

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 32—APRIL, 1895.

I. THE LATEST PHASE OF HISTORICAL RATIONALISM.

IN the last number of the QUARTERLY (pp. 36 *et seq.*), we undertook to give some general account of the new historical rationalism which is being now introduced to the American churches by certain enthusiastic pupils of Adolph Harnack; and then, for its better elucidation, began a somewhat fuller exposition of one or two of the more fundamental positions assumed by Dr. A. C. McGiffert in his *Inaugural Address*, in his advocacy of it. We pointed out in that section of our article Dr. McGriffert's conception of Christianity as a development, and gave some account of the "transformations" which he conceives Christianity to have undergone since its origination by Christ. The most important of these "transformations" he represents, certainly with the best of right from his point of view, to be that from the primitive to the Catholic Church, to the better understanding of which his *Address* is devoted. For our better estimation of the significance of his teaching here, we should next consider more closely:

V. DR. MCGIFFERT'S THEORY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

One of the most striking passages in Dr. McGiffert's *Inaugural Address* is that in which he draws a picture of "primitive Christianity" as it is conceived by him, preliminary to expounding what he calls the momentous "transformation of the primitive into the Catholic Church, of the church of the apostles into that of the old Catholic fathers." That important changes did take place

IV. PAUL ON THE LORD'S SUPPER, IN FIRST CORINTHIANS XI. 17-34.

It is assumed that Paul wrote this epistle to the church in Corinth, which he had founded, and that he wrote it some two or three years after he had left Corinth to labor elsewhere. Moreover, it is assumed that he wrote, not of himself, but as he was moved by the Holy Spirit, so that its teachings are the mind of Christ, and that what he wrote has been transmitted with substantial accuracy. The aim of this article is to determine the meaning of the above-cited paragraph, and especially to settle questions of its interpretation.

I. TEXT. In verse 18 the correct reading omits "the" before "church." So in verse 24 "Take, eat," should be omitted. Whether "broken," in the same verse, should be omitted, is an interesting question. It is omitted in the Vatican, the Sinaitic (original scribe), the Alexandrine, and the Ephraem (original scribe) manuscripts, that is, in all manuscripts as old as the fifth century. And in only one manuscript as old as the sixth century, Claramontanus, is any word for "broken" found; and in that it is not *klōmenon*, the word found in all other manuscripts that contain a word for "broken," but *thryptomenon*. It is likewise omitted in the following ancient versions: Coptic (which has *given*), Armenian (which has *given*, but some of the copies had no expression for "broken"), and the Vulgate (which has *delivered*). It is found in the Syriac and Gothic versions, but it is probable that the Old Syriac omitted it here as in Luke xxii. 19. It is omitted by Athanasius, Cyril, and Fulgentius, and in seven out of eight references in Cyprian. The disputed reading occurs in no manuscript before the ninth century, in no father before the fifth century (Theoderet being the first to present it), and in no version before the fourth century. And it must be remembered that the existing text of this version is in manuscripts of the sixth century. It is manifest that Paul wrote simply, "which for you," a familiar Greek idiom, but intolerable in many languages, as in English;

that in filling out the expression, while the simple verb "to be," or, at most, "be given," was the proper word to supply, the word "broken" was, at first not at all, then sometimes, and at last generally, supplied; and that this has reacted upon the Greek text, and has caused the wrong insertion therein by copyists of later times.

In verse 26 the "this" with "cup" should be omitted, as also the "this" in verse 27. In verse 27 "the" before "blood" should be inserted. "Unworthily" belongs in verse 27, but should be omitted in verse 29. It is important to observe that in verse 29 "the Lord's" should be omitted. The omission is demanded by the four great uncials, by the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, and even by some manuscripts of the Vulgate. "But" should be substituted for "for" in verse 31. The "the" before "Lord" in verse 32 belongs there. Verse 34 should begin with "if," the copulative being omitted. The omissions of "broken" and "the Lord's" in verses 24 and 29 are important corrections of the text, and necessary to correct the most serious misinterpretations of it.

