

## THE LORD'S TABLE/SUPPER IN I CORINTHIANS 10–11

*Abstract.* This session, armed with a proper understanding of the vocabulary used in I Cor. 10/11, a proper understanding of the weekly rabbinical communion (to which Paul refers in I Cor. 10), a proper understanding of the Last Passover eaten as a meal-in-common (to which Paul refers in I Cor. 11), together with a proper understanding of the Corinthian assembly as the Corinthian synagogue, exegetes in detail these critical passages. The results of this session include the following: the meal that Paul is dealing with in either chapter is a real meal in the synagogue, and in fact a meal of full provision, showing by two proofs that it is the Pauline modification of the weekly rabbinical communion; the meal Paul is dealing with is absolutely not ritualized or midrashed in any way; and the link between the Last Passover and Body communion is that both are a meal-in-common in which the divisive behavior of Judas at the Passover (the reason for his being identified as the betrayer and his dismissal prior to the second course of the lamb) answers to the divisive behavior of certain parties at the Lord's Table/Supper. It is a further consequence of this session that the traditional communion of a piece of bread and a shotglass of wine/grapejuice cannot be the Lord's Table/Supper and is in fact a violation of the Lord's Supper since such a ritual cannot show His death, burial, and resurrection for His Body in which there is no ritual, holyday, or ceremony. The true Supper, a real meal-in-common, eaten with generosity and apart from any ritual, shows the death of Christ for the Body, shows their covenant relationship with each other, and is His Body's memorial until the joint-Ascension to the Third-Heaven with Christ.

### *General Outline of Session IV:*

- I. Exegesis of I Cor. 10:16–21—Table of the Lord
  - A. Needed Concepts from Session I
  - B. Needed Concepts from Session II
  - C. Exegesis of I Cor. 10:16–18
  - D. Exegesis of I Cor. 10:19–21
  - E. Relationship of I Cor. 10:16–21 to Context.
  - F. Complete Absence of Symbol, Ritual, Ceremony in Lord's Table
- II. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:18–34—Lordly Supper
  - A. Overview of Issues Regarding Lordly Supper
  - B. Needed Concepts from Session I—I.A above
  - C. Needed Concepts from Session II—I.B above
  - D. Needed Concepts from Session III
  - E. Needed Concepts from Section I
  - F. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:17–22
  - G. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:23–25
  - H. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:27–32
  - I. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:33–34
  - J. Complete Absence of Symbol, Ritual, Ceremony in Lordly Supper

## I. Exegesis of I Cor. 10:16–21—Table of the Lord

- A. Needed Concepts from Session I. Certain foundational ideas are needed from Session I; also see [33] and [50].
1. Meaning of lacham and lechem/artos. Unless the context *requires* otherwise (using special modifiers), **lacham** means **to eat** real, hunger-satisfying food; **lechem** means **food** in the general, non-symbolic sense (namely that which is eaten); and **artos**, the word chosen by the rabbis in LXX to (almost bijectively) translate lechem, means **food** in the general, non-symbolic sense. Session I completes the investigation of *every* occurrence of **lechem** and **artos** in the Hebrew and Greek. If the reader does not agree, then the reader must examine the 295 occurrences of **lechem** in the Hebrew OT, the more than 320 occurrences in LXX (274 in the LXX canon), the 99 occurrences of **artos** in the Greek NT, and see for himself/herself. By the normative hermeneutic, or grammatico-historical method, the burden of proof is on those claiming the contrary, and this burden can only be borne by a context of a given usage. The patterns established in Session I are so unmistakable that a “complacent” passage (where the context does not seem very specific) *must* be rendered as we have stated it. (A member of our assembly asked a close Jewish friend what **lechem** meant to a Jew; and the response was “**fruit of the earth**”; and when further asked if **lechem** was used in the sense of “narrow bread” (bread in the modern sense), the response was “*Never*”).
  2. Meaning of lechem paras(h) / artos kla(s)w. In *every case*, **lechem paras(h)/natan** and **artos kla(s)w** mean to **distribute/share food** so as to share a real, hunger-satisfying meal. This was established in Session I by examining *every* occurrence of these phrases in the Hebrew OT, the LXX, and the Greek NT. If the reader does not agree, let him assume the burden of proof. The Jewish friend alluded to in (1) above responded “*Never*” when asked if **lechem paras** meant tearing bread into pieces.
  3. Meaning of barah/berith. **Barah** means to eat, and **berith** means both **meal and covenant**. This was established in Session I and [33] and [50] by examining all the occurrences of barah and berith. Thus **covenant** means a relationship that can be expressed through sharing a meal together. If the reader does not agree, let him assume the burden of proof.
- B. Needed Concepts from Session II. Certain foundational ideas are needed from Session II; also see [33] and [50].
1. Corinthian assembly as the synagogue. The Corinthian assembly was the synagogue, meeting in the synagogue. Recapping the proofs:
    - a. Officers of the synagogue are officers of the assembly: Crispus, Sosthenes, Gaius, Titius Justus, at the least.
    - b. Paul stays in the hotel managed by Titius Justus and overseen by Gaius, who is the host of the assembly. In the context of the day, this must be recognized as rabbinical language describing the hotel of the synagogue.
    - c. Essentially all of the assembly is from the synagogue.
    - d. The Corinthian assembly has Sadduceans in their midst, as was typical of synagogues of the day.
    - e. Unbelieving Jews are in the very midst of the assembly where they can witness the gift of tongues.

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11

- f. The fact that the gift of tongues in this assembly mandated the gift of translation requires that they be in the synagogue, where alone could be found one individual speaking in a tongue unknown to the congregation along with an interpreter.
  - g. Some unlearned persons were in the hotel and hear the prayers in the meeting room and so say "Amen".
2. Hotel / dining hall of the synagogue.
- a. The term synagogue had two usages in the rabbis: specifically the meeting room or sanctuary, and the synagogue building as a whole which included the rooms of hospitality, or **hospital** or **hotel**, in which the assembly and visiting Jews were hosted. In the larger cities, the officer managing the hotel lived in the hotel.
  - b. Luke uses the term synagogue for the sanctuary in Acts 18 and then describes the hotel as jointly-joined with the sanctuary, i.e. as one building. The hotel was managed by Titius Justus apparently under Gaius (Rom. 16:23—Gaius is **host of the Corinthian assembly**, which again proves that assembly is a synagogue).
3. Meaning of koinwnia/'erub. This is the ancient Jewish communion, without ritual and symbols and commentary, by which members of a community or congregation/synagogue, expressed their union with each other through a shared meal of great generosity (double portions) and hunger satisfaction. In such a meal, each commensal (communer) was to have available at least two helpings of each food stuff; and all this food was to eaten in a non-divisive way so that all dealt with each other respectfully and were filled together.
4. Etiquette of koinwnia/'erub. The etiquette required at koinwnia-'erub, as a feast of generosity and commonality, was that commensals would look out for each other and treat each other with respect at the table. *Violation of etiquette resulted in expulsion and excommunication from the table.* Specifically these rules of etiquette include:
- a. Gluttony and gorging and greed are sin.
  - b. *Never* put your hand in the [serving] dish with your neighbor.
  - c. Always wait for others to begin eating, do *not* be the first to reach out your hand.
  - d. Be with drink as with food, looking always to the needs of others.
  - e. If you are the host, always be generous, not miserly, with food for your guests.
- C. Exegesis of I Cor. 10:16–18 (cf. Session II (III.B.5))

**Verse 16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it absolutely-not the KOINWNIA of the blood of Christ? The food which we share, is it not the KOINWNIA of the Body of Christ?**

**Blessing which we bless.** Semitic figure of polyptoton (see [30]), **which we truly bless.** This is analogous to the **cup of benediction** which, when it occurred—with the exception of Passover (see Sessions II, III)—was the last cup of ordinary meals [12, p. 363], funerals [13.7, p. 42], rabbinical communion on the weekly Sabbath [8, p. 202], and other occasions [13.6]. It simply served as the benediction or giving of thanks or "grace" for the meal at the close of the meal. (However, it was not mandatory in all cases as the references show; in particular, it was common but not mandatory for rabbinical communion ('**Erub**.) occurred in each koinwnia/'erub, each festival meal, and four times in the Passover (see Session II and II.C below). This cup for the original audience was always associated with expression of jointness or koinwnia/'erub. Thus, this truly blessed cup is the **cup which we share, the drink**

**which we share**, and this cup would *never* be ritualized or commented on in a prescribed way (midrashed) (except for the middle two cups of Passover eaten as a meal-in-common), as was established in Session II. The cup of blessing here obviously stands for the drink which the assembly shared as an assembly *in officio* in the hospital, and which was blessed on behalf of the assembly. Unless compelling evidence can be found to the contrary, **this drink was not midrashed**, for this is how a Jew in the synagogue would normally understand Paul and Sosthenes the rabbis. Will this compelling counter-evidence be found, or will we rather find compelling evidence that **reinforces and reinforces** our contention?

**Is.** This is clearly representation by identification or metaphor. This truly blessed cup represents the jointness-koinwnia/'erub of the blood of Christ.

**Absolutely-not.** The strong Greek negative, the answer being “absolutely yes”.

**Koinwnia.** See Session II (Section III.B): this *must* be understood in the rabbinical sense of koinwnia/'erub. This is how the Corinthian Body members from the synagogue would understand this word in the context of a meal, and therefore that is how we must understand it as a matter of *Sola Scriptura*. Koinwnia/'erub is *NEVER* ritualized/ midrashed. Note the concordance of koinwnia in the Greek NT: Acts 2:42, Rom. 15:26, I Cor. 1:19; 10:16-7, II Cor. 6:14; 8:4; 9:13; 13:14(13), Gal. 2:9, Eph. 3:9 (apocryphal usage), Philip. 1:5; 2:1; 3:10, Phil. 6, Heb. 13:16, I John 1:3,6,7. Note that the only occurrences of **koinonia** in the context of eating together are Acts 2:42 and I Cor. 10:16-7, and these should therefore be interpreted with some consistency. The first context is Jewish both in language *and* doctrine, and the latter is Jewish in language and *Pauline* in doctrine.

**Blood of Christ.** This refers to Christ securing His non-ethnic, non-ceremonial Body in accordance with the great mystery *not* known to rabbis, angels, or men (prior to Christ privately telling Paul in the Third Heaven (I Cor. 2:6–16, II Cor. 12:1–4)), thus securing them from all ritual and ceremony (Gal. 4:8–11, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 2:8–23).

**The food which we share** is how the Greek **ton arton** ‘on klwmen *must* be translated, *unless* there is compelling proof to the contrary from the context, and where is that proof—we know of none! The normative hermeneutic / grammtico-historical method (II Tim. 2:15), communicated at the new birth, requires that the normal/usual/ customary meaning, as understood by the original audience, *must* be assigned unless the context, or the context of a parallel passage should require otherwise (normal usage rules unless context overrules); and in such a case, the burden of proof is on the one claiming the exception contrary to the norm.

- a. We have given ample evidence in Session I (cf. [33, 50]) that Grecian Jews *almost always* used **artos** and **artos kla(s)w** in the sense of **food** and **share/distribute food** unless certain modifiers were present in the context (such as a number greater than 1, or “leavened”, or ...). None of those modifiers are present here; so the issue is settled on this basis alone.
- b. But when the context is examined, the eucharistic position suffers another fatal blow, namely the term **koinwnia**, which for these folks of Jewish stock of the synagogue can only be understood in terms of the **koinwnia/'erub** of the ancient rabbis, and in koinwnia/'erub the food was *never* midrashed or ritualized, was by

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
**Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11**

law *generous and hunger-satisfying*, and encompassed all foodstuffs allowed by Moses (except when sanitation was important), as we documented at length in Session II. When this point is combined with (a), the issue is settled twice.

**Is absolutely-not koinwnia?** As discussed above; see Session II (III.B.5).

**Body of Christ.** This refers both to the actual humanity of Christ *and* to the church which is His Body (I Cor. 12:12–27), the latter being the fulness of the former (Eph. 1:23, Col. 2:10 (Greek text)). Hence, this refers to Christ securing His non-ethnic, non-ceremonial Body in accordance with the great mystery *not* known to rabbis, angels, or men (prior to Christ privately telling Paul in the Third Heaven (I Cor. 2:6–16, II Cor. 12:1–4)), thus securing them from all ritual and ceremony (Gal. 4:8–11, Eph. 2:11–16, Col. 2:8–23).

