

The Lord's Supper (1979)

by Maurice Barnett

Introduction

The material in this study first appeared in 1979. It was the result of study I had been doing on the subject for nearly a year before. I wrote out my conclusions and sent them to several dozen brethren over the country for evaluation. Over twenty-Five years later I still believe my conclusions are valid. This material is reproduced here with very little change from the original documents.

The general practices on the Lord's Supper run from anything goes, to virtually closed communion only once on Sunday. The usual practice for the majority of churches is two meetings on Sunday with the major observance of the Supper in the morning. This is followed in the evening with offering the elements only to those who were not present in the morning. Just as in controversies over instrumental music, institutionalism, and others, there are little side issues that cloud the basic principles involved. The objections and arguments that I deal with in this paper are those that I have either read from others or that have been presented to me as objections to the position I have taken here.

Frequency Of Assemblies

I believe in congregational autonomy. Each congregation has the right to schedule and order the number and, to some extent, the nature of the assemblies it may have. (Of course, this must be light of what God has specified in Scripture). Circumstances change from city to city, from one part of the country to another, as well as from nation to nation. Some consider traditional ways of doing things matters of faith; Bible classes at ten, "preaching" at eleven, and an evening meeting where the "emblems" are served only to those who were not there in the morning. This seems to be an obligation demanded of all congregations everywhere. If things are not observed just this way by some congregation, it is looked upon as either unsound or headed that way. Our brethren can be as bad as the denominations in making "traditions" matters of faith.

In some places, congregations find that only one meeting on Sunday fits their circumstances best. That is their decision to make. The church at Troas, Acts 20, had only one meeting, at least the Sunday Paul was there. Another place may decide three meetings are better for them. That is their decision to make. Hebrews 10:25 makes assembling together generic as far as number is concerned. This applies to Sunday as well as any other day. Certainly, there are things we must do on Sunday, but they can be

accomplished in just one assembly. Disciples met for several reasons in the first century, as in the following:

PRAYER — Acts 12:12
HEAR OF WORK DONE — Acts 14:27, 15:4
ACT ON DISCIPLINE — I Corinthians 5:1-13
EAT THE LORD'S SUPPER — Acts 20:7, I Corinthians 11:18-33
SING — Ephesians 5:19, Colossians 3:16
USE SPIRITUAL GIFTS — I Corinthians 14

We might schedule a meeting just for any one of the above reasons, with the exception of spiritual gifts. Certainly we commonly have “singings,” and used to call the Wednesday night meeting a “prayer meeting.”

Frequency of Eating The Lord's Supper

There has been much discussion over whether or not a congregation can have two meetings on Sunday where the Supper is observed. I believe the frequency of eating the Lord's Supper on Sunday is generic. The number of times is in the realm of expediency. Acts 20:7 identifies the day on which it is observed. I Corinthians 11:26 places the frequency on that day in the generic. One preacher recently wrote on the subject, saying:

“On the other side of the coin is the concept of those who eat the Lord's Supper twice on Sunday. These folks reason that since we sing and pray in both the morning and evening service, we ought also to eat the Lord's Supper. Yet, a little reflection reveals that though these acts do have in common the matter of being authorized for the assembly, they are not the same in all respects. The Lord's Supper is a memorial, authorized to be observed on the Lord's Day — period. To do more than this is to act upon that concerning which God said nothing (Cp. Heb. 7:14).”

There are some things in this quotation I will agree with, but there are also some mistaken conceptions as well. It is true, and refreshing to see someone say it, that prayer, singing, etc., are not the same as the Lord's Supper, though some comparisons can be made. We will soon look at the position that they are all alike, equally important, and even some go so far as to say they must be done together as the “five acts of worship.”

First, I don't believe every time we pray and sing on Sunday we also have to take the Lord's Supper. But I do believe that we can eat the Supper more than once; it is permissible. Second, I believe it is an error to say a disciple can eat the Lord's Supper *only once* on Sunday. Because the Supper is a *memorial* has *nothing at all* to do with the frequency of eating it on Sunday. We might as well say only once a year, or once a month, as only once on Sunday. The Passover was observed once a year as a memorial of Israel's escape from the death of their firstborn and departure from Egypt.

I Corinthians 11:25-26

“In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.” ASV

“As often as” is usually applied to the idea of Sunday-to-Sunday, which is assumption. It is from *hosakis*, a relative adverb, and is found only here and in Revelation 11:6; it means just as translated. See Thayer, p. 456, Arndt & Gingrich, p. 589. There is no indication that the phrase is limited to a Sunday-to-Sunday application with only one observance on any given Sunday. It is *generic in regard to frequency* — as often as ye eat and drink. As said before, Acts 20:7 identifies the day, but we are not limited in frequency on that day.

If Matthew 26:29 and Acts 20:7 were not in the Bible, we ask “on what day, and how many times on that day would we be permitted to eat the Lord's Supper?” Obviously, we could eat the Supper on any day of the week, and any number of times on each day; there would be no limitations in Scripture. However, seeing God has limited the Supper to one of those days of the week, Sunday, then that is the only day we can eat it. Yet, the above passages limit only to one of the days of the week. That says nothing about the number of times on that one day of the week. This means that we may eat the Lord's Supper on Sunday morning, and the same disciples eat it again on Sunday night. Keep in mind that the passage does *not* say “as often as ye offer this,” or “as often as ye serve this.” It says “as often as ye eat and drink.”

“Remembrance” of me. The word here means “*not 'in memory of' but in an affectionate calling of the person Himself to mind,*” W.E. Vine, **Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words**, p. 946. There is nothing in the term that demands we have such a “remembrance” only once on Sunday.

If a Christian had a second opportunity have such a “remembrance” of Christ on Sunday, why would he object to doing so?

“Proclaim” the Lord's death till he come. This term is from *katagello*, meaning “to declare, proclaim. . .where the verb makes clear that partaking of the elements of the Lord's Supper is a proclamation (an evangel) of the Lord's death.” W.E. Vine, op. cit., p. 888. Again, if a Christian had a second opportunity to make such a proclamation, why would he refuse to do so?

Some members find they cannot be at every Sunday morning assembly, but could be at night. It may be because of illness, shift work on a job, out of town, or some other reason. It is asked, “would not a congregation be obligated to provide a Sunday night meeting so that such members could take the Lord's Supper?” First, that is fine human reasoning, but where is the scripture or principle that demands it? This would mean that **every** Congregation **must** have two meetings on Sunday “just in case.” Second, what about a member who couldn't be there either Sunday morning or night, but could be there at three in the afternoon? The same argument would require, *just in case*, that a congregation schedule a mid afternoon meeting as well so they could be served the Lord's Supper. We would have to take note of all members concerning what is required for them and provide it.

I believe that the frequency of meeting and partaking of the Lord's Supper are matters for each congregation. But, I also believe that whenever — one, two, or three — meetings are scheduled on Sunday for eating the Lord's Supper that it be handled the same way each time. We will note more on this later.

The “Five Acts Of Worship”

For many years, preachers have hammered away about the “five acts of worship.” These five acts characterize our worship responsibilities on the Lord's Day. These “acts” are, prayer, preaching, singing, communion and contribution. Although I see nothing wrong in having all of these in our Sunday morning worship, there are some ideas and attitudes held by many brethren that leave us wide open for several serious errors. What we have really meant is that we can have *no more than* these five acts to please God, but we can have less at any given meeting. The extreme to which these ideas have gone are characterized by the following quotations. The first is from a preacher's article, and the the last two from a sermon on the Lord's Supper by another preacher.

“While it is certainly true that the Lord's Supper is an important part of our worship, one of the false notions I spoke of above has it as the only act of worship that is of any major or true consequence. In contrast, however, we find five acts of worship in the New Testament which are all important. This is the main reason I never encourage taking the Lord's Supper to those who are sick, unless we can also engage in those other acts of worship the apostles and prophets of the Bible taught.”

“And I will make the statement again that I made last Sunday morning, 'If you want to be a New Testament Church you're going to have to include in each assembly on the Lord's Day those things that the New Testament Church included in its assembly or drop your claim to be a New Testament Church!' Now, I don't believe I can be any plainer than that.”

“In the New Testament, when a Church assembled on the Lord's Day, here's what they did. They prayed, sang, they taught, they gave, and they participated in the Lord's Supper. We have some Churches today that are in the unenviable position of saying we are the New Testament Church and yet assemble for worship on the Lord's Day and have eliminated one of the five things, one of the five distinctive marks of the worship of the New Testament Church. Now, I say that you can't do that and go unnoticed.”

Nonsense! If all “five acts” are equal to one another, and one cannot eat the Lord's Supper without the other four, then “singing,” being equal to the Supper, **cannot** be done without the other four as well; singing is not scriptural on Sunday unless we offer the Lord's Supper and take up a contribution also.

What does that do to a Sunday afternoon singing? *Can't have one without the other four*, it is said. Or, what if the sick person spoken of in quotation one, above, hadn't financially prospered that week at all, they had nothing to contribute? Would they still be worshipping acceptably if they only did “four” acts of worship, or must there somehow still be “five”?

I don't believe that any one of the above men, or the congregations they work with, have **ever** practiced what they so insistently preach! Sometimes the idea they have expressed is put this way: *“We are doing the same thing exactly on Sunday night as on Sunday morning. We have singing, prayer, teaching, communion and contribution, even though, perhaps, only one person takes the Lord's Supper and makes a*

contribution; all of the elements are there so it's the same thing" I don't believe it!

