HARNACK, JÜLICHHER, AND SPITTA ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I.

Of recent years there has been considerable discussion in theological circles in Germany regarding the Lord's Supper, discussion which, in view of the important place the rite holds in the worship of the Church and the reverence with which it is regarded, has naturally awakened considerable interest. In this paper it is proposed to give a brief sketch of some of the more important contributions to this discussion. In reviewing the articles of Harnack, Jülicher, and Spitta, we shall obtain a fair idea of the main questions which have been raised.

Harnack may be said to have given the start to the discussion in 1891 by his paper, "Bread and Water, the Eucharistic Elements in Justin" (Texte und Untersuchungen, VII. 2, pp. 117-144). His object in this paper is to prove that in Justin, the most important witness to the practice of the early Church, the eucharistic elements are represented as bread and water. Having established this point, he proceeds to draw from it certain conclusions as to the nature of the rite itself.

Aware of the startling nature of the question he raises, he endeavours to prepare the way for it by showing that among early Christians the practice of celebrating with bread and water was very prevalent. We find it not only among Gnostics, but in sects differing so widely as Ebionites and Encratites, a proof at once of its antiquity and its wide diffusion. Nor only in heretical sects. We have the evidence of Cyprian to show that it obtained also in the Catholic Churches. From a letter addressed by him to Cæcilius we learn that it was the custom with several North African bishops to celebrate with bread and water. They appear to have defended this practice on the following grounds:—
By appeal to Scripture. All the passages in the Old Testament which speak of the giving of water to drink are cited. The *locus classicus*, according to Harnack, seems to have been Isaiah xxxiii. 16, ἀρτὸς αὐτοῦ δοθήσεται, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῦ πιστὸν.

On grounds of expediency. The smell of wine in the early morning betrayed the Christian. The Aquarii seemed to have argued that seeing some liberty had been used in changing the celebration from evening to morning, a similar latitude might be permitted in the substitution of water for wine.

By appeal to tradition. The practice would hardly have been defended on the above grounds had there not been a precedent for it, and Cyprian himself admits that there were *Antecessores* to whom the North African Church could appeal.

It was no novelty, then, this that Cyprian was protesting against, but a practice which had been some time in vogue. How long we cannot say, but Harnack is of opinion that, seeing it was not based on ascetic grounds, it must have dated from a very early period.

Having thus prepared the way, Harnack comes to the evidence of Justin. The important passage is *Apol.* I. 65–67; but before considering this he first examines all the other passages in Justin's works, in which we have, or might expect, a reference to the Lord's Supper. This examination yields the following results:

1. Justin never speaks of wine in the celebration.
2. In the only passage in which he mentions the liquid (*Dial.* 70) he applies the ὕδωρ πιστὸν of Isaiah xxxiii. 16 to the Sacrament.
3. In six passages in which he mentions the blessing on Judah ("Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes")—a passage consistently
applied by later Fathers to the Lord's Supper—Justin suggests no such application; and even when, on the lines of this passage, he is drawing a comparison between Christ and Dionysus, the point of comparison is found, not in the wine which finds a place in the religious mysteries of Christ and of Dionysus, but in the ass, and the vine to which the disciples are represented as having found the colt bound.

(4) In the two passages where Christ and Dionysus are compared, Harnack suggests that the text has been corrupted, and ὀίνος substituted for ὄνος, which is evidently the correct reading.

There remains, then, the passage, Apol. i. 65–67, in which the elements are mentioned five times. Two of the instances may be dismissed as unimportant, inasmuch as they leave the question open as to what the contents of the cup are. Upon the other three, then, the decision depends. At first sight they appear to tell decidedly against Harnack's contention. But he believes he has good ground for suspecting their genuineness. One of them (c. 65) mentions ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος as the elements. The juxtaposition of ὕδατος and κράματος Harnack finds suspicious, κράμα being itself a mixture of wine and water. One naturally conjectures that the καὶ κράματος is an interpolation. But we are not left to conjecture. There exists a second MS. for chapters 65–67, the Ottobianus, and in it the suspicious words καὶ κράματος are wanting. In the other two passages which remain the elements are given as ἄρτος καὶ ὦνος καὶ ὕδαρ. But we have seen that in two other passages ὦνος has been smuggled in instead of ὄνος, and that καὶ κράματος has been added to the bread and water which Justin gives as the elements. In these circumstances Harnack has little hesitation in regarding the addition of the ὦνος here as due to the hand of an emen-
Justin then, Harnack concludes, describes a celebration of the Lord’s Supper, in which bread and water, not bread and wine and water, were the elements, and his disciple Tatian was introducing nothing new when he used water alone.

