

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

small body of legislation, Lev. xvii.-xxvi., is the transition from Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code." It does not follow without exception that PC rests upon the idea of a state in which all ritual is a settled thing, for the story, as told in Numbers, which is put into this code by the critics, brings out a state anything but settled as to worship and its auxiliaries.

On this branch of the subject we think we have adduced sufficient evidence that the three strata of cultus and legislation are due to the dream of the critic, and can adopt the words of Wellhausen, with a slight difference of application—"A law so living, which stands at every point in immediate contact with reality and which proceeds with constant reference to the demands of practical life, is no mere velleity, no mere cobweb of an idle brain," but is, as we have always been led to believe, the work of Moses, who was faithful in all his house. The other chief branches of objection are equally weak, and if carefully followed out in detail refuse to bear the interpretation put upon them.

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

Correspondence.

"THE HOUR OF COMMUNION."

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—Able and candid as is the article of Mr. Dimock in your last, I think he has exceeded greatly in his estimation of the force of two authorities, alleged by him in favour of non-fasting Communion—the *Teaching of the Apostles* and *St. Ignatius*.

These, he says, are "perhaps the most important witnesses in this matter," and, of the former, "it represents a state of things in the Church, or some portion of it, in which post-prandial or post-cœnal Communion was the ordinary rule and practice;" and "we see a scene of post-Apostolic times, and . . . the Eucharist partaken of by Christians (*sic*) after being filled with a repast (or as part of a repast) . . . which none will maintain to have been the meal of the morning."

I note that a *morning* meal would be no more allowed, in a question of fasting Communion, than one in the evening; but there is really *no* note of time in the *Ἀιδαχή*, and so the whole of its two chapters—ix. and x.—*may* even be read of an *early* Communion.

But the force of the example, upon which so confident a conclusion is made to rest, is wholly in the words, *Μετά δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι*, of which I will only remark that more than one interpretation is allowable (Rom. xv. 24), even though the words were in no special connection with their context; but in the *Ἀιδαχή* they are in an indissoluble connection, which, I think, determines absolutely their special reference, and that is to the Eucharist, and not to any other "eating" whatever. The previous chapter contains the direction as to the "Eucharist," and this includes the Bread *broken* (*κλάσμα*), and forbids anyone to "eat or drink of the

Eucharist" unless baptized. Then follows chapter x., completing the direction, *Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε. . .* Is it possible to dislocate and separate the *one* subject of these two chapters, and to make the one speak of the Eucharist, and the other of some other "eating" or "filling," when the words in both chapters are literally the same? To do so, seems to me almost a paralysis of the interpretative faculty and of the critical function, notwithstanding that some scholars have so wrenched the probabilities of the case.

It is not enough to say (as Mr. Dimock quotes Dr. P. Schaff, in his *Didache*) "the Communion and the *agape* were then inseparably connected," for if this were as certain as it is open to question, the difficulty of construing τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι of the *agape* would be not lessened, seeing that this word does not occur in either chapter, and that the constructional connection is restricted to the Eucharistic action, or to the elements, as alone spoken of throughout. My edition of the *Didache* (by Dr. Aug. Wünsche, 1884) confirms this view, by the translation, *Nachdem ihr aber vollendet habt (d. i. wenn die heilige Handlung vorüber ist) so danket also: Wir danken dir. . .* "When the holy action is finished" is, in a note, varied by "after the use of the bread and wine."

Professor Swainson, in his "Greek Liturgies," p. xlix, gives the *Didache* and the Apostolical Constitutions in exact comparative connection, and the latter have the very probable, tolerable, and consistent reflex of the former in the words *Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν*, corresponding to the τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι in the *Didache*; and that τὴν μετάληψιν has the technical sense of a sacramental reception will scarcely be denied. Nor if the words be only a "paraphrase" will they be the less forcible as a witness of an early interpretation, not favouring the confusion of the *agape* with the Communion.

Mr. Dimock's second authority, "strongly confirming" his view of the *Didache*, is the Epistle of St. Ignatius (ad Smyrn. VIII.), which says, "It is not lawful, apart from the Bishop, either to baptize or to hold an *agape*" (οὐτε βαπτίζειν οὐτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν). It is not safe to assert confidently what is the exact force and reference of ἀγάπην ποιεῖν here; but it is certainly not the way to attain to a right sense of the words to look at them ever so hardly and long, *apart from their context*. Now the things forbidden in the context are not only baptizing and ἀγάπην ποιεῖν, but it is forbidden for anyone to *do anything* affecting the Church without the Bishop: and a valid *Eucharist* is declared to be that which the Bishop has charge of, or is by episcopal appointment. Then, lastly, follows the somewhat strange, seeming repetition, or special selection of two acts, by way of emphasis, which are affirmed to be Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Mr. Dimock insists that the "Eucharist" must be meant here, and not a love-feast; for if not, he says, we are driven to the conclusion that St. Ignatius "did not think it necessary to prohibit the celebration of the Eucharist without the Bishop, while he did feel it necessary to forbid a social meal—a *reductio ad absurdum*."

