

THIS DO

IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME

**A TREATISE ON THE LORD'S
SUPPER, SETTING FORTH IT'S SCRIPTURAL
DESIGN AND OBSERVANCE**

by Ronny Wade

"This Do In Remembrance Of Me"

A Treatise on the Lord's Supper, Setting Forth Its
Scriptural Design and Observance

by Ronny F. Wade

2nd Edition (2020): Contains all original content with editing to formatting and cover design.

Reprinted by Five Minute Bible Study Publications with permission.

All scriptural references and quotations are taken from the *King James Version* unless otherwise indicated.

"THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME"

The above words were spoken by Jesus in Luke 22:19, and repeated by Paul in I Cor. 11:24-25. They have reference to the Lord's Supper. This Supper is without question one of the greatest memorials ever erected. Monuments built by man soon fade and decay, but this one - never. It has stood the test of time and change, and wherever faithful disciples assemble to eat and drink the communion of the body and blood of Christ, it brings afresh to their minds the pain, suffering, and death of a loving Savior.

The purpose of this treatise is to study in detail the design and scriptural observance of the communion. We shall endeavor to "speak where the Bible speaks and remain silent where it is silent," to stand always on a "thus saith the Lord." Because some have failed to do so, this sacred feast has been robbed of its primitive beauty and fundamental significance. In order to be scriptural in serving God and discharging our duty to Him we must follow the Bible pattern given for the observance of the Lord's Supper. Through the following study we hope to discover exactly what that pattern is. So now, if you will, journey back with us to the night of Christ's betrayal when with his disciples He... "took bread."

WHAT IS IT SCRIPTURALLY CALLED?

(1) The Lord's Supper. "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper," (I Cor. 11:20). "Impossible" would be a better word than "not." The real thought of the text is that their behavior (v. 21) made it

impossible to eat the Lord's Supper. But note that "The Lord's Supper" is distinguished from "his own supper."

(2) The Communion. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Communion means a having in common, fellowship, joint participation etc. Thus, we all jointly participate in the communion service. Just as Jesus and his disciples shared this sacred feast the night it was instituted, so we today share it with one another in each congregation of disciples.

ITS PURPOSE

Why do we observe the Lord's Supper? What is its purpose? The answers to these questions lie in the words of Jesus and Paul. Let us notice them.

(1) The communion looks backward — to remember Christ. "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, this is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me," (Luke 22:19). "After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me," (I Cor. 11:25). The above verses tell us why this is a memorial feast. It looks back to the time of Christ's death and suffering, ever keeping before our minds the sacrifice He made for us there. Man many times is prone to forget; God, realizing this, left us a reminder — The Lord's Supper.

(2) The communion looks inward — self examination. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," (I Cor. 11:28). I especially appreciate the above precept for two reasons. First, it relieves me of any responsibility in your examination; and second, it relieves you of any responsibility in examining me. Each one must examine himself. Why? Hear Paul: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body," (I Cor. 11:29). You will notice that the word "unworthily," an adverb, is used instead of "unworthy," an adjective. Unworthily tells how we do something. The idea that we must be worthy to partake of the communion is not taught by Paul here at all. He merely has reference to the frame of mind we are in, and the purpose behind our participation — "not discerning the Lord's body." In other words, if we make a common meal out of this sacred feast and indulge in it for any other reasons than those given by the scripture, we eat and drink damnation to ourselves.

(3) The communion looks forward — until Jesus comes. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," (I Cor. 11:26). We not only look backward to his death, but we also look forward in fond anticipation of his return to receive the faithful. Each time we partake of the communion, we are reminded that Jesus will come again.

(4) The communion looks outward — proclaiming Christ's death. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," (I Cor. 11:26). The word "show" means "to declare, proclaim, preach, and speak forth."

Thus, every time we observe the communion, we are declaring the death of Jesus till he comes again.

WHEN SHOULD IT BE OBSERVED?

"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," (Acts 20:7). The custom of the early Christians was to assemble every first day of the week to "break bread." This was done *every* first day of the week. Someone may object that the word "every" is not found in the passage. This we grant, but remember the Jews were commanded to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. And although the Bible does not say "*every* sabbath day" we know it included "every" sabbath day. Since every week had a seventh or sabbath day in it, just as surely as it came around the Jews observed it. We can also be sure that since every week has a "first day," when it came around the disciples assembled to break bread. Ancient history will bear us out in this, we quote: "On the Lord's Day all Christians in the city or country meet together, because that is the day of the Lord's resurrection; and then we read the apostles and prophets. This being done, the President makes an oration to the assembly to exhort them to imitate and practice the things which they have heard and then we all join in prayer, and after that we celebrate the Lord's Supper," (Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., Vol. 1, p. 135). Also from Eusebius we read, "From the beginning the Christians assembled on the first day of the week, called by them the Lord's Day to read the Scriptures, to preach, and to celebrate the Lord's Supper." The practice of observing the Lord's Supper quarterly, semi-annually, or on any day other than the first day of the week is foreign to the Bible.