POINT. This shared cup and food of the *Corinthian koinwnia*'erub represent what Christ secured for the Corinthian saints, *not* because the food and cup are ritualistic symbols—the food and cup of *koinwnia*'erub were *NEVER* so ritualized and midrashed in the experience of these Corinthian saints of Jewish and synagogue background—but simply because they share this food and cup as joint members of the One Body, i.e. in a manner consistent with the non-ceremonial etiquette of the rabbis for *koinwnia*'erub and therefore consistent with the non-ceremonial salvation to which Christ secured them and consistent with the non-ceremonial law which Christ gave Paul for the Body's obedience.

Verse 17 **For we-are the Many, ONE FOOD, even one Body; for we-partake, all [of us], out-of the ONE FOOD.**

**The Many ('oi polloi).** A signature phrase in Paul indicating the non-ethnic, hence non-ceremonial, Body of Christ: Rom. 4:17–18; 5:15,16,17,19; 8:29; 12:4,5, I Cor. 12:12,14,22, II Cor. 1:11,11, cf. Gal. 4:8–11; 6:15, Eph. 2:11–16; 3:6, Philip. 3:1–8, Col. 2:8–23, etc.

**One Food, One Body.** As discussed under Verse 16. Both from usage and from context (the very language of the rabbis), this is non-ceremonial, non-midrashed food.

**All (pas).** All-without-distinction, as proved by John Owens in Volume 8 of "The Death of Death in the Death of Christ". This is a signature phrase of the non-ethnic, hence non-ceremonial, Body of Christ: Rom. 3:9,19,21,23; 5:12–19; 10:12, etc. In such usages **pas** is equivalent to **polloi**.

POINT. This is precisely the rabbinical language of '**Erubin**, as cited previously for Verse 16 (Session II, Section III.B): seeing is believing. There is no ritual or midrash for such a meal, *none*. This is how the Corinthians would have understood it, and therefore by Sola Scriptura, so must we. Paul and Sosthenes, sons of the synagogue, are communicating to the Corinthian members of the Body of Christ, also sons of the synagogue, in rabbinical terms which all understood: *the elements of an 'Erub were NEVER midrashed* The tradition of '**Erub** derives ultimately from covenant-meal and is partly inspired by the '**Erubin** of the Temple, and covenant-meals were never midrashed with "homiletized" elements save for the rabbinical Passover seder. Bottom line:

**Lord's Table for the Body of Christ =**

**sharing ONE FOOD without midrash or ritual**

POINT. Paul and Sosthenes use the language of rabbinical *koinwnia*-’erub, and this is most appropriate for several reasons:

- a. The Body of Christ itself is an 'Erub, being a mixture or weaving together of Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, male and female, into one joint-Body. Just as the communers in the hotel of the synagogue become all joint-private-owners of the dining hall, and so are many yet one, so also the Body of Christ in the Corinthian *koinwnia*.
- b. All had contributed to the expense of this meal, so again this meal must be 'Erub or *koinwnia*. This 'Erub or communion of contribution indicated that the Corinthian assembly was itself a mixture or communion.
- c. If wine were used, it would be a communion or mixture of wine and water. The rabbis stipulated for Israel the allowable ratios. Note the blood of both the O. T. sacrifices and of Christ Himself was mingled and hence a communion. The important point of 'Erub with respect to the shared drink is that this analogy to the blood of the sacrifices was *never* pointed out explicitly. So here in I Cor. 10:16–17.

**Verse 18 Behold the Israel according to [the] flesh: are absolutely not they which eat the sacrifices KOINWNOI of the altar?**

- a. **Behold** is the second person plural imperative **see ye, look ye, consider ye**.
- b. **The Israel.** A reference to Israel the nation, the ceremonial nation.
- c. **According-to flesh.** A reference to Israel as the ethnic issue of Jacob.
- d. **Absolutely-not.** As in Verses 16–17 above.
- e. **They which eat the sacrifices.** Literally, **the-ones eating the sacrifices**. This refers to the priest and Levitical ministers.
  - i. See Lev. 2:3-4; 6:14-8; 7:1-17 and cf. Lev. 3:3-5,9-11,14-6.
  - ii. Note the priests ate everything—flesh, grains, vegetables bread, drink, etc— from the altar. They ate their *livelihood* from the altar; hence they ate real, hunger-satisfying, life-supporting meals from the altar.
  - iii. We challenge the gainsayers to search Moses and the rabbis to see if the priests midrashed—formatted and commented ritualistically on any part of their food—their eating. The record is that *it never happened* (with the exception of the official Passover sacrifice). This was documented in Session II (Section III.F). The preparation of the *sacrifice* was formatted, but the eating was *never* formatted; see the documentation of Session II (Section III.F), including [13].
  - iv. Paul and Sosthenes are *directly* comparing the Corinthian *koinwnia*-’erub directly to the priestly meals which were *never* formatted nor ritualized nor midrashed and which were real, hunger-satisfying meals!
  - v. The only hope for the pagan eucharistic tradition in this passage, given the word studies done in Session I, II and in [33, 50], is that the context must *force artos* and *klaw* into meaning “breaking bread” in the modern, ceremonial sense. But the context is not helpful; indeed it is downright hostile to such ideas, as we are constantly seeing; and it only gets worse!
- f. **KOINWNOI of the altar.** Oh, what another coup de grace to the eucharistic point of view! In the Greek, Paul has made a play on words with a polyptoton, referring

in Verses 16–17 to the meal, and through it to the Body of Christ, as a **koinwnia**, *vis-a-vis* the priests and Levites being **koinwnoi** of the altar.

- i. Thus when an assembly of the Body of Christ in eating **koinwnia-'erub**, i.e. the Table of the Lord, are **koinwnoi** at that time, even as the priests and Levites in eating the **koinwnia-'erub** of the altar are **koinwnoi**. This parallel is strengthened below by noting that **altar** means **Table of the Lord** in the rabbis.
  - ii. This is rabbinical language, indeed the language of **koinwnia-'erub**. Indeed, this passage, and even this verse alone, justify almost every point of the chart given in Session II, Section II.C on the comparison of the temple with synagogue, the priestly communion with the synagogue communion, the hotel of the Temple with the synagogue hotel, etc. In this passage the '**Erubin** of the Corinthian Body synagogue were analogous to the '**Erubin** of the Temple, which confirms the middle relationship of the right branch of the rooted tree given in Session II (Section IV.A.3).
- D. Exegesis of I Cor. 10:19–21. Before exegeting these verses (and those of I Cor. 11:17–34 in Section II below), it is appropriate to summarize a few facts about the notion of covenant-meal in the indigenous Greek and Roman religions (with the exception of the cult of Mithra dealt with in Session V). These facts are not only needed for exegeting these verses (and I Cor. 11:17–34), but are useful for the passage as a whole. Space and time forbid us examining these facts in the same detail as we have covenant-meal in the Mosaic and rabbinical settings in Session II and [33, 50]. The reader can peruse [36–40] for more details, especially [39, pp. 65–83] and [40, pp. 18–46, 175–178]. Some of the more salient points include the following:
1. Unity with the gods by eating together. The essential act by which the faithful affirmed their unity with the gods and each other was in eating together. From [40, pp. 37-9]:

"To approach a god in due form it was proper always to bring a gift, and ... the commonest gifts were food, either cereal, animal or both, drink, and incense."

"Whatever may be the ultimate origin of such rites [sacrifices to the gods], there is no doubt that to the average ancient the object was to give the god good food, and when worshipping an Olympian, the sacrificer and his friends ... shared the meal [and] indeed took the best of the meat for themselves."

"... close communion with them [the Olympian deities] [was] implied in the shared meal."

"... if there was more flesh than could be eaten on the spot, it might be taken to the nearest market and sold like any other meat."

And from [39, pp. 74-5]:

"The sacrifice is a meal common to the god and his worshippers, linking them together in a close unity. The god is invited by prayer to come to the meal. He receives his portion, and the men, who are the greater number, feast on their portions."
  2. Unity with the dead by eating together. From [40, p. 41], we learn that the feasts for the dead were an extension of the communion enjoyed with the deceased in life and that

"might include animal victims, joined in a common meal. ... an All Souls' day was part of the Greek ecclesiastical calendar. Such festivals were not so much sacrifices, still less worship, as renewals of the table-fellowship which had existed while the dead members of the kin were still alive."

3. Fundamental Vocabulary Word. From [40, p. 41] we learn the basic word for these various communions was **deipnon** or of the **deipnon** word group; e.g. the word for the funeral feast was **perideipnon**. **Deipnon** is the very word used by Paul of **supper** of the Lordly Supper in I Cor. 11:20. We study this word more in Section II below. For now, we simply say that both its pagan and sacred usage indicate that **deipnon** means *the primary meal of the day*; and in the Greek NT, this meaning is without exception unless I Cor. 11:20 is the exception. There is agreement on this point in [29] on this word.
  - a. How can a word meaning the primary meal of the day be the word for communion? This is because in the the Greek mind, *every* meal was a communion with the gods, *especially* the primary meal of the day. We support this point more fully below.
  - b. Even as we see elsewhere in Paul and the Greek NT, we see both the Semitic term (expressed in Greek of course) and the Greek for the same thing. **Koinwnia** is the rabbinical term 'erub expressed in Greek, whereas the "native" Greek term for a communal meal is **deipnon**. (Other examples: **kardia** (heart) for a person's thinking and **nous** for a person's thinking (the former Semitic, the latter Greek); **firstfruits** ('aparchh) for the new nature and **eskrow** ('arrabwn) for the new nature (the former Semitic the latter Greek).)
  - c. One reason for using the rabbinical **koinwnia** in I Cor. 10 is that the contrast is between the Table of the Lord and the communal meals (**deipnon**) of the demons; whereas in I Cor. 11, the issues of the Corinthian 'erub are internal ones and this contrast is not needed, allowing Paul to use **deipnon**.
  - d. We emphasize again that NO Corinthian saint would understand it otherwise: **koinwnia**-**'erub** and **deipnon** both refer to real, hunger-satisfying meals, always. See below.
4. Native Greek and Roman communions always unformatted and unmidrashed.
  - a. Special sacrifices as communions. We should note that while on the occasion of a sacrifice there was an offering of part of the meal to the deity accompanied by prayer, and this preceding the meal, the meal itself was **never** midrashed and the components of the meal were **never** "homiletized".
  - b. Ordinary, daily meals. The far greater number of the Greek and Roman communions were celebrated with ordinary, daily meals. Each daily meal (**deipnon**) was a communion UNACCOMPANIED BY ANY WORDS OR PRAYERS WHATSOEVER, and so *à fortiori* completely *unmidrashed* and "unhomiletized"! Consider the following evidence, beginning with [39, pp. 73–76] (with our emphases):

"The hearth was the center of the house cult and of the piety of daily life. *We should remember that while our piety is expressed chiefly in words, by prayers, the piety of the ancients was expressed chiefly by acts.* ... This fact is particularly evident in daily life. Whereas *we* say a prayer before and after the meal, the *Greeks* before the meal offered a few bits of food on the hearth and after it poured out a



few drops of unmixed wine on the floor. The libation was ... made to Agathos Daimon, the Good Demon, ...”

“Thus the hearth was sacred and the **daily meal** was sacred. ... It is a widespread custom to regard the [daily] meal as sacred. ... The meal unites with sacred bonds all who partake of it. ... This sanctity of the meal ... knits the partakers together in a sacred community ... The word **philothytes** (fond of sacrifices) signifies simply ‘hospitable’.”

“The cult of the hearth comes down from hoary antiquity, from Indo-European times. It induces me to add a remark of general bearing in regard to the difference between our religion [the author is apparently Swedish Lutheran] and that of the Greeks, especially their popular religion. This difference is less appreciated than it ought to be, because *our attitude is not the same as the Greeks*. The sanctity of the hearth was great, and we rightly speak of a cult of the hearth because certain sacred acts were performed there. **But there were no prayers, no images, ... The cult consisted in acts.** The place was sacred in itself ... For us it is not so. Nowadays ... sanctity is conferred upon the building [of a church] by its consecration as a church. In antiquity sanctity was inherent in the place. The place was not made holy by building a house for a god on it, but a house for a god was built on a certain place because the place was holy.”

“... we come upon another difference between ancient and modern religious ideas, which is perhaps greater than any other. We make a clear distinction between the sacred and the profane, we object to using holy things for ordinary purposes. Religion is our Sunday suit. ... *But [among the ancients] the sacred and the profane were intermingled in daily life in a manner of which there are almost incredible examples.* Religion was much more a part of daily life among the ancients than among us. *It consisted in acts more than in words.*”

And Plutarch in his *Roman Questions* as cited in [40, pp. 176–177]:

“Why did they not allow the [daily] table to be taken away empty, but insisted on something remaining upon it? Because no holy place should be left empty, and *the [daily] table is holy.*”

Also from [40, pp. 176–177]:

“... it is safe to say that the pig, after the proper portions had been given to the friendly little deities, formed the staple of the family dinner. **For gods and men shared the same meals in a Roman household.** The *table* at which the human inhabitants of the house dined was in itself a **holy thing**, having, it would appear, its own share of **numen** [supernatural power].”

