

# Debate

# NOTES

## INDIVIDUAL CUPS

Compiled by George Battey

*"I think I was the first preacher to advocate the use of the individual communion cup and the first church in the State of Tennessee that adopted it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chattanooga, Tennessee, then meeting in the Masonic Temple." (G. C. Brewer, Forty Years On The Firing Line, 1948.)*



J. G. Thomas  
(Inventor)



G. C. Brewer  
(Innovator)

These notes were compiled by:  
George Battey, 1994

(Revised 2011)

Cover design and artwork: Debbie Edwards.

Cover photo taken from brother Alfred Newberry's book, The Divine Pattern Advocate.

Analysis and suggestions: Alan Bonifay, Bennie Cryer, and others.

**(NOTE:** Unless otherwise stated, all Bible quotations are taken from the New King James Version, published by Thomas Nelson Publishers.)

For further study contact:

**George Battey**  
[gfbattey@yahoo.com](mailto:gfbattey@yahoo.com)

[www.WillOfTheLord.com](http://www.WillOfTheLord.com)

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BATTEY – THRASHER / DONAHUE DEBATE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>THE PROPOSITIONS DISCUSSED .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Teaching the Word .....	11
The Lord's Supper .....	11
<b>Agreements.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 1 - ANALYZING THE PROPOSITIONS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
PROPOSITION #3 ANALYZED.....	14
PROPOSITION #4 ANALYZED.....	15
<b>SECTION 2 - PROVING ONE CUP IS REQUIRED.....</b>	<b>16</b>
GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.....	16
THE CASE FOR A SINGLE COMMUNION CUP .....	16
REASON #1: One cup was commanded by the Lord .....	17
REASON #2: One cup constitutes a binding example. ....	19
REASON #3: One cup is implied by the Lord. ....	20
REASON #4: One cup is symbolic. ....	21
REASON #5: One cup fulfills the meaning of the word "communion." .....	25
Reason #6: One cup is the only way to have unity. ....	26
<b>SECTION 3 - BIBLE AUTHORITY .....</b>	<b>28</b>
1) God the Father constitutes primary authority: .....	28
2) Jesus has delegated authority: .....	28
3) The apostles have delegated authority:.....	29
AMBASSADORS.....	29
ESTABLISHING AUTHORITY .....	30
WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION.....	30
EXPLICIT & IMPLICIT.....	31
IMPLICATION IS NOT SILENCE .....	33
SIX POSSIBILITIES .....	34
1) Some things are explicitly REQUIRED.....	35
2) Some things are explicitly PERMITTED.....	35
3) Some things are explicitly PROHIBITED.....	35
4) Some things are implicitly REQUIRED .....	35
5) Some things are implicitly PERMITTED .....	35
6) Some things are implicitly PROHIBITED .....	36
THE "EXPLICIT-ONLY" DOCTRINE .....	36
SILENCE FORBIDS .....	37
1) Cain & Abel .....	38
2) Nadab & Abihu .....	38
3) The Jerusalem Conference .....	38
4) Jesus And The Angels .....	39
5) Jesus And The Priesthood .....	39

6) The "Do-Not-Add" Passages.....	40
APPLICATION (pt. 1).....	40
APPLICATION (pt. 2).....	41
COMMON ARGUMENTS .....	42
ARGUMENT #1: "This is nit-picking" .....	42
ARGUMENT #2: "We are under the grace of God" .....	43
<b>SECTION 4 - THE HISTORY OF ONE CUP .....</b>	<b>46</b>
HISTORY .....	46
J. G. Thomas (INVENTOR) .....	46
G. C. Brewer (INNOVATOR) .....	47
<b>SECTION 5 - THE PASSOVER – A TYPE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.....</b>	<b>50</b>
THE PASSOVER.....	50
BACKGROUND INFORMATION .....	50
THE PASSOVER – A TYPE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.....	51
RULE #1: Each household was to take a spotless lamb and kill it!.....	51
RULE #2: Each house was to kill only one lamb! .....	52
RULE #3: The lamb was to remain in one piece!.....	52
RULE #4: No leaven was allowed! .....	53
RULE #5: The blood from the lamb was to be caught in a basin and .....	
sprinkled on the door of the house! .....	53
RULE #6: All the family members had to stay in the house!.....	53
RULE #7: This Passover meal was to be repeated every year so no .....	
one would forget what happened! .....	54
RULE #8: Only God's people could eat this meal! .....	54
THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST .....	55
THE LORD'S SUPPER – AN ANTITYPE OF THE PASSOVER.....	55
RULE #1: Each household was to take a spotless lamb and kill it!.....	55
RULE #2: Each house was to kill only one lamb! .....	56
RULE #3: The lamb was to remain in one piece!.....	57
RULE #4: No leaven was allowed! .....	58
RULE #5: The blood from the lamb was to be caught in a basin and .....	
sprinkled on the door of the house! .....	59
RULE #6: All the family members had to stay in the house!.....	60
RULE #7: This Passover meal was to be repeated every year so no .....	
one would forget what happened! .....	61
RULE #8: Only God's people could eat this meal! .....	62
CONCLUSION .....	62
<b>SECTION 6 - ARGUMENTS CONSIDERED .....</b>	<b>64</b>
ARGUMENT #1: Metonymy .....	64
ARGUMENT #2: Metonymy (again) .....	68
ARGUMENT #3: No drinking vessel intended.....	69
ARGUMENT #4: "Anti" brethren are inconsistent.....	70
ARGUMENT #5: "Cup" is what we drink.....	71
ARGUMENT #6: Drink "from" the fruit of the vine, not the cup .....	72

ARGUMENT #7: Antecedent of "this" .....	73
ARGUMENT #8: "Let this cup pass from Me" .....	76
ARGUMENT #9: The "cup" of Rev 17:4.....	77
ARGUMENT #10: "Divide it among yourselves" (version 1) .....	78
ARGUMENT #11: "Divide it among yourselves" (version 2) .....	79
ARGUMENT #12: Ephesus and Corinth (version 1) .....	80
ARGUMENT #13: Ephesus and Corinth (version 2) .....	81
ARGUMENT #14: Noah's house .....	85
ARGUMENT #15: "The White House said" .....	85
ARGUMENT #16: House of Israel.....	86
ARGUMENT #17: A "hand of cards" .....	88
ARGUMENT #18: Only consumable elements.....	89
ARGUMENT #19: "Guilty of the covenant"? .....	90
ARGUMENT #20: Syllogism #1" .....	90
ARGUMENT #21: Syllogism #2.....	92
ARGUMENT #22: Syllogism #3.....	92
ARGUMENT #23: Syllogism #4.....	93
ARGUMENT #24: Syllogism #5.....	94
ARGUMENT #25: The "One-Cup Man" .....	95
ARGUMENT #26: We still drink the fruit of the vine .....	96
ARGUMENT #27: Spiritual significance.....	97
ARGUMENT #28: Emphasis is on fruit of the vine, not the container.....	101
ARGUMENT #29: Matthew and Mark are saying the same thing as Luke and Paul ..	101
ARGUMENT #30: Copies of the NT .....	102
ARGUMENT #31: Blood inside the NT? .....	103
ARGUMENT #32: A memorial for something in our presence? .....	104
ARGUMENT #33: Cup doesn't look like the NT .....	105
ARGUMENT #34: The NASV .....	106
ARGUMENT #35: Generic authority .....	108
ARGUMENT #36: A church <i>MAY</i> use a plurality of cups.....	109
ARGUMENT #37: Individual cups do not violate the command to eat and drink? ....	109
ARGUMENT #38: A plurality of cups is expedient? .....	110
ARGUMENT #39: Communion with just the Lord .....	110
ARGUMENT #40: Jacob's well .....	112
ARGUMENT #41: Cup of cold water .....	114
ARGUMENT #42: One kind of loaf, one kind of cup .....	115
ARGUMENT #43: Species or categories.....	117
ARGUMENT #44: Jn 6 calls five loaves "bread" .....	118
ARGUMENT #45: Same cup as Jesus .....	119
ARGUMENT #46: An exact replica of Jesus' cup.....	119
ARGUMENT #47: The upper room.....	120
ARGUMENT #48: Night communion.....	123
ARGUMENT #49: Chalkboards, songbooks, microphone system, .....	
overhead projectors, etc. ....	125

ARGUMENT #50: The plate.....	125
ARGUMENT #51: A literal table necessary? .....	126
ARGUMENT #52: A Canteen? .....	127
ARGUMENT #53: Passover cups .....	127
ARGUMENT #54: The dropped cup .....	128
ARGUMENT #55: Large church at Jerusalem.....	129
ARGUMENT #56: The "cup of demons" .....	131
ARGUMENT #57: Sanitation .....	132
ARGUMENT #58: "Anti" brethren are inconsistent.....	134
ARGUMENT #59: Making laws and causing division .....	135
ARGUMENT #60: Everything must be specified to be authorized? .....	137
ARGUMENT #61: "Anti" brethren are like Baptists .....	137
ARGUMENT #62: Nit-picking & Hair-splitting? .....	138
ARGUMENT #63: Lexicons and translations .....	139
ARGUMENT #64: The KJV .....	141
<b>SECTION 7 - WRITTEN QUESTIONS .....</b>	<b>142</b>
WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Part 1) .....	142
Donahue's written responses .....	142
More questions to consider .....	145
WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Part 2) .....	149
Battey's written responses.....	149
<b>SECTION 8 - ADDITIONAL MATERIAL .....</b>	<b>153</b>
E. W. Bullinger (Figures of Speech – Metaphor, pp. 735-741).....	153
G. C. Brewer (Forty Years On The Firing Line) .....	158
J. G. Thomas' letter to E. H. Miller .....	159
<b>APPENDIX A - ANALYSIS OF KEY WORDS .....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS .....</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>APPENDIX C - FINAL ARGUMENTS .....</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>WORKS CITED.....</b>	<b>170</b>

## **BATTEY – THRASHER / DONAHUE DEBATE**

June 23-25, 1994

Mableton & Jonesboro, Georgia

(The following report of the Battey – Thrasher / Donahue Debate was written in the December 1994 issue of *Christian's Expositor* as well as the January 1995 issue of the *Old Paths Advocate*. This article will summarize what occurred during that debate.)

On June 23, 24, 1994 I was privileged to travel to the Atlanta area to moderate a debate between George Battey and Tommy Thrasher on the subject of Bible classes. This discussion took place on Thursday and Friday nights at the Church of Christ in Mableton, Georgia. The church had agreed to sponsor Brother Thrasher and Brother Donahue. On Saturday, June 25, two sessions were held at our building in Jonesboro, the Fielder Street Church of Christ, George debated Pat Donahue on the subject of individual cups.

All of the debaters conducted themselves as Christian gentlemen, and while the argumentation was intense, the behavior of all three was exemplary. It was my first time to serve as a moderator in a debate and it was the first debate I have attended in quite a few years.

George did a superior job in defense of the truth on both issues. The only major disappointment for me was that, as is usually the case, our people provided most of the crowd Thursday and Friday evenings. Our brethren slightly outnumbered the brethren from Mableton even though the debate was in their building. There were very few of Brother Donahue's fellows present on Saturday to hear him. I do not suppose that this state of affairs was the fault of either Brother Thrasher or Brother Donahue, but I believe it is worthy of note with respect to the future. Despite this drawback, the debate will, I believe, have a lasting impact for the truth. The reason I am sure of that is because George, in his preparation for the debate, has written a book on each issue. Both books represent a worthy addition to the literature on these vital subject.

**Debate Notes: Bible Classes** and **Debate Notes: Individual Cups** ... contain an affirmative presentation of what the Bible teaches with respect to each issue. The heart of these books, however, is found in the documented catalogue of arguments presented over the years by various digressive writers and debaters. George has presented each argument in full, together with its major variants, and then the Bible answer. You will also find a very enlightening list of questions and answers exchanged by the disputants. Since these issues are debated so infrequently these days, I recommend that parents and church leaders order copies right away so that this critical part of the truth can be successfully passed on to future generations.

On Thursday night, Brother Thrasher affirmed that "when the church comes together for the purpose of teaching the Bible, it is scriptural to divide into classes for this teaching, some of which may be taught by women." He began by hanging his hat on the principle of generic authority and claiming that Bible classes represented a method of teaching. In his first

reply, George invited the audience to turn to page 78\* in their copy of his book, and he then he led them through the Bible's answer to Thrasher's argument. After that he had them turn to page 76 to learn that classes are a method of grouping and not a method of teaching, and so it went. George was ready with an answer to every quibble Thrasher offered.

Not surprisingly, Brother Thrasher soon tired of his futile argument from generic authority, and made the next mistake of trying to pinpoint specific authority for Bible classes. Of course, once you have admitted that there is no specific authority for Bible classes, it is fairly difficult to back up and convincingly present passages authorizing Bible classes. George simply referred to the appropriate pages in his book and continued to press Brother Thrasher beyond his ability to answer.

Next, Thrasher abandoned his specific authority argument to try one more run at generic authority. Besides all of that, he decided to begin complaining about the wording of his own affirmative proposition, which he voluntarily signed in his eagerness to persuade George to debate. Finally, he complained that George's tactic of providing a book answers to all of Thrasher's arguments (and more) to the audience was "unfair." It was "unfair" because George could refer people to several page numbers in a very few minutes and get on with pressing the heart of the matter. Consequently, Brother Thrasher's smoke screens disappeared in a wisp of vapor. George's negative the first night was more than successful. It was a resounding victory for truth over error.

On Friday evening, George was in the affirmative and adroitly defended the proposition that "the scriptures teach that then the church comes together for the purpose for teaching the Bible, the people must be taught in an undivided assembly by men only."

As the evening approached, we wondered what Brother Thrasher might do, having had 24 hours to study George's book. But he had not one objection to make against the book. In his last speech, Brother Thrasher warned the audience of "inconsistencies and assumptions" in the book, but we thought it was interesting that he did not trot out a single example for examination. Surely, if he could have documented his warning he would have. Obviously, the book on Bible classes was more than vindicated by Brother Thrasher's inability to produce even one weakness. As an interesting note, Thrasher did hand us a note on Saturday, complaining of what he believed to be a misspelling of a transliterated Greek word on page 32. This was his only complaint. We accepted that as a pretty good testimony to the truth presented in George's material.

Brother Thrasher was completely unable to deal with George's affirmatives. He tried to argue that classes were private, but he did not like the consequences of that (see pages 62-65 of the book) so he decided that they were public. However, he soon ran into problems from pages 21 through 30 and the rules of assembly found in 1 Corinthians 14. Then he decided they were sort of public and sort of private, and only Brother Thrasher could tell which they were at a particular moment. However, a good indication as to which way he would decide at any given moment could be gleaned by listening to which argument George was pressing him with.

Actually, Brother Thrasher generally refused to answer George's affirmatives, and spent almost half of his time in three speeches Friday night on his one showpiece argument. On the

---

\* The page numbers in this report are based on the first edition of the notes that were distributed to each member of the audience. Since then, the book has undergone revision and the page numbers have changed.



wall he had taped up a chart that asked: "Are the Bible classes the church come together INTO ONE PLACE?" George said, "NO, Brother Thrasher, they are not – that is what is wrong with them." George then changed his wall chart to read, "Are the Bible classes the church come together?" He asked Brother Thrasher if he would answer "Yes." George then reminded his opponent that that is what Thrasher promised, and as much as he hated it, had voluntarily signed to affirm. Would he do so now?

In his last speech one almost felt sorry for Brother Thrasher. He was obviously totally bereft of material. He spent some 18 agonizing minutes on his little wall chart and did not even attempt to counter George's arguments. As Billy Dickinson stated in his excellent review of the Bailey – Thrasher debate (**Old Paths Advocate**, December 1993, p. 5):

Although Brother Thrasher has engaged in over forty debates, his experience as a debater did little to help him on this occasion. His problem was not a lack of experience or ability, but a lack of truth.

On Saturday morning we began by distributing George's book on Debate Notes: Individual Cups. George began the affirmative eagerly defending "that the scriptures teach that an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion, must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine." George's three affirmative speeches went perfectly. He was able to powerfully present almost all of his affirmative material covering the first 40 pages of the book. His respondent, Pat Donahue, did not make even a token attempt to answer George's material. He began by redefining the word "cup" as all purveyors of false doctrine are wont to, and then he wanted to change the rules of the debate. "Why couldn't George just get up here and answer me?", he wanted to know. Why should George insist on following the rules of the debate and present affirmative material when he was suppose to? Well, Brother Donahue never reached much higher all day.

Pat Donahue hung his hat on the fact that the word "cup" is used metaphorically. While he was mistaken in thinking that it was used that way in every reference, he did prove to be an excellent authority on the meaning of the figure of speech called metonymy. It's all on pages 109 to 121. In question number 1, Donahue astutely noted that "in all likelihood he did use a container (sic)" in the institution of the Lord's Supper. But when asked if the word "cup" was ever used in the scriptures to refer directly or indirectly to that drinking vessel, Donahue replied, "I don't think so." Then, amazingly, Brother Donahue gave an excellent definition of metonymy. George asked:

Metonymy is defined as "a figure by which one name or noun is used instead of another to which it stands in a certain relation." Please answer the following questions about this sentence: "As often as you drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till he comes."

- a) What object is being named when Paul wrote, "Drink this cup"? Donahue replied, "A container."
- b) What is being suggested? Donahue replied, "Fruit of the vine."
- c) What relationship is sustained between the thing named and the thing suggested? Donahue replied, "A cup may contain liquid."

Never mind the contradiction between the cup never being mentioned directly or indirectly with Donahue's definition of "cup" in 1 Corinthians 11:26 as a container. Consider his excellent definition of metonymy. You will not find a better definition anywhere. Later, in one of his charts, Donahue admitted that in Matthew 26:27, the word "cup" was used literally.

As the afternoon wore on it became increasingly clear that, like Brother Thrasher, Brother Donahue was in over his head. Interestingly, neither Thrasher nor Donahue considered either subject important enough to make even the mildest of appeals for our people to change their position. On the other hand, George repeatedly appealed to those on the other side to be converted. He pointed out that the difference was one between right and wrong; obedience and sin; and heaven and hell. George's plea was for all to accept and obey the truth.

When the debate was ended, I believe it was clear to all that George had defended the truth in a most persuasive manner. In addition, we had the comfort of being able to leave all our argumentation, affirmative and negative, in the hands of all the people who were present.

Don't forget to order from George a copy of his debate notes. They will serve you well in home studies, congregational teaching, debating, or just in passing on the doctrine to your children.

***Alan Bonifay  
(1994)***

## **THE PROPOSITIONS DISCUSSED**

Four propositions were discussed during the debate (June 23-25, 1994). These propositions were as follows:

### **Teaching the Word**

Proposition #1: When the church comes together for the purpose of teaching the Bible, it is scriptural to divide into classes for this teaching, some of which may be taught by women.

Thomas N. Thrasher (Affirms)  
George Battey (Denies)

Proposition #2: The scriptures teach that when the church comes together for the purpose of teaching the Bible, the people must be taught in an undivided assembly by men only.

George Battey (Affirms)  
Thomas N. Thrasher (Denies)

### **The Lord's Supper**

Proposition #3: The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion, must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

George Battey (Affirms)  
Patrick T. Donahue (Denies)

Proposition #4: The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion, may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

Patrick T. Donahue (Affirms)  
George Battey (Denies)

## Agreements

- 1) The propositions concerning the teaching will be discussed on a Thursday and Friday nights in the church building of the brethren meeting in Mableton, Georgia. On these nights the brethren of the Mableton congregation will be in charge of arranging and conducting the assemblies. Each of these sessions will begin at 7:30 PM.

The propositions concerning the Lord's supper will be discussed on the next day (Saturday) in the church building of the brethren meeting in Jonesboro, Georgia. On that day the brethren of the Jonesboro congregation will be in charge of arranging and conducting the assemblies. The first session for Proposition #3 will begin at 11:00 AM and the second session for Proposition #4 will begin at 3:00 PM.

- 2) Each session shall consist of three speeches each, by the disputants, of twenty minutes each. The affirmative shall open and the negative shall close the debate on each proposition, but in the closing speeches of each proposition no new matter shall be introduced without mutual consent.
- 3) Each side may submit ten written questions per proposition if they so desire. The written questions shall be submitted to the opposing side two months prior to the start of the debate to be answered and returned one month before the debate begins.
- 4) Each side agrees to be governed by Hedges' Rules of Logis which are summarized as follows:

Rule 1: The terms in which the question in debate is expressed and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there can be no misunderstanding respecting them.

Rule 2: The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate, each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge and desire for truth, with himself and that it is possible therefore that he may be in the wrong and his adversary in the right.

Rule 3: All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect, in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided. All expressions may be considered as unmeaning which contribute nothing to the proof of the question, such as desultory remarks, and declamatory expressions, all technical ambiguities and equivocal expressions.

Rule 4: Personal reflections on an adversary should in no instance be indulged in. Whatever his private character, his follies are not to be named, nor alluded to in

controversy. Personal reflections are not only destitute of effect in respect to the question in discussion, but are productive of real evil.

Rule 5: No one has a right to accuse his adversary with indirect motives.

Rule 6: The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

Rule 7: As truth and not victory is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be on either side should be examined with fairness and candor, and any attempt to ensnare an adversary by arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

George Battey (Agrees)  
Patrick T. Donahue (Agrees)  
Thomas N. Thrasher (Agrees)

## **SECTION 1**

### **ANALYZING THE PROPOSITIONS**

#### **PROPOSITION #3 ANALYZED**

**PROPOSITION #3:** The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion, must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

**The scriptures teach** – that is, after reading the scriptures the reader gains the knowledge that Jesus used only one cup (drinking vessel), that only one drinking vessel was commanded to be used, and only one drinking vessel can fit the description offered by the scriptures.

**Must use** – that is, it is mandatory, essential, and required. Sin is committed by using more drinking vessels than what the Lord specified. One cup is required because it was commanded by the Lord. One cup is required because the Lord gave an example of using only one cup and He intended this part of His example to be followed; He intended His own use of one cup to be imitated by His disciples when they communed on the first day of each week.

**One cup (drinking vessel)** – that is, one and only one container must be shared by each disciple in an assembly.

**In the distribution of the fruit of the vine** – that is, the cup is not empty, but contains the fruit of the vine. An empty cup cannot be used and neither can fruit of the vine only be used. The fruit of the vine must be contained in one drinking vessel and distributed to the audience in one vessel.

**SUMMARY:** The burden of proof is to show four things: (a) that Jesus Himself used only one drinking vessel, (b) that He commanded His disciples to use and share one drinking vessel, (c) that one drinking vessel was consistently used in apostolic times with no deviation and (d) that one drinking vessel is a significant part of the communion service; it must be done in this fashion because the Lord wanted it done in this fashion.

## **PROPOSITION #4 ANALYZED**

**PROPOSITION #4:** The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion, may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

**The scriptures teach** – that is, after reading the scriptures the reader gains the knowledge and impression that congregations today may use individual drinking vessels when observing the communion and in so doing they are following the Lord's example and commands exactly.

**May use** – that is, the Lord gave no instructions to His disciples on how to partake of the fruit of the vine and He made the manner of distributing it a matter of liberty. Using individual drinking vessels fulfills the Lord's commands and examples just as well as if only one drinking vessel were used.

**Individual cups (drinking vessels)** – that is, each participant may have his own individual drinking cup and by so doing is following what the scriptures teach.

**SUMMARY:** The burden of proof is to show: (a) that the Lord made the use of a drinking vessel an incidental item with no spiritual significance, (b) that as an incidental item all drinking vessels may be dispensed with, or as many as men desire may be used, (c) that Jesus gave no commands involving the use of any drinking vessel, and (d) that disciples today may fulfill all of Jesus' commands in regard to communion by using a plurality of vessels.

## **SECTION 2**

### **PROVING ONE CUP IS REQUIRED**

#### **GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

The Lord's supper has been a point of controversy for a long time. Churches are divided over the following issues:

- 1) Is the bread and fruit of the vine symbolic of the body and blood or do they actually become the body and blood? (The doctrine of "transubstantiation")
- 2) When should the communion be eaten? (At weddings? At funerals? On Christmas Eve?)
- 3) How often should the communion be eaten? (Weekly? Monthly? Quarterly? Yearly?)
- 4) Do all the disciples have to be assembled together to eat the supper? (Transporting communion to the sick? Night communion for those unable to assemble and partake with the rest of the congregation? Communion in motel rooms when traveling?)
- 5) Can the church use plurality of loaves or divide the loaf? (Wafers? Bread-breaking – the practice of one man breaking or crumbling the loaf into many pieces before serving the congregation?)
- 6) Can fermented wine or even water be used? (Water as used by Mormons? Wine as used by Catholics?)
- 7) Can a plurality of cups be used?

The focus of this present study will be the last issue mentioned: **The use of one cup.**

#### **THE CASE FOR A SINGLE COMMUNION CUP**

Consider the following seven reasons why one "common" cup should be used by a congregation when serving the communion.



---

## REASON #1: One cup was commanded by the Lord

---

### **Matthew 26:26-29**

26 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to the disciples and said, "Take, eat; this is My body."

27 Then He took **the cup**, and gave thanks, and gave **it** to them, saying, "Drink from **it**, all of you."

28 For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

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."

The word *cup* in v27 is from the Greek word ποτήριον. This word is defined as:

- **"a cup, a drinking vessel"** (Thayer, 533). According to Thayer this word is used literally in v27. Hence, Jesus took a literal drinking vessel in His hands. The word *cup* might be used figuratively elsewhere, but here it is used literally.
- **"cup, drinking vessel"** (Arndt & Gingrich 702). According to Arndt & Gingrich this word is used literally in v27. Again, Jesus took a literal drinking vessel in His hands.

All linguistic authorities concur that the word *cup* in Mt 26:27 is being used literally. Jesus picked up a literal cup in His hands.

The reason for emphasizing this is because some argue the word *cup* is used figuratively throughout the accounts of the Lord's supper. They argue since it is used figuratively:

- No one can tell how many cups the Lord used.
- No one can tell if the Lord even had a cup at all.
- Therefore, since no one can know what Jesus did, it does not matter whether congregations use one literal cup or multiple cups.

The above argumentation is flawed. Verse 27 uses the word *cup* literally according to all linguistic authorities. Since the word *cup* is used literally, here are the facts gleaned from Mt 26:

- Jesus picked up one literal cup.
- Inside the literal cup was grape juice (v29).
- Jesus gave thanks for the juice in only one cup.

- Jesus gave only one cup to His disciples.
- Jesus commanded all the disciples to drink only from the one cup He handed them.

