The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Gardner on the Origin of the Lord's Supper *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, by Percy Gardner, Litt. D. Macmillan. 22 pp. 1s. net.

J. B. Mayor

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 04 / April 1894, pp 148 - 152
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187906, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187906

How to cite this article:

J. B. Mayor (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 148-152 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187906

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

offers *κακῶν κάκιστα τῷ θ.γ.* or *κάκιστα δ' ὦ παῖ τ.θ.γ.*, Hiller *κάκιστα δ' αἰεὶ τῷ θ.γ.*

Perhaps we should read *οἱ ζοοὶ κάκιστα δ' ἦδη τῷ θανόντι γίγνεται*. The syllables *δ' ἦδη*

would readily be simplified into *δέ:* and the word *ἦδη* suits the sense of the passage better than Porson's *αὐτῷ*.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

MARTIAL II. 66.

'Unus de toto peccaverat orbe comarum
Anulus, incerta non bene fixus acu.
Hoc facinus Lalage speculo quo viderat ulta
est,
Et cecidit saevis icta Plecusa comis, etc.'

The 'saevis comis' of v. 4 presents difficulties and is very curiously interpreted.

(1) Friedländer makes it = *propter saevas comas*, and compares *Liber Spectaculorum* i. 3, *Nec Triviae templo molles laudentur Iones*, where 'templo' undoubtedly = *propter templum*. But here *icta* seems to require an abl. of instrument and Friedländer's interpretation is forced.

(2) Stephenson says 'comis = the thongs of the bull's hide whip (*taurea*, Juv. vi. 492).' The passage from Juvenal is indeed a useful parallel to this epigram and illustrates the same phase of feminine cruelty to slaves. But the mention of *taurea* in Juvenal is not sufficient to justify the meaning adopted by Stephenson for *comis*. It is a meaning unsupported by any parallel and seems unnatural.

(3) Paley and Stone seem to waver between Friedländer's interpretation and the absurdity 'Plecusa fell with her hair (*i.e.* scalp) cut'! (Reading *sectis*.)

(4) If we remember that v. 3 has said that the instrument of vengeance used by the mistress was the mirror that showed her the errant curl, I think that *saevis comis* will be seen to refer to the image of the hair seen in the mirror. 'Lalage avenged the crime with the mirror that detected it and felled the tiring-woman with the (counterfeit presentment of the) cruel locks.' In this way the indefiniteness of 'speculo ulta est' in v. 3 is explained and amplified in v. 4 quite after the manner of Martial. The transference of epithet in *saevis* is paralleled by 'tristis capillos' in v. 5; and the metonymy in *comis* is not too harsh for Martial's style. These forced phrases are almost characteristic of his *serious* style when he wishes to display moral indignation. He is much more natural when he jests.

GEORGE SMITH.

GARDNER ON THE ORIGIN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Origin of the Lord's Supper, by PERCY GARDNER, Litt. D. Macmillan. 22 pp. 1s. net.

THE pamphlet before us belongs to a class of writings which is perhaps less likely to receive fair and adequate criticism in England than elsewhere. It is the work of an expert in one province venturing into a province which is not strictly his own. The experts in the latter province are not unnaturally inclined to look with some suspicion on the intruder, especially if he ventures to challenge conclusions which they regard as authoritative. And this is still more the case when the points assailed appear to have any connexion with a subject of great practical importance, such as reli-

gion, which excites the strongest interest not merely amongst the few who are capable of following the steps of a scientific discussion, but amongst the many who care for the conclusions alone. Reviews which are written for the many, whether on the positive or the negative side, are alike impatient of discussion, and prefer to leave unnoticed books which might disturb the security of their readers; or if notice them they must, they occupy themselves for the most part in rhetoric, laudatory or denunciatory, as the conclusions arrived at are, or are not, in accordance with their own preconceived opinions.