The prevalence of the practice of celebrating with water instead of wine—from Justin’s words we might almost conclude it was the general rule—militates against the suggestion that it was due to ascetic tendencies. From Cyprian we have learned that it was based upon tradition. With the object of tracing the origin of the practice, Harnack collects all the available material up to the old Catholic Fathers, which he arranges in the following four groups:

1. Passages in which wine (or wine and water) is expressly mentioned.

2. Those which speak only of the cup or of the draught.

3. Those which speak of water.

4. Those which mention only the breaking of bread, and are silent as to the cup.

The conclusions which follow from this survey are to Harnack very clear. The Lord’s Supper, as it was originally understood, was a simple meal. The blessing of it was connected not with the bread and wine, but with the eating and drinking. Bread and wine are a simple meal. A still simpler is bread and water, and one more within the reach of the poor. This too may become the Lord’s meal. The most constant element in a meal is bread. The contents of the cup may vary. So the constant element in the Lord’s Supper is the bread; the draught is only the accompaniment of the bread, and what kind of drink is used is matter of indifference. The elements
of the Lord’s Supper are bread and the cup—not necessarily the cup of wine.

That this was the case in earliest times is proved by Paul’s testimony. In 1 Corinthians x. 16, xi. 23-28, he speaks only of bread and the cup. True he assumes (1 Cor. xi. 21) that wine is drunk at the Agape, but on the other hand he compares the sacramental draught to the water drunk by the Israelites in the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4), and says absolutely καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, μηδὲ πεῖν σίνον (Rom. xiv. 21). To except the sacramental wine is an “unworthy evasion.” In 1 Corinthians x. 17 he speaks of the Lord’s Supper as if it were a matter of bread alone. In Paul, then, we find all the elements which explain the later practice. We need not wonder that it became the practice later, even in Rome, to celebrate with bread and water, when Paul himself sanctioned such liberty. The position of the Fourth Evangelist is practically the same. To the believer Jesus Christ converts bodily nourishment into spiritual—that is the important point. In this connexion he mentions bread—for bread is nourishment κατ’ ἐξοχήν—and calls Christ the Bread come down from heaven. He says nothing of wine, but speaks of the living water (iv. 6).

Ignatius and the Didache follow on the same lines. The former says nothing of wine, but mentions only the bread, and speaks of spiritual eating and drinking. The latter finds in the phrase κλάσεως τοῦ ἄρτου a sufficient description of the ceremony. Evidently the drink is regarded only as an accompaniment.

Justin is only following Paul and John and Ignatius, then, when he describes the gathering of the Christians as a gathering εἰς ἄρτους (Apol. i. 67), and his phrase τροφῆς ξηρᾶ τε καὶ ὑγρᾶ may be regarded as the classical one to express the earliest view of the Sacrament. In Justin, it is true, we find a certain advance beyond the position of
Paul. Paul's is the standpoint of freedom. To celebrate with water is permissible. But in the time of Justin the permissible has become the regular practice. How did this come about? And how did the practice so quickly cease? We can only conjecture. Harnack gives the following sketch of what he believes may have been the course of development:

