

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

them. The argument that because a rule was broken therefore it did not exist has indeed been used for the rewriting of Biblical history, but even there its success is not assured.

These considerations seem sufficient to answer the excerpts given by Mr. Stead. For the endeavour which the book represents to place the attitude of the Jews from the first towards the Gospel in a more favourable light than that in which history presents it, gratitude is due to the author.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

ART. III.—THE SACRIFICIAL ASPECT OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.¹

THERE are in the New Testament four accounts of our Lord's institution of the Holy Communion. If we place these side by side and mark their points of similarity and their points of difference, we shall find that while on the one hand there is no small amount of variety in form and in the expressions used, yet there is, on the other hand, a striking agreement amongst all four writers in idea and principle. If we make a careful analysis of the contents of each narrative we shall find prominence is given by all to three distinct features about the institution :

1. That it consisted of certain acts done by our Lord before His disciples—the acts, viz., of taking, blessing, and distributing the elements.

2. That it consisted of certain words of explanation spoken by our Lord which gave to the elements a new sacramental character, so that they are to be regarded as definitely connected with our Lord Himself—with His body offered and with His blood poured out—and no longer merely bread and merely wine.

3. That it consisted also of certain words of command spoken by our Lord which enjoined upon the disciples the use and purpose to which the elements were to be applied.

St. Matthew and St. Mark content themselves with simply giving it in the form that the elements are to be consumed : “Take, eat ”; “Drink ye all of it.”

St. Luke and St. Paul, omitting any actual reference to this part of the command, while yet presupposing its existence, report the additional direction : “Do this in remembrance of Me.” Now, the words used by the last two, St. Luke and St. Paul, in their rendering of our Lord's command have been the subject of no small dispute.

¹ The substance of a paper read before the Swansea Ruri-decanal Chapter.

There are three expressions to which a distinctively sacrificial sense has been attached, and it is asserted by many that it is in this sense that we are to understand them in the records of the institution.

1. It is said that the expression *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* does not mean here simply "do," "perform," this, but "offer this as a sacrifice."

2. It is again said that the phrase, *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* does not mean here simply, "for My remembrance," but, "for a memorial of Me before God."

3. It is further said that the words of St. Paul's comment: "Ye proclaim the Lord's death"—*τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε*—does not mean simply, "Ye proclaim as a witness to yourselves or to men the Lord's death," but, "Ye proclaim, ye exhibit, ye present to God the Lord's death."

Let us consider each of these:

1. *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. What meaning are we to give to this phrase? The answer is returned by some writers to the effect that *ποιεῖν* is here used by our Lord as a technical term for offering a sacrifice to God, and we are therefore to translate and to understand the words in the sense of "offer this," or "sacrifice this," or "offer this sacrifice." What ground is there for this view? So far as I have been able to discover, the arguments adduced in support of it are based chiefly upon (a) the LXX. use of the word *ποιεῖν* in a sacrificial sense, and also (b) upon the supposed interpretation in its favour given by some of the Fathers, more especially Justin Martyr.

Now, in the LXX., it is quite true that *ποιεῖν* is undoubtedly used in some passages as the translation of the Hebrew word "to offer." We have, for example, in Exod. xxix. 39 the words, "The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." The LXX. in each case renders this word by *ποιήσεις*. Again, in Lev. ix. 7 the words occur, "Draw near unto the altar, and offer thy sin offering and thy burnt offering." The LXX. rendering here also is *ποιεῖν* (*προσελθὲ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ποιήσον τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας σου*).

But let us be quite clear as to how far this use of the word takes us. *Ποιεῖν*, in Greek, is one of those wide, general terms, like the words "to do" or "to make" in English, which is capable of being used in a vast variety of meanings. The broad, general sense with which the word starts, so to speak, on its course, is the carrying out, the carrying on, of action, without necessarily defining what special kind of action is going on or is done. We gather what that particular action is only from the context of the words, and when the context makes it quite clear to our minds what the special

action is, we read that meaning into the word "doing" or "making," and often in a translation we substitute a word which conveys the particular action for the more general expression.

