

1. “Lord’s Supper” – 1 Co. 11:20	3
The word “supper”	3
Three different “suppers”	5
The “Lord’s Supper”	6
The Lord’s “Supper” and the Passover Supper.....	6
Some practical considerations.....	8
2. “Communion” 1 Co 10:16	9
Vertical “communion”	9
How does one have “communion” with Christ in the L.S.?	10
Erroneous concepts	11
Hypocrisy	12
3. Breaking of Bread – Ac 2:42	13
“Break bread” = L.S.?.....	13
Wrong Concepts.....	15
Proper Concept.....	17
4. Eucharist.....	18
Term unknown to NT.....	18
Usage?.....	18
Denominationalism.....	18
5. Sacrament.....	19
Term.....	19
Seven/Two	19
Roman Catholicism.....	19
Lutherans.....	19
Protestants.....	19
True Intent – Memory – 1 Co 11:24-26.....	20
6. Mass	20
Metaphor	20
Summary Lesson.....	21
1) “Lord’s Supper” – 1 Co 11:22	21
2) “Communion” – 1 Co 10:16	21
3) “Breaking of Bread” – Ac 2:42.....	21
4) “Eucharist”	21
5) “Sacrament”	22
6) “Mass”	23

Various terms referring to same thing:

1 Corinthians 11:20, NASB “20 Therefore when you meet together, it is not to eat the **Lord’s Supper**,”

1 Corinthians 10:16, NASB “16 Is not the cup of blessing which we bless a **sharing** [KJV, NKJV, “**communion**”; NIV, “**participation**”] in the blood of Christ? Is not the bread which we break a **sharing** in the body of Christ?”

Acts 2:42, NASB “42 And they were continually devoting themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to fellowship, to the **breaking of bread** and to prayer.”

While all these terms are used to refer to the *same memorial meal*, they convey *different ideas* about that meal.

Compare in our vocabulary (i.e., this is not strange):

Of the *same* meal, we may say...

“**Dinner**,” connoting *main* or *formal* meal

“**Supper**,” connoting *evening* meal

“**Feast**,” connoting *unusually good* or *abundant* meal

While any of these terms may be appropriate in referring to this meal, note that the following words would *not* convey the proper idea reference to *this* meal:

“**Lunch**,” connoting midday meal

“**Picnic**,” connoting outdoor, excursion meal

Note the **failure of communication** if the connotations of these terms are not understood.

E.g. “meet you for *lunch*,” but person interprets as evening meal...

E.g. say to lady who prepared a fine meal, “Nice *picnic*..”!

Likewise, for proper understanding and communication we need to have a correct view of the terms that are used in Scripture to refer to the memorial meal of the Lord’s death. We will address ourselves to that study.

Moreover, in future studies we will look at terms not found in Scripture that are used to refer to this memorial meal to see if they convey scriptural concepts—e.g., “Eucharist,” “sacrament,” “Mass.”

1. “*Lord’s Supper*” – 1 Co. 11:20

1 Corinthians 11:20, NASB “20 Therefore when you meet together, it is not to eat **the Lord’s Supper**,”

The word “supper”

Literal meaning in 1st century

The word translated “supper” (*deipnon*) was used at that time to refer to the **main** meal of the day, **usually eaten in the evening** (VN, Gingrich, TH).

deipnon

“(in Hom. the morning meal or breakfast...this the Greeks afterwards call the ariston..., designating as the deipnon the evening meal or supper);

1. supper, esp. a formal meal usually held at evening...

2. univ. food taken at evening...” TH

“dinner, supper the main meal of the day, eaten toward evening...(formal) dinner, banquet...” Gingrich, Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament

“denotes (a) ‘the chief meal of the day’ dinner or supper, taken at or towards evening...”

Vine’s Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words

Greek Custom

- Breakfast - little bread dipped in wine
- Midday meal - eaten anywhere, even on the street or city square
- Supper (deipnon) - main meal, no hurry, lingered together - Barclay, Letters to the Corinthians

“Supper” used figuratively in “Lord’s Supper”

Examples: “blood”; “cross”; “cup”

In **Rom. 5:9**, “**blood**” is not used in its ordinary, or literal, sense of the red fluid circulating through our arteries and veins, but to his **death**, v. 10

Romans 5:9,10, NASB “9 Much more then, having now been justified by His **blood**, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him. 10 For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the **death** of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life.”