5. Some conclusions in relation to Greek and Roman communions.
  - a. Native Greek and Roman communions are communions with demons, as they themselves sometimes admit. The Scriptures acknowledge (I Cor. 8:5–6) that the gods of the Gentile religions are angelic (and hence demonic); cf. the LXX in Deut. 32:17–21, Psalm 96:4–5; 97:7. And so these communions are with the elemental spirits (in the language of Gal. 4:8–11, Col. 2:8–23).

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
**Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11**

- b. The Jewish communion was *NEVER* formatted, and there was no pressure or influence from native Greek and Roman religion to do otherwise, since native communions were *NEVER* formatted. This strengthens our point about *koinwnia-erub* in the Jewish community and the Corinthian assembly. As we demonstrated in [34], Jews would adapt their social customs to the cultures around them, but were more resilient in matters of religious practice. And here in Corinth there were no native reasons to change the format of their communions one whit.
  - c. We see now why the faithful Jews were so scrupulous about not eating with Gentiles; cf. Matt. 8:11, Acts 11:3, etc.
  - d. The use of **deipnon** as the primary meal of the day is universal in the Greek NT (see Section II below). In a religious context it is the same as rabbinical **koinwnia-erub** or communion, even as it was in everyday Greek life.
6. Mithraic communion from the East. The great exception to all of the foregoing was a communion imported from the East and which by the first century A.D. had become commonplace throughout the Roman empire, namely the communion of Mitras-Perseus, the Hindu-Mazdean god of light. From Session V, we learn that Mitras slew the sacred bull (celebrated today in the bullfights of southern Europe and Mexico), and that his great victory for the sons of light was celebrated by a communion with his father, the god of the sun, a communion including a cross-embossed wafer and a chalice—the latter filled with water or wine diluted with water—over which were pronounced words announcing the meaning of these Mithraic elements. This communion originated around 1400 B.C., entered the Persian realm and the Mazdean religion around 600 B.C., entered the Greek empire around 300 B.C. due to Alexander's conquests of the East, and entered the Roman empire around 68 B.C. through the Roman military. By the time of Christ, Mithraic chapels dotted the Roman landscape, even into Britain. Mithraism infiltrated Jewish Gnosticism and the confessing church. Constantine was first and foremost a Mithraist, and he completed the Mithraizing of the confessing church. Paul is indirectly addressing the Mithraic communion as well as Greco-Roman communions in I Cor. 10:16–21 and Col. 2:8–23, forbidding them to participate in *no* demonic, and hence *no*, Roman, Greek, or Mithraic communion. We point out that **deipnon** cannot describe a Mithraic-like symbolic snack, since **deipnon** indicates the primary meal of the day.

Verses 19–20 **What then am I saying? That a thing sacrificed to an idol is anything, or that an idol is anything? But I am saying that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and absolutely-not to God; and I do not want you to be KOINWNOUS of the demons.**

**Sacrifice.** This part of Paul's comments specifically addresses native, i.e. non-Mithraic, communions; for in the native Greek communion, a portion of the meal was placed on the hearth in sacrifice to the deity which they were communing by means of this meal. The Mithraic communion involved no sacrifice.

**Idols.** The demons were the power behind the idols, as the rabbis well understood (cf. the LXX in Deut. 32:17–21, Ps. 96:4–5; 97:7. By I Cor. 8:5–6, the Gentile gods are angelic (so demonic), and so these communions are with the elemental spirits (in the language of Gal. 4:8–11, Col. 2:8–23).

**KOINWNOUS of the demons. Communers or commensals**, another form of **koinwnoi** and of the same word group as **koinwnia**.

- a. This proves that **koinwnia** = **deipnon** in general meaning, since Paul identifies the communers with the rabbinical term in contrast with the native Greek communions (**deipnon**) in which part of the meal was put on the hearth (votive) for the deity.
- b. But to practice any pagan communion, including Mithraic, is to be a communer with demons. Hence the principle of not communing with demons implies that the Body is to avoid the Mithraic communion as well.
- c. The Body of Christ is above angels (I Cor. 6:3) and is not to subject themselves to any such communions.

Verses 21 **You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons.**

**Drink** translates **pinw**. There are consequences.

- a. **Pinw** occurs 74 times in Greek NT and 288 times in LXX.
- b. **Pinw** always means drinking in a thirst-quenching way. It NEVER means just tasting as in a ritual snack-drink. With the exception of the cups of Passover, it NEVER means a midrashed, ritualistically commented on drinking.
- c. **Pinw** in its usage deals a fatal blow all by itself to the ritual-snack view of the Lord's Table and the Lordly Supper; for the normative hermeneutic, or grammtico-historical REQUIRES that we interpret **pinw** as thirst-quenching and non-ceremonial in I Cor. 10 and I Cor. 11. If any one disagrees, let them make the case that the context here and in I Cor. 11 overwhelmingly overturns this very strong usage. But we shall see that this context always supports this usage, overwhelmingly so.

**Cup of the Lord.** The meaning of the **cup of the Lord**, in context, must be taken from verse 16, i.e. **cup of the Lord** = **cup of the KOINWNIA-'ERUB** = **shared drink of the assembly when they come together for 'erub**. The cup of the koinwnia-'erub, as established in Session II and above, commemorates the terms of the covenant, namely the blood of Christ, and the covenant unity thereby procured for His Body.

Furthermore, this shared drink was substantial, thirst quenching, and *unmidrashed* (i.e. not ritualistically commented on), with the exception of Passover. This is how it would be understood by the Corinthian Jewish saint, and hence by us if we seek to understand by *sola Scriptura*. Paul's point is that one cannot demonstrate oneself to be in covenant unity with Christ and His Body, and demonstrate oneself to be in covenant unity with demons by sharing the drink at a meal of a table (either in a temple or in a private home) known to be pagan. This interpretation is strengthened below in our discussion of the Table of the Lord, which discussion further implies that the phrase "Cup of the Lord" is indeed a rabbinical phrase for cup of the koinwnia-'erub either of the Temple or synagogue or courtyard or otherwise. Note how **cup of the Lord** and the concept of koinwnia-'erub reinforce the usage of **pinw** above.

**Table of the Lord.** Not only is this phrase defined by the preceding context in Verses 16–18, but this phrase has an extensive history.

- a. In Scripture used of the **Altar of the Temple**; see Ezek. 41:22 (cf. Ex. 30:1); 44:16, Mal. 1:7,12. The point is that the same object was both altar and table: it was the

altar from the standpoint of offering to God; it was the **Table of the Lord** when the congregation of the priests and Levites ate from it, i.e. in this sense it was also the **table of the congregation of priests and Levites**. So then **Table of the Lord = Table of the Congregation**.

- b. Used by the rabbis in Talmud both for the altar of the Temple **and** for the **table in the home** of the faithful after the destruction of the Temple; see [6, pp. 33, 170].
- c. Lightfoot maintains that the phrase "**Table of the Most High**" is not uncommon among the rabbis as a designation of the altar of the Temple; see [4, p. 229].
- d. A similar phrase appears in Ps. 23:5; 78:19 with respect to tables of covenant unity.
- e. In context of Verses 16–18, this is the table of the koinwnia-'erub of the Corinthian assembly, i.e. it is the assembly's table. Thus the Table of the Lord in the context of the assembly/synagogue is the **dinner table of the assembly**, even as the Table of the Lord in the context of the Temple was the dinner table of the congregation of priests and Levites. It is therefore *unmidrashed*, "unhomileticized", and hunger-satisfying since this was *always* the case of the priestly meals—*search Moses and the rabbis and see*. This Table commemorates the unity of the Body of Christ with Christ and each other. This is how a Corinthian Jewish member of the Body would understand Paul's and Sosthenes' language here.
- f. Note that this Table answers to the **bread of koinwnia-'erub** of verse 16. Now the table of the priests in Verse 18 was what was offered on the altar; i.e. they jointly shared all manner of foodstuffs from the Table of the Lord. This simultaneously supplies additional confirmation for two statements discussed previously throughout Sessions I–III and Part A above:
  - i. **Artos** in Verse 16 must be understood in the broad sense of **all food of the Lord's Table/Altar**.
  - ii. **Artos klaw** in Verse 16 must be understood in the sense of **shared food of the Lord's Table/Altar**.
- g. Given the implicit comparison in Verse 18 between the table of the congregation of the Temple and the table of koinwnia-'erub, Paul is referring to the table of the assembly koinwnia-'erub by language used previously of the table of the priests. This simultaneously supplies additional confirmation for two statements discussed previously in Session II (section II.C) and B above:
  - i. Synagogue was in many ways an imitation of the Temple with the congregation of the synagogue answering to the congregation of the priests and Levites, and with the **'Erubin** of the synagogue answering to and deriving from the **'Erubin** of the Temple. In this way the Table of the Lord refers to both the table of the priests and Levites **and** to the table of the synagogue in the hospital.
  - ii. The Corinthian assembly was the Corinthian synagogue.  
This also confirms the rooted tree in Session II (Section IV.A.3) concerning the derivation of the communion of the Corinthian assembly.
- h. The pagan tables are tables of demons: this is demonstrated from Scripture (Is. 65:11, Jer. 7:18, Ezek. 16:18–9; 23:41), Apocrypha (**Bel and the Dragon**), and the material presented above on the Greek religions and Mithraism (see Session V). Paul's point is that this assembly could not show unity with the Body of Christ by eating from the assembly table *and* demonstrate unity with the demons by eating from their tables.

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
**Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11**

Chart based on Verse 21 linking I Cor. 10:16–21 to I Cor. 11:17–34 Verse 21 is extremely important in making explicit the link between this passage and I Cor. 11:17–34, as the following chart shows.

<u>Koinwnia-'erub</u>	<u>Lord's Table</u>	<u>Lordly Supper</u>
Cup of koinwnia-'erub: shared drink of the assembly commemorating the blood of Christ (10:16).	Cup of the Lord (10:21).	Cup commemorating blood and death of Christ (11:26–7).
Food of koinwnia-'erub: shared food of the assembly commemorating the body of Christ (10:16).	Table of the Lord (10:21).	Food commemorating body and death of the Christ (11:26–7)

These correspondences prove **Koinwnia-'erub = Table = Supper, artos = food in broad sense, artos klaw = shared/distributed food**, both in the tenth chapter and in the next chapter, but we are ahead of ourselves. The distinction, in our opinion, between the discussions of Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 is simply that in the former, Paul and Sosthenes are dealing with the relationship between the Body saints and other covenant-tables, while in the latter they are dealing with the relationship between Body saints and disruptive reprobates in the synagogue/assembly. In other words, the first discussion is "externally" motivated, and the second discussion is "internally" motivated.

- E. Relationship of I Cor. 10:16–21 to Context. The relationship of these verses to the context set by 9:24–10:15 is that those who eat and continue to eat without repentance at these pagan tables, having covenanted with the Body at the koinwnia-'erub of the Lord's Table, manifest themselves to be reprobates. This is the whole point of Paul's hitting at idolatry in context and connecting it with being overthrown or cast away by God. Note that for the offenses of the next chapter against the Supper (which in our opinion is the Table), many were put to death, thereby openly manifesting their reprobation.
- F. Complete Absence of Symbol, Ritual, Ceremony in Lord's Table.
1. We have demonstrated that the Lord's Table of I Cor. 10:16–21 is indeed modeled after the koinwnia-'erub of the synagogue, for indeed this assembly was the synagogue. Koinwnia-'erub was utterly devoid of any ritual or pronouncement of meaning (midrashim). Further, the native Greek and Roman communions around these saints were also utterly devoid of ritual; so there was no pressure from these communions to make a ritual where none had been before. The only pressure is from Mithraic-Roman communion; but Paul and Sosthenes have commanded them with apostolic authority to avoid all pagan communions.
  2. Koinwnia-'erub was a real, hunger-satisfying meal, with all variety of foodstuffs.
  3. Koinwnia-'erub was a generous meal, with double helpings for each communer (Session II, Section III.C).
  4. *The Body of Christ is the shrine of the Father in the Third Heaven* by its very calling and place in the decrees of election, redemption, and regeneration (Eph. 2:19–22(Greek), cf. Eph. 1:18(Greek), Rom. 8:9–11, I Cor. 3:16–17; 6:3, II Cor. 3:16–17; 12:1–4, Eph. 1:19–21; 2:6, Phil. 3:20 (Greek)). Therefore, when the Body eats together, it is the Pauline Table of the Lord by virtue of simply what the Body is in

these decrees as the non-ceremonial, non-ritualistic fullness of Christ (Col. 2:10(Greek)). Any added ritual is an offense against this shrine of the Body (Col. 2:8–23).

