

The Lord's Supper

📖 Matthew 26:26-30

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 January 25, 2017

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

We are studying the Final Week of Jesus. On the chart depicting the events of this week, notice that the events began Saturday night when Jesus was in Bethany at the home of Simon the Leper with Mary, Martha, Lazarus and the disciples. As Jesus was reclining with Lazarus, Mary anointed Him with a very costly perfume. In response, Judas Iscariot, and others, began scolding her, arguing that she could have sold the perfume for a year's wages and the money given to the poor. Jesus was incensed at their anger, commended her for her good deed to Him and explained that it prepared His body for burial. Something in that event triggered Judas' eventual decision to betray Jesus over to the religious authorities the following Wednesday. The agreed upon price for betrayal was thirty pieces of silver, the fine for one whose ox killed a common slave. Thursday was the day of preparation for the Galilean Jews who would celebrate Passover Thursday evening. Peter and John were selected to prepare the Passover and asked Jesus the location of the Passover. Jesus told them that when they entered the gate of the city they would find a man carrying a pitcher of water. They should follow this man to the house he entered and make request of the owner. This was to keep the location secret from Judas who was betraying Him. The parallels say that when they found the house they entered and the upper room was already furnished and ready. The only thing Peter and John needed to do was select the Passover lamb, have it sacrificed, roasted whole and taken to the upper room. That afternoon the disciples argued about who would sit in the favored positions on the right and left of Jesus, while He selflessly prepared to offer Himself as the Passover Lamb who takes away the sin of the world. We gather that in the end John sat on His right and Judas sat on His left. The left was actually the most favored position. As Edersheim said, "But the chief place next to the Master would be that to His left, or above Him. In the strife of the disciples, which should be accounted the greatest, this had been claimed, and we believe it to have been actually occupied, by Judas."¹ This was due, in part, to Jesus' extension of grace to Judas, whom He knew was betraying Him. When they arrived they probably followed Passover traditions of the 1st century, which are not entirely clear to us, but generally so. Jesus was the chief personage or Head, and so directed the Passover. They took the first of four cups of wine. Then Jesus washed their feet and revealed by it that He would be betrayed, saying, "...you are clean, but not all of you." The disciples did not understand this until later. When they came to the main course He revealed for the second time that He would be betrayed, saying "Truly I say to you that one of you will betray Me." The disciples were

emotionally traumatized and they each in turn said to Him "Surely not I, Lord?" He answered, "He who dipped his hand with Me in the bowl is the one who will betray Me." Yet even this did not reveal the betrayer because they had all dipped in the bowl with Him. The statement was made to state clearly that one of them had betrayed the close ties of friendship. Judas must have known that Jesus knew he was betraying Him. Then Jesus pronounced once more that He was to go to death, in order to fulfill what was written of Him in the OT prophets; but that this did not mitigate responsibility of the individual who betrayed Him. So horrible would be the consequences that it would be better for that individual if he had not been born. This was another extension of grace to Judas. At that time Judas said to Jesus privately, "Surely it is not I, Rabbi? And Jesus said to him, "You said it." If any other disciples overheard this it was ambiguous what was meant, but Jesus and Judas knew full well what was happening. It would not be long before Jesus would offer the sop to Judas and by offering it to Judas first, who occupied the favored position, Jesus was extending grace to him once again, giving Him an opportunity at salvation and a change of mind concerning the betrayal. As Pentecost said, "...it is to be noted that since the giving of the bread was in effect an offer of salvation, Christ was offering forgiveness to Judas if he would accept the offered salvation and put his faith in Him. This was grace exemplified. Perhaps no greater demonstration of the love and the grace of Christ can be found anywhere in Scripture than in this scene, for the One who would be betrayed was offering the betrayer forgiveness of sin if he would accept it."² In the end Judas accepted the sop but we have no notice that it entered his mouth, but rather that Satan entered into him and he went out. By this we know for certain that Judas was unregenerate because Satan cannot indwell a believer.

Tonight we come back to the Upper Room and events during the Passover that most likely precede Judas' departure. If so, then Judas was there for the institution of the Lord's Supper. So tonight we will cover Matt 26:26-29, the institution of the Lord's Supper, which grew out of the Last Passover. And we will spend considerable time on this portion of Scripture because the Lord's Supper is for the Church and there is a lot of confusion about the few words that Jesus uttered to institute the Supper.

