

## THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.

LUKE xxii. 19; 1 COR. xi. 24.

BISHOP ELLICOTT, in his valuable commentary on 1 Corinthians, has this note on τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, xi. 24: "To render the words 'sacrifice this,' in accordance with a Hebraistic use of ποιεῖν in this sense in the LXX. (Exod. xxix. 39, Lev. ix. 7, al.; see Schleusn. *Lex. Vet. Test.* s.v.), is to violate the regular use of ποιεῖν in the N.T., and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them." His own explanation of "do this" is—"continually thus take bread, give thanks, and break it."

In reviewing Bishop Ellicott's commentary in the *Classical Review* for April, the present writer made this remark on the note in question:

"In short, to quote this text in support of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is only in degree less unwise than to quote the passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. Supposing that St. Paul and St. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than ποιεῖν?"

A writer in the current number of the *Church Quarterly Review* (No. 51, pp. 252, 253) makes the following criticisms upon the remark just quoted. "1. The passage in St. John's First Epistle, v. 8, seems to us to differ less in 'degree' than in kind from 1 Cor. xi. 24, where there is no question of the reading of different manuscripts. 2. Why does Dr. Plummer elect to ignore what might be almost called the *contemporanea expositio* furnished by the two passages in Justin Martyr, as well as the evidence of the Early Liturgies? 3. If St. Paul and St. Luke *did*

intend a sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than ποιεῖν?"

The three points here raised will make a convenient division of the subject. Of the value of the first and last as criticism, readers of the EXPOSITOR must judge.

1. No one would think of intimating that 1 John v. 7 (not 8) is similar in any way to 1 Cor. xi. 24. But it is quite possible to make an *equally unwise use* of two totally different texts. And if the view of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, which has been almost universal until the present generation, be correct, then to make use of the passage in order to support the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, is not a wise proceeding; any more than it is wise to use 1 John v. 7 to support the doctrine of the Trinity. In the one case a highly disputable *text* is employed to prove an important doctrine: in the other a highly disputable *interpretation* is employed for a similar purpose. The latter proceeding is "in degree less unwise" than the former, because the doctrine is less momentous, and because the interpretation employed, however improbable, is just possible, whereas the genuineness of the disputed portion of 1 John v. 7, 8 is not possible. But there is abundance of un wisdom in both cases, for the person who thus argues lays himself open to the obvious remark: "The doctrine which you advocate must indeed be questionable, when you are driven to make use of such very questionable material in order to prove it." Moreover, to make use of such material, without at the same time confessing that it *is* much questioned, is to provoke a suspicion of either great ignorance or bad faith. "Either you did not know that your argument is based on questionable material; in which case you are not qualified to discuss the matter: or, although you did know this, you wished to take advantage of the ignorance of others." In most cases this suspicion would be very untrue, but it would not be unreasonable: and those who are interested in

maintaining the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion would do wisely in ceasing to lay any stress upon an argument which cannot be fairly used without admissions which deprive it of almost all appreciable value. Yet a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July, 1886 (p. 328), is rash enough to stake everything upon this highly disputable interpretation of "Do this." "We do not see that any other explanation of the origin of the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is forthcoming." A Zwinglian would be much gratified by so enormous a concession.

2. But, it is asserted, what might be almost called the contemporaneous exposition of Justin Martyr and the evidence of the early liturgies support the sacrificial interpretation.

Let us admit for the moment that Justin and some of the early liturgies interpret *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* "Offer this." Is such evidence of much weight in face of the evidence on the other side. And here I am quite content to adopt the language of a recent writer, who certainly has no prejudices against the sacrificial rendering of the words, but evidently would gladly accept it, if he could think it tenable. Canon Mason, in *The Faith of the Gospel* (Rivingtons, 1888, p. 309) says: "But the rendering 'Offer this' has against it the fact that it is of recent origin. *All the Greek Fathers*, with the exception of S. Justin Martyr, treat the words as meaning, 'Perform this action.'" These Greek Fathers knew their own language, knew their Greek Testament, knew their Septuagint; and many of them held very high views indeed respecting the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Is it likely that all of them would pass over so conclusive an argument for the Eucharistic Sacrifice as that the very words used by Christ Himself in instituting it, necessarily, or at least probably, mean "Sacrifice this" or "Offer this sacrifice"? If St. Paul and St. Luke and their contemporaries had understood the words in this sense, is it probable that a tradition of such moment, connected with the central rite of

the Christian religion, would have left no impression on any one of the Greek Fathers, excepting (if he be an exception) Justin Martyr? The only reasonable explanation of their invariably treating the words as meaning "Perform this action," is that they had never heard of the other rendering, and that it never occurred to them that such a rendering was even possible. It is improbable that they knew of the sacrificial interpretation and passed it over in silence; but if any one cares to adopt this hypothesis, then their general rejection of the sacrificial interpretation is certainly a weighty piece of evidence against this interpretation.