Mt 26:27 is a command from the Lord for all the disciples to drink from one cup. Even if each disciple had his own cup at the table, it does not change the fact that they were commanded to drink from the one cup Jesus handed them.

This study could stop at this point and it would have been proven one cup is required, but more passages and more proof will be offered.

### **1 Corinthians 11:2**

2 Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and **keep the traditions just as I delivered them to you.**

Here Christians are reminded to keep the divine traditions *"just as they were delivered."*

### **1 Corinthians 11:23**

23 For I **received from the Lord** that which I also delivered to you: ...

**Q:** Why must divine traditions be kept *"just as they were delivered"*?

**A:** Because they came directly from the Lord.

### **1 Corinthians 11:23-25**

23 For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you: that the Lord Jesus on the same night in which He was betrayed took bread;

24 and when He had given thanks, He broke it and said, "Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me."

25 In the same manner **He also took the cup** after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. **This do**, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

*"This do"* is a command to do what Jesus did. Once again Christians can see one cup is commanded by the Lord Himself.

### **SUMMARY:**

- Christians are commanded to keep divine traditions *"just as they were delivered."*
- The apostle received his instructions directly from the Lord Himself.
- Congregations are to follow the example of the Lord.
- The example includes only one cup containing unfermented grape juice.

Therefore, only one cup may be used because it is commanded by the Lord Himself and by His apostles.

---

**REASON #2: One cup constitutes a binding example.**

---

Mt 26 contains the command of Jesus:

**Matthew 26:27**

27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "**Drink from it**, all of you.

Did the disciples actually drink from that one cup?

**Mark 14:23**

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave **it** to them, and **they all drank from it**.

Mk 14:23 constitutes a binding example.

*"example" – "a particular single item ... that serves as a pattern to be imitated" (Webster).*

Mk 14:23 was given as a pattern to be imitated. How can Christians know this?

**1 Corinthians 11**

23 For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you: ...

25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. **This do**, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

According to 1 Cor 11:23-25, what Jesus did when instituting the communion, congregations are to follow as an example.

- Congregations must use unleavened bread – because that is what Jesus used.
- Congregations must use unfermented grape juice – because that is what Jesus used.
- Congregations must use only one loaf – because that is what Jesus used.
- Congregations must use only one cup – because that is what Jesus used.

Congregations using individual cups are inconsistent for the following reasons:

- If other churches used *leavened bread* (Mormons) instead of unleavened bread, they would point to the pattern of Jesus and insist that it be followed.
- If other churches used *water* (Mormons) instead of fruit of the vine, they would point to the pattern of Jesus and insist that it be followed.
- If other churches started observed the communion *on Thursday once a year* (Jehovah's Witnesses), they would point to the pattern of the Lord's disciples (Acts 20:7) and insist that it be followed.

**Q:** Why do churches have to follow the pattern in all of these things, but not in every respect?

- Why does it matter what the congregation eats?
- Why does it matter what the congregation drinks?
- What does it matter when the congregation observes communion?
- Yet, it does matter *how* the congregation does it?

It is inconsistent to insist on following the pattern in some respects, but not in all respects.

(Some argue the pattern requires meeting in an "upper room" like Jesus used and reclining at a table like Jesus did. See ARGUMENT #47: The upper room.)

---

### **REASON #3: One cup is implied by the Lord.**

---

Thomas Warren:

Let it be repeated: what is bound on men living today by the implication of explicit statements is bound not because men have inferred it, but because God has implied it by His explicit statements. (Example, 29)

This is important. What is binding on men today is bound not because men have inferred it, but because God implied it. One cup is required because it is implied by the Lord Himself:

#### **1 Corinthians 11:26**

26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.

The word "you" in v26 is plural. A plurality of brethren are to "*drink this cup.*" In this passage the Lord is implying that all Christians in the assembly drink from one cup. If a plurality of cups had been used at Corinth, the passage would have said: "For as often as you ... *drink these cups*, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes." By saying, "as often as you ... *drink this cup*," the Lord implied only a single cup.

When the Lord implies something He is not being silent. (See Mt 22:23-32 where the Lord implied a resurrection. Implication is not silence.) Since He implied one cup in 1 Cor 11:26, He was not being silent about one cup.

---

#### **REASON #4: One cup is symbolic.**

---

One cup is required because it symbolizes something. The communion cup itself is spiritually significant as a symbol.

In Mt 26:28 and Mk 14:24 Jesus said, "This is My blood." The word *this* grammatically and logically refers to the grape juice inside the cup. The grape juice represents the blood of Christ. But this is not all the Lord said. He said, "This is My blood *of the new covenant.*" This means the Lord's blood *ratifies* the new covenant.

- The Lord's blood is one thing.
- The new covenant ratified by His blood is a separate thing.

Here are two separate items. The grape juice does not represent the new covenant.

If Christians had only Matthew and Mark's accounts, they would not know the cup itself symbolized anything. With Matthew and Mark Christians learn only what the grape juice symbolizes. Luke and Paul focus on the cup itself (container) and explain what it symbolizes:

#### **Luke 22:20**

20 Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, "**This cup is the new covenant** in My blood, which is shed for you.

When the Lord said, "This cup is the new covenant," He meant the cup *symbolizes* the new covenant. When He said, "This cup is the new covenant *in My blood*," He meant His blood *ratified* the new covenant.

Let this soak in: ***The cup symbolizes the new covenant.*** The apostle Paul, who trained Luke, said the same thing:

### **1 Corinthians 11:25**

25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "**This cup is the new covenant in My blood**. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

The cup itself represents or symbolizes the new covenant. Without contradicting one another, Matthew and Mark explain what the grape juice symbolizes (the Lord's blood) while Luke and Paul explain what the cup itself symbolizes (the new covenant). Here is a chart:

Matthew & Mark	→	" <b>This (fruit of the vine) represents My blood</b> which ratifies the new covenant."
Luke & Paul	→	" <b>This cup represents the new covenant</b> ratified by My blood."

Matthew and Mark focus on the meaning of the liquid inside the cup. Luke and Paul focus on the meaning of the container itself. The container has spiritual significance. There are not just two spiritually significant items in the Lord's supper – there are three: the bread, the grape juice and the container.

When Jesus died, three significant things happened:

- His body was sacrificed.
- His blood was shed.
- The new covenant was ratified.

In the communion, the Lord gave three items to remind Christians of these significant items:

One loaf	→	Symbolizes the Lord's one body.
Grape juice	→	Symbolizes the Lord's blood.
One cup	→	Symbolizes the new covenant.

There are three spiritually significant elements in the Lord's supper – not just two. The emphasis is not on the fruit of the vine only. Emphasis is also placed on the container itself.

## A WORD ABOUT SYMBOLS

---

Every major covenant God made had a symbol to represent that covenant.

1) **The covenant with Noah.**

**Genesis 9:13**

13 I set My **rainbow** in the cloud, and it shall be for **the sign of the covenant** between Me and the earth.

The rainbow does not look like a covenant, but it symbolized a covenant simply because God said so.

2) **The covenant with Abraham.**

**Genesis 17:11**

11 and you shall be **circumcised** in the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a **sign of the covenant** between Me and you.

Circumcision does not look like a covenant, but it symbolized a covenant simply because God said so.

3) **The covenant with Israel.**

**Exodus 31:16-17**

16 Therefore the children of Israel shall keep **the Sabbath**, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations as a perpetual covenant.

17 It is a **sign** between Me and the children of Israel forever; ...

The Sabbath day does not look like a covenant, but it symbolized a covenant simply because God said so.

4) **The covenant with Christians.**

**Luke 22:20**

20 Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, "**This cup is the new covenant** in My blood, which is shed for you.

The cup (container) does not look like a covenant, but it symbolizes a covenant simply because God said so.

This is why one cup is significant.

- Jesus had only one body. Therefore, it is fitting that only one loaf be used to symbolize His one body in communion. (1 Cor 10:16-17).
- Jesus ratified only one covenant. Therefore, it is fitting that only one cup be used to symbolize that one covenant.

While the grape juice symbolizes the price paid to ratify the new covenant, the cup itself symbolizes that new covenant. The wisdom of God is seen in this simple arrangement:

<b>A CUP AND ITS CONTENTS</b>	<b>THE BLOOD AND THE COVENANT</b>
(a) A liquid is incomplete without a container.	(a) The blood of Christ is incomplete without a new covenant.
(b) A container is incomplete without a liquid.	(b) A new covenant is incomplete without the blood of Christ.

Because the new covenant is inseparable from the blood which ratified it, God chose two items that are also inseparable to symbolize His divine scheme of redemption: (a) a cup and (b) its contents. While both items are essential, neither item by itself symbolizes anything.

**Hebrews 9:16-17**

16 For where there is a testament, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.

17 For a testament is in force after men are dead, since it has no power at all while the testator lives.

A testament (covenant) without blood has no power. It takes both the blood and the testament together to produce results.

**Hebrews 9:18-20**

18 Therefore not even the first covenant was dedicated without blood.

19 For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people,

20 saying, "This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded you."

Notice two important features from this passage:

- The blood which dedicated the old covenant was not the old covenant.
- The old covenant which was dedicated with blood was not the blood.



Clearly there are two distinct elements involved in a valid, covenant: (a) blood which ratifies the covenant and (b) the covenant itself. The blood is not the covenant and the covenant is not the blood. These two items cannot be confused nor separated.

God had a *problem* so to speak. He needed something that would symbolize two separate items: (a) the covenant and (b) the blood. Yet, at the same time, He needed to demonstrate the dependence of both items upon each other. In choosing a cup filled with grape juice, He chose two items that are distinct from each other and yet dependent upon each other.

To picture the one new covenant between God and His people one and only one cup is essential.

- a) **One loaf** – symbolizes the body of the Lord. He had only one physical body (Heb 10:5) and only one spiritual body (Eph 1:22-23; 4:4), therefore congregations must use only one loaf (1 Cor 10:16-17). More than one loaf destroys the symbolism intended.
- b) **Fruit of the vine** – symbolizes the blood of Christ that *dedicated* or *ratified* the new covenant (Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24; Heb 9:18-20).
- c) **One cup** – symbolizes the one new covenant between God and His people (Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25). More than one cup destroys the symbolism intended.

---

#### REASON #5: One cup fulfills the meaning of the word "communion."

---

The word *communion* requires the use of only one loaf and one cup.

**"Communion"** – means "joint participation" or "sharing something together."

*Communion* and *individual* are antonyms. It is impossible to have *individual communion*. *Communion* implies assembling together with brethren and sharing something with each other.

#### **Acts 20:7**

7 ... on the first day of the week, ... **the disciples came together** to break bread,  
...

#### **1 Corinthians 11:33**

33 Therefore, my brethren, when you **come together to eat**, wait for one another.

If communion were *individual* Christians would not need to "come together." Communion requires all the brethren assembling together and sharing together the one loaf and one cup.

The Christians at Corinth were not sharing together anything and were therefore not having communion:

**1 Corinthians 11:20-22**

20 *Therefore when you come together in one place, it is not to eat the Lord's Supper.*

21 *For in eating, **each one takes his own supper** ahead of others; and one is hungry and another is drunk.*

22 *What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God and shame those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I do not praise you.*

Notice v21, "each one takes his own supper." When these brethren ate by themselves "ahead of others" without sharing, they were turning the Lord's supper into an "individual supper."

- *An individual supper* is not the Lord's supper.
- *An individual supper* is each man's *own supper*.

The Lord's supper is sharing together a common loaf and cup. This passage (1 Cor 11:20-22) is an explicit prohibition against everyone having his own wafer or cup.

This is why a second serving of the Lord's supper on Sunday afternoon is wrong. Many congregations allow brethren to miss worship on the Lord's day. While most of the brethren have assembled for worship, others are working or sleeping late. In the afternoon, the ones who missed the morning service partake while the rest of the congregation watches. This is not the Lord's supper. This is "*each one taking his own supper*" – a violation of an explicit prohibition. Communion means sharing together one loaf and one cup. It requires all the brethren and sisters to assemble. It is sinful for Christians to work or sleep late and not assemble to break the bread (Heb 10:25).

Individual cups destroy the very purpose of communion. They are not only un-scriptural, they are anti-scriptural.

---

**Reason #6: One cup is the only way to have unity.**

---

Christians are commanded to have unity. Division is sinful:

**1 Corinthians 1:10**

10 Now I plead with you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all **speak the same thing**, and that there be **no divisions** among you, but that you **be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment**.

The only way to "speak the same thing" and "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and same judgment" is to only do what is revealed in scripture. Everyone can agree that one cup is scriptural, but Christians are divided over the use of individual cups. Therefore, the only way to have unity is to use what everyone agrees is right.

N. B. Hardeman wrote the following:

"If ... you can worship God acceptably without the organ – and still will not give it up, I must charge you with the responsibility of perpetuating division and strife against the pleadings and prayer of our Lord." (Boswell-Hardeman, 62).

"The man that injects the difference, the man that brings in the thing that causes the trouble is the man that makes the test of fellowship." (Boswell-Hardeman, 181).

Brethren who use individual cups admit it is scriptural to worship without individual cups. However, they say anyone who binds one cup on them is "making a law where God made none." Their final argument is to say that brethren insisting on one cup are the ones causing division. This is wrong. Brethren are not causing division when they insist the NT pattern for communion be followed.

## **SECTION 3**

### **BIBLE AUTHORITY**

**Authority** – "the right to command and enforce obedience or administer punishment"

Authority comes in two forms:

- Primary authority
- Delegated authority

#### **1) God the Father constitutes primary authority:**

There is no one above God. He answers to no one.

##### **1 Corinthians 11:3**

3 But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.

##### **Daniel 4:35**

35 All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing;  
He does according to His will in the army of heaven  
And among the inhabitants of the earth.  
No one can restrain His hand  
Or say to Him, "What have You done?"

Since God has all authority, He can delegate (give) that authority to someone else. This is what He did.

#### **2) Jesus has delegated authority:**

##### **Matthew 28:18**

18 And Jesus came and spoke to them, saying, "All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth.

When Jesus said His authority "has been given," He meant "has been delegated." Who gave (delegated) this authority to Him? The Father gave it.

### **Matthew 11:27**

27 All things have been **delivered to Me by My Father**, ...

Since Jesus has all authority, He can delegate (give) some of that authority to someone else. This is what He did.

### **3) The apostles have delegated authority:**

#### **Matthew 16:18-19**

18 And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.

19 And **I will give you** the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven."

Keys symbolize authority. The apostles are being given authority by the Lord.

When the Lord said the apostles would bind things on earth and those things would "be bound in heaven," the Lord was using a perfect, passive participle. When He said the apostles would loose things on earth and those things would "be loosed in heaven," He was again using a perfect, passive participle. The English Standard Version (ESV) gives the correct translation of this grammatical construction in the footnotes: *"shall already have been bound ... shall already have been loosed."* The apostles were not making laws. They were revealing and enforcing laws previously made in heaven.

### **AMBASSADORS**

Jesus, then, was an official representative of the Father's authority (Jn 14:9). The apostles were official representatives of Jesus' authority.

#### **2 Corinthians 5:20**

20 Now then, **we** [apostles] **are ambassadors for Christ**, as though God were pleading through us: **we** implore **you** on Christ's behalf, be reconciled to God.

Some use this verse to teach that all Christians are ambassadors for Christ. That is not true. Notice the distinction between *we* and the *you*. The "*you*" are the Corinthians. The "*we*" are the apostles. An ambassador is an official representative. An ambassador speaks officially for the king.

### **1 John 4:6**

6 **We** [apostles] are of God. **He** who knows God hears **us**; he who is not of God does not hear us. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.

Here are two groups: *We* and *he*. The *we* are the apostles. They speak officially for the Lord.

## **ESTABLISHING AUTHORITY**

"Establishing authority" means that for everything taught and everything practiced Christians and congregations must *establish* the fact that the Lord authorized the teaching or practice.

### **Colossians 3:17**

17 And whatever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him.

There are five important phrases in this passage:

- "whatever" – means everything or anything (American Heritage)
- "in word" – means things Christians say or teach
- "in deed" – means things Christians do or practice
- "do all" – means the same as "whatever" above
- "in the name of the Lord Jesus" – means by the authority of Jesus (cf. Acts 4:7, 10, 12)

To have authority from Jesus means: Either (a) Jesus Himself authorized the doctrine or practice or (b) one of His official representatives (ambassadors | apostles) authorized the doctrine or practice. Having authorization from Moses or the prophets will no longer work. After the Lord was raised from the dead, the announcement would be made that men must listen to Jesus only (Mt 17:5-9).

## **WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION**

Not only must Jesus or the apostles authorize every doctrine and every practice, the authorization must be in written form. No one may say: "I feel the Lord is leading me to do a certain thing" – as though inner leadings, promptings, feelings and premonitions authorized anything. No one may say: "Jesus told me to do a certain thing" – as though Jesus were still revealing things today. No. The authorization from Jesus or His apostles must be in written form (the NT scriptures).

**John 16:13**

13 [Jesus said to His apostles] when He, **the Spirit of truth**, has come, **He will guide you into all truth**; for He will not speak on His own authority, but whatever He hears He will speak; and He will tell you things to come.

Consider this passage carefully:

- If the Spirit would reveal "all truth" to the apostles,
- And if the apostles wrote down all which the Spirit revealed,
- And if that revelation was preserved,
- Then there would be no further need for revelation.

Here are three conditions which were actually fulfilled according to the apostles.

- Peter affirmed that all truth was revealed to the apostles (2 Pet 1:3).
- Paul affirmed that all the truth revealed was written down by the apostles (2 Tim 3:16-17; Eph 3:3-5).
- Peter and Jesus affirmed that the revelation of God's will would be preserved forever (1 Pet 1:23-25; Mt 24:35).

Since the conditions have been met, there is no further need for any revelation whatsoever. All revelation ceased with the close of the apostolic era (1 Cor 13:8-13; Jude 3). Neither the Father, nor the Son, nor the Spirit leads or guides anyone independently from the written scriptures.

Therefore, for everything taught or practiced there must be written authorization from either Jesus Himself or from one of the apostles. If there is no such written authorization, the doctrine cannot be taught and the action may not be performed – no matter how innocent or trivial the item under consideration may seem.

**EXPLICIT & IMPLICIT**

When God instructs His people thru written scriptures, there are only two possible ways He may communicate His wishes:

- Explicitly
- Implicitly

There is no third alternative. These two ways exhaust all possibilities.

**Explicit** – means "fully and clearly expressed; leaving nothing implied" (American Heritage)

**1 Timothy 4:1**

1 Now the Spirit **expressly says** that in latter times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons,

Here the Spirit is said to communicate *expressly* or explicitly. Explicit authorization means someone is able to find a NT passage and read word for word the doctrine or practice under consideration.

**Implicit** – "implied or understood though not directly expressed" (American Heritage)

**Mark 12:26-27**

26 But concerning the dead, that they rise, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the burning bush passage, how God spoke to him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'?

27 He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. You are therefore greatly mistaken."

In the burning bush passage God taught two things indirectly:

- He taught Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are still alive – though their bodies are dead.
- He also taught there will be a resurrection from the dead.

God did not explicitly say any of these things in that passage, but He *implied* them.

To *establish authority* someone must be able to point to a scripture (or combination of scriptures) where (a) Jesus or (b) the apostles either explicitly or implicitly authorized what is being taught or practiced. If the scriptures are silent about an item under consideration, Christians are forbidden to teach or do that thing because silence does not authorize.

Passages which teach silence forbids:

- Gen 4:4-5
- Lev 10:1-2



- Dt 4:2
- Dt 29:29
- 1 Ch 13
- Prov 30:6
- Mt 15:9
- 1 Cor 4:6
- Gal 1:8-9
- Acts 15:24
- Rom 10:17 → in connection with 2 Cor 5:7
- Heb 1:5, 13
- Heb 7:14
- 2 Jn 9-11
- Rev 22:18-19

## **IMPLICATION IS NOT SILENCE**

An important concept is the fact that implication is not silence.

- When the burning bush passage (Mk 12:26-27) implied Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive and will be resurrected, God was not being silent about the resurrection.
- When Ps 68:18 implied that Jesus would come down to the earth and live like a man, God was not being silent about the incarnation of Jesus (cf. Eph 4:8-10).

Implication is not silence. Alexander Campbell wrote:

"... nothing can be rationally inferred from any verse in the Bible that is not in it; and whatever can be logically deduced from any sentence in the Book, is as much the revelation of God as anything clearly expressed in it." (Campbell, 69)

In other words, when God implies something, whatever is implied is as much His word as anything explicitly stated. This explains why Jesus was incredulous with the Sadducees for not knowing about the resurrection in the burning bush passage (Mk 12:26-27).

To illustrate, when God commanded Noah to build an ark (Gen 6), He implied any tools necessary to carry out the command. God was not silent about:

- Some type of measuring device.
- Some sort of wood-cutting device.
- Some sort of wood-hauling device.

- Some sort of device which would nail or cement or bind the wood together (nails, rope, wood dowels).
- Some sort of brush or mop to apply the pitch (tar).

All of these tools were authorized, but they were not authorized explicitly. They were authorized implicitly. It may be said, then, that God was not silent about tools for building the ark.

Some brethren are saying:

"The preachers say **individual cups** are wrong and **instrumental music** is wrong because the Bible is silent about them, but then they turn around and say we can have **a church building** and **songbooks** and **a thousand other things** which the Bible is also silent about. How can they condemn cups and instrumental music and Bible classes because of silence, but then accept church buildings, songbooks and other things?"

The truth of the matter is: God was not silent about church buildings and songbooks and many other items which are carelessly lumped together with instrumental music, cups and classes.

- When God authorized the church to assemble together (1 Cor 11:33; Heb 10:25), He automatically authorized any tools (e.g. a building) necessary to carry out the command to assemble.
- When God authorized the church to sing (Eph 5:19), He automatically authorized any tools (e.g. songbooks) necessary to carry out the command to sing.

Although there is not explicit authorization for a church building or songbooks, there is implicit authorization. As pointed out, implication is not silence.

## **SIX POSSIBILITIES**

Since everything the Bible teaches is taught either explicitly or implicitly, there are six possibilities:

<b>Explicitly</b>	<b>Implicitly</b>
1) <b>Required</b>	4) <b>Required</b>
2) <b>Permitted</b>	5) <b>Permitted</b>
3) <b>Prohibited</b>	6) <b>Prohibited</b>

Consider each of these six possibilities carefully:

---

1) **Some things are explicitly REQUIRED**

---

**Acts 2:38**

38 Then Peter said to them, "**Repent**, and let every one of you **be baptized** in the name of Jesus Christ **for the remission of sins** ...

---

2) **Some things are explicitly PERMITTED**

---

**Romans 14:5**

5 One person esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind.

Here is an explicit permission. A man does not have to esteem one day above another, but is permitted to do so.

---

3) **Some things are explicitly PROHIBITED**

---

**1 Corinthians 14:34-35**

34 Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says.

35 And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church.

---

4) **Some things are implicitly REQUIRED**

---

**Exodus 20:8**

8 "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.

This passage implicitly required keeping *every* Sabbath day holy (cf. Num 15:32-36). In the same way, Acts 20:7 implies communion is to be observed *every* first day of the week.

---

5) **Some things are implicitly PERMITTED**

---

**Ephesians 4:28**

28 Let him who stole steal no longer, but rather let him labor, working with his hands what is good, that he may have something to give him who has need.

This passage implicitly permits a man to be a mechanic, a carpenter, a computer programmer or any other occupation which is considered good. No one is required to be a mechanic, but they are permitted (authorized). Is there Bible authorization to program computers? Yes – Eph 4:28.

---

## 6) Some things are implicitly PROHIBITED

---

### **Matthew 5:44**

44 But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you,

While this passage explicitly requires certain things (love for enemies), it also implicitly prohibits things. It implicitly prohibits anything that is hateful toward an enemy (killing). So, while there is no passage which explicitly say, "Do not join the military and kill the enemies of your country," this passage implicitly prohibits such.

## **THE "EXPLICIT-ONLY" DOCTRINE**

There is a false doctrine called the *explicit-only doctrine* which states that only those things which are explicitly stated are required. The entire area of implicit teaching is rejected because it requires human reasoning and human reasoning at its very best is believed to be flawed. Thomas Campbell believed this false doctrine:

"That although inferences and deductions from Scripture premises, when fairly inferred, may be truly called the doctrine of God's holy word, yet are they not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians farther than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so; for their faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power and veracity of God. Therefore, no such deductions can be made terms of communion, but do properly belong to the after and progressive edification of the Church. Hence, it is evident that no such deductions or inferential truths ought to have any place in the Church's confession."

(<http://www.mun.ca/rels/restmov/texts/tcampbell/da/DA-2ND.HTM#Page25>).

F. L. Lemley believed this false doctrine:

Since all inferences are of human origin, unless we want to hold on to human patterns we should discard necessary inference as poor pattern material. (Warren, 91)

Any time a process of human reasoning or deduction has to intervene between the word and a conclusion, the conclusion is human and not divine, and therefore cannot be (even when true) a part of the New Testament pattern. (Warren, 90)

Only those examples that are objects of direct command are binding on us. (Warren, 91)

**Q:** How did F. L. Lemley and Thomas Campbell reach their conclusions that implicit teachings are not binding?

**A:** They used reasoning and drew inferences. In other words, they had to use human reasoning themselves to reach the conclusion that others are forbidden to bind laws which require human reasoning.

If the explicit-only doctrine is true, then most of the Bible becomes irrelevant because none of its commands were explicitly directed to anyone living today. Jesus' rebuke of the Sadducees in Mk 12 clearly demonstrates the explicit-only doctrine is false. The implicit teachings of the scripture are just as binding as the explicit teachings.

## **SILENCE FORBIDS**

The scriptures clearly teach that when God is silent about a doctrine or practice that item under consideration is forbidden – it is unauthorized. This is called *legislative silence*.

<p><b><u>Legislative silence</u></b> – when the law is purposefully silent about an action and that silence is viewed as expressing the intent of the lawmaker.</p>
---

Silence means the absence of both explicit and implicit teachings. Implication is not silence. When God implies something, He is not being silent. True silence is the absence of all explicit and implicit teachings.

Consider the following passages which demonstrate silence-forbids:

---

## 1) Cain & Abel

---

### **Genesis 4:4-5**

4 Abel also brought of the firstborn of his flock and of their fat. And the LORD respected Abel and his offering,

5 *but He did not respect Cain and his offering. And Cain was very angry, and his countenance fell.*

In Heb 11:4 it is revealed that Abel offered his animal sacrifice *by faith*. Since faith comes from hearing the word of God (Rom 10:17), the necessary conclusion is that Cain and Abel were instructed by God regarding sacrifice. Abel offered what God commanded. Cain offered a sacrifice which God did not command. Silence-forbids is the only possible conclusion.

