

# Lord's Supper: Our View vs Catholic View (Lk. 14:22-26)

---

---

By  
Andy Davis

## At A Glance:

- I. Introduction
- II. Helpful Categories
- III. Biblical Data
- IV. Conclusion
- V. Questions for Further Thought

---

*These sermon study notes are designed to be a tool used after listening to the sermon. This resource is a guide to help deepen understanding regarding the Scriptures and ideas presented in the sermon. Those who use these study notes are encouraged to look up, read through, and think about Scripture references in this guide. There is more information in these notes than what is presented in the sermon. These study notes are designed to be used as an independent study tool to help the formation of Biblical convictions, character, and conduct.*

---

# Lord's Supper: Our View vs Catholic View

## I. Introduction

### A. Illustration: Developing Personal Convictions

1. As I've stated several times in the past, my background includes being exposed to the church at an early age. Growing up in a Christian family allowed me to have access to Biblical ideas while I was young. One of the rules my parents used for my brother and I was that we had to wait to be baptized because my parents wanted us to be able to more fully understand what baptism meant and what we were agreeing to if we got baptized. I had to wait until I was thirteen years old to get baptized—which I did.
2. Once baptized, I was able to participate in what we usually called "communion." A.B. Simpson, the founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance called it "the sacred ordinance".<sup>1</sup> While I participated in the Lord's Supper on a monthly basis, I only had a general idea as to why my church practiced it. I was familiar with the passages of the New Testament that dealt with the Lord's Supper and I knew it was something Jesus wanted His church to do, but I had never studied the practice or had my view challenged. Everyone in my church seemed to agree with what was taught, so I didn't have a reason to question it. I came to accept what I thought about the Lord's Supper simply through being part of my home church's culture.
3. Once I got to college and took my first theology class, I realized there were views on the Lord's Super that I had never heard of before. For the first time, I was exposed to how other Christians thought about what I thought was the standard practice of communion. Even in college, I wasn't that interested in learning about the various views because the view I held still seemed like the heavy favorite, despite my exposure to the other views. I learned a little about the different views, but I was comfortable with my own view and didn't have the need to take the other views too seriously. Even after being exposed to these other views, my current view was the best explanation of the various Biblical passages—by far.
4. However, as I was working in the church (especially a non-denominational one), I started to encounter people who had different views of the Lord's Supper, and who were passionate about their views. Some even make this church practice the center of the Christian life. Facing this situation, I had to respond to these other views and take them more seriously. As I studied the alternative positions on communion more fully, I realized that for some people, it was a critically important issue (some see it as the central feature of the entire Christian life. While all Christians agree that the Lord's Supper is important and we all participate in it, we don't all agree how best to understand or practice it.

- B. While your journey will likely be different from mine, there are probably some similar themes when it comes to the development of your own personal convictions. Perhaps there are views

---

<sup>1</sup> A. B. Simpson, [\*The Apostolic Church\*](#) (New York; Nyack: Christian Alliance Publishing Co., n.d.), 119.

and doctrines you hold based only on what you have picked up from the church culture or teachings you have been exposed to. It is easy to land in a spot by default without being intentional. Maybe you've encountered other people's views that differ from your own which has caused you to re-evaluate your own thinking. There may even be a few topics which you have had to dive deeper into and have studied them out from the Scriptures while considering all the various views. There is a general pattern of personal conviction development that is visible here.

- C. If we are open to traveling down a sometimes uncomfortable and painful path of deepening our personal convictions, we can come out on the other side much more confident in our own views with a greater patience toward others who disagree with us. In fact, this journey is necessary if we are to have a better impact on others for Jesus. Having well developed personal convictions, along with the right attitude (especially in our technology-rich, globalized world), goes a long way for meaningful impact. As we reach into a culture that dismisses Christianity as an outdated naive perspective that isn't worth taking seriously, it is even more necessary that disciples speak from informed personal convictions.
- D. Since part of our highest priorities as a church is to help transform people's convictions (this is how we define discipleship), the elders thought it would be beneficial for me to provide you with more instruction regarding the Lord's Supper, which we celebrate every month. We also realize that our church has people from all different kinds of backgrounds. It is a safe assumption to think that everyone connected to our church won't have the same understanding of the Lord's Supper that our denomination holds.<sup>2</sup> Given all this, it is a wise idea for us to spend some time more fully explaining the nature of our understanding of the Lord's Supper.