II. TRANSLATION. Verse 17. "But in giving the following exhortation I do not praise you, because ye come together, not for the better, but for the worse. 18. For first, when ye come together in an assembly, I hear that there are schisms among you. And I partly believe it; 19. For there must be also heresies among you, in order that the approved may become manifest among you. 20. When, then, ye come together at the same place, it is not possible to eat *Lord's* supper. 21. For each one his own supper taketh before, another in your eating; and one is hungry, and another is intoxicated. 22. For have ye no houses for eating and drinking? or God's assembly do ye despise, and put to shame the destitute? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.

"23. For *I* received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night that he was betrayed took bread, 24. And, giving thanks, brake it, and said, 'This is my body that is for you; this do for my remembrance.' 25. Likewise also the cup, after they had taken supper, saying, 'This cup is in my blood the new covenant; this do, as oft as ye drink it, for my remembrance.'

"26. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, the Lord's death ye show till he come. 27. And so whoever eateth the bread or drinketh the cup of the Lord in a way unworthy will be guilty as to the body and the blood of the Lord. 28. But let a man prove himself, and thus let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup; 29. For he who eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh condemnation for himself if he do not thoroughly judge his body.

"30. On this account, among you are many weak and sick, and quite a number fall asleep. 31. But if we judged ourselves thoroughly, we should not be judged. 32. But when judged by the Lord, we are chastened, that we may not be condemned with the world.

"33. And so, my brothers, when ye come together for the eating, wait for one another. 34. If any one is hungry, let him eat at home; that ye may not come together unto condemnation."

III. NOTES. At vii. 1, Paul began to treat of certain things that the Corinthians had written to him about, and he is occupied with these things through chapter xi., remarking that the other things of which they had written him, and of which he had not treated, he would set in order whenever he should come. (xi. 34.) It is manifest that these inquiries concerned the relations of the sexes and matters of worship. In the passage immediately preceding the one we are studying he was able to praise them for remembering and observing his instructions. (xi. 2-16.) Thus conciliating them, he now (verse 17) proceeds to correct an evil in their assemblies for eating the Lord's Supper. But first, and preliminary to this, he refers to the reports which had come to him of schisms or divisions occurring in their assemblies, that is, discords arising in their meetings; and he remarks that there must be even permanent separations, great as is the evil of them, because thereby God will test and approve his true people.

In verse 20 his reason for referring to these alienations and divisions into cliques becomes apparent: they make it impossible for them really to eat the Lord's Supper according to its true meaning and intent. Then, in verse 21, he points out the precise evils, which are two: they do not partake together; mere appetite is indulged. Not only does each one provide his own supper, in-

stead of there being a common meal provided for all, but they do not even wait for one another, so as to eat at the same time; so they utterly fail to partake together; and some go so far as to get intoxicated, while some are left hungry; it being thus manifest that they have converted the institution into a feast for the gratification of appetite. The apostle is outraged, especially that they have turned God's sacred assembly into a riotous picnic, and, in their anti-communion spirit, made the poor ashamed.

To correct these evils, he first (verses 23-25) sets forth the original institution in its simple purity. He anticipates all objections to the correctness and authority of this statement by asserting that he did himself receive it from the Lord. Whether he had received it from the Lord by immediate revelation is not the exact point, but this, that he no more originated the institution than did they; but in delivering it to them he was but passing on what originated from the Lord himself. It was, therefore, beyond the authority of even apostles to alter.

And Jesus threw around this institution a peculiar pathos by establishing it the very night of his betrayal; and that he did it then, and in the full certainty of being about to be offered up, is the key to its meaning. Only as the crucified for our sins could he have truthfully said what he did say.

If the record were "*took the bread*," it would mean the bread on the passover table, the passover bread, and might be a reason for insisting upon the use of unleavened bread in the Lord's supper. If the Greek were *one loaf* (*hena arton*, or *hena tōn artōn*), emphasis would be laid upon the use of one rather than of parts of several loaves. But as the Greek is simply *bread*, attention is directed neither to the special kind of bread, nor to its being all in one piece of baking, but to its being bread, the nourisher of man's life, man's prepared food. Hence the bread of the Lord's supper represents Christ as the prepared food for man.