And yet it cannot be doubted that, as regards any great and complex subject, it is necessary that it should be attacked from

various sides by minds of various quality and training, if real progress is to be made in the ascertainment of the truth; and that, however unwelcome negative criticism may be, it is an essential factor in the establishment of a body of truth which is to command the confidence of educated men. For these reasons I think it is well that a periodical like the *Classical Review*, while it holds aloof from religious or doctrinal discussion in the abstract, should not shrink from the treatment of religious questions, so far as they are involved in the criticism, interpretation and illustration of the language of the early Christian writers. Such a review must welcome every serious effort to throw new light on all subjects connected with Classical Antiquity, irrespective of the quarter from which it may proceed or the interest in which it may be used.

Professor Gardner's modest book, which has suggested these remarks, contains a hypothesis as to the Eucharist grounded upon two alleged facts:—

(1) The command to repeat the Lord's Supper as a memorial is not to be found in the original text of the Gospels, but only in 1 Cor. xi. 20 foll.

(2) St. Paul there professes to have received the command by immediate inspiration from Christ.

I will begin by examining the second point as the simpler of the two. The words are *ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν* κ.τ.λ. (v. 23), which Prof. Gardner translates 'I myself received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you.'

In support of his view he refers to the many undoubted cases in which St. Paul claims to have received direct revelations from Christ; and though he allows that in 1 Cor. vii. 10 (*παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος*) it is the teaching of Christ as handed down in the Church, not as revealed to St. Paul by direct inspiration which is referred to; yet comparing it with Col. iii. 24 (*ἀπὸ Κυρίου ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν*) (which 'we must certainly render *ye shall receive direct from the Lord the reward*'), and the omission of the words *ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου* after *παρέλαβον* in 1 Cor. xv. 3 (where the reference is to mere human testimony), he thinks there can be no doubt that in our passage there is a claim to personal inspiration, which is further marked by the emphatic *ἐγὼ*.

To deal first with this last point, I do not think there is any occasion to interpret *ἐγὼ* 'I myself,' as Mr. Gardner does. It seems

to me sufficiently explained by the antithesis to *ὑμῖν*, 'I received from Christ what I handed on to you.' Otherwise why should not the emphatic *αὐτὸς ἐγὼ* have been used, as in Rom. vii. 25, ix. 3, xv. 14, and elsewhere? Next as to the use of *παρέλαβον*. In the sense which it bears here it is regularly followed by the preposition *παρά*, as in Gal. i. 12 *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρ' ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό*, 1 Th. ii. 13 *παρελάβοντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν*, *ib.* iv. 1 *παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν*, 2 Th. iii. 6 *κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν*. This is in fact the only passage in the N.T. in which it is followed by *ἀπὸ*, and we naturally surmise that there must have been some reason for departing from the ordinary use. The difference between the two prepositions is that *παρά* implies the passing on of tradition from hand to hand, while *ἀπὸ* denotes simply the source, especially the ultimate source, just as, in contradistinction from *ὑπό*, it implies the remoter cause or agent (cf. James i. 13 *ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πειράζομαι*). I cannot therefore agree in the rendering of Col. iii. 24 'ye shall receive direct from the Lord the reward.' As contrasted with *κομίσεται παρὰ Κυρίου* 'at the Lord's hand' in the parallel passage of Eph. vi. 8, the suggestion would be just the other way. As to the passage under consideration, I agree with Winer that *ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου παρέλαβον* would be an inappropriate expression for 'the Lord has himself personally, as in an *ἀποκάλυψις*, revealed it to me.' Mr. Gardner however holds that the phrase 'I received from the Lord' 'can scarcely by fair criticism be regarded as equivalent to *I received from those who heard the Lord*.' Perhaps the use of the corresponding *παράδωκε* may help us to a decision on this point. In Acts vi. 14 we read *τὰ ἔθνη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς*, which might have been equally well expressed by the words *ἃ παρελάβομεν ἀπὸ Μωυσέως*. Plato (*Theæt.* 180 C) even uses the expression *τὸ πρόβλημα παρελήφαμεν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων* 'the question has come down to us by tradition from the ancients,' where *παρά* is used of the first link in the chain.