In **Gal. 6:12,14**, “**cross**” does not refer to a literal tree upon which one was crucified, but to the **gospel, or message of the cross** (Compare 1 Cor. 1:17,18).

1 Corinthians 1:17,18, NASB "17 For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the **gospel**, not in cleverness of speech, that the **cross** of Christ should not be made void. 18 For the **word of the cross** is to those who are perishing foolishness, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God."

In **1 Cor. 11:26**, "**cup**" is used figuratively, not in its ordinary meaning, a small container for beverages, but to the **contents** of it, **the fruit of the vine**.

1 Corinthians 11:26, NASB "26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes."

That the word "**supper**" CANNOT be used in its ordinary or literal sense (as defined above) in reference to this memorial or the Lord's death is clearly seen **from 1 Cor. 11:34**. "Supper" = "main meal" literally, yet Paul said meal to satisfy hunger to be eaten at home.

1 Corinthians 11:34, NASB "**34 If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home....**"

Therefore, to base any conclusions as to the time or manner of observance of this memorial from the ordinary or literal meaning of the word "supper" is erroneous, being based on the false premise that the word "supper" in such usage carries with it its ordinary or literal significance.

Note: "Supper" never applied to Passover in O.T. In fact, "supper" not occur in O.T. Passover called "supper" only by John (13:2,4), evidently bec. it was the "main meal, eaten toward evening." The *intent* of the Passover meal was a memorial, but it was *in fact* the "main meal" of the day relative to satisfying hunger, thus, "supper."

Q: Did they not eat it in the "evening," Ac. 20:7ff?

It seems so, but this may have been due to their working hours. Remember, the first day of the week was not a "day off" in the Roman empire. Whatever the reason it is not because the word "supper" in the designation "Lord's supper" is to be taken literally, connoting an evening meal.

Note: Even in literal usage supper "usually eaten toward evening" (TH) - sometimes not?

Three different "suppers"

There are three different "suppers" mentioned in 1 Cor. 11:17-34.

"Lord's supper" - v. 20

"20 Therefore when you meet together, it is not to eat the **Lord's Supper**,"

"own supper" - v. 21

"21 for in your eating each one takes his **own supper** first; and one is hungry and another is drunk."

"after supper" - v. 25, i.e. Passover supper

(Compare Lk. 22:1,7,11-13,20)

"25 In the same way He took the cup also, **after supper**, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.""

Luke 22,1,7,11-13,20 "1 Now the **Feast of Unleavened Bread, which is called the Passover**, was approaching." ... "7 **Then came the first day of Unleavened Bread** on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed." ...11 "And you shall say to the owner of the house, 'The Teacher says to you, "Where is the guest room in which I may eat the **Passover** with My disciples?"'" 12 "And he will show you a large, furnished, upper room; prepare it there." 13 And they departed and found everything just as He had told them; and they prepared the **Passover**." ... "20 And in the same way He took the cup **after they had eaten**, saying, "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood."

Note: Paul, like Luke, is only one to mention that Jesus said the bread was his body with is "for you." (KJV, NKJV, "broken for you"; Lk, "given for you"). Paul, like Luke, records, "new covenant in my blood" (Mt, Mk, "blood of the covenant"). Paul, like Luke, mentions he took the cup "after supper" (Lk, "after they had eaten"). All which serves to confirm that "after supper" refers to the Passover supper which the context of Luke clearly points to.

