

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 13

Article 31

5-1-1942

Miscellanea

J. T. Mueller

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1942) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*: Vol. 13 , Article 31.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol13/iss1/31>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Miscellanea

Κοινωνία: Communicatio or Communio?

Notes on 1 Cor. 10:16 ff.

The question has been asked by readers of this periodical: "Does the Greek word κοινωνία in 1 Cor. 10:16 mean *communicatio*, as many Lutheran dogmaticians and exegetes have explained it, or does it mean merely *communio* [Luther: *Gemeinschaft*; King James Version: *communion*; British Revised Version: *communion* or *participation*; so every other modern translation that we were able to compare]?"

1

That the word κοινωνία may have the meaning *communication* is avouched by dependable Greek scholars of ancient and modern times. Thus in traditional Greek dogmatic terminology the *genus maiestaticum* was denominated by Theodoret (perhaps the greatest of the earlier Christian exegetes, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, d. ca. A. D. 457) κοινωνία τῶν θεῶν, the communication of divine attributes, sc., to the human nature, and in this connection he speaks also of κοινωνία ὀνομάτων, the communication of divine names. Theodoret, who certainly knew Greek, thus uses κοινωνία in an active, contributive sense. The expression κοινωνία τῶν θεῶν afterwards remained the Greek *terminus technicus* for the "communication of divine attributes" in dogmatic parlance. (Cf., for example, Dr. Pieper "Christliche Dogmatik," Vol. II, p. 160 ff., footnotes. We refer to this popular work because it is accessible to our pastors.) Melanchthon, an excellent Greek scholar, explains κοινωνία in 1 Cor. 10:16 to mean *id, per quod fit ipsa communio*, "that by which the communion takes place" (cause for effect: metonymy). This exposition was adopted by the erudite Reformed divine Grotius, who also knew Greek well, and is substantially sanctioned by Meyer (cf. Commentary, *sub. l.*), who writes: "The cup, i. e., its contents as these are presented and partaken of, is the medium of this fellowship: it (the fellowship) is realized in the partaking. The sense therefore is: Is not communion with the blood of Christ established through partaking of the cup?" He adds in a footnote that "Hofmann, too, comes to this in substance after all," explaining further in what respect Hofmann's exposition in certain details departs from his own.

Following Melanchthon, many Lutheran exegetes have explained κοινωνία in the same active sense of communication. The popular Hirschberg Bible transcribes 1 Cor. 10:16 a as follows: "Ist er [der Kelch] nicht (ist es nicht ausgemacht, dass er wahrhaftig sei) die Gemeinschaft (das in Gemeinschaft und Verbindung mit dem Blut Christi stehende und uns desselben teilhaftig machende Darreichungsmittel) des Blutes Christi?" The same is afterwards said of the bread. The Weimar Bible adds to the words "die Gemeinschaft des Blutes Christi": "Wird uns nicht vermittelt des gesegneten Kelchs im heiligen Abendmahl das wahre, wesentliche Blut Christi zu trinken dargereicht und mit-