Jesus instituted a meal to commemorate His death, or rather, He represented bodily nourishment as His flesh and blood, i.e. as nourishment of the soul (through forgiveness of sin), if partaken of in thankful commemoration of His death. When Jesus instituted the rite, bread and wine stood on the table, and these were the elements He selected. These were also, no doubt, the elements which the disciples used in their daily celebration. But from the beginning the breaking and the eating of bread occupied the foreground; for it was a meal that was celebrated. At the meal there was drink, and whatever was drunk was drunk as the blood of Christ. It was sometimes, especially with the poor, water. Ascetic tendencies contributed to the substitution of water for wine. Paul warned against offending the weaker brethren who scrupled to use wine. And so the practice of celebrating with wine and water gradually increased, especially between 64 and 150 A.D., until towards the end of this period Justin could speak as if it were the established custom. But after 150 A.D. a reaction set in. The Church perceived the danger of the ascetic tendencies which had contributed to the celebration with water. At the same time reverence for the letter of Scripture increased. According to the Gospels Christ had used wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper. Upon this fact the Church took its stand in opposing the water celebration. Wine and water may have been suggested as a compromise, but wine was insisted on. Naturally, of course, the practice of using water took some
time to die out. As the ascetic reasons for the practice were abandoned, considerations of expediency, as we have seen, took their place. But gradually the Catholic manner of celebration gained the ascendancy, until at last even the memory of the former practice almost disappeared.

The lesson which Harnack would draw from his study of the subject is briefly this:—That it is an error to think that the elements in the Lord's Supper are matter of importance. It is the act of eating and drinking that is the distinctive feature. "In representing nourishment as His body and blood, the Lord has sanctified the most important function of the natural life. He thus introduces Himself into the midst of the natural life of His followers, bidding them nourish this natural life for the development of the spiritual. This they cannot do of themselves; but Jesus promises at every meal which they celebrate in His memory to be present with the power of forgiveness of sins."

Harnack's paper excited a good deal of adverse criticism. It called forth a reply from Júlicher among others, whose paper "On the History of the Celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Early Church" (Theologische Abhandlungen, Weizsäcker gewidmet, 1892, pp. 217-250) contains a spirited attack upon the conclusions of Harnack, and an interesting contribution to the discussion as to the significance of the Lord's Supper, suggested by the latter part of Harnack's article. We proceed to give a brief survey of the course of his arguments.

First then in criticism of Harnack. It is quite true, Júlicher admits, that, apart from Apol. i. 65-67, Justin never speaks of wine in the Sacrament. But there is nothing surprising in the fact that instead of bread and wine he should speak of bread and the cup, seeing that these are the expressions used by Paul and the Synoptists. And it is true, further, as Harnack points out, that Justin applies the ὄδωρ ἑστιῶν of Isaiah xxxiii. 16 to the Sacra-
ment. But must we therefore conclude that the cup contained only water? By no means. All we conclude is that Justin, having been induced by the ἄρτος δεσπήσεται αὐτῷ to interpret the verse with reference to the Eucharist, proceeded further to apply the ὕδωρ πιστῶν to the sacramental wine—no great liberty in a typologist. The comparison of the ὕδωρ πιστῶν to the wine of the Sacrament is not a whit more striking than that of the wine to the blood of Christ. As to the fact that Justin, in the various passages in which he speaks of the blessing on Judah (Gen. xlix. 11), finds no reference to the wine of the Eucharist, this is by no means so significant as Harnack would make out. As a matter of fact, Novatian, Augustine, and many other writers explain the passage without any reference to the sacramental wine. In Justin's case, indeed, such a reference would be out of place. His explanation of the verse is a piece of fantastic allegory. Why then should we expect him to take the words ἐν ὠίνῳ and ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς literally?

Harnack lays much stress on the fact that ὅνως has twice been changed into ὀίνως in Ἀπολ. 54 and Dial. 69, where Justin is making a comparison between Christ and Dionysus, and finds in the correction an attempt to draw a parallel between the Lord's Supper and the Dionysus mysteries. Jülicher admits the text-correction, admits even the motive which, according to Harnack, inspired it; but he denies the importance which Harnack assigns to the fact. The matter may be very simply explained. The copyist did not know anything about the ass in the Dionysus mysteries, but he knew that Dionysus was the god of wine, and naturally thought that ὅνως was a mistake for ὀίνως. But that does not justify us in concluding that every other ὀίνως in Justin, concerning which we feel doubtful, must be ascribed to this copyist. It is by no means improbable that a scribe of the fifth or ninth cen-
tury, who found an esteemed Father like Justin giving bread and water as the elements in the Lord's Supper, may have thought it a mistake and added καὶ οἶνος; but the probability is in no way increased by the fact that the same scribe, in two quite different passages, changed an ὕδωρ which he did not understand into οἶνος.