Q: "it is not to eat the Lord's Supper" ? - 1 Co. 11:20

American Standard Version, 1901: "**it is not possible** to eat the Lord's Supper"

"ouk esti with the infinitive means 'it is impossible' to eat" - Lenski

“Lit.: ‘there is no such thing as your eating,’ i.e., ‘it is impracticable,’ ‘impossible’” -
 Lange
 NOT:
 That they made no pretense to observe it, for they did, but failed. Thus the reproof.
 That they shouldn’t, for he tells them how and the need for it.
 Contextually, only reasonable interpretation = “it is impossible...” Why impossible?
 “...for...,” v. 21-22. What they did was not the “Lord’s Supper,” i.e., what the Lord
 instituted or intended (“For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to
 you...,” v. 23).

The “Lord’s Supper”

Is that memorial the **Lord** established (v. 23)

“23 For **I received from the Lord** that which I also delivered to you, that **the Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed took bread ...**”

to be observed in remembrance of **Him** (v. 24,25),

“24 and when He had given thanks, He broke it, and said, “**This is My body**, which is for you; **do this in remembrance of Me.**” 25 In the same way He took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant **in My blood**; do this, as often as you drink it, **in remembrance of Me.**””

and distinguished from their “own supper” which *they* introduced into their assemblies *to satisfy their hunger* (v. 21-22,34).

“21 for in your eating each one takes his **own supper** first; and **one is hungry and another is drunk**. 22 What! Do you not have **houses in which to eat and drink?** Or do you despise the church of God, and shame those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you? In this I will not praise you.” ... “34 **If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home**, so that you may not come together for judgment. ...

The “Lord’s Supper” speaks of the **authority** from which it derives its existence and form, and of the **purpose** of its observance.

The Lord’s “Supper” and the Passover Supper

The “*Lord’s Supper*” is the memorial the Lord instituted during and after the *Passover Supper*, a Jewish memorial. These two memorials **were alike, but different**.

Same focal point - the sacrifice of the Lamb of God

They shared the same focal point: for 1500 years the Passover Supper looked *forward* to **the sacrifice of the Lamb of God**; thereafter, the Lord's Supper looked *backward* to that sacrifice. The Passover Supper found its *fulfillment* in the sacrifice which the Lord's Supper *commemorates*.

Both are memorials to God's people of redemption by blood

They are both memorials to God's people of redemption by blood. The *Passover* Supper was a memorial to Israel of their redemption *from the bondage of Egypt by the blood of a lamb*. The *Lord's Supper* is a memorial to Christians of their redemption *from the bondage of sin by the blood of the Lamb*.

Thus, "supper" for memorial meal - metonymy

This should enable us to see how "the name of one thing" ("supper" from the Passover supper) could be appropriately used "for that of another" (The Lord's memorial meal) because of being "associated with or suggested by it." (See definition of "metonymy" above.)

Differ in form, frequency, scope, origin

In **form** (Lord's "Supper" not a literal supper; other particulars in method of observance)

In **frequency** (weekly versus yearly)

In **scope** (Lord's Supper includes no reference to national experience)

In **origin** (Passover instituted by Moses; Lord's Supper instituted by the Lord).

"Lord's""Imperial" supper!

"*Kuriakos*, adjective from *kurios*, belonging or pertaining to the Lord, is not just a biblical or ecclesiastical word, for it is found in the inscriptions and papyri in the sense of imperial (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 358), as imperial finance, imperial treasury." A. T. Robertson's *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Accordingly, the

"Lord's" supper is the **imperial** supper - the **supper of the King!** Compare Matt. 26:29, Mk. 14:25, Lk. 22:16,18.

Matthew 26:29, NASB "29 "But I say to you, I will not drink of this fruit of the vine from now on until that day when I drink it new with you **in My Father's kingdom.**"

Mark 14:25, NASB "25 "Truly I say to you, I shall never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new **in the kingdom of God.**"

Luke 22:16, NASB "16 for I say to you, I shall never again eat it until it is **fulfilled in the kingdom of God.**" ... "18 for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine from now on **until the kingdom of God comes.**"

Some practical considerations

"Own supper" belongs to the home ("at home"), not the church

"Let him eat at home" - 1 Cor. 11:34. The apostle placed the common meal in the "home," not the church. See v. 22. Consider the confusion that exists in the religious world today in this matter, manifested by churches engaging in many activities that belong in the home.