His next act was to give thanks. Matthew and Mark use here the word "bless," but it is evident that they mean by "bless" "give thanks for," "bless God for." This word "bless" has the same meaning also in connection with the cup. Nor was this blessing or giving thanks anything other than Jesus always did

when receiving food. This conveyed no blessing to the bread. It did not even make it more wholesome, much less did it change it into something else. There is a sense in which this thanksgiving consecrates the elements, but it is no other sense than that in which it is true that the same thanksgiving consecrates any gift of God. God's appointing anything for our use, and our receiving it with grateful prayer, sanctify that gift in the only sense in which anything of use can be holy. (See 1 Tim. iv. 3-5.) And the bread and the cup of the Lord's Supper are no otherwise holy or sacred than any other food or drink received with thanksgiving. Consequently, the form of prayer so often used, that God would set apart the elements from a common to a sacred use, has no meaning, or wraps up an error; and "set apart so much of the elements as may be used" is still worse. The notion that the blessing does anything to the elements, or does something concerning them different from what thanksgiving for food and drink always does, is the germinal error out of which all the errors of sacerdotalism and Romanism as to the Supper have sprung.

After the thanksgiving came the breaking of the bread. This, also, Jesus always did when about to distribute bread to be eaten, and, therefore, to make it mean here something altogether different from what it meant on other occasions is an unwarranted assumption. Now, the bread was broken on other occasions, in order that it might be distributed among the partakers, just as we now more frequently cut the bread at our tables; and doubtless Jesus had just this reason for breaking the bread on this occasion. No parallel act was done in the case of the cup, because a liquid can be distributed among many without thus dissevering it. The breaking of the same bread among several, that they might all partake of the same bread together, being necessary to their communion, was suggestive of it; and this exhausts the whole meaning of the breaking of the bread, that it suggests communion of the same bread. And the custom of breaking the bread in the administration of the Lord's Supper is beautiful and unobjectionable, but it can hardly be made an essential part of the ordinance. To make the breaking of the bread serve as a pictorial image of the lacerating of the flesh of Jesus in the crucifixion and the prelimi-

nary scourgings is really absurd. It may not be easy to determine whether this notion grew out of the gloss "broken" in verse 24, or the false reading out of this notion; but certainly the notion is without ground of support. Not only is it true that the body of Jesus was never "broken" in this sense, *klōmenon*, but Jesus became bread by his crucifixion; and the bread for which we give thanks before it is broken is then the symbol of a crucified body, not of a body to be crucified. Otherwise the thanksgiving ought to come after the breaking of the bread.

We come now to the saying, "This is my body." To enact a ceremony in which a thing is called what it is not is to make that thing stand for that which it is called. If the Lord's Supper is not a ceremony, a teaching symbolism in action, then these words mean that the bread is the body in other than a ceremonial or symbolic sense; but if the supper is a symbolic ceremony, then these words mean that the bread is the body in a symbolic sense. Protestants must maintain rigidly that it is a ceremony, and all should be willing to let the nature of the Lord's Supper regulate the interpretation of these words, and not make the interpretation of these words determine the nature of the Supper. And that the Lord's Supper is a ceremony is evident from these four facts: that it is a development from a ceremony, the paschal supper; that those who partook of it at its first institution must have understood it to be such, a kind of parable in action; that the Corinthians manifestly saw in it only either a ceremony or an ordinary meal, which would have been impossible if Paul had taught them that it was an eating and drinking of the real body and blood of Christ; and that Paul, although here endeavoring to awaken in them a due regard for the solemnity of the Supper, gives no hint that it is other than a ceremony.

When we come to the cup, we read here, "This cup is the new covenant"; but in Matthew and Mark we read, "This is my blood"; and Luke has the same phraseology as Paul. In all of these four forms the cup is evidently put for what was in the cup, and the words "in my blood," as reported by Luke and Paul, do not belong with "covenant," making it "the new covenant which is in my blood," but with the copula "is," making it "this cup is

the new covenant by reason of its being my blood." In other words, what is reported by Paul and Luke means, "What is in this cup, being my blood, is the new covenant." And just as his saying of the bread "this is my body" makes the bread stand for the body of Christ, so his saying "this cup is my blood" makes the cup stand for his blood. But to say that his blood is the new covenant is a strong way of exalting his blood into a place of the greatest importance in the terms of the covenant: *his blood is the principal thing promised in the new covenant.*

It is this primary importance of the blood that grounds the special emphasis here laid upon receiving it with due appreciation every time, "as oft as ye drink it," and also grounds the special injunction given elsewhere, that all should drink of it; and there was more danger of drinking the cup for mere appetite and without due appreciation, than of thus misusing the bread.