---

## 2) Nadab & Abihu

---

### **Leviticus 10:1-2**

1 Then Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, each took his censer and put fire in it, put incense on it, and offered **profane fire** before the LORD, **which He had not commanded them**.

2 So fire went out from the LORD and devoured them, and they died before the LORD.

The argument of this passage is based on silence. Since the fire offered by Nadab and Abihu was never authorized, they were forbidden to use this fire. Silence forbids.

---

## 3) The Jerusalem Conference

---

### **Acts 15:23-24**

23 They wrote this, letter by them:

The apostles, the elders, and the brethren,

To the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia:

Greetings.

24 Since we have heard that some who went out from us have troubled you with words, unsettling your souls, saying, "You must be circumcised and keep the law" — **to whom we gave no such commandment** —

This argument of the apostles and elders is based on silence. Since there was no command authorizing circumcision nor keeping Moses' law, men were forbidden by that silence to teach either doctrine.

---

#### 4) Jesus And The Angels

---

##### **Hebrews 1:5**

5 For to which of the angels did He ever say:

"You are My Son,

Today I have begotten You"?

And again:

"I will be to Him a Father,

And He shall be to Me a Son"?

Here are two questions:

- To which angel did God ever say, "You are My Son, Today I have begotten You?"
- And, to which angel did God ever say, "I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son?"

What is the answer to these questions? Did God ever say these things to an angel? No. The argument of this passage is based on silence. Because God never said these things to any angel, men are *forbidden* to teach that Jesus is an angel.

##### **Hebrews 1:13**

13 But to which of the angels has He ever said:

"Sit at My right hand,

Till I make Your enemies Your footstool"?

What is the answer to this question? Did God ever say this to an angel? No. Again, the argument being made is based on silence. When the scriptures are silent about Jesus being an angel, men are *forbidden* to teach such.

---

#### 5) Jesus And The Priesthood

---

##### **Hebrews 7:14**

14 For it is evident that our Lord arose from Judah, of which tribe **Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood.**

The argument of this passage is based on silence. Since the OT scriptures were silent about priests coming from the tribe of Judah, the Lord Himself was forbidden to be a priest under that law. Silence forbids. In order for the Lord to be a priest, the law will have to be changed:

**Hebrews 7:12**

12 For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the law.

The NT law is not silent about Jesus being a priest, but the OT law was silent and since silence forbids, Jesus could not be a priest as long as the OT remained in force. It had to be taken away (Col 2:14) in order for Jesus to be the High Priest for Christians.

---

**6) The "Do-Not-Add" Passages**

---

All of the *do-not-add* passages teach the doctrine of silence-forbids.

**Deuteronomy 4:2**

2 You shall not add to the word which I command you, nor take from it, that you may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.

**Proverbs 30:6**

6 Do not add to His words,  
Lest He rebuke you, and you be found a liar.

**Revelation 22:18**

18 For I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book;

Passages which forbid adding to God's word are teaching that silence is significant. God not only revealed His will in what He said (explicit and implicit teachings), but He also revealed His will in what He did not say (silence).

**APPLICATION (pt. 1)**

Everything taught or practiced must be authorized either by Jesus or one of His official representatives – the apostles (Col 3:17).

If the Bible is silent about a practice that means there is no explicit nor implicit teaching authorizing the practice. Silence means the absence of all teaching and all authorization. Therefore, the following things are unauthorized because Jesus and His official representatives (apostles) were silent about these things:

- Popery
- Praying thru Mary and other "saints"
- Infant baptism



- Sprinkling for baptism
- Musical instruments
- Bible classes
- Individual communion wafers
- Fermented wine in communion
- Individual communion cups
- A second-offering of the communion on Sunday afternoon
- Transporting the communion to sick people
- Church-treasury-financed recreation
- Church-treasury-financed schools and colleges
- Choirs
- Hand-clapping during singing of praise to God
- Religious dancing
- Religious drama performances during worship services
- Telling alien sinners they may pray in order to be saved
- Gambling as a way to make money
- Sisters in Christ trimming their hair

The NT is silent about all these things. Silence forbids. All of the things in the list above are forbidden by silence.

## **APPLICATION (pt. 2)**

This present set of notes concerns the Lord's supper and the use of individual communion cups. Individual cups are forbidden by the silence of scripture. Neither Jesus nor the apostles authorized a plurality of communion cups. They did not authorize them explicitly nor did they authorize them implicitly. There is complete and absolute silence regarding a plurality of communion cups in the scriptures.

In order to disprove the conclusion of this study, all one has to do is present proof from the NT scriptures that individual communion cups are authorized either **explicitly** or **implicitly**.

- If there is **explicit** teaching, then individual cups are authorized and may be used.
- If there is **implicit** teaching, then individual cups are authorized and may be used.

However, if there is silence (neither explicit nor implicit teaching), then individual communion cups may not be used. Silence would forbid the use of individual cups.

Remember: God not only teaches by what He says, He teaches by what He does not say (legislative silence).

If someone asked for authorization for one single communion cup, that could be done:

**Matthew 26:27**

27 Then He took **the cup**, and gave thanks, and gave **it** to them, saying, "Drink from **it**, all of you.

**1 Corinthians 11:25**

25 In the same manner **He also took the cup** after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. **This do**, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

However, if someone asked for authorization for a plurality of communion cups, that cannot be done.

- There is no passage in the NT that **explicitly** authorizes a plurality of communion cups.
- There is no passage in the NT that **implicitly** authorizes a plurality of communion cups.
- There is only silence about a plurality of communion cups.

Silence forbids. Silence cannot authorize. Therefore, individual communion cups are sinful and unauthorized.

## **COMMON ARGUMENTS**

Consider two common arguments used by many to evade the force of these Biblical truths.

---

### **ARGUMENT #1: "This is nit-picking"**

---

With all the major problems in the world today (drugs, teenage sex, rape, murder, homosexuality, and war) how can anyone possibly be concerned about whether it's right or wrong to use instruments of music, plurality of cups, or Bible classes?
--

**REPLY:** This reasoning is designed to make Christians look like unreasonable fanatics for insisting that God's word be respected. Reverse this reasoning for a minute: Do men really think they can keep "big" commandments when they cannot keep "little" commandments? If they cannot sing or assemble or commune like God directed, will they do any better with bigger commands?

**Luke 16:10**

10 "He who is faithful in what is least is faithful also in much; and he who is unjust in what is least is unjust also in much.

The Pharisees are considered by most people as being "nit-picky," but Jesus did not condemn them for being "nit-picky." He condemned them for being hypocrites.

**Matthew 23:23**

23 "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faith. These you ought to have done, without leaving the others undone.

These Pharisees were not condemned for tithing mint, anise and cummin. They were condemned for neglecting the "weightier matters." Jesus said they should have done both the little and big things. Yet some today argue that the little things should be neglected. They say only the big things should be performed.

Consider the following passages:

**Matthew 5:19**

19 "Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

**2 Corinthians 2:9**

9 For to this end I also wrote, that I might put you to the test, whether you are obedient in all things.

**Hebrews 2:2-3**

2 For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just reward,  
3 how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed to us by those who heard Him,

---

**ARGUMENT #2: "We are under the grace of God"**

---

We are not justified based on our ability to keep the law. We are saved based on God's grace. When you are saved on the basis of faith and grace you don't have to worry constantly about whether you're keeping God's law.
---

**REPLY:** In effect this argument is declaring that God's grace gives men license to violate His law.

### **Romans 6:1-2**

- 1 What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?
- 2 Certainly not! How shall we who died to sin live any longer in it?

God's grace does not give men the right to do things that are wrong. Apply this logic and see how well it might work:

- **King Saul** – "God, You know that we humans are prone to make mistakes and we cannot keep Your law perfectly, and we know that you are a merciful and gracious God. Therefore I am going to disobey Your law and spare King Agag."
- **Nadab & Abihu** – "God, You know that we humans are prone to make mistakes and we cannot keep Your law perfectly, and we know that you are a merciful and gracious God. Therefore we are going to offer strange fire which You did not command."
- **Instrumental music** – "God, You know that we are not saved by works of human righteousness, and You know that we cannot keep Your law flawlessly. Therefore we plan to ignore what You said about the music of the church, and we intend to substitute our own form of music."
- **Individual cups** – "God, You know Yourself that we humans make mistakes and we cannot keep Your law perfectly. Therefore, we are going to change some things in the communion and do it differently than You commanded."
- **Bible classes** – "God, You know that we often make mistakes, but we know that You are merciful and gracious. Therefore, we are going to ignore Your rules about teaching the word and we are going to substitute our own methods instead."

All of this reasoning is rebellion. It constitutes a blatant disregard for God's divine law. Grace does not eliminate obedience. No one denies Christians are saved by grace, but it is wrong to believe that grace eliminates the need for exact obedience.

### **Luke 17:10**

10 "So likewise you, when you have done all those things which you are commanded, say, 'We are unprofitable servants. We have done what was our duty to do.' "

### **2 Corinthians 2:9**

9 For to this end I also wrote, that I might put you to the test, whether you are obedient in all things.

The saving grace of God is given *conditionally*. What is the condition? That men obey His will. This has always been the case in both the OT and NT.

**Matthew 7:21**

21 "Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in heaven.

The apostle Paul, who wrote more about grace than any other New Testament writer, did not believe that grace eliminated exact obedience:

**1 Corinthians 14:37**

37 If anyone thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord.

When God gives a pattern His silence excludes all other methods not found in the pattern. It is readily admitted:

- a) God is silent about mechanical instruments, but He is not silent about vocal singing (Eph 5:19).
- b) God is silent about Bible classes, but He is not silent about one undivided assembly (1 Cor 14:23).
- c) God is silent about individual cups, but He is not silent about one cup (Mt 26:27).
- d) God is silent about loaves, but He is not silent about loaf (1 Cor 10:17).

Silence does not indicate liberty. Christians must respect God's silence, obey what He said, and not venture into realms unauthorized. God had the prophets of old record the disastrous results of violating the silence of God. Any today who repeat their same mistakes, shall reap the same results.

## **SECTION 4**

### **THE HISTORY OF ONE CUP**

#### **HISTORY**

To begin this short section, it is necessary to emphasize that a practice is not wrong simply and solely because it is of recent origin. There are many old and ancient practices which are wrong just as some modern practices are wrong. Any practice or innovation is wrong, however, when the Lord's instructions are violated.

The history of how many cups were used in communion is interesting and demonstrates several things:

- a) Church historians attest to the fact that only one cup was used by the early church.
- b) The introduction of individual cups was based, not on the fact that they were taught by scriptures, but because men became concerned about the sanitation of drinking from one cup.
- c) The introduction of individual cups caused division within the church of Christ.

#### **J. G. Thomas (INVENTOR)**

Individual communion cups were first invented and patented by John G. Thomas who was both a preacher and doctor. He states the purpose of his invention: *"The object of this invention is to provide an individual or separate cup for the use of each person at the celebration of the Lord's Supper."* (Newberry, 21)

In a letter written to E. H. Miller the Thomas Communion Company wrote:

"Dear Sir: Your letter of April 17, 1950 has been received and we are pleased to inform you that the writers grandfather, John G. Thomas, who was both a physician and a minister invented the first individual communion outfits. The first patents were issued to him in 1894. The Market Street Presbyterian Church, of Lima, Ohio is believed to be the first church to used individual communion cups in a communion service. This also occurred in 1894. What is believed to be the original individual communion service used by this church is on display in the Allen County Historical Museum in Lima, Ohio." (See J. G. Thomas' letter to E. H. Miller.)

Until this time most denominations and churches of Christ used a single communion cup although some used two cups. No church, however, used individual communion cups before 1894 – the year J. G. Thomas invented them.

### **G. C. Brewer (INNOVATOR)**

G. C. Brewer was one of the more prominent preachers who had a taste for innovations. He claims to have been the first person to introduce individual communion cups into the church of Christ. Read his own report:

"A good many of the *fights* that I have made have been with my own brethren on points where I believed them to be in the wrong. I think I was *the first preacher to advocate the use of the individual communion cup* and the first church in the State of Tennessee that *adopted* it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chattanooga, Tennessee, then meeting in the Masonic Temple. My next work was with the church at Columbia, Tennessee, and, after *a long struggle*, I *got the individual communion service into that congregation*. About this time, Brother G. Dallas Smith *began to advocate* the individual communion service and he *introduce it* at Fayetteville, Tennessee; then later at Murfreesboro. Of course, I was *fought* both privately and publicly and several brethren took me to task in the religious papers and called me digressive. Brother Smith came to my rescue and, in the year 1915, Brother David Lipscomb wrote a short paragraph in the Gospel Advocate saying that *he had changed his view* in reference to the communion cup and that he did not believe it was any digression or in any way a corruption of the service to use as many cups as might be demanded by the occasion. This brought that controversy to an end and, from then on, the churches began using the individual communion cup everywhere." (Brewer, xii-xiii. See G. C. Brewer (Forty Years On The Firing Line) in these notes.)

Notice these key words and phrases:

- Fights
- First preacher to advocate the use of individual communion cups
- Adopted
- A long struggle
- Got the individual communion service into that congregation
- Introduced it
- Fought
- He had changed his view

The point to focus on is the fact that Brewer admits to fighting and struggling with brethren to force an innovation into the church which he himself believed to be a matter of liberty. He was willing to split the body of Christ for what he believed to be a matter of liberty. He and others admit to changing their views and introducing something into the church which had never been present before.

All innovators take the same approach.

- Advocates of missionary societies claim that such arrangements are a matter of liberty and they will not give the practice up for the sake of unity. Their argument is that they will not allow someone to bind them with laws God did not make.
- Advocates of mechanical instruments claim their instruments are matters of liberty and refuse to give them up for the sake of unity. They refuse to be "bound" by people making laws.

Compare this attitude with that of the apostle Paul:

**1 Corinthians 9:19-23**

19 For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a servant to all, that I might win the more;

20 and to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews; to those who are under the law, as under the law, that I might win those who are under the law;

21 to those who are without law, as without law (not being without law toward God, but under law toward Christ), that I might win those who are without law;

22 to the weak I became as weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.

23 Now this I do for the gospel's sake, that I may be partaker of it with you.

Paul recognized his freedom, but for the sake of the gospel he would forgo his freedom that he might win men to Christ. He would not take anything that was a matter of liberty and push it upon others so as to cause division.

Some men had doubts about certain matters of liberty and if they participated with doubts they would be sinning (Rom 14:23). As long as the world stood Paul would not practice a liberty that would lead someone who doubted to participate against their better judgment.

**Romans 14**

19 Therefore let us pursue the things which make for peace and the things by which one may edify another.

21 It is good neither to eat meat nor drink wine nor do anything by which your brother stumbles or is offended or is made weak.



22 Do you have faith? Have it to yourself before God. Happy is he who does not condemn himself in what he approves.

## **SECTION 5**

### **THE PASSOVER – A TYPE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER**

#### **THE PASSOVER**

##### **Luke 22:15-16**

15 Then He said to them, "With fervent desire I have desired to eat this **Passover** with you before I suffer;

16 for I say to you, I will no longer eat of it until it is **fulfilled in the kingdom of God.**"

##### **1 Corinthians 5:7**

7 Therefore purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new lump, since you truly are unleavened. For indeed **Christ, our Passover**, was sacrificed for us.

In these two passages Christians are introduced to the idea that the Jewish Passover lamb was a type of the Lord Himself and the Passover meal was a type of the Lord's supper. A study of the Passover feast in the Old Testament is very revealing regarding how the Lord's supper should be observed.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

To convince Pharaoh to let Israel go God sent nine plagues upon the land:

- 1) Water turned to blood
- 2) Frogs
- 3) Lice
- 4) Flies
- 5) Plague on livestock
- 6) Boils
- 7) Hail
- 8) Locusts
- 9) Darkness

As terrible as these plagues were, still Pharaoh hardened his heart and refused to let the people go. God declared there would be one final plague:

### **Exodus 11:1**

1 And the LORD said to Moses, "I will bring yet one more plague on Pharaoh and on Egypt. Afterward he will let you go from here. When he lets you go, he will surely drive you out of here altogether.

This final plague would be the worst plague that Egypt had yet experienced: The Plague upon the Firstborn!

### **Exodus 11:4-8**

4 Then Moses said, "Thus says the LORD: 'About midnight I will go out into the midst of Egypt;

5 'and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh who sits on his throne, even to the firstborn of the female servant who is behind the handmill, and all the firstborn of the animals.

6 'Then there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as was not like it before, nor shall be like it again.

7 'But against none of the children of Israel shall a dog move its tongue, against man or beast, that you may know that the LORD does make a difference between the Egyptians and Israel.'

8 "And all these your servants shall come down to me and bow down to me, saying, 'Get out, and all the people who follow you!' After that I will go out." Then he went out from Pharaoh in great anger.

God would send an angel forth to kill the firstborn in each house throughout Egypt. However, He provided a plan whereby Israel could escape disaster!

## **THE PASSOVER – A TYPE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER**

Let's examine this divine plan which God gave Israel. This plan contained eight distinct rules:

---

### **RULE #1: Each household was to take a spotless lamb and kill it!**

---

### **Exodus 12:3-5**

3 "Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his father, a lamb for a household.

4 'And if the household is too small for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next to his house take it according to the number of the persons; according to each man's need you shall make your count for the lamb.

5 'Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year. You may take it from the sheep or from the goats.

God was very particular about this! Only the best lamb could be used. A diseased or crippled lamb would be totally unacceptable.

---

**RULE #2: Each house was to kill only one lamb!**

---

**Exodus 12:3**

3 "Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his father, a lamb for a household.

"A lamb for an house" meant one and only one lamb per house! Using more than one lamb would have been wrong because God specifically said one.

---

**RULE #3: The lamb was to remain in one piece!**

---

**Exodus 12**

4 'And if the household is too small for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next to his house take it according to the number of the persons; according to each man's need you shall make your count for the lamb.

46 "In one house it shall be eaten; you shall not carry any of the flesh outside the house, nor shall you break one of its bones.

These regulations were designed so that one and only one lamb could be used in each house! It was okay to invite neighbors to come over and help eat the lamb, but it was wrong to cut off a portion of the lamb and carry it over to the neighbor! Not one bone could be broken in that lamb's body! It was to be roasted and eaten whole:

**Exodus 12:8-9**

8 'Then they shall eat the flesh on that night; roasted in fire, with unleavened bread and with bitter herbs they shall eat it.

9 'Do not eat it raw, nor boiled at all with water, but roasted in fire; its head with its legs and its entrails.

God was so careful with these instructions! He did not want that lamb's body divided into pieces!

---

**RULE #4: No leaven was allowed!**

---

**Exodus 12:18-20**

18 'In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at evening, you shall eat unleavened bread, until the twenty-first day of the month at evening.

19 'For seven days no leaven shall be found in your houses, since whoever eats what is leavened, that same person shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he is a stranger or a native of the land.

20 'You shall eat nothing leavened; in all your dwellings you shall eat unleavened bread.' "

Leaven is yeast! Nothing with yeast in it could be consumed during this Passover meal and for six days following no leaven could be consumed!

---

**RULE #5: The blood from the lamb was to be caught in a basin and sprinkled on the door of the house!**

---

**Exodus 12:22**

22 "And you shall take a bunch of hyssop, dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two doorposts with the blood that is in the basin. And none of you shall go out of the door of his house until morning.

"The basin" means one basin! Each house had one basin with blood in it and each house was to have that blood sprinkled around the door posts! When God specified one basin, He at the same time excluded more than one. Whether the basin had spiritual significance or not, each Israelite family could use only one because that is what God specified.

---

**RULE #6: All the family members had to stay in the house!**

---

**Exodus 12:22**

22 ... And none of you shall go out of the door of his house until morning.

Only by staying in the house with the blood of a lamb on the outside could they be safe from death!

**Exodus 12:13**

13 'Now the blood shall be a sign for you on the houses where you are. And when I see the blood, I will pass over you; and the plague shall not be on you to destroy you when I strike the land of Egypt.

---

**RULE #7: This Passover meal was to be repeated every year so no one would forget what happened!**

---

**Exodus 12:24-27**

24 "And you shall observe this thing as an ordinance for you and your sons forever.

25 "It will come to pass when you come to the land which the LORD will give you, just as He promised, that you shall keep this service.

26 "And it shall be, when your children say to you, 'What do you mean by this service?'

27 "that you shall say, 'It is the Passover sacrifice of the LORD, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt when He struck the Egyptians and delivered our households.' " So the people bowed their heads and worshiped.

This meal was a tool for teaching their children and the strangers within the land what great things the Lord had done for Israel!

---

**RULE #8: Only God's people could eat this meal!**

---

**Exodus 12:43-45**

43 And the LORD said to Moses and Aaron, "This is the ordinance of the Passover: No foreigner shall eat it.

44 "But every man's servant who is bought for money, when you have circumcised him, then he may eat it.

45 "A sojourner and a hired servant shall not eat it.

This was not a game! This was not a "tool" for evangelism. The Passover was very solemn and was for God's people only! Only God's people had been delivered from death! This meal was to remind them of how they were delivered! There was nothing for a foreigner to "remember" because no foreigner had been delivered from death like the Israelites!

- This meal was meaningless to foreigners.
- This meal was sacred and intended only for God's people!

## **THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST**

According to the NT this Passover event pointed forward to the crucifixion of Christ:

### **1 Corinthians 5:7-8**

7 Therefore purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new lump, since you truly are unleavened. For indeed Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed for us.

8 Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

Just as the Jews were given a meal to eat in remembrance of their deliverance, the Lord gave us a meal to remember His death and our deliverance:

### **1 Corinthians 11:26**

26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.

As the Passover lamb pointed forward to the Lord's death, the Lord's supper points backward to the Lord's death. Here are some similarities between the Passover meal and the Lord's supper.

## **THE LORD'S SUPPER – AN ANTITYPE OF THE PASSOVER**

Let us recall the first rule of the Passover:

---

**RULE #1: Each household was to take a spotless lamb and kill it!**

---

This spotless lamb signified Christ:

### **1 Peter 1:18-19**

18 knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, like silver or gold, from your aimless conduct received by tradition from your fathers,

19 but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.

Because the Passover lamb represented Christ, it is very clear to us now why God required that the lamb be "without blemish"! An imperfect lamb would not have appropriately represented Christ because He was perfect!

---

**RULE #2: Each house was to kill only one lamb!**

---

In the communion the church was instructed to use only one loaf to signify the Lord's body. Just as the Israelites were allowed only one lamb per house, Christians are allowed only one loaf per congregation!

**1 Corinthians 10:16-17 (NIV)**

16 ... And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ?

17 Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf.

Notice carefully that Christians are to have only one loaf of bread to signify the Lord's one body! When men tamper with the communion and place two, or more loaves on the table, they have destroyed the symbolism which God ordained!

Many, to justify their use of more than one loaf in the communion, have used the following "reasoning" for their practice:

**ARGUMENT:** "One bread"<sup>1</sup> really means "one kind of bread." It's OK to have several loaves just as long as they are all the same kind!

**REPLY:** Suppose to avoid the use of one lamb per house a "progressive" Israelite made the following argument: "One lamb per house means "one kind of lamb" per house. Each house in Israel could have several lambs just as long as they were all the same kind!

Would God have accepted such reasoning? To ask the question is to answer it. How, then, do men think they will get away with this kind of reasoning today?

Still men will not give up in their efforts to change divine patterns. They continue their argumentation as follows:

**ARGUMENT:** If a man breaks off a piece of bread to eat there are now two pieces – the one piece in his hand and the other piece on the plate. If there can be two pieces of bread after communion has begun, then two loaves may be present before beginning the communion.<sup>2</sup>

**REPLY:** Suppose some progressive Israelite in Moses' day argued in similar fashion? "When we break off a piece of meat from the lamb to eat, there are really two pieces – the one piece in our hand and the other piece on the table. Since there are two pieces after we begin eating, we may as well have two lambs before we begin eating!"

---

<sup>1</sup> The KJV and NKJV use the expression "one bread" while the NIV more accurately uses the expression "one loaf." When a cardinal number is placed before the word "bread" it is more accurate to use the word "loaf." Thus, rather than saying, "one bread," "two breads," etc., we say, "one loaf," "two loaves," etc.

<sup>2</sup> This reasoning was used by George Dickson in the Lindsey-Dickson Debate, a debate concerning the use of more than one loaf; published by Ellis Lindsey, 1975, pp. 7-8. Available online at [www.WillOfTheLord.com](http://www.WillOfTheLord.com).



In essence, this is no argument at all! It is merely human wisdom used to justify sin. Such "reasoning" will not be accepted by God!

---

**RULE #3: The lamb was to remain in one piece!**

---

The body of the Passover lamb was to remain whole. No bones could be broken in it. However, the people could break off portions of meat from the body and eat it. There was a reason for this! The lamb had no broken bones because it symbolized Jesus:

**Exodus 12:46**

*46 "In one house it shall be eaten; you shall not carry any of the flesh outside the house, nor shall you break one of its bones.*

**John 19:32-36**

*32 Then the soldiers came and broke the legs of the first and of the other who was crucified with Him.*

*33 But when they came to Jesus and saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs.*

*34 But one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out.*

*35 And he who has seen has testified, and his testimony is true; and he knows that he is telling the truth, so that you may believe.*

*36 For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled, "Not one of His bones shall be broken."*

Since the body of the Passover lamb remained whole and the body of Jesus remained whole, the loaf in the communion must remain whole!

- a) Just as they broke off portions of meat from the Passover lamb to eat it, Christians too break off portions from the loaf to eat.
- b) Just as they had to leave the body of the lamb whole, Christians must leave the loaf whole. Brethren and sisters cannot divide the loaf in half!

When the Bible speaks of "breaking bread" it means simply that brethren broke off a portion of the loaf to eat.

**1 Corinthians 10:16-17**

16 ... The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?

17 For we, though many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of that one bread.

Notice these facts:

- a) To "break" the bread means to "partake of the bread" (verse 17). This passage alone teaches that "breaking bread" does not mean crumbling up the loaf, nor dividing the loaf in half.
- b) Christians "share" together and "commune" only when they eat together: "we are all partakers of that one bread."

It would destroy the symbolism of the Passover lamb to divide the loaf in half, or to crumble it into pieces. Christians "break" the loaf only when they break off a portion and eat it together!