"LORD'S" Supper – manner HE appointed, to remember HIM

Since it is "the Lord's Supper," it is to be observed in the manner He appointed (1 Cor. 11:23a) to remember Him (1 Cor. 11:24,25). Anything else is not the "Lord's Supper."

- He has authority to determine elements, time, etc.
- Sincerity, reverence, thanksgiving, praise in observance

Life to harmonize

One's attitude in life should harmonize with the significance of this being the "Lord's Supper." For example, our lives should accord with a memorial to honor the Lord who redeemed us from sin. Also, this "imperial supper" declares the honor of our King who went the way of the cross—shall we then not be willing to "take our cross daily" and follow Him?

2. “Communion” 1 Co 10:16

1 Corinthians 10:16, NASB “16 Is not the cup of blessing which we bless a **sharing** [KJV, NKJV, “**the communion**” - *koinonia koinonia*] in the blood of Christ? Is not the bread which we break a **sharing** [KJV, NKJV, “**the communion**” - *koinonia koinonia*] in the body of Christ?”

Synonyms to “communion”: sharing; fellowship; participation

Vertical “communion”

It is true that when we partake of the Lord’s Supper together there is a “*horizontal*” fellowship—man with man, each benefiting from the other’s faith, **Heb. 10:23- 25**; but the focus in this section of scripture is on “vertical” fellowship—man **with God**. Note the opening and closing statements of this section. **v. 14, 22.**

“**14** Therefore, my beloved, **flee from idolatry.**” ...

.....

“**22** Or do we **provoke the Lord to jealousy?** We are not stronger than He, are we?”

Three acts of worship laid side by side: Christian; Jew; Idolater. Observe *vertical* fellowship being discussed in each.

Demons



Idolater

1 Corinthians 10:20,21, NASB “20 No, but I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice **to demons**, and not to God; and I do not want you to become **SHARERS in** [KJV, NKJV, “have fellowship with” - *koinonov koinonos*] **demons**. 21 You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of [metecw *metechO*] the table of the Lord and the table of demons.”

God



Jew

1 Corinthians 10:18-20 NASB “18 Look at the nation Israel; are not those who eat the sacrifices **SHARERS** [KJV, NKJV, “partakers” - *koinonov koinonos*] **in the altar?** 19 What do I mean then? That a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an

idol is anything?” 20 No, but I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and *not to God*; and I do not want you to become sharers in [KJV, NKJV, “have fellowship with” - *koinonov koinonos*] demons.”

Christ



Christians

1 Corinthians 10:16,21 NASB “16 Is not the cup of blessing which we bless a **SHARING in the blood of Christ**? Is not the bread which we break a **SHARING in the body of Christ**?” ... “21 You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons.”

Mistaking the “communion” to be *horizontal* – man with man- some think the partaking by a few on Sunday evening is not proper “communion” — no “communion” *with others*. But it is *vertical* communion in view and that is true whether one or many partake. Compare the single Israelite bring his sacrifice to the alter or the single Corinthian eating at the idol’s table.

The *horizontal* fellowship is the sharing in the other’s faith, **Heb. 10:23-25; 1 Co. 11:26**

1 Corinthians 11:26, NASB “26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, **you proclaim the Lord’s death** until He comes.”

How does one have “communion” with Christ in the L.S.?

Three religious acts are paralleled in this section. Paul appealed to the evident fact of communion in two to establish the fact of fellowship in the third. Therefore, understanding how communion is had in one explains how communion is had in the others.

1. Lord’s Supper
2. Jewish sacrifices
3. Idolatrous sacrifices
- 4.

Jew & the alter

Note: The Jewish sacrifices represented as the “food” of their God, **Lev. 3:11,16; 21:6,8,17,22; Num. 28:2**. When the Jew ate of the sacrifice of the peace offering

(**Lev. 7:11-18**) and God “ate” (figuratively - the fire of the altar consuming the sacrifice - ?), they “communed.” ***This religious act signified covenant fellowship between the worshiper and his God.***

Note that one purpose of communal meals according to **Gen. 26:26-31; 31:43-55** was to *confirm a covenant*.