HOW IT IS TO BE OBSERVED

To clearly get before us the situation, let us read Matthew and Mark's account of the Lord's Supper. Mt. 26:26-28, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, 'Take, eat; this is my body.' And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.'" Mk. 14:22-24, "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, 'Take, eat: this is my body.' And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, 'This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.'"

From the above we learn that while Jesus was eating the Passover with his disciples he...took bread.

TOOK BREAD

What kind of bread you ask? The answer lies in the circumstances surrounding Christ's eating. They were eating the Passover. During the Passover, no leaven was to enter their house. Ex. 12:15, "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." It would seem evident from this that Jesus used unleavened bread, unless of course we would accuse him of breaking the law. This we feel sure he didn't do.

JESUS TOOK ONE LOAF

The record says, "Jesus took bread." The Greek word translated bread is *artos* in Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22. It means and is translated many times when used in the singular simply – "a loaf." The RV, RSV, and the ASV all render the passage, "He took a loaf." The fact that Jesus took only one loaf of bread is significant for several reasons. First of all, it sets a Bible pattern for us to follow. Had Jesus taken several loaves or a loaf for each disciple, we could claim justification for doing likewise. Since, however, He used only one, it behooves us to follow his example.

Secondly, since Christ had but one physical body, and the bread is to represent that body, it logically follows that we should use but one loaf. When a congregation of disciples uses a plurality of loaves in the communion, whose bodies do they represent? Christ had but one; therefore, we need but one loaf to represent it. Thirdly, there is but one spiritual body, the church. (Eph. 4:4; Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22-23). In I Cor. 10:17 Paul says, "For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." Our writer, endeavoring to teach those people a valuable truth, reasons from the known to the unknown. It was commonly known that each Lord's Day in the communion they used but one loaf; thus, Paul uses this to teach them that because they all partook of one loaf, they were one body. This fact symbolized their unity in Christ. Why, then, will men try and destroy the beautiful symbolism contained in the "one loaf" by using more than one? But, next, let us notice how:

JESUS BROKE BREAD

"Jesus took bread, blessed it, and brake it," (Mt. 26:26). The question of how Jesus broke bread is a much controverted one. However, by noticing his example as well as several other pertinent passages I believe we can reach a scriptural conclusion.

(1) What did Jesus do? There are two questions that we must consider here: did Jesus break bread for himself, or did He break bread for all the assembled disciples? To better understand and answer these questions, let us notice Lk. 22:19, "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them saying, 'This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.'" After blessing the bread Jesus broke it, gave it to his disciples and said, "This do." "This" is a demonstrative pronoun which has for its antecedent the action of Christ. In other words, Jesus is asking his disciples to do as he had done. However, if Jesus had taken a loaf of bread and broken it in two (in the middle), it would have been impossible for his disciples to have done likewise. Or, if he had taken a loaf of bread and broken it into a hundred pieces, it would have been impossible for the disciples to do that unless they had another loaf. But if Jesus took a loaf of bread and broke a piece off of it, and then asked his disciples to do likewise – this they could do. Let us go to other passages and see if this is what actually happened.

(2) In Acts 2, after three thousand souls were added unto them we read in verse 42, "And they (three thousand plus the apostles) continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine and

fellowship, and breaking of bread..." This shows that all broke bread.

(3) Acts 20:7, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread Paul preached unto them." The disciples at Troas came together to eat the Lord's Supper, and when they did, they all broke bread. We could never imply from this passage that one man broke a loaf into in the middle or that one man broke a loaf into many pieces. The breaking here was performed by each communicant just as it was done the night when Jesus instituted it.

