

wrote it had known the theories of Galileo and of Darwin.' If the subject is the religion of Abraham, they attribute to him the monotheism of Moses, as if God had never needed to say to Moses, 'Hear, O Israel, thy God is the only God there is.' In the stories of Jephthah, Samuel, or Elisha, everywhere and always we assume that the men of the Old Testament were, from the outset, all equally acquainted with the moral and religious content of the revelation preached by an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, if not even by Jesus Christ and St. Paul.

Professor Westphal calls this historical heresy. In art it would be called a lack of perspective. It would recall the paintings of the earliest masters, of Cranach or of Albert Dürer. And what is the

effect of it? Its effect is to suggest that men who behave at times like the uttermost barbarians have been taught all the will of the just and holy God, and have even been commanded to behave thus barbarously. Professor Westphal takes the revelation of God in the Bible as historical and progressive. And he takes these words loyally and courageously in the fulness of their meaning. He tells his pupils that in the early stages of Bible history there was not a direct, immediate, and adequate revelation of the true God, but an indirect and educational revelation, which was to the true knowledge of God, as the shadow of blessings to come, to use a Biblical phrase, is to the glorious light of Christ, or as the milk which children enjoy is to the meat which only the adult can digest.

## The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

### PART II.

IV. (*continued*). This incidental allusion to the true nature of the Eucharist in 1 Co 10<sup>16-21</sup>, therefore, must not be read as if it were a formal description according to the conditions of time and sequence. It is an exposition of truth, into which time does not enter. Paul shows what is the real meaning of the Church ceremony (which he understands as being familiarly known to the Corinthians), partly by direct interpretation, and partly by contrast with the rites of pagan dæmonic powers, rites which had an outward similarity to the Christian rite, but which were absolutely opposite in character and power. Nowhere does Paul show more clearly that he conceived the universe as a balance, more or less uneasy, between vast contending forces. The world around us cannot be understood, according to his view, as an inert mass; it is a war of tremendous powers, sweeping the life of man with them towards evil or towards good. In such a simple situation as the invitation given to a Corinthian Christian by some pagan friend are involved infinite possibilities and mighty forces of good and bad, of right and wrong. By participating in the pagan ceremonies, which

were a necessary accompaniment of every pagan feast, the Christian entered into a fellowship united through dæmonic powers, and was thereby repelled from the fellowship which is cemented by the Christian sacrament.

No one can read this passage intelligently without perceiving that Paul regarded the Eucharist not as a mere symbolic ceremony, but as a force of infinite potentiality in the life of man and in the constitution of the Church. So far as we can judge, Mark and Matthew regard the ceremony as teaching of important truth through parable; but the teaching is the prediction of the Saviour's death. They do not intimate any wider meaning in the acts and words; and they do not show any appreciation of force and driving power inherent in the due performance of the rite. To Paul the rite has far greater significance than we should gather from the narrative of Mark; and yet his opinion on this matter is seen only from his chap. 10, and would not readily be gathered from chap. 11, as we shall see.

We take *κοινωνία δαιμονίων* in the sense of 'a communion and fellowship (of men with one

another) united and cemented through dæmonic powers.' That, however, is not the meaning which most scholars take. It is a more common view to understand the *κοινωνία δαιμονίων* as 'the communion with dæmonic powers' (so, for example, Professor Gwatkin in his *Early Church History*, i. p. 268). Throughout the passage the genitive with *κοινωνία* seems to be used in the same sense. In 10<sup>16</sup> it is the fellowship and unity of the Brotherhood cemented through participation in the Cup and the Bread of the Eucharist. The Cup and the Bread are to Paul the fellowship of the Blood and the Body, *i.e.* the fellowship which is created and constituted through the Blood and the Body. He is speaking of forces and spiritual powers, not of material things. Those are the realities of life: the spirit is the true body: the material thing is merely outward appearance, the measure of man's ignorance, the existing proof of man's inability to discern the spiritual reality behind the external show. So again in 10<sup>18</sup>, 'They who eat the (Hebrew) sacrifices are a body of fellows of the Thysias-terion' ('altar,' R.V.), where there cannot be any doubt that Paul is describing the unity of the Hebrew race through their common relation to the Thysias-terion.

It is also clear that in Paul's estimation, just as every pagan feast was a rite fraught with vast potentialities of evil through the fellowship of dæmonic powers, so every common meal where several of the faithful were met together was a potential sacrament. There can be no thought of anniversaries or of recurrence on some special day or occasion in such an idea as he had. No connexion of the Sacrament with the Passover was possible in his mind: the Passover was an annual feast according to the Law: the Sacrament was a permanent factor, always existent, in the common life of the Brotherhood.