---

**RULE #4: No leaven was allowed!**

---

Any soul caught eating leaven was cut off from Israel. All leaven had to be removed from the house to observe the Passover. This is very significant because Jesus instituted the communion during the Passover meal:

**Matthew 26:17-19**

17 Now on the first day of the Feast of the Unleavened Bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying to Him, "Where do You want us to prepare for You to eat the Passover?"

18 And He said, "Go into the city to a certain man, and say to him, 'The Teacher says, "My time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at your house with My disciples." ' "

19 So the disciples did as Jesus had directed them; and they prepared the Passover.

26 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to the disciples and said, "Take, eat; this is My body."

27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

Because the communion was instituted during the Passover:

- a) Only unleavened bread may be used.
- b) Only unleavened grape juice may be used.

Jesus did not use fermented wine because He instituted this communion during a feast which did not allow yeast to be used. Fermented wine has yeast. Clearly Jesus did not use leavened wine.

---

**RULE #5: The blood from the lamb was to be caught in a basin and sprinkled on the door of the house!**

---

The blood from that lamb was caught in a single basin. Each house had the blood in one basin! Likewise, each congregation of the Lord's church is to have the fruit of the vine in one cup:

**Mark 14:23**

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

When congregations use more than one cup, they destroy the symbolism of the Lord's supper just as it would have destroyed the symbolism of the Passover meal if the blood of the lamb had not been caught in one and only one basin. The use of a plurality of cups ignores the Lord's example and command to use only one.

Some have imagined they have found a way around this divine pattern! They base their argument on the following passage:

**1 Corinthians 10:16**

16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? ...

Their "reasoning" is as follows:

**ARGUMENT:** Paul was at Ephesus and these people were at Corinth. **Yet** he said we (meaning those at Ephesus and those at Corinth) bless the same cup! You see, Corinth had at least one container and Ephesus had at least one container and yet Paul called it "***the cup.***" Now if they could have two containers and still call it "the cup," then we can have a dozen containers and still call it "the cup."<sup>3</sup>

**REPLY:** Suppose the Israelites had argued in a similar fashion based on the instructions given to them:

---

<sup>3</sup> See also, ARGUMENT #13: Ephesus and Corinth (version 2) of these notes.

**Exodus 12:5-6**

5 'Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year. You may take it from the sheep or from the goats.

6 'Now you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month. Then the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it at twilight.

Suppose a Jew argued: "Well there are 10,000 houses among the Israelites and each one has a lamb. But God said the whole assembly shall 'kill it.' Now if there are thousands of lambs in Israel and God still calls it 'the lamb,' then I can have several lambs in my house and still call it 'the lamb.'"

The fallacy of this argumentation is obvious to all. As hard hearted as those Jews were, not one of them argued like some argue today!

**NOTE:** The Passover meal was observed on a household level! The rules applied to a single household ... one lamb per house!

Likewise, the communion is observed on a congregational level! The rules apply to a single congregation ... one loaf and one cup per congregation!

---

**RULE #6: All the family members had to stay in the house!**

---

Suppose a Jew decided the Passover meal was not worth his time and he left the house and was caught outside when the death angel came thru the land!

- a) "I would like to eat the Passover meal, but I have to work at my job!"
- b) "I would like to eat the Passover meal, but I am tired and I just don't feel like doing it today!"
- c) "I would like to eat the Passover meal, but I need a break and I'm going on vacation and I just can't do it!"
- d) "I would have eaten the Passover, but I forgot to set the alarm and I slept too late to observe it!"

Not one of those Jews gave any of these excuses! They knew their lives depended on being present and eating the Passover like God said! Yet some brethren treat the communion and the church as though it were an option! They act like the assembly and the communion are scarcely worth their time! Their jobs, vacations, and rest are all more important to them than their souls!

**Hebrews 10:25**

25 not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as is the manner of some, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as you see the Day approaching.

A Jew was playing with his life if he left off the Passover meal. If he left the house, he lost his life! Today men are playing with their souls! If they leave off the assembly and leave off the church they lose their souls!

---

**RULE #7: This Passover meal was to be repeated every year so no one would forget what happened!**

---

The communion is specifically designed to bring to remembrance what the Lord did on the cross.

**1 Corinthians 11:24-26**

24 ... [of the loaf He said] "Take , eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me."

25 ... [of the cup He said] "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.

Verse 26 says: "As often as you eat ... you proclaim the Lord's death." How often do brethren and sisters eat this meal? The Passover was eaten each year, but how often do Christians eat this communion meal?

**Acts 20:7**

7 Now on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul, ready to depart the next day, spoke to them and continued his message until midnight.

God chose the first day of the week because that is the day Jesus arose from the grave (Mk 16:9). Each first day of the week the church is to gather and observe the communion.

---

**RULE #8: Only God's people could eat this meal!**

---

So it is with the communion. It is designed only for God's people.

**1 Corinthians 11:27-32**

27 Therefore whoever eats this bread or drinks this cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

28 But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.

29 For he who eats and drinks in an unworthy manner eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

30 For this reason many are weak and sick among you, and many sleep.

31 For if we would judge ourselves, we would not be judged.

32 But when we are judged, we are chastened by the Lord, that we may not be condemned with the world.

Notice the contrast in verse 32 between Christians and "the world." The Lord's supper is for Christians, not the world.

**1 Corinthians 10:16**

16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?

The Lord's supper is a communion of the body and blood of Christ! The world has no fellowship and no part in the Lord's body and blood until they obey Him and are baptized! Christians should explain to unbelievers that attend our worship services that the communion is strictly for the members of the church. If someone is present whom brethren and sisters do not know, they should pass the communion to them, because the visitor might be a Christian whom they simply do not know. However, brethren and sisters should not knowingly pass the communion to someone who is not a baptized believer.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Passover meal was given by God to look *forward* to what Jesus would someday do on the cross. The communion today, when done properly, looks *backward* to remind us of what the Lord did.

The comparisons between the Passover and the communion teach us some lessons as to how the communion should be observed. Christians must be careful that they do not destroy the symbolism contained in this divine pattern.

**Hebrews 8**

2 a Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord erected, and not man.

5 who serve the copy and shadow of the heavenly things, as Moses was divinely instructed when he was about to make the tabernacle. For He said, "See that you make all things according to the pattern shown you on the mountain."

Moses could not tamper with the divine pattern lest he destroy the symbolism God intended. Neither can men tamper with the communion lest they destroy the divine symbolism contained in this wonderful meal.

## **SECTION 6**

### **ARGUMENTS CONSIDERED**

#### **ARGUMENT #1: Metonymy**

"Cup" is used by metonymy and does not mean a drinking vessel, but rather the fruit of the vine.<sup>4</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

- 1) The word "cup" is not always used by metonymy in the Lord's supper passages. (See APPENDIX A - ANALYSIS OF KEY WORDS in these notes.)
- 2) Even when the word "cup" is being used by metonymy, a literal cup (drinking vessel) is still in view. Notice the following definitions of metonymy:

**metonymy** – "A figure of speech by which one name or noun is used instead of another, to which it stands in a certain relation." (Bullinger, 538)

**metonymy** – "A figure of speech consisting of the use of the name of one thing for that of another of which it is an attribute or which it is associated." (Webster, 718)

**metonymy** – "A figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it." (Williams, 220)

---

<sup>4</sup> This is the reasoning of W. Curtis Porter in The Porter-Waters Debate, Lambert Book House, 1975 edition, pp. 71-72. This is almost a universal argument used by virtually everyone embracing a plurality of drinking vessels. Gene Frost in *"Elements of the Lord's Supper," Gospel Anchor*, January 1983, p. 25 went so far as to say, "'The cup,' as used with the Lord's supper never refers to the literal vessel, but always to the fruit of the vine. The 'cup' of the Lord is the fruit of the vine. 'Cup' is used figuratively in what is called metonymy" (emphasis his).



From the above definitions it is clear that there are three distinct elements involved in metonymy:

- a) The thing named
- b) The thing suggested
- c) A relationship between the two objects

Metonymy is used in some verses using the word "cup":

**1 Corinthians 11:26**

26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.

Applying the above definitions of metonymy here are the necessary conclusions:

- a) The thing named → a literal cup (a drinking vessel)<sup>5</sup>
- b) The thing suggested → literal fruit of the vine (the contents of the cup)
- c) A relationship between the two objects → the fruit of the vine is contained within a literal cup

Even in metonymy a literal cup is involved.

3) The above definitions clearly indicate five facts about metonymy:<sup>6</sup>

- a) The object named is not the thing suggested.
- b) There is a real object, not an imaginary one, named.
- c) Both the thing named and the thing suggested must exist.
- d) In the Metonymy of the "container for the contained," the container named must contain the thing suggested.
- e) One can only suggest the contents of as many cups as he names.

Because of these facts, here are the conclusions that must be drawn relative to the communion cup:<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Even Donahue admits that a literal container is being named in this passage to suggest its literal contents. See Donahue's response to written question #5 (a) in SECTION 7 - WRITTEN QUESTIONS of these notes.

<sup>6</sup> These facts were first pointed out by Ervin Waters in the Porter-Waters Debate, p. 79-80.

<sup>7</sup> Waters, op cit, p. 80.

- a) Paul named "this cup," or "this cup of the Lord," to suggest its contents, the fruit of the vine.
  - b) Since the *object named* is not the *thing suggested*, "this cup" is *not* the fruit of the vine.
  - c) There is a *real cup named*.
  - d) Both the cup, which is named, and the contents, which are suggested, must exist.
  - e) The cup, which is named, *must contain the thing which is suggested*, the fruit of the vine.
  - f) Since one cup was named, the *contents of only one* are suggested.
- 4) In metonymy the drinking vessel is just as literal as the fruit of the vine which it suggests.
- a) If the fruit of the vine is literal, then the drinking vessel named to suggest it must be literal.
  - b) If the fruit of the vine is not literal, neither is the drinking vessel.
- 5) Fruit of the vine can be called a "cup" only when it's in a literal cup. It is improper and illogical to call grape juice a "cup" (singular) if:
- it is still in the cluster<sup>8</sup>
  - it is in a bottle
  - it is in a plurality of cups

The following sentences illustrate this point:

- a) Paul could have written, "*As often as you eat this bread and drink these cups, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.*" (This is not what the Bible says, but what it should have said if a plurality of drinking vessels were used.)
- b) Instead, Paul actually wrote, "*As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.*" (This necessarily implies the use of only one literal drinking vessel called a "cup.")

---

<sup>8</sup> Donahue incorrectly believes that fruit of the vine may be called a cup anytime, including when it is still in a cluster on the vine. See his answer to question #4, in SECTION 7 - WRITTEN QUESTIONS of these notes.

- 6) When metonymy is used, it adds to the meaning of "cup" rather than subtracts.

Advocates for individual drinking vessels mistakenly suppose that metonymy subtracts from the meaning of "cup." They assume that no drinking vessel is involved at all and only the liquid is envisioned. This is a false conclusion. Notice the following quotation from E. W. Bullinger:

"Applied to words, a figure denotes some form which a word or sentence takes, different from its ordinary and natural form. This is always for the purpose of giving additional force, more life, intensified feeling, and greater emphasis. Whereas today "Figuratively language" is ignorantly spoken of as though it made less the meaning, and deprived the words of their power and force. A passage of God's Word is quoted; and it is met with the cry, "Oh, that is figurative" – implying that its meaning is weakened, or that it has quite a different meaning, or that it has no meaning at all. But the very opposite is the case. For an unusual form (figura) is never used except to add force to the truth conveyed, emphasis to the statement of it, and depth to the meaning of it. When we apply this science then to God's words and to Divine truths, we see at once that no branch of Bible study can be more important, or offer greater promise of substantial reward."<sup>9</sup>

Bullinger is correct. Many people say of the "cup": "Oh, that is figurative," meaning that the word "cup" is weakened or means no literal cup at all. As Bullinger correctly points out, the exact opposite is true. When used by the figure metonymy, the word "cup" takes on additional meaning. Rather than meaning simply a drinking vessel alone, metonymy envisions a drinking vessel plus its contents.

- 7) When "cup" is used by metonymy, lexicons list such usage under "literal" usage because a literal container is being named to suggest a literal liquid. Notice the following two examples:

Thayer, p. 533

Literal – "a cup, a drinking vessel" Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; Lk 22:17,20; 1 Cor 10:16; 11:25,28 ... metonymy – of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk Lk 22:20b; 1 Cor 10:21; 11:25sq.,27

Figurative – "One's lot or experience, whether joyous or adverse, divine appointments, whether favorable or unfavorable, are likened to a cup which God presents one to drink Mt 20:22,23; Mk 10:38,39; Rev 14:10; 16:19; 18:6"

---

<sup>9</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. v-vi.

Arndt & Gingrich, p. 702

Literal – "cup, drink-vessel" Often in the language of the Lord's supper λαβὼν ποτήριον. Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; cf. Lk 22:17, [20a]; 1 Cor 11:25a ... The cup stands, by metonymy, for what it contains ... [Lk 22:20b]; 1 Cor 11:25b, 26 ... vs. 28 ... 1 Cor 10:16 ... 11:27

Figurative – Of undergoing a violent death Mt 20:22; 26:39, 42; Mk 10:38; 14:36

So, even when metonymy is used, it does nothing to remove the fact that a literal drinking vessel was used by Jesus and shared among the disciples.

## **ARGUMENT #2: Metonymy (again)**

"Cup" is always used by metonymy in the Lord's supper passages<sup>10</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) This is simply not true. Each occurrence of any word must be analyzed separately from other occurrences. For example:

#### **Romans 9:6**

6 But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect. For they are not all Israel who are of Israel.

The first occurrence of the word "Israel" refers to saved Christians. The second occurrence refers to unsaved Jews.

Likewise, each occurrence of the word "cup" must be examined separately from other occurrences. The word "cup" is used in at least three different ways:

- Literally – as in Mt 26:27.
- In a metonymy – as in 1 Cor 11:26.
- In a metaphor – as in 1 Cor 11:25 and Lk 22:20.

Bullinger discusses how to determine when a word is figurative or literal. See "ARGUMENT #4: "Anti" brethren are inconsistent" in these notes

2) See APPENDIX A - ANALYSIS OF KEY WORDS of these notes, where each usage of the word "cup" is discussed.

---

<sup>10</sup> This argument was used by both Pat Donahue during the Battey – Donahue Debate, Jonesboro, GA, June 25, 1994.

### **ARGUMENT #3: No drinking vessel intended**

Since "cup" is used by metonymy no literal drinking vessel was intended<sup>11</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

"Cup" is not always used by metonymy in Lord's supper passages. It is used in at least three ways:

- a) Literally – as in Mt 26:27.
- b) In a metonymy – as in 1 Cor 11:26.
- c) In a metaphor – as in 1 Cor 11:25 and Lk 22:20.

In all three cases, a literal cup is envisioned.

In the case of Mt 26:27, a literal cup is mentioned by Matthew in his narration of what Jesus did. In this case no figure is being used. Matthew, in narration, is simply writing what literally took place. Any spiritual meaning to any elements of the communion will be made by Jesus later. Before any figurative, or spiritual meaning may be attached to something, the literal elements and literal events must first be described. Thus, "cup" is used literally by Matthew in 26:27.

In the case of 1 Cor 11:26, a literal cup is mentioned to suggest its literal contents. Christians "Drink this cup" only when what they drink is in a cup – a literal drinking vessel. It is improper to say, "Drink this cup," if no literal drinking vessel is present.

In the cases of 1 Cor 11:25 and Lk 22:20, a literal cup is being compared to the New Covenant. Rather than using a simile and saying, "The cup is like the New Covenant," Jesus used the stronger figure of metaphor and said, "This cup is the New Covenant." When a metaphor is used both object used in the comparison must be used in their absolute literal sense. See Bullinger's discussion of this very point under "ARGUMENT #27: Spiritual significance."

---

<sup>11</sup> A commonly used argument. See also, ARGUMENT #28: Emphasis is on fruit of the vine, not the container.

#### **ARGUMENT #4: "Anti" brethren are inconsistent**

"Anti" brethren are inconsistent in how they say "cup" is used – First they argue that "cup" is literal in Mt 26:27 and then they change when they are forced to admit it is used figuratively in passages like 1 Cor 11:26.

#### **REPLY:**

1) Will those making this argument "reason" the same way on other words? For example, will they argue that the word "Israel" in the NT is always used figuratively in reference to saved Christians? Or will they admit that each word must be examined separately and on its own merits? Obviously each word must be examined separately.

2) Bullinger explains how to determine when a word is used literally, or figuratively:

It may be asked, "How are we to know, then, when words are to be taken in their simple, original form (i.e. literally), and when they are to be taken in some other and peculiar form (i.e. as a figure)?" The answer is that, whenever and wherever it is possible, the words of scripture are to be understood literally but when a statement appears to be contrary to our experience, or to known fact, or revealed truth; or seems to be a variance with the general teachings of the scriptures, then we may reasonably expect that some figure is employed. And as it is employed only to call our attention to some specially designed emphasis, we are at once bound to diligently examine the figure for the purpose of discovering and learning the truth that is thus emphasized. (Bullinger, xv)

Figures are not mere mistakes of Grammar; on the contrary, they are legitimate departures from law, for a special purpose. They are permitted variations with a particular object. Therefore they are limited as to their number, and can be ascertained, named, and described. (Bullinger, xi)

No one is at liberty to exercise any arbitrary power in their use. All that art can do is to ascertain the laws to which nature has subjected them. There is no room for private opinion, neither can speculation concerning them have any authority. (Bullinger, xi)

It is not open to anyone to say of this word or sentence, "this is a figure," according to his own fancy, or to suit his own purpose. We are dealing with a science whose laws and their workings are known. If a word or words be a figure, then that figure can be named and described. (Bullinger, xi)

Notice, the rule:

- A word must ordinarily be taken literally if at all possible.
- Only when forced to must a word be taken figuratively.
- If a word is labeled as "figurative," that figure can be named and the rules that govern that figure can be described.

Just because the word "cup" is used figuratively in 1 Cor 11:26, this does not mean it was therefore used figuratively in 1 Cor 11:25 or other related passages.

In 1 Cor 11:25a, "In the same manner He also took the cup," the word "cup" must be taken literally, because there is nothing to force us into taking it figuratively. It does not involve an impossibility for Jesus to pick up a cup. It is not "repugnant to reason" to think that He picked up a cup while sitting at a dining table.

In 1 Cor 11:25b, "This cup is the new covenant," the word "cup" must be taken figuratively, because a cup cannot literally be a new covenant between God and man. Since this is labeled "figurative" the figure can be named – metaphor. In a metaphor the nouns used must be taken in their absolute literal sense and the figure lies only in the verb "is." (See Bullinger's comments under "ARGUMENT #27: Spiritual significance.")

In 1 Cor 11:26, "Drink this cup," the word "cup" must be taken figuratively, because a cup cannot be literally swallowed. Since this is labeled "figurative" the figure can be named – metonymy. In a metonymy one thing is named to suggest another thing. Thus, two items are involved: (1) the thing named, and (2) the thing suggested. The thing named (cup) is not the thing suggested (fruit of the vine). Therefore, in 1 Cor 11:26, Paul names a literal cup (one thing) to suggest the liquid inside that cup (another thing).

### **ARGUMENT #5: "Cup" is what we drink**

**The "cup" is what we drink** – In 1 Cor 11:26 the scriptures say we "drink this cup." The "cup" is what we drink and we cannot drink a drinking vessel. Therefore the "cup" is the fruit of the vine.<sup>12</sup>

### **REPLY:**

The "cup" is what Christians drink only if what they drink is in a cup! Fruit of the vine can be called a "cup" only when it is in a cup. When Christians drink fruit of the vine out of one cup

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Porter, op cit, p. 72-73.

they are drinking "the cup" (singular). This is what the Bible says in regard to the communion (1 Cor 11:26). If Christians drank fruit of the vine out of individual cups they would be drinking "the cups" (plural). However, the Bible never says this.

The scriptures, even when using figures of speech, use language that necessarily infers one and only one drinking vessel.

### **ARGUMENT #6: Drink "from" the fruit of the vine, not the cup**

**We drink "from" the fruit of the vine, not the cup** – Mt 26:27 says we drink "from" it. But, Mt 26:29 says we drink "from" (ἐκ) the fruit of the vine. These verses show that we do not drink from a literal container, but from the fruit of the vine.<sup>13</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

The difference between drinking from the cup and drinking from the fruit of the vine is that the genitive cases are different.

**Thayer** – "ἐκ a preposition governing the genitive case."

"I. [genitive] of place. ... After πίνειν [Greek word for "drink"], of the thing out of which one drinks [differently in II. 9 below]: ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου, Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; 1 Cor 11:28." (Thayer, 189)

"II. [genitive] of the origin, source, cause. ... 9. of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, etc. ... Mt 26:29; Mk 14:25; Jn 4:13sq; Rev 14:10; 18:3, (differently than in I. 1 above)." (Thayer, 191)

#### **Arndt & Gingrich**

"1. to denote separation. ... After πίνειν [Greek word for "drink"], of the object fr. which one drinks ... Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; 1 Cor 11:28 ..." (BAG, 233)

"4. It is also used in periphrasis ... e. after verbs of supplying, receiving, consuming ... Mt 26:29; Mk 14:25 ..." (BAG, 235)

**Thayer** – under πίνω [Greek word for "drink"] distinguishes between the two different kinds of genitives used:

---

<sup>13</sup> Tommy Thrasher, [The Bailey-Thrasher Debate](#), Aug. 7, 1993, 1st negative speech.



"πίνω ἐκ w. a gen. of the vessel out of which one drinks, ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου, Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; 1 Cor 10:4 [cf. above]; 11:28, ...

"ἐκ w. a gen. denoting the drink of which as a supply one drinks, Mt 26:29; Mk 14:25; ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, Jn 4:13sq." (Thayer, 510)

Clearly, different genitive cases are being used. The grammatical construction between Mt 26:27 and Mt 26:29 is not the same. In Mt 26:27 Jesus was commanding the disciples to drink "out of" the drinking vessel, while in Mt 26:29 He spoke of drinking "from" the fruit of the vine as a supply.

Let us then summarize what Jesus did in Mt 26:27.

- Jesus took one drinking vessel (Mt 26:27)
- He gave thanks for one cup
- He gave one cup to the disciples
- He commanded them to drink from one cup (Mt 26:27)
- They obeyed Him and all drank from one cup (Mk 14:23)

Jesus then **commanded** His disciples to drink from the one cup which He handed to them. Likewise He commanded us to do the same when He said, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me" (1 Cor 11:25). Drinking from one cup (drinking vessel) is a command of the Lord Jesus (cf. Lk 6:46).

### **ARGUMENT #7: Antecedent of "this"**

The antecedent of "this" in Mt 26:28 is "cup." Therefore, the cup is the blood, not the drinking vessel.<sup>14</sup>

**REPLY:** Notice the passage in question:

#### **Matthew 26:27-28**

27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

28 "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

---

<sup>14</sup> Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.

The entire argument being made on this passage is built upon an assumption. It is assumed that grammatically the word "this" can **only** refer to "cup." If this assumption is false, the entire argument falls.

**Matthew 26:28-29**

28 "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

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."

**QUESTION:** Can the pronoun "this" refer to anything else besides "cup"? The answer to this questions is yes! The pronoun "this" can grammatically refer to the fruit of the vine!! How? By "indefinite pronoun reference."

"In Choice Written English the demonstrative pronoun this occurs about twice as often without a substantive antecedent as with one. This and other demonstratives occur in various other constructions pointing to antecedents unexpressed but clear in the context."<sup>15</sup>

"We have seen that these pronouns in the spoken language may refer to something in the general situation, and that in the written language they point either back or forward. In writing, the thing pointed to may be a noun."<sup>16</sup>

It is a mistake to argue the word "this" can refer only to some word that precedes the pronoun. Notice carefully Mt 26:29:

**Matthew 26:29**

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."

Notice that "this" refers to "fruit of the vine" even though "fruit of the vine" comes after the pronoun.

"The 'near' demonstratives this/these can have both anaphoric [referring to a preceding word] and cataphoric [referring to a succeeding word] reference, while the 'distant' demonstratives that/those can have only anaphoric reference." [Quirk, 375]

Notice a Greek grammar on this same point:

---

<sup>15</sup> Paul Roberts, Understanding Grammar, Harper, 1954, p. 83.

<sup>16</sup> Roberts, op cit, p. 82.

"Οὗτος [Greek word for "this"] ... not necessarily referring to the noun which is nearest, but to the noun which is most vividly in the writer's mind (deictic)." (Turner, 135)

**QUESTION:** What was most vividly on the Lord's mind when He said, "This is my blood"? Obviously He was speaking of the fruit of the vine! The pronoun "this" refers to the fruit of the vine:

- Grammatically
- Logically
- Scripturally

The pronoun "this" does not refer to the cup in verse 27. The cup is not the blood. No scripture even *remotely* suggests that the "cup is the blood." The cup is a drinking vessel.

A clear Biblical example of "indefinite pronoun reference" is found in the following passage:

**Matthew 9:28**

28 And when He had come into the house, the blind men came to Him. And Jesus said to them, "Do you believe that I am able to do **this**?" They said to Him, "Yes, Lord."

Here the pronoun "this" refers to the *understood* ability of Jesus to heal the blind men. The blind men understood what Jesus meant by "this" without the antecedent being specifically named.

**CONCLUSION:** The antecedent of "this" in Mt 26:28 is not "cup," but is a classic example of indefinite pronoun reference. Neither this passage, nor any other passage teaches the false idea that "the cup is the blood."

## **ARGUMENT #8: "Let this cup pass from Me"**

In Mt 26:39 Jesus prayed for the "cup" to pass from Him. Was He praying for a literal drinking vessel to pass from Him? You see then that "cup" does not always mean a literal drinking vessel.<sup>17</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) This argument is designed to ridicule and its fallacy is easily demonstrated. Because advocates of individual cups say "cup" always means "fruit of the vine," let us ask a similar question posed by this argument: *When Jesus prayed for the "cup" to pass from Him, was He praying for "fruit of the vine" to pass from Him?*

2) There is a simple rule to determine when the word "cup" is used literally, and when it is used figuratively: ***The cup is just as literal as the liquid it contains.***

If the liquid involved is a literal liquid, the cup will be a literal cup. For example in 1 Cor 11:26:

- The drinking is literal
- The liquid to be drunk is literal
- The cup named to suggest this liquid is also literal

Likewise, in Mt 26:39:

- There is figurative drinking
- There is figurative liquid
- The cup named to suggest this liquid is also figurative

---

<sup>17</sup> This type of argumentation was used by Thrasher. He would read various passages where the word "cup" was found in the Bible and then ridicule the idea that "cup" means a drinking vessel. Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 2nd negative speech.