## II. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:18–34—Lordly Supper

- A. Overview of Issues Regarding Lordly Supper. All positions on the Supper must admit: I Cor. 11:23–6 contains no *direct, explicit* commands to the Body of Christ; and this is especially the case if the mid-Acts dispensational position be true, in particular, if the Twelve be not in the Body and be not its apostleship. The proof of this assertion begins with the fact that the forms of commands in the Greek NT are easily discerned, generally using the imperative (indicated in English by the missing subject for the second person, sometimes in conjunction with the verbs **be** or **do**, and indicated in the other persons by **let**) or explicit constructions such as **I would that**—examples of commands in context include I Cor. 10:1,7–14,24,31; 11:1,3,6,28,33–4; and the proof of this assertion is completed with the observation that the *direct commands* in the whole 11:17–34 passage are really obvious—Verses 24–25 (**do**, commanded directly of the Twelve/Israel), Verse 28 (**let examine, let eat, let drink** commanded of the Body), Verse 33 (**tarry** commanded of the Body), and Verse 34 (**let eat** commanded of the Body). Now we should always understand a passage in context (as part of the normative hermeneutic), but the absence of a common, explicit form implies an *especial dependence* on both the context of the passage and the thinking of its audience, for the author is counting on these factors to make obvious what he has chosen not to specify. In other words, if there are commands/instructions for the Body in I Cor. 11:23–6, they can only be understood by an especially careful analysis of its context and the mindset of the Corinthian assembly. It behooves all sides to therefore have a clear understanding of (at least) the following:
1. Covenant/sacred eating in ancient Judaism. Mosaic and rabbinical, both ritualistic and non-ritualistic, including rules of etiquette.
  2. Covenant/sacred eating in the Greek religions. Ritualistic and non-ritualistic.
  3. Covenant/sacred eating in the Mithraism. See comments in Section I.D above and especially Session V.
  4. Extended context of 11:23–6. This is primarily I Cor. 10–11. See Section I above for I Cor. 10:16–21 and the chart of I.D linking the Lord's Table to the Lordly Supper.
  5. Specific context of 11:23–6. This means I Cor. 11:17–34.
- B. Needed Concepts from Session I—I.A above. The usage rules established in Session I and summarized in Section I.A above *must* be followed in interpreting I Cor. 11 *unless* the context clearly and compellingly requires *otherwise*. This is mandated by the normative hermeneutic / grammico-historical method, i.e. by II Tim. 2:15. This means that unless the context requires otherwise, we **MUST** take **artos** as **food** in the broad sense of all foodstuffs, **artos klaw** as **share/distribute food**, and eating together from common foodstuffs as indicating **covenant** relationship without imposition of a ritual. *Will the context supply compelling evidence to the contrary, or will it repeatedly REINFORCE this usage documented in Session I?*
- C. Needed Concepts from Session II—I.B above. The facts established in Session II and summarized in Section I.B above—the Corinthian assembly was the synagogue, equipped with a hotel, the nature and etiquette of rabbinical communion (koinwnia- 'erub)—are a

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
**Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11**

necessary part of the context in I Cor. 11 even as they were in I Cor. 10 considered in Section I. We add two additional facts established in Session II:

1. *Rabbinical Passover was formatted in the pattern of cup-food-cup-wash-food-cup-cup.*
2. *Rabbinical Passover as a meal-in-common was eaten as koinwnia- 'erub under the same rules of etiquette.*

These facts are extremely important since Paul refers to the Passover eaten by Christ and the 11, which in fact was eaten in the cup-food-cup-wash-food-cup-cup format and as a meal-in-common or koinwnia- 'erub. Indeed, as was established in I above.

D. Needed Concepts from Session III. Since Paul refers to the Passover eaten by Christ and the 11, it is critical that we understand that Passover. Therefore, certain facts from Session are very important.

1. Last "Supper" precisely rabbinical Passover. The harmonization of the four Gospel accounts in Session III is critical to our study of I Cor. 11.
  - a. It is established in Session III that Christ ate Passover with the 11 and nothing more, i.e. he did not set up a separate symbolic snack as a ritual for the 11 to observe in perpetuity.
  - b. It is established in Session III that Christ followed precisely the format of cup-food-cup-wash-food-cup-cup, and this harmonization of this Passover is based on manuscript evidence in Luke 22 that is simply overwhelming from *every* perspective: the supporting evidence is both the oldest (by centuries), the most numerous (by almost an order of magnitude), and the best (quality and credibility of papyri, uncials, etc).
  - c. It is established in Session III that Christ therefore followed precisely the format of rabbinical communion established in Session II from contemporary rabbinical sources. Thus we have two, independent proofs of the Passover that night: gospel accounts as harmonized, and rabbinical accounts of ancient (pre-Temple destruction) Passover.
  - d. We repeat that it necessarily follows that the gospel accounts, and the Jewish audience in I Cor. 11, know nothing of a separate snack set up after the Passover meal that night. (The root of such a teasingly self-denying snack has its roots in the East in Hindu-Persian-Roman Mithraism—see Session V).
2. Last "Supper" precisely Passover as meal-in-common. Christ and the 11 co-registered and ate this Passover as a meal-in-common and with the etiquette required for such a meal. They prepared for it together and their number is exactly in the range of those eating from a single lamb.
3. Identification of Judas as betrayer through divisive eating. Judas was identified as the betrayer by his constantly disrespecting Christ at the table; i.e. Judas is identified as the betrayer through his constant violation of proper table etiquette—he kept putting his hand into the dish with Christ who was the host of the table. By the rabbinical rules, the host *must* dismiss him from the Passover. This means that Judas failed to partake of the second course of the Passover, the course in which the lamb was served. Thus Judas' reprobation was sufficiently manifested at the table by his violation of table etiquette and his dismissal by Christ prior to the serving of the lamb.

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11

- E. Needed Concepts from Section I. All of the concepts and results of Section I carry over to our present discussion, as seen in the chart of I.D. just below the exegesis of Verse 21 which establishes (and the exegesis below will continue to confirm) that the Lord's Table = the Lordly Supper. Thus we must bring to this passage the concepts of *koinwni-'erub*, the proper etiquette for such, and the excommunication for dishonoring such etiquette.
- F. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:17–22.

**Verses 17–19 But charging [you as to] this, I praise you absolutely-not, because absolutely-not for the better but for the worse are you jointly-come-together. For firstly, indeed, [when] you are jointly-coming-together in assembly, I hear schisms among you to be, and some part I believe. For it-is-necessary for sects among you to be, in-order-that the documented-ones should-become manifest among you.**

**In assembly** refers to the Corinthian assembly coming together as an assembly under the authority of the eldership, i.e. as the synagogue.

**Schisms** is the actual Greek word meaning **divisions**, parallel with **sects**, literally the Greek **heresies**, in the next verses. Paul understood the situation in the Corinthian synagogue very well—Body saints of Jewish background run the synagogue, but reprobate Jews of Israel's Second Generation are also present, and even these are in sects, including the Sadducees who deny the resurrection. The prevalence of such sects is immediately explained by this assembly being the synagogue (I.B.1 above). Note that there were natural "divisions" in a properly functioning synagogue, for those of the same occupation typically sat together; for this is how Paul would have met fellow tentmakers Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:1–4, cf. [21]). This reinforces that these divisions are doctrinal *and* behavioral (see below).

**I hear, I believe some-part.** From Sosthenes, the co-author of this letter, who was one of the chief rulers of the synagogue and knew the divisions in this synagogue first-hand.

**Documented-ones.** This distinctive Greek wording means those who were true saints, i.e. regenerated. True members of the Body of Christ were being manifested openly in the Corinthian synagogue through these divisions and sects. Proof of this meaning can be seen in the usage of **dokimos** for saint and its negation **adokimos** for reprobates.

**To-the-intent-that ... should** translates **hina** with the subjunctive, a prominent way for the Greek to indicate purpose. The reprobate Jews of Israel's Second Generation are ordained to serve this role of division and disruption so that the Body saints in this synagogue should be manifest. What a sign in itself that Israel's program is on hold and that the great Mystery concerning the Body is being implemented.

**Verse 20 Therefore, when you are-jointly-coming-together upon the same, it is absolutely-not to eat the Lordly Supper.**

**Upon the same** translates **'epi to auto** and indicates that they are coming together as an assembly to eat together, i.e. *to eat the koinwnia-'erub*: the verb **jointly-come-together** by itself indicates they are coming together as an assembly under the authority of the officers of the synagogue, but **upon the same** indicates they are coming together at the same place viewed as common to all, namely the hotel, for the purpose of eating the *koinwnia-'erub*. There is no other consistent interpretation of



this distinctive Greek phrase in light of the nature of the Corinthian assembly *and* the present context.

**Lordly** translates **kuriokos**, which means **of or pertaining to the Lord**; it is not the genitive form of **kurios**. **Kuriokos** occurs twice in the Greek NT (I Cor. 11:20, Rev. 1:10). In our view it functions essentially as the genitive. We comment more below why the **Lordly Supper** is the **Table of the Lord** (with genitive) of I Cor. 10; and also we believe that **Lordly Day** (Rev. 1:10) is the **Day of the Lord** (many times in LXX, Greek NT).

**Supper** translates **deipnon**, a Greek word with clear meaning and serious implications for this passage.

- a. The concordance of **deipnon** in the Greek NT is Matt. 23:6, Mark 6:21; 12:39, Luke 14:12, 17,24; 20:46, John 12:2; 13:2,4; 21:20, I Cor. 11:20,21, Rev 19:9,17; and its concordance in LXX canon is Dan. 1:8,13,15,16; 5:1, IV Macc. 3:9. See also the usages recorded in [40, p. 41] (cited in I.D.3 above) and [62, p. 139]. Also see the comments of Vincent [29] for I Cor. 11:20.
- b. The concordance of the verb form **deipnew** in Greek NT is Luke 17:8; 22:20, I Cor. 11:25, Rev. 3:20; and the concordance in LXX is Prov. 23:1, Dan. 11:27, Tob. 7:8; 8:1. See also the usages recorded in [62, p. 138].
- c. Unless I Cor. 11:20 is the singular exception, and this can be the case ONLY IF there is absolutely overwhelming evidence to the contrary (and there is not—all evidence is supportive), **deipnon** ALWAYS MEANS THE PRIMARY MEAL OF THE DAY, ALWAYS MEANS A NON-RITUALIZED MEAL and **deipnew** ALWAYS MEANS TO EAT SUBSTANTIALLY, with no known exceptions for either word.
- d. The rule observed in (c) above is reinforced by the fact that in LXX **deipnon** is used for **lechem** (Dan. 5:1) and **deipnew** is used for **lacham** (Prov. 23:1), and we know from Session I that **lechem** always means food unless there are specific modifiers in the context to narrow it to bread. Overwhelming evidence for **lechem/lacham** supporting overwhelming evidence for **deipnon/deipnew**. This is only the beginning.
- e. Does the context so far over whelm the overwhelming evidence of (a–d)? *No, it only reinforces it.*
  - i. The context from I Cor. 10 (Section I above) is *koinwnia-erub*, which is a real, hunger-satisfying, non-ceremonial meal, without any known exception.
  - ii. The immediate context so far includes the phrase **upon the same**, indicating *koinwni-erub* officially eaten in the synagogue hotel.
- f. **Deipnon** is a real, non-ceremonial meal. Does this allow for a symbolic communion in the Hindu-Mithraic-Roman style as practiced today by confessing Christians? NO.

**Lordly Supper** refers to the assembly eating together a real, hunger-satisfying, non-ceremonial meal as pertaining to Christ, that is as pertaining to Christ as Head of the Body. Restated, **Lordly Supper** refers to the assembly eating together, in unity, a real, non-ceremonial meal in expression of the non-ritualistic, non-ceremonial salvation which Christ secured for them as their non-ceremonial Head (for as the Ancient of Days He Himself participates in no heavenly ceremony). A symbolic,

ceremonial, hunger-teasing snack of self-denial, deriving from Hindu-Mithraic-Roman communion, *cannot* be the **Lordly Supper**.

**It is absolutely-not to eat** literally translates the Greek, but the idea in context is that with their divisions and sects (some true saints of the Body, others reprobates), **it is absolutely-not possible to eat** together as One Body and hence to eat the Lordly Supper. They come into the synagogue to eat together, but their divisiveness makes it impossible for this to be a true koinwnia-'erub, i.e. Lordly Supper. *This by itself indicates that when saints in an assembly today come together to eat, and do so honoring each other, it is the Lordly Supper(!)—formatting is NOT the issue.*

REDUCTIO AD ABSURDAM. Some say there was a ritualistic communion-snack associated with a main “fellowship” dinner. But *each could eat his/her own supper and then come together for the ritual snack*: Paul and Sosthenes are describing a situation which is *not* a problem for ritual communion, and hence I Cor. 11:20–34 should not exist! Indeed, this is apparently what was done in the pagan communion of Roman-Mithraism (see Session V), which was sometimes associated with banquets. This by itself indicates that the ritual interpretation of this passage and Verses 23–26 is wrong.