(4) I Cor. 10:16, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Notice "we break" not someone for us, but "we." Verse 17 identifies the "we" for us, notice, "For we being many are...one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." This should forever settle the dispute. We all partake of the bread by all breaking and eating. If one can break for us, then one can partake for us. If not, why not? The foregoing arguments lead to the irresistible conclusion that Jesus took bread, blessed it, broke off a piece of it, ate, gave to His disciples and they did likewise. But now let us consider:

THE CUP OF THE LORD

We come now to a study of the cup of the Lord. The divine record says, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it,'" (Mt. 26:27). "And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it," (Mk. 14:23). The word "cup" used by Jesus comes from the Greek word *poterion*, which means "a drinking vessel." The following definitions are given by *Thayer*

in his Greek dictionary: "A cup, a drinking vessel," (p. 533). "The thing out of which one drinks," (p. 189). "The vessel out of which one drinks," (p. 510). From the above it is evident that the Lord took a literal cup or drinking vessel. It is also significant that he took only one. Cup is used in the singular. This drinking vessel which Jesus used also contained something: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," (Mt. 26:29). From this we see that the drinking vessel used by Jesus contained the fruit of the vine. Now the fruit of the vine in the cup was not the cup, as some falsely reason. The cup Jesus took was a drinking vessel, a solid. In the cup (solid) there was fruit of the vine (liquid). What then, is the cup of the Lord? The cup of the Lord is a drinking vessel containing fruit of the vine, which is sanctified by prayer and thanksgiving.

For some time now there has been disagreement over the number of drinking vessels to be used in the distribution of the fruit of the vine. Some claim that the cup means nothing, and therefore as many as are desired can be scripturally used. With this we disagree. We believe that the Bible proves conclusively that one cup should be used in each congregation of disciples. It is generally agreed that the Bible may teach a thing either by divine command, approved example, or necessary inference. It is usually conceded that a thing need-be taught by only one of these ways for it to be binding upon us today. But, we shall endeavor to prove that the use of one cup in each congregation for the distribution of the fruit of the vine is taught not only by one, but by all three, i.e. approved example, divine command, and necessary inference.

ONE CUP IS TAUGHT BY EXAMPLE

Jesus used one cup. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it,'" (Mt. 26:27). The RV and ASV render it, "And he took a cup." "And he took the cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it," (Mk. 14:23). The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders Mk. 14:23, "They all drank out of it," that is, the cup. But notice again I Cor. 11:25, "After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.'" Could language be plainer than this? Dear reader, could anyone read the above verses and by the farthest stretch of the imagination get more than one cup out of them? Certainly not. The example of our Lord is one cup containing fruit of the vine.

ONE CUP IS TAUGHT BY COMMAND

Mt. 26:27, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, 'Drink ye all of it.'" *Goodspeed's* translation says, "Ye must all drink from it." This is a plain simple command from Jesus to his disciples. Did they understand? Let us see. Mk. 14:23, "And they all drank of it," or, "They all drank from it," (*Goodspeed*). It is impossible to obey the Lord's command when individual cups are used. You cannot "drink from it" when you use them.

In I Cor. 11:2 we read, "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." In these few words the apostle commands these brethren to keep the ordinances just as he

delivered it to them. He is forbidding a change in the divinely appointed procedure. What is it Paul? Notice: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread..." V. 25, "And he also took the cup..." In short, what he says is this: "You brethren keep the ordinances like I delivered them to you, for what I delivered I received from the Lord – and, what I received from the Lord was: 'He took the cup.'" Notice cup, not cups. I ask you: can we obey Christ and use more than He or Paul authorized?

ONE CUP TAUGHT BY NECESSARY INFERENCE

Having already proved the use of one cup by example and command, we come now to our last point of proof, necessary inference. By this we mean that the scriptures necessarily infer the use of one cup. Let us notice: I Cor. 11:26, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." The expression "drink this cup" is figurative. The figure of speech involved is metonymy. "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which the name of one object is used for that of another which it clearly suggests." Such as, "container for the thing contained," (Tanner, *Composition and Rhetoric*). In other words we, "drink the cup" by drinking its contents. However, we cannot drink a cup unless there is a cup present, so when Paul said "drink this cup" he infers by his language that a cup is present. And we might add a real literal cup. If we wanted to suggest more than one cup we would say "drink the cups." It is significant however that Paul did not do this. Thus, one cup is taught by necessary inference.

TO FOLLOW JESUS AND PAUL, I MUST USE ONLY ONE CUP

We now invite your attention to another series of arguments based upon the above proposition. Please notice carefully.

(1) Christ took one cup. "And he took the cup," (Mt. 26:27); "And he took the cup," (Mk. 14:23); "Likewise also the cup after supper," (Lk. 22:20); "After the same manner also he took the cup," (I Cor. 11:25).