There remains then only the section Ἀπολ. 65–67 as evidence that Justin gives water as the second element. What do we find in it? The elements are mentioned three times, once as ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, and twice as ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ. What strikes us first is that there appear to be three elements here instead of two. Why this explicit mention of the water, seeing it was understood as a matter of course? Jülicher accepts Zahn's explanation, that Justin's object in expressly mentioning the water is to show the groundlessness of the calumnies current as to the orgies celebrated at the meetings of the Christians. The use of κράμα in the first of the three passages is strange. We should have expected οἶνος; and Harnack has no hesitation in concluding that it is an interpolation. But the very strangeness of the word is against this. If there is an interpolation here, surely the corrector would have chosen the simple οἶνος which occurs immediately after, instead of this strange word κράμα. It is true that in another MS. of later date the καὶ κράματος is wanting. But this later MS. is full of errors, and the omission of καὶ κράματος after ὕδατος may easily be explained by Ηομοιοτελεύτων. The difficulty of the word κράμα still remains. We must probably take it as meaning the wine mixed with water.

Harnack's arguments in favour of the reading ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος in chapter 65, then, fall to the ground. With them falls all reason for believing the οἶνος in the other passages—attested by both MSS.—to be spurious.

But even though Justin's testimony be discredited, there
still remains a formidable array of evidence brought forward by Harnack in proof of the use of water in the Sacrament. Jülicher subjects it also to severe examination. That it was the practice among various sects to use water is no proof, he urges, of a tradition to this effect in the Church. The practice may be easily accounted for by the ascetic or dualistic tendencies of the sects concerned. If, as Harnack alleges, they appealed to Scripture in support of their practice, that is rather a proof that the practice so defended was an innovation. From Cyprian’s letter, indeed, it is plain that the practice obtained to a certain extent in the Church in Africa. But to what extent? Throughout the whole province? as Harnack concludes. Surely this is too wide an interpretation of the quidam whom Cyprian mentions. Apart from this letter of Cyprian’s, we should never have heard of such a practice in the African Church. Can we believe, then, that it was general? Hardly. It is not the prevalence of the practice, but the novelty of it, and the importance of the point at issue, that makes Cyprian enter so fully into the matter.

Harnack concludes further from Cyprian’s letter that the practice was supported by an appeal to Scripture. This Jülicher regards as very questionable. It is hardly compatible with the ignorantia and simplicitas which Cyprian attributes to the offenders. True, Cyprian touches on various passages of Scripture. But we have no proof that they had been already cited by his opponents. Most probably it was he himself who first introduced them into the discussion. Having entered on the question, he is determined to thrash it out, and anticipates any possible defence that may be made on the authority of Scripture.

How are we to account for the origin of this practice? Harnack attributes it to fear lest the smell of wine in the morning should betray the Christian. But this motive of fear is only urged by Cyprian as a reproach, and is hardly
to be taken seriously. Jülicher advances a simpler explanation. The use of wine in the morning was an offence against the laws of good society. He quotes Clemens Alexandrinus and Novatian in proof of this feeling. In justification of the use of water instead of wine at the morning celebration, it was urged that the change from evening to morning warranted some change also in the elements employed. So the Aquarii used water in the morning, and in the evening *mixture calicem*. A long-established practice may have contributed further to the use of water at the morning celebration. It was customary to take some of the consecrated bread home and partake of it next morning before any other food. This could not be done with the wine; but if the bread were dipped in water, one had the feeling of having fully partaken of the Eucharistic meal. If that was permissible to the individual, why not to the whole congregation?