geteilt?" (Is it not true that in Holy Communion through the consecrated cup the true, substantial blood of Christ is presented and communicated to us that we may drink it?) The same is again substantially said of the bread. Bengel adds to the word *communion* in this passage: "That is, while we partake of the cup, we truly partake of the blood of Christ," which is essentially Melancthon's explanation of *κοινωνία*. Some Lutheran exegetes really combine the two meanings: *communication* and *communion*, thus, however, endangering the hermeneutical principle *Sensus literalis unus est* (The literal sense can be but one). Dr. Kretzmann writes on the passage: "The entire passage breathes the consciousness, the certainty of Christian fellowship, first, with Christ, in whom they [the communicants] participate through the wine and the bread [the ancient Melancthonian explanation], and, secondly, with the other communicants who partake of the same bread and of the same cup." Dr. Lenski offers this explanation: "*Communion* denotes actual and real participation in the blood of Christ. . . . The cup, i. e., its contents, received by drinking, mediates this 'communion.'" In Schaff-Lange's commentary we read on the score: "*Κοινωνία* is not the precise equivalent of *communication* . . .; it may denote *participation*, which, however, is certainly not without communication. But the word here is used by way of metonymy for the means of communicating or participating." This exposition is accepted also by Hodge, who says: "The cup is the means of participating." The *Lutheran Commentary* describes the term *κοινωνία* as signifying *sharing* or *participation*, and then goes on to say: "The meaning is that by drinking of the consecrated wine, with it we become partakers of the blood of Christ. The Greek word, properly speaking, does not mean 'communication'; and yet, since the cup is the sharing in the blood of Christ, no violence is done the meaning by declaring that the cup is a means of communicating, or imparting, Christ's blood, or a communication of Christ's blood." Zahn's commentary has this to say: ". . . das Wort *κοινωνία* selbst, das mit dem Genetiv der Sache, sei es einem expegetischen . . . oder einem partitiven, . . . ueberall eine wirkliche Beteiligung aussagt. Dass Leib und Blut Christi dabei von Paulus als die Organe des heilschaffenden Sterbens Christi gemeint sind, beweist die deutliche Beziehung auf das erste Abendmahl. Wenn endlich doch nicht das Handeln der Teilnehmer selbst, sondern Brot und Kelch es sind, von denen solche Anteilnahme ausgesagt wird, so wird daraus hervorgehen, dass die *κοινωνία* zwar durch jenes vermittelt, aber der eigentlichen Ursache nach in diesem gegeben ist; doch deutlich ist zugleich, dass Brot und Kelch diese *κοινωνία* eben dadurch sind, dass mit ihnen ein sakraler Vollzug vorgenommen wird. Dass in jener heiligen Handlung an Kelch und Brot eine objektive Wirkung im Sinn realer Anteilnahme an Christi Leib und Blut sich knuepfe, betont danach das Ganze."

Let this suffice for the exposition according to which *κοινωνία* in the passage either means communication directly or else by implication. Others again find in the term *κοινωνία* no more than the meaning: *communion, participation, partaking*. So Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*: "*Κοινωνία*: participation, fellowship." So also *The Expositor's Greek Testament*: "The Lord's Supper constitutes a com-

munion." So already in ancient times. Tyndale: "Κοινωνία: partaking." So, moreover, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown: "Communion—the joint participation." Other commentators say substantially the same thing. Lexicographers encounter the same difficulties with the term as do the exegetes. The well-known popular *Woerterbuch* of Schirlitz assigns to κοινωνία only three classes of meaning, which, however, are basically the same: (1) Gemeinschaft (communion), and then: Umgang, Verkehr (association), Zusammenhang, Verbindung (connection); (2) Das Antellnehmen an einer Sache, die Teilnahme, participation; (3) Die Teilnahme an dem Werk fuer die Heiligen, der Veranstaltung von Kollekten, which essentially is nothing more than participation or even only fellowship. The much-used Thayer gives as general meanings of κοινωνία: fellowship, association, community, joint participation, intercourse; in particular: (1) participation, or the share which one has in anything; (2) intercourse, fellowship, intimacy; (3) a benefaction, jointly contributed, a collection, a contribution as exhibiting an embodiment and proof of fellowship. Preuschen-Bauer, more modern and scholarly than those quoted so far, has the following threefold classification of meanings: (1) Gemeinschaft, enge Verbindung, innige Beziehung; (2) Erweis der Gemeinschaft, Erweis bruederlichen Zusammenhaltens (*abstractum pro concreto*), for which he quotes Heb. 13:16: "But of doing good and of communicating (κοινωνίας) be not forgetful." To this he adds faintly: "To this perhaps belongs also κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (the communion of the blood of Christ), the means for acquiring an intimate relation to the blood of Christ (body of Christ), 1 Cor. 10:16 a, b; (3) Das Anteilhaben an, die Beteiligung an, die Teilnahme an, participation. But again he says: "Perhaps here should be added 1 Cor. 10:16: to participate in the blood of Christ. Preuschen-Bauer thus leaves the question open: κοινωνία may denote communication or participation.