A Jew might eat a lamb with no other purpose but to satisfy his hunger at any time or place; but when he ate a lamb sacrificed on “the altar” of Jehovah, the *objective* import (*regardless of subjective intent*) of that act was a declaration of faith in the God of that altar and devotion to his covenant. He was thus a “partaker” in the religion that altar represented.

Idolater & idol’s table

Likewise, to eat meat at the idol's table in the idol's temple had the *objective* import (again, *regardless of subjective intent*)—and this is vital to Paul's argument, see **v. 19**) of honoring those idols and thus having “fellowship with demons” in the false system of religion founded upon them.

Christian and the Lord’s table

The Christian may eat unleavened bread and drink fruit of the vine anytime just because he likes it, but when done so in memorial to the death of his Lord, he “**proclaims the Lord’s death until He comes**” **1 Cor. 11:26**. He and the Lord “commune” (compare “drink the cup of the Lord,” **v. 21**, and **Mt. 26:29**, “drink it new with you”) in this religious act ***as the worshipper declares his fellowship with Christ in the life made possible by that sacrifice and in his devotion to the covenant ratified by that death.***

Erroneous concepts

Note that “communion with the body and blood of the Lord” does NOT refer to

Christian to Christian (already discussed)

Obtaining forgiveness of sins by partaking of the memorial. One shares in the forgiveness made possible by the death of Christ through baptism, **Mk. 16:16, and then by prayer, 1 Jn. 1:9.**

Obtaining a mysterious Divine blessing communicated through the elements—the **“sacramental” concept** (to be studied in a future lesson)

Q: Do our prayers at the table reflect an understanding of this facet of “communion” in the Lord’s Supper?

Hypocrisy

Note the hypocrisy of eating a memorial to “the blood of the covenant” and then showing no interest in, commitment to, or respect for that covenant the rest of the week!

3. **Breaking of Bread – Ac 2:42**

Acts 2:42, NASB “42 And they were continually devoting themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to fellowship, to the **breaking of bread** and to prayer.”

“**Break bread**” = L.S.?

“**Break bread**” = common meal

“Bread” was used by synecdoche for food in general (Gen 3:19; 43:31-32; Mt 6:11; etc.). To “break bread” was to break the food off in pieces for purpose of eating or distributing, Lam 4:4; Lk 9:16 (of fish, as well as bread); Mk 6:41-43 (“broken pieces” included the fish, v. 43, which had been “divided, v. 41). and Thus, to “break the bread” was used of a common meal, Ac 20:11.

Ac 20:11 “11 And when he had gone back up, and had **broken the bread** and eaten, he talked with them a long while, until daybreak, and so departed.” NASB.

“**Break bread**” ALSO = L.S.

1 Corinthians 10:16 “Is not the cup of blessing which we bless a sharing in the blood of Christ? Is not the **bread which we break** a sharing in the body of Christ?” NASB.

This meal to declare one’s faith in the suffering of Christ and is NOT a common meal to satisfy hunger.

1 Corinthians 11:34, “**If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home**, so that you may not come together for judgment. And the remaining matters I shall arrange when I come.”

Evidence “**breaking of bread**” = L.S. in Ac 2:42

- **Actions mentioned are the *result of obedience to the gospel* v. 41**

Acts 2:41,42, NASB “41 So then, **those who had received his word were baptized**; and there were added that day about three thousand souls. 42 **And they** were continually devoting themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer.”

- **Clearly, two of the other three actions accompanying this one are *spiritual* activities as result of obedience to the gospel: Apostles’ teaching; prayer.**

Likely “fellowship” is also (contributing to needs of the saints, apostles’ support – v. 44f)

- **Therefore SOME kind of special eating together**
 - **(1) as a result of obeying the gospel, and**
 - **(2) associated with apostles’ teaching, prayer, fellowship.**
- No evidence early churches ever *told* to have or *had* special meals together to satisfy hunger . In fact, contrarily, they were told to eat such meals “at home.”

