

DOES A “MAKE-UP” SUPPER FIT THE PATTERN?

I. What 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 is Saying:

A. Addressing 2 Problems:

1. A party spirit overflowed into the L.S. in that different people were partaking at different times.
2. The simple, reverent supper had been transformed into a common, social meal.

B. Breakdown of Text:

1. **vs. 17** – Your meetings are doing more harm than good.
2. **vs. 18** – You folks are divided (**cf. 1 Corinthians 1:12**).
3. **vs. 19** – At least the cream will rise to the top over this issue.
4. **vs. 20** – You may think you are observing the L.S., but you’ve blown it.
5. **vs. 21** – You are not partaking together; you are not waiting for each other (**vs. 33**).
6. **vs. 22** – What you’re doing is condemned; you’re shaming the church; eat S.M. at home.
7. **vs. 23-26** – Here is what is authorized: reverence, proper emblems, together.
8. **vs. 27** – There are serious consequences for what you’re doing.
9. **vs. 28** – Better look inward and make sure you are part of the cream.
10. **vs. 29** – Again, do not go to hell over the matter.
11. **vs. 30** – Due to problems and lack of S.E., many are spiritually ill and some are spiritually dead.
12. **vs. 31** – Again, look inward so you are not condemned (judged).
13. **vs. 32** – I am telling you these hard things so you will not be lost.
14. **vs. 33** – Back to problem #1 – set a time to come together and wait for one another.
15. **vs. 34** – Back to problem #2 – Do not connect common meals to the church.

II. There is a Pattern: (Gospels; Acts 20:7ff; 1 Cor. 11:17ff)

- A. If there were no N.T. pattern for partaking of the L.S. correctly, then doing anything in any way would be acceptable.
- B. But there is a N.T. pattern for partaking of the Lord's Supper correctly, thus doing it any other way is unacceptable.

III. What the Pattern Includes:

- A. **What:** Unleavened Bread – **Mt. 26:26; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:23-24.**
- B. **What:** Cup (Fruit of the Vine) – **Mt. 26:27-29; 11:25.**
- C. **When:** Day (1st day of week) – **Acts 20:7.**
- D. **When:** Church assembly – **Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:33.**
- E. **Who:** Disciples/ Christians – **Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:17-34.**
- F. **Who:** All present that came to do it – **Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11.**
- G. **Where:** In/as the church (“in one place”) – **1 Cor. 11:17-20.**
- H. **Why:** In remembrance of Christ – **1 Cor. 11:24-25.**
- I. **Why:** Proclaim the Lord's death/coming – **1 Cor. 11:26.**
- J. **How:** In a worthy manner (proper emblems only; reverence) – **1 Cor. 11:27-29.**
- K. **How:** Together – **Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:17, 18, 20, 33, 34.**
- L. **How:** Wait for each other (**1 Corinthians 11:33**).

IV. Questions:

- A. Which of the above is non-essential? Why or why not?
- B. Is there a passage which authorizes us to provide a special (limited, make-up) service for only a few saints present to partake?
- C. Do situation ethics allow us to by-pass, circumvent, or otherwise change the authorized way of eating the L.S.?

V. The Pattern Shows, Among Other Things:

- A. Congregational action (**Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 11:17, 18, 20, 33, 34**).
- B. One offering (**Acts 20:7-11**).

VI. Questions:

- A. Are we content to stick with what we can read?
- B. If we know that one Supper for all who can be there at the assembly is scriptural, why would we ever want to do more or less (e.g. partaking with family in hotel room; taking to shut ins; a make-up Supper)?

VII. Do Emotional Arguments Authorize Anything?

- A. *“You antis won't give one dime to feed a starving baby.”*
 Does this authorize church support of an orphan home?
- B. *“Those people would've never heard the gospel if it wasn't for churches working thru our organization.”*
 Does this authorize church support of a missionary society or sponsoring church?
- C. *“Those people would've never set foot inside our church building had it not been for our social programs.”*
 Does this authorize a church fellowship hall/ family life center?
- D. *“Those brethren would've never been able to partake of the Lord's Supper if not for us offering it again on Sunday PM.”*
 Does this authorize a make-up L.S.?