## II. Helpful Categories

- A. One of our top priorities here at Community Alliance Church is to help individuals develop their own personal convictions, which is why our mission statement includes, "Transforming convictions". We want people to take personal responsibility for their own beliefs so they will meet the Biblical requirement: "Each person must be fully convinced in his own mind" (Rm. 14:5). Having informed and developed convictions leads to spiritual maturity, confidence, and has a huge impact on the way a person lives. Our conduct (lifestyle) is ALWAYS a reflection of our convictions. Everybody lives their accepted theology. This is why doctrine matters.
- B. What we think about the Lord's Supper, particularly as we consider our denomination's view versus the Catholic view, is impacted by what a person thinks about salvation (how a person is made right with God by being forgiven).<sup>3</sup> The differences regarding the Lord's Supper and the

---

<sup>2</sup> While our denomination focuses on the most important and essential doctrines while allowing vast freedom on secondary issues—which is one of our great strengths, for the purpose of greater unity across the theological spectrum, there is no official statement on the denominations view of the Lord's Supper. As far as I know, A.B. Simpson's view is not required although it is encouraged. However, both Simpson's view and the large majority of ordained workers in the Alliance will be presented here.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Council of Trent, the Eucharist is necessary for salvation, "Canon IV. If any one shall say, that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous, and that without them, and without desire thereof, men, through faith alone, obtain of God the grace of justification; though all [the sacraments] be not necessary for every individual; let him be anathema." Theodore Alois Buckley, [\*The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent\*](#) (London: George Routledge and Co., 1851), 52.

Eucharist point to one of the most significant differences between the Catholic church and the evangelical or Protestant church.

- C. Before we can start thinking through this topic, it will be helpful to provide a few intellectual categories that apply to this topic. These categories will help give you the skills needed to think through this topic with clarity. It is necessary to make a few distinctions and to use these categories to work through your understanding of the Lord's Supper. Hopefully after covering this material, you will be in a better position to work through your understanding of the Lord's Supper in a deeper and more careful way.
- D. In the Bible, there are three basic sources of information regarding the Lord's Supper that are relevant to developing our views on this topic. The first is the physical elements themselves. In this category, we want to pay attention to everything the Bible says in all the passages that talk about the physical elements of the Lord's Supper, which includes the bread and the wine. Looking for descriptions, designations, and what happens to the physical elements themselves is a consideration when determining what a person believes on this topic. The second category of information is what is said about the physical elements. Different individuals (most importantly Jesus) make statements about the bread and the wine. What is said about the physical elements is a distinct category from the physical objects themselves. All the various statements about the elements should be taken together to develop an adequate Biblical view. Lastly, we also have statements about the events or ritual (practice) of the Lord's Supper. Primarily, our information here comes from Jesus and Paul. There are statements not about the physical elements but what participation in the Lord's Supper means. Statements interpreting and explaining the sacrament are found in Scripture. Each of these categories should be considered and kept distinct from one another.
- E. It is also instructive to understand the three main categories of views on communion.<sup>4</sup> Broadly speaking, the three views include first, some sort of change to the physical elements of the bread and wine. This includes Catholic and Lutheran views. While the change to the physical elements doesn't have to be a change of appearance or physical structure, there is some meaningful change to the physical elements themselves. The second view holds to the idea that there isn't an alteration to the physical elements themselves, but there is a special presence of Jesus that surrounds the physical elements in a unique way during the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (the Reformed position). This includes the idea that grace and a special spiritual benefit occurs when the Lord's Supper is practiced appropriately. The third and final view is that the Lord's Supper is vitally important, but there is no change to the physical elements and there is no special grace or spiritual benefit that is unique to the Lord's Supper. While the Lord's Supper can be a means of grace or spiritual benefit, this is not of a different nature or kind exclusive to the Eucharist. This is typically considered the Baptist view (or the Zwinglian view).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Millard J. Erickson, [Introducing Christian Doctrine](#), ed. Arnold L. Hustad, Third Edition. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 418–421. Millard actually outlines four major views. For the purpose of simplification, I have reduced these views to the three main logical categories.