1 Corinthians 11:34, NASB “34 If anyone is **hungry**, let him **eat at home**, so that you may not come together for judgment....”
- IS evidence the early churches were *told to* and *practiced* regularly a memorial meal of faith in the Lord’s death, Mt 26; Mk 14; Lk 22; 1 Co. 11
- Therefore, context and harmony clearly point to “the breaking of bread” in Ac 2:42 to refer to the regular observance of the memorial to the death of their newly professed Savior.

What about v. 46?

Acts 2:46, NASB “46 And day by day continuing with one mind in the temple, and **breaking bread** from house to house, they were taking their meals together with gladness and sincerity of heart,”

“house to house” – NOT in the temple.

What went on in the temple daily?

Acts 4:1...18 NASB “1 And as they were speaking to the people, the priests and the captain of the **temple** guard, and the Sadducees, came upon them...18 And when they had summoned them, they commanded them not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus”

Acts 5 NASB “20 “Go your way, stand and speak to the people in the temple the whole message of this Life.... 25 But someone came and reported to them, “Behold, the men whom you put in prison are standing **in the temple** and teaching the people!” 26 Then the captain went along with the officers and proceeded to bring them back without violence (for they were afraid of the people, lest they should be stoned). 27 And when they had brought them,

they stood them before the Council. And the high priest questioned them, 28 saying, “We gave you strict orders not to continue teaching in this name, and behold, you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching, and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.” 29 But Peter and the apostles answered and said, “We must obey God rather than men.”... “42 And every day, **in the temple** and from house to house, they kept right on teaching and preaching Jesus as the Christ.”

They were **teaching the gospel** daily in the temple.

True, they were *also* teaching house to house (5:42), but, unless the verse in question refers to it—and it’s not inherent in the phrase—it never says they ate meals daily in the temple. One would wonder whether such would be allowed (hundreds? eating common meals in the temple daily) by either the Jewish rulers or even the Lord – Jn 2:16-17!

“meals” (*trophE*) denotes food taken for nourishment
(see uses in NT – Worship class)

“they” - ?

- Pronouns may refer to remote antecedent (Gen 32:25; Ex 34:28, etc.)
- Theme of this book: “Acts of the APOSTLES”
- Who has Luke been focusing on *before* this verse and *who after*? APOSTLES
- Suggestion: Since these occupied with daily teaching they could not give themselves to their secular work. So, “they” went “house to house” where the brethren fed them during this unusual and intense period.

Wrong Concepts

“Breaking bread” is symbolical and each person (or leader) **MUST** “break” pieces off “one loaf” - “*This do* in remem. of me”

“Break bread” used of common meals - nothing symbolical

To “break bread” was to break the bread off in pieces for the purpose of eating or distributing. **Lam. 4:4; Mt. 14:19; Lk. 24:30; Ac. 27:35.**
Nothing symbolical.

Lam. 4:4 "The tongue of the infant cleaves To the roof of its mouth because of thirst; **The little ones ask for bread, But no one breaks it for them.**"

Mt 14:19 "And ordering the multitudes to recline on the grass, He took the five loaves and the two fish, and looking up toward heaven, He blessed *the food*, and **breaking the loaves** He gave them to the disciples, and the disciples gave to the multitudes,"

Lk 24:30 "And it came about that when He had reclined *at the table* with them, He took the bread and blessed *it*, and **breaking it**, He began giving it to them."

Ac 27:35 "And having said this, he took bread and gave thanks to God in the presence of all; and **he broke it and began to eat.**"

"This do" = do what Jesus did? Five verbs-Lk 22:19

"19 And when He had (1) **taken some bread** and (2) **given thanks**, He (3) **broke it**, and (4) **gave it to them**, (5) **saying, ...**"

Which one of the five? Why ONLY 1,2,3?

"This do" = "take eat"

Lk 22:19 "... saying, "This is My body which is given for you; **do this** in remembrance of Me."

Mt 26:26 "... and said, "**Take, eat; this is My body.**"

"Breaking" the bread symbolical of Christ body "broken" for us - ?

klaO (broken) - "metaph to *sOma* [the body, srf], shattered as it were, by a violent death, 1 Cor. 11:24..." Thayer's. *If this be the meaning, does the Christian reenact killing Christ when he "breaks" the bread?*

Compare:

Lk. 22:19 - "...body, which is **given** for you..."