VIII. Arguments Used to Justify a “Make-Up” Offering of the Lord's Supper:

- A. *“It has always been done this way.”*
1. Where is the passage that gives the evidence and makes the argument valid?
 2. This is simply not true – those who suggest such know not what they say (**cf. 1 Timothy 6-7**).
 3. The Lord's Supper has not always been done the way many churches “do it” today.
 4. Look at the pattern and hear the testimony of aged saints.
- B. *“We've done it this way for many years.”*
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. Which passage affirms this is the way to establish Bible authority?
 3. **Acts 8:9-11**
 4. Catholics have sprinkled children for a long time, does this make it right?
 5. We will not allow for the denominationalists to determine authority this way.
- C. *“The elders approved it.”*
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. Where is the passage that says elders can change the pattern?
 3. **Jeremiah 44:19**
 4. Many elders have approved eating halls, unlimited benevolence, etc.
 5. Can elders change the meeting day? How about the way we give? How about the way we lift praise to God? How about what is preached? Then why...
 6. Elders are not the authority (**Colossians 3:17**).
- D. *“The last preacher preached it.”*
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. Where is the passage that says the preacher may preach man-made traditions and opinions?
 3. Whatever a preacher preaches must be found in the Word of God (**2 Timothy 4:2**).
 4. Is the idea of a second, make-up offering of the L.S. even remotely found in the Word of God?
 5. **1 Corinthians 2:5**
 6. Many preachers preach direct operation of the Holy Ghost, error on the women's role, etc.
 7. Preachers are not the authority. (**Colossians 3:17; Acts 17:10-11**)
- E. *“My Parents did it.”*
1. Please point to the passage that gives authority for a make-up Supper.
 2. Which passage states that parents are infallible and that they are the authority for matters spiritual?
 3. **1 Kings 15:25-26**
 4. What if the parents had transgressed the pattern?
 5. Parents used to spit tobacco in spittoons in meeting houses. Should we do this today?
- F. *“Most congregations have a ‘make-up’ Supper.”*
1. Where is the passage that shows the pattern involves a make-up Supper?
 2. **2 Peter 2:1-2**
 3. Only 2 of 7 churches in Asia Minor (Smyrna and Philadelphia) were wholly approved (**Revelation 2:8ff; 3:7ff**).
 4. Just because a lot of people believe something does not make it true – **Matthew 7:13-14**.

G. *“We think it is a good idea.”*

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. The rich farmer Jesus spoke of thought he had a good idea ([Luke 12:15ff](#)).
3. Uzzah must have thought he was doing God a favor by touching the Ark ([2 Samuel 6:1-7](#)).
4. [Isaiah 55:8-9](#); [Jeremiah 10:23](#); [Proverbs 3:5-6](#); [2 Corinthians 10:5](#)

H. *“Let’s leave ‘well-enough’ alone.”*

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. Does the Bible support this “good enough” idea?
3. If a person disobeyed the pattern to be buried (let’s say an arm did not go under the water), would the congregation say, *“Let’s not make her go all the way under, let’s just leave ‘well-enough’ alone.”* C’mon now, would they?
4. Why then can people disobey the pattern to wait for one another and partake of the Lord’s Supper together and say “Let’s leave ‘well-enough’ alone.”
5. [1 Thessalonians 5:21](#); [2 Corinthians 13:5](#)

I. *“I don’t want to change.”*

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. What a great attitude.
3. God has given us a pattern which He will not change ([Malachi 3:6](#)).
4. [Romans 2:5](#)

J. *“It does not say we cannot.”*

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. This is the worst ever.
3. Again, when God gets specific about what He wants, He does not have to tell us everything that He *does not* want!
4. It does not say that we cannot use coke and banana bread either! Will those who hoist this argument allow for such?
5. Where does this line of reasoning end?
6. The N.T. does not say we cannot have rooms in the church building so married couples can fulfill [1 Cor. 7:3](#).
7. Consistency demands that if we can do one, we can do the other.

K. *“It is just an aid to help us fulfill the command.”*

1. Just where is the passage that allows for a make-up Supper?
2. Aids are authorized (microphone) so long as they do not change the specific pattern (preach the Word).
3. Something is no longer an aid if it changes the specific command; at this point it becomes an addition.
4. Additions are not authorized, but are rather condemned ([Revelation 22:18-19](#)).
5. Now really, how does a make-up Supper wherein a few partake while the rest watch, aid in the command to assemble together on the first day of the week, wait for all who can be there to get there, then partake together?
6. The make-up Supper does not aid us in fulfilling the pattern; it is an addition to the pattern.

L. *“If this is true, then you better start meeting in upper rooms, using one cup, preaching until midnight, etc.”*

1. Where is the passage authorizing a make-up Supper?
2. This is an attempt to really cloud the issue.
3. First of all, multiple containers for the fruit of the vine are clearly authorized by an approved example ([Luke 22:17](#)).
4. Second of all, meeting in upper rooms and long sermons are authorized, but are not commanded. What we cannot change is the specific pattern for worship we find in the New Testament.
5. Even if we were inconsistent and did need to start meeting in upper rooms, etc. this still does not prove that a congregation may have a make-up Supper.