It remains now to consider the evidence of Paul, in whom Harnack professes to find all the elements which explain the later practice. That Romans xiv. 21, *καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μὴ δὲ πεῖν οἶνον*, should have been adduced by Harnack in support of his thesis, is in the highest degree surprising. There is not a single word in the whole context suggesting reference to the Lord's Supper. The Apostle is enforcing by concrete example the propriety of sacrificing our liberty when the conscience of a weak brother is imperilled. The point in question is that of meats. It is about meat and eating that Paul is speaking all through the chapter. It is only when he comes to sum up the discussion in a general conclusion that he speaks of drink, just as he sums up the corresponding discussion in 1 Corinthians with the general law, *εἰτε οὖν ἐσθίετε, εἰτε πίνετε, εἰτε τι ποιεῖτε, πάντα εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ ποιεῖτε* (1 Cor. x. 31). Do we conclude from that verse in Corinthians that there was any question as to the per-
missibility of wine? Equally inadmissible is any such conclusion from Romans xiv. 21. But further, the whole context not only does not admit, but positively forbids, any reference to the wine of the Lord’s Supper. Paul is speaking of that which a brother regards as κοινόν. Could any Roman Christian at the time Paul was writing have thus regarded the wine which Christ offered to His disciples at His last meal? And can we imagine Paul complaisantly giving way to such scruples, and urging the majority to alter the character of their celebration in conformity to them?

The other passages in Paul appealed to by Harnack are equally unconvincing. 1 Corinthians x. 23 no more proves the use of water in the Sacrament than the ὁδῷ ἡπτον of Isaiah xxxiii. 16 in Justin. That the Lord’s Supper was celebrated among the disciples as a meal is true indeed, and we are grateful to Harnack for emphasizing this aspect of the Eucharist. But he goes too far when he puts the breaking and eating of bread in the foreground, and regards the drink as no integral part of the meal. To the Oriental, drinking is as essential a part of a meal as eating. 1 Corinthians x. 17 does not prove the greater importance attached to the bread. Paul could hardly have used the cup to illustrate the thought he wished to express.

Specially noteworthy is the protest which Jülicher makes against the distinction drawn by Harnack between the Lord’s Supper and the Agape. This, he maintains, is to introduce later distinctions into apostolic times. Paul knows nothing of an Agape and an Eucharist thereafter, but of one celebration alone, which from beginning to end was, or should be, κυριακόν δείπνον. When he speaks of one ἔσθιων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως (1 Cor. xi. 27), he is thinking, not of a man who has become intoxicated at the preceding Agape, but of one who regards the Lord’s Supper as an ordinary meal and thinks only of satisfying his appetite.
What Paul blames in the Corinthians is not that they allow some brethren to come hungry to the table of the Lord while they have themselves eaten to the full, but that at that table they snatch greedily at the bread and wine for themselves, instead of dividing it in a brotherly spirit among all. We must remember how different was the celebration then from what it is now. The Lord’s Supper was a meal. The bread and wine were passed round to all, not once but many times, until all had been consumed. When Paul blames the Corinthians because ἐκαστὸς τὸ ἱδίον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει, it is because they are frustrating the purpose not of the preceding Agape, but of the Lord’s Supper, a meal not for the satisfaction of one’s appetites but for realising the brotherly unity of the Christian congregation.

We come now to the most interesting part of Jülicher’s paper. He raises the following most important question as to the origin of these κυριακὰ δείπνα of which we read in Paul: Is there reason to believe that Jesus formally instituted the Lord’s Supper as a rite intended to be repeated among believers in commemoration of His death? Startling as the question appears, it is forced upon us by a careful examination of the authorities. We have four accounts of the Lord’s Supper—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul. Matthew and Mark say nothing of such formal institution; Luke and Paul, on the other hand, plainly assert it. But Luke’s indebtedness to Paul here is generally admitted. We have then Paul on the one side as an independent witness, and Matthew and Mark on the other. Matthew and Mark are certainly some decades later than 1 Corinthians, but they, like Paul, are no doubt merely reproducing the traditional account they have received. The sources from which they draw are similar to Paul’s, and the decision as to which account is to be preferred must rest on internal evidence. Comparison of Matthew and Mark leads to the conclusion that the shorter account
of Mark is the original. The choice then rests between Mark and Paul, and Jülicher has little hesitation in deciding for Mark. We detect the hand of Paul in the complicated τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι, as compared with the simple and more natural τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης of Mark. Possibly the καινὴ of Paul is original, but otherwise our verdict must be in favour of Mark. But see what follows. While Paul has τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, Mark has only the simple λάβετε—a slight difference according to Weizsäcker, but to Jülicher of the very highest importance. For with Mark alone before us we should never conclude that Jesus meant the celebration to be repeated. Now we can imagine no reason why Mark should have omitted the injunction which we have in Paul, had he found it in the tradition on which he was basing. From the earliest times, so far as we can learn, the Church had adopted the view presented by Paul. If Mark omits all mention of this formal institution, then it must be because he found nothing to that effect in the source from which he drew. But while we can imagine no reason for the omission of the words of institution, if they had been preserved in the tradition, we can easily account for their insertion if they had not. They are only the explicit statement of what was universally believed to be the Saviour's purpose in the celebration. What more natural than that some words should have been introduced into the narrative, expressly indicating what all understood to be the Saviour's intention! We conclude then that in Mark and Matthew we have the earliest tradition regarding the Lord's Supper—the earliest tradition, according to which Jesus gave no indication that He desired the celebration to be repeated.

