when they were (all) come together'." Thus the charge was given to only certain of the Twelve, as they went with Jesus to join the others. This may be grammar, but can it possibly have been Luke's meaning?

The rendering *convescens* is adopted, among Protestant exegetes, by H. A. W. Meyer, Overbeck, Hilgenfeld (*Z. W. Th. Vol. xxxviii [1895]*)

¹ So Rosenmüller and others whose renderings are cited by Woolsey, p. 617 f.

² Knowling and Hatch cite Holtzmann for the contrary view, which he supported in his first and second editions, but seems to have given up partly under the influence of Brandt. In his grammatical construction of the word, Holtzmann follows Field.

p. 74), B. Weiß, Blaß, Preuschen (Handwörterbuch s. v.), Feine (Vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas 1891, p. 160), and especially Wendt. This was also the view of so critical a Catholic as Richard Simon, and of some other older scholars. The *Novus Thesaurus Philologicus* (The Hague 1780, Part iii s. v.) of Johann Christian Biel gives the meaning *convescor*, with no reference to any other.

Leaving lexical considerations, we may turn to the internal evidence of Luke's narrative. We are at once struck by the fact that the characteristic and constant element in the Lucan presentation of the post-resurrection manifestations is that Jesus ate with his disciples. This is the clear statement of Act 10, 40—42. Here Peter is giving the gospel story in brief to Cornelius. Of the resurrection he says, "Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be manifest . . . to us, who did eat and drink with him (*συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ*) after he rose from the dead, and he charged us to preach" etc. The sole content of the manifestations mentioned here is the common meals and the apostolic charge. In the earlier narrative does Luke so describe it? Precisely so. In the Gospel he describes two "appearances" of the risen Master. Each consists of just these two elements, an eating and a charge. So the Emmaus episode, so the appearance to the Twelve in Jerusalem. In both these episodes the partaking of food has an evidential value; in both he was known to them in the breaking of the bread. The only other report of the post-resurrection manifestation is that in these opening verses of Acts; there, too, we must find the eating, in *συναλιζόμενος*, there, too, we find the charge. There also the eating has something of evidential value; it is one of the "many infallible proofs" (*τεκμηρίοις*) with which he manifested his certain presence to them during those forty days.

But in all these passages the eating has another and more important significance; it is the expression of the intimate fellowship that binds Jesus and his followers together in one family, almost one body. Here is the germ and the beginning of the Eucharist, in so far as it was more than the commemoration of the Last Supper. Here is the original *Agapē*, the feast of love, where the exalted Lord and his people, in the sacrament of the common food, are made one. That is said in very clear fashion by all the phraseology of the Emmaus story, whose supreme climax receives (Lc 24, 35) the technical appellation of *ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, the breaking of the bread. For it was toward evening, and he sat down and took the bread and blessed it and brake and gave to them.

In the appearance to the Twelve the element of communion is less obvious than the evidential element; yet it is far from absent. It was keenly felt to be there, only needing fuller expression, by those early Christians who added the well-known gloss in Lc 24, 43. When Jesus had eaten of the fish, (λαβών) τὰ ἐπιλοιπα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, says this gloss. Perhaps there is a possibility that it is genuine; at any rate, it is true to one element in the meaning of the passage. The communion-idea comes out further in the fact that it was fish which Jesus ate. How early did the fish become the symbol of Christ himself, and of his body which was eaten in the Eucharist? It is that already in the second century, as witness the eucharistic pictures in the catacombs. But it is that already for the evangelists, for the stories of the feeding in the wilderness, with their loaves and fishes, have already the eucharistic phraseology and are shaped by its suggestion, as we should know even if the Fourth Evangelist had not taken the pains to tell us so with such explicitness. At Emmaus it is bread, at Jerusalem it is fish; the two elements are coördinate and may appear either singly or together. In the stories of the feeding in the desert they are together; just so they are in the wonderful story in John 21. "Jesus cometh and taketh the bread and giveth them, and the fish likewise. This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to the disciples." The holy Supper is called the Breaking of the Bread; it might almost equally well have been called the Breaking of the Fish, save that bread was used in the common practice.

The beginnings of the Eucharist need to be more fully examined in their connection with these post-resurrection narratives, with the stories of the desert feedings, and with the fish. Here we cannot pursue the subject further, fascinating as it is. It must be added that the communion-idea finds expression also in the very wording of Lc 24, 43, in the phrase, "he did eat before them" (ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν). The words mean: in their intimate presence, and establish a community of relationship between him and them. Compare the use of ἐνώπιον in such phrases as ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου), but especially Luke's own words in 13, 26. Here Jesus is speaking of the fellowship with his person which many will allege in the last day as a ground for their admission to the kingdom. Matthew 7, 22 has it at length; they call him Master, Master, and do many wonders through his name. But Luke has an entirely different sentence to express the intimacy. "We ate and drank in your presence" (ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν). As ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου means fellowship here, so does ἔφαγεν

ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν in 24, 43. This language (13, 26) has no parallel in the other evangelists; indeed ἐνώπιον (save for a single instance in John 20, 30) is a word used by no evangelist except Luke, who has it with extraordinary frequency, both in Gospel and Acts.