Now, in the case of the quotations from the LXX. to which I have referred, the context of the passages makes it unmistakably clear what the action signified by the word *ποιεῖν* really is. You read the passages, and you find that they are all about sacrificial worship. This in no sense depends upon the word *ποιεῖν*, but upon the whole body of language employed. It is about an altar, a lamb being offered, about sin offerings and burnt offerings, and making atonement. So that when we encounter the word *ποιεῖν* in this connection, as describing man's action, we have no alternative but to understand it of a particular sort of action, viz., offering sacrifice. The general sense of the word has become special. Why has it become special? Not surely because the word *ποιεῖν* in itself means "to offer," wherever we meet with it, but because its association with other sacrificial terms on this occasion has given that sense to the action embodied in the word. Let me illustrate this. In St. Matt. xiii. 28 you have the expression "An enemy hath *done this*"—*τοῦτο ἐποίησιν*. What has the enemy done? The context at once shows: he has been sowing tares. The context shows that *ποιεῖν* here really means sowing tares.

So in St. Luke v. 6: "And when they had this done"—*καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες*. What had they done? They had let down their nets. That was the special action denoted by the word *ποιεῖν*—not mere general action, but letting down their nets for a draught. Now, applying this principle to the Lord's words before us, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, what special kind of action are we to understand He bids them do? The word *ποιεῖν* is general, colourless; we have no right to take some special meaning like that of "offer" simply because we find it means that when used elsewhere. The point for us to consider is, What does the context show that it means here? If the connection points to offering of sacrifice, then we must so translate it, but not otherwise. What, then, is the context? The Lord has just before taken the loaf and the cup in His hands, has blessed or given thanks for them, and has distributed them amongst the disciples, telling them what they are sacramentally. The disciples are there consuming the bread and the wine that the Lord has just given them. This is the scene, the context. And then He says, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* to them. Candidly, I think we can only say that the Lord must mean either, Do this that you are doing—viz., eat and drink this bread and this wine sacramentally—or, Do this that I

have just done—viz., take bread and wine, bless or give thanks, distribute, and consume them, regarding them as My body and blood.

The supposed parallel between the sacrificial meaning of *ποιεῖν* in the LXX. and the use of the word by our Lord is not, therefore, one, as I think, that can be relied upon.

But there is something further to be said against this suggested rendering of *ποιεῖν*. We have to bear in mind that the Greek language has other and less equivocal words for expressing this idea of offering or sacrifice than the term *ποιεῖν*. It has the word *προσφέρειν*, and it has the word *ἀναφέρειν*. Both of these words express the idea without suggesting any doubt about the sense. They mean, definitely and technically, to make an offering, to offer sacrifice. They are largely employed both in the LXX. and in the New Testament to convey this idea. You have only to read through the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Greek in order to see how frequently these terms are used when the subject of sacrifice is being dealt with, and it is surely a remarkable thing that had St. Luke or St. Paul wished to give the sacrificial meaning as being what our Lord really said to His disciples they should not have used the ordinary word *προσφέρειν* for it, and so have avoided all possibility of misconception; and again that neither by the three Evangelists, nor by St. Paul, is any such unambiguous word as *προσφορά* or *προσφέρειν* used in connection with the Holy Communion. To this, also, should be added the fact that the word they *do* employ—*ποιεῖν*—nowhere occurs, so far as I know, by itself in the whole of the New Testament—apart from the disputed passage before us—in the sense of making an offering.

I should like, if I may, to commend to you the excellent note on the matter which you will find in Dr. Plummer's St. Luke, in the "International Critical Commentary," and also an article by the same author in the *Expositor* of June, 1888, on the meaning of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. He quotes with approval the opinion of Dr. Ellicott on their meaning, which runs thus: "To render the words 'sacrifice this' in accordance with a Hebraistic use of *ποιεῖν* in this sense in the LXX. is to violate the regular use of *ποιεῖν* in the New Testament, and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them."