2

More attention perhaps should be bestowed on what Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament* has to say on this point. Of all the lexicographical works on the New Testament, Kittel's is the most thorough, most extensive, most modern, and most scholarly. Kittel clearly defends the old Melancthonian view of κοινωνία in the sense of communication. He writes among other things: "Κοινωνία, Abstraktbildung zu κοινωνός and κοινωνέω, bezeichnet die Teilhabe, Gemeinschaft, besonders im Sinn der engen Verbindung. Κοινωνία drueckt ein beiderseitiges Verhaeltnis aus. . . . Wie bei κοινωνέω kann dabei entweder mehr die gewaehrende oder die empfangende Seite der Gemeinschaft im Vordergrund stehen. Κοινωνία ist 1. Anteilhaben (participation), 2. Anteilgeben (communication) und 3. Gemeinschaft (communion).

It is interesting to note what Kittel writes in regard to the use of the term in connection with the participation of pagan worshipers in feasts dedicated to their gods. These temple feasts according to ancient popular opinion actually made the worshipers participants of their gods; or, in other words, the gods became their companions ("Mahl- und Tisch-

genossen") at the feasts. The *κοινωνία* of the sacrificial feasts thus established a most intimate fellowship between the worshiper and the god that he worshiped. The term then had a distinctive meaning, which Christianity later received, purified, and made actually true. Kittel thus seeks to furnish the background for a better understanding of the fact why the word *κοινωνία* should be used by the great missionary among the Greek heathen as frequently as he does. We may say: Just as pagan worship is a caricature of true worship, so also pagan communion fellowship is a caricature of true communion fellowship with Christ, our divine Lord, taking place in His Holy Supper.

We do not agree to everything that Kittel writes in the following paragraph, but we believe that it is helpful in understanding his view of 1 Cor. 10:16 ff. We read: "Paulus verwendet sodann hoechst bedeutungsvoll *κοινωνία* fuer die im Abendmahl entstehende Gemeinschaft. Das Teilhaben an Christus, das grundsuetzlich und vollstaendig im Glauben erlebt wird, wird in gesteigerter Form—ohne dass eine dogmatische Abgleichung erfolgt—im Sakrament verwirklicht und erlebt [?], 1 Kor. 10:16 ff. Paulus stellt das Abendmahl zunaechst in eine Linie mit den juedischen und heidnischen Opfermahlzeiten [?]. Nach dem in der Antike allgemeinen Glauben [?] ist es ihm dabei eine Selbstverstaendlichkeit, dass die Teilnehmer der Kultmahlzeit Genossen des Gottes werden. So werden die Teilnehmer an den juedischen Opfermahlen *κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* (V.18), wobei *θυσιαστήριον* Deckwort [?] fuer Gott ist. Der Altar stellt die Gegenwart Gottes dar und verbuergt sie. Ebenso selbstverstaendlich werden ihm die Teilnehmer der heidnischen Kultmahle *κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων* (V.20). Analog werden beim Abendmahl die Teilnehmer Genossen Christi. Die hier ganz real entstehende Verbindung ergibt fuer den Christen die naturgemaesse religioese Folgerung, Kultmahle fremder Gottheiten zu meiden (V.21). Der Art des Abendmahls entsprechend, wird von Paulus die Gemeinschaft mit der Person Christi in die Doppelaussage einer *κοινωνία* mit Leib und Blut Christi auseinandergelegt. . . . Brot und Wein sind dem Paulus Traeger der Gegenwart Christi, so wie der juedische Altar die Gegenwart Gottes verbuergt. Das Geniessen von Brot und Wein ist Zusammenschluss (Anteilschaft) mit dem himmlischen [?] Christus. Der erhoehte Christus ist dem Paulus mit dem irdisch-historischen identisch. *Κοινωνία* drueckt dabei eine innige Verbindung aus. Gerade das ist dem Paulus an der Feier wichtig. Selbstverstaendlich schliesst fuer Paulus die reale Verbindung mit dem Erhoehten auch das in seinem Tod gewonnene Gut der Suendenvergebung ein. Wie diese Vereinigung im Kultmahl zustande kommt, ist von Paulus weder fuer die Seite der daemonischen noch der Christugemeinschaft gesagt. Es kommt dem Paulus nicht auf die Art, sondern auf die Tatsache der engen Verbindung an. In dem zwischeneingefuegten Satz (V.17) spricht Paulus noch aus, dass es—ganz wie bei den Opfermahlen—auch beim Abendmahl zu einer Verbindung der Mahlgenossen untereinander kommt. Auch diese kommt nicht abseits von Christus, sondern in gleichzeitiger Verbundenheit mit ihm zustande, wie Christus ja in dem einen Brot dargestellt [?] ist."