For background, remember that it was Thursday night, according to the Galilean reckoning of days from sunrise to sunrise. In this way Jesus could enjoy the Passover on Thursday and on Friday, according to the Judean reckoning of days, be the Passover Lamb who takes away the sin of the world. Thus, it can be seen, that Passover was a memorial that looked back to God's deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, but also looked forward to God's Lamb who would deliver Israel from the bondage of sin. Since Israel has never enjoyed deliverance from the bondage of sin then it is clear that the ultimate fulfillment of Passover is in the kingdom and not at the cross. As Pentecost said, "The Passover was to find its ultimate fulfillment, not in the cross, but rather in the kingdom of God...." But the relationship is that the way into the kingdom of God is through the cross and you can never have a kingdom without a cross.

A final note before the exposition is to observe how the Lord's Supper grew out of the Last Passover, a critical observation. This relationship shows the proper understanding of the distinction between Israel and the Church.

Israel and the Church are completely distinct, but they are not divorced. Understanding distinct but not divorced is not only biblical but a key to avoiding certain mistakes such as saying there are two new covenants, one for Israel and one for the Church, or that Christ's blood is divided into two, one aspect for redemption to the Church and the other for the new covenant to Israel in the future. Those are errors that have opened up some dispensationalists to attack from our opponents, and rightfully so. There is no evidence in the Scripture for two new covenants or for dividing Christ's blood into two separate spheres. Once one understands that the Church is completely distinct from Israel, but not divorced, he can understand how the Church can have a relationship to the new covenant, but not be fulfilling it, as well as have a relationship to the kingdom, without being in the kingdom now. The first major evidence for this description of the relationship is the fact that the Lord's Supper, an ordinance for the Church, grew out of the Last Passover for Israel, and therefore, distinct but not divorced is the key terminology.

In Matt 26:26, **While they were eating, Jesus took some bread, and after a blessing, He broke it and gave it to the disciples, and said, "Take, eat; this is My body."** What happened here was very significant because it follows Passover in many ways but introduces a new significance to the bread. The expression **While they were eating** refers to their eating of the main course of the Passover meal, which was the paschal lamb. It was customary during the main course for the Head of the Passover to take **some bread**. This **bread** was unleavened bread. At the Exodus the nation Israel was commanded to not eat leavened bread for seven days. Leaven signified the sin of Egypt. By cleansing their houses of leaven and baking unleavened bread they were remembering that when God redeemed them from Egypt they were leaving the sin of Egypt behind. Because the bread had no leaven it appeared as a flat cake, what we call a matzah. Then the Head of the Passover would pronounce **a blessing**. The traditional **blessing** that many Jews used when thanking God for food was, "Blessed are you, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who brings forth bread from the earth."³ And this may have been uttered by Jesus. After blessing the matzah the Head of the Passover would **break it** into pieces. He would then dip the bread and give one piece to each person at the Passover. This is what Jesus did. Pentecost explains, "The dipping of a piece of bread was a significant part of the Passover ritual. In the course of the paschal meal, the master of the feast would pick up some unleavened bread...He would put bits of lamb on the piece of bread, sprinkle some bitter herbs on it, and then roll it. Then he would dip the bread containing the meat and herbs into a bitter sauce. This bread would then be handed to a guest...It was customary to offer the first piece to the most honored guest at the feast...the place of highest honor had been given to Judas." This mixture represented God's salvation and eating it represented appropriating salvation by faith. Jesus gave a piece to Judas but the piece never entered Judas' mouth. Instead, Satan entered into Judas. As He **gave** a piece **to** each of **the disciples**, He **said, "Take, eat; this is My body."** This statement was entirely foreign to the Passover. Barbieri said, "He **took bread** and **gave** it a special meaning." In the Passover it represented separation from sin but in the Lord's Supper, which grew out of it, the bread represents the body of Jesus. He commanded them to

take it and to **eat** it. Since one must **take** it and **eat** it means that one must partake of Him to enjoy eternal salvation. Judas did not partake of Him. He had no salvation.