In regard to the second line of argument for the sacrificial use of *ποιεῖν*, drawn from the writings of the Fathers, I shall say but little. To go into the matter at all thoroughly would demand far more time than we have now at our disposal, and a far more intimate knowledge of patristic literature than I certainly can claim. But from what I have been able to read

on the matter the conclusion seems to be somewhat of this sort: There appears to be a pretty general agreement amongst really fair-minded critics that however strongly the Greek Fathers held to a sacrificial view of the Holy Communion, yet they do not base their view of it upon any sacrificial sense of the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. As Dr. Plummer says, "All the other Greek Fathers, with the exception of Justin, interpret the words 'perform this action,'" and Canon Mason in "The Faith of the Gospel"—and no one who knows Canon Mason's theological preferences will accuse him of attempting to minimize the arguments in favour of the sacrificial view—says: "The rendering 'offer this' has against it the fact that it is of recent origin. All the Greek Fathers, with the exception of Justin Martyr, treat the words as meaning 'perform this action.'" In this connection it should be observed that even some Roman Catholic commentators, like Estius, who are most concerned of all people in finding every possible support for their extreme sacrificial doctrine of the Eucharist, do not attempt to press the meaning of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* into their service. The controversy as to Justin's interpretation is a difficult and perplexing one. Dr. Plummer holds it to be very questionable whether the references in his writings prove that he attached a sacrificial sense to the *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* of the institution; even if he did, which is doubtful, it would not make him right, especially in face of the rest of the Greek Fathers who take the opposite view.

2. We now come to the second critical phrase, *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. How are we to understand this? The answer is returned by some to the effect that *ἀνάμνησις* is also a technical term for a memorial made before God in sacrifice, and again the basis for this view is sought chiefly in the LXX. use of the word for the Levitical offerings. Prebendary Sadler, *e.g.*, speaking of the Lord's Institution, says in one place in his book "The One Offering" (p. 4): "He commanded all to be done by His disciples as a remembrance, or memorial, or commemoration of Himself, using the same words to express 'do this' and 'remembrance' as are used in Scripture in connection with the most solemn sacrifices." And in another place, speaking of *ἀνάμνησις*, he says: "Christ, in setting forth the end or purpose of the institution, used a word which is used in Scripture of sacrifices or sacrificial acts done as in the sight of God, and with a view to His acceptance" (p. 26). Now here, again, we admit that it is quite true that the LXX. does so use the word *ἀνάμνησις*—*e.g.*, in Lev. xxiv. 7 we read, "And Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be to the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord."

The rendering of this word "memorial" in the LXX. is *ἀνάμνησις*. So, again, in Num. x. 10 it is prescribed that on the great festivals trumpets should be blown over the offerings and sacrifices and "they shall be to you for a memorial before your God," where, again, the word in the LXX. is *ἀνάμνησις*. But I beg you to observe particularly one thing. In both of these references *ἀνάμνησις* is set in the midst of other words which state clearly and definitely that the memorial is Godward. In the first we have "bread for a memorial," and then, as defining in what sense, it adds, "even an offering made by fire unto the Lord." So in the second, "they shall be for a memorial," and then, as showing the direction in which the memorial is made, it adds, "before your God." Now consider the strict sense of *ἀνάμνησις*. It means, primarily, not an outward concrete thing by which memory is stirred, but in classical Greek, as Bishop Wordsworth says, "a calling to mind, an act of recollection." And not only in the classics, but in the LXX. also this primary sense is found. So in the Book of Wisdom (xvi. 6) we read of God sending trouble upon His people "to put them in remembrance" of the commandment. Here there can be no question that *ἀνάμνησις* means man's own subjective act of remembering. But in the LXX. also, as we have seen, a secondary sense follows—viz., that of commemoration—some outward act, some record or thing which awakens or embodies a recollection. In this secondary sense *ἀνάμνησις* is equivalent to the cognate word *μνημόσεννον*—memorial. Bearing in mind these two points—(1) That when in the LXX. *ἀνάμνησις* is used in the sense of a memorial Godward there are additional words used to make it clear that that is the meaning intended, and (2) that the primary sense of the word is an act of recollection—let us go to our New Testament to see how the word occurs. There are, as a matter of fact, only four instances of its use in the whole of the New Testament. Three of these are now before us—St. Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25—and in no single case is there any word in the context to show that the memorial is before God (*cf.* Sadler on this, 26 *et seq.* and 98). The other occurs in Heb. x. 3; the passage runs thus: "For in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year." The writer of the Epistle is speaking of the imperfection of the legal sacrifices. How are they shown to be imperfect? By the fact of their repetition year by year. Had they ceased we might suppose that men's consciences were free from the sense of sin. But they have not ceased, and their repetition keeps up the remembrance of sins. This is the writer's argument, and the connection between *ἀνάμνησις* in verse 3 and *συνείδησις*—conscience—in the preceding verse makes it