To leave the grammatical point, Mr. Gardner would make 'the tradition received from the Lord' cover all that follows to the end of the 25th verse; understanding St. Paul to have seen in a vision the whole scene of the Last Supper enacted before his eyes. But is it conceivable that, if this were intended, such an unsuitable word as *παρέλαβον* would have been used? Should we not have had *ἐγένετο ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἕκστασις* as in Acts x. 10, or *δραμα ὥφθη* as in Acts xvi.

9, or ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι as in Rev. i. 10? It seems to me far more natural to regard the παραδόσις as limited to the words of institution 'This is my body' &c., the rest being merely the circumstantial framework. Logically expressed it would run 'I received by tradition from the Lord the words spoken by him after the breaking of the Bread *This is my body given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.*'

I now turn to the first allegation. The words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν are not found in the first two Gospels, and in St. Luke's they are bracketed by WH., along with other words supposed to be borrowed from 1 Cor. xi. 23 foll.

I will not venture here to oppose the verdict of our two greatest textual authorities given in the Appendix to their Greek Testament, 'there is no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of St. Luke' (p. 24), but I confess to considerable difficulty in accepting it. This is one of the very few cases in which they allow a preponderating weight to the Western tradition, represented by Codex Bezae, &c., in opposition to the Vatican, the Sinaitic, the Alexandrian and the other chief MSS. It would be out of place here to discuss the grounds of their conclusion, but I may mention one consideration which I think has weight on the other side. We are told by St. Paul that the account he gives of the Last Supper was that which he received from the Lord and which he imparted to his converts. Was it likely that St. Luke, the devoted friend and companion of St. Paul, should be ignorant of this account, or could knowingly have passed it over in his Gospel, written several years after the Epistle to the Corinthians? If the words 'this do in remembrance of me' were interpolated in order to give the story in full, why do we not find a similar interpolation in the other Gospels? Is it not conceivable at any rate that they were omitted, whether purposely or accidentally, from the text of St. Luke by some scribe who was familiar with the shorter form as given in St. Matthew and St. Mark?

I will not however press this. I will assume that WH. are right in bracketing the words. Does it follow that, because they are not recorded by the Evangelists, they were therefore not spoken by the Lord at the Last Supper? The most careless comparison of the Gospels shows how precarious such an inference would be. If we do not doubt that the Parable of the

Prodigal Son was really spoken by Christ, though omitted in the first two Gospels; if we accept as true the narrative of our Lord's discourse with Thomas and with Peter after the Resurrection in spite of the silence of the Synoptists; if we believe St. John's statement that all that is written is but a small selection from the words and acts of Jesus; then the want of positive evidence is no proof that these words were not uttered upon earth, but only revealed in vision to St. Paul. Will it be said that they are of such transcendent importance that, if spoken, they must have been recorded? But the instances of omission we have noticed are sufficient to prove the fallaciousness of such reasoning; and further it may be doubted whether the words would have been felt to be so important at the time when the Gospels were written. By that time at any rate the command 'Do this in remembrance of me' was so universally obeyed, that it might seem to stand in less need of being reported than the other words which are said to have accompanied the first institution of the Sacrament.

Mr. Gardner however questions whether the existence of the Eucharist, as a commemorative feast, can be traced further back than St. Paul's visit to Corinth. He thinks that the κλάσις ἄρτου of which we read in the Acts implies nothing more than 'the Feast of Charity held daily or at set intervals, when all who professed the name of Christ ate and drank together'; and he explains this custom as an outgrowth of the common life of the Apostles, not necessarily connected with the Lord's Supper. It was St. Paul's influence, he thinks, which gave a sacramental and commemorative character to the Agape; and he suggests that the idea of this development may have come to him from his observation of certain rites of the Greek religion. The cultus of Heroes was a rallying point for the tribe, reminding the members of their relation to one another and to their invisible head. The Mysteries of Eleusis fostered a belief in immortality under the symbol of the buried corn. Might it not be possible in like manner to raise the Agape into a Communion, which should deepen the sense of the believer's union with Christ and also serve as a pledge of a joyful resurrection?