In Act 1, 4 *συναλιζόμενος* has primarily this significance of fellowship, and as we have seen, is etymologically the exact word to be used here. Hilgenfeld, indeed, suggested (*Z. W. Th.* Vol. xxxviii [1895] pp. 74 f.) that the word contains an allusion to the literal partaking of salt. As salt was used in the sacrifices of the Jewish cult (Lev 2, 13, Ezek 43, 24), and was an essential element in the sacred suppers of the Therapeutae (Philo, *De Vita Contemp.* 9), and plays so prominent a part in the Clementina, being, as we saw, used in the Eucharist itself, Hilgenfeld thinks salt also, as a distinct element in the Eucharistic meal in some branches of the church, is here literally intended. But since there is evidence for this Eucharistic salt only in the Jewish-Christian circles of the Clementina (cf. Hilgenfeld in *Z. W. Th.* Vol. i [1858], p. 411), it is difficult to bring it into Luke's horizon. But Hilgenfeld's suggestions deserve some attention and investigation. It is well known how large a part salt plays in a host of ethnic cults and in the folk-lore of all nations.¹

In Act 10, 41 the eating has also the communal value; "we ate and drank with him" (parallel to Lc 13, 26). Thus in these four Lucan notices of post-resurrection manifestations we have the same elements, a charge and an eating, and in each the eating is on the one hand evidential, and on the other an expression of sacramental fellowship and related to the Eucharist. This whole circle of ideas is of great significance to Luke. There is in the Gospel (22, 30) a suggestive saying, quite peculiar to this evangelist. In the parallel in Matthew (19, 28), Jesus promises the disciples that they shall be seated on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel. Luke prefixes to this promise the words, "You shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom". This is the picture of perfect fellowship.

We have said above that Act 10, 41 furnishes the model to which Luke's earlier statements as to the post-resurrection association conformed. The conformity is even closer than yet indicated. It is striking that in Act 1, 4 as in 10, 41f: the word "he charged" (*παρήγγειλεν*) follows the statement of eating. In the parallel in Lc 24, 36—53 the word *παράγγελλω* is not used, but *εἶπεν* (verse 44) is here its equi-

¹ cf. H. C. Trumbull: *The Covenant of Salt* 1899.

valent; "he ate and said" (*ἔφαγεν. εἶπεν δὲ κτλ.*). The larger context Act 10, 39—43 reproduces very closely, even to details of expression, Lc 24, 44—48. The "charge" of 10, 42 f. is verbally from Lc 24, 47; the "charge" of 1, 4 is verbally from Lc 24, 48. Since Luke himself thus binds Act 10, 41—43 with 1, 4, let not commentators put them asunder.

The comparison of Act 1, 1—12 with Lc 24, 36—53 shows conclusively that the element of eating must appear in the later account. The outline is precisely the same. First the manifestation itself (*ἔστη 24, 36, παρέστησαν ἑαυτὸν 1, 3*), then the infallible proofs (hands and feet, flesh and bones 24, 39, *τεκμηρία 1, 3*), the eating, the charge, the ascension (for *καὶ ἀνεβήετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν* is genuine in 24, 51). It would be extraordinary if the central and striking element of eating, marked in every other Lucan notice of the post-resurrection manifestation, should be absent from one of these two passages, parallel in every other element.

It would seem certain, therefore, that the marginal reading and the text of the English version of this passage should exchange places. Luke wrote, "And sharing a common meal with his disciples, Jesus charged them not to depart from Jerusalem". The scene was in his mind the original of the later *Agapē-Eucharist*. This institution was for him in a very real sense the foundation of Jesus himself, not simply by his words at the Last Supper, but by his repeated practice during the forty days when, in his glorified Messianic state, he was their frequent companion. The first of such common meals, where the risen Master broke the bread of fellowship, was the scene at Emmaus, the second was the scene in Jerusalem when he ate the fish before them. Often later did the sacred scene recur, and as they sat at meat together, did he give them bidding for their future careers as his witnesses in the world. These meals Luke thinks of as evening meals in every case; so also the feeding with bread and fish in the desert. These meals are joined by an unbroken continuity with the Eucharists of Luke's own day; without interruption they went on after that fortieth day when the Master departed not to return. Only now there was a vacant chair at table, a beloved form was absent, and another must break the bread, doing it all in remembrance of Him. "They continued steadfastly in the breaking of bread" (Act 2, 42). "Breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness" (2, 46). What these verses say in a sentence, Act 1, 4 says in the single word *συναλιζόμενος*.