We shall not take time to discuss certain details with which we might take issue in this paragraph; essentially Kittel's view here is

that of Zahn and, let us add, that of the Lutheran Church, inasmuch as he teaches that by receiving the Holy Supper we truly take part in our blessed Savior. Whether, however, this is done *ex opere operato* or by spiritual eating and drinking or because of any sacramental union the paragraph does not state; nor shall we treat these points at greater length, since they would lead us too far afield. We quoted the paragraph merely because it supports and clarifies Kittel's exposition of *κοινωνία* in the sense of *communicatio*. We may add here another paragraph from Kittel, because it supplements the thought just expressed. We read: "Die Christugemeinschaft fuehrt notwendig ueber in die Christengemeinschaft, die Gemeinschaft der Glieder untereinander. Auch hierfuer gebraucht Paulus in mehrfachen Beziehungen *κοινωνέω*, wobei das *Teilhaben* an den Bruedern dem Wortsinn von *κοινωνέω* entsprechend mehrfach in das *Teilgeben* uebergeht. . . . Als Leidensgenossen des Paulus werden ihm die Philipper zu Genossen seiner Gnade (Phil.1:7), das heisst wohl der ihm von Gott zum Heil aufgelegten Leidensnot. Und Paulus dankt ihnen fuer die ihm in seiner Truebsal gewaehrte Teilnahme (4:14). Auch hier geht das fuehlende Teilnehmen in das taetig hilfreiche Anteilgeben ueber, wie Paulus an der Stelle ja den Dank fuer die empfangende Gabe ausspricht. Auch in Heb.10:33, wo der Verfasser die Leser in solche einteilt, die (unmittelbar) die Verfolgung erlitten, und solche, die (mittelbar) zu Genossen der Dulder wurden, ist wohl an teilnehmende Gesinnung und hilfreiche Tat (Anteilgeben) gegenueber den Duldern gedacht."

Kittel thus defends the meaning of *κοινωνία* in the sense of communication, especially in the writings of St. Paul. As proofs he further mentions Phil. 4:15: *Οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν* (no church communicated with [to] me); Gal. 6:6: *Κοινωνοίτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι* (Let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth); Heb. 13:16 (not given by Kittel as Pauline): *Τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε* (But of doing good and of communicating be not forgetful).

The question now confronting us is: How does the meaning of *κοινωνία* in the sense of communication agree textually and contextually with 1 Cor. 10:16 ff.? This matter indeed requires careful consideration.

3

First of all, let it be noted that the passage 1 Cor. 10:16 occurs in a severely hortatory portion of Paul's epistle. The general introductory warning to this passage is: "Flee from idolatry" (v. 15). That theme dominates everything in the *passus* up to v. 22. In presenting the warning to the Corinthians, the apostle appeals to the Christian discernment and judgment of the Corinthian believers (v. 15). The special point he makes is that the Christians at Corinth must not partake of the pagan sacrificial idol feasts, such especially as were held in the temples in honor of heathen gods (v. 21). To do so would provoke God to jealousy, i. e., punishment (v. 22). Properly speaking, verse 16 introduces Paul's reasoning against eating *εἰδωλόθυτα* in an idolatrous manner. (Under certain circumstances, Paul admits, *εἰδωλόθυτα* may be eaten