In 26:27, the Head of the Passover introduced the third cup of wine in the Passover. This was the cup of redemption. **And when He had taken a cup and given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for forgiveness of sins.** The **cup** was a cup of wine diluted with water. Geisler, in his article on *A Christian on Wine-Drinking*, says, "According to the Talmud the "wine" used in the Passover meal was three parts water and one part wine (cf. 2 Macc. 15:39)."⁴ Wine was used in Passover and in the Lord's Supper until the mid to late 1800's. This was when Mr Welch invented His grape juice. It was initially very unpopular with pastors and churches because it changed the prescription for the element used in the Lord's Supper. It only became popular during prohibition in the 1920's when it became a tasty substitute for soldiers. Today it is almost universal, but there is nothing wrong with drinking wine or using it in the Lord's Supper, especially if one follows what the Bible says when it speaks of taking wine, that it is speaking of a diluted wine, averaging somewhere between three and four parts water to one part wine. If we were to compare modern wine to Scripture it would be the equivalent of unmixed wine which was considered strong drink, and was condemned for causing folly and sin.

After taking **a cup** He gave **thanks**. Constable said, "The Greek word *eucharistesas* ("gave thanks") is a cognate of *euchariste* ("thanksgiving") from which we get the English word "eucharist," another name for the Lord's Supper."⁵ However, because the Eucharist has taken on a meaning peculiar to Roman Catholicism, we abstain from using this term, even though the term itself is a good one. After giving **thanks He gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for forgiveness of sins."** This was entirely new. Barbieri said, "**Then** taking **the cup** of wine, He **gave** it a special meaning too." In the Passover it represented the blood of the lamb that was placed on the doorposts and lintel of each home, but in the Lord's Supper the cup comes to represent Jesus' **blood of the covenant**, which relates to the **forgiveness of sins**. He commanded them to **drink from** the cup. Since each one must **drink from it** it means that each one must partake of Him by faith to enjoy eternal salvation.

Having expounded the passage several things need to be discussed. First, there has been great controversy throughout Church history over the Lord's Supper. Four views have emerged. First, Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy teach a doctrine of transubstantiation. This doctrine teaches that the priest's words are efficacious in turning the bread and the cup into the actual body and blood of Christ, though in appearance and taste there is no change. They rest their case on the literal rendering of John 6:53, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life in yourselves." Thus, when a Roman Catholic talks about going to Mass and taking the Eucharist, they are talking about something very different than what we are doing in the Lord's Supper. They are talking about a very mystical ceremony of cannibalism, one of many mystical elements of Roman Catholicism which betray it as being a pagan religion. Second, Lutheranism

teaches a doctrine of consubstantiation. This doctrine teaches that Christ's humanity is omnipresent and therefore in, with and under the elements. This differs from transubstantiation because the elements do not change into the body and blood of Christ but His physical body is viewed as in, with and under the elements in a special way during the ceremony. This is less mystical but still mystical. Third, Reformed churches teach a doctrine of spiritual presence. This doctrine teaches that Christ is the host of this spiritual feast and that the Spirit enables us to mystically ascend to heaven for real communion with Christ. This is clearly a mystical view. Fourth, many evangelicals teach the doctrine of memorialism. This doctrine teaches that the elements are representative of His body and blood and serve as a memorial of Christ's death. I think this view is the best for several reasons. First, just as the **bread** and **cup** were representative in Passover so they are representative in the Lord's Supper which grew out of Passover. The only thing that changed was what the elements represented. So just as in the Passover there was no special presence of God in the bread and cup so in the Lord's Supper there is no special presence of Christ. It is memorial only. Second, the Passover was to be done in memorial of the Exodus. In Exodus 12:14 God said, "Now this day will be a memorial to you, and you shall celebrate it as a feast to the LORD..." Therefore, since the Passover was memorial then the Lord's Supper that grew out of the Passover is also memorial. Third, Jesus said the Lord's Supper was to be a memorial of His death. In 1 Cor 11:24-25 Jesus said, "do this in remembrance of Me." He said this twice so it is very clear. Therefore, the reason we take communion regularly is to remember His death, not to have a special grace communicated to us, that is mysticism. So when you talk to people in other churches about the Lord's Supper or Communion or the Eucharist, understand that they may be thinking of it very differently than you, and if you attend their church you will find it is very different than what we do here. Most follow a liturgy whereas we sense the freedom to focus on different parts of the texts related to Christ's death and the need to believe. So the first big point is that there has been a lot of controversy over the Lord's Supper in Church History, but remember, the Lord's Supper grew out of Passover, and since Passover was memorial then the Lord's Supper is also memorial. And there is no special communication of grace to us, either in baptism or the Lord's Supper, that is present in every other view, but our view is that His grace is always available to us, and we avail ourselves of it by faith.