In 1954, Tomas B. Warren formulated his famous "Constituent Elements" argument on institutionalism. "All of the elements are scriptural, the whole is scriptural." In public debate with Warren, Cecil Douthitt countered with demonstrating that, with Warren's argument, **Tabernacle Baptist Church** is a scriptural name. Douthitt pointed out something like this — "Hebrews 8:5 mentions the *tabernacle*, so we know that the word is scriptural and acceptable. In Matthew 3:1, we find *Baptist* mentioned as John the Baptist, so we know the word Baptist is scriptural and acceptable. In Matthew 16:18, we find the word *church*, and we know that is scriptural. Each of the elements are scriptural, so the whole is scriptural and **Tabernacle Baptist Church** is an acceptable name. Of course, that is false reasoning.

Several years ago, I heard an argument made concerning a particular eldership. Their qualifications were questioned, but the reply came back that the eldership met all the qualifications in Timothy and Titus. Of the five elders, two were married, but only one had any children, three of them were apt to teach, four were temperate, three were sober-minded, one was given to hospitality, etc. When you put them all together all the qualifications were present in the eldership.

The point? On Sunday morning we have all the "five acts" participated in by the congregation. That is, the Lord's Supper is passed to all so that all present may eat. The contribution plates are passed for all who can give, to place their money therein. All sing, and listen attentively to the sermon and prayers. However, on Sunday night, there might be only *one* person there who partakes of the bread and fruit of the vine, and perhaps puts something in the plate. Yet, because there was prayer, singing, a sermon, and one person did the rest, it is claimed that the congregation did the same thing on Sunday night as on Sunday morning! I don't believe that any more than that the above "eldership" would be qualified. In the context of the above quotations, what if there would be no one there on that Sunday night who partook of the bread and fruit of the vine, or make a contribution to the treasury? I have seen that happen many times. It would then mean, according to the position of some, that the "congregation" did only three of the five acts and the congregation would have failed to worship God as He directs; it would mean they were not a New Testament church!

Since it has been said that every "act" of worship is equally important with the rest, therefore, singing is as important as the Lord's Supper. Suppose we came back on Sunday night for the usual meeting and find that instead of congregational singing we would have a couple of soloists and a quartet do the singing while the rest just listened. Few will accept

that. But, if we had prayer, a sermon, several solos and a quartet number, and one of the members ate the bread and fruit of the vine and put something in the plate, would that not amount to the congregation doing the “five acts” of worship and be therefore scriptural? Not hardly! It should be easily seen in this instance that we would not be doing the same thing on Sunday night as on Sunday morning.

The Lord's Supper and the Contribution

Let's single out one of the “five acts” for special comparison. It is said that the contribution is just as important as the body and blood of Christ, and they are to be treated alike. I don't believe this is so. I Corinthians 16:1-2 does *not* say “on the first day of the week, let each congregation pass a plate and take up a collection.” The emphasis is on “*each one of you lay by in store as he may prosper.*” II Corinthians 8:12 says “according as a man hath, not according as he hath not.” Acts 4:35 and 5:2 say that those who had money to give “laid it at the Apostles' feet.” This is figurative language, meaning they brought it in and turned it over to the Apostles, showing there are several ways a “contribution” can be “made.” Actually, our practice of passing a plate during the assembly is not specified in scripture; As long as we meet the specifics of I Corinthians 16, we could do it in several ways. In most cases of husbands and wives, the husband is the one who has the income, writes out and signs a check, which he drops in the collection plate. The wife actually, physically, puts nothing in at all. Does she worship God acceptably in that case? We usually point out that the wife is represented in what the husband puts in, as per Acts 5:1-10. Can the husband take the Lord's Supper for her also? No. They are not the same and cannot be treated alike.

Some members mail a check in, or leave it with someone to put in for them, even though they, bodily, will not be present. As a member of the congregation, his regular contribution to the local work he has agreed to support is necessary, though we will not argue that point now. We usually point out, correctly, that the second person is acting as an agent for the other in delivering the check or cash; all the money goes in at the same time anyway. Can another person also act as our agent in taking the Lord's Supper? No. The items are different by their very nature and the specific instructions of scripture.

Actually, when we pay by check the money is still in our account. We have given no money, as such, and it won't be in the church's account until that check clears through our account. That really doesn't change anything; we have still made our “contribution.” Occasionally, some member's check “bounces.” He has misfigured his check-book and

doesn't have enough in his account to cover it, so the check comes back to the church. He usually writes another one, and by the next Sunday it is put in with the rest and goes on through. But, what does that do to his worship the Sunday before? He only did "four" of the "five" acts of worship. Was his worship nullified? No. Or, perhaps some brother is paid for the month on the first of that month. He contributes on the first Sunday according as he has prospered financially. The other Sundays that month he contributes nothing, for he has already contributed. He could have split it up over each Sunday, but it would amount to the same thing. When he is "prospered" again, then he will give accordingly. Has he worshipped only one Sunday a month?

The point of all this is that the Lord's Supper and the contribution are not the same things in place, importance, or treatment. The instructions for each are different.

Only an Assembly

I Corinthians 11:17-34, Acts 2:42-46, 20:7 show specifically that the Lord's Supper is observed only in connection with an assembly of a local congregation. These instances are as specific as singing that establishes the kind of music in our worship. This means we are not at liberty to observe it in any other way; no taking it out to the sick who had to stay at home or in the hospital, no "brown bagging" it on a trip someplace, no taking it to the fishing hole on Sunday. If the individual can take it at home, alone, there must be some authority found to authorize it, either by establishing a specific showing such a practice, or a generic of arrangement. That, however, has not been found. Some argue "extenuating circumstances" where one is "caught" someplace where there is no congregation on Sunday. However, when we start coming up with extenuating circumstances that counter specific authority, there will be no stopping place.

Where two or three are gathered - Matthew 18:20. This passage is sometimes referred to as authorizing some few taking the Supper outside of a congregational assembly, as long as at least two Christians are present taking it. However, *this passage does not apply*. Verse 19 shows the power of combined prayer. When two or more can agree, determine the Lord's will, and agree on the subject of the prayer, the prayer will be granted. Why? Because when they are gathered in the Lord's name to do this, they can be assured He is there also. We know from scripture that Christians can pray alone, in any number of a group, or within a congregational meeting. But, the same thing is not said about the Lord's Supper!

By an assembly. When it is said that an assembly of a local congregation must be involved in eating the Supper, I want to point out that the **same passages** that show that also show it was not just observed **in** an assembly, but **by an assembly.** In this, the Supper and singing have *some* likeness. Our congregational singing is not just done **in** an assembly, which would leave us open to solos and quartets, but it is done **by** an assembly of disciples. That is an important difference. If we can just offer the Supper for those who missed that morning, could we not also have just singing by those who missed singing that morning?

Decently and in Order. I Corinthians 14:40 gives a regulation that is applied in that chapter to the confusion of their assemblies where spiritual gifts were used. Verses 26 and 33 contain other regulations of assemblies, applied to this one at Corinth at the moment. They also apply to us today. Our meetings are for the purpose of edifying, not in confusion, but peace, or as in verse 40 — “But let all things be done decently and in order.”

“Decently” refers to what is becoming, done in a seemly manner. “Order” means *“an arranging, arrangement, order (akin to tasso, to arrange, draw up in order) is used in Luke 1:8 of the fixed succession of the course of priests; of due order in contrast to confusion, in the gatherings of a local church, I Cor. 14:40; of the general condition of such, Col. 2:5 (some give it a military significance here). . .”* W.E. Vine, **Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words**, p. 817.

In all our assemblies, whatever we do is to be done in a seemly manner, becoming to God's people, and in an orderly arrangement. In the assembly of I Cor. 14, there was a proper time during the meeting for all activities. There was a time for prayer, singing, tongue speaking, and prophesying, each in its own order, done in a seemly, peaceful manner. To-day, we have a meeting on the Lord's Day specifically called for specific purposes. The time for the meeting is set. During that meeting, we have a time designated for each item in which we engage. We complete one of the items before going on to another one. This is both seemly and orderly.

In this way, we have fellowship with one another in the local worship by our joint participation in that meeting. The items we engage in may call upon us for different reactions, but we still take part. Praying calls upon most of the congregation to listen attentively to the one who leads that prayer, so that all will pray with one mind and heart and can say amen at the end of it, thereby making it their prayer. In singing, the congregation is to actively join in during the time allotted for singing. The time for preaching arrives and the many listen and learn from the teacher, and that way take part in what is done. The time arrives for eating the Lord's supper and the disciples participate at that time by eating it properly. This is completed before going on to another song or prayer. Each of these

items are done together by the disciples assembled there. This is important to remember in regard to Acts 20:7-8 and I Corinthians 11:17-33. In Acts 20, the disciples observed decency and order in their meeting. In I Corinthians 11 however, there was a lack of both decency and order, and it prompted the rebuke and instructions of Paul to set it aright.

So, for me, the question is not “*Is Sunday night communion scriptural,*” or perhaps “*can we take it more than once on Sunday?*” I believe that *yes* is the answer to both questions. The major question is *how* it is to be done; is there a pattern to be followed? With this in mind we will approach the pertinent scriptures.

Acts 20:7

“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.”

Paul waited at Troas for a week, obviously in order to meet with the church on the Lord's Day. It was obviously around evening time when they finally met to take the Lord's Supper. He was especially interested in this meeting because he would not see them again, vs. 38.