QUESTION. Is it impossible because they are divided against each other simply in doctrine and beliefs, but they still treat each other with courtesy and respect at the table? Or is it impossible because their BEHAVIOR makes it impossible, and their behavior is divisive *because* their doctrine is divisive? This brings us to the next verse.

Verse 21 **For in this eating, each [divisive] one pre-takes his own supper, and on-one-hand one is hungry and on-the-other-hand another is drunken.**

**For in this eating**. The article **the** is the article of previous reference, i.e. **this eating**. So it refers to (what should be) the Lordly Supper, i.e. koinwni-'erub, the meal of jointness as members of the Body of Christ. **Phagw** used for **eating** is also used in Verse 20, and its root **esthiw** is important in I Cor. 11.

- a. **Phagw** occurs 98 times in the Greek NT and is the aorist of **esthiw** (cf. our **eat**, German **essen**) which occurs 63 additional times in the Greek NT. There are also hundreds of occurrences of these verbs in the LXX, primarily used of the Hebrew **ahkhal** (to eat).
- b. Based upon their usage, both verbs mean **eat, devour, consume, gorge**. They are NEVER used of hunger-denying, ritual snacking. Indeed, the noun form **phagos** means **glutton**. Similarly for the Hebrew **ahkhal**.
- c. This is yet *another* unanticipated, overwhelming confirmation that the Lordly Supper is a real, non-ceremonial meal and cannot be a Hindu-Mithraic-Roman ritual snack.
- d. The context does not merely supply supportive evidence in favor of the usage of **deipnon**, it continues to supply *overwhelming evidence* in support of **deipnon**. What the ritual position needs is overwhelming evidence against the usage of **deipnon**, but the context is simply hostile to doing that so far. Will the subsequent context supply the evidence so desperately needed by the ritual position?

**Each [divisive] one pre-takes his own supper.** *This is exactly rabbinical language concerning those who eat divisively*—cf. the citations in Session II, Section III.E.(1,2), Section IV.D(1–4), and see Section I.B.4 above.

- a. Paul and Sosthenes, the rabbis, are saying: certain ones are eating from the common foodstuffs—the **one food** (I Cor. 10:17) of *koinwnia-’erub*, with such speed and greed, that it is as if the assembly has been forced to say to them, “TAKE YOUR PORTION AND GO; DIVIDE FROM US” (Session II: III.E.(1,2), IV.D(1–4)!).
- b. Thus the divisive ones are viewed as having **pre-taken** their own supper out of the common supper or *koinwnia-’erub*, and they have manifested *through divisive eating* their division from the true saints in doctrine. They eat so quickly it is as if they had their own meal first *before* anyone else could eat and drink.
- c. Since the rabbinical rules on social etiquette on the table of *koinwnia-’erub* were very well known to the Corinthians in the synagogue, then we may infer that these eating divisively are without excuse.
- d. *Once again, the impossibility of the Lordly Supper in this context is the not the lack of ritual format (there was none in koinwnia-’erub), but the divisive behavior at the common table.*
- e. Note again the Sword of Damocles, **deipnon**, hanging over this phrase as over Verse 20, negating any possibility of there being any ritualistic snack in view.

**And on-one-hand one is hungry and on-the-other-hand another is drunken.**

Several things must be said:

- a. **On-one-hand one ... on-the-other-hand another** is a standard translation of the Greek construction **men hos... de hos**. A contrast is being set-up between the two phrases.
- b. There can be NO direct contrast being hungry and drunken—what direct contrast is there between not eating on one hand and having drunk your fill on the other hand? Therefore, this is the figure of ELLIPSIS (or gap) (see [30] for definitions). What Paul and Sosthenes are really saying is the following:

**On-one-hand one is hungry and on-the-other-hand another has eaten his fill,  
on-one-hand one is thirsty and on-the-other-hand another has drunk his fill.**

- c. This makes sense: we can now compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges; and the **eating one’s fill** is implicitly there in the **deipnon** which a divisive one takes for himself. Thus, Paul and Sosthenes have left gaps which were obvious to the Corinthians (and to us) and which are to be filled in by the reader. Scripture is replete with ellipses which the reader is called on to fill—see [30] for many examples.
- d. This is EXACTLY the situation which the rabbinical rules forbade in the citations of Session I, Section III.E(1,2), Section IV.D(1–4); and see Section I.B.4 above. All these folks in the Corinthian synagogue know these rules very well. Again, the divisive ones are sinning against the Body of Christ with full and informed intention.

- e. HOW IS POSSIBLE TO EAT ONE'S FILL OR DRINK ONE'S FILL AT A RITUAL SNACK? HOW IS BEING HUNGRY OR THIRSTY RELEVANT TO A RITUAL SNACK? Both of these are ludicrous. This is *overwhelming evidence* that the Lordly Supper cannot be a ritual snack. The Lordly Supper must be such a generous meal that IF certain ones were to be divisive, there could exist full and hungry commensals and drunken and thirsty commensals. Such situations are not even conceivable with a ritual snack.
- f. Now Paul and Sosthenes have supported all the overwhelming evidences supporting the overwhelming evidences supporting **deipnon** with yet more overwhelming evidence. What could the context possibly, subsequently provide to counterbalance the mountains upon mountains upon mountains of evidence against the Hindu-Mithraic-Roman snack point of view?

Verse 22 **For have you absolutely-not not homes for-the-purpose-of this eating and drinking? Or do you despise the assembly of the God and put to shame them that have not? What-precisely should I say to you: shall I praise you; in this I praise [you] absolutely-not.**

**For.** The first **for** is **gar**, a conjunction connecting this verse with previous verses.

**Absolutely-not not** is not a misprint, but a translation of the Greek double negative pairing absolute negative **ou** with general negative **mh**. This gives an extremely intense negative which further intensifies the authors' rhetorical question: **you really and truly do have homes for ..., don't you?** This means the answer to their very negative rhetorical question is a very intense positive response **absolutely-yes yes**.

**Homes** translates **oikias**, which means **homes**. Not **oikoi** or **houses** in the broad sense of the entire property, homestead, and material goods. When a distinction is to be observed between **oikia** and **oikos**, the former is the **dwelling** at the center of the latter. Thus Paul and Sosthenes have pinpointed the actual **dwelling** or **home**. Now one could eat in their yard, but they are far more likely to eat in their home or dwelling, hence their choice of **oikia(s)**.

**For.** The second **for** translates **eis**, a preposition meaning **to**, and in this context **to/toward the purpose of**, or more idiomatically, **for the purpose of**.

**This eating and drinking.** Article of previous reference, referring not to the eating and drinking of the Lordly Supper, but to the divisive eating and drinking of those who eat and fill up and drink and fill up while the others are still hungry and thirsty. Note **esthiw**, **pinw** for substantial eating, drinking (see I Cor. 10:21; 11:21 above).

**Homes for this eating and drinking.** The point of this phrase: eating and drinking like a pig, wolfing one's food and drink down, is private behavior appropriate for one's private dwelling. But eating and drinking like a pig, wolfing one's food and drink down, is not appropriate behavior at the table of the assembly, at which there is eating from the one food and drinking from the one cup which belong in *koinwnia-erub* to ALL the assembly. To eat in this way is divisive. Thus, those wanting to eat and drink in this way are required to reserve that behavior for their private dwellings. Those who insist on eating and drinking this way in the assembly are in violation of the assembly, the *koinwnia-erub*, the Table of the Lord, the Lordly Supper, and indeed of what the

koinwnia expresses—the oneness of the Body with Christ and each other, for **we being the Many are One Food** (I Cor. 10:17).

**Or do you despise the assembly of the God and put to shame them that have not?**

Another rhetorical question whose answer is **yes**. Some of these divisive eaters do in fact despise the **assembly of the Father**, namely the Body of Christ. In the Corinthian synagogue there remain Jews who hate Jesus the Nazarene and especially hate Paul's gospel that this Jesus is now exalted as Head of the Body of Christ in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile. These Jews remain in the synagogue and they come with hatred in their hearts against those who have assumed control of the synagogue—see I.B.1 above and Session I, Section II.D. Further, these Jews understand *very well* the rules for proper etiquette at koinwnia-'erub; and they fully intend to violate those rules in order to communicate they indeed **despise the assembly of the Father**. They attempt to shame Christ as Head by shaming those who truly desire to express the Body of Christ through their eating in accordance with proper etiquette, and who therefore are waiting to eat with the assembly and who are therefore hungry and thirsty while the reprobates are stuffing themselves. Therefore, in the context of the Corinthian assembly being the synagogue, we have:

- a. Some of the divisive eaters are those despising the Body of Christ, reprobate Jews of Israel's Second Generation who have remained in the synagogue. These are being put to death by the Spirit of God in Verse 30.
- b. Some of the divisive eaters are Body saints who are foolish and not in control of their appetites. These are being chastened with illness by the Spirit of God in Verse 30.
- c. The **have not** are those who honor the Body of Christ by following proper etiquette and who therefore **have not** food or drink while the divisive ones are filling themselves full at the assembly koinowni-'erub at the expense of properly behaving and eating saints.

**What-precisely should I say to you: shall I praise you; in this I praise [you] absolutely-not.** **What-precisely** is **ti(s)** with the accent mark. Paul absolutely does not praise this assembly. This synagogue is under the authority of the elders who are to enforce these rules of civility which the koinwnia-'erub requires. Both those violating the koinwnia table and the elders not enforcing the table are accountable. But what he says precisely to them takes us to the next section of verses.

POINT. The behavior of the divisive eaters are in stark contradiction to the communion traditions of both Jews and Greeks as we have before set them forth in Session II and I.D above, among both of whom the tradition of covenant-meal was very well established. In short, their behavior at the Lordly Supper = Lord's Table was unheard of (cf. I Cor. 5:1), except for the case of Judas, which again brings us to the next set of verses.

POINT. The reader will notice how the context continues to support the usage of **deipnon** and the other factors indicating that the Lordly Supper is a true supper and not a ritual snack. What was overwhelming upon overwhelming continues to gain independent confirmation upon confirmation.

G. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:23–25. This passage is an abbreviated record of what transpired at the Last Passover; it is not direct instruction to the Body of Christ. Before exegeting these verses, it behooves us to under the idiom **receive ... deliver** with which Paul introduces this section. Some claim that this idiom indicates a special, separate, context-independent revelation just for the purpose of this next section, as opposed to indicating Paul's accuracy in transmitting previous information to the Corinthians which included this next section. We now show the latter is the case, and then we exegete the passage.

1. Tense. Note the past (aorist) tense. Paul had already dealt with them on these matters in person in the past.
2. Concordances of **receive** and **deliver** in Greek NT.
  - a. **Receive** or **paralambanw** in the sense of receiving doctrine and/or Scripture: Mark 7:4, John 1:11; 14:3, I Cor. 11:23; 15:1,3, Gal. 1:9,12, Phil. 4:9, Col. 2:6; 4:17, I Thess. 2:13; 4:1, II Thess. 3:6, Heb. 12:28.
  - b. **Deliver** or **paradidomi** in the sense of delivering doctrine and/or Scripture: Mark 7:13, Acts 6:14, Rom. 6:17, I Cor. 11:2,23; 15:3, II Pet. 2:2, Jude 3.
  - c. **Delivered** and **received** together: Mark 7:4,13, I Cor. 11:23, I Cor. 15:3.
3. Secular usage of **receive ... deliver** and related phrases. See the introductory comments in [62, pp. 482–3, 486]. In the following examples, the fifth translation is that of [62] and the first four are mine:

[62, p. 483]. "Upon completion of the time, I **shall** also **deliver** doors which [are] as I **have received** (context is the leasing of a house).

[62, p. 483]. "After the time I **shall remove** the innocents (?) just as I **have received**.

[62, p. 483]. "I **shall deliver** both the goats and sheep ... completely acceptable even as I **have received** [them]".

[62, p. 486]. "These things **have** we **received** in the Temple of Apollo from the acting priest and **delivered** afterward to the acting priesthood" (context is the **anathemata** or **curses** in the Temple of Apollo at Delos).

[62, p. 486]. "**Receive** from Pothus the reeds all together, send me word how many bundles you **have received**, and **deliver** a few of them to one of our friends".