Mr. Dimock plainly errs here from his oversight of the context. St. Ignatius *did* forbid a Eucharistic action, apart from the Bishop; and so there is no absurdity, and we are not forced upon "the only alternative" of supposing "that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν included the partaking of the Supper of the Lord."

I hope not to be thought presumptuous if I doubt that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν has any conclusive force here, either as to the Eucharist or the *agape*. The great names who have thought otherwise will surely forgive a modest doubt, when the question is less one of exact scholarship than of the general interpretation of the passage. My reasons for hesitation are (1) the fact that St. Ignatius has, in the chapter in question, before

spoken emphatically of the Eucharist, and a *repeated* mention of that is not easily accounted for; (2) that *ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* is nowhere else used for the Eucharist; (3) that the form of this expression is, may I say? suggestive of *τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν, and ποιῶντος ἐλεημοσύνην* (St. Matt. vi. 1, 3), and *may* refer to some general Church action in "distributing to the necessities of the saints," such as the "daily ministrations" (Acts vi. 1), which required to be under episcopal control. Such action, and the gatherings at stated times for baptism, would not unmeetly be selected for special mention together, as we find in the Ignatian text, and this would be no repetition of the previous order as to the Eucharist. Baptism, notably as administered in the early days of the Church, being the public admission of members at once, and mainly of adults, into the Church's ranks, and the distribution of the Church's contributions to its members, were matters of the earliest concern; and the latter, whether at some *agape* (when collections were made) or otherwise, would be a special matter of episcopal supervision—as, in fact, it was actually ordered in after days.

What the *agape* of St. Ignatius may have been is not without some doubt. What were afterwards known as *agapæ* fell into abuse, and the Council of Laodicea (fourth century) forbade any to be held in "basilicas or churches," using the very phrase of Ignatius, but in the Latin, "*Agapem facere*;" and this settled use of the term is some evidence that the Ignatian words were not meant to refer to the Eucharist. But neither this nor the mention of the *agape* by Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and in the Apostolical Constitutions is decisive, as to the exact meaning of *ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* in Ignatius at an earlier date.

If it were absolutely certain that "In the Apostolic age the Eucharist formed part of the *agape*," it would be very reasonable to allege this fact in support of the argument that Ignatius had that in view, when writing within, say, seventy years from the example of the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. xi.); but strict evidence that this *was* the Apostolic use is wanting. The Eucharist is not named—nor proved to be referred to—by St. Jude when, some years after, he speaks of the "feasts of charity," and it is only an "inference" that the *agape* is referred to by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 17. Whether the Apostle in verse 20 refers to the Eucharist or to some *agape*, is admitted by great authorities to be uncertain, though a current of opinion is in favour of both being the object of one meeting. I venture to doubt whether the Corinthians came together to "hold" what was afterwards strictly called an *agape*, but is not so named here, and whether that name has not been reflected backwards from later days to the action of the earlier Church. Is it not allowable to think that the Apostle's whole language and warning point rather to a total abuse and *misconception* of the character of the Holy Eucharist, as if it were essentially and only a *meal* partaken of in common? It is to this *false* character of the observance that all the fervour and weight of the Apostolic authority and inspired testimony are turned throughout the chapter. The Corinthians came together in such action as was not to keep *the Lord's* institution—the eating of His Body. They "despised the Church of God" by convivial, common, disorderly "feeding themselves without fear" (Jude 12). They came together in the church, but not for sacramental action and use, "not discerning the Lord's Body." How absolute is the distinction between a common meal and a sacramental reception: "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" "If any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation!" And how is the retributive effect of this abuse and radical misconception enforced, "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep!"

Looking at the whole record of the Apostle's action, his aim can scarcely be missed—to stop the intrusion of *any* non-sacramental eating in the church, and to affirm the true ideal of the Eucharist; and surely if any acknowledged authority and inspiration of knowledge could stop the mischief, St. Paul's would suffice. It is allowable to think the evil *was* stopped at once, and warded from re-entrance for a long period by the further "order" which he promised to promote and most probably *did* effect. At least there is no evidence of its recurrence till after Ignatius and the *Didache*. There is a strata of Church history, after the Corinthian scandal—for, say, seventy years—with no record save St. Jude's, and the external notice of Pliny. The former does not indicate a connection of the *agape* with the Eucharist, or give any hint of the time of their being held; but the latter, not uncertainly, gives both, and perhaps, at less than forty years' interval, may help to illustrate the hour of St. Jude's *agape*. Pliny determines the early dawning as the hour of the Eucharistic meeting, and also that the common meal or *agape* was *afterwards*, at an uncertain hour, after some delay.