But was it really necessary that a Jew should be brought in contact with Pagan ceremonial before he could realize the religious importance of commemorative festivals? St. Paul's own language is opposed to this. He finds parallels for the Christian sacra-

ments in the past history of the Jews (1 Cor. x. 2, 3) and in their sacrificial feasts (*ib.* 18): and surely no Jew who had ever duly kept the Passover could have anything to learn from Eleusis or elsewhere as to the closeness of the tie which bound each Israelite to his brethren and to his God. To the disciples moreover the commemoration of the Passover had acquired a new and deeper meaning since the Last Supper. Christ himself was their Passover, their Paschal Lamb (Matt. xxvi. 17 foll., John xix. 36, 1 Cor. v. 7, xi. 24). And though the phrase *κλάσις ἄρτου* need not, of itself, imply a sacramental feast, yet when we find 'the breaking of the bread' joined with 'the prayers' and the attendance in the temple, as part of the religious life of the first converts (Acts ii. 42, 46); when we find the first day of the week celebrated, as it would seem, by the breaking of bread (Acts xx. 11); and the word *κλάσμα* used in the *Didaché* (ix. 3) as a technical word for the Sacramental Bread; I think we can hardly avoid the conclusion that the word and the act were associated in the minds of the disciples with the solemn scene of the Last Supper. St. Paul's own words in 1 Cor. x. 16 *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν...τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν* witness to the 'cup of blessing' as joined with 'the breaking of bread' in the same religious rite, and certainly seem to imply that this rite was known to all Christians, though the argument on the *κοινωνία* shows that its import as a bond of union was not fully recognized in Corinth. Moreover the words in xi. 2, introductory to the present discussion, *καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε*, seem to appeal to the authority of the traditions as something independent of St. Paul, though communicated by him: and this is confirmed by v. 16 *εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνηκος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, where St. Paul appeals to the practice of other churches as confirming his own decision in regard to the position of women. Is it likely that he would appeal immediately afterwards to a private tradition, unknown to the other churches, on the subject of the Sacrament? Would not his injunction in xi. 20 foll. have more weight with the turbulent Corinthian converts if it appealed to a universally accepted tradition of the Christian Church, than if understood of a private revelation to St. Paul?

Prof. Gardner cites two passages as evidence that St. Paul's account of the Eucharist was not admitted by all his contemporaries. One is from the the *Didaché*, 'which,'

he says, 'shows a noteworthy independence of the Pauline teaching.' The passage he quotes is the Eucharistic prayer in ch. ix., 'As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together became one, so let thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom,' which he contrasts with St. Paul's words 'as often as ye eat this bread ye do show forth the Lord's death.' But though there is no resemblance between *Did.* ix. 4 and 1 Cor. xi. 26, yet there is a considerable resemblance between it and 1 Cor. x. 17 *εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἔσμεν*, as on the other hand there is a marked resemblance between the Pauline account of the Eucharist and *Did.* x. 2, 3 *εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι πάτερ ἄγε...ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου...Σὺ, δέσποτα παντοκράτωρ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου*.

I must own that Mr. Gardner's other reference is one that considerably surprises me. He describes the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel as 'an elaborate expansion of the phrases *I am the living bread and Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life*,' and he considers that, the writer could not have connected these phrases with the feeding of the multitude, 'if he had accepted their Pauline attachment to the Christian Sacrament.' Might it not with equal justice be alleged that because St. John records the words to Nicodemus 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' he must have therefore rejected the command given to the Apostles to baptize all nations? To me the argument lies just the other way. It was because of the danger of the misuse of the universally received Sacraments, that St. John was at such pains to record discourses which dwelt, not on the sign, but on the thing signified. The writer who lays such stress on the witness of the water and the blood (Joh. xix. 34, 35; 1 Joh. iv. 6—8) cannot have been ignorant of their sacramental use, any more than it was possible for one like St. Paul, familiar with the figurative use of the words 'bread' and 'food' in the O.T., to have limited the feeding on Christ to the actual participation of the Eucharist.

