but indicating a further and more matured  
separation, where not only is there present:  
dissension, as in the Agapæ, but a deliberate   
choice and maintenance of party distinction.   
It does not appear, in spite of  
all that has been written in Germany on  
the supposed parties of ch. i. 10, that such  
separations had yet taken place among  
the Corinthians. Nor even in Clement’s  
Epistle, forty years after this, do we find  
any allusion to such, but only, as here, to  
a general spirit of dissension and variance)   
**among you, that the approved**[**also**] (i.e. as well as the other party,  
who would become manifest by their very  
conduct. This word **also** is found in some  
of our oldest MSS., and not in others)  
**may be made manifest among you**; viz.  
through a better and nobler spirit being  
shewn by them, than by the contentious  
and separatists.

**20.**] The same subject—resumed from ver. 18: see notes on  
“*in the first place.*’—**When then ye come  
together** (*are assembling*, present tense,  
and perhaps here, where he deals with particulars,   
this is to be pressed,—as their  
*intention* in thus assembling is blamed)  
**to one place—there is no eating** (or,  
**it is not to eat**, i.e. *with any idea of  
eating*) **the Lord’s Supper** (emphasis on **the  
Lord’s**, as opposed to “*his own*” below).

**the Lord’s Supper**] ‘*the Supper  
instituted by the Lord.*’ This was an  
inseparable adjunct, in the apostolic times,  
to their agapæ or feasts of love. Chrysostom   
and Tertullian give an ample description   
of these feasts, which were of the  
nature of mutual contributions, where each  
who was able brought his own portion,—  
and the rich additional portions for the  
poor. *During* and *after* this feast, as shewn  
by the institution, by the custom at the  
Passover, by the context here, and by the  
remnants of the ancient custom and its  
abuse until forbidden by the council of  
Carthage,—the ancient Christians partook  
of the Supper of the Lord. It was necessary   
for the celebration of the Lord’s  
Supper, that all should eat of the same  
bread and drink of the same cup; and in  
all probability, that a prayer should be  
offered, and words of consecration said by  
the appointed ministers. Hence cessation  
of the feast itself, and solemn order and  
silence, would be necessitated even by the  
outward requirements of the ordinance.  
These could not be obtained, where each  
man was greedily devouring that which  
he had brought with him: where the extremes   
were seen, of one craving, and  
another being drunken. This being their  
practice, there could be no possibility, and  
at the same time *no intention* of celebrating  
the *Lord’s* Supper,—no provision for it,  
nor discernment of the solemnity of it.

**21.**] **taketh before another**, viz. during  
the feast, not *at home*, before coming. Obviously   
the each one must be limited to the  
*rich*: the poor had no *supper of their own*  
to take, and were the losers by the selfishness   
of the rich.

**one is craving** (the  
poor), **another is drunken** (the rich. There  
is no need to soften the meaning of thislatter  
word, as Meyer says, “ Paul draws the picture   
in strong colours, and who can say  
that the reality was less strong?”).

**22.**] **For** (a reason for the blame in the  
foregoing: this should not be: for) **have  
you no houses, to eat, &c.**: meaning, ‘*at  
home* is the place to satiate the appetite,  
*not the assembly of the brethren.*’

**or do ye shew your contempt for** (pres.) **the  
congregation of God** (*of* *God*, to express  
the dignity of the congregation. This contempt   
was expressed by their *not sharing*with the congregation the portion which  
they brought),—**and put to shame those  
who have not** (houses to eat and to drink