[v.27.) Now, believers as such partake of the Sacrament of the Altar. But that is the *Lord's Supper*, since the wine has communion with the blood and the bread with the body (v. 16). By partaking of the bread (and, of course, also of the wine, a reference which the apostle omits) the believers become *one body* (v.17), namely, the *spiritual body of Christ*. This is true, of course, since in the Lord's Supper through faith they are engrafted into Christ. In v.17, then, Paul states his major premise: By partaking of the Lord's Supper believers become the one spiritual body of Christ, or are engrafted into Christ. The preceding verse (v.16) leads up to this premise, or, we may say, it prepares the way for it. In v.18 the apostle next illustrates the great truth stated in his major premise by an illustration from the Old Testament: the priests eating of the sacrifices offered on the altar thereby became especially joined to the Lord, because there was a certain communion between the sacrifices and the Lord. V.18 thus supports the thought in v.17: "By partaking of the Lord's Supper we become so intimately joined with the Lord as to be His spiritual body." But the same thing that happened in the case of the Old Testament priests who ate of the sacrifices happens (though in a different way) to the pagan Greeks who eat of idol sacrifices. Of course, idols are nothing (v.19); they do not exist. But idol worship is devil worship (v.20): Idolaters therefore actually have fellowship with the devils (v.20). And now, this central point having been demonstrated and the major premise (v.16) and the minor premise (v.20) having been clearly and convincingly impressed, Paul comes with his impressive warning conclusion: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils..." (v.21). His *facit* is: "Either . . . or! You cannot do both. Either you partake of the table of the Lord, or you partake of that of the devils. But both *cannot* (remember, he does not say *must not*) be done; for as soon as one partakes of, or joins himself to, the devils, he cannot partake of the Lord, or be truly joined to the Lord. Such is the apostle's striking, convincing argument, which today (among other things) we may apply especially to all unchristian and antichristian lodges. We believe that this is one of the most effective and telling syllogisms in the entire New Testament. But that thought belongs into another field. Just now we are interested in what bearing the apostle's ratiocination has on the meaning of the term *κοινωνία*.

4

To the proverbial casual observer the very context may appear to support Kittel's and Melancthon's definition of *κοινωνία* as an *Anteilgeben*, or *communication*; for just upon this very point the apostle's whole argument seems to hinge. But those who argue from the context that *κοινωνία* in v.16 must mean *communication*, overlook the fact that v.16 is only introductory and that the apostle's demonstration of the *effects* of partaking of the Lord's Supper begins only in v.17. There first he states that by partaking of the Lord's Supper we become His spiritual body; and we do so for the obvious reason that the wine is the communion of the blood and the bread that of the body of Christ. Just so in the Old Testament the priests had communion with

the Lord by partaking of the sacrifices, because these sacrifices stood in intimate relation to the Lord: they were the *Lord's* sacrifices. And just so the pagan idolaters associated themselves with the devils, because the sacrifices offered by the heathen were offered to the devils and therefore stood in an intimate relation to them; they were *devils' sacrifices*.

It is not true, therefore, that the context forces us to take *κοινωνία* in v.16 in the sense of *communication*. On the contrary, the context, or rather the close reasoning of the apostle, step by step, demands that we take *κοινωνία* in that meaning which it has originally, both because of its etymology and its *usus loquendi*, namely: *communion*, or *participation*, both of which practically mean the same thing.

From a close study of all passages in which *κοινωνία* occurs, it is obvious that, whenever the word *κοινωνία* is used in an active sense, it is used in a figurative or wider meaning, which also Kittel's remarks on the point suggest. In fact, even in such cases the original meaning of *κοινωνία*, as communion or participation, can well be traced. Thus *κοινωνία* is called a collection (2 Cor. 8:4); it is so called because by contributing to the needs of the saints Christians have fellowship with one another; for which reason both the Authorized and the British Revised Version translate the expression at this place with "fellowship of (in) the ministering to the saints." The same is true of all the other passages which Kittel quotes for *κοινωνέω* in the sense of *jemand Anteil geben an etwas*, to let anyone share in something (e. g., Phil. 4:15; Gal. 6:6; 2 Cor. 9:13 [Authorized Version: "your liberal distribution"; British Revised Version: "the liberality of your contribution"]; Heb. 13:16. In all these passages the *Grundbedeutung*, i. e., the underlying sense, is that of *participation*, or *communion*.

5

The long and short of it is that in spite of all that modern and ancient scholars have written on behalf of the meaning *communication*, we cannot become convinced that we should revise the current translation *communion* and *Gemeinschaft* in 1 Cor. 10:16 to *communication* and *Anteilgeben*. In the first place, the meaning *communion* or *participation* of *κοινωνία* is the etymological and historical meaning of this much-used term; any other connotation is exceptional and figurative. In the second place, hermeneutical common sense compels us to adhere to the current meaning of the term, unless the text and context force us for stringent causes to depart from it, which in this instance is certainly not the case. In the third place, to translate *κοινωνία* in v.16 with *communication* means to anticipate the apostle's argument in v.17 and to misunderstand his entire argumentation in the whole *passus*. In the fourth place, the translation *communication* no doubt proceeded from Melancthon's eagerness to contradict Calvinistic exegeses; but, by a strange irony of fate, some of his very opponents took up his suggestion and proved from it their own erroneous view of the Lord's Supper. In the same way, Romanistic theologians found ground in 1 Cor. 10:16 for their *ex opere operato* doctrine. Lutheranism, in fact, does not gain anything by Melancthon's translation *communication*,