DISCIPLES — This did not *necessarily* mean every single member of the congregation. It would mean all of the disciples able to meet. In Acts 15, reference is made to “the apostles.” It only means the apostles that were in Jerusalem at the time. But it would certainly refer to *all the apostles in Jerusalem at the time who could possibly be present*. They met with the elders to consider the matter. In the institution of the Lord's Supper, not all of the disciples of Christ were present, but all those there at the moment were told to eat and drink, Matthew 26:26-27.

GATHERED TOGETHER — This is one word translated as two. It is generally translated as it is here, though there are some variations. This was a specific meeting called for a specific purpose.

TO BREAK BREAD — This is a figure of speech, meaning to eat, that stands for the Lord's Supper, as in Acts 2:42. Though other things were done during that meeting, this was the stated purpose of the meeting of the disciples.

Comments on the passage. To understand our duties from this passage, we must determine the limits of the details. Did the disciples do what they came together to do? Obviously so. We can see this in some parallel passages, using the same word, *sunago*.

(a) Acts 13:44 — “And the next Sabbath almost the whole city was gathered together to hear the word of God.” Since they were gathered together for that purpose, did they do it together?

(b) Acts 15:6 — “And the apostles and elders were gathered together to consider this matter.” This was a specific gathering for a specific purpose. Did they do together what they came together to do?

(c) I Corinthians 5:4-5 — “. . .ye being gathered together, and my spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh. . .” Again, gathered together to perform something. Did they do together what they came together to do? Was it done the “same hour” by all present? It seems obvious. They did.

(d) So, in Acts 20:7, when they came together to break bread, why would we assume they did *not* do together what they came together to do?

Under *sunerkomai*, a synonym translated as *come together*, we find several other passages, especially I Corinthians 11:18-34. Verse 20 uses *assemble together* connected with eating the Lord's Supper. It is no wonder we find that connection in verse 33 — “. . .when ye come together to eat, wait one for another.” “To eat” refers to eating the Lord's Supper of verse 20; it states the specific purpose of their coming together. Were they to do together what they were coming together for? If not, what could it possibly mean and still keep the orderly togetherness required by an assembly? The context of the passages in that chapter shows clearly its meaning.

Objections to the position given on Acts 20:7

Some try to prove the disciples did not necessarily eat the Lord's Supper together, but in some other way that would allow a staggered or haphazard manner of eating all through an assembly. Overall objections to the position presented in this paper will be considered later under a separate heading. Following are some objections that have been presented to me.

1. “GATHER TOGETHER” IS GENERIC and includes all meetings on the Lord's Day. The Sunday evening meeting is just an extension of the morning, so you have only “one” assembly and only one communion on Sunday, though you serve it both morning and night. It is one assembly with a five or six hour intermission. Acts 11:26 shows it is generic: “. . .even for a whole year they were gathered together with the church and taught much people.” This was not one unending meeting together, so it must have meant a generic assembling that included all of the meetings.

ANSWER:

(a) Acts 11:26 is not parallel to Acts 20:7 in meaning of “gather together.” It is *figurative* in Acts 11. It refers to the reception that Paul and Barnabas received among the disciples, including everything they did together, not just some assemblies they were in. On the other hand, Acts 20:7 is *literal* and specific. It refers to a specific assembly of disciples for a specific purpose.

(b) The assembly in Acts 20:7 was a completed assembly, as the grammar shows. It was completely gathered in one place before the purpose of the gathering was even begun. All of the disciples identified in the passage were all together at the same time in the same place to break bread together. This is what was universally taught by Paul, I Corinthians 11.

(c) What the single assembly argument contends for is a staggered observance of the Lord's Supper. If the one or two on Sunday night that eat the Supper are just a part of the morning assembly, then a congregational assembly could just be staggered throughout the whole day. From this, some contend for a table in the foyer so people can eat the elements as they arrive at the building; a sort of cafeteria Lord's Supper. People drop-in and drop-out throughout the day, and eat the Supper whenever they get there. Actually, this is very close to the sort of practice Paul was criticizing the Corinthians for in I Corinthians 11. There is absolutely no evidence for the position anywhere, in or out of Scripture.

(d) Very few contend for such a position. Most brethren are aware that the morning assembly is a distinct meeting with a specific beginning and ending. The evening meeting is also distinct. They are two separate gatherings.

2. EVERYONE MUST SWALLOW AT THE SAME INSTANT if disciples are to eat the Supper together as you insist; together means simultaneous! In most congregations, the people in the front of the auditorium have already taken the elements by the time those in the back get them five minutes later. Whether it's five minutes or five hours apart makes no difference. It is still acceptable.

ANSWER:

(a) The objector here will have to check the dictionary and get his definitions straight. “Together” doesn't require “simultaneous.”

(b) When the Supper was instituted by Jesus, He blessed the bread, broke it (a piece for himself to eat), gave it to his disciples to eat. The cup was also given—all were to drink of it. A time, therefore, arrived in the

course of the evening when this all took place. What was done was done together, at a particular place in the evening, the only activity going on. I don't read that Jesus told them to hold the bread, then put it in their mouths simultaneously, chew and swallow at the same instant. Yet, it was still done together. There was no activity to distract and intervene during the eating and drinking. They ate the bread before they ever took up the drink. Someone show us otherwise!

(c) I believe in congregational singing, and we are to sing together. However, that does not mean that four part harmony with alternating leads, etc., is not singing together. Suppose we have a bass lead for several measures, and no other parts open their mouths during that time. We are told that five seconds or five hours wouldn't make any difference. Well, why could we have a morning service where the basses do all the singing, and that night rest of the congregation sings? From that standpoint, what would then be wrong with a choir? If we don't have to do what we do together, then we can chop it up any way we please.

(d) I have heard mothers say something like this — “We never seem to eat a meal together anymore. Now, I've fixed a good meal tonight, and we are all going to sit at the table and eat together.” If “together” means “simultaneous,” we must understand that a very peculiar thing is going to happen. The father directs the meal by saying, “First a forkful of mashed potatoes, together now, dip it in the gravy, now into the mouth, waller it around, and all together now, swallow. Next, the carrots. Your mother insists we eat a meal together, and that's what we're going to do!” Nonsense!

(e) Paul criticizes the factious and disunited way the Corinthians were doing things, I Corinthians 11:18-33. He insisted they do what they were supposed to do together, in an orderly fashion.

(f) What is intended by the argument being reviewed here? It is an attempt to say that the church at Troas observed the Supper in a staggered manner, sort of spotted around throughout the meeting, intertwined with other activities. That won't fit the facts, however.

(g) Refer to the section on “Decently and in Order.”

3. “TOGETHER” MODIFIES “CAME” and answers the question “where (?)” Thus “together” does not demand that all the disciples ate the Lord's Supper at the same time.

ANSWER:

(a) They came together to do something. If they were not going to do it together, why did they all come together there at the same time? Why so much effort expended to try to prove they didn't do together what they

came together to do? In Acts 15:6, when the apostles and elders came together to consider the problem, are we to conclude that they didn't necessarily all consider it together? In I Corinthians 5:4-5, when the church was to be gathered together to deliver the ungodly to Satan, must we conclude that they didn't necessarily do that? I don't think so. The same holds true in Acts 20:7. Notice that in that passage there was a set time during the assembly when the Lord's Supper was eaten.

(b) "Came together" is from a compound word that simply means "assembled" and answers to "what," as in "what did they do?" The purpose of their assembly must be stated in *other words*, as it does in this passage. The "where" of their assembly is of no consequence.

4. "ACTS 20:7 DOES NOT TELL US HOW the disciples broke bread, but Paul does tell us how to do so in I Corinthians 11. . . in memory of Christ, showing the death of Christ, discerning the body of Christ.

ANSWER:

(a) The objector here confuses *how* with *why*. The references to I Corinthians 11, in memory of Christ, etc., show us *why*, the purposes of our eating it. The *mechanics* are something else. At least we know the disciples had to come together to eat it.

5. "BREAK BREAD" IS A SYNECHDOCHE, a figure of speech that means simply to "worship." It stands for *all* things that go into a Sunday service, and does not mean just the Lord's Supper specifically.

ANSWER:

(a) What a completely unfounded assertion! It stands for both eating and drinking, just as it does in Acts 2:42, where it is listed separately from such things as prayer. Or, what will we say about the same phrase in Acts 2:46?

(b) If break bread includes singing, prayer, etc., then we are either limited to doing those things on the first day of the week, or we can eat the Lord's Supper any time of the week. If singing is breaking bread, and we can sing on Wednesday night; if prayer is breaking bread and we can pray on Thursday night; if the Lord's Supper is also breaking bread, we can observe it on Friday night. The argument proves too much.

(c) Even accepting the argument, the question still remains; did they do these things *together*? Did they sing together, pray together, study together, eat the Lord's Supper together? Or was it some sort of jumbled, disjointed "Pentecostal" meeting?

6. YOUR POSITION DEMANDS THAT YOU BE LIMITED to eating the Supper only at night, seeing the Troas church obviously met in the evening. You just can't take the example of this passage too specifically.

ANSWER:

(a) Those who make this argument are the first to insist that this passage teaches the Lord's Supper can *only* be eaten on the first day of the week, and *only* in an assembly of the congregation. They rely on this passage to prove their point. They just want to fish out of it what they want. The time of day is found in generic authority, as in Hebrews 10:25 and related passages concerning assemblies and the Lord's Supper. The *arrangement* for the Supper is a result of specific authority, Matthew 26, I Corinthians 11.

7. YOU ARE LIMITED TO TAKING THE LORD'S SUPPER only in an upper room, third story at that, because that is specified in the example of Acts 20:7.