<sup>5</sup> It can be difficult to formally put these different views into a particular category according to their approach to the Lord's Supper. For example, Zwingli was Reformed although he disagrees with what is commonly understood as the Reformed approach to the Lord's Supper. In reality, different views might not fit nicely into their category, these categories can still be helpful.

- F. One final distinction is important to consider, which is at the center of this discussion: Do we take Jesus' words literally or as a metaphor? At the heart of this topic is the way a person understands Jesus' words on this practice when He says, "this is my body" and "this is my blood". At the heart of the differences of opinion is the definition of the word "is".<sup>6</sup> We must ask ourselves the question, considering the Biblical evidence, what is the best explanation of Jesus' words? Did Jesus intend, and did the disciples understand, His words to be taken literally or metaphorically? Since this is at the center of this debate, the literalness or the metaphorical understanding of Jesus's words will be the main focus of our discussion.
- G. These categories can help us think through the content of the Bible with greater clarity and understanding. By using these categories, a person can arrive at a more informed personal conviction regarding one of the central practices of the church. Hopefully, these categories will help deepen your own understanding of the Lord's Supper.

### III. Biblical Data

- A. Now that we have some tools to work with, we are now in a position to apply those tools to the information we find in the Bible. Having the framework with which to process information is important. Now the next critical step is to make sure we are using those categories with the right information. Having a full knowledge of all the relevant Biblical texts is the focus of the next step in the process of developing our own personal convictions regarding the Lord's Supper. Since this is an introduction to this issue and not an exhaustive study, we will only be able to look at a couple of the most important details in the most significant passages. The most important texts include Jesus establishing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the gospels (Mt. 26:20-29, Mk. 14:22-26, Lk. 22:14-23), the fullest explanation of the Lord's Supper by the apostle Paul (1 Cor. 10:14-33, 11:18-34), and another significant passages that frequently comes up in this discussion (Jn. 6:1-71).
- B. We will start by looking at Lk. 22:14-23 which provides us the most detailed description of Jesus establishing the Lord's Supper with His disciples in the gospels:

<sup>14</sup> When the hour had come, He reclined *at the table*, and the apostles with Him. <sup>15</sup> And He said to them, "I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; <sup>16</sup> for I say to you, I shall never again eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." <sup>17</sup> And when He had taken a cup *and* given thanks, He said, "Take this and share it among yourselves; <sup>18</sup> for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine from now on until the kingdom of God comes." <sup>19</sup> And when He had taken *some* bread *and* given thanks, He broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is My body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me." <sup>20</sup> And in the same way *He took* the cup after they had eaten, saying, "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood. <sup>21</sup> But behold, the hand of the one betraying Me is with Mine on the table. <sup>22</sup> For indeed, the Son of Man is going as it has been determined; but woe to that man by whom He is betrayed!" <sup>23</sup> And they began to discuss among themselves which one of them it might be who was going to do this thing.

---

<sup>6</sup> Leon Morris, [\*Luke: An Introduction and Commentary\*](#), vol. 3, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 324.

- C. Without entering the debate as to why Luke and Paul mention the cup first while Matthew and Mark have the bread first, we will simply take the elements in the order that Luke presents them. Notice that Jesus “had taken a cup *and* given thanks” (v. 17). This cup is one of the Passover cups which would have contained wine which Jesus makes clear, “I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer” (v. 15).<sup>7</sup> This context is an important detail when considering whether or not to take Jesus’s words literally or as metaphor (one item standing in the place of another due to a likeness between the two)—symbolically. In the Passover celebration, every item on the table represents something else.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, both Jesus and the disciples would have a default mindset of symbolism.
- D. Notice how Jesus describes the first physical element connected to the Lord’s Supper that He is instituting with His disciples: “I will not drink of the fruit of the vine” (v. 18). This becomes even more significant when Matthew and Mark put this wording AFTER the Lord’s Supper is completed (Mt. 26:29, 14:25). Further, these are the same physical elements that will be used during the ultimate fulfillment of the Lord’s Supper in the eternal kingdom of God, “until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God” (v. 16) and “until the kingdom of God comes” (v. 18). In other words, the “fruit of the vine” is the physical element to be used in this sacrament of the church for its entirety. The same person who said of the cup, “This is My blood,” also called it, “the fruit of the vine”—which He does after giving thanks. This is significant in understanding what His words mean. Both these statements, taken together, strongly point to a symbolic and metaphorical understanding rather than a literal understanding.<sup>9</sup>
- E. After Jesus’s introductory remarks, “He had taken *some* bread *and* given thanks” (v. 19), Jesus did the same with the cup (“And in the same way *He* took the cup after they had eaten” v. 20). Jesus took bread and a cup of wine and gave it new meaning. Luke tells us Jesus thanked God for the provision of the bread and the wine. However, both Matthew and Mark describe Jesus’s actions and words as, “after a blessing” (Mt. 26:26, Mk. 14:22). Did Jesus offer thanks or a blessing? Both are saying the same thing. We have the traditional blessings of the Jews for both the produce of the land and the wine.<sup>10</sup> With the words “fruit of the vine” Jesus is using the exact words of the traditional Jewish blessing for wine. These “blessings” were offered as an act of thanks to God. This is important as the blessing is not said over the physical elements to transform them as the Catholics claim. These blessings were directed toward God, not the food or physical elements. In addition, there is no indication whatsoever that the physical elements change into something else due to this blessing/act of thanksgiving (“take this and share it among yourselves” v. 17 and “He broke it and gave it to them” v. 19). These references go back to the cup/fruit of the vine and the bread. Another major problem is that the exact same term