But *does* Justin Martyr really differ from the other Greek Fathers on this point? The fact that none of the others even notice the sacrificial rendering, at once creates a presumption that his words do not imply that he adopted it. Some of them had read Justin. If those who had read him had understood him to advocate so striking a rendering as "Offer this sacrifice in remembrance of Me," would not some of them have called attention to the fact? But let us look at Justin himself, and form our own conclusions as to his meaning.

ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσα, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν (*Trypho*, xli.).

Mr. Sadler, in contending for the rendering "Offer this," translates Justin thus :

"The offering of the flour commanded to be offered (*προσφέρεσθαι*) for persons cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the offering of the bread of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ gave command to offer (do, *ποιεῖν*) for a memorial (*ἀνάμνησιν*) of the sufferings which He underwent for those whose souls are cleansed from all iniquity" (*Comm. on St. Luke*, p. 561).

It will be observed that the words "of the offering" between "a type" and "of the bread" are an insertion made by the translator. Justin does not say "was a type of the offering of the bread," but "was a type of the bread." It would have been quite easy for him to have written *τύπος ἦν τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας*, but he has not done so; possibly because the idea of "offering of the bread" was not in his mind. Secondly, it is by no means certain that Justin uses *ποιεῖν* in the sense of "offer." The words *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* are an intentional quotation of the words of institution, and they naturally draw after them the verb with which they are there joined, viz. *ποιεῖν*. The same may be said of the similar passage in chap. lxx. of the same Dialogue.<sup>1</sup> Thirdly, it does not at all follow, that, if Justin himself used *ποιεῖν* in the sense of "offer," therefore he believed that St. Paul and St. Luke understood the word in this sense. The question before us is, not whether Justin considered the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, nor yet whether *he* uses *ποιεῖν* for "to offer," but whether his language is such as to show that he believed *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* in the words of institution to mean "Offer this sacrifice." The first question must be answered in the affirmative, and very possibly the second also; but the third must be answered in the negative. A sober and cautious inquirer will require something much more definite than these two passages to convince him that, in the interpretation of a crucial text such as this, Justin differs from all the other Greek Fathers, and that this difference is *never once alluded to by any of them*. And even if it were proved that Justin did understand *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* as meaning "Sacrifice this," is his authority such to outweigh that of all the other Greek Fathers put together?

<sup>1</sup> The number of idiomatic uses of the verb "to do" in English should put us on our guard as to dogmatizing respecting the meaning of such a phrase as "to do the bread" in Greek.

Canon Mason takes no notice of the alleged evidence of the early liturgies: and he is quite right in doing so, for the argument is trivial. That the early liturgies bear witness to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is indisputable; and that they quote the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* is equally indisputable: but that the sacrificial terms used are intended as equivalents of *ποιεῖτε*, there is no evidence. Whence, then, comes the notion of sacrifice? From *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. This solemn act is to be continually performed in remembrance of Christ, *i.e.* to "show forth His *death*"; which death was a sacrifice. This is the meaning of the "therefore," which occurs in the liturgies between the words of institution and "we offer," and which is closely joined with "mindful" and far removed from "we offer." Thus in the Clementine Liturgy;—*Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν . . . προσφέρομέν σοι, κ.τ.λ.*;—some forty words intervening in the place left vacant. Similarly in the Roman Liturgy;—*Unde et memores . . . offerimus*: where thirty words separate the *unde* from *offerimus*. In the Greek Liturgy of St. James six lines of close print intervene between *Μεμνημένοι οὖν* and *προσφέρομέν σοι*. The Syriac Liturgy of St. James is still more conclusive; for there "Therefore we celebrate the memorial of Thy death" is in one sentence, and "We offer to Thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice" is in another, which is quite cut off from the "therefore." Any person who will take the trouble to look at these instances (Hammond's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, pp. 17, 336, 41, 70) will easily see that the "therefore" refers back, not to "do this" in the sense of "offer this sacrifice," but to "do this *in remembrance of Me*." "Because Christ said 'Commemorate My death by performing this action,' *therefore* we remember His passion, death, and resurrection, and offer this bread and this cup." To quote the early liturgies in support of the doctrine that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, is thoroughly

legitimate; to quote them in favour of the sacrificial translation of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, is very much the reverse.