ANSWER:

(a) This is the same argument as no. 6. It seems strange to run into this argument among conservative brethren today. Again, time and place are generic due to the instructions given, Hebrews 10: 25. There are other specifics on the Lord's Supper that must be followed; such teaching is specified in other passages.

8. FIRST CENTURY MEETINGS WERE QUITE LONG, perhaps all day, and people drifted in and out, and so took the Lord's Supper whenever they could in keeping with the time they could be there. Acts 5:1-10 shows this.

ANSWER:

(a) I've heard that asserted several times, but have never seen any evidence of it, either in or out of the Bible. It is obvious the Troas meeting was at night, but we have no idea just when it started. Further, the Greek grammar of the passages requires we understand there was a completed assembly of the disciples before any activities started.

(b) There is no evidence in Acts 5:1-10 that there was any congregational meeting, though at one point several people were present. While we are just "supposing," how do we know that the three hours

mentioned was just *one* meeting? They could have had a short meeting, dismissed that one, and two or three hours later started another meeting at which time the wife comes in. I have found a lot of supposing on the part of brethren, trying to imagine what early meetings could possibly have been like. The supposing is always in keeping with what one wants to prove, and then *insisting* it must have been that way!

9. THERE WERE NO CLOCKS OR WATCHES in the first century so all disciples couldn't have gotten there at the same time. They must have dribbled in over a period of time. So, whenever a person arrived he “took the Lord's Supper.” They couldn't have taken the Supper at the same time.

ANSWER:

(a) Sometimes brethren get very silly. This is just more imagination and assertion. The argument assumes that brethren could not tell exact time, then sets up the eating of the Supper within that framework of what is assumed. Where is there any indication of any of that?

(b) First century people could “tell time.” Peter was aware that it was but the “third hour of the day,” Acts 2:15. Other passages speak of different “hours.” There were different “watches” for guard changes, etc. Maybe the meeting at Troas started at sundown; all could tell when that “time” would be.

10. YOU CAN ONLY HAVE ONE ASSEMBLY ON SUNDAY if you apply this example too closely, because they obviously only had one here.

ANSWER:

This is the same argument as the previous two. The number of assemblies is generic. Instructions elsewhere inform us on what is specific and generic in this passage.

I Corinthians 11:17-34

Troas came together to eat the Lord's Supper, and obviously did it correctly. A year before that meeting, Paul wrote to Corinth and chastised them for their errors on the Supper. There were certain rules that had to be observed that Corinth was not.

COME TOGETHER — from *sunerkomai*. Thayer, p. 604, says it means just that. In this section, it is found in verses 17,18,20,33,34. As in Acts 20:7, this refers to a regular meeting of the congregation for the purpose stated.

TO EAT — verse 33. “when ye come together to eat” must refer to the eating of the Lord's Supper of verse 20. It couldn't refer to a common meal for this was condemned in verses 22 and 34.

COMMENTS ON THE SECTION — The meeting was to observe the Supper together, and not satisfy hunger. Two things were necessary: a proper attitude and correct external arrangement. There are three things pointed out by Paul that violated this.

(1) They were not properly showing respect for one another, the purpose and arrangement of the Supper itself. Opposed to this are verses 23-32. They must have the proper attitude.

(2) They had substituted and emphasized a common meal, vss. 20-21. Opposed to this practice, verses 22-34 give order to eat at home if one is hungry; that is the proper place for such.

(3) They ate in cliques and at different times, some in advance of others, verses 20-21. Opposed to this is the order of verse 33, and some teaching in the verses preceding it. “When you come together to eat, wait one for another.” Seeing they were to come together to eat, they were to eat together. But, does it just mean to wait until everyone is assembled? It doesn't matter where we place it, the meaning is the same. Why instruct them to wait until everyone had arrived, if it was not to do together what they were arriving for? This instruction was a contrast to the fact that they were not eating even the common meal they had together.

Objections To Position Taken On I Corinthians 11

1. EATING THE LORD'S SUPPER IS STRICTLY INDIVIDUAL; it is *vertical* only, being between the individual and God. This is according to verses 28-29. It may be compared to James 1:26-27 as individual responsibility. One preacher wrote:

“Thus, it is the duty of EACH individual disciple of Christ to examine HIMSELF, and it is the duty of EACH individual disciple of Christ to eat and drink.”

“The Church does not partake in the Lord's Supper! I partake of the Lord's Supper. You partake of the Lord's Supper. Certainly we do it together, but it is not something that the Church does. The Church is an institution. We have a contribution; the Church doesn't give its means.

Otherwise, we would be taking money out of the treasury and putting it into the collection plate, but that's not what we do. What do we do? We take some money out of our pockets, and we put that in the collection. That's individual action that takes place in the Church; and so my first point about the Lord's Supper, it is, that it is a personal act of fellowship with the master. 'Albeit' it is something that is done in the worship services of the Church on the Lord's Day. It is still an individual action."

ANSWER:

(a) The first quote is certainly true, but the statement was made to counter any idea of disciples eating the Supper together. Carried to its logical conclusion, it would nullify a congregational meeting for eating the Supper. We can eat it at home, alone, or under any circumstances. The arrangement would be a matter of generic authority. Certainly, the arrangement is either specific or generic. If generic, we can do anything we want to do. If specific, then we are limited to the arrangement specified. The second quote spends a lot of energy on the point, but then admits that the Supper is to be eaten *together by the disciples*. The same points he made can be made for singing. There is some singing that we must do together, Ephesians 5:19. That cannot be done by ones self. Yet, each is individually responsible for singing. There are other things we are to do together, yet each individual takes a part.

(b) Most of the objectors here insist that on Sunday night, if only one person eats the Supper, *there still must be an assembly* of disciples there to watch them take it in order to for it to acceptable to God. That makes that individual's acceptability in eating dependent on others *just watching* them do it. That alone makes it more than just individual.

2. WAIT ONE FOR ANOTHER, vs. 33, applies only to the specific problems at Corinth, and does not apply today, unless we have duplicate circumstances of the factionalism, division, and manner of their eating "before others." Another representative preacher said:

"Regarding I Corinthians 11:33. I said I do not believe the passage is used as I have so frequently heard it, that is, we are not to eat the Lord's Supper until all of the members arrive at the meeting house. Instead, I believe that Paul was directing his remarks to a very special situation at Corinth. There was division in that church. Some factions were not eating with others. There was confusion. It was an unsightly situation. When Paul said, 'tarry one for another,' I believe

he referred to their mutual participation in eating the Lord's Supper and not dividing into factions. I do not believe what Paul said there is to be applied to a congregation at peace within its own ranks, serving the communion at a morning and evening service.”

ANSWER:

(a) Taking this view will require we give up I Corinthians 16:1-3, on giving, unless we can duplicate the specific circumstances of relief for poor saints overseas! The liberals have thrown that one at us before.

(b) The above objectors hasten to use I Corinthians 11:22 and 34 against liberal practices of eating in the church building and against “church suppers.” Neither of those practices is specifically in the verses, though I think the verses apply. I don't know of a liberal church that has a breakfast, lunch, or supper during the meetings when they eat the Lord's Supper. Further, I am not aware of any instance among the liberal's “socials” wherein they are divided and factious during such socials. Indeed, they are quite united and content. When the liberals have their church socials in the meeting house on other mornings and nights of the week beside Sunday, these passages are still marshaled against them by the above objectors. But, they will have to quit using verses 22 and 34 now.

(c) Also, verses 28-29 are hastily used today, by the above objectors, to show the proper attitude we must have in eating the Supper, even though those words were used to counter the Corinthians' attitude in what they were doing.

(d) The regulations of I Corinthians 14 about “decently and in order” are rightly used concerning our assemblies today, regardless of the specific circumstances of a congregation. That regulation was not thrown out with the end of spiritual gifts. The regulations applied in that circumstance and so were used by Paul. The same is true in I Corinthians 11. The regulations were positive instructions on how the Lord's Supper is to be observed. They are applied in that chapter to the errors of the Corinthians. We can violate the same positive instructions in other ways today. There is a proper place for eating common meals, and Corinth violated this. There was a proper attitude necessary in viewing the death of Christ, the bread and cup. Joint participation by the disciples was the proper way to observe the Supper. Corinth violated all of these. We may, also, in other ways. The rules still exist.

(e) Notice in the quotation given above that the objector admits that “When Paul said 'tarry one for another,' I believe he referred to their mutual participation in eating the Lord's Supper and not dividing into

factions.” Correct. But, notice that the rule of mutual participation was being violated by *their* practice; *the rule is still the rule*.

General Objections To The Position Taken Here

The following objections are not in any sort of order, and no doubt the list is incomplete. They represent all I have been able to gather at this time that deal especially with the position I have put forth in this paper. There are other arguments that have been made on another facet of this subject, the position that a congregation can have only one communion observance on Sunday; many of the objections to that position do not apply here and so there is no reason for me to deal with them.

1. NUMBERS 9:6-13 SHOWS THAT THE PASSOVER COULD BE MADE UP by an individual that was either unclean or on a journey at the proper time of taking it. There was a date set a month later for them. This shows God recognizes the principle of having a valid excuse for missing some act of worship, but being allowed to make it up later. Here is the argument presented by one preacher and represents the argument.