<sup>7</sup> For a brief overview of the Jewish Passover meal see Thomas R. Schreiner, “[Luke](#),” in *Evangelical Commentary on the Bible*, vol. 3, Baker Reference Library (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995), 835.

<sup>8</sup> We possess the Jewish ritual and understanding of the Passover in the Mishnah Pesachim 10:1-7: Jacob Neusner, [The Mishnah : A New Translation](#) (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), 249–251.

<sup>9</sup> How could the physical elements inside the cup be both the “fruit of the vine” and “blood” at the same time? These are two substances with incompatible physical properties.

<sup>10</sup> These blessings are found in the Mishnah Berakoth 6:1: Jacob Neusner, [The Mishnah : A New Translation](#) (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), 9: “Blessed are you, O Lord, Our God, King of the Universe, Creator of the fruit of the vine.” For the bread the blessing was: “Blessed are you, O Lord, Our God, King of the Universe, Who brings forth bread from the earth.”

for blessing is used for regular meals (Mt. 14:19, Mk. 6:41, 8:7, Lk. 9:16, 24:30).<sup>11</sup> Therefore, if the prayer/blessing/thanksgiving is the means by which the elements become the body and blood of Jesus in the Lord's Supper, this must also be true everywhere these words are found in Scripture in order to be consistent. There is no textual reason to see a distinction between these words in the Lord's Supper and elsewhere.

- F. While the language regarding the cup seems straightforward in Luke, the language contained in Matthew and Mark add to the discussion by saying, "for this is My blood" (Mt. 26:28, Mk. 14:24). In other words, the cup is the blood of Jesus if taken literally. A Catholic understanding of the Eucharist holds that the physical elements (in this case the cup, or more specifically the wine) become the real blood of Jesus.<sup>12</sup> Jesus's words are taken literally.<sup>13</sup> An important concept to understand in Catholic theology is the idea that the substance/essence of the bread and wine no longer exist as they've been replaced with the body and blood of Jesus.<sup>14</sup> The only indicator we get as to a possible change in the physical objects themselves come from the words of Jesus, "this is my body" and "this is my blood"—these are statements ABOUT the physical objects and not a statement of what happens to the physical elements. However, if we take these words of Jesus literally, we have a contradiction coming from Jesus Himself. He calls the wine, "the fruit of the vine" and "My blood" at the same time. Taking Jesus's second statement as a metaphor not only removes this contradiction, it also provides the best explanation of the rest of the Biblical data on this topic.
- G. Further, Jesus provides another description related to the blood that is important, "the new covenant in My blood" (v. 20, 1 Cor. 11:25) or "for this is My blood of the covenant" (Mt. 26:28, Mk. 14:24). Jesus is not just talking about His blood; He is talking about what His blood accomplishes, which strongly points to a symbolic rather than a literal meaning. To take this whole statement literally would require us to think of the covenant as physical contained in Jesus's blood. Nowhere is this taught or affirmed in the New Testament.
- H. Another critical consideration is that Jesus says, "This cup is poured out for you" (v. 20). Again, if we are taking ALL of Jesus's words literally, the wine or blood of Jesus must be poured out. However, there is no description of this happening. Instead of being poured out, it is drunk according to Mark, who gives us the greatest detail on this point: "He gave it [a cup that He

<sup>11</sup> In the multiplication of the loaves, Jesus gave the blessed food to everyone—including those who didn't believe in Jesus.