(2) He gave thanks for one cup. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks," (Mt. 26:27); "And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks," (Mk. 14:23).

(3) We give thanks for one cup. "The cup of blessing which we bless," (I Cor. 10:16).

(4) Jesus gave one cup to His disciples. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them," (Mt. 26:26); "He gave it to them," (Mk. 14:23).

(5) Jesus called the contents of the one cup his blood. "This is my blood," (Mt. 26:28); "This is my blood," (Mk. 14:24).

(6) Jesus commanded His assembled disciples to drink one cup. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it,'" (Mt. 26:27); "Drink from it," (*Goodspeed*).

(7) The disciples obeyed and all drank of one cup. "And he took the cup and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them and they all drank of it," (Mk. 14:23), or they "all drank from it" or "they all drank out of it."

(8) The communicants of an assembly are admonished to drink of one cup. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup," (I Cor. 11:28). From the above arguments, it is evident that if I follow the Bible only, I will use only one cup in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

Since, however, there is disagreement over these issues we feel it only right that we notice:

SOME OBJECTIONS

As is usually the case with controverted subjects, there are always objections raised by the opposition. While we feel that many of these are not even worthy of consideration, we will mention just a few.

"DIVIDE IT AMONG YOURSELVES"

In Luke 22:17 Jesus said, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves.'" Some after reading this say, "We are at liberty as to how this dividing is done." "And," they continue, "since Christ couldn't divide a literal cup, it is alright to use individual cups." They seemingly forget that when Jesus said, "Divide it," he had reference to the contents of the cup. And that the language involved is a metonymy. How did they actually divide the cup?

Let the Bible answer it. "They all drank of it," (Mk 14:23). The dividing was done by each disciple drinking out of the one cup, and in no other way. We divide the cup by sharing its contents. However, this argument does those who use individual cups no good at all, for they themselves fail to practice it. Each communicant has nothing to do with the division of the cup as they claim it should be. Before they ever get to church someone squirts a little grape juice into some containers and all is prepared before they ever arrive. So why the objection?

THE CUP CHRIST USED

In a vain attempt to discredit the use of one cup, many contend that we must use the very cup Christ used. This is not true for several reasons. Their contention is that if we are going to use one cup because Christ did, then we must use the same cup he did. However, they use bread and the fruit of the vine because he did but don't insist on using the same bread and fruit of the vine. Although we cannot use the same bread and fruit of the vine that Christ used, we can use some bread and fruit of the vine for the same purpose. Likewise, while we cannot use the original cup that he used, we can use another one for the same purpose.

SANITATION

Some claim that one cup is unsanitary. They say, "I wouldn't want to drink after that person," etc. Others are afraid that they would catch some terrible disease. It seems to me that if more people were concerned about doing the will of God than catching a disease they would be better off. And besides this, surely Jesus knew what He was doing when He instituted the

communion. Had there been any danger involved in using one cup He would have done differently. However, for those who are concerned about sanitation we include the following from *The Pathfinder Magazine*, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1944: "Sacred tradition of the common communion cup which dates back to the upper room in Jerusalem has been freed of the oft repeated charge of being a 'germ carrier' by scientific research of two University of Chicago professors."

"In a report of the *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, Dr. William Burrows, associate professor of bacteriology, and Dr. Elizabeth Hammons, instructor in the Walter G. Zoller Dental Clinic, point out that heavy metals, particularly silver, have long been known to have a bactericidal effect, and are self-sterilizing, so that common cups do not spread disease. 'Significant differences between the usual restaurant tableware, and the silver communion cup,' the scientists stated, 'were the bacteria-killing action of silver, and the care with which the sacrament is administered.'"

From the above, it can be seen that even aside from the scriptures, the sanitation argument has no foundation.

LARGE ASSEMBLIES

Some object to the common communion cup by asking, "What about large assemblies?" They reason that the congregation may grow so large that one cup would not be practical. They seemingly forget that we have scriptural authority for more than one assembly for the communion but we have no scriptural authority for more than one cup for the assembly. Herein lies the solution to the supposed problem. Visions of congregations reaching three and four thousand are

foolish anyway, and those who use this argument couldn't point out one that size if they had to.

We could go on and on noting objections to one cup. These, however, are the chief ones used. After all is said and done, the Bible will read the same—the arguments and objections of the opposition to the contrary notwithstanding—“And he took the cup...”