[62] also testifies (*loc.cit.*) that **receive** is also commonly used with **send (apostellw)**. It is also used with **keep/hold/secure (katechw)** (e.g. I Cor. 15:2). And **deliver** is also used with **keep** (I Cor. 11:2). Hence we have these pairings: **receive/deliver**, **receive/send**, **receive/keep**, **deliver/keep**.

4. Comments and Conclusions.
  - a. The evidence does *not* support the contention that **received/delivered** indicates a separate, special, self-contained revelations in 11:23–5 and 15:3 which is independent of those contexts. Rather, Paul's language is simply emphasizing that Paul was a faithful, accurate instrument in transferring revelation. Indeed, this verbal pair strongly indicates that Paul has given them the very words of that part of his revelations dealing with this matter, so that there is no paraphrase—these are the actual Greek words which Christ gave Paul. Thus the issue is literalness in transmission rather than “specialness”. This is reinforced in our next observation.
  - b. *This is rabbinical language for Grecian Jews*. This is proved from two directions.

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11

- i. Mark 7:4,13 cited above shows that this language was indeed used of rabbis passing traditions to their students, who would pass them to their students.
- ii. Every student was to consult weekly with his rabbi as to the very wording of the rabbi's instruction. Throughout the Talmud, one constantly sees statements like "**R.A said in the name of R.B, who said in the name of R.C, who said in the name of R.D, ...**", referring to a rigorous oral tradition in which *Rabbi A delivered the very words he received from Rabbi B, who delivered to Rabbi A the very words he received from Rabbi C, who delivered to Rabbi B the very words he received from Rabbi D ...* This proves again that Paul is dealing with the Corinthian saints as sons of the synagogue!
- c. Paul wrote this epistle before Luke wrote Luke-Acts (since Luke wrote at the end of the Acts period, and this epistle is some five to eight years earlier), so that regardless of the timing of the other gospels, the written record of the last Passover night was incomplete. However, as children of the synagogue, they knew the order of ancient Passover very well and that Christ would have followed. What they did not yet have in writing is that Christ explicitly midrashed BOTH courses of Passover to refer to Himself. Paul's prior delivery to them gives that record for both courses, since Luke covers the first course of Passover and Matthew/Mark cover the second course (Session III and [33,50]).

Verses 23–24 **For I received from the Lord what also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was betrayed, took food, and having given thanks, He distributed/shared [it] and said, This is my body which is distributed/shared for you—this do for my memorial.**

**For ... received ... delivered.** Paul, as discussed just above, is asserting his accuracy in repeating exactly what Christ told him concerning the Passover He ate with the Eleven. **For** is **gar**, a conjunction linking us to preceding verses, and indicates that this information is *context-related*, further supporting our contention just above that **received/delivered** is not indicating a special, context-free revelation. There is no direct instruction here for the Body of Christ.

**Night in which He was betrayed.** This is an extremely pivotal and important phrase.

- a. **Betrayed** is **paradidomi**, the same Greek word behind **deliver**. What a play on words! Paul delivers to the Corinthian assembly the information about Judas delivering Christ. **Paradidomi**, and related words, are used, in the sense of **to deliver someone up as a breach of trust, to betray, to deliver over as a traitor**, in each account of Judas' betrayal: Matt. 10:4; 17:22; 26:2,15,16,21,23,24,25,45,46,48; 27:3,4, Mark 3:19; 14:10,11,18,21,41,42,44, Luke 22:4,6,21,22,48, John 6:64,71; 12:4; 13:2,11,21; 18:2,5,30,35,36; 21:20, I Cor. 11:23.
- b. Because of the concordance of **paradidomi** in (a) above uniquely associates that verb in the sense of betrayal with *Judas Ischariot*, then the statement of Christ to Paul MUST refer to Judas—there is no other choice.
- c. **HOW DID JUDAS FIRST INDICATE HE WAS THE BETRAYER? BY DIVISIVE EATING.** Literally rendering the Greek (see Session III and D above):  
Luke 22:21 [*during* the first course]: **Behold the hand, of the-[one]-betraying me, [is] with me upon the table.**

Mark 14:20 [*toward the end* of the first course]: **[It is] one out-of the twelve, the-[one]-dipping with me into the dish.**

Matt. 26:23 [at the *end* of the first course]: **The-[one]-having dipped with me within the dish, the same-one will betray me.**

But according to the rabbinical etiquette, Judas is *flagrantly* disrespecting his host (Christ is the host of this Passover since He is the one giving the commentary). See Session II, Section III.E, Section IV.D, I.B.4 above, and C above, from we remind ourselves of a few rules (see II:III.E for references):

“If thou sit at a bountiful table, be not greedy upon it, and say not, “there is much food upon it. Stretch not thine hand whithersoever it looketh, and THRUST IT NOT WITH HIM INTO THE DISH. When thou sittest among many, REACH NOT THINE HAND OUT FIRST OF ALL.”

POINT Judas betrayed and despised Christ at the table. He treated Christ at the Passover the very same way that the divisive ones in Corinth treated the Body of Christ. Think of it: a reprobate Jew of Israel's Second Generation treats Christ *the very same way* that reprobate Jews from Israel's Second Generation treat the Christ's Body in Corinth. Paul (and Christ) could have identified that night in so many different ways (night in which Christ was beaten, was put on trial before the Sanhedrin, ...). But that night is identified by the fact that Christ was betrayed by Judas, who proclaimed his betrayal NOT BY ACTS OF RITUAL, BUT BY DIVISIVE EATING. There are several further consequences and points to be made:

- i. The Passover, among other things, was a meal of covenant unity with God and *with each other*. Passover for elect Israel was a meal of unity in the New Covenant, of unity in Christ as the Lamb of God.
- ii. The format and structure of Passover was the seven-fold-cup-food-cup-wash-food-cup-cup, as proved in Session II and Session III, where the first food (course) centered around the bitter herbs and the second course centered around the lamb.
- iii. Christ as the Host of the Table initiates the identification of Judas as the betrayer; it was not proper that the betrayer participate unimpeded in a meal of unity (John 13:18), *especially when that betrayer is betraying Christ in the very manner of his eating at this very table*. In accordance with the doctrine of manifest reprobation, Judas was to be made manifest (had his hand to the plow, but looked back (Luke 9:62)). Christ allowed Judas to eat of the bitter herbs, but not of the lamb; it was not proper that reprobate Judas complete this meal of New Covenant unity and so eat that course speaking most directly of Christ. In doing this, Christ was acting well within the rabbinical etiquette cited in Session II, for the rabbis say:

“Come and hear: Members of a company, one of whom is quick-handed, are at liberty to say to him, ‘Take your portion and go!’ And not only that, but even when five arrange for a meal-in-common, THEY ARE AT LIBERTY TO SAY TO HIM, ‘TAKE YOUR PORTION AND GO!’ Are the members of a company [co-registered for Passover] permitted to divide, or not permitted to divide? Come and hear: Members of a company, one of whom was quick-handed, are at liberty to say to him, ‘Take your portion and go!’ ... Said he to him, ‘DIVIDE FROM ME. ... SO HE DIVIDED FROM HIM.’ ”



John 13:26–28: **And having dipped the sop, he gives it to Judas Ischariot, Simon's son. ... Then said Jesus to him, What thou doest, do quickly.**

So Christ gave Judas a final portion of bitter herbs and told him to go—this was his portion, which included *none* of the lamb.

- iv. Judas on his part responds to Christ's frequently raising the issues both of divisive eating and betrayal, not by repenting, which he had ample opportunity to do, but *by continuing to eat divisively and not finishing the meal*, i.e. *by being even more divisive*. *It was unheard of that a Jew would not complete Passover*. Judas' behavior at the table was his first public act of betrayal; his meetings with the scribes had been surreptitious, and he had not yet exposed himself to the Eleven. Judas' divisive and disrespectful eating, verbal identification by Christ as the betrayer, and his subsequent breaking off participation in the meal explicitly marked him in the Jewish context as one of God's reprobate. *He refused to properly eat and complete the Kingdom meal of New Covenant unity, so acted divisively at the Last Passover, so manifested his betrayal of Christ, and thus manifested his reprobation*.
- v. The whole context of I Cor. 10–11 seems to be concerned, in one way or another, with the issue of manifested reprobation; e.g. 9:27–10:10. In particular, many of those who had acted divisively with respect to the Lord's Supper were dead by God's judgment; for they manifested their reprobation by their behavior at the Table. The eldership had not removed them (cf. Christ's dealing with Judas, and recall *Paul had previously dealt with them on the Supper*), and so God removed them supernaturally.
- vi. Paul's described that night as he did to make the same point which he made in 10:5–10: to wit that those professing to be of the Body should not do that which Israel's reprobate did in manifesting themselves as reprobates; in particular, true Body members must not eat divisively, for in eating divisively, Judas manifested himself as nonelect and a betrayer.
- vii. Paul's description of that night emphasizes that the issue in 11:17-34 is one of divisive behavior at the Supper and not ritualistic formatting and midrashing of the eating and drinking. Contextually, this is a severe blow to the ritual position, a position which desperately needs massively compelling evidence to countermand the overwhelming evidence against it already discussed.

**Took food, and having given thanks, He distributed/shared [it].**

- a. Session I completes the analysis begun in [33,50], with the resulting rule that—w5th rare exception—**artos** means simply food in the broad sense of the word *if and only if artos* is in the singular and does not have special modifiers (see I.A above). This rule was established by considering ALL occurrences of **lechem**, **artos**, **matzah**, **azdumh**, etc in the Hebrew OT, LXX, and Greek NT. None of these special conditions are present in this passage. *Therefore we have no choice*: it CANNOT be restricted to “bread” in a ritual or modern sense (though it can be “bread” in the ancient OE sense, in which “bread” *always* meant “food”—see the Appendix of Session II). Let those who disagree either submit to the evidence or show us where we have missed something (but we are skeptical since we have

considered ALL the usage!). The rule for **artos** simply adds to the already overwhelming support against the ritual position in this passage.

- b. Session I completes the analysis begun in [33,50], with the resulting rule that **klaw** in conjunction with **artos** means simply to share and distribute a common foodstuff of a real, hunger-satisfying meal; and there are NO exceptions (see I.A above). Let those who disagree either submit to the evidence or show us where we have missed something (but we are skeptical since we have considered ALL the evidence!). The rule for **artos klaw** simply adds to the already overwhelming support against the ritual position in this passage.
- c. **Artos klaw** for these Corinthian Jews means the beginning and sharing of (a course of) a real meal, for these folks were not Mithraists of the Mysteries. In this specific context—the night in which He was betrayed—it refers specifically to Passover.

QUESTION Which course of Passover is being referred to here by **artos klaw**?

ANSWER. BOTH COURSES. Christ added this midrash to the traditional midrash with both courses of Passover (as we proved in Session III) as the Host of Passover (Session II). Thus all that was eaten in the covenant meal spoke of the shared body of Christ. The Corinthian Jews were fluent in rabbinical customs—they were indeed the synagogue—and understood Passover and its structure perfectly, and understood it precisely as we have presented it in Sessions II and III: Christ follows His own command and obeyed those sitting in Moses' seat (Matt. 23:1)! What Paul needed to remind them of was how Christ's Passover differed from the rabbinical Passover, namely the additions He made to the midrash. Most importantly, Paul had previously explained all this to them before the writing of this epistle, so they already *knew* this was Christ's addition to *both courses* (remember, **received/delivered** are in the aorist tense), and so they *knew* Paul's citation of Passover night was a reference to *all that was shared and chewed*.

**This is my body which is distributed/shared for you** (cf. Luke 22:19, Mark 14:22, Matt. 26:26). This phrase has many important consequences.

- a. **This (touto)** CANNOT refer to **food (artos)**, since **this** is neuter and **food** is masculine, and therefore CANNOT refer to a cracker as snapped in two.
  - i. The best explanation (from P. Dennis) is that the whole “complex” of all within these courses constitutes the neuter antecedent. More simply put, the sharing/distribution of the food/drink is the neuter antecedent.
  - ii. Such a complex is the neuter antecedent in Eph. 2:8–9, where the complex of **grace** and **faith**, both feminine, is the antecedent of **this**.
- b. **Is** translates **estin**, here meaning **representation by identification**, a metaphor [30]. The distribution of this shared food is food being shared and distributed by Christ as Host to His co-registrants and commensals represents His physical body.
- c. The human body being represented GUARANTEES that our view of **klaw** is correct, i.e. that this representation is by **distribution/sharing** ONLY and NOT by the snapping in two of crackers or wafers as the Roman Mithraists would allege—they claim that **artos klaw** must be translated **break bread** and that **break bread** must refer to **food baked of grain** which can be **torn or snapped into pieces**. What saith the Scripture (Ex. 12:9,46, Num. 9:12, John 19:31–36):

**But roast [the lamb with] fire, his head with the legs with the purtenance thereof [i.e. roast him whole]. ... Neither shall ye break [a] bone thereof ... nor break any bone of it.**

**The Jews ... besought Pilate that their legs might be broken ... Then came the soldiers and broke the legs of the first and of the other which was crucified with Him. But when they came to Jesus and saw that He was dead already, they broke not His legs. ... For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken.**

HOW CAN SNAPPING A WAFER OR TEARING A PIECE OF BREAD REPRESENT A BODY THAT WAS NEVER BROKEN IN ANY WAY?