<sup>12</sup> "The signs of bread and wine become, in a way surpassing understanding, the Body and Blood of Christ." Catholic Church, [Catechism of the Catholic Church](#), 2nd Ed. (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 2000), 336. How is this accomplished? "In the *institution narrative* the power of the words and the action of Christ, and the power of the Holy Spirit, make sacramentally present under the species of bread and wine Christ's body and blood" Catholic Church, [Catechism of the Catholic Church](#), 2nd Ed. (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 2000), 341.

<sup>13</sup> As the catechism of the Council of Trent says, "but in the eucharist, that which was bread and wine before consecration, after consecration is truly the substance of the body and blood of the Lord." Catholic Church, [The Catechism of the Council of Trent](#), trans. Theodore Alois Buckley (London: George Routledge and Co., 1852), 213–214. The cup and the bread "mystically" become the blood and body of Jesus in some sense usually referred to as a change "in nature" or "substance" but not in "physical form" or "species". Whether this takes Jesus's words literally or not is for people to decide—I don't see this understanding as literal. Not even Catholics take Jesus's words literally in the sense of human blood is not in the cup and human skin is not what is eaten.

<sup>14</sup> Here is what the Council of Trent says, "In the first place, the holy synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that, in the sacred sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things." Theodore Alois Buckley, [The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent](#) (London: George Routledge and Co., 1851), 71.

gave thanks for] to them, and they all drank from it.” (Mk. 14:23).<sup>15</sup> The physical contents of the cup were never poured out, which means Jesus is not using literal language here. While more could be said, a strong case has been made for a non-literal, metaphorical understanding of Jesus’s words when initiating the Lord’s Supper with the disciples.

- I. How did the disciples understand Jesus’s words, “This is my body” and “this is my blood”? It is extremely likely that the disciples did not understand Jesus’s words literally. Why? Because they ate and drank it without any words of protest or hesitation. The same person, Peter, who later objected when God told Him to eat unclean food (Ac. 10:9-16) spoke no words of protest when Jesus told him to consume “blood,” which was a clear violation of the divine command found in Leviticus 17:10-14. Jews were not to consume animal blood as a means of respecting and honoring the life of the animal, as well as using it for a different purpose other than the purpose for which God gave it to them. If this was true of animals, how much more so would this be true of human blood? If this was true of human blood, how much more valuable is the blood of Jesus, the incarnate God? For the disciples to understand Jesus to be telling them to consume real human blood without a word of objection is unfathomable.
- J. Now we will take a quicker look at Paul’s explanation of the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:23-34). From the start, Paul refers to the physical elements as bread (“took bread” (v. 23) and “the cup” (v. 25), which is assumed to be wine). Those who “eat of the bread and drink of the cup” (vv. 26, 27) both “proclaim the Lord’s death” (v. 26) and “eat and drinks judgment to himself” (v. 29). Yes, the language of, “This is My body” (v. 24) and “the blood of the Lord” (v. 27) are also used, but the physical elements themselves are said to be bread and the cup. It is the bread and cup as physical elements are directly connected to the spiritual consequences of the Lord’s Supper, both positive and negative. Paul says he is repeating what he received from Jesus (“I received from the Lord” v. 23). Therefore, if there is a strong metaphorical case for Jesus’s words (see above), this carries over to Paul’s understanding as well.
- K. If we take Paul literally on the elements being the body and blood of Jesus, they we must do the same again with the covenant, “This cup is the new covenant in My blood” (v. 25). The new covenant must be physically present in the cup. How can a relationship between God and humans be physically contained in a cup? Once again, there is good reason to take Paul’s words as metaphorical as well.
- L. Finally, we will take another brief look at parts of John chapter 6. Jesus is speaking with a group of people who do not yet believe in Him who had witnessed His miracles and His multiplication of the loaves of bread (Jn. 6:2, 6:5-12). These people did not yet believe in Jesus (Jn. 6:36). This context becomes clear as Jesus begins His discussion about being the “bread of life” by speaking of the motivation with which the people are approaching Him, “you seek Me, not because you saw signs, but because you ate of the loaves and were filled” (Jn. 6:26). Jesus is trying to tell the crowd, who is looking for more food, that He offers them something better.
- M. Further confirmation of this salvation-focused theme comes in Jesus’s appeals for the crowd to believe in Him (Jn. 6:29, 35, 36) as well as His emphasis on coming to Him by the Father’s