1 Cor. 11:24 - "...body, which is **broken** for you..."

I.e., he gave his life on our behalf.

In the institution of the Supper, **Christ** broke the bread, *not* the participants. What he told **them** to do was, "Take, eat..."

Remember: People of that day "broke" bread to partake of it, or to distribute it for partaking ...

Proper Concept

To "break bread" = partake

1 Co 10:16 - "the bread which **we break...**"

1 Co 10:17 - "**we all partake** of the one bread"

Synecdoche (part for whole)

Compare:

Ac 2:46 "And day by day continuing with one mind in the temple, and **breaking bread** from house to house, they were **taking their meals** together with gladness and sincerity of heart,"

Lk 24:35 "And they *began* to relate their experiences on the road and how He was recognized by them in the **breaking of the bread.**"

Thus, simply, to partake of the memorial meal we call "The Lord's Supper," including the fruit of the vine

Ac 2:42 "And they were continually devoting themselves to the apostles' teaching and to fellowship, to the **breaking of bread** and to prayer."

Ac. 20:7 "And on the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to **break bread**, Paul *began* talking to them, intending to depart the next day, and he prolonged his message until midnight."

4. *Eucharist*

Term unknown to NT.

"*eucharisteō*," "when he had given thanks"— **1 Co 1:24, also Mt 26:27/Mk 14:23/Lk 22:17,19**

However, in these texts, of *Christ* giving thanks.

Usage?

If mean no more than the memorial meal where we give thanks for the death of Christ, though not a biblical term, it would convey a scriptural thought.

"The Eucharist is moreover, as the name itself implies, on the part of the church a living and reasonable thank-offering, wherein she presents herself anew, in Christ and on the ground of his sacrifice, to God with prayers and intercessions." Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, p. 389

Beware, however, of connotations (e.g. "sacrament")...

Denominationalism

"The Eucharist is both a **sacrament wherein God conveys to us a certain blessing**, and a sacrifice which man offers to God." McClintock & Strong

"In the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, and in the Anglican, Lutheran, and many other Protestant churches, it is **regarded as a sacrament** (q.v.) , which both symbolizes and **effects the union of Christ with the faithful**. Baptists and others refer to Holy Communion as an "institution," rather than a sacrament, emphasizing obedience to a commandment." Funk & Wagnalls Ency (bold mine, srf)

If mean "sacrament," unscriptural. See below...

5. *Sacrament*

Term

"religious sign or symbol, especially associated with the Christian Church, in which a sacred or spiritual power is believed to be transmitted through material elements viewed as channels of divine grace." *Ency. Britannica*

The term is never applied to the L. S. in the N.T. As the grace bestowed in is done so in a "mysterious" way "beyond comprehension," a Greek word, *mustErion*, mystery, later became the equivalent of the Latin, *sacramentum* (holy thing). But, *mustErion* never used of the LS in the NT.

Seven/Two

Roman Catholicism recognizes seven sacraments;
Protestantism only two.

Roman Catholicism

Bread & wine actually are transformed into the true body and blood of Jesus. ("Mass")

Requisite to its power or "perfecting"

- Proper elements (material)
- Proper words (form)
- Proper administrator (priest doing bidding of the church)

Conveys forgiveness of sins

Lutherans

"Consubstantiation" – similar, but different

While Luther argued "this is my body" literal, they do believe the bread remains bread and the wine remains wine, yet the body and blood of Christ is invisibly added and communicated to the participants.

Protestants

NOT literal body and blood of Christ

Inexplicable transfer of grace by H.S.

Spiritual grace is conveyed to the soul of the participant by the H.S. (forgiveness? strengthening?)

True Intent – Memory – 1 Co 11:24-26

Compare **Ex 13:3** (feast of unl. bread); **Num 15:39**
(tassals); **Dt 5:15** (sabbath); **Dt 16:10...12** (Pentecost);
Psa 78:40-42 (result of failure to remember)

6. Mass

Bread and wine actually become the body and blood of Christ and he offers Himself, just as He did at the cross, now through an unbloody sacrifice, through the priest, for the sins of the living and the dead.