*Against* the proposed translation may be urged (1) the ordinary meaning of *ποιεῖν*, both in Greek literature generally, and in the N.T.; (2) the interpretation of all the Greek Fathers with the possible (though not probable) exception of Justin Martyr; (3) the fact that the ordinary meaning of *ποιεῖν* makes excellent sense and suits the contexts; (4) the authority of the early liturgies, which do *not* use *ποιεῖν* or *facere* when the bread and wine are offered, but *προσφέρειν* or *offerre*, although the words of institution immediately precede the oblation and suggest *ποιεῖν* or *facere*; (5) the authority of the large majority of modern commentators of the most various schools: Cornelius à Lapide, Faber Stapulensis, Maldonatus, Isaac Williams, Alford, Plumptre, Farrar, F. C. Cook, T. S. Evans, T. Shore, Lewin, Conybeare and Howson, Lias, Olshausen, Holtzmann, Lange, and De Wette (on 1 Corinthians), take no notice of the words, as if there could be no question as to their signification; while Estius, Quesnel, Bengel, Blomfield, Peile, Wordsworth, Stanley, Harvey Goodwin, Beet, Elliott, Godet, Lange, Meyer, Kaye, Webster and Wilkinson, Mason, and De Wette (on Luke), either expressly reject the sacrificial interpretation, or give the ordinary rendering without mentioning any other as worth considering; (6) the fact that St. Paul and St. Luke might easily have placed the sacrificial meaning beyond a doubt by using a word which could mean nothing else. But this leads directly to the last division of our subject.

3. It has been asked, "Supposing that St. Paul and St. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than *ποιεῖν*?" This question has been evaded rather than answered by a second, "If St. Paul and St. Luke *did* intend a sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to

use than ποιῆν?" A straightforward answer to this second question can very easily be made: They would certainly have used either προσφέρειν or ἀναφέρειν, not to mention other words which mean "to sacrifice" or "to offer," but are not so suitable or obvious as these two. In the Epistle to the Hebrews προσφέρειν occurs about twenty times in the active and passive voice, always in this sense. It occurs several times in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts in this sense, as well as in some other places in the N.T. The cognate substantive προσφορά, "an offering," occurs in the Acts, in Romans, Ephesians, and Hebrews. The use of προσφέρειν in John xvi. 2 is instructive, as showing how clearly the Evangelists and Apostles could express a sacrificial idea when they wished to do so. "The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service," or, as the Revisers more accurately render it, "will think that he offereth service unto God." St. John, if he had not intended any sacrificial meaning, might easily have said ἀρέσκειν, or τιμᾶν, or δουλεύειν, or δοξάζειν, and the like. What he does say is λατρείαν προσφέρειν, the substantive meaning "religious service," and the verb "to offer sacrifice." Ἀναφέρειν occurs in the sense of offering sacrifice in Hebrews, James, and 1 Peter. Why does neither St. Paul nor St. Luke employ either of these obvious words? Because they did not wish to express what these words naturally express.

The conclusion at which we have arrived seems to be this: that there is not very much to be said for the proposal to translate τοῦτο ποιῆτε "offer this sacrifice," and much to be said against it. As Canon Mason rightly urges, its recent origin is fatal to it; and that serious objection (as we have seen) does not stand alone. Wetzer and Welte, the Roman Catholic editors of the *Kirchenlexicon*, act wisely in not urging this translation in support of sacrificial doctrine (Art. *Abendmahl*), and in this they seem to be

following the example of the Council of Trent. Those who have at heart a more general belief in the Eucharist as a sacrifice will do well in placing this argument for the doctrine very much in the back ground; and they will do still better in abandoning it altogether.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

---

THE LATEST DISCOVERIES AMONG THE  
FAYÛM MANUSCRIPTS.

It is now exactly three years since I first brought under the notice of the readers of THE EXPOSITOR a general account of the marvellous "find" from Egypt called the Fayûm Manuscripts. In May, 1885, I gave a sketch of the subject as then known; but three years have since elapsed, and much is now known which then lay concealed from the diligent and learned eyes of the Viennese scholars who have been devoting the labour of their lives to the elucidation of a discovery hitherto unparalleled. It will be my object in this paper to bring the information about these later investigations down to date, hoping thereby to stir up some persons to assist in the work by subscribing at least for the somewhat expensive but yet most valuable *Mittheilungen*, which from time to time gathers into permanent shape the results gained. Its full title we give below.<sup>1</sup>

The chief interest in the discovery for Biblical scholars centred in what has usually been called the Fayûm Gospel fragment. I described that manuscript in the number of this Review published in August, 1885. Three years, however, comprise such a long space, and so many events happen in them, that the most important discoveries are soon forgotten. It will perhaps then be the best course to

<sup>1</sup> *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erherzog Rainer.*