## **ARGUMENT #9: The "cup" of Rev 17:4**

The word "cup" in Rev 17:4 is listed by Thayer and other scholars as a literal "cup." Are you willing to stand by the scholars now?<sup>18</sup>

**REPLY:** Yes, brethren are willing to stand by the scholars in their assessment of Rev 17:4. John was seeing visions on the Isle of Patmos (Rev 1:1). The things he saw in vision appeared real, but of course each real thing he saw in vision symbolized some future event. In Rev 17 John saw in vision:

- A real harlot – though the harlot symbolized the city of Rome.
- A real beast – though the beast symbolized the Roman Empire itself.
- A real cup – though the real cup and its contents symbolized the sins committed by the harlot.

Jesus in His parables often did the same thing. He would take a literal seed and a literal sower and describe how some seed fell on literal "wayside" soil, "stony places," among "thorns," and in "good ground." Though each item in the parable was being used literally, each of these literal items symbolized something spiritual and Jesus so explained it (Mt 13:1-23).

Likewise, John is seeing literal items in vision that symbolize spiritual matters.

Just as literal bread is used to symbolize something spiritual (the body of Jesus), and as literal fruit of the vine is used to symbolize something spiritual (the blood of Jesus), and as a literal cup is used to symbolize something spiritual (the new covenant), even so, the literal cup seen in the harlot's hand (Rev 17:4) symbolized something spiritual.

---

<sup>18</sup> Unpublished argument.

## **ARGUMENT #10: "Divide it among yourselves" (version 1)**

In Lk 22:17 Jesus told His disciples to "divide it among yourselves." Since the container could not be divided Jesus did not have reference to a container at all, but to the fruit of the vine only. Therefore, the "cup" is the fruit of the vine.<sup>19</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) It has already been proven that Jesus had a literal container.<sup>20</sup> This argument is trying to deny that a literal vessel was even present at all since it cannot be "divided."

**QUESTION:** If there was no literal drinking vessel at all, could a cluster of grapes be passed from person to person and each person pluck off a grape and drink the juice from the grape?<sup>21</sup> Obviously not.

2) "Divide it among yourselves" means simply to "share it among yourselves."<sup>22</sup> The disciples "divided" the cup, or "shared" the cup among themselves by each drinking from the cup which Jesus handed them (Mk 14:23).

3) There are, admittedly, several ways to "divide" or "share" a cup:

- Pour the contents from one cup into other cups and then each person drinks from his own cup.
- Each person drinks from the same cup and passes it on to the next person and thus the cup is "shared."

The question is, which method did the disciples use?

### **Matthew 26:27**

27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

### **Mark 14:23**

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

---

<sup>19</sup> Porter used this type of reasoning, Porter-Waters Debate, p. 66.

<sup>20</sup> See "THE CASE FOR A SINGLE COMMUNION CUP," in Section 2 of these notes.

<sup>21</sup> Donahue answers this question, "yes, yes." See SECTION 7 - WRITTEN QUESTIONS, of these notes. Probably few would go to this extreme. Eating grapes in communion does not fulfill the Lord's example and command given for communion.

<sup>22</sup> Greek: **διαικρίδω** – "share with someone," Arndt, op cit, 185.

The evidence points to the conclusive fact that the disciples "divided" or "shared" the cup by each one drinking from the cup which Jesus handed them.

### **ARGUMENT #11: "Divide it among yourselves" (version 2)**

In Lk 22:17 Jesus said to, "Divide it among yourselves." "Divide" does not mean to "drink" and "drink" does not mean to divide. Therefore, the dividing was not done by drinking, but rather, each man poured the fruit of the vine into his own container to drink.<sup>23</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

- 1) With the same reasoning it could be said, "Divide" does not mean "pour" and "pour" does not mean "divide."
- 2) It is assumed that each disciple present had his own drinking vessel. Human assumptions prove nothing in civil courts, nor in Bible discussions.
- 3) According to the other accounts of the Lord's supper, how did the disciples "divide" or "share" the cup which Jesus gave them?

#### **Matthew 26:27**

27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

#### **Mark 14:23**

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

They "divided" or "shared" the cup by each drinking from the cup.

---

<sup>23</sup> Leon Odom, What is the Cup of the Lord, tract published by McDonald's Books & Bibles, Nd, pp. 9-10. A complete review of Odom's tract has been written by George A. Hogland entitled, "The Cup Of The Lord" Is It The Fruit Of The Vine Only?.

## **ARGUMENT #12: Ephesus and Corinth (version 1)**

There was at least one cup at Ephesus and one cup at Corinth and that makes two cups. If we can have two cups, then we can have two hundred.<sup>24</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) By applying this reasoning to the Jewish Passover, the fallacy of this argument becomes apparent. Notice:

#### **Exodus 12:3-4**

3 "Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his father, a lamb for a household.

4 'And if the household is too small for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next to his house take it according to the number of the persons; according to each man's need you shall make your count for the lamb.

Would it have been reasonable for an Israelite to argue, "There's a lamb in my one neighbor's house and there's a lamb in my other neighbor's house. That makes two lambs. If there's two I can have two hundred in my house."

This conclusion is false because the Passover was not observed on a national level, but on the household level, just like the communion is not observed on a universal level, but on a congregational level.

- Each house was to have only one lamb and one basin containing blood (Ex 12:3,22).
- Likewise, each congregation is to have only one loaf and one cup containing fruit of the vine (1 Cor 10:16-17).

2) See "ARGUMENT #42: One kind of loaf, one kind of cup."

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.



### **ARGUMENT #13: Ephesus and Corinth (version 2)**

Paul wrote, "The cup of blessing which we bless" (1 Cor 10:16). Paul was at Ephesus writing to the Corinthian congregation. By using the pronoun "we" Paul included both congregations as blessing the one cup. Since it was impossible for both congregations to use the same drinking vessel, the word cup must refer to the fruit of the vine only and not at all to the drinking vessel.<sup>25</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) This argument is false because it misinterprets two key words: "we" and "body." By saying the word "we" includes both congregations at Ephesus and Corinth, cups advocates are actually assigning the following meanings to these words:

- "We" = congregations.
- "Body" = the universal church.

They mistakenly think Paul is envisioning a giant body which is composed of smaller bodies (or groups) called congregations. This reasoning is used by denominations to justify their existence.

The true Bible meaning is this:

- "We" = individual people.
- "Body" = the local congregation.

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech. See comments on this argument under "RULE #5: The blood from the lamb was to be caught in a basin and sprinkled on the door of the house!" of these notes.

Notice the following chart depicting the denominational usage of "we" and "body" in the 1 Corinthian epistle:

<b>Reasoning of Denominations</b>	<b>The True Bible Meaning</b>
<p>"We being many are one bread and one body,"<sup>26</sup> means, "We different churches, although many, are one body." Paul meant the church at Ephesus, Corinth, and other places.</p> <p>Thus, the Baptist church is one member, the Methodist another, the Presbyterian a third, and so forth. Together they all compose the "one body."</p>	<p>The word "we" refers to individual people and the word "body" refers to the local congregation (1 Cor 12:27).</p>

Now, compare the reasoning of cups advocates with that of denominations and you will immediately see that the same false reasoning is made by both:

<b>Reasoning of Cups Advocates</b>	<b>The True Bible Meaning</b>
<p>"We being many are one bread and one body," means, "We different churches, although many, are one body." Paul meant the church at Ephesus, Corinth, and other places.</p> <p>Thus, the Ephesian congregation is one member, the Corinthian congregation is another, the Philippian congregation a third, and so forth. Together they compose the "one body" and "we" all drink from the same "cup" and eat from the same "bread."</p>	<p>The word "we" refers to individual people and the word "body" refers to the local congregation (1 Cor 12:27).</p>

By asking several relevant questions it becomes obvious that Paul was speaking about individual members within a congregation, rather than the denominational concept of different groups forming a universal body.

---

<sup>26</sup> Based on 1 Cor 10:16-17.

**Q:** Who blesses the cup in the communion? Individual people, or congregations from all over the world?

**A:** Individual people bless the cup in the local worship assembly.

**Q:** Who blesses the bread in the communion? Individual people, or congregations from all over the world?

**A:** Individual people in the local worship assembly.

**Q:** Who are the many members that make up the one body? Individual people, or congregations from all over the world?

**A:** Individual people in the local worship assembly.

**Q:** How many loaves do individual people in the local worship assembly bless?

**A:** Scripturally they should be blessing one loaf (1 Cor 10:16-17).

**Q:** How many cups filled with fruit of the vine do individual people in the local worship assembly bless?

**A:** Scripturally they should be blessing one cup (1 Cor 10:16).

2) Paul often used "we" to indicate that he was present "in spirit" with the congregation to which he wrote.

**Colossians 2:5**

5 For though I am absent in the flesh, yet I am with you in spirit, rejoicing to see your good order and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ.

**1 Corinthians 5:3**

3 For I indeed, as absent in body but present in spirit, have already judged (as though I were present) him who has so done this deed.

In this same sense Paul could easily say, "We all partake of one loaf," or "The cup of blessing which we bless." He meant simply "we the assembled."<sup>27</sup>

In the same way Paul could write as though he would be alive when the Lord came again:

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Henry Alford, *Alford's Greek New Testament*, Baker, 1980 reprint edition, Vol. 2, p. 558; Jamieson, Fausset, & Brown, *A Commentary Critical, Experimental, and Practical*, Eerdmans, 1976 reprint edition, Vol. 3, p. 311.

### **1 Thessalonians 4:17**

17 Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And thus we shall always be with the Lord.

The pronoun "we" in this passage proves Paul will be alive when the Lord comes again just as much as the pronoun "we" in 1 Cor 10:16-17 proves that Ephesus and Corinth blessed the same loaf and the same cup.

3) This argument ignores the context of the passage. The Corinthian congregation was divided and on the verge of splintering. Throughout the entire epistle Paul is trying to show the Corinthians that they must be united as one body of believers. To illustrate and emphasize his point Paul uses the communion:

- "We" Christians who compose the local congregation ought to be as united as the one loaf of bread used in the communion which symbolizes Jesus one body (1 Cor 10:16-17).
- "We" Christians who compose the local congregation ought to be as united as the one cup which we share together in "communion" (1 Cor 10:16).

The obvious and true meaning is that Paul was illustrating the unity which should exist in the local congregation.<sup>28</sup>

The "Ephesus-Corinth" argument completely ignores this context and artificially tries to make Paul say: "The congregation at Corinth ought to have unity with the church at Ephesus because both congregations bless the same kind of bread."

- Unity between Corinth and Ephesus was not an issue which Paul was writing about.
- It cannot be proven that "one loaf" means simply one "kind of loaf" and "one cup" means simply one "kind of cup."

(See "ARGUMENT #42: One kind of loaf, one kind of cup.")

---

<sup>28</sup> Unity between sister congregations is important and taught in other passages, but this is not the subject of 1 Cor 10:16-17.

#### **ARGUMENT #14: Noah's house**

In Heb 11:7 the Bible says, "Noah built an ark to the saving of his house." Does that mean Noah saved his literal house?<sup>29</sup>

**REPLY:** Yes, the "house" of Heb 11:7 is referring to a literal house to suggest the people that lived inside the house. This is a metonymy of the container for the contained.

However since advocates of individual cups believe the "cup" is the "contents" consider this question: Did Noah have a literal house, or did he live in a figurative house? One maintains a relationship to a house differently than a liquid does to a container.

For more information on how metonymy involves naming one literal object to suggest another literal object, see "ARGUMENT #1: Metonymy."

#### **ARGUMENT #15: "The White House said"**

When reporters write, "The White House said ...," the container (White House) is named to suggest the President and he may not even be in the White House at all. He may be in Arkansas. Likewise, when the container (cup) is named in the Lord's supper to suggest the contents (fruit of the vine) the contents does not actually have to be in a cup to be called a "cup."

**REPLY:** A man maintains a relationship with the White House by remaining "in" the White House and a liquid maintains a relationship with a container by remaining "in" that container.

The point to remember in this argument is that a man "enters" and "remains in" the White House, not by physically entering into a building, but by entering and remaining in a political office. A liquid, on the other hand, "enters" and "remains in" a container only when it physically enters into that container.

1) A man "enters" the White House by being elected into the political office of Presidency. He "leaves" the White House when he dies, is impeached, when he resigns, when he loses a re-election bid, and so forth.

---

<sup>29</sup> Unpublished argument.

- George Bush "entered" the White House in 1989 when he was sworn in as President. When he spoke in official capacity reporters would write, "The White House said ..."
- George Bush "left" the White House in 1993 because he lost his re-election bid. No matter what he may say now, reporters may not write, "The White House says ...," because he does not hold the office of Presidency.

2) By contrast, a liquid is called by the container it happens to be in at the time it is referred to.

- If a liquid is in a pitcher it is proper to say, "He is going to drink that entire pitcher by himself."
- If, however, the liquid is in a cup, it is proper to say, "He drank the entire cup and wanted more."
- Again, if the liquid is in a barrel, it is proper to say, "He drank the entire barrel in less than a week."

The point of all this is that a man maintains a relationship with the White House by remaining in the office of Presidency and a liquid maintains a relationship with a container by remaining in that container.

- When a man truly "leaves" the White House, he may no longer be referred to as the "White House" when speaking.
- Likewise, when a liquid "leaves" a container, it may no longer be called by that container's name.

## **ARGUMENT #16: House of Israel**

The Bible speaks of the "house of Israel." Does this mean there was a literal house and all the nation of Israel lived in it?<sup>30</sup>

**REPLY:** "House" comes from the Greek word οἶκος and has three distinct usages.<sup>31</sup>

"A house" – that is, a literal house. Examples include:

---

<sup>30</sup> Unpublished argument.

<sup>31</sup> Thayer, op cit, p. 441.

- Acts 2:2 – the sound of wind filled the house
- Acts 19:16 – men fled out of the house wounded

"By metonymy the inmates of a house, all the persons forming one family, a household"– Examples include:

- Lk 10:5 – "Say peace to this house"
- Lk 11:17 – a house divided against itself cannot stand

"Stock, race, descendants of one"– Examples include:

- Lk 1:27 – "House of David"
- Mt 10:6 – "House of Israel"
- Heb 8:8 – "House of Judah"

The point to focus upon is that "house" can indeed be used by metonymy. When it is so used, as in the case with the cup (a) a literal container (house) is named, (b) suggesting literal people, and (c) the relationship between the two is that the people live in the house. When used by metonymy, the house does not cease being literal.

However, as seen in the above definitions, "house of Israel" is not listed as a metonymy. Neither Thayer, Greenfield,<sup>32</sup> nor Arndt & Gingrich<sup>33</sup> list this as a metonymy. Properly it means simply the descendants of Israel.

**CONCLUSION:** The expression "house of Israel" cannot be used to prove that when "cup" is used by metonymy it may well include more than one single cup, and neither does it prove that the literal container is simply non-existent.

---

<sup>32</sup> Greenfield, William, The Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament, Regency Reference Library, 1970, p. 127.

<sup>33</sup> Arndt & Gingrich, op cit, pp. 562-563.

## ARGUMENT #17: A "hand of cards"

When a person has been dealt a good "hand" (singular) of cards, this does not mean he necessarily held the cards in only one literal hand. In this example of metonymy only one object (hand) is named, but two hands could be envisioned or perhaps none at all. Likewise, though one cup is named in communion passages, a plurality of cups could be envisioned or perhaps no cups at all.<sup>34</sup>

**REPLY:** This argument involves an *assumption*. It is being *assumed* that "hand" in the above usage is a metonymy. Where is the evidence that this is a metonymy?

E. Cobham Brewer:

"In card-games the word [hand] is used for the game itself, for an individual player (as 'a good hand at WHIST') or the cards held by him."<sup>35</sup>

The Oxford English Dictionary records:

"23. In games of cards: The cards dealt to each player; the handful of cards held by each at the beginning of the game. Also, the cards held at any stage of such a game as Poker.

"b. The person holding the cards, elder or eldest hand, the person who plays first; so younger hand, second, third hand, etc.

"c. A single round in a game in which all the cards dealt at one time are played."<sup>36</sup>

Other sources will reveal the same information.<sup>37</sup> The point to notice is that none of these authorities say that "hand," as used in reference to card games, is a metonymy. How a round of cards, or an individual player, or the cards themselves came to be called a "hand" is not stated. Unless it is documented from an authoritative source that this is a metonymy, no argument can be made relative to the communion controversy.

---

<sup>34</sup> This is the essence of Donahue's written question #6, found in SECTION 7 - WRITTEN QUESTIONS of these notes.

<sup>35</sup> E. Cobham Brewer, Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, Harper & Row, Publishers, Revised by Ivor H. Evans, 1970 edition, p. 504.

<sup>36</sup> The Oxford English Dictionary, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2nd Edition, 1989, Vol. VI, p. 1064.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Albert H. Morehead, Richard L. Frey, and Geoffery Mott-Smith, The New Complete Hoyle, Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1947, p. 728; The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Second edition, Unabridged, Random House, 1987, p. 865.



## **ARGUMENT #18: Only consumable elements**

The only elements in the Lord's supper are those elements which we consume – bread and fruit of the vine. The drinking vessel is no part of the supper because we cannot consume it.<sup>38</sup>

### **REPLY:**

- 1) Where is the scripture that says only *edible* items compose the Lord's supper?
- 2) There is no reason to doubt that the Corinthians had unleavened bread and fruit of the vine. If those two elements alone composed the Lord's supper, how could Paul say that the Corinthians were not eating the Lord's supper (1 Cor 11:20)? Evidently, it was because those were *not* the only necessary elements.

It should be obvious that there are other elements besides bread and fruit of the vine which are necessary and without which the supper is not the Lord's supper. The necessary elements there are:

- Unleavened bread
- Fruit of the vine
- A cup
- A table
- A blessing
- Proper behavior
- A proper frame of mind
- Eligible participants

Obviously Christians do not eat every element, but only the *edible* elements. Brethren and sisters do not eat the cup or the table or the blessing or the proper behavior or the proper frame of mind or the people. When the scripture speaks of "eating the Lord's supper," it is speaking only of eating the *edible* parts.

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the reasoning used by Gene Frost, op cit, p. 28.

## **ARGUMENT #19: "Guilty of the covenant"?**

If the container was a significant part of the communion, why doesn't 1 Cor 11:27 say that if men partake unworthily they would be guilty of the body, the blood, and the covenant?<sup>39</sup>

**REPLY:** This is the reasoning used by unbelievers: "If baptism is an essential part of salvation, why isn't it mentioned in Jn 3:16?" The point to remember is that not everything concerning salvation is found in Jn 3:16. Other passages discussing salvation must not be excluded.

Likewise, 1 Cor 11:27 does not contain everything the Bible has to say about communion. Brethren cannot isolate this one verse by itself and ignore other verses that speak on the same subject. First Cor 11:25 demonstrates clearly that the literal cup itself has spiritual significance.

- For further study see "THE CASE FOR A SINGLE COMMUNION CUP," in these notes.

Why the Lord chose to word 1 Cor 11:27 as He did is open to speculation. No one but the Spirit of God knows the mind of God and why He worded things like he did (cf. 1 Cor 2:11). However, nothing in 1 Cor 11:27 contradicts or negates what is said in 1 Cor 11:25 where Christians are specifically told the cup itself is a representation of the new covenant.

## **ARGUMENT #20: Syllogism<sup>40</sup> #1"**

(a) It takes both the container and the contents to equal the cup of the Lord. (One-container preacher's doctrine) (b) Saints have been commanded to drink the cup of the Lord. (Mk 14:23)  
(c) Therefore, If we drink only the contents when we drink, we do not drink the cup of the Lord.<sup>41</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) This violates rule #7 for syllogisms: "A negative conclusion cannot be drawn from two affirmative premises."<sup>42</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Thrasher, op cit, 1st affirmative speech.

<sup>40</sup> A syllogism is a deductive argument composed of three elements: (a) a major premise, (b) a minor premise, and (c) a conclusion. An example of a syllogism is: (a) All mammals are warm-blooded. (b) All dogs are mammals. (c) Therefore, all dogs are warm-blooded. In this example, the sentence, "All mammals are warm-blooded," is called the "major premise." The sentence, "All dogs are mammals," is called the "minor premise." Finally, the sentence, "Therefore, all dogs are warm-blooded," is called the "conclusion." If the major and minor premises are true, and the rules for syllogisms are correctly followed, then the conclusion will also be true. For rules governing syllogisms see APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS of these notes.

<sup>41</sup> Odom, op cit, p. 15-16.

<sup>42</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS for rules governing categorical syllogism.

2) This violates rule #1 for syllogisms: "A valid standard-form categorical syllogism must contain exactly three terms, each of which is used in the same sense throughout the argument."<sup>43</sup>

The present syllogism is suggesting that the only way to drink the cup of the Lord is to swallow both the container and its contents. Note the four distinct elements of this argument:

- a) It takes both the container and the contents to equal the cup of the lord.
- b) The only way to drink the cup of the Lord is to drink both the container and the contents.
- c) Saints have been commanded to drink the cup of the Lord.
- d) Therefore, if saints drink only the contents when they drink, they do not drink the cup of the Lord.

The Bible does not teach that the only way to drink the cup is to drink both the container and its contents. No one teaches this. This argument misrepresents the Bible and insults common sense. If this invalid reasoning is tolerated, the following illogical syllogism would be allowed:

- a) It takes both a container and its contents to equal a glass of milk.
- b) A child has been commanded to drink his glass of milk.
- c) Therefore, if the child drinks only the contents, he did not drink his glass of milk.

The absurd conclusion of this syllogism is no worse than the one made in reference to the Lord's supper. Both are invalid.

---

<sup>43</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS.

## **ARGUMENT #21: Syllogism #2**

(a) We do not drink the cup of the Lord when we drink only the contents. (Based upon the above syllogism) (b) We cannot drink the container. (All agree) (c) Therefore, what is drunk is not the cup of the Lord!<sup>44</sup>

### **REPLY:**

- 1) This syllogism is based upon the faulty conclusion of syllogism #1 above. Since the first syllogism is faulty, any conclusion based upon it will also be faulty.
- 2) This violates rule #4 for syllogisms: "No standard-form categorical syllogism is valid which has two negative premises."<sup>45</sup>

## **ARGUMENT #22: Syllogism #3**

(a) The container plus the contents equals the cup of the Lord. (One-container preacher's doctrine) (b) We are commanded to divide the cup of the Lord. (Luke 22:17) (c) Therefore, we must divide both container and contents before the cup of the Lord has been divided.<sup>46</sup>

### **REPLY:**

- 1) This violates the first part of rule #1 for syllogisms: "A valid standard-form categorical syllogism *must contain exactly three terms*, each of which is used in the same sense throughout the argument."<sup>47</sup>

The present syllogism is suggesting that the **only** way to drink the cup of the Lord is to swallow both the container and its contents. Note the four distinct elements of this argument:

- a) It takes both the container and the contents to equal the cup of the lord.
- b) The only way to drink the cup of the Lord is to drink both the container and the contents.

---

<sup>44</sup> Odom, op cit, p. 16.

<sup>45</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS.

<sup>46</sup> Odom, op cit, p. 16-17.

<sup>47</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS.

- c) Saints have been commanded to drink the cup of the Lord.
- d) Therefore, if saints drink only the contents when they drink, they do not drink the cup of the Lord.

The Bible does not teach that the only way to drink the cup is to drink both the container and its contents. No one teaches this. This argument misrepresents the Bible and insults common sense. If this invalid reasoning is tolerated the following illogical syllogism would be allowed:

- a) It takes both a container and its contents to equal a glass of milk.
- b) A child has been commanded to drink his glass of milk.
- c) Therefore, if the child drinks only the contents, he did not drink his glass of milk.

The absurd conclusion of this syllogism is no worse than the one made in reference to the Lord's supper. Both are invalid.

2) This violates the second half of rule #1 for syllogisms: "A valid standard-form categorical syllogism must contain exactly three terms, *each of which is used in the same sense throughout the argument.*"<sup>48</sup>

The word "divide" is being used in two different senses. In the minor premise when the Lord used the word "divide" He was using it in the sense of "share together,"<sup>49</sup> but in the conclusion the word "divide" is being used to mean "separate into pieces." Because the word "divide" is not used in the same sense throughout, no valid conclusion is reached.

### **ARGUMENT #23: Syllogism #4**

(a) The cup of blessing is the communion of the blood of Christ. (1 Cor 10:16) (b) The fruit of the vine is the communion of the blood of Christ. (Mt 26:28) (c) Therefore, the cup of blessing is the fruit of the vine.<sup>50</sup>

**REPLY:** The problem with this syllogism is that the minor premise is simply false. Mt 26:28 does not teach that the fruit of the vine alone is the communion of the blood of Christ. This syllogism is assuming the very point that must be proven and is therefore "begging the question."

<sup>48</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS.

<sup>49</sup> Greek: διαμερίζω – "share with someone," Arndt, op cit, 185.

<sup>50</sup> Odom, op cit, p. 17.

In contrast to the above syllogism, the New Testament teaches:

**1 Corinthians 10:16**

16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? ...

**ARGUMENT #24: Syllogism #5**

(a) The Bible says we "drink the cup." (1 Cor 11:26) (b) We cannot drink the container. (c) Therefore, the cup is the contents which represents his blood.<sup>51</sup>

**REPLY:**

1) This violates rule #5 for syllogisms: "If either premise of a valid standard-form categorical syllogism is negative, the conclusion must be negative."<sup>52</sup>

2) This violates rule #1 for syllogisms: "A valid standard-form categorical syllogism must contain exactly three terms, each of which is used in the same sense throughout the argument."<sup>53</sup>

The present syllogism is suggesting that the only way to drink the cup of the Lord is to swallow both the container and its contents. Note the four distinct elements of this argument:

- a) It takes both the container and the contents to equal the cup of the lord.
- b) The only way to drink the cup of the Lord is to drink both the container and the contents.
- c) Saints have been commanded to drink the cup of the Lord.
- d) Therefore, if saints drink only the contents when they drink, they do not drink the cup of the Lord.

The Bible does not teach that the only way to drink the cup is to drink both the container and its contents. No one teaches this. This argument misrepresents the Bible and insults common sense. If this invalid reasoning is tolerated the following illogical syllogism would be allowed:

---

<sup>51</sup> Unpublished syllogism.

<sup>52</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS.

<sup>53</sup> See APPENDIX B - CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS.

- a) It takes both a container and its contents to equal a glass of milk.
- b) A child has been commanded to drink his glass of milk.
- c) Therefore, if the child drinks only the contents, he did not drink his glass of milk.

The absurd conclusion of this syllogism is no worse than the one made in reference to the Lord's supper. Both are invalid.