Therefore, **klaw** must mean **distribution/sharing**: His body in its benefits is shared by His people: the kingdom benefits are shared by Elect Israel and implicitly the Righteous of the Nations, and the Mystery benefits of Paul's gospel are shared precisely by the Body of Christ.

- d. Compare with Luke 22:17, where Christ takes the first cup of Passover and says **divide [the cup] among yourselves** does NOT mean break a cup into pieces so that each gets a piece of the cup! Rather, it means **distribute/share the drink**.
- e. The ritual position is dealt another mighty blow, after so many mighty blows already. By now the reader must ask: is the context *ever* supportive of the ritual point of view?

**This do for my memorial.** The ritualists claim that **memorial** requires of the Body of Christ that words be said over each element of the ritual snack to in order for that element to symbolically represent either the body or blood of Christ and hence be a reminder and hence a memorial. Does the Greek require thia; indeed does the Greek even allow such an interpretation? What the ritual position desperately needs is an unprecedented mountain of evidence to overcome all the unanimous evidence against to so far in I Cor. 10–11.

- a. **For** translates **eis**. The Authorized translated **eis (for, as)** *incorrectly* by **in**, which together with the notion of **remembrance** is taken to mean that at the time of eating one must be remembering something. The preposition plays an important role.
- b. **Memorial** translates **anamnesis**. **Remembrance** (of the Authorized) is not correct with **eis**, as we shall see.
  - i. The only occurrences of **anamnesis** with **eis** in the Greek NT is in Luke 22:19 and I Cor. 11:24–25, the passages under dispute.
  - ii. The only occurrence of **anamnesis** with **eis** in the LXX is Lev. 24:7, and here the meaning is very clear:

**And these things [pure frankincense and salt] shall be for artous [plural] for a memorial set forth before the Lord.**

Note the anointed loaves were Jehovah's memorial, and no formatted speech is required for them to be Jehovah's memorial. What they and where they were made them the memorial.

- iii. Though the inscription is incomplete and does not have **eis**, a battle monument is called **memorial** in [62, p.36].
- c. While **anamnesis** can have the notion of actively remembering, it is not always the case, and it is not the case in the passage most grammatically parallel to the passage in dispute (Lev. 24:7 in LXX). But there is more that needs be said. *In context this is a command to the Twelve, and by extension, to New Covenant Israel; there is no command to the Body here.* However, the ritualists claim **this** in **do this** must include the Body saying what Christ said to the Eleven in verse 24. Let us divide the question:
  - i. If the command **do this for my memorial** includes saying **do this for my memorial**, then the command is a tautology and meaningless, and this is sin.
  - ii. If the command includes midrashing the eating of a meal or snack as being the body of Christ, then this command could only have this meaning in the context of a meal (e.g. Passover) for which midrash was *already previously required*. In other words, midrash would be understood by the original audience as imposed on the Twelve given they *already knew* this meal was midrashed anyway; so in the context of a midrashic format already in place, Christ's particular midrash would *already* be required. *But this begs the question as to whether the Lord's Supper is formatted for Israel apart from Passover or on any occasion for the Body, so again we have a meaningless tautology, which is sin.*
  - iii. **This** cannot refer to **food/artos** since **this/touto** is neuter and **artos** is masculine. Thus **this** is not referring to any specific kind of food.
  - iv. The meaningful interpretation of **this** is for Israel only and is simple and two-fold:
    - 1) **This** means Eleven and Israel change their midrashim/commentary of the courses of Passover to comment on Christ, to reflect that Christ is the fulfillment of Passover for Israel, and that the food represents His body and the drink represents His blood. This is precisely what Christ's very words imply: the course, whether matzahbitter-herbs or matzah/bitter-herbs/ lamb, has been distributed and is about to be ingested, and Christ says **do this for My memorial**. Now for the Twelve eating together in Passover where midrash is already required, this imposes midrashic content, adding to the midrashim of the courses even as Christ did.
    - 2) **This** means that Israel eat Passover, and indeed all their meals together, in New Covenant unity, i.e. in koinwnia-'erub. Christ's words, especially in the context of His having dismissed Judas from the Passover table for divisive, and especially given the rabbinical etiquette for Israel eating together, mean **eat this together in New Covenant unity for My memorial**.
    - 3) The *application* to the Body is simply that when the assembly eats together from common foodstuffs, they must eat in covenant unity, koinwnia-'erub, and harmony for a memorial of the body and blood of Christ sacrificed for the Body hope and salvation. This fits *beautifully* with the context: some of the Corinthians were not doing this, and were therefore manifesting themselves as reprobates, as betrayers of Christ; i.e. this interpretation alone

explains the linkage of the Last Passover to the Corinthian problem at the Lordly Supper and explains Paul's reference to it. This takes us to Verse 26.

SUMMARY *The interpretation of do this for my memorial is for Israel* concerning how they ought to eat together, and in the case of Passover, what the host should say in commentary concerning the the food of each course (cf. Sessions II and III). The application of this in context is that the Corinthian assembly eating and drinking in unity, as members of the Body of Christ, is the memorial of the Lordly Supper of the sacrifice of Christ, both body and blood, for His Body. This is the application that Paul makes for the Body, beginning in Verse 26, of Christ's instruction for Israel.

Verse 25 **In like manner also the cup, after having-eaten-substantially, saying, This very cup is the new covenant in my blood—do this, as-often-as you might drink [it], for my memorial.**

**After having-eaten-substantially.** **Having-eaten-substantially** translates the aorist infinitive of **deipnew**. The complete concordance of this verb is given above in F.Verse21(b) for both LXX and the Greek NT, along with secular usage from [62].

This verb in this strategic location in this passage has many consequences:

- a. This verb means *without exception* to eat substantially. Search and see.
- b. This confirms that each course of Passover was substantial since it refers to both of them. In particular, this is a final, independent proof that **artos klaw** means to eat substantially and CANNOT mean to eat a ritual snack..
- c. This confirms that Christ instituted no ritual snack at the close of Passover, for this is the cup that goes with each distribution of food, proving that distribution of food to be a distribution of generous portions in full accordance with rabbinical rules.
- d. This confirms that whatever application is to made to the Corinthian assembly and to the Body of Christ, the Lordly Supper CANNOT be a ritual snack. This powerful verb simply excludes this possibility.
- e. This confirms the compounding mountains of evidence against the ritual snack point of view: *koinwnia*-<sup>2</sup>erub, Altar/Table of the Lord, **deipnon**, **artos klaw**, **deipnew**, etc, etc, etc.

**In like manner also the cup.** This refers to a distributed/shared drink, which confirms our claim that **artos klaw** only refers to sharing real, hunger-satisfying food. This **cup** specifically refers to the Second and Third Cups of the Last Passover, namely those that occurred after a course of Passover *and* were midrashed or commented on.

- a. **Deipnew**, as discussed just above, refers to EACH of the two courses of Passover, the first of unleavened bread, bitter herbs, side dishes, sweet sauce (charoseth), and the second of unleavened bread, bitter herbs, side dishes, and paschal lamb. And Christ added the midrash of Verse 24 to EACH course (Session III)
- b. This cup is that which follows such a midrashed course since it is a midrashed cup. Hence this is a reference to the Second and Third Cups. And Christ added the midrash of Verse 25 to EACH of these cups (Session III).

**Do this for my memorial.** Completely analogous to the discussion under Verse 24.

**Should drink** translates the subjunctive of **pinw**, which by its usage (see I COr. 10:21 under I.D above) ALWAYS means thirst-quenching drink and CANNOT mean a thirst-denying taste of a ritual-snack drink. A terrible blow to the ritual view.

**As-often-as** or **hosakis**. Deferred to Verse 26 below. The only thing we point out now is this phrase in context is referring to the Last Passover, which means that all drinking that night was a commemoration of the blood of Christ. This fits beautifully the following facts:

- a. There were many cups drunk in Passover besides the Four Cups; the only restriction of the rabbis was that no cup be drunk between the Third and Fourth Cups, but they explicitly allow for cups cups besides the four cups ([9, p. 605]), in effect one could drink whenever one wished.
- b. Thus whenever they chose to drink that night commemorated the blood of Christ. Note these other cups were **not** midrashed. This fits our claim that all covenant eating and drinking between saints represents the death and blood of Christ.

H. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:26–32. As indicated by the change from **me** to **the Lord's** and **his**, Verses 24–25 were the words of Christ which Paul is faithfully transmitting and Verse 26 returns us to Paul's and Sosthenes' instruction for the Body. Thus their instruction up to Verse 22 for the Body is interrupted for the citation of Christ's words to Israel, and Verse 26 resumes that instruction. Thus Verses 24–25 are cited in order to continue the instruction concerning the problem with divisive eating at the Corinthian *koinwnia*-'erub.

**Verse 26 For as-often-as you would-eat this food and would-drink the cup, you are-showing the Lord's death until He comes.**

**For** is the conjunction continuing the discussion.

**As-often-as** translates **hosakis**, which merits a few comments, particularly given its usage in Verse 25.

- a. Concordance in Greek NT: I Cor. 11:25-6 (passage under discussion), Rev. 11:6.
- b. Concordance in LXX: no occurrences in LXX.
- c. Usage in secular Greek: many examples of **hosakis** where it means **whenever** [62, p. 460]; e.g. "whenever he was invited to join the banquet".
- d. **Hosakis** is here combined with **ean** (**if**) which emphasizes the notion of **whenever**. This is further emphasized by both verbs (**eat, drink**) being in the subjunctive.
- e. **Ean** by itself with the subjunctive indicates a condition of the third class.
- f. We conclude that the basic meaning is **whenever**. We note that this is the translation in this passage in the NIV. In essence, we are taking this as a condition of class having strength somewhere between third and fourth class—**if you were to eat, and you might, and if you were to drink, and you might**.

**Would-eat, would drink**. The subjunctives of **esthiw** and **pinw**, whose usage is discussed above (I Cor. 10:21 in I.D above, I Cor. 11:21 under F above). These ALWAYS refer to hunger-satisfying, thirst-quenching eating and drinking. A terrible blow for the ritual view. The importance of these subjunctives is discussed above.

**This food, the cup**. Even though many manuscripts do not have **touto** for the cup, the article **the** is the article of previous reference. So this phrase means **this food, this cup**. The question is: what is being referred to?

- a. **Food** is **artos**, which absent the special conditions detailed in Session I, MUST mean substantial, hunger-busting food. Further, this **artos** is the what is consumed

by eating in the sense of **esthiw/phagw**, which always means eating to satisfy hunger with no exceptions anywhere in Greek NT and LXX.

- b. **Cup** always means thirst-quenching drink, and this **cup** is what is drunk in the sense of **pinw**, which always means to drink in a thirst-quenching way, no exceptions.
- c. On the basis of **artos, cup, esthiw/phagw, pinw** alone, we can say what **this food, this cup** CANNOT refer to: a ritual snack in the Roman-Mithraic sense.
- d. On the basis of Paul's rebuke of the Corinthian assembly in Verses 17–22, we can say what **this food, this cup** CANNOT refer to: divisive eating in the hotel of the Corinthian synagogue from the common food and drink of *koinwnia-'erub*.
- e. On the basis of the context, we can also say that **this food, this cup** CANNOT refer to Passover; for the latter is once a year, but the Lordly Supper was not tied to an annual observance—it was apparently done weekly in the synagogue as the *koinwni-'erub*.
- f. This verse resumes the instruction of Paul and Sosthenes to the Corinthian assembly of the Body of Christ in their context. **This food, this cup** refer to *the food and drink of the Lordly Supper, the hunger and thirst satisfying koinwnia-'erub of the Corinthian assembly, when eaten and drunk with mutual respect and courtesy as members of the Body of Christ*.

**You are-showing the Lord's death until He comes.** The death of Christ for the Body of Christ, as opposed to His death for Israel and the Nations, secured the Body to be fully unified with Him as the fullness of His humanity and thereby secured them to be non-ethnic (neither Jew nor Gentile), non-ceremonial and non-ritualistic, non-earthly, seated in the Third Heaven over all the angelic hosts, etc (I Cor. 6:3, Eph. 1:20–21; 2:6, etc). What kind of eating and drinking show forth the dispensationally specific atonement made for the Body of Christ?

