the Apostle regarding the coming of the  
Lord as near at hand, in *his own time;*  
see notes on 2 Cor. v. 1–10. After the  
coming, there will be no longer any need  
of the symbols of His Body, since the  
Body itself will be with us; therefore  
the Apostle says, “*Till He come.*”

**27.**] *A consequence,* from the nature of the  
ordinance being, *to proclaim the Death of  
the Lord: the guilt of the unworthy participation   
of either of the elements.* The  
Death of the Lord was brought about by  
the breaking of His body and shedding His  
blood: this Death we proclaim in the ordinance   
by the bread broken—the wine poured  
out, of which we partake: whoever therefore   
shall either eat the bread *or* drink the  
cup of the Lord unworthily (see below, ver.  
29) shall be guilty of the Body and Blood  
of the Lord: i.e. shall be subject to the  
penalty of offence against the Body and  
Blood of Christ. Such an one proclaims  
the Death of Christ, and yet in *an unworthy   
spirit*—with no regard to that  
Death as *his* atonement, or a proof of  
Christ’s love: he proclaims that Death *as  
an indifferent person:* he therefore *partakes   
of the guilt of it.* Chrysostom  
strikingly says, “He makes that Death a  
murder, and not a sacrifice” The Romanists   
absurdly enough defend by this or  
(the meaning of which is not to be changed  
to *and*, as *is most unfairly* done in our  
A.V., and the completeness of the argument   
thereby destroyed) their practice   
of *communicating only in one kind.*  
Translated into *common language*, and  
applied to the ordinary sustenance of the  
body, their reasoning stands thus: “Whoever   
eats to excess, *or* drinks to excess,  
is guilty of sin: *therefore* eating, without  
drinking, will sustain life.”

**28.**] The **but** implies an opposition to, and  
wish to escape from, the guilt just sug-  
gested.

**examine himself**] **prove himself:**   
ascertain by sufficient tests, what his  
state of feeling is with regard to the death  
of Christ, and how far this feeling is evinced  
in his daily life—which are the best guarantees   
for a worthy participation.

**and so**] i.e. ‘*after examination of himself?*’   
The case in which the self-examination   
ends in an *un*-favonrable verdict,  
does not come under consideration, because  
it is assumed that such a verdict will lead  
to repentance and amendment.

**29.**] **For he that eateth and drinketh** (of the  
bread and of the cup: certainly not, as  
Meyer suggests, ‘the *mere eater and  
drinker*, he who partakes as a mere act of  
eating and drinking,’ which is harsh to the  
last degree, and refuted by the parallel,  
ver. 27. The word “*unworthily*” is spurious,   
not occurring in our most ancient  
MSS., and having found its way into the  
text by repetition from ver. 27), **eateth  
and drinketh judgment to himself** (i.e.  
brings on himself judgment by eating and  
drinking. The *judgment* meant, as is evident   
by vv. 30–32, is not *‘damnation*,’ as  
rendered in our A. V., a mis-translation,  
which has done infinite mischief), **not appreciating**   
(i.e. if **he discern not**, “if he  
have no idea of the solemnity of the ordinance,   
or of the magnitude of the gift bestowed   
on him.” Chrysostom) **the body**  
(of the Lord: here standing for the *whole*  
of that which is symbolized by the Bread  
and the Cup, *the Body and Blood*. The  
mystery of these, spiritually present in the  
elements, he, not being spiritual, *does not  
appreciate*: and therefore, as in ver. 27,  
falls under the divine judgment, as trifling  
with the Death of Christ).

**30.**] *Experimental proof of the assertion that he  
eateth and drinketh judgment to himself,*