“Moses and the Passover was types (sic) of Christ and the Lord's Supper (I Corinthians 5:7b, 8). Jesus and his disciples were eating the Passover feast when the Lord instituted the Lord's Supper (Matth. 26:17-29). The Passover was to be eaten on the second sabbath of the first month (fourteenth day) (Exodus 12:1-20; Num. 9:1-3), once each year. This was a direct command by God. However, there was an exception (Num. 9:6-11). A person who through no fault of his own, was not able to eat the supper on the first day could eat it later in the year. This was to be done even if it was only one man (v. 10). If God allowed the Jews a "second chance" to eat the Passover, and the Passover is a type of the Lord's Supper, then we offer a "second chance" to one who had not enjoyed the first chance.”

ANSWER:

(a) There are so many errors in this quotation I hardly know where to begin. The argument given is aimed at the position of no-Sunday-night-communion. I don't take that position. Yet, it does have some bearing on what I believe, so I will deal with it. It's pitiful that a gospel preacher has to go to the Old Testament to get authority for his New Testament practice.

We have scoured denominations for decades for doing the same thing. It simply shows that brethren won't hesitate to grab at anything to justify their practices if they can't authorize them by the New Testament.

(b) First, I Corinthians 5 is not talking about the Lord's Supper. It is figurative language referring to the local church. Neither does the fact that it was at a Passover meal that Jesus first taught his disciples about his coming Supper make any doctrinal connection between the two.

(c) However, just granting the type and anti-type connection, one error of the argument above is in claiming that the *requirements, regulations, or allowances* of types apply to antitypes. That's quite dangerous reasoning. The objector above picks out *which* regulations he wants to apply and leaves the rest alone, just like any denominational preacher.

(d) We would be *obligated* to have a second observance of the Supper, seeing that the "second Passover" was required of God. That would mean that the congregations who would have only one meeting on Sunday would be in error; they would have to have another meeting for those who could not be there at the first one.

(e) The Passover, even the "second" one, was only once a year. Some denominations have their "Lord's Supper" once a year for this reason. One cannot take just one item from the list of regulations and reject what one doesn't want.

(f) Despite the sentence in the above quotation — "This was to be done even if it was only one man (v. 10)" — the conclusion implied by the statement is just not so. Though Numbers 9:10 does say "If any man of you" to emphasize that every person in that category was to do this, the language shifts in verses 11-12 to "they," meaning all of those in that category. Notice that verse 12 closes by insisting the second Passover was to be observed "*according to all the ordinances of the Passover they shall keep it.*" So, noting the ordinances governing the Passover, Exodus 12:4, we note that it was never eaten alone. If a family was too small, he joined in with a neighbor, and all present ate it. Even on the "make up" Passover, the individual would have to seek out others in like circumstances so that there would be enough so that "*every man according to his eating shall make you count for the lamb.*" A lamb was chosen according to the number of people to eat it; the law required that there be enough people present to consume it during the night with no edible parts left over. The ordinances required all of this, even on a "make

up.” The Passover was never eaten alone, and all present ate it. The “Passover” does not prove the objector's point.

2. OUR SUNDAY NIGHT ARRANGEMENT IS JUST AN EXPEDIENT when we offer the Supper to just one or a few members. It expedites the command to take the Lord's Supper.

ANSWER:

(a) Would taking the Supper Monday night, if a person couldn't be there at all on Sunday, be an expedient? No. Would a sick member taking it at home, alone, on Sunday be an expedient of his taking the Supper? No. In order for a thing to be expedient, it must be lawful. Within the confines of the scriptures that authorize the proper taking of the Supper, expedients may be used.

3. YOU ARE DENYING A CHRISTIAN HIS RIGHT TO TAKE THE SUPPER by not providing it for him on Sunday night when he can't be there on Sunday morning. They *want* to take it, so you *must* provide a second service in which they can take it.

ANSWER:

(a) I have no objections to a second observance of the Lord's Supper, so this objection is not totally applicable.

(b) If a member is sick at home and *wants* to eat the Lord's Supper, but can't be at an assembly, and nobody will take it to him, are you not denying him the *right* to take it?

(c) If a member can't be at an assembly either morning or night, but could be there at three in the afternoon, must we arrange for that? He *wants* to eat it, and it is his *right*, but the congregation won't schedule a mid-afternoon assembly to provide it for him. Why not?

(d) Note the restrictions placed on the Lord's Supper, the rules, that we have noticed in scripture already. Also, where was the second meeting at Troas in Acts 20:7? Only one meeting on Sunday and one eating of the Lord's Supper is certainly scriptural. These objectors are *requiring* a congregation to have two or more assemblies on Sunday. Where's the scripture that teaches that?

4. YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO BE CERTAIN THAT EVERY PERSON there takes it. If you insist that *all* are to take it whenever the Supper is observed, then you will have to police the members to see they take it. If one member fails, it will ruin it for all.

ANSWER:

(a) No more than on Sunday morning; we would have to “police” that as well. We are to *sing* together also, but if one member doesn't sing on Sunday morning, it doesn't authorize us to have *solos*. This is where the individual nature of our assemblies appears. We are to provide to do certain things together, making every possible endeavor in teaching and arrangement. If some member does not do it properly, then the responsibility is his.

(b) The present, widespread, practice *specifically excludes* the majority of the disciples from participating on Sunday night. Preparation of bread and containers is made on Sunday night for only a very few, a half dozen people or so. From that alone, everyone knows this is something that is not for the congregation to do. Then, something is said, like, “the table is prepared for those who didn't partake of the Supper this morning,” or “if those who didn't take the Lord's Supper this morning will rise, you will be served.” This long standing conditioning of brethren has instructed them that they can't eat the Supper more than once on Sunday; they are turned into just observers on Sunday night. Yet, many preachers insist that there be a congregational assembly for the Lord's Supper, but on Sunday night the assembly of observers is necessary to make the eating by one or two members acceptable to God. Joint participation by the congregation is what is taught in the New Testament. It also makes more sense.

5. BUT, THOSE “OBSERVING” ARE PARTAKING IN SPIRIT with those who do eat, so that all are participating in the Lord's Supper.

ANSWER:

(a) If that is the *same* as actually partaking of the bread and cup, then why not do the same on Sunday morning. We'll just have one person eat the bread and drink the cup on Sunday morning too, while the rest “spiritually” participate; that way we can save on the cost of the necessary items. We could do the same with singing, baptism, and perhaps some other things. Only a soloist sings while the congregation participates by listening, like in preaching. I Corinthians 10:21 shows you don't “partake” of the Lord's table unless you eat.

6. NO CHRISTIAN EVER TAKES THE LORD'S SUPPER ALONE, according to I Corinthians 10:16-17. He takes it with Christ and every

other Christian in the world. Paul was many miles away but included himself in the “we” of the passage. He wasn't with the Corinthians, but he took the Supper with them. This answers the question, “where is the authority for a single Christian to take the Supper by himself.

ANSWER:

(a) This destroys the necessity of an assembly for eating the Supper. One can take it at home, or on a trip, and still be eating it with all other Christians in the world. The objector who makes this point also insists that time, place, and distance apart mean nothing. It is strictly individual action. *Why have an assembly, then?*

(b) The passage used, I Corinthians 10, is referring to a universal spiritual fellowship, as indicated by the language. When it comes to how the disciples ate the Supper, I Corinthians 11, Acts 2:46 and 20:7 are specific. Disciples came together locally in joint participation of worship, including the Lord's Supper.

7. I HAVE ALREADY EATEN THE SUPPER IN THE MORNING and am not going that night for that purpose. Once a day is enough.

ANSWER:

(a) This is the same feeling many brethren have about assemblies, period. They come only on Sunday morning; once is enough. They have done everything God requires of them on Sunday; no need to come back. They, and the above objector, are all “one-timers.”

(b) What the objector is admitting is that the Sunday night meeting is not scheduled for the same purpose as the morning. Sunday night is just for “possibles.” Some one or more persons *might* be there who hadn't eaten the Supper that morning; so, the Sunday night meeting is not for the same purpose as Sunday morning, regardless of the claims.

8. IF ALL PRESENT ARE TO TAKE THE SUPPER AGAIN ON SUNDAY NIGHT, then you must take up another contribution and not just for those who were not present in the morning. The contribution is just like the Supper as one of the acts of worship on Sunday.

ANSWER:

(a) See the material on previous pages concerning the contribution. They are not alike in instruction.

9. THE IDEA THAT IF A PERSON IS “PROVIDENTIALLY HINDERED” from being there at the appointed time he is not obligated to take the Supper on Sunday is glibly said, but where is the scripture that says any such thing?

ANSWER:

(a) I don't know what is intended by the objector here. I think it is rather a smokescreen. The principle is certainly taught in the Bible, such as II Corinthians 8:12. The Lord doesn't hold us accountable for something we *cannot* do. If a person cannot be in attendance either morning or night, does the Lord still hold him accountable for eating the Supper?

10. “SUPPER” AS FOUND IN “LORD'S SUPPER” MEANS EVENING MEAL. If you are going to be so picky about following the instructions and examples, then you will be limited to taking it in the evening, which in keeping with Troas in Acts 20:7-8.

ANSWER:

(a) *Deipnon*, supper, actually referred to the *chief*, or *most important meal* of the day. It so happened that it was the evening meal that the Jews considered the most important. In the strict and literal sense, the Lord's Supper is not a meal at all. Just a small amount of two elements is all there is. The word *deipnon* was used to emphasize something eaten and its importance. The “Lord's Breakfast” would have been demeaning. Be careful about attaching the literal characteristics of something to the figurative.

11. YOU WILL HAVE TO BREAK UP THE BREAD AFTER PRAYER and before it is served in order to follow the example of Jesus, since you insist on following examples so exactly. When Jesus instituted the Supper, He gave thanks and then broke the bread. You have to do the same.