- a. Such an eating and drinking must be done with mutual respect, each honoring the other as members of the Body of Christ (Phil. 3:3).
- b. Such an eating and drinking must be done without ceremony and ritual rules, which would inevitably be food and drink rules concerning when to touch and when to touch not (Eph. 2:11–16, Phil. 3, Col. 2:8–23).
- c. True saints eating and drinking from common foodstuffs with mutual courtesy/honor PRECISELY shows the death of Christ for His Body. This is the Lord's Supper / *koinwnia-'erub* (see Verse 27) for the Jewless-Gentileless Body of Christ.

Verse 27 **Therefore, whoever eats this food or drinks this cup of the Lord in-an-unworthy-manner, will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.**

**This food, this cup.** The Greek has **the** in each case, but this is the article of previous reference. Again, we have **artos** and **cup** which never signify tasting s snack, but rather food and drink (except for **artos** under special conditions which are not present here—Session I). This language forbids ritual snacks.

**Eats, drinks** are **esthiw, pinw**, which always indicate real hunger-busting, thirst-quenching meals. This language forbids ritual snacks.

**Food ... cup of the Lord.** This is an ellipsis. Surely the food is **food of the Lord**, i.e. the phrase **of the Lord** is meant to be distributed to both **food** and **cup**. Both are parts

of the Lordly Supper and therefore both are **of the Lord**. Thus Paul and Sosthenes are really saying:

**this food of the Lord or this cup of the Lord**

This language forces a relationship between I Cor. 10:16–21 and I Cor. 11:17–34, i.e. between the Table of the Lord and the Lordly Supper, that further justifies our viewing both in terms of the *koinwnia*-erub of the Corinthian synagogue, per the table of I.D above, which we repeat:

<u>Koinwnia-'Erub</u>	<u>Lord's Table</u>	<u>Lordly Supper</u>
Cup of <i>koinwnia</i> -erub: shared drink of the assembly commemorating the blood of Christ (10:16).	Cup of the Lord (10:21).	Cup of the Lord commemorating the blood and death of Christ (11:26–7).
Food of <i>koinwnia</i> -erub: shared food of the assembly commemorating the body of Christ (10:16).	Table of the Lord (10:21).	Food of the Lord commemorating the body and death of Christ (11:26–7)

Again, these correspondences prove **Koinwnia-'Erub = Table = Supper, artos = food in broad sense, artos klaw = shared/distributed food**, which rules out ritual-snacks.

**Verse 28 But it-is-required-that a man document himself, and in-this-manner eat out-of this food and drink out-of this cup.**

**It-is-required-that** indicates the third person imperative which Paul and Sosthenes use with each of the verbs **document, eat, drink**. Paul and Sosthenes as apostles are giving a command for all three: it is required that each document himself, and if documented, then that saint is required to eat and to drink in an appropriate way.

**Document himself.** Each one is to examine himself whether he is in the faith of the Body of Christ or not, i.e. does he have the internal documentation of the indwelling Holy Spirit that he is a member of the Body of Christ? Restated in Roman 10:6–13 terms, does this person say to Christ, **Lord Jesus** in the sense of *non-ceremonial, non-ethnic, third- heavenly Head of the Body of Christ in which there is no ceremony, no ethnicity, and no earthly prospect* and does this person believe in his heart that *Christ rose from the dead to justify such a Body* (Rom. 4:25)? Then such a one has assurance of that regenerate nature from the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:3) through which He indwells this Body (Rom. 8:9–11, I Cor. 3:16, II Cor. 6:16) as the Shrine of the Father in the Third Heaven (Eph. 2:19–22 (Greek), II Cor. 12:1–4, Eph. 1:3). This is documentation indeed.

**In-this-manner eat out-of this food and drink out-of this cup.** Such a documented one is to eat and drink in a manner reflecting, in keeping with, his documentation. If he is a documented member of the Body of Christ, then let him eat as a documented member of the Body of Christ.



2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11

- a. Since the Body of Christ is One Body, then he must eat and drink in a manner which bespeaks his unity with the members of the Body of Christ, i.e. with mutual respect and non-divisiveness.
- b. Since the Body of Christ is far above all angels and angelic ceremony, and hence far above all ceremony, then he must eat and drink in a manner which bespeaks his freedom from all ceremony and ritual. Thus the traditional communion, derived from Roman-Mithraic communion, is FORBIDDEN for those who are documented members of the Body of Christ.
- c. Paul's and Sosthenes' vocabulary—**artos, cup, esthiw/phagw, pinw**—absolutely forbids any ceremonial meal and any ritual snack. The very words, as we have repeatedly proved and reproved, simply FORBID such.

Verses 29–32 **For the one eating and drinking judgment to himself eats and drinks not discerning the Body [of the Lord]. Through this, many among you are truly sickly-weak, and a proper-number are-put-to-sleep.**

**But if we discerned ourselves [as members of the Body], then we were absolutely-not judged; but being judged under the Lord, we are chastened to-the-intent-that we should not be condemned with the kosmos.**

1. **Eating, drinking.** **Esthiw, pinw** as above for real, non-ceremonial meals. Reference to the Lord's Supper as a real, non-ritualistic meal of unity, namely the *koinwnia*-erub, the Table and Cup of the Lord.
2. **Not discerning the Body.** Those who ate and drank in a way contrary to the Body of Christ, in the case of Corinth those eating and drinking divisively, did not exhibit in their behavior the doctrines concerning the Body and its hope and calling and Law. They ate in a manner inconsistent with the Body of Christ and so were therefore eating in a way which manifested non-discernment of the Body. They were under judgment for doing this.
3. Two kinds of judgment are in place for this divisive behavior (see under Verse 21 in F above):
  - a. Judgment of the **Many**, namely the Body of Christ. Recall **polloi** is one of those red flags indicating the Body of Christ; see Verse 17 in I.C above. These are true saints, sinning against their own calling and hope by their divisive eating and drinking, but who are forgiven by the very body and blood they dishonor; and so they are chastened by being **weak** through **great sickness**. **Truly-sickly-weak** translates the hendiadys **weak-and-sick** (with both nouns, joined by the copulative **kai** being of the same case and number and describing the same judgment), and by its usage [30] *must* be so understood. *This condition prevents them from eating!*
  - b. Judgment of the **proper-number** unto death. In the context of the Corinthian assembly = Corinthian synagogue (Session II, Section II.D, and I.B.1 and C(1,2) above), these are reprobate Jews of Second Generation Israel remaining in the synagogue who knowingly eat divisively to dishonor the Body of Christ at the Corinthian table even as Judas knowingly ate divisively to dishonor Christ at the Last Passover. The Greek **hikanoi** comes from a root meaning **fitting, proper, enough, sufficient**. The Spirit has marked out a certain number to manifest their reprobation and be put to death, even as Judas was marked out for reprobation and death. The verb **sleep** is literally in the passive, so **put-to-sleep**, the same figure

we use for animal euthanasia. The Spirit is not tolerating the behavior of these reprobate Jews at the Body's table and so is putting them to sleep. (The RSV's translation **died** is just plain wrong.) Thus the Body of Christ took over Second Generation Israel's greatest synagogue in Diaspora; and those reprobates protesting this takeover in their eating at the *koinwnia-erub* are put to death. What a witness to Second Generation Israel and to angels and men concerning the Body of Christ! Paul's distinctive gospel is the gospel of salvation today, and those who challenged it in the Corinthian synagogue though eating, during the Body's charismatic phase, were put to death. Not only did the Body take over the synagogue, but they exhibited those gifts openly, and in a way Jews of the synagogue would understand (the gift of interpretation meeting rabbinical requirements for the third part of the service—see Session I). Thus the Spirit of God hardened their hearts until they disrespected the Body's covenant *erub*, and then He killed them.

4. The judgment of the **Many**, being under Christ's Headship, brings them under chastening so that they should be corrected and not condemned with those that oppose Paul's distinctive, non-ethnic, non-ceremonial gospel, the **order** or **kosmos** of those opposing Paul's gospel. The word **kosmos** in this case indicates the **anti-Body** (Cf. II Thess. 1:7; 2:7) of the **Lawless Mystery** (= **anti-Mystery**) even as **kosmos** in certain other Pauline passages indicates the **Body** (II Cor. 5:18–21, etc) of the **Mystery** (I Cor. 2:6–8, Rom. 16:25, Eph. 3:6, etc).
- I. Exegesis of I Cor. 11:33–34. Capstone of this remarkable passage. In these two short verses, *every basic aspect of the Lord's Supper, including it being a real, unritualized koinwnia-erub, is confirmed*. Also is confirmed each significant vocabulary issue. The result is a total victory for this non-ritual view, overwhelmingly complete on every front and from every angle, anticipated and unanticipated. The truth of the real Body communion sets us free from the tyranny exercised for over two millennia by the ancient Hindu-Mithraic-Persian-Roman communion/Mysteries/Sacramenta so that we can obey ever more fully the Law of Christ and thereby honor our Head and our hope with Him far above all angels and ceremonies. This is the Lord's Table/Supper by *Sola Scriptura*.

Verse 33 **So therefore, my brethren, wait for each other when you jointly-come-together for the eat[ing].**

**So therefore.** Paul's final summation before the Body in Corinth.

**Jointly-come-together for the eat[ing].** This is precisely the notion of *koinwnia-erub*, and it additionally completely confirms that **jointly-come-together upon-the-same** in Verse 20, to which it obviously answers, means exactly that claimed above under Verse 20 in F above. So *Paul is giving final instructions on what they are to do when they eat the Lordly Supper*. And just what are those final instructions?

**Wait for each other.** THIS IS PART ONE OF THE INSTRUCTION TO THE BODY OF CHRIST FOR THE LORDLY SUPPER.

- a. This verb is in the imperative mood, so this is Paul's apostolic command.
- b. Paul does not say, snap a cracker, pronounce some words, etc. No instruction as to menu or formatting or midrashing. No such commands for the Body of Christ.

2001 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LIGHT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA  
Session IV: The Lord's Table/Supper in I Corinthians 10–11

- c. Paul's command is simply this: *when you eat the Lordly Supper, eat together in mutual respect, honoring each other as members of the Body of Christ*. In this way we show forth the body and blood of Christ for us as His Body.
- d. Paul's command is: *do not eat divisively so that one is full while another is hungry*.
- e. Paul's command is: *do not eat as a reprobate, even as Judas ate and as the reprobate Jews in the Corinthian assembly ate, for these are examples to us and this is written for our learning*.

**The Eating.** This uses **phagw** (see under Verse 21 in F above), a verb which means **eat, devour, consume, gorge**. It ALWAYS means to eat a full meal (the noun form **phagos** means **glutton**), no exceptions; and it never means to eat a ceremonial meal with the exception of Passover. These rules cover hundreds of usages between LXX and Greek NT. The hermeneutic of II Tim. 2:15 applies with inexorable rigor and demands that we so interpret here as well. We must submit and obey these words of Scripture for this is Sola Scriptura. A final total defeat for the pagan ritual-snack view.

Verse 34 **If anyone should greatly-hunger, it-is-required-that he eat within [his] property, to-the-intent-that you should not jointly-come-together for judgment.**

THIS IS PART TWO OF PAUL'S INSTRUCTION TO THE BODY OF CHRIST FOR THE LORDLY SUPPER.

**Greatly-hunger.** This is **peinaw**, meaning to hunger to the point of craving and need (see [Thayer, p. 498]). It occurs 23 times in the Greek NT.

- a. The point is not that if a saint feels some hunger, then he cannot assuage that hunger at the Lord's Table—for ALL the vocabulary associated with this meal indicates that it is a hunger-satisfying meal; but that if one feels hunger which they cannot sufficiently control at the Lordly Supper so as to eat non-divisively, i.e. **wait for others** as commanded in Verse 33, then they should first eat at home.
- b. This is the exact meaning that fits the usage of **peinaw** in Verses 21,34, the usage of all the words used of the Lordly Supper, and the very problem Paul and Sosthenes are dealing with in context, namely divisive eating.

**Within [his] property.** This is the dative of sphere of **en** with **oikw**, from **oikos** meaning **homestead, property**, within which was the **okia** (dwelling) used in Verse 22. This **en oikw** is equivalent to **okia** used in Verse 22. Urgent eating is to done at home so that when one eats his fill at the assembly table, he eats in a manner honoring the Body of Christ and hence Christ.

**To-the-intent-that you should not jointly-come-together for judgment.** Paul has dealt with them previously on this issue. This passage is the second warning (Tit. 3:10): do not eat divisively as a reprobate or else you are judged a reprobate.

- J. Complete Absence of Symbol, Ritual, Ceremony in Lordly Supper