

# The Lakeview Lamp

*“Your word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path.” -Psalm 119:105*

**April 3, 2005**

*“Love-Feasts”*

William V. Beasley

Jude describes ungodly men of the first century as being “hidden rocks (spots, KJV) in your love-feasts (feasts of charity, KJV)” (**Jude 12**; see also **2 Pet.3:13**). What are (were) these love-feasts” or “feasts of charity”? The importance of this question is apparent when one considers the practices of some congregations of the Lord in providing for and having common meals as a function of the church. Oft times when asked about the practice (the scripturalness of it...we, of all people, should never be offended when asked to prove our practices by God’s word) it is not uncommon to have the participants of these common meals refer to them as “love-feasts.” Was Jude writing about a common meal in **Jude 12**?

For anyone to answer “Yes” to the above question, he must go to secular writers to substantiate it. The second definition of agape given by Joseph

Henry Thayer is “love feasts, feasts expressing and fostering mutual love which used to be held by Christians before the celebration of the Lord’s supper, and at which the poorer Christians mingled with the wealthier and partook in common with the rest of the food provided at the expense of the wealthy...” Actually, Thayer’s second definition of agape was simply “love-feasts,” and everything after that was the work of Thayer the commentator and not of Thayer the lexicographer. His definition is unquestioned; his commentary on this point is questioned.

Others tell us that the “love-feasts” were held “after the celebration of the Lord’s supper (J.D. Davis, A Dictionary of the Bible), or that those “congregational joint meals ended with the celebration of the Lord’s supper” (Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistles). Some describe this difference (before or after the Lord’s supper) as an evolutionary process: “The love feasts were at first celebrated before the Lord’s supper; in the process of time they appear to have been celebrated after it” (Clarke’s Commentary). Most are agreed that these “love-feasts” were in connection with the Lord’s supper (The Pulpit Commentary).

We wonder why people who claim to want a twentieth century church like the church of the first century would go to secular authorities to learn how to do it. We wonder why they refuse the when of having the “love-feasts” as given by their secular authorities when they had to have the secular authority to learn what the “love-feasts” were. Why, my brethren (if you are one who partakes of a common meal and calls it a “love-feast”), do you not have it “in connection with the Lord’s Supper” (The Pulpit Commentary)?

We are firmly convinced that the early church did indeed have a common meal in connection with the Lord’s supper. It was NOT with the approval

of the apostles, but was, in fact, the subject of severe rebuke: “*When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord’s supper I or in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What, have ye not houses beat and to drink in? Or despise ye the church of God, and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you? In this I praise you not*” (1 Cor.11:20-22).

That there were common meals, called “love-feasts” in the second century is not to be questioned. We can and do question whether these were ever authorized by the sacred writings. It is sometimes claimed that Paul is condemning only the abuses of having a common meal as a church function in 1 Cor.11. Not so! The question “*What, have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?*” denies such a contention. The having of common meals is the proper function of the home and not of the church.

“*You are the God who does wonders; You have declared Your strength among the peoples.*” – Psalm 77:14

“*What Is Truth?*”

Troy Nicholson

Pilate asked the question, “*What is truth?*” (John 18:38). Many people cannot give a definite answer to this question. According to a survey by pollster George Barna, they base their morality on how they feel rather than on what the Bible teaches.

Of all adults surveyed, only 22% believed in moral absolutes; 64% felt truth was relative to the person and his circumstances; only 32% of “born again” Christians believed in moral absolutes. This mentality, notes Barna, is culminating in a one-world view that is summed up by “whatever.” Relativism, tolerance, and diversity are becoming the hallmarks of secular and Christian thinking (Traditional Values Coalition, 2-15-02).

*“There is a way that seems right to a man, but its end is the way of death”*(**Proverbs 14:12**).

**Lakeview church of Christ**  
**132 New Shackle Island Road**  
**P.O. Box 514**  
**Hendersonville TN 37077**

**Building: 824-1376**  
**[www.BibleSaints.com](http://www.BibleSaints.com)**  
**Bible Call: 824-1310**

Troy Nicholson  
[troyjenn@myfreei.com](mailto:troyjenn@myfreei.com)

"This is the day the Lord has made; we will rejoice and be glad in it" (Psalm 118:24).