But if Jesus did not institute the rite in remembrance of Himself, what purpose had He in the celebration? What meaning are we to attach to the impressive words with
which He handed to His disciples the bread and cup, "This is My body," "This is My blood"? Weizsäcker has described them as "a parable," and Jülicher accepts the description; but not in the sense in which Weizsäcker uses the word. He protests here, as he has done so vigorously elsewhere, against the parables of Jesus being regarded as riddles of which He gave the solution to His disciples in private. Can we imagine Jesus, a few hours before His death, on the last occasion on which He could speak in peace with His disciples, leaving as a legacy to His most intimate friends—a problem to solve? No, the words which flow from a heart moved as that of Jesus must have been at this time are plain and simple, words from the heart to the heart. The more ingenious or profound the interpretation advanced of the Saviour's words, the greater reason for suspecting it. For this reason Jülicher rejects Harnack's interpretation. It makes too great demands on the hearer or reader, and gives a meaning to the words of Jesus which only the ingenuity of the student can discover in them. The simplest explanation is the best. Jesus lets the cup full of red wine pass round among His disciples. "As this wine will soon disappear," He says to them virtually, "so will My blood soon be shed; but not in vain," He adds to comfort them, "for it is shed ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; it is blood of the covenant." His words, when He hands the bread to His disciples, are to be understood in the same sense. Weizsäcker would make a distinction between the two parts of the celebration. In the wine he sees a reference to the death of Christ; but when Jesus says of the bread, "This is My body," he thinks that, so far from pointing to the death of this body, He is referring to His personal presence, of which He had given promise in Matthew xviii. 20. The objection to this is obvious. Is it likely that Jesus, with the two elements for consumption on the table before Him, would choose one of them as a
symbol of the permanent and the other as a symbol of the perishable? Or that He would select that body, to whose death He is about to refer in the next breath, as a symbol of His permanent presence? And if He had done so, is it likely that the disciples would have understood Him? No. Nothing is more certain to Jülicher than that both parts of the celebration are to be interpreted in the same sense. True, bread in itself does not suggest the death of the body; but all the four accounts mention the breaking of the bread, and it is here that the point of comparison lies. By bread and wine, then, Jesus illustrates the same thought. They are used by metonymy to denote the perishable part of Him, bread the solid being compared to His body, wine the liquid to His blood. It is quite in accordance with the practice of Jesus to use such a double illustration. We have called His words a parable, and we know how frequently He used a pair of parables to illustrate the same thought, e.g. the leaven and the mustard-seed, the lost sheep and the lost piece of silver. Those who have the craze for interpreting the parables as allegories will no doubt want to know why bread is chosen to represent Christ’s body and wine His blood. That is a question which must be left to the allegorisers to discuss. In so far Harnack is quite right. Jesus could have illustrated the same thought by the Paschal lamb and a cup of water.

So far as we have gone we have found the \textit{tertium comparationis} in the ἐκλάσεν in the one case, and the ἐκχυστάνομενον in the other. And the thought suggested by the “parable” is the impending death of Christ. But Jesus speaks not only of His death but of the blessings which follow from it. And in view of this we may ask further: Is it mere accident that the elements Jesus selects are things for eating and drinking, things which nourish the body? Or does He mean further to suggest that just as the bread, when it is broken and devoured, gives nourish-
ment and strength, so the destruction of His body will result in blessing to man? And of the wine likewise? It may be so. In this case we should have to widen our conception of the tertium comparationis, and instead of confining it to the points mentioned above, regard it as embracing the nutritive character of the elements as well. This further thought is not so certain as the reference to the death. Even if we admit it, however, it is quite a different thing from what Harnack professes to find in the celebration when he speaks of it as "the sanctification of the most important function of the natural life." Are the sower and the seed and the leaven sanctified by their place in the parables of Jesus?