ANSWER:

(a) The objector misunderstands what “break bread” means, and just what Jesus did. Bread, in that time, was baked in rather thin, round shapes, usually about the thickness of the thumb. In order to eat, one had to break off a piece of the large flat “loaves.” In order for Jesus to eat, He first had to break off some of the loaf; He then passed the loaf to the others and told them to “eat.” They did just what Jesus did, broke the bread in order to eat a piece of it. When the disciples came together, Acts 20:7, to

“break bread,” it did not mean they came together to crumble up bread. It is a figurative use to say they came together *to eat*. The same is true in Acts 2:46.

12. YOU'RE SAYING THEN THAT A CHURCH WHO SERVES TO JUST ONE person, or two, on Sunday night is sinning, and they will roast in hell for eternity for it!

ANSWER:

(a) This is usually stated early in any discussion on this subject. It reminds me of the institutional brethren from the beginning of that controversy. They countered our appeals to study with, “You're saying that a church that takes a *dime* from the treasury to help a poor starving orphan is going to roast in hell for eternity.” Or, others talk about their “poor old Baptist mother.” None of that has any bearing on what truth is. People hide behind such statements so they won't have to consider the subject. The question is, “what does the Bible teach.”

Meaning of Deipnon

We will see in the quotations referred to in this paper that social customs in regard to meals, like all other customs, change from time to time. And the terms used to identify those customs undergo a difference in application and meaning. Quite some time before the first century, the custom was to have three meals a day. But, by the first century the custom was only two meals a day. The first was called *ariston*, and the second *deipnon*. *Ariston* identified the period from breakfast to lunch. *Deipnon* referred to supper. Some confusion exists because of the English translation into the word **Dinner**, which at some times, in our modern world, refers to the noon meal and at others to the evening meal. The meaning of the word **Dinner** has varied in English from country to country, century to century, and even now from region to region in this country. Luke 14:12 records these two meals — “When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends. . .” Here **dinner** comes from *ariston*, and **supper** from *deipnon*. The King James and American Standard, for example, both translate the terms as above. However, the New American Standard and New English Bible, translate them respectively as **luncheon**, (lunch), and **dinner**.

What is clear in Luke 14:12 is that only two meals are detailed, and in a particular order. This is in keeping with the facts of first century custom of meals. **Bullinger's Critical Lexicon**, referring to *ariston*, p. 225, points

out that it means to eat any meal before the principal meal, *deipnon* (supper). He is explicit that it was always taken before *deipnon*. **Arndt & Gingrich Lexicon**, p. 106 lists, under *ariston*, two applications, namely, breakfast, and noon meal. The same is true of **Thayer's Lexicon**, p. 73, though he chooses the words **first food**, **breakfast**, and **dinner**, the last meaning the noon meal. **Liddell & Scott**, 1852 edition, pp. 208-209, list both the verb *aristao*, and the noun, *ariston*. They show the terms referring to breakfast and lunch, or any meal except dinner or supper. This identifies *ariston* as the morning to noon meal.

Two authorities have been the cause of controversy and misunderstanding on *deipnon*, though such misunderstanding has not been their fault. The fault has been with not taking the "context" of their statements into account. The first reference is **Bullinger's Lexicon**, p. 751. He lists *deipnon* under the word "Supper." He says that it is the principal meal "whenever taken, but gen. towards evening." The "whenever taken," by itself implies that it was eaten at any time of day, even early morning, and was the main meal at such times. However, noting what Bullinger said about *ariston*, that it was "always" eaten first in the day, and **before** the *deipnon*, indicates that Bullinger has something else in mind as to the "whenever eaten." We will better understand what that means as we continue.

The second authority is **Thayer's Lexicon**. Under *deipnon* he lists, first, that it refers to "1. *supper, esp. a formal meal usually held at evening. . .*" This is taken by some to say that since he says it is "usually" held at evening, it is not always held at evening. So, that places it as possible at other times of the day. Well, yes and no. We must understand just what he is saying. Notice that he says "*esp. a formal meal. . .*" A "formal meal" was a feast, and feasts were "usually" held at evening, but not always. Some feasts were held earlier in the day, and then they were called *ariston*. Luke 14:12 shows both terms refer to feasts. But, such a formal meal, feast, was "usually" held at evening, and when it was it answered to *deipnon*. Notice two other remarks made by Thayer. First, in the preliminary remarks he says that in the time of Homer, at least 800 B.C., *deipnon* referred to breakfast. But, concerning breakfast "the Greeks afterwards call to *ariston*. . . designating as to *deipnon* the evening meal or supper." That is where it stands in the first century.

Liddell & Scott Lexicon, 1852, p. 314, discusses *deipnon*, showing the changes in words and their applications.

By the first century they point out that *deipnon* meant "the chief meal, answering to our dinner. . . begun towards evening, and often prolonged till night." They also say that in the time of Homer it was used as an equal to either *ariston* or *dorpon*, the latter referring to the evening meal. However, in passage of time from Homer's time *deipnon* came to take the place of

dorpon as the evening meal. So, note under the word *dorpon*, on page 367, that the term referred to the “after noon or evening meal, whether called dinner or supper.”

W.E. Vine's **Expository Dictionary**, p. 416, states that *deipnon* denotes “the chief meal of the day, dinner or supper, taken at or towards evening. . . .” Vine obviously means the same thing by dinner as he does supper, and identifies the time area as “at or towards evening.” **Berry's Lexicon**, located in the back of **Berry's Interlinear**, p. 24, says that *deipnon* means “the chief or evening meal, supper. . . .” **Arndt & Gingrich Lexicon**, p. 173, says it means “dinner, supper, the main meal (toward evening. . . .” **Abbot-Smith Lexicon**, p. 100, simply says “the chief meal of the day, dinner, supper.”

What these authorities reveal is that the first meal of the day, whether a feast or common meal, either breakfast or lunch, was called ariston. Bullinger is specific that it was “always” the first meal of the day. The second meal of the day occurred any time after noon to late night, covering a possible period of several hours, and was called deipnon. This explains Bullinger's meaning of “whenever eaten,” yet confining it to that period of after noon to late evening, but generally “toward evening.” One thing is clear, deipnon was not eaten in the morning. The first meal of the day, the morning meal, was called ariston, not deipnon.

DEIPNON AND THE LORD'S“SUPPER”

There are two errors that have been presented based on the word deipnon (supper) as it relates to the Lord's Supper. The first is that it confines us to eating the Lord's Supper to night time only. The second is that it confines a Christian to eating the Lord's Supper to only once each Sunday; it would be a sin to eat it more than once on a Sunday. However, both of these errors have the same basic approach in that they try to apply literal characteristics to a word that the scriptures do not. If we begin indiscriminately to apply literal characteristics to a figurative use of a word, we fall into grave error, making laws where there are none. An example of this sort of thing is found in trying to apply literal characteristics to the word “circumcision” in the New Testament in order to get infant sprinkling authorized. The Lexicons we have noticed tell us several things about the word deipnon.

1. It was the main, most important, meal of the day.
2. That being so, the largest amount of food was served and eaten.
3. Likewise, the largest variety was served.
4. It was to satisfy physical hunger.
5. It was eaten every day.

6. It was eaten anytime after noon to late night, generally evening.

The problem involves applying such characteristics from the literal to the figurative when we confront the Lord's "supper." Our only guide, of course, will be the application the Scriptures make.

It's obvious from I Corinthians 11:20-33 that the word is used figuratively. The Lord's Supper is contrasted with "each one taketh. . .his own supper." Their *own*, as versus the supper belonging to the Lord. Their own literal, ordinary deipnon, as versus the Lord's. But, there are some very real contrasts between the two.

Points 2 and 4 go together in that the largest amount of food was served and eaten in order to satisfy hunger. That is naturally involved in the "main meal" of the day, as it would be with our own today. However, the Lord's Supper was not intended to do that. Paul said in vss. 22 and 34 that if any one was hungry he was to eat at home. What they were to eat in the Lord's Supper was small in amount, and certainly not enough to satisfy hunger.

Point 3 notes that the largest variety of food would be served at the "main meal" of the day, as would be more time in preparation of such a meal. When we look at the Lord's Supper we find only two elements, bread and fruit of the vine, eaten in small amounts. See vss. 23-26.

Point 5 is that the deipnon, main meal of the day, was eaten **every day**. However, the Lord has limited us to just one day of the week for eating His Supper. Matthew 26:29 shows the Lord had a particular day in mind for that, and Acts 20:7 is an example of disciples doing that very thing. That day is Sunday.

Point 6 shows some time element in the deipnon. However, though a particular day is specified by the Lord for His Supper, no particular time on that day is. The Lord left it as generic authority. This is further emphasized in I Corinthians 11:25-26. **As often as** is indefinite of repetition, and hence generic. The verbs in vs. 26 are **Present Subjunctive** in form. **Winer's Grammar**, p. 308, says that it refers to a "frequently repeated action not limited to any particular time. . ." No particular time or frequency is given by the Lord outside of confining it to the first day of the week.

That leaves us with the first point given, and the only item that can be applied to the Lord's Supper — **main meal**. The Lord's Supper is something eaten, and it is very important. This is clearly seen from all passages relating to it, especially I Corinthians 11:20-34, and these are the only characust as well close the morning hours before noon as a time of eating. To attempt to base either position on deipnon is to misuse the word of God and makes laws where teristics of deipnon that are applied in Scripture.