but loses very much for its Scriptural doctrine of the real presence. In the fifth place, most Lutheran exegetes who take *κοινωνία* in 1 Cor. 10:16 in the sense of *communication*, put into the term a double meaning: *communion plus communication* (even Kittel is no exception), thus overthrowing the hermeneutical rule that *sensus literalis unus est*. Zahn's commentary, which we have found correct in so many things touching on linguistic problems, is right also with regard to the one under consideration: "Dass in jener heiligen Handlung an Kelch und Brot eine objektive Wirkung im Sinn realer Anteilnahme an Christi Leib und Blut sich knuepfe, betont danach das Ganze." We would say: "erklärt und betont Vers 17"; though we accept "das Ganze" in the sense that from v.17 to 21 the apostle urges the effect of the Lord's Supper on the Christian believer. And let us remember: in this passage the apostle does not argue that also unbelievers receive the true body and blood of Christ, as he does in 1 Cor. 11:27 ff., but he treats the problem from the viewpoint of the Christian believer. Let us, then, say it again: There is nothing in the text or context of 1 Cor. 10:16 that compels us to take the term *κοινωνία* in the sense of *communication*, or *id, per quod communicatio fit*. We admit that in a few exceptional passages *κοινωνία* may mean *communication*, though the background of communion or fellowship remains also in these passages; but to translate 1 Cor. 10:16 thus: "The cup of blessing . . . is it not the communication of the blood of Christ?" is decidedly unwarranted and confuses the sequence of thought in this passage. It is a translation which goes too far and therefore does not go at all.

6

It may interest our readers to hear what Luther, the greatest of all exegetes in the New Testament, has to say on this passage, on which he wrote very extensively against the Reformed. It is from this controversial point of view that we must understand Luther's often misunderstood *modus loquendi*. Perhaps Dr. F. Pieper, the great and thorough student of Luther, may best clear up the Reformer's view for us before we quote Brother Martin himself. In his monumental work *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. III, p. 400, he treats Luther's view on *κοινωνία* in an important footnote. Dr. Pieper himself rejects the translation of *κοινωνία* with *communication*, clinging closely to the textual reading that there is a communion (*Gemeinschaft*) between the wine and the blood and between the bread and the body. He writes: "Der Apostel schaeft, wie wir oben bereits in einem andern Zusammenhang sahen, den Korinthern, die leichtfertig mit dem Abendmahl umgingen, sehr nachdruecklich ein, dass fuer die Teilnehmer am Abendmahl der gesegnete Kelch 'die Gemeinschaft (*κοινωνία*) des Blutes Christi' und das gebrochene Brot 'die Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi' sei." (Vol. III, p. 400.) Then he goes on to say in footnote No. 1293: "Die erste Bedeutung von *κοινωνία* ist natuerlich 'Gemeinschaft' (*communio*). Ob es im Neuen Testament auch 'Mitteilung' (*communicatio*) bedeuten kann, was die einen bejahen (Ebeling), die andern verneinen (Cremer), braucht hier nicht untersucht zu werden. Hier ist es jedenfalls 'Gemeinschaft', wie Luther uebersetzt hat. Das fordert der Kontext. [Italics ours.]

Wie durch die Teilnahme an den Opfermahlen der Heiden die Gemeinschaft mit den Daemonen vorhanden ist, so ist durch den Genuss des Abendmahlskelchs Gemeinschaft mit dem Blut Christi vorhanden. Unrichtig bemerkt Meyer zu 1 Kor. 10:16, dass Luther *κοινωνία* nicht als 'Gemeinschaft,' sondern als 'Mitteilung' fasse. Wo Luther *κοινωνία* uebersetzt, fasst er *κοινωνία* als 'Gemeinschaft,' wie seine Bibeluebersetzung und z. B. XX, 236 beweist. Dass er bei der Darlegung des Sinnes der Stelle auch von der *Mitteilung* des Leibes Christi redet, kommt daher, dass, wer an der *communio corporis* festhaelt, damit auch die *communicatio corporis* lehrt. Ist fuer alle am Mahl des Herrn Teilnehmenden, fuer Wuerdige und Unwuerdige, das Brot die *Gemeinschaft* des Leibes Christi, so wird natuerlich durch das Brot der Leib Christi *mitgeteilt*." Dr. Pieper's argument is unanswerable and reproduces Luther's view of the *κοινωνία* exactly.