---

<sup>15</sup> Some speculate that one communal cup was poured into individual classes from which the disciples then drank. However, Mark’s description contradicts that speculation.



enablement (Jn. 6:37, 44-45). Jesus then leverages the multiplication of the loaves to share the gospel with the crowd so that they might come to believe in Him (Jn. 6:27-29). On the topic of bread, the crowd brings up God's provision of manna for their ancestors as they ask for a sign for the purpose of believing in Jesus (Jn. 6:30-31). Jesus, using the same imagery, then claims to be the bread that comes from heaven.

- N. The spiritual message that Jesus is communicating is that the crowd needs to look at Jesus and believe in Him in order to receive eternal life (a present quality of life made available to those who believe) and be resurrected to life in the future (Jn. 6:38-40). This is the substance of what Jesus is saying. Since the crowds were not understanding Him and to chase away those who were not being drawn to Him by the Father, Jesus said the same thing using the imagery of eating His flesh and drinking His blood. Jesus uses the EXACT SAME WORDS as believing in Him (Jn. 6:54). Everyone who "beholds the Son and believes in Him will have eternal life" (v. 40) and "I Myself will raise him up on the last day" (v. 40). Jesus simply repeats Himself with different language using the image of His physical body: "He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life" and "I will raise Him up on the last day" (v. 54). Belief and eating lead to the same outcomes. Eating Jesus's flesh and drinking His blood symbolically represents believing in Him, which Jesus explicitly says (Jn. 6:63).<sup>16</sup> Jesus repeats His plea for the crowd to believe in Him several times and in several different ways in this chapter.
- O. In light of all these texts, the question we must answer is this: Is the best explanation of all the Biblical data to take Jesus literally when He says, "this is my body" and "this is my blood," or is it better to understand His words as a metaphorical figure of speech? This is the difference between our view and the Catholic view. Given the above evidence, what do you think? Read the texts for yourself. Read the claims of the official positions of the Catholic church. Make an informed decision.<sup>17</sup>

#### IV. Conclusion

- A. While we have only scratched the surface in this ongoing theological discussion, we have covered the most important ground related to the most important topic in this debate. In the Christian and Missionary Alliance denomination, we hold to a symbolic or representational view of the physical elements of the Lord's Supper. This does not mean the Lord's Supper is merely symbolic, however. Real spiritual benefits are obtained by practicing it.
- B. Jesus intended this practice of the church to bring the church together in unity. Unfortunately, it has become a matter of division. Hopefully, we can learn to be more gracious with those who don't share our personal understanding of the Lord's Supper and allow others, through the guidance of the Spirit, to draw their own theological convictions from the Bible. We don't all have to explain the texts and understand the Lord's Supper the same way, as long as the Scriptures are taken as the Word of God, without error, and it sets the boundaries on what is acceptable for orthodox doctrine.

<sup>16</sup> John repeats the same mistake throughout His gospel: those who misunderstand Jesus get stuck on taking His words literally because they don't understand the spiritual nature of His message. Just two quick examples include Nicodemus who thought he had to climb back into his mother's womb and the woman at the well who thought Jesus was offering her water to drink.

<sup>17</sup> For those who may be interested in diving deeper into this issue. A good resource is James Whites' book *Fatal Flaw: Do the teachings of the Roman Catholicism Deny the Gospel?*

**V. Questions for Further Thought**

- A. What is your understanding of the Lord's Supper? Where do you see these ideas in Scripture?
- B. How do you think Jesus understood the physical elements of the Passover meal?
- C. Have you ever encountered other Christians who hold to a different view of the Lord's Supper than yours? What was that experience like? How did you respond?
- D. What encouragements or benefits may result from participating in the Lord's Supper?
- E. What is acceptable and not acceptable when it comes to practicing the Lord's Supper? What are your personal preferences? Is there a difference between the two?