### **ARGUMENT #25: The "One-Cup Man"**

Those of us using individual cups are the true "one-cup" people. We believe in one cup for the whole world and that "cup" is the fruit of the vine!<sup>54</sup>

**REPLY:** By applying the above "reasoning" to the Passover meal of the Old Testament the fallacy of this argument becomes readily apparent.

God told the Israelites to take one lamb per house for the Passover meal:

#### **Exodus 12:3-4**

3 "Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his father, a lamb for a household.

4 'And if the household is too small for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next to his house take it according to the number of the persons; according to each man's need you shall make your count for the lamb.

Suppose some Israelites argued like this, "Well, I believe that 'one lamb' means one kind of lamb (a year old male without blemish). Therefore I can have as many lambs in my house as I desire provided they are all of the same kind." With this kind of argument they could have claimed to be the true "one lamb" people because they believed in one kind of lamb for the whole nation of Israel!

This type of reasoning is designed to make void the word of God. It is an invalid argument that would not have worked in the days of Moses, and does not work under our present system of grace.

See "ARGUMENT #42: One kind of loaf, one kind of cup."

---

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.

## **ARGUMENT #26: We still drink the fruit of the vine**

Whether the fruit of the vine is in one cup or one hundred cups, it's still fruit of the vine, it still represents the Lord's blood, and we are still drinking the fruit of the vine, so it doesn't matter how many cups are used.<sup>55</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) No one is denying that cups advocates are drinking fruit of the vine out of individual cups. Everyone agrees that fruit of the vine is still fruit of the vine whether in one cup or one hundred cups. However, that does not remove the problems associated with individual cups:

- People are not obeying what the Lord commanded when they use individual cups. He commanded that all His disciples drink from the same cup (Mt 26:27).
- Fruit of the vine in individual cups does not represent the Lord's blood. The Lord's blood, according to scripture, is represented when fruit of the vine is in one cup with prayer offered for it (Mt 26:27-28; Mk 14:23-24).
- The symbol the Lord chose of one cup representing the one new covenant is destroyed (Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25).

2) This reasoning is similar to those in denominations who argue: "What difference does it make that we do not baptize exactly like you? We still immerse people and we still do it in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. So what difference does it make?"

- Baptism must not only be by immersion, but it must also be for the right reason (the remission of sins). Being close and doing *almost* what the scriptures teach isn't good enough.
- Likewise, drinking fruit of the vine by itself is not enough, it must be done in the way specified by the Lord (from one cup – Mt 26:27). Being close and doing *almost* the same thing is no substitute for obedience.

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st affirmative speech.



## ARGUMENT #27: Spiritual significance

The cup has no spiritual significance.<sup>56</sup>

### REPLY:

- 1) See "THE CASE FOR A SINGLE COMMUNION CUP." Notice "REASON #4: One cup is symbolic."
- 2) Does the cup represent anything in the Lord's supper? Jesus said that it did!
  - "This (bread) is my body" (Lk)
  - "This (fruit of the vine) is my blood" (Mt & Mk)
  - "This cup is the NT" (Lk & Paul)

Bullinger says that each one of these three sentences are *metaphors*. The rules governing metaphors are as follows:

"The two nouns themselves must both be mentioned, and are always to be taken in their absolutely literal sense, or else no one can tell what they mean. The figure lies wholly in the verb, or copula, which, in English, must always be expressed, and never understood by Ellipsis.

"For example, "All flesh is grass." Here "flesh" is to be taken literally as the subject spoken of, and "grass" is to be taken equally literally as that which represents "flesh." All the figure lies in the verb "is."<sup>57</sup>

"The whole figure, in a metaphor, lies, as we have said, in the verb substantive "IS"; and not in either of the two nouns ..."<sup>58</sup>

"All this establishes our statement that, in a Metaphor, the two nouns (or pronoun and noun) are always literal, and that the figure lies only in the verb."<sup>59</sup>

"In all these (as in every other Metaphor) the verb means, and might have been rendered, "represents," or "signifies."<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Frost, op cit, pp. 24-25.

<sup>57</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 735-736.

<sup>58</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 739.

<sup>59</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 740.

<sup>60</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 740.

Bullinger is not alone in stating that the literal sense of the nouns must be retained in a metaphor:

"The figurative meaning of a metaphor relies on its having some kind of similarity to the word's literal sense and, consequently, cannot be understood apart from its literal sense."<sup>61</sup>

Remember, the nouns and pronouns in a metaphor are to be taken in their absolute most literal sense and the figure lies in and only in the verb "is."

Let us now apply this rule to the three sentences before us:

Mt 26:26

"Absolutely literal" bread represents the "absolutely literal" body of Jesus.

Mt 26:28

"Absolutely literal" fruit of the vine represents the "absolutely literal" blood of Jesus.

1 Cor 11:25

"Absolutely literal" cup represents the "absolutely literal" new testament.

Brother Ronny Wade gives the correct critical analysis of the grammar involved in each of these sentences:

- a) These three statements are contextual, analogical, syntactical and grammatical parallels in their essential particulars.
- b) Each has a subject and a predicate joined by the copula "is."
- c) Each embraces a metaphor which is a figure of comparison and which is suggested by "is" in which usage "is" carries with it the idea "represents."
- d) Each also embraces a prolepsis, "is given," "is shed," anticipatory language, in which a future event is spoken of as an accomplished fact.
- e) The subject of each is a literal something.
- f) If bread is literal and fruit of the vine is literal, then the cup is literal.
- g) If after Christ made these statements, the bread was still literal bread but with a spiritual significance, and the fruit of the vine was still literal fruit of the vine but with a spiritual significance, then the cup was still a literal cup but with a spiritual significance.
- h) If when Christ said of the bread, "This is my body, which is given for you," the bread and the body of Christ were two different things but with a spiritual relationship;

---

<sup>61</sup> Colliers Encyclopedia, (New York: P. F. Collier), 1988 edition, Vol. 20, 585.

and if when Christ said of the fruit of the vine, "This is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many," the fruit of the vine and the shed blood were two different things but with a spiritual relationship; then when Christ said, This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you," the cup and the new testament were two different things but with a spiritual relationship.

- i) If the bread Christ took was literal bread before, when, and after He took it, and if the fruit of the vine was literal fruit of the vine before, when, and after He took it, then the cup He took was a literal cup before, when, and after He took it.
- j) Jesus was no more defining "cup" than He was defining "bread" and "fruit of the vine." Bread was still bread. Fruit of the vine was still fruit of the vine. Cup was still a cup.<sup>62</sup>

Bullinger writes further: *"The verb "is" means in this case represents; there may not be the least resemblance!"*<sup>63</sup>

To demonstrate that the nouns used in metaphor are to be taken in their "absolutely literal" sense, and placing the figure wholly within the verb "is," consider the following parallel passages:

Gal 4:24

"Hagar is the Old Testament" → a literal woman represents a literal testament.<sup>64</sup>

Gal 4:24

"Sarah is the New Testament" → a literal woman represents a literal testament.

1 Cor 11:25

"The cup is the New Testament" → a literal cup represents a literal testament.

If everyone can see that a literal women like Hagar and Sarah can represent the Old Testament and New Testament, there should be no problem in seeing that the cup represents the New Testament.

- 3) When Jesus died there were three significant events that took place and the Lord gave us a token to remember each event by:

---

<sup>62</sup> Ronny Wade, Old Paths Pulpit No. 2, M. Lynwood Smith Publications, 1978, pp. 210-211.

<sup>63</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 735.

<sup>64</sup> Although this is an "allegory," W. Ross Winterowd makes the following observation about allegories: "An Allegory may be regarded as a continued Metaphor; as it is the representation of some one thing by another that resembles it, and that it is made to stand for it." (Rhetoric, A Synthesis, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.), date unknown, p. 204.)

- His **body** was sacrificed. The one loaf signifies this.
- His **blood** was shed. The fruit of the vine signifies this.
- The **New Testament** was ratified. The one cup (drinking vessel) signifies this.

The Lord said the **cup is the new testament** thus making the container spiritually significant.

4) Every major covenant had a token, or symbol to represent that covenant:

- Covenant with Noah – rainbow (Gen 9:13)
- Covenant with Abraham – circumcision (Gen 17:11)
- Covenant with Israel – Sabbath day (Ex 31:12)
- The New Covenant – the cup (drinking vessel – Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25)

By substituting plurality of drinking vessels for the one cup of the Bible, the symbolism of this great memorial feast is destroyed.

5) James Bales, although an advocate of individual cups, admits that the blood and the covenant are two distinct items:

"His blood is the blood of the Covenant, his blood made the Covenant operative, but the Covenant is not the blood itself, although the cups whose contents symbolized his blood was said to be the New Covenant in his blood (Luke 22:20). However, Christ is the mediator of the covenant (Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24). He is not the mediator of his blood. His blood dedicated the Covenant and made it operative (Heb 9:15-26). His blood is the blood of the everlasting covenant, but it is not the blood of the everlasting blood – as it would have to be if the blood and the covenant are the same thing (Heb 13:20)."<sup>65</sup>

The only mistake Bales makes in his analysis is saying, "the cups ... [were] said to be the New Covenant in his blood." Instead he should have said, as the scriptures do, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."

---

<sup>65</sup> James Bales, "The New Covenant and the Bible," *Firm Foundation*, July 17, 1973, p. 4 [452].

## **ARGUMENT #28: Emphasis is on fruit of the vine, not the container**

The emphasis is upon the fruit of the vine and not the container.<sup>66</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) Emphasis was placed upon the fruit of the vine in Mt 26:28 and Mk 14:24, when Jesus said the fruit of the vine represented His blood.

But emphasis was also placed upon the cup (drinking vessel) itself in Lk 22:20 and 1 Cor 11:25 when Jesus said the cup represented the New Testament. Jesus is the one who placed the emphasis upon the cup in these passages and brethren must honor His emphasis.

2) If no emphasis was intended for the cup itself, the scriptures would merely have said, "Jesus took the fruit of the vine, gave thanks, and gave it to the disciples." Although the scriptures could have said this, they did not. Emphasis was placed upon the cup itself by inspired writers.

## **ARGUMENT #29: Matthew and Mark are saying the same thing as Luke and Paul**

When Luke and Paul write, "This cup is the NT in my blood," they are simply saying the same thing Matthew and Mark say, only in reverse order.<sup>67</sup>

**REPLY:** The fallacy of the argument stems from a failure to recognize that the contribution a word makes to the meaning of a statement is dependent upon the grammatical function of that word. Matthew and Mark are not saying the same thing as Luke and Paul:

### **Matthew & Mark**

"This (fruit of the vine) is my blood of the new testament."

### **Luke & Paul**

"This cup is the new testament in my blood."

The subjects, predicate nominatives, and modifying prepositional phrases are all different. The statements are not a simple reversal of each other.

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Frost, op cit, pp. 24-25.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.

- In Mt & Mk the word "blood" is the predicate nominative and is coupled with the subject, while "NT" is the object of the preposition and modifies the predicate.
- In Lk & Paul, just the opposite is true. "NT" is the predicate nominative coupled to the subject, while "blood" is the object of the preposition which modifies the predicate.

Subject	Connecting Verb	Predicate Nominative	Prepositional Phrase
This (fruit of the vine)	is	My blood	of the NT (Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24)
This cup	is	the NT	in My blood (Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25)

Luke and Paul are not contradicting Matthew and Mark. They are simply giving us more information than Matthew and Mark did. When Christians put these passages all together they have the whole story.

### **ARGUMENT #30: Copies of the NT**

If the container does represent the New Testament, why can't we have individual containers anyway? After all, we have individual copies of the New Testament when we come to services.<sup>68</sup>

**REPLY:** The fallacy of this argument is that the new covenant is being equated with the New Testament scriptures. While these two items are very much inter-related, yet they are distinct items.

The distinction between the new covenant and the written scriptures must not be confused.

- The new covenant was in full force on the day of Pentecost, 50 days after Jesus resurrected and 10 days after He ascended back into heaven. The people baptized on that day were in full covenant relationship with God.
- However, the written scriptures of the new covenant did not begin until about 24 years later and they were not completed until about 66 years later.

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 2nd negative speech.

The cup does not represent the collection of 27 books from Matthew to Revelation, but rather it symbolizes the new covenant between God and His people which was ratified by the blood of Jesus.

From the time of the cross, God did not make individual covenants with individual people as He had done in former times,<sup>69</sup> but He made one new covenant with His people. Within the worship assembly, there is to be only one cup on the Lord's table to symbolize that one new covenant:

**1 Corinthians 11:25**

25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

The New Testament scriptures tell us the stipulations of the new covenant and there are many copies of the New Testament scriptures, but it remains a fact that there is one and only one new covenant between God and His people. Individual cups destroy this picture while one cup maintains the symbolism intended by God.

**ARGUMENT #31: Blood inside the NT?**

The Bible says the NT is "in my blood," but if the cup represents the NT we would have the blood "in the NT" – just the opposite of what the Bible says.<sup>70</sup>

**REPLY:** This argument is based on a lack of understanding of the Greek preposition en (translated "in" when used in 1 Cor 11:25). This preposition en is used with both the locative and instrumental cases.

**Locative case** – to indicate the location or position.

**Instrumental case** – to indicate the means by which something is done.<sup>71</sup>

When Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood" (1 Cor 11:25), He was using the instrumental case and was indicating the *means by which* the new covenant came into force. Notice the language concerning the "dedication" of the Old Testament:

---

<sup>69</sup> As in the case with Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and other patriarchs.

<sup>70</sup> J. T. Smith, "Using Great Plainness of Speech," Guardian of Truth, Nov. 1982, p. 10.

<sup>71</sup> Thayer, op cit, p. 210.

**Hebrews 9:18-20**

18 Therefore not even the first covenant was dedicated without blood.  
19 For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people,  
20 saying, "This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded you."

When Moses said, "This is the blood of the covenant," he meant, according to verse 18, "This is the blood which dedicates the covenant." The blood of animals was the instrument used to dedicate or ratify the first covenant.

Likewise, when Jesus said, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," He meant, as Moses worded it, "This cup is the new covenant dedicated by My blood." The blood of Christ was the instrument used to dedicate or ratify the new covenant.<sup>72</sup> Jesus was *not* saying the New Testament was located or positioned inside blood.

To argue that the Greek preposition *en* is being used in the locative case is both illogical and completely unfounded.

**ARGUMENT #32: A memorial for something in our presence?**

The bread is a memorial for something we do not have (the body of Jesus). The fruit of the vine is a memorial for something we do not have (the blood of Jesus). We do not need a memorial for something we do have (the New Testament).<sup>73</sup>

**REPLY:** This argument is confusing the new covenant with the written scriptures. See "ARGUMENT #30: Copies of the NT."

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Alford, *op cit*, Vol. II, p. 573.

<sup>73</sup> Unpublished argument.



### **ARGUMENT #33: Cup doesn't look like the NT**

The bread looks like a body and fruit of the vine looks like blood, but a cup doesn't even look like the New Testament.<sup>74</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) The similarities between a cup and the New Testament are not in how the cup looks, but in how it functions.

- A liquid is incomplete without a container just like the blood of Christ is incomplete without the New Testament.
- The purpose of a cup is to distribute its contents to people just like the New Testament distributes the blessings of Christ's blood to people.
- By all sharing the same cup together during communion, a picture is seen of one covenant distributing the same blessings to all members of the church.

2) Physical appearance is not the basis for accepting the loaf and the fruit of the vine as tokens of the body and blood. They are accepted as such because Jesus said so. Likewise, the cup is accepted as a symbol of the New Testament because Jesus said so.

3) Nothing physical will ever "look like" a non-physical covenant. A rainbow and the surgical procedure of circumcision do not "look like" covenants. Clearly, the rainbow, circumcision, and the cup are all accepted by faith, not by appearance.

4) A metaphor is involved in comparing the cup to the New Testament. When a metaphor is used, there need not be the slightest resemblance between the two things being compared. Bullinger comments: *"The verb 'is' means in this case represents; there may not be the least resemblance!"*<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Unpublished argument.

<sup>75</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 735.

## ARGUMENT #34: The NASV

The NASV translates Lk 22:20 as, "This cup which is poured out for you," thus the cup is the blood. (The participle must agree with the noun it modifies in case, so "shed" can refer only to cup because both are in nominative case.<sup>76</sup>)

**REPLY:** Jesus said in Lk 22:20 that something was "poured out for you." What was it that Jesus shed?

### **NASV**

20 ... This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood.

What was poured out for us? (a) a cup? (b) fruit of the vine? (c) blood? Obviously Jesus shed His blood. Those versions which have the participle modifying *blood* rather than cup are to be favored.

### **KJV**

20 ... This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

Obviously the phrase "which is shed for you" modifies the blood of Jesus, not the cup, or the fruit of the vine.

### **NKJV**

20 Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for you.

### **ASV**

20 ... This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.

### **NIV**

20 ... This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you.

The NASV records Mt and Mk as saying that Jesus shed **blood**. He did not shed a cup, nor did He shed fruit of the vine.

**QUESTION:** Would Mt & Mk apply **shed** to blood just to have Luke apply it to the fruit of the vine which was never shed, or to the cup which was never shed?

---

<sup>76</sup> Ellis Lindsey, a one time cups and classes advocate, wrote a critical analysis concerning the translation of Lk 22:20 in the NASV entitled: The Meaning of "Cup" in Lk 22:20 and 1 Cor 11:25. It was originally written in 1970. Available online at [www.WillOfTheLord.com](http://www.WillOfTheLord.com).

The following critical analysis, written by Ellis Lindsey, correctly explains the unusual Greek construction found in Luke's gospel:

"The first point which must be brought to bear upon the controversy is the uncertainty of grammar. To our knowledge, the writers of the new testament did not have at their disposal grammars of the Greek language in which they wrote. What rules they did follow were those commonly understood from usage and style and differed to some extent from writer to writer. The grammars which we today have were prepared by men who have simply studied the Greek new testament and who broke all the verses down into what they thought to be the principles used by the writers. It is, therefore, difficult for any scholar today to determine whether or not the writer violated rules of grammar. This problem should be a simple one, however, for any scholar who believes the Bible to have been written by inspiration. That a construction is used one time in a certain way does not mean the writer was wrong in grammar. Grammar since Winer's time has observed everything from logic to contextual interpretation in arriving at correct principles.

"That great scholar Alfred Plummer has written the following (The International Critical Commentary, Luke, p. 499):

"In sense to ekchunomenon agrees with haimati, but in grammar with poterion: in Mt and Mk, both in sense and grammar with haima.

"In other words, we have established that the passage must be interpreted according to context, sense, logic, and style, and that grammar, after all, depends upon these elements. If one set out to interpret the works of literature purely by grammatical means, and did not consider these principles, he would misinterpret most passages and miss the intent of the writer.

"The New American Standard Bible is, therefore, incorrect when it renders Lk 22:20b as follows: "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood." First, this translation stands alone in this rendering among the later translations. Second, the translation is inconsistent in the translation of ekchunomenon, which it renders "is poured out" (past) in Luke 22:20b, but renders it "is to be shed" in Mt 26:28 and Mk 14:24, other accounts of the supper which utilize the same word in the same form. In fact, the latter two passages prove that the term shed refers only to the blood in those passages; and, consequently, in Lk 22:20b, as Lk 22:20b is an account of the same words of Jesus that the other passages are." (Lindsey, 18-20)

Thayer's Lexicon is in full agreement with this conclusion. Thayer writes concerning 1 Cor 11:25 and Lk 22:20:

"In both which the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'"<sup>77</sup>

Thus, even Thayer agrees that the blood of Christ was shed, not a cup, nor fruit of the vine. Also, Thayer agrees the fruit of the vine is an emblem of the blood of Christ, while the cup itself is an emblem of the new covenant.

### **ARGUMENT #35: Generic authority**

Individual cups are authorized by "generic authority."<sup>78</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) This argument admits there is no explicit authority for individual cups.

- No explicit requirement.
- No explicit permission.

2) The major problem with this reasoning is that no passage or combination of passages can be given which imply individual cups.

When there is no explicit nor implicit authorization there remains only silence. Silence forbids. (See "SILENCE FORBIDS" under Section 3 of these notes.)

---

<sup>77</sup> Thayer, op cit, p. 15.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st affirmative speech.

### **ARGUMENT #36: A church *MAY* use a plurality of cups**

A church is not required to use a plurality of cups, but it may use them if it so chooses.<sup>79</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

- 1) This admits a plurality of cups is not to be found in NT scriptures. If plural cups were in the NT scriptures, they would be mandatory and an essential part of God's pattern for the communion.
- 2) This argument "begs the question." In other words, this argument assumes what must first be proven. Scripture must be given to prove a plurality of cups are permitted. What passage either explicitly or implicitly authorizes a plurality of cups as a permission?
- 3) Since there is no passage (or combination of passages) proving a plurality of cups *MAY* be used, there exists only silence. Silence forbids. (See "SILENCE FORBIDS" under Section 3 of these notes.)

### **ARGUMENT #37: Individual cups do not violate the command to eat and drink?<sup>80</sup>**

**REPLY:** This argument is missing the point entirely. One might as well argue:

- A plurality of cups do not violate the command to be baptized.
- A plurality of cups do not violate the command to pray.
- A plurality of cups do not violate the command to obey your parents.
- A plurality of cups do not violate the command to love your enemy.

The point is, a plurality of cups does violate the command to drink from one cup (Mt 26:27).

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st affirmative speech.

<sup>80</sup> Compare with the reasoning used by Benjamin Lee Fudge, The "One-Cup" Doctrine, tract published by C. E. I. Publishing, Co., Nd., p. 12. A complete review of Fudge's tract has been written by George A. Hogland entitled, Did Jesus Use Individual Cups?.

### **ARGUMENT #38: A plurality of cups is expedient?<sup>81</sup>**

#### **REPLY:**

- 1) Before saying plural cups are an expedient way of carrying out the Lord's command, it must first be shown that they do not violate any specific command. Herein lies the problem with a plurality of cups. They do violate specific commands given by the Lord.
- 2) Is this a scriptural reason for individual cups, or an opinion? What authority is there for saying cups (plural) are expedient?
- 3) In what way are individual cups expedient? What advantage is there in having them? If the church is going to be divided over this specific details need to be offered.
  - Are they expedient because it "speeds up" the communion process? Is this why brethren want to use them? Have some reached the point where they want to "hurry up and get the communion over with"?
  - Are they expedient because they are more sanitary? If so, see "ARGUMENT #57: Sanitation."

### **ARGUMENT #39: Communion with just the Lord**

The unit of communion is the individual. Paul said, "But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." When individual cups are used, each man is still having communion with the Lord and that's all that matters.<sup>82</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

- 1) Some aspects of communion are indeed individual (e.g. self-examination). But other aspects are collective actions of the entire congregation (e.g. praying for the emblems, sharing the emblems together).

To say that the Lord's supper is ***totally*** individual is to teach something the Bible never taught.

#### **1 Corinthians 11:33**

33 Therefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another.

---

<sup>81</sup> Smith, op cit, p. 9.

<sup>82</sup> Fudge, op cit, pp. 12-13.

Why "tarry one for another" if communion is strictly and totally individual?

2) Suppose this argument is correct. Suppose communion is strictly an individual matter. Christians still are not at liberty to violate the divine pattern for communion.

- Jesus took one cup (Mk 14:23)
- He gave thanks for one cup
- He gave one cup to the disciples
- He commanded them to drink from one cup (Mt 26:27)
- They obeyed Him and all drank from one cup (Mk 14:23)
- Paul told us to keep the ordinances just as they were delivered (1 Cor 11:2)
- He delivered one cup to the churches (v. 25)
- He declared that all Christians drink from that one cup (v. 26)

No one can say this entire pattern is worthless even if communion were individual.

3) If communion is strictly individual, then why bother to assemble to eat the Lord's supper. Why not:

- Each man stay home and eat it by himself – as when the communion is taken to a sick person.
- Each man stay home and eat it by himself – as some do when they're on a trip and they eat the communion in the motel by themselves.
- Each man stay home and eat it by himself – like the man on Sunday night who eats by himself when he missed the morning communion while working.

4) The very word "communion" means "joint participation."<sup>83</sup> To say "individual communion" is a contradiction of terms. One might as well say "honest liar" as to say "individual communion."

The very idea of "communion" is the coming together of Christians in an assembly to share together a "common" loaf and a "common" cup – a "communion cup." Individual cups and wafers destroy the entire meaning of "sharing together" and "joint participation."

---

<sup>83</sup> Thayer, op cit, p. 352.

## ARGUMENT #40: Jacob's well

The scriptures say Jacob and his children and cattle drank from the well (Jn 4:12). They did this without putting their lips to the well. Likewise, we can drink the cup without putting our lips to the same literal vessel.<sup>84</sup>

### REPLY:

1) The Greek word ἐκ (translated "from" or "of") is used with the genitive case, but there are many different kinds of genitives. Thayer lists 6 different kinds of genitives with various meanings. Arndt & Gingrich also lists 6 different kinds of genitives.<sup>85</sup> Both Thayer and Arndt & Gingrich specifically state that the genitive connected with the communion cup and Jacob's well are the genitive "of the thing out of which one drinks" (Thayer 189). Thus:

- Concerning Jacob's well, it is the "object out of which one drinks."
- Concerning the "cup," it is the "object out of which one drinks."

This argument explodes the theory that "cup" in the communion passages does not refer to a literal drinking vessel. Both Thayer and Arndt & Gingrich specifically state the word "cup" in Mt 26:27, Mk 14:23, and 1 Cor 11:28 is the "object out of which one drinks!"

2) This argument insults the intelligence of everyone concerned. This argument suggests that men drink from a cup at a dinner table in the same way that cattle drink from a well.

3) In Jn 4:13 and following, a different genitive is used when Jesus speaks of "drinking of this water."

- When the Lord told the disciples to, "Drink from it, all of you" (Mt 26:27), He was using the genitive of "the thing out of which one drinks."<sup>86</sup>
- But when Jesus said, "Whoever drinks of this water" (Jn 4:13), He was using the genitive "of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, etc."<sup>87</sup>

4) The standard method of drinking from a cup is to pick the cup up, put it to one's lips, and drink.

---

<sup>84</sup> Porter, op cit, pp. 25-26.

<sup>85</sup> See both Thayer and Arndt & Gingrich's definition of ἐκ.

<sup>86</sup> Thayer, op cit, p. 189, 510. Arndt & Gingrich, op cit, p. 233. See both Thayer and Arndt & Gingrich's definition of ἐκ.

<sup>87</sup> Thayer, op cit, p. 191; Arndt & Gingrich, op cit, p. 235.



