Christ, which is found in the gross materialism  
of transubstantiation. See further  
on ch. xi. 26, 27.

**which we break]**  
probably already the *breaking* of the bread.  
in the communion was part of the act of  
consecration, and done after the example  
of our Lord in its institution. See ch. xi.  
24; Acts ii. 42; xx. 7, 11. For the  
rest, see above.

17.] **Because we, the**  
(assembled) **many** (so literally), are one  
**bread** (by the assimilation of that one  
bread partaken : not ‘one loaf’) **one Body**  
(by the participation of the Body of Christ,  
of which that bread is the vehicle); **for the  
whole of us partake of that one bread**.  
By partaking of that bread, we become,  
not figuratively but literally, *one bread*:  
it passes into the substance of our bodies,  
and there is in every one who partakes, a  
portion of himself which *is that bread*. The  
*bread* which was *before*, *is now ourselves*.  
But that loaf, broken and blessed, is the medium  
of participation of the Body of Christ;  
we then, being that one bread, are *one  
Body* ; *for* we all partake of that one bread.  
The argument is a very simple and direct  
one ;—the bread is the Body of Christ ;—  
we partake of the bread: therefore we partake of the Body of Christ. Of these propositions, the *conclusion* is implied in the  
form of a question in ver. 16: the minor  
stated in the latter clause of ver. 17; its  
connexion with the *major* producing the  
conclusion given in the former clause, “ *This  
is my body*.” The *major* itself, “ *because  
we being many are one bread, one body,*”  
is suppressed, as being a maxim familiar to  
Christians.

**18.]** Another example of  
**Participation** from the *Jewish feasts after  
sacrifice.*

**Israel after the flesh,** the  
actual **material Israel**, as distinguished from  
“ *Israel after the Spirit,*” see Rom. ii. 29 ;  
Gal. iv. 29; and “*the Israel of God*,”  
Gal. vi. 16.

**they which eat the sacrifices,** viz. those parts of the sacrifices which  
were not offered; see on ch. viii. 1—The  
parts to be offered are specified, Levit. iii.  
3; the practice of eating the remainder of  
the meat sanctioned and regulated, ib. vii.  
15—18.

**partakers with the altar**(in a strict and peculiar sense,—the *altar*  
having *part* of the animal, the *partaker*  
*another part* ; and by the fact of the religious  
*consecration* of the offered part, this  
connexion becomes a *religious connexion*.  
The question has been raised, and with  
reason, why the Apostle did not say partakers with *God*? Meyer answers,—because the Jew was *already in covenant  
with God*, and the Apostle wished to express a *closer connexion*, brought about by  
the sacrifice in question :—De Wette,—because he was unwilling to ascribe so much  
to the mere act of sacrifice, see Heb. x. 1 ff:  
and to this latter view I incline, because,  
as De Wette remarks, “ God” would have  
*suited the analogy better than “ altar,*”  
but St. Paul avoids it, and evidently is reluctant  
to use it. Still the inference lies open,  
to which our Saviour’s saying points, Matt.  
xxiii. 20, 21. The altar is GOD’S altar).

**19, 20.]** The inference from the  
preceding analogies would naturally be,  
that St. Paul was then representing the  
idols as *being in reality what the heathen  
supposes them to be*—and the eater of  
meats offered to them, as partaking with  
the idol. This objection be meets,—but  
with the introduction of a new fact to their  
consideration—that the things which the  
heathen sacrifice, they sacrifice really to  
*devils*.

19.] What do I say then?  
i.e, **what am I then assuming? that a  
thing sacrificed to an idol is any (real)  
thing so sacrificed** (*i.e. has any real existence as a thing sacrificed*)? **or that an**