M. *“We are still together in one place just some people are partaking and some are not.”*

1. Where is the command, approved example, or necessary conclusion that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. Being in the same place together and partaking together is not the same thing.
3. This is exactly what Paul condemned in [1 Corinthians 11:20](#).
4. Even if they would have not perverted the Supper (by adding the common meal), they would have still been partaking at different times. Again, this very idea is condemned.

N. ***“All must have an opportunity to partake.”***

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. Where is the passage that says this?
3. Did folks at Troas (**Acts 20:7-11**) have an opportunity to partake if they missed? C'mon now did they?
4. Could they do it at home if they couldn't make it to the assembly? Why not? Didn't they need an opportunity?
5. Could they have taken it to those who were shut in earlier in the day? Why not? Didn't they need an opportunity?
6. Could they come Monday? Why not? Didn't they need an opportunity?
7. Could they use strawberry pop if they ran out of juice? Why not? – They needed an opportunity, right?
8. So, how far are people willing to go in order to provide this “opportunity” to have the L.S.?

O. ***“The ‘Passover Principles’ demonstrate that we may partake of a make-up Supper.”***

1. Note that this is the only argument so far that even brings up scripture (cf. **Numbers 9:1-11**).
2. What does the New Testament say about mixing the O.T. and the N.T. for doctrine? (**Galatians 5:1-4**)
3. Moses inquired of the Lord and the Lord legislated a make-up offering? Has he legislated so for us?
4. Must those who miss L.S. wait one month to partake?
5. When they partake must they use bitter herbs or is that principle “passed-over” as well?
6. Has God told us in the New Testament to offer a make-up serving per these rules given to Jews?
7. Me in time past – now see it as a lame excuse, and not a scriptural reason or authority for a second serving.

P. ***“If we do not offer it a second time to those who missed, we are being inconsiderate and thus, sinful.”***

1. Back to emotionalism. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. It is okay if people plan to miss the A.M. assembly to work, or to visit with family, or to travel – being inconsiderate to their brothers and sisters in Christ and insulting God (**Hebrews 10:24-25**), but we are inconsiderate, right? Hmm.
3. Are we not in reality being more considerate and helpful to the souls of men if we help them get their priorities in order and make it to the assembly, rather than helping to enable them in their decision to plan to miss?
4. If a local church has only one Sunday worship assembly (as many do), are those who use this argument saying that they are NOT being considerate for those who may not be able to make it to that one service?
5. Are such congregations then sinful for not being considerate?
6. We cannot be so considerate that we change the authorized pattern. (Wasn't Uzzah being considerate – **2 Sam 6**?)
7. Ask those who offer the make-up Supper this question: If they met only once on Sunday, and brother XYZ made it known he was going to miss, would they be sinning if they didn't re-arrange everything for him? (They should.)
8. Do most truly want to be considerate, or are most truly just comfortable?

Q. ***“If you are going to insist that it be done together and we are to wait for each other, then all must partake at the exact same moment.”***

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. What does this really prove anyway, with regard to the issue under discussion? Nothing.
3. This is an attempt to get the focus off the real issue – asking for authority.
4. In no passage regarding the L.S. are we commanded to have the bread or juice hit our lips at exactly the same time.
5. What the pattern does call for is congregational eating; eating together in one place (**1 Cor. 11:17, 18, 20, 33, 34**).
6. Even if we needed egg timers, our alleged inconsistency does not authorize a make-up Supper.

R. ***“Sunday night worship is just a continuation of Sunday morning worship.”***

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. Where is the passage that says a second worship assembly on the same day is a continuation of one earlier?
3. Are those who hoist this argument willing to accept the consequences?
 - (a) If they believe that they simply continue the L.S. at night, then they must admit that the A.M. L.S. partaking was incomplete.
 - (i) If this is so, they should not say in the A.M. “This concludes the L.S.”
 - (ii) They need to start saying “*We will continue the Lord's Supper tonight.*” Note – even if they did say this, there is no authority for such a concept in scripture.
 - (b) If it is a continuation, they have only partially worshipped, and will not be finished until Sunday P.M. ends.
 - (i) If this is the case, then brethren who did not come back in the PM have only partially worshipped, and have not finished.
 - (ii) Also, those who do not come on Sunday morning have only half-way worshipped.
 - (iii) Will God accept their incomplete, partial worship? (**Matthew 22:37**)