Though there may be a thousand unconventional ways to drink from a cup, in the absence of all evidence to the contrary, it must be concluded the standard method was used by Jesus and His disciples.

5) This argument proves too much for advocates of cups because ***there's just one literal well present!*** If the idea of picking up one literal cup, placing it to the lips, and drinking from the cup seems amusing and absurd to some, let us demonstrate the non-sense involving Jacob's well. Here is a true parallel between Jacob's well and those who advocate individual cups:

- Men would first have to pick up Jacob's well and pour it into individual wells.
- Each man drinks out of his own individual well.
- Then a passage would need to say all of these men who drank from these individual wells actually drank from Jacob's one well.

The entire argument is a desperate attempt to justify something which the NT scriptures are silent about.

6) Notice another inconsistency. It is often argued that, "The cup is the blood." If this is true, one might as well ask, *Is the well the water?*

- Is the well literal? *Yes.*
- How many wells were there? *One.*
- Was the well the water or were the well and the water two separate items? *Two separate items.*

Consider now the communion cup:

- Is the cup literal? *Yes.*
- How many cups were there? *One.*
- Was the cup the blood, or were the cup and the blood two separate items? *Two separate items.*

The "Jacob's well" argument does nothing to remove the fact that Jesus Himself used one literal cup, gave it to His disciples, and commanded them to all drink from it.

**Mark 14:23**

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

## **ARGUMENT #41: Cup of cold water**

Mt 10:42 says if you give someone "a cup" of cold water you will not lose your reward. What if you give them two cups of water? Will you lose your reward then? After all, it says "a cup." If we can give someone two cups of water without losing our reward (even though it says "a cup"), then we can use two or more cups in communion (even though it says "a cup").<sup>88</sup>

### **REPLY:**

- 1) The grammatical construction is not the same. Mt 26:27 is in the imperative mood and delivering a command. Mt 10:42 is in the subjunctive mood and contemplating merely potential action without delivering a command.
- 2) Although Mt 10:42 is parallel in some respects with the communion passages, it is not parallel in many vital ways. Notice the two passages compared:

<b>Mt 10:42</b>	<b>Mt 26:27</b>
(1) a cup (container)	(1) a cup (container)
(2) of water (contents)	(2) of fruit of the vine (contents)

Concerning Mt 10:42, a disciple would be allowed to change both:

- The number of containers and
- The contents

In either case a disciple will not lose his reward. A disciple will not lose his reward if he changes either the number of containers or the kind of liquid contained in the cup.

In the communion, however, no one can change either the contents or the number of containers. There is no spiritual significance attached to a cup of cold water in Mt 10:42, but there is vital significance for both the container and the contents in the Lord's supper. Not only is there significance to the elements themselves, but to the very number of elements.

- It was spiritually significant to have a lamb for the Passover, but it was also spiritually significant to have only one lamb (Ex 12:3-4). Both the element and the number were important.

---

<sup>88</sup> Porter, op cit, p. 27.

- It is spiritually significant to have unleavened bread to represent the Lord's body, but it is also spiritually significant to have only one loaf (1 Cor 16:16-17).
- Likewise, it is spiritually significant to have a cup symbolizing the new covenant (1 Cor 11:25) and only one cup (Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23).

There are a lot of things men can do to receive a reward *outside the public worship* of the church. They may change the number of containers or the liquid in those containers when they offer a drink to someone. But when it comes to the Lord's table, Christians must abide by the divine pattern given (Heb 8:5).

### **ARGUMENT #42: One kind of loaf, one kind of cup**

When 1 Cor 10:16-17 speaks of "one loaf" and "the cup" it means "one kind of loaf" (unleavened bread) and "one kind of cup" (fruit of the vine).<sup>89</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) By applying this reasoning to the Jewish Passover, the fallacy of this argument becomes apparent. Notice:

#### **Exodus 12:8**

8 'Then they shall eat the flesh on that night; roasted in fire, with unleavened bread and with bitter herbs they shall eat it.

#### **Exodus 12:22**

22 "And you shall take a bunch of hyssop, dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two doorposts with the blood that is in the basin. And none of you shall go out of the door of his house until morning.

As cups advocates now do, someone might have argued back then: "There are probably a million households in Israel, yet the Bible says that the whole nation of Israel is to 'eat it' and the blood is to be in one basin. How can every household in Israel eat just one lamb? How can every household use just one basin? Therefore God must have meant we are to kill one kind of lamb and use one kind of blood. There may be actually be more than one lamb and more than one basin in each household."

---

<sup>89</sup> Jim Dearman, tape recorded sermon at the church of Christ in Klang, Malaysia, Aug. 8, 1986; via Newberry, op cit, p. 39.

This conclusion is false because the Passover was not observed on a national level, but on the household level, just like the communion is not observed on a universal level, but on a congregational level.

- Each house was to have only one lamb and one basin containing blood (Ex 12:3,22).
- Likewise, each congregation is to have only one loaf and one cup containing fruit of the vine (1 Cor 10:16-17).

2) The concept of "kind" or "type" cannot be introduced to escape the force of a numerical adjective.<sup>90</sup> For example:

- "One God and Father" (Eph 4:6) does not mean "one kind of God and Father," thus leaving open the possibility of many gods of the same kind.
- "One lamb per house" (Ex 12:3) does not mean "one kind of lamb," thus allowing many lambs of the same kind.
- "Five loaves and two fish" (Mt 14:17) does not mean "five kinds of loaves" and "two kinds of fish," thus denying that a miracle was even performed by Christ.

One of the most important rules of interpretation is that a passage must be taken literally unless one is forced to understand it figuratively. There is no reason to take "one loaf" or "the cup" (1 Cor 10:16-17) as figurative. The numerical adjectives must be allowed to have their natural meaning: only one loaf of bread and one cup may be scripturally used in the communion.

---

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Newberry, *op cit*, p. 16.

### ARGUMENT #43: Species or categories

It is possible for a word to be singular and yet refer to a plurality of objects.

"Go to the ant thou sluggard" (Prov 6:6).

"The fruit of the vine."<sup>91</sup>

The woman raised her baby on the bottle.<sup>92</sup>

The drunkard loves his bottle.

Mexican food is my favorite dish.<sup>93</sup>

Likewise, the word "cup," though singular, may refer to several cups.<sup>94</sup>

**REPLY:** It is obvious that a singular noun may refer to a species or category of objects, but the context will tell us when this is the case.

- "Go to the ant, thou sluggard" refers to one species or category of insects. However, if one focuses on a single occasion, he would say, "I picked up the ant and considered it carefully." In this case there is only one single ant envisioned.
- Jesus said, "I will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine." This refers to a category or species of plants. However, when Gen 40:9-10 says, "In my dream a vine was before me, and in the vine were three branches," only a single vine plant is envisioned.
- A mother may say, "I raised my baby on the bottle." This refers to a category or species of objects. However, if one focuses is on a single occasion, he would say, "The woman picked up the bottle, filled it with formula and gave it to her baby." In this case there is only a single bottle involved.
- "The drunkard loves his bottle" refers to one species or category of objects. But if one focuses on a single occasion, he would say, "The drunkard took the bottle and broke it." In this case there is only a single object involved.
- A man may say, "Mexican food is my favorite dish." This refers to a category or species of food. However, if one focuses on a single occasion, he would say, "The woman picked up the dish, placed enchiladas on it, and served it to her husband." In this case there is only a single dish involved.

---

<sup>91</sup> Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.

<sup>92</sup> Porter, op cit, p. 28.

<sup>93</sup> Smith, op cit, p. 9.

<sup>94</sup> Porter, op cit, p. 28.

When Matthew recorded, "He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink from it, all of you,'" the word "cup" is not being used as a species or category, but rather it envisions a single occasion and a single literal drinking vessel.

#### **ARGUMENT #44: Jn 6 calls five loaves "bread"**

In Jn 6:9ff Jesus fed 5000 people with five loaves. Later in verse 23 these five loaves are called simply "bread" (singular). Thus, fruit of the vine, whether in one cup or one hundred cups may still be called a "cup."<sup>95</sup>

**REPLY:** This is a variation of the "species" argument. See "ARGUMENT #43: Species or categories."

The relationship between loaves and bread is different than the relationship between fruit of the vine and a cup.

- "Loaves" are a form of "bread."
- "Cups" are not a form of "fruit of the vine."

By referring to a category the scriptures said Jesus fed the multitude with "bread." However, when the lens of scripture is focused upon the actual event, the scriptures said, "Jesus took the loaves" (Jn 6:11). Thus:

- When general action is being described, a species or category of objects may be envisioned.
- When specific action is being described, only the number of objects specified are envisioned.

When Matthew recorded, "He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink from it, all of you,'" the word "cup" is not being used as a species or category, but rather it envisions a single, literal drinking vessel.

---

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Thrasher, op cit, 1st affirmative speech.

#### **ARGUMENT #45: Same cup as Jesus**

If we must use one cup like Jesus did, then we would need the very same cup that He used. If not, why not?<sup>96</sup>

**REPLY:** The fallacy of this argument is easily seen when one asks the same questions about the loaf and fruit of the vine:

- Must Christians use unleavened bread like Jesus did? If so, must they use the very same loaf He used? If not, why not?
- Must Christians use fruit of the vine like Jesus did? If so, must they use the very same fruit of the vine He used? If not, why not?

The point is, brethren use unleavened bread like Jesus used, but not the very same loaf He used. They use fruit of the vine like He used, but not the very same fruit of the vine. They must also use one cup like He used, but it is not necessary to use the very same one.

#### **ARGUMENT #46: An exact replica of Jesus' cup**

If we cannot use the very same cup Jesus used, then wouldn't we have to have an exact replica? What did the cup Jesus used look like? Who gave authority for using a cup that looks different?<sup>97</sup>

**REPLY:** The fallacy of this argument is easily seen when the same questions are asked about the loaf and fruit of the vine:

- Must Christians use unleavened bread that looks exactly like the loaf Jesus used? What did that loaf Jesus use look like? Who gave authority for using a loaf that looks different?
- Must Christians use fruit of the vine that looks exactly like the fruit of the vine Jesus used? What did that fruit of the vine look like? Was it red, purple, clear, or some other color? Did it have pulp or was it strained? Who gave authority for using fruit of the vine that looks different?

---

<sup>96</sup> Maxie B. Boren, "Reflections on 'Making Issues' Over Matters of inconsequence," a sermon preached to the Westhill Church of Christ in Corsicana, TX in 1983, p. 2.

<sup>97</sup> Boren, op cit, p. 2.

The point is, brethren use unleavened bread, fruit of the vine, and a cup like Jesus used. The Bible did not specify exactly what any of these items looked like and brethren therefore have liberty in this area, but they may not substitute other items.

### **ARGUMENT #47: The upper room**

If we must use one cup like Jesus did, then we must also meet in an upper room like Jesus did.<sup>98</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) This argument "begs the question." All it might prove is that Christians should begin meeting in an upper room, but it does not prove, "An assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion, may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine."

Because this argument proves nothing in favor of the proposition, it serves only as a "smoke screen" to confuse the unsuspecting.

2) This reasoning fails to distinguish between an example that must be followed and an "incidental" item.

**example** – "an instance ... serving to illustrate a rule or precept or to act as an exercise in the application of a rule"<sup>99</sup>

**incidental** – "being likely to ensue as a chance or minor consequence ... syn. see accidental; ant. essential"<sup>100</sup>

Notice that the antonym (opposite) of incidental is "essential." An incidental is something that is unessential. An example is an illustration of how to obey a rule. Thus, a binding example must have a *background rule* which it is illustrating. Now let's look at the upper room:

**Background command:** "He will show you a large upper room ... there make ready for us" (Mk 14:15).

**Binding example:** "His disciples went forth ... and found as he had said ... and made ready the passover" (Mk 14:16).

---

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Elmer Moore, "The Impact of Opposition to Cups and Classes," Guardian of Truth, January 2, 1986, pp. 142-143.

<sup>99</sup> Webster, op cit.

<sup>100</sup> Webster, op cit.



If the disciples had:

- Prepared a ground level room, they would have disobeyed Jesus' command!
- Prepared a basement, they would have disobeyed!
- Prepared a table in the open air, they would have disobeyed!

The "example" of Mk 14:12-16 is a binding example for anyone who receives the command to "prepare an upper room for the passover."

**QUESTION:** Have brethren today received a command to "prepare a large upper room for eating the communion"? The answer is, "NO." Therefore, the upper room in Mk 14 is not binding!! If no command is produced which demands an upper room, then the upper room is merely an incidental; it is unnecessary.

3) Jesus has "loosed" the place for worship:

**John 4:21**

21 Jesus said to her, "Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father.

Since Jesus loosed the place, the upper room is not binding.

4) Roy Cogdill correctly enumerated the seven rules which must be met before an example is binding.<sup>101</sup>

- **Rule of uniformity** – i.e. there is no variation in the way an event was done.
- **Rule of unity** – i.e. an action cannot violate another passage which God gave on the same subject.
- **Rule of universal application** – i.e. everything taught in the gospel of Christ must be within the realm of possibility for all people in all parts of the world to practice.
- **Law of materiality** – i.e. the practice must be "material," or relevant in carrying out the command of God.
- **Law of competence** – i.e. the evidence offered for a practice must be shown as competent to support the conclusion.
- **Law of limited application** – i.e. a practice can only be applied to the same circumstances as God applied it to.

---

<sup>101</sup> Roy E. Cogdill, Walking By Faith, Cogdill Foundation Pub., 1976, pp. 22-28.

- **Law of exclusion** – i.e. a practice is to be excluded when there is no command, example, or necessary inference.

When all of these seven rules are applied to the upper room it becomes quite evident that the upper room is not binding upon God's people today. Notice:

- **Rule of uniformity** – it cannot be proven that every time Christians broke bread it was always in an upper room. The church often met in the houses of brethren (cf. Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Col 4:15), yet it cannot be proven these houses were all two-story houses and that the services were conducted in the upper story. The upper room fails this test.
- **Rule of unity** – while utilizing an upper room does not violate another passage which God gave on the same subject, remember, this point alone does not constitute a binding example.
- **Rule of universal application** – an upper room is not within the realm of possibility for all people in all parts of the world to practice. Nomads in deserts and Eskimos in frozen tundra are not able to utilize an upper room. The upper room fails this vital test.
- **Law of materiality** – an upper room is not a "material," or relevant part in carrying out the command of God. Jesus loosed the place of worship (Jn 4:21).
- **Law of competence** – the evidence offered to for using the upper room does not support the conclusion. The upper room was to fulfill a command in regards to the passover, not the Lord's supper (Mk 14:15). No command was ever given to "prepare a large upper room" in order to eat the communion.
- **Law of limited application** – the practice of using an upper room can only be applied to the same circumstances as God applied it to – the disciples eating the last passover with Jesus before He died.
- **Law of exclusion** – the practice of using an upper room is to be excluded because there is no command, example, or necessary inference.

By applying these seven rules, it becomes obvious that the upper room is not a binding example that must be followed, but rather an incidental item. Now, let us apply the same seven rules to determine if the use of one cup is a binding example.

- **Rule of uniformity** – there is no variation in the way the communion was conducted. In every account there was one and only one cup present!
- **Rule of unity** – the use of one cup does not violate any other passage which God gave on the subject of the Lord's supper!

- **Rule of universal application** – everyone in the world is able to use a single cup for the Lord's supper.
- **Law of materiality** – a literal drinking vessel is material and essential in carrying out the Lord's command to "Drink ye all of it."
- **Law of competence** – the evidence offered supports the claim that Jesus took a literal cup, gave thanks over one cup, gave one cup to the disciples, commanded the disciples to drink out of that one cup and that the disciples obeyed and all "drank from it."
- **Law of limited application** – the use of one cup is being applied to the exact same thing God applied it – to a congregation of saints observing the Lord's supper.
- **Law of exclusion** – because there is no command, example, or necessary inference for a plurality of cups they are therefore excluded; they are sinful!

#### **ARGUMENT #48: Night communion**

If we must use one cup like Jesus did, then wouldn't we have to eat the Lord's supper at night time like He and others did?<sup>102</sup>

**REPLY:** Let those who make this argument answer it themselves.

- They believe brethren must use unleavened bread like Jesus did. Do they therefore believe Christians must eat the supper at night time like Jesus and others did?
- They believe brethren must use fruit of the vine like Jesus did. Do they therefore believe Christians must eat the supper at night time like Jesus and others did?
- They believe brethren must meet on the first day of the week like the disciples did in Acts 20:7. Do they therefore believe Christians must eat the supper at night time like they did?

Brethren do not have to observe the communion at night time because the so-called "examples" of night time observance are not true Bible examples of how to obey a command. A distinction must be made between true examples and "incidental" items.

---

<sup>102</sup> Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.

**example** – "an instance ... serving to illustrate a rule or precept or to act as an exercise in the application of a rule"<sup>103</sup>

**incidental** – "being likely to ensue as a chance or minor consequence ... syn. see accidental; ant. essential"<sup>104</sup>

An example is an illustration of how to obey a rule. Thus, a binding example must have a *background rule* which it is illustrating. Notice:

**Background command** (statement): "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes" (1 Cor 11:26).

**Binding example**: "On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul, ready to depart the next day, spoke to them and continued his message until midnight" (Acts 20:7).

Acts 20:7 illustrates, by means of example, how the statement of 1 Cor 11:26 is carried out. Disciples must eat the communion "often" and Acts 20:7 demonstrates how "often" – upon the first day of each week. The fact that it was night in Acts 20:7-12 has nothing to do with illustrating the statement of 1 Cor 11:26.

Notice in the above definition of "incidental," the antonym (opposite) is "essential." An incidental is something that is unessential.

- Observing communion at night is unessential and therefore an "incidental" matter, not an "example" that must be followed.
- In contrast, a drinking vessel is essential in observing what Jesus commanded and is therefore a true "example" to be followed, not an "incidental" item.

---

<sup>103</sup> Webster, op cit.

<sup>104</sup> Webster, op cit.

#### **ARGUMENT #49: Chalkboards, songbooks, microphone system, overhead projectors, etc.**

Where is your authority for chalkboards, charts, songbooks, electric lights, PA systems, and other things which are not mentioned in the scriptures?<sup>105</sup>

**REPLY:** Although none of these items are specifically mentioned in scriptures, they are acceptable because they do not violate any specific commands and they are authorized by implication. A plurality of drinking vessels, on the other hand, do violate specific commands and have no implicit authorization.

See "ARGUMENT #60: Everything must be specified to be authorized?" in these notes.

#### **ARGUMENT #50: The plate**

Where is the scripture for using a plate for the bread?<sup>106</sup>

**REPLY:** Rather than producing Biblical proof for the use of individual cups this argument is saying, "One cup people are just as guilty as we are." Little consolation is found in such reasoning.

1) A bread plate is acceptable, however, because it does not violate any specific command when it is used. The brethren all partake of one loaf with or without a plate being used.

2) In contrast, individual cups are wrong because they do violate the command for all disciples to drink from one cup:

##### **Matthew 26:27**

27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

##### **Mark 14:23**

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

---

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Porter, op cit, p. 178; Thrasher, op cit, 1st affirmative speech.

<sup>106</sup> Porter, op cit, pp. 32-34.

## **ARGUMENT #51: A literal table necessary?**

Since 1 Cor 10:21 mentions a table, must we have one literal table?<sup>107</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) This argument is designed to ridicule, but does nothing to prove the validity of individual cups, nor the invalidity of one cup. All this argument can accomplish is to demonstrate that one-cup brethren are inconsistent.

**QUESTION:** If some are inconsistent in not requiring one table, have individual cups been proven scriptural? Of course not.

2) A literal table is necessary because whatever is necessary to obeying a command is not an incidental, but an essential item. Whether the table has spiritual significance or not, it is an essential item in obeying what the Lord said. It is essential to set the loaf and cup down on top of something in order to observe the communion the way the Lord directed. Since it is essential to have something to set these items upon, the table becomes an essential. By way of statement (1 Cor 10:21) the table was made essential.

3) There is no division over whether to use a table or not.

- Everyone agrees Jesus instituted the Lord's supper on a literal table (Mt 26).
- Every congregation uses a literal table when observing the Lord's supper.
- Everyone agrees the Lord's supper must be set on top of something and everyone agrees on what to put it on – a table!

The point of this argument is mute.

---

<sup>107</sup> Smith, op cit, p. 9.

## **ARGUMENT #52: A Canteen?**

Since the Greek word ποτήριον means simply "a drinking vessel," can we use a canteen, a Coke bottle, or some other such vessel?<sup>108</sup>

**REPLY:** Because the Lord did not specify exactly what the cup He used looked like, Christians are at liberty to choose from cups of various sizes, shapes, and materials.

This argument does nothing to disprove one cup, nor to validate individual cups.

## **ARGUMENT #53: Passover cups**

There were at least four passover cups on the table when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper. Therefore, individual cups may be used.<sup>109</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) With this, all arguments that the "cup" is figurative are swept away. Most advocates of individual cups will argue that "cup" is figurative, it doesn't refer to a literal drinking vessel, it refers to the fruit of the vine only, and has not the slightest reference to a literal container.

With this argument the reverse is true. This argument says, "Not only is 'cup' literal, there may have been four or more literal cups present during the Lord's supper!"

2) There is no Biblical evidence of a plurality of cups on the table during this passover. In order to make an argument, the following must be proven:

- There was a drink element in the Passover as God gave it to Israel.
- There were then a plurality of cups used during Passover.
- Jesus followed this same procedure when He observed the Passover.

---

<sup>108</sup> Unpublished argument.

<sup>109</sup> Smith, op cit, p. 8.

This argument suggests that Jesus worshiped God according to traditions of men. There was no drink element in the passover according to the Law of God. If the Jews introduced such an element they did so without divine authority. If Jesus used this innovation He would have been worshiping with a human innovation – a thing which He condemned (Mt 15:9).

James Hastings is one notable scholar that teaches there were no cups in the passover:

"Later Jewish writers have described how the Passover was celebrated in their time, with four (and sometimes five) cups circulating at intervals, one of which may have been the Eucharistic cup. But we do not know that this ritual was in existence in the time of Christ. And if it was, we do not know that Christ ... followed the existing ritual."<sup>110</sup>

3) Even if it could be proven there were several cups on the table when Jesus and His disciples observed the Passover, it does not help the individual cups position, because when it came time for communion, Jesus used only one!

- Jesus took one cup (Mt 26:27).
- He gave thanks for one cup.
- He gave one cup to the disciples.
- He commanded them to drink from one cup (Mt 26:27).
- They obeyed Him and all drank from one cup (Mk 14:23).

#### **ARGUMENT #54: The dropped cup**

If the cup is dropped and broken another cup would have to be used to finish serving the congregation. If multiple cups can be used because of unfortunate circumstances, then why can't they be used because of fortunate circumstances (a large crowd)?<sup>111</sup>

**REPLY:** This argument is invalid because it assumes that what is done because of an accident may be done purposefully.

---

<sup>110</sup> James Hastings, A Dictionary of the Bible, Hendrickson Publishers, 1988 reprint edition, Vol. 3, p. 148.

<sup>111</sup> Porter, op cit, pp. 54-55.



- Suppose an Israelite, who was required to have only one lamb in his house for the Passover meal (Ex 12:3-4), had his lamb stolen after he prepared it. He would have to get another one and prepare it. Is the command of God to use only one lamb therefore nullified because of this accident? Of course not.
- If one missed worship services because of an accident on the way to services, is he therefore justified to purposefully miss next time?
- If someone unintentionally forgot to pay for something, does this justify shoplifting?
- If one accidentally kills someone, is he therefore justified to premeditate murder?

Thus, accidents cannot be used to change the commandments of God.

### **ARGUMENT #55: Large church at Jerusalem**

The church at Jerusalem was too large to use just one cup. A plurality of cups had to be used to serve such a large congregation.<sup>112</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) This contradicts the idea that a drinking vessel is an incidental item. In effect, the present argument is saying a drinking vessel is essential and in fact a plurality of cups are essential under some circumstances. Here are the conclusions of this argument:

- Drinking vessels that are unnecessary are now necessary.
- An expedient item now becomes essential.
- A liberty now becomes mandatory.

2) This argument assumes there was only one congregation in the Jerusalem vicinity. For this argument to work there could not have been a congregation at:

- Bethany
- Bethphage
- Bethlehem
- Jericho
- Emmaus

---

<sup>112</sup> Jerry Moffitt, "The Kniffen-Moffitt Debate on One Cup," Thrust, Nd., Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 9.

All of these cities were within walking distance from Jerusalem. If there were congregations in all these cities, counting Jerusalem itself, there would be six congregations within walking distance. Three thousand disciples distributed among six congregations would make 500 people per congregation – an audience small enough to use a single cup.

- If there were any "country churches," the number of people per congregation would decrease even more.
- If some of these cities had two or more congregations, then the number of people per congregation is decreased even more.
- It would have been possible to have had 12 congregations within walking distance of each other. One apostle could be present in each congregation to help conduct services. With 12 congregations in the area, each congregation would have on average only 250 people present – a crowd small enough that one cup could easily be used in communion.

There is scriptural authority for having more than one congregation within a city, but there is no authority for having more than one cup on the Lord's table.

3) Besides assuming there were no other congregations within walking distance, this argument assumes that all 3000 members of the church met in one massive assembly for communion.

It is very doubtful that a Jewish controlled city would have allowed a massive assembly by Christians to eat the Lord's supper in honor of Jesus whom they had just crucified. Human assumptions that 3000 Christians met in a single assembly to eat the Lord's supper is not proof of anything. Assumptions prove nothing in a civil court of law and they prove nothing from the Bible.

4) In the days of Moses, although one congregation was spoken of, the Passover meal was eaten in small assemblies inside brethren's houses.

### **Exodus 12**

3 "Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his father, a lamb for a household.

6 'Now you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month. Then the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it at twilight.

This "congregation" of about 2,000,000 people were to "kill it." How did they do this? With one massive assembly? No! By many local assemblies. Each house killed a lamb and each house ate a lamb and in this way the entire "congregation" of Israel "killed it."

How did the 3000 Christians in Jerusalem eat the Lord's supper? In one massive assembly? There is no evidence to suggest this and much to oppose it. However, by meeting in many local assemblies they were able to break bread utilizing a single loaf and a single cup as the Lord directed.

5) This is the same reasoning used by denominations who insist that baptism could not possibly be immersion because 3000 people could not have been immersed in a single day.<sup>113</sup>

Three thousand could easily have been immersed by having more than one man baptize. In the same way, 3000 people could easily assemble in more than one congregation.