certain that the remembrance here referred to is an act of recollection in man, just as *συνείδησις* is his own self-knowledge. So Bishop Westcott says of *ἀνάμνησις* here that it means "not simply a record made of sins, but a calling to mind of sins whereby *men* are put in remembrance of them." Bishop Westcott goes on in his note to refer to the use of *ἀνάμνησις* by St. Luke and St. Paul. "The use of the word *ἀνάμνησις*," he says, "suggests a contrast between the Jewish sacrifices and the Christian Eucharist.—They were instituted to keep fresh the thought of responsibility: that was instituted, in Christ's words, *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, to bring to men's minds the recollection of the redemption which He has accomplished." This note makes it clear in what sense the scholarly Dr. Westcott understood the disputed word before us—not certainly in the sense of a memorial before God, but as an act of recollection in those who communicate.

I would only add two brief remarks before leaving this point. The first is this:

(a) When our Lord instituted the Eucharist His mind was evidently full of the thought of His impending separation from His Church. The Gospels give great prominence to this. Is it not, therefore, obvious and natural that when we find Him using a word which means in its simple, first, ordinary sense an act of memory by man, we should understand by it a desire on His part to keep alive a vivid remembrance of Himself and His redemptive work amongst His people during the time when His seen personal presence should be withdrawn? Is it not, I say, far more obvious and far more natural to understand it thus than to give to the word a meaning that is secondary and that occurs nowhere else in the New Testament?

(b) The second remark I would make is this: The Institution of the Eucharist was at a Passover Feast. One feature of that feast was the calling to mind of the redemption wrought by God for Israel, and that, not in the form of a memorial presented to God, but by simple question and answer amongst those who sat round the board of what the feast was intended to commemorate. Again, I ask, is it not obvious and natural that, when we find as a general rule the leading features of the Passover Feast perpetuated in the Christian Eucharist, and when we find a word, like this, of remembrance, which, taken in its first natural sense, suggests in the Christian Passover Feast a feature parallel to one in the Jewish Passover, that we should conclude that that sense, and not another, is probably the one originally intended by our Lord?

3. We have now to consider the right meaning of St. Paul's phrase: "*Ye proclaim (καταγγέλλετε) the Lord's death till He come.*"