- S. ***“We must have all five acts of worship every time we assemble on Sunday.”***
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. What passages are used to back up the argument?
 3. Is there even an example or necessary conclusion that the early church met more than one time on the Lord’s Day?
 4. If all 5 (sing, word, pray, supper, give) are something we must have, then they must be done in both assemblies.
 5. Offering something is not the same thing as doing something.
 6. If this argument is true, then where does that leave congregation XYZ that over a period of two months on 3 occasions had no one partake or give at the Sunday P.M. assembly?
 7. Not only is the argument unscriptural, but advocates of the make-up Supper do not even follow it themselves.
- T. ***“While the few partake we are mentally communing as they physically eat and drink (commune).”***
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. Where is the passage that discusses that mental eating (mental action without physical action)?
 3. I agree that communion involves mental action (**1 Corinthians 11:24-25**), but it also involves physical action (**1 Corinthians 10:16**).
 - (a) Stated another way: remembrance + eating = communion.
 - (b) Thus, remembrance – eating ≠ communion (or, mental action alone does not equal communion).
 - (c) Scripture defeats this argument.
 - (d) There is no way (scripturally speaking) that those who sit there at a P.M. service, while the few who missed partake, are communing with them.”
 - (e) I may say I am mentally skinny, but does that make it so? Folks, let’s get real here!
- U. ***“You are binding where God has not bound. The New Testament is a law of liberty – thus, we are free to offer the Lord’s Supper to those who missed Sunday morning.”***
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. Granted, adding to the will of God is just as bad as subtracting from it (**Revelation 22:18-19**).
 3. But, are we adding to it (binding) or are we simply following the pattern we can read about in Scripture?
 4. The law of liberty (**James 1:25; 2:12**), is also called the law of faith (**Romans 3:27**).
 - (a) How does faith come (**Romans 10:17**)?
 - (b) Is God’s word silent about a make-up Supper or does it legislate one? (Be honest now.)
 5. Does not even **James 1:25** show that within the law of liberty there is a right way and a wrong way to do things?
 6. Are we really ready to suggest that **James 1:25** means we are free to change the specific pattern God has given us?
 7. Are we really ready to admit that we are going to be judged (**James 2:12**) by doing what is right in our own eyes?
 8. If **James 1:25** allows for a changing of the pattern and a make-up Supper then it also must allow for:
 - (a) Instrumental music in worship – a change in the specific pattern.
 - (b) Sprinkling for baptism – a change in the specific pattern.
 - (c) Elders may be women – a change in the specific pattern.
 - (d) Any specific may be altered without consequence.
 - (e) This is plainly ridiculous and all who are honest can see the lunacy of this law of liberty argument.
- V. ***“You people are against Sunday P.M. assemblies.”***
1. Where is the divine, scriptural authority for a make-up Supper?
 2. This is a ploy to get the discussion going in a different direction and is inserted to try and muddy the waters.
 3. The Lord’s people may assemble as often as they desire on Sunday, but they must conduct those assemblies in keeping with the pattern.
 4. Is a make-up Supper part of the pattern?
- W. ***“We have never heard this before, it cannot be true.”***
1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
 2. Is whether or not we have ever heard something the standard for authority?
 3. Based on this logic, no one in the first century could have been saved (**1 Corinthians 2:6-9**).
 4. Will those who hoist this argument be consistent and allow the same statement to carry weight from a denominationalist?
 - (a) Thus, can they worship with instrumental music, since they have never heard of another way?
 - (b) “Oh, consistency where art thou?”

X. “*We partook earlier and by having a second serving are waiting for those to partake in the evening; thus, we have fulfilled 1 Corinthians 11:33.*”

1. Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?
2. This argument is a real stretch (**2 Peter 3:16**).
3. Paul said, “Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry (wait) one for another” (**1 Cor. 11:33**).
4. How in the world does this get twisted to authorize: coming together in the morning to partake of the L.S. without waiting for those who can show up in the evening – then sit there and do not partake as they partake?
5. Listen, congregations that assemble twice on Sunday either “wait” in the A.M., and obey the inspired instructions, or they do not. It is just that simple!
6. Do those who offer a make-up Supper “wait to eat,” or do they “eat so they can wait?”
7. Who would want to go to the judgment, and explain to Christ why they flip-flopped the rules of His Supper?

IX. **Conclusion:**

A. I will ask one last time: Where is the passage that authorizes a make-up Supper?

B. If it is not from the mind of God, then it must be from the mind of man (**Matthew 15:9; Mark 7:8-9**).

C. Summary:

1. This is Authorized:

(a) A local church sets a time to assemble to partake of the L.S. and when all willing and able saints are present they eat the Lord’s Supper together.

(b) **Heb. 10:25; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:17-34.**

2. Is this Authorized?

(a) Church appoints several times to assemble to have different groups partake of the L.S. at convenient times, when not all saints present eat together.

(b) (____ ? ____)

D. Concluding Remarks:

1. Is it not obvious that those who offer a make-up Supper have zero scriptural authority to do so?

2. As noted last week, we can prove what we do at Palmer Road is right.

(a) Let’s not give into the innovations of men.

(b) Let’s not allow men to cloud the issue with man-made arguments.

(c) Let’s continue to be content to follow what we can read about in the New Testament.