Let us consider, for example, the passage in Luther referred to by Dr. Pieper in Vol. XX, 236 f. Here Luther writes: "Merk zum drittenmal, dass er helle und klar heraus sagt: 'Dasselbige Brot, welches wir brechen, ist die Gemeinschaft des Leibs Christi.' Hoerst du, mein lieber Bruder? Das gebrochene oder mit Stuecken mitgeteilte Brot ist die Gemeinschaft des Leibs Christi; es ist, es ist, es ist (sagt er) die *Gemeinschaft des Leibs Christi*." Here Luther clearly defends the translation: "The bread is the communion of the body." But then he draws the conclusion from this communion by saying: "Was ist [what follows from] die Gemeinschaft aber des Leibs Christi? Es mag nicht anders sein, denn dass diejenigen, so das gebrochene Brot, ein jeglicher sein Stueck, nehmen, in demselbigen den Leib Christi nehmen. Dass diese Gemeinschaft sei soviel als teilhaftig sein, dass den gemeinen Leib Christi ein jeglicher mit dem andern empfahet, wie er daselbst [1 Kor. 10:17] sagt: 'Wir sind alle ein Leib, die wir eines Brots teilhaftig sind. Daher es auch von alters her *communio* heisst, das ist, Gemeinschaft."

Let us note what Luther in this passage infers from the fact that the bread is the communion of the body and the wine the communion of the blood of our Lord. Since the bread is the communion of the body and the wine the communion of the blood, it follows that every communicant, worthy and unworthy, receives in, with and under the bread and wine the true body and blood of Christ; and this conclusion he draws on the basis of 1 Cor. 10:17, where this very fact is clearly stated. On page 1088 of Volume XX Luther argues thus: "Darum muss vonnoeten der rechte, wahre Leib Christi leiblich im Brot sein, das wir brechen, dass sein die Unwuerdigen gleich geniessen moegen, weil sie sein geistlich nicht geniessen, wie dieser Spruch Pauli lautet: 'Das Brot, das wir brechen, ist die Gemeinschaft,' das ist, der gemeine Leib Christi, unter die geteilt, so das gebrochene Brot empfaehen." Luther's argumentation, of course, is always directed against the Reformed, who deny the real presence, the sacramental union, and the oral manducation, teaching in its stead only the spiritual reception. Against the Reformed spiritual eating and drinking (by faith) he again and again stresses the thought: "Es kann hie an diesem Ort nicht heissen die Gemeinschaft des Glaubens im Herzen; denn der Text redet hier von solchem gemeinen Gut, das man empfaehen und geniessen soll, als da ist das Brot

und Becher. Denn er spricht: 'das Brot, das wir brechen, der Becher, den wir segnen,' und hernach: 'Wir alle sind ein Leib, die wir von einem Brot und einem Becher teilhaftig sind' usw. [1 Kor.10:17.] So ist nun gewiss, dass *κοινωνία*, die Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi, ist nichts anderes denn der Leib Christi als ein gemein Gut, unter viele ausgeteilt und gegeben zu geniessen." (P.1087.) Dr. Pieper thus is right in maintaining that Luther translates *κοινωνία* with *communion*, but infers from this *communion* (on the basis of 1 Cor.10:17) the real presence and sacramental eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ.