MATTHEW 26:27-28

One of the main arguments that many use in defense of individual cups, is a perversion of the above passage. After reading what is said, they argue that: “The cup is the blood.” Many of them honestly believe Jesus taught this. But re-read this passage and notice what is said. “And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, ‘Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.’” “Cup” here is from *poterion* (“a drinking vessel,” *Thayer*). Jesus took a literal cup, and after giving thanks, he handed it to the disciples and they all shared it by drinking from it, or out of it. The “this” of verse 28 refers by metonymy to the contents of the cup. This is the interpretation given by the men who understand the language of the New Testament. A.T. Robertson says *poterion* (cup) in Matt. 26:27 means a literal cup, while in verse 28 “this” means “contents.” Stringfellow, professor of Greek at Drake University says, “‘This’ (in Greek) is a neuter word, and must refer to ‘cup’ which is also neuter; but the reference is by metonymy to the contents of the cup.”

Thus, the Bible does not teach that the “cup is the blood,” but to the contrary that the contents of the cup, or the

fruit of the vine, represented the blood, while the cup represented the New Testament. Luke 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25.

A SERIES OF FINAL ARGUMENTS

We now offer for your consideration a series of final arguments on the use of one cup in the distribution of the fruit of the vine. They are as follows:

(1) One cup in the communion is the tradition delivered by the apostles. 2 Thess. 3:6, "Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." Never did Paul deliver the tradition of individual cups.

(2) We can use "one cup" and walk by the same rule. Phil. 3:16-17, "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing." The rule by which we walk never mentions more than one cup in the communion.

(3) We can use "one cup" and speak as the oracles of God. I Pet. 4:11, "If any man speaks, let him speak as the oracles of God." The oracles of God say "cup" not "cups."

(4) "One cup" is a plant of God. Mt. 15:13, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." God never planted, recommended, nor authorized more than one cup in the communion.

(5) "One cup" is a good work. 2 Tim. 3:16-17, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that

the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The scriptures furnish the use of one cup in the communion and no more.

(6) The use of "one cup" is of faith. Rom. 10:17, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

(7) Only the use of "one cup" in an assembly "pertains to life and godliness." 2 Pet. 1:3, "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertains unto life and godliness."

(8) We can use "one cup" and have unity because division is condemned, I Cor. 1:10. However, those who use more than one cup cannot find their practice in the Bible.

(9) We can use "one cup" and worship God in truth. John 4:24, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and in truth." What is the truth? "Thy word is truth," (Jno. 17:17). But the Word teaches the use of one cup, not a plurality. Therefore, to worship God in truth, we must use one cup.

(10) "One cup" for an assembly is found in the counsel of God. Paul said in Acts 20:27, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Paul declared the use of one cup, not cups.

The above should be sufficient to show us the unscripturalness of a plurality of cups in the communion. May we ever stand for that which is written, and accept nothing but a "thus saith the Lord" for our faith and practice.

THE FRUIT OF THE VINE

We now come to a study of the contents of the cup. When Jesus took the cup and gave it to his disciples the record says, "They all drank of it," (Mk. 14:23). What did they drink? For an answer to this let us notice Mt. 26:29, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine." Mk. 14:25, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine." From these verses we learn that the drink element used by Jesus is the "fruit of the vine."

The word "fruit" in Mt. 26:29 and Mk. 14:25 is from the Greek word *gennema*. It means "offspring, progeny, fruit, produce" (*Robinsons Lexicon*, p. 141). From this it can be seen that the fruit of the vine is the produce of the vine. What then does the vine produce? Should we go into a vineyard and squeeze the clusters of grapes in our hands, would not the juice that comes forth be the fruit of the vine? Can any man deny that it would be? Surely not. Since this would meet all the scriptural requirements for the drink element in the Lord's Supper, why should we seek something else? Could any man prove that fermented, alcoholic, intoxicating wine is the produce of the vine? Never! There is no vine on earth that produces such. Alcoholic wine is not the fruit of the vine. Could we ever conceive of the Lord using that to represent his blood that "At last biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder?" (Prov. 23:32). Surely not.

In order to prove that fermented wine is not the fruit of the vine, we invite your attention to the following scriptures: Gen. 1:11, "And God said, 'Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself.'" This passage teaches a truth arranged by God in the very beginning of time: the vine tree produces fruit (grapes which yield juice) with seed in itself. No vine

produces intoxicating wine. It is the product of fermentation. In Jno. 15:4 Jesus says, "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." While our Lord is here teaching a spiritual lesson, the figure used is literally true. Unfermented grape juice is produced on a branch in the vine. Fermented wine is not. Fermented wine is produced after the grape juice is pressed from the grapes and the process of fermentation takes place. How then can man claim this to be the fruit of the vine?