In Mr. Sadler, again, we find an advocate for the view that the proclaiming here spoken of is an exhibition, a showing before God. He does not, indeed, attempt to discuss the ordinary meaning of the word *καταγγέλλειν*, nor St. Paul's use of it in other passages (p. 99). What he says about it is this: "To ascertain the scope of this word we must be guided by what is said in other places respecting the design of Holy Communion as to whether we are to understand this 'showing' to be before God or before men," and he then goes on to say how unlikely and incredible it is to think that St. Paul meant the word in the latter sense and not in the former. I submit, with all deference to Mr. Sadler's acknowledged learning, that this is neither a scholarly nor a satisfactory method of defining the meaning of terms. For it is surely nothing else than a veiled form of special pleading to say, before you have honestly examined the word itself, that its scope is to be determined by what other entirely different terms teach upon the subject. What, then, is the truer statement of the matter? To start with, the word *καταγγέλλειν* means to proclaim aloud, as an accredited messenger, or *ἄγγελος*, would utter his message. Elsewhere St. Paul employs the word six times in his Epistles, and in each case, without doubt, of a public proclamation to men. He uses it of preaching the mystery of God (1 Cor. ii. 1), of preaching the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 14), of preaching Christ (Phil. i. 17; Col. i. 28). He uses it also of the faith of the Roman Christians proclaimed throughout the whole world (Rom. i. 8). Outside St. Paul's writings the word is used in the New Testament eleven times, and again in each case of a public proclamation to men. It is used of the preaching of the prophets (Acts iii. 24), of the preaching of Christ and the Resurrection (Acts iv. 2), of the preaching of the Word of God (Acts xiii. 5, xv. 36), of remission of sins (Acts xiii. 38), of the way of salvation (Acts xvi. 17), or of some other aspect of the Gospel message (*cf.* Acts xvii. 3, xiii. 23, and xxvi. 23). So that of the eighteen times where the word is used, seventeen give one and the same consistent sense—to proclaim to men. Ought we not to conclude that the eighteenth, unless there are strong reasons to the contrary, bears a similar meaning? But it has been objected that it is most improbable that St. Paul would speak in this way of the Holy Communion as proclaiming Christ's death to men, since those to whom it would be addressed—the worshippers—already knew of it and believed in it. The answer seems to me a simple and obvious one. To whom was St. Paul writing the words? To the Corinthian Christians. Why did he write to them at all on the subject of the Holy Communion? Because, as the chapter shows quite plainly, they were

abusing it; because they were turning the Lord's Supper into a drunken carouse, and were evidently forgetting the very purpose for which the Eucharist was founded—to recall to mind the Lord and His death. Were they not, then, men who needed to be recalled to a sense of their true position? Was there not an urgent need in their case for the holy ordinance itself to proclaim to them its real message? There is nothing therefore, I think, improbable in interpreting St. Paul's use of the word *καταγγέλλειν* here, as in other places, of a proclaiming to men and not to God.

J. A. HARRISS.

ART. IV.—THE LORD'S PRAYER: ITS LITURGICAL USE AND MEANING IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

IT would be very helpful, if it were at all possible in a sketch of this nature, to give the sayings of the early Fathers on this prayer. The work of selection is here our chief difficulty, for every comment seems almost of equal importance. However, I shall give a few of those which are best known, and which have reference to the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer in olden times.

St. Chrysostom, in Homily 42, said: "Every good Christian uses this prayer daily, and by these holy words 'Thy Kingdom come' expresses his belief in the Resurrection." Cyprian, in his commentary on the Lord's Prayer, said: "This bread we *daily* ask to be given to us lest we who are in Christ, and *daily* receive the Eucharist for the food of Salvation, should be separated from the body of Christ." These words show that not only was the Lord's Prayer in daily use, but that the Eucharist was daily received. In the Apostolic Constitutions it was ordered that this prayer should be repeated three times a day (some, like Theodoret, thought this was in respect to the Trinity). It was a canon of the fourth Council of Toledo that no clergyman should omit the Lord's Prayer in public or private offices, and "Whoever then of the priests or the inferior clergy shall omit to say this Lord's Prayer in public or private office shall be judged for his contempt and deprived of his office."

The same Council of Toledo, in its ninth canon, also declared, "St. Hilary said, 'Give us to-day our daily (*quotidianum*) bread. For what does the Lord desire more than that Christ, who is the Bread of Life and the Bread from Heaven, should daily dwell in us? And because the prayer is in daily use (*quotidiana*), the prayer is also that it (the bread) may be given daily (*quotidie*).'"

We thus see the reason why St. Cyprian and others called