Briefly then to sum up Jülicher's conclusions. The Lord's Supper is neither a riddle propounded by Jesus to His disciples, nor an important contribution to Christian ethics, nor a provision in any way for the Church of the future. Jesus inaugurated nothing, instituted nothing. He had no thought of keeping His memory fresh. The Man who spoke Matthew xxvi. 29 did not look forward to any long separation. His action at the table is to be regarded simply as a solemn farewell to His disciples. His hour has come; and He desires to assure them that the death He is going to meet, which appears to involve the frustration of all His hopes and plans, will yet be a source of blessing to man. The words that fall from His lips are addressed to Himself as well as to them. If they are meant to comfort His disciples, they serve at the same time to lighten His own heart.

But if Jesus had no thought of making a permanent institution of the celebration, how did it come so soon to acquire this character in the early Church? To this question the last part of Jülicher's paper is devoted. He gives a sketch of the possible course of events. The celebration must have made a deep impression upon the disciples.
How precious the words of Jesus must have seemed to them as they began to recover from the shock of His death! When they assembled again at Jerusalem, the little family eagerly looking for the return of the Head, would not every meal at which they met together recall that last supper they had eaten with their Master—what He had said and done? As they broke bread to eat, as the cup was passed round, would they not repeat what Jesus had said at that farewell meal? So the rite would live on in the early Church. So far as possible believers would endeavour to reproduce the original situation, and it appears highly improbable to Jülicher that water or anything else would be used instead of wine. But one point of difference there must be—now there was a looking back, whereas in the original celebration there had been a looking forward. The purpose of the first Lord's Supper had been τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλειν. This purpose was not lost sight of later (1 Cor. xi. 26), but the “shewing forth” now took the form of commemoration; nor was it likely that this daily commemoration of the death of Christ, in which the faith and love of the brotherhood found appropriate expression, would be continued were it believed to be contrary to the will, or without the sanction, of the Master. It was only to be expected that some words, such as the τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, should find their way into the narrative. We do not know what may have happened at the first of these celebrations at Jerusalem. Possibly some of those appearances of the risen Saviour which are mentioned in 1 Corinthians xv. 5, 7 may have taken place on such occasions. If so, that would increase the reverence attached to these δείπνα κυριακά. But even without this we can understand how readily such celebrations would become a sacred practice in the early Church, and would be introduced into every new congregation, so that one Christian might recognise
another ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἀρτοῦ (Luke xxiv. 35). In the second century congregations became too large for meeting together at an ordinary meal; abuses, such as those mentioned in 1 Corinthians, suggested the need of a change, to which no doubt the feeling that there was a certain profanation in associating such a solemn celebration with a meal for the satisfaction of the appetites contributed. And so gradually, but not for a long time, not till they had assumed new forms and been employed for new purposes, the original δείπνα disappeared. The meaning of the celebration was changed; massive formulas were employed to describe the blessings which flowed from participation; the τοῦτο ἐστίν was taken literally, as proving that it was actually the body and blood of Christ that was partaken of.

"The purpose of the first Eucharist was to teach the disciples to believe in and understand the death of Christ. His followers continued to celebrate it in commemoration of that death. This is the point of view of Paul, the man who has contributed most to our appreciation of the death of the Saviour. But with him the celebration has lost its mournful character, for the death of Christ is to him tidings of gladness. The 'for you' has absorbed the other elements, and in the Lord's Supper we are celebrating not what we have lost, but what we have gained by Golgotha. In spite of the enormous changes which the piety or the superstition of later ages has introduced, the Lord's Supper still fulfils the purpose which the Saviour had in view—to reconcile His followers to the fact, and enlighten them as to the significance, of His death."

G. Wanchope Stewart.