Second, having said that, there is no command that one must be in fellowship in order to partake of the Lord's Supper. This is actually a preparatory hangover from the other views of the Lord's Supper where Christ is present in some spiritual way in the elements and therefore the recipient of the elements needs to be in fellowship in order to have grace communicated to him. Usually 1 Cor 11:27-31 is used to support this teaching. Paul said, "Therefore whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. But a man must examine himself, and in so doing he is to eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he who eats and drinks, eats and drinks judgment to himself if he does not judge the body rightly. For this reason many among you are weak and sick, and a number sleep. But if we judged ourselves rightly, we would not be judged." Why are these verses not commanding that people be in fellowship in order to take the Lord's Supper? Because in the Passover the command is to take, eat and drink and in the Lord's Supper

the command is "do this." It is a point of obedience to take it. There are no spiritual requirements placed upon it. Even Judas was told to take and eat, and he took but we have no record that he ate. But as a believer, if you don't take and eat then you have committed disobedience and are out of fellowship. What Paul meant by judge ourselves rightly and examine ourselves is stated clearly in the context of 1 Cor 11:17ff. They were eating out of turn, one man went hungry, another was drunk on the wine, which shows you they used wine in the Lord's Supper. Paul was ashamed they were acting this way during the Lord's Supper. He said to them in the end, "So then, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home." The whole thing is really a plea to evaluate how you are taking the Lord's Supper. The reason they were being judged and some even died, was because they were treating it like a common meal, and worse, some were even getting drunk, as if the Lord's Supper were just another pagan feast. My big point is not to say don't be in fellowship but that the Lord's Supper is not get in fellowship time, it is memorial time, it is time to remember Christ's death, to look outside of self at Christ and what He did dying for our sins, and not to look in.

Third, when Jesus introduced the **cup** he explained that it represented His blood of the covenant which stands in connection with the **forgiveness of sins**. The **cup** in the Passover had not related to a covenant but to the Exodus as a memorial only. But the **cup** in the Lord's Supper is His blood of the covenant, and is related to a covenant. The covenant in view is the New Covenant. This covenant was promised most clearly in Jer 31:31-34 and is connected with the "forgiveness of iniquity." Toussaint said, "It seems that the King is looking back to the prophesied new covenant also known as the everlasting covenant and the covenant of peace (Jeremiah 31:31-34; 32:37-40; Ezekiel 34:25-31; 37:26-28)." The parallel in Luke 22:20 explicitly states this is the new covenant. "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood." Therefore, make no mistake, the covenant in view is the New Covenant. In Jer 31:31 the Lord contrasted the new covenant with another covenant saying it is "not like the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke." The covenant they broke was the Mosaic Covenant. Therefore, the contrast is between the old Mosaic Covenant and the New Covenant. The old Mosaic Covenant ended at the cross and the New Covenant went into effect. In 2 Cor 3:6ff, when Paul said that we are "ministers of a new covenant," he spent considerable time contrasting the Mosaic and New Covenants and connected the New Covenant to the gospel. One of the difficulties is determining the Church's relationship to the New Covenant because in Jer 31:31 the parties of the covenant are said to be "Israel" and "Judah." Toussaint captures the problem, "When all these facts are analyzed, a very crucial problem takes shape. If the new covenant is with Israel and pertains to the kingdom age, what relationship does Christ's ratification of it have to do with the present church age?"⁶ This problem has been a particularly thorny one for premillennial dispensationalists. Four answers have been given.

First, amillennialists and postmillennialists believe that the new covenant promised to Israel is being fulfilled to the Church. In other words, the Church has replaced Israel. When one looks at all the terms of this covenant, living in the land of promise in peace with beasts on earth living in harmony, one quickly realizes that the only

way this could be fulfilled in the Church is if the language is taken allegorically. Therefore, this view is unsatisfying.