Recurring to St. Paul's language to the Corinthians, I am unable, even with the great weight of Waterland's name, to see with him the difficulty of the Apostle's "quick transition" from the *agape* to the sacrament. In fact, the transition does not exist if the Corinthian abuse was not an *agape*, but a fundamental misconception, and a travesty of the sacrament. To the Apostles' thought there was really only one subject—our Lord's institution, with the false observance overshadowing it; and this thrown aside and cast out, the word of the revealed truth shone forth, to complete by divine contrast the condemnation of the evil perversion.

I hope it may be some justification for this restricted examination of Mr. Dimock's two special authorities that both have been my special attention, and the subject of comment in print long ago; and that the proper valuation of both is of real concern to the general argument, upon which I do not now remark.

Your obedient servant,
W. F. HOBSON.

TEMPLE EWELL, DOVER,
March 22nd, 1886.

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—I have to thank you for kindly allowing me to see Mr. Hobson's letter, and affording me space for a note on its contents.

For the importance of the subject, the letter deserves, and I hope will receive, a fuller and more satisfactory reply. But now, very briefly, as to—

I. The argument from the *Διδαχῆ*. I think the way may be cleared by two inquiries: (1) Could the words *μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι* have been naturally used of the Eucharistic service as altogether separate from the partaking of a meal? (2) Have we any warrant whatever for supposing that, as connected with a meal, it was ever connected with any other meal than a supper?

Some discussion on the meaning of the expression will be found in Schaff's edition, p. 60. See also note, pp. 194-5.

II. The language of Ignatius. The argument from the context, as anticipated (in part) by Bishop Pearson, has been ably and (as it seems to me) effectually dealt with by Bishop Lightfoot in a note (v. ii., s. i. pp. 313-4), the pith of which I have quoted on pp. 426-7 (Reprint, p. 10). But the whole of the note should be read, as well as the important observations on the subject in vol. i., pp. 386-7.

I have, however, noted, for correction in any future edition, some words which, I gladly acknowledge, might convey a misapprehension.

III. Mr. Hobson's interesting discussion of 1 Cor. xi., which will, I trust, receive due attention. I do not understand that it is questioned by Mr. Hobson that in the Corinthian Church the Eucharist was, in some sort, made to be a part of (or, by error, made into) a social meal, and that this meal was a *supper*.

Not but what, beyond this, Mr. Hobson's argument has an important bearing on the subject.

I will only add that, in speaking of Pliny as determining "the early dawning as the hour of the Eucharistic meeting," Mr. Hobson is inadvertently begging the question (not altogether an unimportant one) on which I have touched in my note on pp. 431-2.

Yours faithfully,

N. DIMOCK.

ST. PAUL'S VICARAGE, MAIDSTONE,
April 2, 1886.

Reviews.

A Dictionary of Islam. A Cyclopædia of the Doctrines, Rites, Customs, and Theological Terms of the Muhammadan Religion. By THOMAS PATRICK HUGHES, B.D., 1885. London: W. H. Allen and Co.

IF the reader expects to find in this review a blind and wholesale abuse of Muhammad and his doctrines, and an uncritical disregard of the great fact that one hundred and seventy-five millions at this moment adhere to this persuasion, he is mistaken. The subject is a very solemn one, and should be treated with solemnity. The writer has lived a quarter of a century in intimate acquaintance with Muhammadans. The servants who cooked his dinner and waited at his table; the coachman who drove his carriage; the horsemen who were his companions in his rides; many of the clerks and officials who engrossed his orders and transacted his business; the judges of first instance who presided in the Civil Courts; the Collectors of the State-Revenue; and the superintendents of the police stations were, in a very large number, followers of Islam, intermixed with an equal number of Hindus; and yet they were upright, trustworthy, and esteemed, full of affectionate interest, and entirely devoid of fanaticism. The Muhammadan nobleman or prince is a born gentleman, stately in his bearing, courteous in his expressions, and yet dignified and reserved.

The great leading error, disfigurement, and misfortune of a Muhammadan is simply this—that *he is not a Christian*. He has no idols to get rid of; no abominable customs, such as widow-burning, female infanticide, human sacrifices, or cannibalism, to be trodden down; his laws, his ceremonies, his customs, are reduced to writing, and in these latter days are printed. He is not ashamed of his past history, for his creed has filled a large page in the world's chronicles, overrunning large portions of Asia, Europe, and Africa. If the political influence of that creed is now on the wane, the propagandist power is by no means diminished. We must consider the phenomena of its existence with judicial calmness. It cannot be supposed that such a mighty factor in the world's history came into play without the special sanction of the Almighty. The promulgation of the doctrines of Muhammad is one of the greatest land-