We cannot pick and choose the literal meanings that we want and apply them. To insist on only once a day would jHe has not.

I Corinthians 11:26 and “Proclaim”

The Lord's Supper is an important and prominent activity. Like everything else we do as Christians we must observe it correctly whether it be the elements, time, attitude, or arrangement. I Corinthians 11:26 gives us some instruction on more than one necessary item. It says,

“For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.” But, just what does “proclaim” mean in this passage?

The original term is **katangelo**, a compound of **angelo**, meaning a message, proclamation, and a preposition, **kata**, meaning down or down to. **Angello** by itself is not found in the New Testament; it appears compounded with some preposition only. Two related words are found in the New Testament, **angellia** and **angellos**. W.E. Vine, *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, page 735 says that **angellia** is “akin to angello, to bring a message, proclaim, denotes a message, proclamation, news.” On the next page he says that **angellos** means “a messenger, an angel, one sent.”

Angello can be compounded with any preposition, each compounded word carrying the significance of the preposition used. Some of these distinctions are discussed in the following from the commentary on I John, (1:5) by B.F. Westcott, page 15.

“*Angellein* simply ‘to bring tidings’ occurs only in John 20:18. *Anangellein* to report, with the additional idea of bringing the tidings *up to* or *back to* the person receiving them. *Apangellein* to announce with a distinct reference to the *source* or *place from* which the message comes. *Katagellein* to proclaim with authority, as commissioned to spread the tidings *throughout* those who hear them. In *anangellein* the recipient, in *apangellein* the origin, in *katagellein* the relation of the bearer and hearer of the message, are respectively most prominent.”

Our word in I Corinthians 11:26, **katangelo** (*katangellein*), is specific as to some proclamation or message that is given to another “down to.” This is further seen from the Lexicons.

PARKHURST LEXICON, page 293: “to declare plainly, openly, or aloud, to proclaim, to preach, publish.” Then follows numerous passages that contain the word, including I Corinthians 11:26.

LIDDELL & SCOTT, page 886: Though primarily classical Greek gives “announce, proclaim, declare,” as the meaning, with only a passing reference to the New Testament.

W.E VINE'S EXPOSITORY DICTIONARY OF N.T. WORDS, page 888: “to declare, proclaim, is translated to proclaim in the R.V., for A.V., to shew, in Acts 16:17; 26:23; I Cor. 11:26, where the verb makes clear that the partaking of the elements at the Lord's Supper is a proclamation (an evangel) of the Lord's death.”

CRITICAL LEXICON by Bullinger, page 697: “to bring word down to *any one*, i.e. bring home to him; hence, to proclaim somewhither. *The word may contain a hint at the unknown contents of the proclamation, as well as an increased emphasis of the verb.*”

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON by Cremer, page 30: “to publish somewhither, to proclaim. . .The word may contain a hint of the unknown purport of the proclamation and a strengthening of the simple verb; cf. Rom. 1:8, I Cor. ix. 14, xi.26.” The term *angelo* by itself, as we have seen, means to proclaim, announce, or publish. When it is compounded with the preposition *kata* the meaning of the word is strengthened and emphasized.

VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT by Moulton & Milligan, page 326 “The official sense of the word 'make proclamation with authority,' which appears in its NT occurrences (see Westcott on I Jn 1:5), is very evident in such a psephisma as. . .”

There are three other references of importance I will get to in a moment. These lexical authorities all insist that the term means to announce, publish, openly proclaim something that is done from one person to another. It is not done to oneself, nor by oneself alone. It can only be done with someone else involved.

CELEBRATE?

It has been argued that the word “proclaim” in I Corinthians 11:26 only means to “celebrate,” which is something a person can do by himself, eating and drinking alone. One would, to himself, celebrate the death of Christ. The word “celebrate” is defined in such a way as to make it possible to do “it” by oneself.

The **Random House Dictionary of the English Language** lists six distinct meanings of the word “celebrate.” Definition number 1 says “to observe (a day) or commemorate (an event) with ceremonies or festivities.” Number 4 says, “to perform with appropriate rites and ceremonies; solemnize.” And, number 6 is even more pointed, “to perform a religious ceremony, esp Mass or the Lord's Supper.” Perhaps any one of these can be applied to something a person can do by himself. Hence, it is argued that the Lord's Supper is just such a celebration.

As authority for such a conclusion, two references are cited. The first is **Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon** that primarily analyzes and lists grammatical word forms. Under our term here, ***katangelo***, it just says, “to announce, proclaim, Ac. 13:38; in N.T., to laud, celebrate, Ro. 1.8.”

However, that is hardly an adequate explanation, especially in view of the passage cited, Romans 1:8, which says:

“First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is proclaimed throughout the whole world.”

We could hardly substitute the word “celebrate” in this passage for “proclaimed,” meaning to perform some religious ceremony. The term “laud” might be used, but that takes us back to something declared to others.

The second reference used is **Thayer's Lexicon**, page 330. Thayer is just partially quoted and then misrepresented by those who want the Lord's Supper to be something one can do alone. Here is how it's done, quoting Thayer: “with the included idea of celebrating, commending, openly praising . . . Ro. i.8. . . I Co. xi.26.” The word “celebrating” is lifted out and defined, either by statement or implication, as something that could be done by oneself, no other person being present. But, that misrepresents what Thayer said. Notice that Thayer said, “with the included idea.” Well, *included in what?* He means *included in the definition of the word that he previously gave*, which is “**to announce, declare, promulgate, make known; to proclaim publicly, publish.**” Any idea of “celebrating” must be within the context of this definition. Indeed, meaning number 2 in the Dictionary previously noted says that *celebrate* means “*to make known publicly; proclaim.*”

Let's round out the sense and harmony of all this with the **Arndt & Gingrich Lexicon**, page 410. After defining the term to mean “proclaim solemnly,” it comments “you proclaim (by celebrating the sacrament rather than with words) the Lord's death I Cor. 11:26.”

I Corinthians 11:26 says that when we eat and drink we proclaim. And this is how the word “celebrate” got into the subject in the Lexicons. They did not intend to mean by the word that just a private subjective observance of the elements representing the Lord's death is all that's necessary. This is why in the King James translates the phrase reads “ye do *shew* the Lord's death.” To *show* is to present it to others by what you do rather than what you say. *Young's Literal Translation* says you “show forth.” The *Estes Translation* says “you announce.” The *Paraphrased New Testament* says “For every time you eat this bread and drink this cup you are re-telling the message of the Lord's death, that he died for you. Do this until he comes again.” Nearly all other translations use the word “proclaim.” None that I know of use the word “celebrate” to translate ***katangelo***.

Let's look at the passage again. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." "As often as" refers to indefinite repetition of something done. But, it also includes the idea that every time it is done some requirement must be met. As far as this passage is concerned, at whatever interval the Lord's Supper is eaten, every time it is eaten, it is done in such a way that "proclaims" the Lord's death. The arrangement for eating the Lord's Supper must involve more than one person; a Christian cannot eat it by himself.

I CORINTHIANS 10-11

Division was a major subject in I Corinthians. Their divisions took many forms, detailed from the first chapter. In chapter 10, Paul insists they cannot take part in idolatrous worship; they were having communion with idols and hence, demons. He argues that their communion (participation in) was with the blood and body of Christ by drinking the cup and eating the bread, vss. 16-17. There are some things we must keep clear about this section.

1. The Lord's Supper is viewed from the *spiritual and figurative* side.

(a) The word "communion" means "participation in." We have participation in the blood of Christ by drinking the cup we bless. We have participation in the body of Christ by eating the bread.

(b) In this spiritual view, we (the church) are said to be *one bread*. The figurative nature of Paul's point should be evident. Not only are we one bread, but also *one body* because we all eat the one bread, another figurative idea.

(c) A Jew who ate the sacrifices offered in the temple had a participation in the offering made on the altar; it was for that purpose. The heathen who ate the sacrifices offered to idols for the purpose of such participation had communion with demons. The Christian who drank the cup and ate the bread had participation in the blood and body of Jesus; he further declares that doing so shows we are one body, one "bread." This is figurative and spiritual. The Christian could not drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; he could not partake of the table of the Lord, and the table of demons.

2. In chapter 11, the problems there, and the cure for them, are detailed. Seeing that those who participate in the cup and bread of the

Lord are ONE bread, ONE body, the actual eating and drinking arrangement must show that as well.

(a) Verses 17-18, 20, 33 show specifically that an assembly of the Corinthian church is understood. A clear distinction is made between doing certain things together as a local assembly, and doing things at home. Verses 22 and 34 say this. It is a distinction that started at the beginning, Acts 2, where it is specified that common meals were eaten *at home*, a social setting, yet they had the Lord's Supper from the beginning. A year after the Corinthian letters, Troas "came together" to eat the Lord's Supper, Acts 20:7.

(b) The church was divided instead of being one body. Verse 18 states that divisions existed, *which meant it was not possible to eat the Lord's Supper*. The divisions he was talking about had to do with the Lord's Supper itself. Unless *everything done* is according to God's rules, it cannot be called "The Lord's Supper," verse 20.

(3) To eat in an "unworthy manner" brings destruction. "Unworthy manner," as we have seen in preceding material, refers to the way something is done. Corinth was eating in an "unworthy manner."

(c) First, their attitude was wrong; it was wrong toward the Lord, the elements, their part in what was to be done, the nature of the local church and toward their brethren. Second, they had substituted a common meal for the elements of the supper. Third, they were not eating even that together, but rather without regard to any others and eating as soon as ("before other") they arrived. Paul corrects each of these errors.