The Catholic, in partaking of the bread, partakes of both the body and blood of Jesus.

Metaphor

"All the world's a stage" – Shakespeare

"This is my mother" – picture on the wall

1 Co 11:25 (cup is my covenant)

1 Co 12:27 (you are Christ' body)

See **1 Co 10:16** – a fellowship

Summary Lesson

(summary of several lessons on L.S. in past year)

1) “Lord’s Supper” – 1 Co 11:20

NOT literal supper – 1 Co 11:34

“Lord’s”...

- Lord established, 1 Co 11:23
- In memory of him – 1 Co 11:24-25
- “Imperial” supper – Mt 26:29

2) “Communion” – 1 Co 10:16

“Communion” (KJV, NKJV); “Sharing” (NASB);
fellowship; participation (NIV)

Vertical fellowship – vv. 18-20...21

Horizontal fellowship occurs – 1 Co 11:26. But this not what 1 Co 10:16 discussing.

HOW “fellowship”? What “share”? 1 Co 11:26

Declare faith in and fellowship with death of Christ and devotion to the covenant ratified by that death.

3) “Breaking of Bread” – Ac 2:42

NOT symb. of “breaking” Christ body

1 Co 11:24. Taken this way some mistakenly think that “breaking” the bread is symbolical of Christ’ body being “broken.”

“Break bread” = partake of

1 Co 10:16...17

Synecdoche – part for whole

4) “Eucharist”

Unknown to NT

“*eucharisteo*” 1 Co. 11:24, “when he had given thanks” – of CHRIST giving thanks

Usage?

If mean a meal wherein one expresses thanks for the death of Christ – OK. But, beware of connotations...

Denominationalism

Often viewed as a "sacrament." If so, unscriptural...

5) Sacrament"**Term**

"religious sign or symbol, especially associated with the Christian Church, in which a sacred or spiritual power is believed to be transmitted through material elements viewed as channels of divine grace." *Ency. Britannica*

The term is never applied to the L. S. in the N.T. As the grace bestowed in is done so in a "mysterious" way "beyond comprehension," a Greek word, *mysterion*, mystery, later became the equivalent of the Latin, *sacramentum* (holy thing). But, *mysterion* never used of the LS in the NT.

Seven/Two

Roman Catholicism recognizes seven sacraments; Protestantism only two.

Roman Catholicism

Bread & wine actually are transformed into the true body and blood of Jesus. ("Mass")

Requisite to its power or "perfecting"

- Proper elements (material)
- Proper words (form)
- Proper administrator (priest doing bidding of the church)

Conveys forgiveness of sins

Lutherans

"Consubstantiation" – similar, but different

While Luther argued "this is my body" literal, they do believe the bread remains bread and the wine remains wine, yet the body and blood of Christ is invisibly added and communicated to the participants.

Protestants

NOT literal body and blood of Christ

Inexplicable transfer of grace by H.S.

Spiritual grace is conveyed to the soul of the participant by the H.S. (forgiveness? strengthening?)

True Intent – Memory – 1 Co 11:24-26

Compare **Ex 13:3** (feast of unl. bread); **Num 15:39** (tassals); **Dt 5:15** (sabbath); **Dt 16:10...12** (Pentecost); **Psa 78:40-42** (result of failure to remember)

6) "Mass"

Bread and wine actually become the body and blood of Christ and he offers Himself, just as He did at the cross, now through an unbloody sacrifice, through the priest, for the sins of the living and the dead.

The Catholic, in partaking of the bread, partakes of both the body and blood of Jesus.

Metaphor

"All the world's a stage" – Shakespeare

"This is my mother" – picture on the wall

1 Co 11:25 (cup is my covenant)

1 Co 12:27 (you are Christ' body)

See **1 Co 10:16** – a fellowship

Conc: **Ac 2:42** – Continue in apostles' doctrine, not the traditions and precepts of men.