More formally and intentionally descriptive is the passage 1 Co 11<sup>20-30</sup>. Accordingly, inferences as to time and order are here permissible; and we observe that the Bread is first; it is a part of the meal; and after the meal was the Cup.<sup>1</sup> This expression 'after the supper' is quite conclusive as to the succession of the acts; and the same order appears also in vv. 26, 27, 28, 29, which are more allusive and therefore less decisive as evidence;

<sup>1</sup> Hence v. 20, 'When ye assemble . . . it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper.' The main action causes the name. The Cup was a subsequent stage 'after the supper.'

the succession in them is determined by the succession previously stated in vv. 23-25.

We observe that Paul states the authority and sanction on which the Church rite is founded: the authority is that of the Lord Himself. The exact meaning of the words has been a subject of dispute: 'I received from the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.' This which he had received was the rite of the Bread and Wine, which he had taught the Corinthians to celebrate. Did Paul receive the knowledge direct from the Lord, or as handed down in the tradition from the Lord's lips?

The question was worth raising. It is inevitably raised by every one who reads the passage with an inquiring mind. Yet the answer cannot long be doubtful. If Paul claimed here to have received this knowledge direct from the Lord, he would be practically claiming to have founded the ceremony, and to have made the Church accept it, and to be the authority from whom the narrative, as it appears in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, was derived. How explain the universal acceptance by the Church? How explain the narratives of the Gospels, taken on credit from Paul and interpolated in the rest of the story which is derived from other authorities, and yet containing so many divergences from the one authority in regard to this ceremony. It is true that divergences occur in the different accounts of Paul's Conversion, all of which are founded ultimately on his authority; but those are divergences of a different kind. The only rational and the only possible explanation of the acceptance of the Eucharistic ceremony in all sections of the Church, even those hostile to Paul, is that it was handed down from the Lord.

Accordingly Paul means practically, 'I am only a link in the chain of tradition, reaching from the Lord at the Last Supper down to you.' The correlative terms which he uses, *παρέλαβον* and *παρέδοκα*, imply this. From his statement we must infer that the ceremony was practised by all Christians, that it was a necessary and universal part of the Christian religion, and that it was in existence from the beginning. Hence the words and the rite were familiar to all Christians in the ordinary service of the Church; and a revelation was not needed to communicate them to Paul. His point is not that he had a special revelation, but that the rite was fundamental and universal in Christianity; and in so far as he added anything on his own account (except simply to declare more

clearly the meaning of the words and acts), he detracted from the universality, and spoiled his own case.

Yet the theory has been seriously advanced that the command to repeat the rite as a ceremony of remembrance was unknown to the authors of the four Gospels, or was not believed by them to be genuine; that it was added by Paul on the authority of a private and special revelation made to him; and finally, that this command was interpolated in the text of Luke's Gospel. In proof of this latter part of the theory, it is pointed out that the Western text of Luke omits the command. On this theory we have to suppose that Paul seriously remodelled the sacred rite and gave it new meaning and greater importance. All such theories are inconsistent with the situation and the facts established by general consent.

Now let us carefully examine the account that Paul gives—professedly and intellectually the account of a rite long habitual in the Church, and coming down from the institution by the Lord. The very fact that it was universally familiar makes Paul's account brief, and prevents him from referring to it often in his letters. It was too well known to need emphasis or description. In writing to the Corinthians, these allusions to it are forced on him in the critical question of the right of Christians to participate in feasts at which pagan gods were honoured. Those gods were in themselves nought; but they barred the Christians who took part in their honour from the table of the Lord: 'Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of dæmonic beings.'

It is convenient to arrange the steps of the rite as Paul mentions them in the same way as those which Mark describes. We keep the same numbers, stating within square brackets those which Paul omits, and marking by an asterisk those which Paul mentions and which Mark omits. Where Paul describes in two stages an act which Mark sums up in one stage, or where Paul mentions one stage of an act of which Mark mentions only the other, we designate the two stages by the same number with the letters A and B.

1. He took bread.
2. He gave thanks (in Mark, He blessed it).
- \*3A. He brake the bread.
- [3B. omitted: He gave to the Twelve.]
- 4A. He said, 'This is my body' [Paul omits 'take'].

\*4B. 'Which is for you: this do in remembrance of me.'

5. The cup after supper: 'in like manner' implies 'he took.'

6. 'In like manner' implies 'he gave thanks.'

7. 'In like manner' implies 'he gave to the Twelve.'

[8. omitted (in Mark: 'they all drank': in Matthew and Luke the command to drink is given).]

9A. He said, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.'

\*9B. 'This do, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me.'

[10. omitted: a prediction.]

In Paul's formal description of the rite as it was performed, two steps of the action, which Mark mentions, are omitted wholly: two are omitted partly: three are left to be inferred from the word 'in like manner.' Yet the sequence shows that there was no difference between the two recorders in regard to the acts: the omitted steps can be inferred from those which are mentioned. So the fact that all the disciples ate of the bread is not mentioned either by Mark or by Paul, yet it can be inferred from the details that they mention; and it is implied in 10<sup>17</sup>.