Second, some premillennialists believe that there is one new covenant with Israel only which has no relationship to the Church. This view has gained popularity in our day. It rests primarily on the fact that Jer 31:31 says the new covenant parties are Israel and Judah. It concludes, therefore that the Church could have no relationship to the new covenant. However, this view is a symptom of the failure to understand that the Church is completely distinct from Israel, but not divorced. It therefore has problems. First, Jesus said the new covenant was for His disciples who formed the foundation of the Church, Christ Jesus being the cornerstone. Matt 26:27-28, **Drink from it, all of you; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.** The apostles drank it. They became the foundation of the Church. Therefore, they are part of the Church and so the new covenant must have some relationship to the Church, at least to the apostles who are the foundation of the Church. But second, the new covenant is for more than the apostles who are the foundation of the Church, it is for every member of the Church, because in 1 Cor 11:24-25 Paul quoted Jesus saying to the Church at Corinth, "This is My body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of Me." And "This cup is the new covenant in My blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." If we have no relationship to the new covenant in His blood then we have no relationship to His body either. It would be strange that the chief ordinance of the Church memorializes His death but we have no relationship to the covenant established by His death. Toussaint said, "Therefore, the new covenant must be in effect today, and it must sustain some relationship to the Church." So while it is true that the new covenant parties are Israel and Judah this does not eliminate the possibility that the Church may participate in some of the blessings of the new covenant now. Toussaint explained, "The church will enjoy the blessings of the kingdom, but there is no hint in the Old Testament of such a group participating in it. The very fact that the church was unknown to the Old Testament prophets made it impossible for them to prophesy concerning the relationship of the church to the new covenant." Third, 2 Cor 3:6 Paul says that God made us "adequate as ministers of a new covenant" and went on to contrast his ministry with that of the Mosaic covenant. It is obvious that God made Paul adequate to minister the new covenant to Jews and Gentiles, not Jews only, so the new covenant must have some relationship to both Jews and Gentiles who constitute the Church. Fourth, Rom 11 paints the picture of the olive tree with its rich root that nourishes the branches. The rich root is the Abrahamic covenant and all the blessings of the other covenants, including the new covenant, are for both the natural and unnatural branches during this present age. There is no way to isolate the blessings to Jewish believers only, the unnatural branches are Gentile believers. Fifth, Heb 8:6 and 9:15 say that Christ is mediating the new covenant from His high priesthood in heaven. If He is mediating the new covenant now it is in effect now. This does not mean that it is being fulfilled or partially fulfilled, but that it is in effect and some of its benefits are available now to the Church. This view is a symptom of the failure to understand that the Church is completely distinct, but not completely divorced from Israel.

Therefore, the view that there is one new covenant with Israel only and having no relationship to the Church is unconvincing.

Third, some premillennialists believe that there are two new covenants, one with Israel and one with the Church. This view is also a symptom of the failure to understand that the Church is completely distinct from Israel, but not divorced. It, therefore, has some insurmountable problems. First, to say that there are two new covenants referred to by the same words but that are not the same is very confusing. If there is a covenant for the Church that is distinct from the new covenant for Israel, why would there not be a different name for it? Further, multiple times in the Book of Hebrews the author quotes Jer 31:31-34 and makes application to the Jewish believers in the Church. Why would he do that if they are not under that covenant? And if they are one wing of the Church how could the Church be unified unless the Gentile wing is also under that covenant. So to say there are two new covenants by the same name, one for Israel and one for the Church, is not a satisfactory explanation. The basic reason, once more, is the failure to understand that the Church is completely distinct from Israel, but not divorced.

Fourth, the best view is that taken by some premillennialists who believe that the Church is enjoying some of the spiritual blessings of the new covenant without fulfilling the new covenant. This view admits that the new covenant was made with Israel and can only be fulfilled to that nation in the Kingdom. However, Christ's death ratified the new covenant and made forgiveness of sins and other provisions of the new covenant available then those who believe and enter the Church enjoy these spiritual blessings. We are partaking in blessings of the covenant, not taking over the blessings of the covenant. The evidences that contradicted the first view are the same evidences that show this view to be the best. First, Jesus said the new covenant was for His disciples who formed the foundation of the Church (Mt 26:27-28). Second, the New covenant is for every member of the church built on the foundation (1 Cor 11:24-25). Third, Paul was a minister of the new covenant (2 Cor 3:6). Fourth, the rich root of the Abrahamic extends blessings through the New Covenant to Jews and Gentiles in this age (Rom 11:11-21). Fifth, Jesus is mediating the new covenant from His high priesthood in heaven now (Heb 8:6; 9:15; et. al.). It is not very difficult to see how this is true when one realizes that the Church is completely distinct, but not divorced from, Israel. Toussaint says, "It must be concluded...that the church benefits from certain spiritual blessings of the new covenant such as regeneration and the forgiveness of sins, but all the blessings will be Israel's as manifested in the future earthly kingdom. It was impossible for the Old Testament prophets to predict the relationship of the church to the new covenant since the church was unknown to them (Ephesians 3:1-13). Since the King has provided the basis of establishing the new covenant with Israel, it is very possible for some of the spiritual benefits to be available in the church age. The church's relationship to the new covenant is parallel in certain respects to its connection with the kingdom promises of Israel. The church is constituted, blessed, and directed by the same Person who shall bring about the literal Jewish kingdom. It also will reign with Christ during the millennial age. In a parallel manner, the church participates in the benefits of the new covenant."⁷