LEAVENED AND FERMENTED

If you remember, when we studied the bread we learned that all leaven was to be put out of their houses during the Passover week. From this we concluded that Jesus used unleavened bread in the institution of His Supper. Some, however, who contend for unleavened bread, turn right around and contend for leavened wine. "Leavened" means "fermented." "Leavened, anything leavened or fermented," (*Young's Analytical Concordance*, p. 596). "To leaven" means to "produce fermentation in" (*Webster*). Since leavened wine is fermented wine, and since all leaven was to be put out of their houses, it logically follows that Jesus couldn't have used fermented wine without disobeying the law. We feel sure that he didn't do this.

The New Testament in Modern Speech by Weymouth renders Mt. 26:29, "The produce of the vine." *The Twentieth Century New Testament* renders it, "The juice of the grape." Ferrar Fenten under Mt. 26:29 has this footnote: "It should be noted that no fermented wine might be used by the Hebrews during the Passover week." In restoring the New Testament

pattern for the observance of the communion, let us not forget the "fruit of the vine."

SERVING AT THE TABLE

Serving at the Lord's table is a very serious matter. It is not a time for fun making or levity. The person who serves should make remarks that are appropriate and to the point. It should be remembered that the purpose of these remarks is to call attention to the affairs at hand. It is not a time to review the sermon or rehearse the events of the past week. There is no set prayer that must be prayed. However, it should be remembered what the prayer is for. I have heard some become so entangled in their prayers for the bread and cup that they nearly forgot the real purpose of the prayer. This should not be. By way of suggestion we would point you to the remarks of Paul in I Cor. 10:16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" I can think of no better prayer than this. It is both scriptural and adequate.

Another thing we should avoid is misdefining the emblems. I hear some say, "We thank thee for this cup which is the blood." This is not true. The cup is not the blood. Jesus said in Lk. 22:20, "This cup is the new testament in my blood." The fruit of the vine—not the cup—represents the blood of Christ. Let us be careful to always use scriptural language when referring to the elements of the Lord's Supper.

Because of the seriousness and importance of this feast, the one serving at the table should take great care in the remarks made and the thanks offered. In so doing he can add to its primitive beauty and significance.

CLOSING REMARKS

The object of this short essay has been to present to your minds the scriptural observance of the communion. For many years after the establishment of the church, the communion was observed just as it is presented in the Bible. But as is the case many times, man injects his ways into the things of God, and spiritual disaster is the result. With many, the spirit of innovation is strong, and once a divine pattern is forsaken there seemingly is no place to stop. The communion has been badly handled by those who know more of theology than the Bible. Had we all been more careful to carry out divine commandments, and less interested in our own opinions, all would be better off. Sooner or later someone must say, "Stop." Many times the one who does is branded an "old foggy" or "trouble maker," but nevertheless it must be done. Because we feel this is the case with the communion, we present this tract for your study.

In order to get before your mind the beginning of this departure from the truth we invite you to read the following:

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUPS IN HISTORY

Until near the end of the nineteenth century the chalice, or cup, was used in the distribution of the wine at the Lord's Supper. At that time more attention began to be paid to hygiene, and the use of the common cup began to be unpopular with communicants. Rev. J.G. Thomas, who was both a minister and a physician, was the originator of the idea of individual cups. From his medical practice he learned the uncleanliness and

danger of the common cup and felt that the Lord's Supper could be made more attractive and beautiful by the use of individual cups. His first patent was granted in March 1894. The first individual cup service was held in a little Putnam County Church in Ohio. (*The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* by Thomas H. Warner, p. 237 238)

From the above it can be seen that some 1800 years after Christ, man began to add to the divine pattern. This departure continued and, within a few years, that which was sacred had become the object of man's fancy. Change after change has been made until, at present, it only bears a small resemblance of its former beauty. When will all this stop? Only when men dare to stand upon that which is written, neither adding to nor taking from. We sincerely hope and pray that this tract will cause some to stop and think. Compare these teachings with the Bible. If they are true, accept them; if not, reject them. Remember,

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again
The eternal years of God are hers,
But error wounded writhes in pain, and
Dies among his worshippers.

Since truth never loses by an honest investigation, should the reader desire a more intensive study of this subject, he may obtain other reading material by contacting the author.

A Five Minute Bible Study Publication
by Aaron Battey



For more study materials go to
fiveminutebiblestudy.com