In narrating a series even of the simplest actions, no two observers will select exactly the same details. Every describer will omit some matters as being implied in those which he mentions; and no two will omit the same steps in the action.

It is characteristic of Paul's style that it is hardly possible to say where the words which the Lord speaks end, and where his own comment begins. Is v.<sup>26</sup>, 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come,' Paul's interpretation, or does he give this as part of the words of Jesus? The answer must be sought in probabilities and in comparison of other accounts. From Paul's letter we could not come to any sure conclusion, though the word 'for' suggests rather that he attributes the words to Jesus. But none of the other accounts give these words, or anything exactly corresponding to them; and yet even that is not conclusive, for 10<sup>17</sup> and other records imply that more was said than is quoted by any authority.

All that can be asserted is that Paul gradually changes from direct quotation of the Lord's words to statement of his own inferences from the words.

Similarly in Gal 2<sup>14ff.</sup>, it is impossible to tell where the words which Paul actually addressed to Peter end, and where the moral which he drew for the benefit of the Galatians begins: <sup>1</sup> he gradually and insensibly passed from the one to the other. As we have seen, there was much instruction given in discourse by Jesus at this stage of the Supper; and, even though no other authority records these words of v. 28, it is quite possible that Paul believed them to have been spoken by the Lord. But v. 27 is, unquestionably, Paul's inference and interpretation: Jesus pronounced no words of condemnation and denunciation here, not even though Judas Iscariot was present (for so we shall see was the case, disguised as it is by Mark and Matthew).

While Paul's second account of the Eucharist has the value of being a literal and matter-of-fact description of the rite as he transmitted it to the Corinthians (and therefore to all his Churches), and so carries back the tradition to the time of his conversion a few years after the Crucifixion<sup>2</sup>—except for those who, in defiance of the deep conservatism of the East in matters of ritual like this, suppose that the ceremony was transformed and remade during the extension of the Church to the Gentiles—the first account has in some respects an even higher value, when it is regarded from the proper point of view. It is from chap. 10 that we learn most about the power and meaning which Paul felt to lie in the Eucharist. That point of view is one with which, in modern times, many find it difficult fully to sympathize. Paul's view is of the first century, the belief of one trained in Jewish thought and in the ideas of a Græco-Oriental city like Tarsus; and it is not easy to understand it. Many of us, who catch eagerly at the idea of the 'power' that lies in the rite, hastily identify Paul's conception with later ideas of a mediæval type on the subject; but probably they do not err so far from the truth as those do who neglect altogether the power which he attributes to the sacred rite, and see in it a mere symbolic and occasional reminiscence of the Lord's death.

One who reads chap. 11 too superficially might readily understand from v. 17 that Paul thought of the rite only in that fashion, as a memory and testimony of 'the Lord's death.' But underneath

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. Comm. on Galatians*, p. 305.

<sup>2</sup> Three years I believe to be the probable length of the interval between the two events.

that verse lies the whole transcendent and supreme potentiality which Paul knew to exist in the fact of that death. The Lord's death was to Paul the essential and overpowering fact in the force of the Faith, *i.e.* it was the triumphant display in a form that men's senses could appreciate of the Divine power over all the falsities and shams and outward show of the world.

The account in chap. 10 must therefore always be read along with that in 11, as indeed it necessarily would be fresh in the mind of the reader who takes the Epistle as a continuous letter, and does not cheat himself by reading 11 apart from 10. The two accounts are closely united. They form part of the treatment of one subject; and the view which is most prominently put in 10 is repeated in 12<sup>12</sup> under another image: 'As the body is one and hath many members . . . so also is Christ, for in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'

It is through the first account, then, unliteral and regardless of order and sequence in time as it is, that we gather better what Paul saw in the Eucharist—the triumph of spirit over matter, the reality of spirit, the unreality of matter, the absolute oneness of the Church in spite of apparent division in space. The rite is a method of lifting men for the moment so that they can regard the world and human life on the plane of eternal truth and reality—so that they can be in the Spirit and forget the material conditions which obscure the spiritual reality.

The importance of these references to the Eucharist in the early history of Christianity is incalculable. Without them it would appear from Paul's other letters that he attached small consequence to the rite; and the teaching of John would be separated by an apparently impassable gulf from that of the Synoptics. Paul makes the bridge once and for all in this Epistle; and yet it is only, in a sense, accidental that he mentions the subject. A question and a difficulty suggested the explanation. It is an excellent example of the valuelessness of the argument *a silentio*. But for a chance, we should have been ignorant of Paul's views. We should be slow, therefore, in arguing that Mark failed to perceive the power that Paul saw in the rite. Did Mark intend to explain his views and beliefs on this matter? If he did not, his silence means nothing.