Having thus set forth the original institution in its purity, Paul next infers from its significance with what mind it should be celebrated. (Verses 26-29.) It is a showing of the Lord's death. It is not a repetition of that death, but an exhibition of it. To call two separated things the one the body and the other the blood of a man, is to exhibit him as dead; and, since this commemoration is to be perpetuated till he come, it follows that whoever, at Corinth or elsewhere, in that age or in any other, shall eat and drink unbecomingly, that is, for the gratification of appetite, and not with appreciation of the death exhibited, will be guilty of a sin, the sin of treating with disrespect the body and the blood of the Lord as they are shown in this ceremony to have been offered to God for us, that they might be offered by God to us. It is a sin of the same nature as the sin of hearing the same truth exhibited in words, as in a sermon, without appreciating it.

How is one to guard himself against the commission of this sin? "Let a man prove himself." He is not to test his worthiness to partake; it is absurd for a man to test his worthiness to do what he is commanded to do. But it is proper for him to test his fitness at a given time, with the intention of putting himself in condition to perform the duty enjoined; and Paul means simply that one should test his state, and, if he finds, say hunger, first

remove it by eating, "and so," in the state to which this proving has brought him, "let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup" along with the others.

"For he who eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh condemnation for himself if he do not thoroughly judge his body." The word rendered "discern" in the common version is the first word rendered "judge" in verse 31; and manifestly it has the same meaning in both places in this same discussion; and when we correct the false reading here, "the body of the Lord," by omitting "of the Lord," it is manifest that "body" in the corrected text designates the body of the person partaking of the supper. The apostle here has in mind, as the occasion of one's eating and drinking unbecomingly, the interference of bodily appetite with the mind's appreciation of the truth set forth.

He next, verses 30-32, shows that these principles find a confirmation in evils suffered by the Corinthians, and explain the occurrence of those evils. He ascribes the physical weakness and sickness of many, and even the death of a considerable number, not, indeed, wholly to excesses in the Lord's Supper, but to the lack of thorough mastery of their appetites, which lack found its most shocking manifestation in their excesses in the Lord's Supper; for "on this account" refers to the immediately preceding "if he do not thoroughly judge his body." Yet he speaks with a divine kindness that ought to have prevented all misinterpretation of his teaching into a fencing of Christ's trembling saints from his table. "But when we are judged of the Lord," for the sin here rebuked as well as for other sins, "we are chastened," not that we may be cast off as guilty of an unpardonable sin, but "that we may not be condemned with the world."

And now, verses 33-34, he closes by explicitly stating the two injunctions needed to correct their practice: to eat together, and not to eat for the satisfaction of appetite. The Lord's Supper is not a meal in reality, but in form; a ceremony, and a ceremony of communion.

IV. RESULTS. 1. The idea of any consecration of the elements in the Lord's Supper, other than the consecration which any appointed gift of God receives by our thanksgiving for it, is superstition.

2. The breaking of the bread in the institution of the Lord's Supper was in order to its distribution, and it ought never to be treated as a pictorial or other symbol of the lacerating of the body of Jesus in his passion.

3. "Discerning the Lord's body" is not a phrase of scriptural origin, and is an unhappy and misleading combination of words unless used with caution. As it is wrong for us to partake of the Lord's Supper for the gratification of bodily appetite, the truth on which Paul is here insisting, so it must be a sin to partake of the Lord's Supper with a mind of contempt or indifference for its significance, or without humbly and purposely at the same time accepting Christ as he is offered to us for our salvation; but to understand the plan of salvation, or to have attained unto assurance of faith, is not necessary to a profitable partaking of the Lord's Supper.

F. P. RAMSAY.

Augusta, Kentucky.