After all is said, therefore, the ancient translation of *κοινωνία*, current in our common versions, such as the Authorized and Luther's, is the preferable one, indeed the only one that fully agrees with the etymological meaning of the term, its *usus loquendi*, and the sequence of thought in the passage 1 Cor.10:14-22. What 1 Cor.10:16 really says is just this: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

But no matter whether we take *κοινωνία* in the sense of *communion* or *communication*, the Reformed will always employ the passage to defend their error of the *manducatio spiritualis* and their denial of the real presence. Thus Dr. A. T. Robertson (*Word Pictures*, IV, pp.154,155) writes: "Literally [*κοινωνία* means] a participation. . . . It is, of course, a spiritual participation in the blood of Christ, which is symbolized by the cup." On the other hand, our readers remember the complaint of our Formula of Concord (*Triglot*, Art. VII, p.993): "We are justly astonished that some are so bold as to venture now to cite this passage [1 Cor.10:16] which they themselves previously opposed to the Sacramentarians, as a foundation of their error that in the Supper the body of Christ is partaken of spiritually only. [For thus they speak]: The bread is the communication [*communicatio*] of the body of Christ, that is, it is that by which we have fellowship with the body of Christ, which is the Church, or it is the means by which we believers are united with Christ, just as the Word of the Gospel, apprehended by faith, is a means through which we are spiritually united to Christ and incorporated into the body of Christ, which is the Church." The translation of *κοινωνία*, therefore, in the sense of *communication* does not help the Lutheran exegetes a whit in defending the Scriptural doctrine of the real presence. On the other hand, the ancient and current translation *communion* throws upon the Reformed opponents a burden of proof which even by their most subtle reasoning they cannot supply without violating the text.

NOTE.—The question has been asked whether 1 Cor.10:16 can rightly be used at all as a proof text for the real presence. Those who have raised the question argue thus: "Since in v.18 the apostle asserts a communion between the partakers of sacrifices and the Old Testament altar, as also between the partakers of the heathen sacrifices and the devils (v.20), there cannot be predicated a real presence in v.16, since certainly there is no real presence predicated in vv.18 and 20, which illustrate v.16." Or, considering the point from its positive side: "If a real

presence is taught in v. 16, a real presence must be taught also in vv. 18 and 20." But those who reason in this way, forget that an illustration agrees with the thing illustrated only in the point of comparison (*tertium comparationis*). Thus in Deut. 18:15 the prophecy of Moses that "the Lord, thy God, will raise up unto thee a Prophet . . . like unto me," has for its point of comparison only the fact that Christ, like Moses, was a prophet (*κατ' ἐξοχήν*) *proclaiming God's Word and therefore demanding obedience* ("unto Him ye shall hearken"). No one, therefore, dare conclude from Deut. 18:16 that Christ (being like Moses) is a mere man or, again, that, as Christ, so also Moses was the Son of God; but the illustration must not be used beyond its *tertium comparationis*. Furthermore, in John 17:11 Jesus prays His heavenly Father that the disciples "may be one as We are." From this passage we dare not infer that as the three persons in the Godhead form an essential unity (*una numero essentia*), so in Christ also the believers and God form an essential unity (pantheism), but the *tertium comparationis* is no more than the *unio mystica*, the thought being *a maiore ad minus*. So also we must consider 1 Cor. 10:16, where St. Paul expressly supports the doctrine of the real presence (cf. 1 Cor. 11:27 ff.), taught so clearly in the words of institution, by saying very definitely that there is a communion between the bread and the body and the cup and the blood. However, he does not so speak in vv. 18 and 20, for there he merely says that those eating the sacrifices are partakers (*κοινωνοί*) of the altar and that those eating *εἰδωλόθυσια* are partakers (*κοινωνούσες*) of devils. The very reading of these verses proves that the apostle, while illustrating the real presence and oral reception in the Holy Supper, does not place on the same level with the Holy Supper the two similarities which he employs for the purpose of illustration. Certainly, no one would be so utterly foolish as to predicate a real presence and an oral manducation at the Old Testament sacrifice-eating or at the New Testament pagan *εἰδωλόθυσια*-eating! Manifestly those who argue as we showed above, prove too much and thus do not prove anything. Not every communion is of the same kind. There is a sacramental communion, and there is, for instance, a communion of prayer and worship. Other communions may illustrate the sacramental communion, but are not parallel to it, the sacramental union being unique. We may illustrate Christ's sacrifice on the cross by the sacrifices of the Old Testament; but Christ's redemptive sacrifice nevertheless was unique, that is to say, the only one of its kind or without equal. The same difference holds between the "communion" in 1 Cor. 10:16 and that in v. 18 and in v. 20.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