(d) First, he corrects their attitude by all the statements he makes through verse 34. Second, he points out that common meals are to be eaten in a social setting, "at home," as versus eating the Lord's Supper. By contrast eating the Lord's Supper is not placed in a social setting, but rather a religious and spiritual one, a local church assembly for that purpose, verses 22, 34. Third, he specifies that when they came together to eat the Lord's Supper, they were to do it together, verse 33. This is a reflection of the oneness of the brethren in partaking of the one bread, being one bread, one body as versus division as it had been. This is the reason for the statements of verses 29 and 31 where the "body" refers to "ourselves," the local church.

(e) This oneness of the body is applied again in chapter 12. There was division involving spiritual gifts. There, the local church is likened again to a body with different members having different abilities. Each is told to use his own ability together with others that there be "no schism in

the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another," verse 25.

(f) We may also note chapter 14 and the proper use of spiritual gifts in an assembly. There he mentions the "whole church" being assembled together. There was division in such an assembly there; Paul corrects it. He concludes by saying: "But let all things be done decently and in order." verse 40. This is to characterize all assemblies of the saints. At Troas, Acts 20, the disciples came together for the expressed purpose of breaking bread. It was a completed assembly and the Lord's Supper was eaten before Paul spoke to them (See the section on The Assembly At Troas in this material). They ate together; they were one body. They did just what Paul instructed the Corinthians to do.

Letter written in response to questions asked by a preacher

I'm pleased to give attention to the questions you raised.

First, ***fellowship, communion***. There is no ethereal condition wherein I am "in fellowship" with some Christian somewhere in the world about whom I know nothing and probably will never even know exists. We may both be in fellowship with God; we may have a "common" (*koinos*) salvation, Jude 3, and a "common" (*koinos*) faith, Titus 1:4, ("common" in both passages is an adjective, modifying *salvation* and *faith*). But, we can only be "in fellowship" (*koinonia*) *with one another* if we are doing something *actively* and *jointly* together in the work, worship or service to God; some kind of joint *action* is required.

Perhaps this is best seen in I John 1:5-10 that speaks of our fellowship with God. Verse 7 is not talking about fellowship between Christians. The entire context refers to our relationship with God. If we walk in darkness and say we have fellowship with God, we lie. If we walk with God in the light, then we have fellowship "one with another," i.e., each individual has fellowship with God. "One with another" does not mean Christian to Christian but Christian with God. Walk in darkness and there is no fellowship with God; walk in the light where God is and each individual has fellowship with Him. Understanding our fellowship with other Christians is found in other passages than this one, though we cannot have true fellowship with others unless each one first has fellowship with God. The fellowship does not exist without "walking" with Him; it is active! "*Shall two walk together, except they have agreed?*" Amos 3:2.

As Christians, we hold in common everything God has taught us to believe and to do. A Christian in Russia is obligated to do what I am to do in the U.S. But, when the Christian in Russia sings spiritual songs and I sing spiritual songs in the U.S., we are not having fellowship with one another. When the Russian Christian prays in Russia and I pray here, we both have communication and fellowship with the Father but not with one another.

In I Corinthians 10, the word “communion” is *koinonia*, fellowship, joint participation. The Lord’s Supper is something that all Christians everywhere are to eat. The emphasis is on each one eating and in the eating, there is communion with what is eaten and with the Lord or demons, etc. Each Israelite who offered at the altar had communion with the altar. Gentiles who offered at, and ate of, the pagan altar had communion with demons. Christians are not to have communion with the table of demons, not to drink the cup of demons but rather partake of the table of the Lord and drink the cup of the Lord. This instruction is for every Christian and views the universal church because it is for every individual Christian, Paul included. Beyond that, these passages are not talking about joint participation *between* Christians.

Notice this in I John 1:5-10. John includes himself, just as Paul does in I Corinthians, by saying “we.” It was something that should exist with all Christians. Note also what John says in verses 3-4 - “that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ: and these things we write that our joy may be made full.” The fellowship, *koinonia*, that John had with the Christians was in his writing to them this information. But, he also said that “our fellowship is with the Father....” All of them had fellowship with the Father but only had fellowship with one another when they acted jointly in something.

See also Philippians 4:15 where Paul says no church had fellowship with him in giving and receiving (funds) except Phillipi. In Romans 15:26, Paul says that it was the good pleasure of “Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution” for the poor in Jerusalem. “Contribution” is from *koinonia*, fellowship. Though he lumps all of the churches of Macedonia and Achaia, in application, each churches’ contribution was distinctly its own. I Corinthians 16:2-3. Their contribution was not combined with the churches of Achaia as a collective effort of churches, as institutional brethren claimed. This was concurrent, not collective, action. Paul could order the collection at Corinth but beyond that had no control. Corinth had to approve who would take “your bounty” to Jerusalem.

Consider that the institutional liberals argued for a universal fellowship that would justify their centralized projects. The Christian Church argued

the same. Since all Christians and churches equally have the duty to spread the gospel, then we can do it in any way we please. This is the same approach of those who defend individually supported missionary societies. The liberals argued on the basis of the “we” of Galatians 6:10 that they could do whatever they wanted to with institutional and cooperative projects. “We” are to do these things so “we” can do it in any way we want. However, other passages bearing on the subjects must be considered.

Need I point out that if we ignore chapter 11 and focus on the “we” of chapter 10, then individual action is all we must consider and it doesn't matter what arrangement there is for the Lord's Supper. We can eat it any way we please. There is no need whatever for a local church assembly. We can eat it alone somewhere and are still having “fellowship” with all other Christians as well as the Lord. We can take it on a trip, out fishing and hunting, alone or in any group arrangement. If Paul's inclusion of himself in “we” means that only one person can eat the supper on Sunday evening then a local assembly is not necessary to begin with. That's concluding that Paul was in Ephesus but was having joint communion with the Corinthians in eating the Supper. He didn't even have to be present with them to have that fellowship which means that the members of a congregation do not have to be present in an assembly to have fellowship with the others in eating the Supper on either Sunday morning or night. Once you require a local church assembly in order to have the Supper, the argument on “we” breaks down. Chapter eleven specifies the arrangement for partaking of the table of the Lord properly. Is the eating individual? Certainly, but it is eating *together with others* in a local church assembly on the first day of the week.

In a discussion several years ago with another preacher, he contended that when only one person eats on Sunday night that the rest of the people are also “eating” because of their quiet fellowship with the person eating. Thus, the Lord's Supper was being eaten in fulfillment of the Lord's instruction. If that is the case, why could we not have only one person actually eat the Supper on Sunday morning while the rest have “fellowship” by quietly following what is being done, like in public prayer. The rest really do not have to actually eat. Why not apply that to singing, also. One person, or a small group, could sing while the rest listen reverently and be edified. The singers teach and edify themselves and everyone else. There is “fellowship” in singing. In each instance, they are jointly doing something together.

Let's explore that some more. In singing, "we" are instructed to sing. Because someone misses the morning assembly where singing is done, can we ask those who were not there in the morning to sing solos or quartets at the evening assembly? Can we ignore the specific instruction regarding reciprocal singing by the local assembly? Can we sing country western or pop songs on Sunday night since we have already had psalms and hymns in the morning? Can we use instrumental music on Sunday night because we sang without the instrument on Sunday morning. Or, must we observe all specific instruction about congregational singing every time we do it.

I have a good friend, fellow gospel preacher, who contends that the evening assembly is just an extension of the morning meeting, assemblies in the first century were all day, drop in drop out meetings so that disciples would eat the supper whenever they got there whether a single individual or any combination. That not only destroys the unity of the Supper in I Cor. 11 but also emphasizes and sanctifies the Supper by geographical location alone. One must just come to the "building" to do something he could just as well have done at home and still had "fellowship" with all other Christians. But, why not, if the "we" of chapter 10 makes the Supper a matter of just universal "fellowship?" I don't think we can insist on a local assembly for the Supper while taking a position negates the need for that assembly by making the eating one of just universal "fellowship." If it is a matter of local fellowship, then it must remain local fellowship. Opening it up to some universal, spiritual, "fellowship" between Christians with only one person eating on Sunday night is an entirely different concept than that of Sunday morning.

The point is, some passages may be general in speaking of all Christians or all churches but in application will be carried out in some specific manner according to all passages dealing with that subject. I Corinthians 11 details how, in what manner, the Lord's Supper is to be eaten; it is specific. It is eaten by a local church assembly that is a reflection of the unity of the local body of Christ. I point out again, the Supper was not just eaten within a local assembly but by the local assembly. That's the pattern. I have no objection to having the Lord's Supper twice on Sunday ("as often as") but whenever we eat it, *all the specifics* must be observed. Now, what are the specifics? Among those specifics were that they were to come together to eat it and were to eat it together. Were they to do together what they came together to do? Why were the Corinthians to come together to eat the Supper if that was not necessary? It should be eaten on Sunday evening the same way as it is on Sunday morning, just like singing.

Now, in the light of the specifics, is there any passage, anywhere, statement, command, example or necessary inference, that shows the usual Sunday night practice of “serving” the Supper to, perhaps, only one person? (By the way, the Bible does not speak of “serving” the Supper but of eating it). By long standing practice and instruction, most people present are specifically *excluded* from eating. Only a small amount of bread and a few containers of juice are prepared so that only one or a few could possibly eat. A statement is made that “the table is prepared for those who did not eat that morning,” *specifically excluding* most of those present. I have specific authority for what we do on Sunday morning, but I don’t find this practice anywhere in Scripture.