Those who are conscious of the deadening effects of familiarity will be grateful to Prof. Gardner for enabling them to look

with a fresher eye on the subject which he discusses, as well as for the interest of many of his incidental remarks; but I cannot think that he has succeeded in giving probability

to any of the main points in his theory as to the origin of the Lord's Supper.

J. B. MAYOR.

GOODHART'S THUCYDIDES VIII.

The Eighth Book of Thucydides, edited with Notes and Introduction by H. C. GOODHART. Macmillan & Co. 1893. Pp. xlii., 180. 9s.

For the editor of a library edition of Thucydides there is plenty of work ready to hand. Much remains to be done even after the labours of Poppo; and much has been rightly left undone by the producers of the modest school editions with which we are familiar. It would be for any scholar a laudable ambition to make some day a library edition of one of the latter books. At the same time the learning that is essential for the performance of the task, as I conceive it ought to be performed, is not to be acquired in a few years, but only by a laborious and often vexatious study of all the authors who have imitated or cited from Thucydides. It is only by such study that we can hope to settle the disputed question of the origin of the *Vatican* version of the text from vi. 92, 5¹ to the end. That the question will yet be settled is not improbable; and it is to be regretted that an editor in many respects so entirely competent as Prof. Goodhart did not set his hand to the plough instead of merely giving an able and useful summary of what has in the main been already done.

Prof. Goodhart's text is based upon sound principles of criticism: his introduction and commentary are throughout lucid and interesting: he expresses his thoughts with a clearness that may excite the envy of less gifted workers in the same field: he exercises an independent judgment that is not to be imposed upon by any authority. The results of these conspicuous merits are (1) that he has offered here and there explanations that are much better than those given by his predecessors; (2) that his book is the pleasantest and on the whole the most serviceable edition of the Eighth Book with which we are acquainted.

¹ Prof. Goodhart wrongly says vi. 94. This error had been corrected by Hude.

But alas! the mystery of the *Vatican* remains to be solved. Even a cursory glance through such authors as Denys, Josephus, Lucian, and Procopius—not to mention such servile followers as Dio Cassius and Aristides—would do something for the text, and much for the illustration of the use of words.² Thus, in the case of the text, it surely counts for something that the readings of C have the support of Plutarch against the *Vatican*. Again, in vii. 49 my school edition has ὄκνος τις καὶ μέλλοις ἐνεγένετο with *Vat.* But Bloomfield had already quoted Josephus *Arch.* 1, 2 ὄκνος μοι καὶ μέλλοις ἐγένετο in support of C's ἐγένετο. I am not now concerned to point out my own blunders; but Bloomfield is scarcely right in saying that ἐνεγένετο 'elegantior est quam quae librariis originem debeat'; for some of the *Vatican* readings certainly owe their existence to the *elegantia* of the Atticists of our era.

Wide indeed is the gulf that separates the true scholar from the *vir doctissimus* who devours everything and digests nothing. But no available detail, however minute, should be omitted by the scholar who hopes to generalize from his accumulated knowledge. Prof. Goodhart might urge that a biologist who sets out to investigate the elephant disregards the parasites that live upon the great beast. But to this it may be replied that in this case the great beast's anatomy—*absit verbo invidia*—is here and there defective, and can only be reconstructed by studying the lesser organisms. The first page of the commentary will illustrate these remarks.

In a very good note on τοῖς πάνι στρατιωτῶν the editor quotes parallels to show that the meaning is 'actual soldiers.' Now it has not been noticed that the imitators have their fads. Four phrases from the first section of this book reappear in Dio Cassius, and he

² As far as illustration goes, this has of course been done to some extent, especially by Bloomfield and by Hertlein (whose MS. notes passed through Krüger's hands into my possession). But nobody has perceived the full importance of the method in the latter books.