At last we come to the very important verse Matt 26:29, **But I say to you, I will not drink of this fruit of the vine from now on until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom.** Evidently, the first thing we note, is that the Lord was going to die very soon. How do we see that? Because wine was an everyday drink among people, the alcohol purified the water for drinking. Therefore, if He would not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom then He must be leaving very soon. So the first thing to note is it implies He is going to die soon. Second, the kingdom is still to come. There is no kingdom now. For some period of time the kingdom was being postponed. But it's future establishment is certain. Here is just another verse showing that the kingdom is not now. Third, Jesus didn't say He would drink with them in the Father's kingdom but that he would drink new wine. Wine symbolized joy, rest and relaxation. It is literal wine but it also pictures the joy, rest, and relaxation of the kingdom. Plummer said, "It will be joy transformed and glorified; joy so different from the joys experienced here that the heart of man cannot conceive it."

In 26:30, **"After singing a hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives.** It was customary to sing a hymn at the end of the Passover. They went out toward the Mount of Olives where the Garden of Gethsemane is located. Along the way He will have some very interesting things to say to the remaining Eleven.

In summary, we have seen how the Lord's Supper grew out of the Last Passover. The entire scene develops on the basis that that generation rejected the King and His kingdom was being postponed. During the postponement the Church would form. The proper way to think about the Church's relationship to Israel is that the Church is completely distinct from Israel, but not divorced. In verse 26, they were eating the main course at Passover, the lamb. Jesus as the Head of the Passover took some unleavened bread, representing separation from sin in Egypt, He gave a typical blessing, broke it into pieces and gave it to His disciples and invested the bread with new meaning, "Take, eat, this is My body." This is a command to partake of His body and to partake of His body is to partake of Him by faith. In 26:27 He took the cup, representing the blood of the lamb that was put over the door and lintel in Egypt so that God would Passover. He gave thanks and gave the cup to them and invested new meaning saying, "Drink from it, all of you; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins." His blood ratified the new covenant and provides forgiveness of sins for those who partake of Him by faith. In the present age the Church is enjoying spiritual blessings of the new covenant. Paul quoted the Lord Jesus' words with respect to the Church so that we see clearly that the Church is not divorced from Israel but it does remain completely distinct. However, the fulfillment of the new covenant to Israel will take place in the future in connection with the kingdom which He speaks of in 26:29. Jesus would not drink of the vine from that day on until the day when He drinks it anew in the kingdom, signifying great joy. So the kingdom is still to come.

What can we learn? First, the Lord's Supper is memorial in nature. This is because the Lord's Supper grew out of the Passover which was memorial. All that Jesus did was assign new symbology to the elements. He did not change the memorial nature of the elements. To claim that there is some kind of real spiritual presence of Christ

in the elements is to take a mystical approach to the Lord's Supper that puts the focus on inward preparation rather than outward on Christ. Second, the Church is completely distinct from Israel, but it is not divorced from Israel. This means the Church is a different program from Israel, but it grew out of the program for Israel. The Lord's Supper for the Church grew out of the Passover for Israel showing this relationship. Third, the Church is enjoying spiritual blessings from the New Covenant found in Christ's blood. When Jesus died the provisions of the New Covenant went into effect. People immediately began to profit from His death, for example, enjoying forgiveness of sins and the possession of the Holy Spirit. However, the fulfillment of the covenant will not take place until the nation Israel repents in the future. This relationship is simply one example of how the Church is distinct but not divorced from Israel.

¹ Edersheim, quoted by J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, 425-6.

² J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, 431.

³ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 26:26.

⁴ Norman L. Geisler, "A Christian Perspective on Wine-Drinking," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 139, no. 553 (1982): 51.

⁵ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 26:27.

⁶ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, 300-1.

⁷ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, 302-3.