### **ARGUMENT #56: The "cup of demons"**

Do you believe a table with a plurality of cups constitutes the "table of the Lord," or the "table of demons"?<sup>114</sup>

**REPLY:** A plurality of cups constitutes neither the "table of the Lord," nor the "table of demons." Our brethren have never believed that more than one cup constitutes the "cup of demons," in reference to 1 Cor 10:20-21.

#### **1 Corinthians 10:20-21**

20 Rather, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God, and I do not want you to have fellowship with demons.

21 You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the Lord's table and of the table of demons.

The "cup of the demons" is what Gentiles used in their worship and "sacrifice to demons" (v. 20).

Justin Martyr was born only several years after the apostle John's death (AD 110 to AD 165). He was described as "mighty in the scriptures." Because he lived so near the time of the apostles he would be qualified to know what Paul meant by the "cup of demons." He says:

"For the apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them: that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, This do in remembrance of Me, this is My body; and that after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, This is My blood; and gave it to them alone. Which the wicked

---

<sup>113</sup> Albert Barnes used this reasoning to justify sprinkling in his commentary, Barnes' Notes on the New Testament, Kregal Publications, 1980 reprint, one volume edition, p. 392.

<sup>114</sup> Porter, op cit, p. 56.

devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same thing to be done. For, that bread and cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn."<sup>115</sup>

The reference to the "table of demons," then, in 1 Cor 10, was a perversion of the Lord's supper by heathens. The heathen used a cup of water while Jesus used a cup of the fruit of the vine.

If the "cup of demons" was a drinking vessel with water in it which is then used in worship to demons, then the "cup of the Lord" is a drinking vessel with fruit of the vine in it which is then used in worship to the Lord.

### **ARGUMENT #57: Sanitation**

One cup is unsanitary.<sup>116</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

1) This is the real reason churches use individual cups. If all would be honest, 99% of all brethren who use individual cups would confess it is because of sanitation, not:

- Because they studied their Bibles and became convinced that Jesus used individual cups, or
- The grammar of the Scriptures forced them to accept individual cups.

Brethren use individual cups because they just do not want to drink after their own brethren! Instead of making all these other arguments, brethren ought to just step right up and admit the **real** reason!

Brethren are spending time trying to **justify** themselves for not observing the Lord's supper the way Jesus did. This is why unreasonable arguments surface:

- "The cup is figurative."
- "The cup is the blood."
- "The church at Jerusalem was too large for one cup."

---

<sup>115</sup> Justin Martyr, Ante-Nicene Fathers, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson editors, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1973 reprint edition, Vol. 1, p. 85.

<sup>116</sup> Victor Knowles, The One Cup Faith, Vanguard, 1976, pp. 87ff. A complete review of this book was written by Ronny Wade in the columns of the "*Old Paths Advocate*," March thru August 1977. A written debate between Ronny Wade and Victor Knowles also occurred in this publication beginning with the January 1978 issue and concluding in the June 1978 issue. The "*Old Paths Advocate*" is a monthly periodical published by Don L. King, Fremont, CA.

- "What about the upper room?"

Why do brethren not admit the *real* problem?

2) Standard individual cups do not guarantee sanitation. Unless each used cup is removed from the tray and kept separate from all clean cups, it is possible that a cup might be shared by two people.

3) Cleanliness is often a virtue, but it can be over done. In fact, it can be overdone to the point of sin if someone refuses to obey because of a fear of germs. Often God required men to do things that were quite unsanitary by modern standards:

- Noah was required to be on an ark for over a year with all the animals and only one window. Not very sanitary!
- Jesus often ate with unwashed hands which offended the more sanitary Pharisees (Lk 11:37-38).
- Jesus once spit on the ground, made clay, and put the spittle into a blind man's eyes to heal his blindness (Jn 9:6)
- Jesus spit again directly into a man's eyes to heal his blindness (Mk 8:23).
- Brethren in the early church were to salute each other with a holy kiss (Rom 16:16).

As squeamish as many are they would rather have died than to submit to such requirements as these.

4) Do the Lord's people no faith in the living God! If Jesus commanded His disciples to drink from one cup do they not have enough faith that God will protect and provide for them if they obey His word?!

G. A. Trott, M.D.:

"If all they have ever said of the dangers of the common cup were true, I would still prefer to defy every germ that ever existed, rather than defy the Lord by refusing to follow his example."<sup>117</sup>

J. W. McGarvey:

"We have always been a little squeamish about drinking out of the same cup with certain persons that we could name and now, seeing that by doing so there is a risk of our swallowing some of their microbes, the practice has become

---

<sup>117</sup> Via Phillips, op cit, p. 39.

intolerable. It is true that our Lord appointed it this way; but then he may have forgotten, just at the moment, that he had made all these microbes, and that they were such awful things; or else he thought that, as in the case of our new criticism, the age in which he lived was not prepared for a revelation on the subject, and so he left matters as he found them. Perhaps he reflected that the many millions who were destined to premature graves by swallowing these microbes at the Lord's Supper, would die in a good cause, and he therefore left them to their fate until an enlightened age would correct the evil. We have now reached that enlightened age, for the Spirit is still leading us into the new truth; and we propose to stop that needless waste of human life by having individual cups from which to drink the wine. If any man cries out against it as being unscriptural, exclusive or finicky, or anything of that sort, we will call him a legalist, a literalist, a Pharisee, a back number, a last year's almanac, and a whole lot of things that we use to silence croakers with."<sup>118</sup>

5) For those concerned about the sanitation aspects, I would highly recommend obtaining a copy of Sanitation in Communion, second edition, written by James Orten and Alton Bailey.<sup>119</sup> In this fine book Brothers Orten and Bailey prove convincingly from the most recent research available that drinking from one communion cup does not pose any significant health risk.

### **ARGUMENT #58: "Anti" brethren are inconsistent**

"Anti" brethren are inconsistent and that proves they are wrong. Someone who's right will not be inconsistent.<sup>120</sup>

**REPLY:** If it is ever proven that "Anti" brethren are inconsistent all that has been proven is that they are inconsistent in one point and perhaps wrong in one point, but it does not prove they are wrong on their position of one cup.

- To illustrate, Peter and Barnabas were inconsistent when they withdrew from the Gentiles and refused to associate with them (Gal 2:11-13). This proved they were inconsistent only in this one area, but not in everything they stood for.
- A father may spank his son for telling "big lies" but not spank him for telling "little white lies." The father may be inconsistent, but it does not prove he should never spank his son for lying. It only indicates the father should become more consistent in administering discipline.

---

<sup>118</sup> J. W. McGarvey, "Microbes," Christian Standard, March 31, 1900.

<sup>119</sup> Alton B. Bailey and James D. Orten, Sanitation In Communion, An Informer Publication, 1983.

<sup>120</sup> Thrasher, op cit, 1st negative speech.

- If the "Anti" brethren are truly inconsistent, it might be argued that they need to improve themselves and become more consistent, but it does not prove they are wrong in their position of one cup in the communion.

### **ARGUMENT #59: Making laws and causing division**

Insisting on one cup is making a law God did not make and is causing division.<sup>121</sup>

#### **REPLY:**

- 1) The best way to prove that "one-container" people are making laws which God did not make is to find a command, example, or necessary inference in the Bible for a plurality of drinking vessels being used in the communion.
- 2) A plurality of vessels are not wrong simply because they are not specified. They are wrong because they violate specific commandments given by the Lord.
- 3) Are brethren indeed making a law that God did not make? The scriptures record:
  - Jesus took one cup (Mk 14:23).
  - He gave thanks for one cup.
  - He gave one cup to the disciples.
  - He commanded them to drink from one cup (Mt 26:27).
  - They obeyed Him and all drank from one cup (Mk 14:23).
  - Paul praised the Corinthians for keeping the ordinances just as they were delivered (1 Cor 11:2).
  - He delivered one cup to the churches (v. 25).
  - He declared that all Christians drink from that one cup (v. 26).

Are brethren at fault for insisting that this great ordinance be kept "just as it was delivered"?

#### **1 Corinthians 14:37**

37 If anyone thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord.

---

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Smith, op cit, p. 10; Moore, op cit, p. 144.

4) When people admit they do not have to use individual cups, but still insist and persist upon doing so, they are the ones guilty of causing division.

N. B. Hardeman correctly said:

"If ... you can worship God acceptably without the organ – and still will not give it up, I must charge you with the responsibility of perpetuating division and strife against the pleadings and prayer of our Lord."<sup>122</sup>

"The man that injects the difference, the man that brings in the thing that causes the trouble is the man that makes the test of fellowship."<sup>123</sup>

This is true, not only of instrumental music, but concerning individual cups as well. When brethren admit that individual cups are not essential, that they may fulfill all their obligations to commune without them, but refuse to give them up for the sake of unity, then they are the ones who must be charged with causing division within the body of Christ.

G. C. Brewer admitted that when he introduced individual cups into the worship services it cause division:

"A good many of the fights that I have made have been with my own brethren on points where I believed them to be in the wrong. I think I was the first preacher to advocate the use of the individual communion cup and the first church in the State of Tennessee that adopted it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chattanooga, Tennessee, then meeting in the Masonic Temple. My next work was with the church at Columbia, Tennessee, and, after a long struggle, I got the individual communion service into that congregation."<sup>124</sup>

Notice the fighting and struggling being done to introduce something that is supposed to be a liberty and non-essential. Who is really guilty of causing division within the body of Christ?

---

<sup>122</sup> Hardeman, N. B. and Ira Boswell, Boswell-Hardeman Discussion on Instrumental Music in the Worship, Guardian of Truth Foundation Pub., 1981 reprint edition, p. 62.

<sup>123</sup> Hardeman, op cit, p. 181.

<sup>124</sup> G. C. Brewer, op cit, p. xii, emphasis mine – GFB. See G. C. Brewer (Forty Years On The Firing Line) of these notes.



## **ARGUMENT #60: Everything must be specified to be authorized?**<sup>125</sup>

"Anti" people demand that everything must be specified to be authorized<sup>126</sup>

**REPLY:** One-cup brethren do not believe this. They believe implication is sufficient for authorization. (See SECTION 3 BIBLE AUTHORITY). The problem with individual cups is that there is neither explicit nor implicit authority for their use. Where is the passage that merely implies a plurality of cups? There is no such passage.

## **ARGUMENT #61: "Anti" brethren are like Baptists**

"Anti" brethren add the word "only" to the Bible like Baptists add "only" to passages about faith. They say the "only" way the church can commune is with one cup.<sup>127</sup>

### **REPLY:**

1) To prove the "anti" brethren are guilty of adding to the Bible, all cups advocates have to do is:

- Produce a command for a plurality cups.
- Produce an example of God's people using a plurality of cups.
- Produce a necessary inference for a plurality of cups.

If no such command, example, or necessary inference can be produced, then "anti" brethren are not the ones adding to the word of God.

2) Every passage in the New Testament that mentions the communion speaks specifically about one cup.

- Jesus took one cup containing fruit of the vine (Mt 26:27).
- He prayed for one cup and its contents (Mt 26:27).

---

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Moore, op cit, pp. 141-142.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Moore, op cit, pp. 141-142.

<sup>127</sup> Unpublished argument commonly used to ridicule the "one cup" position.

- He gave one cup and its contents to the disciples (Mt 26:27).
- He commanded all the disciples to drink from the one cup he handed them (Mt 26:27).
- They obeyed what He commanded and all drank from that one cup (Mk 14:23).
- The use of one cup was taught to every congregation of apostolic times (1 Cor 4:17; 10:16; 11:25-29).

## **ARGUMENT #62: Nit-picking & Hair-splitting?**

Insisting on one cup is nit-picking and hair-splitting. It is "straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel."<sup>128</sup>

**REPLY:** The Bible never warns anyone from being too careful in following God's word. Just the opposite is true. Over and over men are warned to obey God's will in everything both great and small.

### **Matthew 5:19**

19 "Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Disobedience in the "least commandments" has never been a virtue. If "least commandments" were unnecessary to obey, God would never have given them.

### **Luke 16:10**

10 "He who is faithful in what is least is faithful also in much; and he who is unjust in what is least is unjust also in much.

If one cannot keep even the "little" commandments, how will he ever be able to keep the big ones?

### **2 Corinthians 2:9**

9 For to this end I also wrote, that I might put you to the test, whether you are obedient in all things.

Could it be that God is testing our faithfulness and loyalty with these "little commandments"?

### **Luke 6:46**

46 "But why do you call Me 'Lord, Lord,' and do not do the things which I say?

---

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Boren, op cit, p. 1.

**NOTE:** If one-cup brethren are "straining out gnats and swallowing camels," then please point out the "camel" is that is being swallowed.

Some people think it is alright to swallow gnats! Christians should not want to swallow either gnats or camels and anyone showing them their error would be considered a friend.

**Matthew 23:23**

23 "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faith. These you ought to have done, without leaving the others undone.

If it is not safe to follow all of God's commandments at all times and under all circumstances, it is not safe to follow the Bible at all. A church of Christ can "speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent" by using only one drinking cup in the communion service.

**NOTE:** The Bible does warn men about relying upon themselves rather than upon God. If Christians begin to harbor pride in their hearts and begin to think they are deserving of heaven, they are trusting, not in God, but in themselves. This is wrong and is the sin that condemned the Pharisees. After carefully obeying God's word in every detail, small and great, Christians must humbly admit they are undeserving of the rewards and blessings offered by God.

**Luke 17:10**

10 "So likewise you, when you have done all those things which you are commanded, say, 'We are unprofitable servants. We have done what was our duty to do.' "

**ARGUMENT #63: Lexicons and translations**

We should not use lexicons and different translations. We should use the KJV and let the scriptures speak for themselves.<sup>129</sup>

**REPLY:**

1) What passage teaches only KJV may be used? Be careful of "making laws where God made none" (cf. Rom 2:21-23).

2) What passage teaches that a lexicon (dictionary) to define words is sinful? Be careful of "making laws where God made none" (cf. Rom 2:21-23).

---

<sup>129</sup> Unpublished argument.

3) Whether some like to admit it or not, everyone depends upon lexicons, dictionaries and other linguistic aids. The men who translated the KJV:

- Had to select which Hebrew and Greek manuscripts to use in order to produce their translation. When men read the KJV they are relying upon these decisions made by men.
- These translators had to decide how to translate each Hebrew and Greek word into English. When men read the KJV they are relying upon their decisions and scholarship.

Since the KJV was produced, hundreds, perhaps thousands of old Bible manuscripts and fragments have been found and has made way for a more accurate, complete and reliable Hebrew and Greek text. Furthermore, the English language has changed radically since 1611. Some English words have completely changed their meaning (e.g., "let," "suffer," "conversation," "Easter," etc.). Christians rely upon mortal men and women to teach them that these words mean something different today than in 1611.

People have a choice to make: (a) Either rely upon the translators to explain what the Hebrew and Greek means, or (b) get the same tools they used and check it out personally. Either way, people are relying upon the work done by mortal men when they read the Bible.

4) Jesus and the apostles quoted from different translations. Sometimes they would quote from the original Hebrew text and at other times from the Septuagint. Were they sinning in so doing? Of course not.

5) The prophets and apostles often quoted from uninspired books (cf. Acts 17:28) and referred God's people to uninspired historical records to verify what they were saying (cf. Num 21:14; Josh 10:13; 2 Sam 1:18; 2 Ch 35:4).

6) Rules of grammar, which can only be learned from uninspired text books, were strictly observed and cited by divinely inspired writers. Two common examples include:

- The tense of verbs emphasized by Jesus (Mt 22:32).
- The number of nouns emphasized by Paul (Gal 3:16).

7) **CONCLUSION:** Information is not wrong just because it did not originate from an inspired writer, but it is wrong if it contradicts what an inspired writer said. If one rejects definitions and translations, he must have a valid, logical reason for doing so rather than rejecting it because it is "uninspired," or simply because it contradicts what others want to believe.

## **ARGUMENT #64: The KJV**

I believe God providentially oversaw the production of the KJV.  
We should not be using any other translation.<sup>130</sup>

### **REPLY:**

- 1) How do you know God did this? Divine revelation is required to identify providence at work (cf. Esther 4:14) and divine revelation has ceased (1 Cor 13:8-12).
- 2) How do you know God did not providentially oversee the translation of the NKJV, ASV, NIV, NASV, or any other translation? If He could work providentially in 1611, why could He not do so in the 1900s?
- 3) Are you afraid? Many, in making this argument, are saying in essence, "I'm afraid that if I go to the original sources to verify my conclusions, I will discover I'm wrong. I do not want to be wrong and I do not want to change."
- 4) If a lexicon or translation gives a wrong definition or translation, show us the error and give us a reason for your accusation. Do not be dogmatic.

---

<sup>130</sup> Unpublished argument.

## **SECTION 7**

### **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

#### **WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Part 1)**

The following questions were submitted by George Battey and answered in writing by Pat Donahue

---

#### **Donahue's written responses**

---

- 1) When Jesus instituted the Lord's supper, did He use a literal drinking vessel? Donahue's reply: *in all likelihood, he did use a container [sic]*
- a) If so, was the word "cup" ever used in the scriptures to refer directly or indirectly to that drinking vessel? Donahue's reply: *I don't think so*<sup>131</sup>
- 2) Is a metaphor a figure of speech? Donahue's reply: *yes*
- a) If so, is "bread" being used in a metaphor in Mt 26:26? Donahue's reply: *yes*
- b) If "bread" is used metaphorically, is "bread" still literal bread although being used in a figure of speech? Donahue's reply: *in this case, yes*
- c) If so, is "fruit of the vine" being used in a metaphor in Mt 26:28-29? Donahue's reply: *yes*
- d) If "fruit of the vine" is used metaphorically, is "fruit of the vine" still literal fruit of the vine although being used in a figure of speech? Donahue's reply: *in this case, yes*
- e) If so, is "cup" being used in a metaphor in 1 Cor 11:25? Donahue's reply: *yes*
- f) If so, is "cup" still a literal cup although being used in a figure of speech? Donahue's reply: *in this case, no*<sup>132</sup>
- g) If "cup" is being used as a metaphor in 1 Cor 11:25, is it also being used by metonymy at the very same time? Donahue's reply: *yes – cup refers by metonymy to juice, which is compared by metaphor to "N.T. in my blood"*<sup>133</sup>
- h) Do the nouns used in a metaphor have to be literal? Donahue's reply: *no example – "His hand (metonymy for cards) was a bear (metaphor)."*<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> Compare this answer with Donahue's answer to question #5 (a) where he admits that the word "cup" refers to a container.

<sup>132</sup> Donahue gives no explanation why the first two sentences involve literal objects (bread and fruit of the vine) while in this third sentence supposedly does not.

<sup>133</sup> See Bullinger's remarks concerning metaphors. Bullinger points out that the nouns used in a metaphor are to be taken in their absolutely literal sense. See E. W. Bullinger (Figures of Speech – Metaphor, pp. 735-741) of these notes.

<sup>134</sup> There is no evidence offered by Donahue to prove that "hand," in reference to a card game, is a metonymy and certainly not a metonymy of the "container for the contained." See "ARGUMENT #17: A "hand of cards"" of these notes.

3) Is it sinful to use one cup in the communion to distribute the fruit of the vine? Donahue's reply: *not unless you bind it*<sup>135</sup>

4) When may grape juice grammatically be referred to as "cup"?

- a) When the juice is still in the cluster on the vine.<sup>136</sup>
- b) When the juice is in a cup.
- c) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Donahue's reply: *it may be referred to as "cup" anytime*<sup>137</sup>

5) Metonymy is defined as, "a figure by which one name or noun is used instead of another, to which it stands in a certain relation."<sup>138</sup> Please answer the following questions about this sentence: *"As often as you drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes."*

- a) What object is being named when Paul wrote, "Drink this cup"? Donahue's reply: *a container*<sup>139</sup>
- b) What is being suggested? Donahue's reply: *fruit of the vine*
- c) What relationship is sustained between the thing named and the thing suggested?

Donahue's reply: *a cup may contain liquid*

6) If the sentence, "This (bread) is my body," (Mt 26:26) means, "This (bread) represents my body," and if "This (fruit of the vine) is my blood," means, "This (fruit of the vine) represents my blood," then what does the sentence, "This cup is the new testament," (1 Cor 11:25) mean? Donahue's reply: *"This cup is the new testament IN MY BLOOD" means the same thing as the phrase "this is my blood of the new testament" in Mt 26:28. It means that the fruit of the vine represents Jesus' blood which is associated with the new testament (blood with new testament in it). [sic]*<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> See "ARGUMENT #59: Making laws and causing division."

<sup>136</sup> Donahue placed a check mark by all three items in this list and then wrote additional information under "(c)."

<sup>137</sup> See "ARGUMENT #1: Metonymy."

<sup>138</sup> Bullinger, op cit, p. 538.

<sup>139</sup> Donahue here contradicts his answer given to question #1 (a) where he answered that the word "cup" never refers to a literal container either directly or indirectly.

<sup>140</sup> See "ARGUMENT #29: Matthew and Mark are saying the same thing as Luke and Paul."

7) If the container is totally irrelevant, can a cluster of grapes be passed around and each participant pluck off one grape and drink the juice out of it? Would that be "drinking the cup"? Donahue's reply: yes, yes<sup>141</sup>

8) In Mk 14:3 the Bible says a woman, "Broke the flask and poured it on His head."

- a) What is the antecedent of "it"? Donahue's reply: flask
- b) Was there a literal flask being used by the woman? Donahue's reply: yes
- c) Is a figure of speech being used? Donahue's reply: yes
- d) If a figure is being used, what figure? Donahue's reply: metonymy – container for contained "poured it"<sup>142</sup>

9) Would it be scriptural for each disciple to bring with him to the services his own drinking vessel containing fruit of the vine and his own loaf of unleavened bread? Donahue's reply: yes as far as I know

- a) If so, could each disciple keep these items in his own possession during worship services? Donahue's reply: I'm not sure; they might have to bring it together for the prayer (see next part)
- b) When it came time for communion to be eaten, could each disciple pray his own prayer for the items which he brought without a brother "leading" a prayer on behalf of the congregation? Donahue's reply: I'm not sure

10) Is at least one drinking vessel essential to observe the communion, or may a congregation observe the communion scripturally without any drinking vessel at all? Donahue's reply: not scripturally essential, but aids practically

- a) If no drinking vessel at all is essential, how could a congregation commune without at least one? (Please explain in detail.) Donahue's reply: see #7

---

<sup>141</sup> This is an extreme position that few would probably endorse. Elmer Moore wrote the following in his debate with Ronny Wade: "Since fruit of the vine is a liquid, we must have some kind of container for it. However, the particular kind or number of container(s) is a matter of judgment. The drinking vessel is implicit in the command to drink. ... After one reads what [Ronny Wade] writes, one may be impressed with his ability in the field of grammar, but what does he prove: That there was literal bread, juice and a vessel? Who denies it?" ("The Wade-Moore Debate," *Old Paths Advocate*, March 1987, pp. 3,6). When Moore wrote, "Who denies it?" we may now answer that Pat Donahue denies that a vessel is necessary or was even present.

<sup>142</sup> If brethren can see in Mk 14:3 that a literal container is being named to suggest its literal contents then they ought to be able to see the same thing in regards to the cup when it is used by metonymy in communion passages.



---

## More questions to consider

---

For those who are seriously considering the validity of individual communion cups, the following questions are submitted for consideration.

- 1) Please define the word metonymy and name the source from which you get your definition.
- 2) Did Paul tell the story of Jesus eating the communion with His disciples (1 Cor 11:23-25) in order to provide an example to the Corinthians of how the Lord's supper should be observed?<sup>143</sup>
- 3) In the following passages, when is the word "cup" used literally, by metonymy, by metaphor, or by some other figure?<sup>144</sup>

**Mt 26:27**

**1 Cor 10:21**

**Mk 14:23**

**1 Cor 11:25a**

**Lk 22:17**

**1 Cor 11:25b**

**Lk 22:22a**

**1 Cor 11:26**

**Lk 22:22b**

**1 Cor 11:27**

**1 Cor 10:16**

**1 Cor 11:28**

- 4) How do you decide when a word is used literally and when it is used in a figure of speech?
- 5) What is the antecedent of the word "this" in Matthew 9:28?
- 6) What would the scriptures have to say, which they do not already say, in order to prove one and only one drinking vessel was essential?
- 7) Jesus said in Luke 22:20 and in 1 Corinthians 11:25 that something was (i.e. represents) the New Testament. What did He say represented the New Testament that had been ratified by His blood?
- 8) Which sentence suggests the contents of a plurality of cups?
  - Drink this cup.
  - Drink these cups.

---

<sup>143</sup> If yes, then we must use one cup as He did. If no, why did he tell the story? This demonstrates the difference between our two brotherhoods. We believe it is an example to follow.

<sup>144</sup> For an analysis of how "cup" should be interpreted, see APPENDIX A - ANALYSIS OF KEY WORDS.

9) What linguistic authority, if any, lists ποτήριον ("cup") in Matthew 26:27 as a case of metonymy?

10) Metonymy is defined as, "a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."<sup>145</sup>

- a) In metonymy, is the thing named and the object suggested one and the same?
- b) If a cup is named to suggest its contents, are the cup and the contents one and the same?
- c) What relation would a cup have to a liquid that would "readily suggest" the liquid by naming the cup?

11) In Acts 20:7, the phrase "break bread" is a figure of speech called synecdoche which is a type of metonymy . Synecdoche is "a figure of speech by which a part is put for the whole."<sup>146</sup>

- a) If the phrase "break bread" is a type of metonymy (specifically: synecdoche), does the bread remain literal?
- b) If the phrase "drink this cup" is a metonymy, does the cup remain literal?
- c) In metonymy, if a literal liquid is suggested, is the object named to suggest that liquid literal or figurative?

12) Would it be scriptural to observe the Lord's supper on Wednesday nights and if not, why not?<sup>147</sup>

13) Who is responsible for the division in the church over the use of instrumental music?

- a) Those who insist instrumental music is not mentioned in the New Testament pattern for worship, and thus will not accept it?
- b) Those who say the use of instruments is a matter of liberty. Those who say they could worship with or without instruments, but insist that no one shall take away their liberty and bind upon them laws God did not make and thus insist on using the instruments?<sup>148</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Williams, op cit, p. 220.

<sup>146</sup> Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, G. & C. Merriam Co., 1979 edition, p. 1174.

<sup>147</sup> Obviously the answer is "NO" because the divine example given in Acts 20:7 is the first day of the week. Must we then follow the example of when the communion was eaten, but not how it was eaten?

<sup>148</sup> The ones who introduced the innovation, yet admitted it was not necessary, are the ones responsible for the resulting division. The same holds true for the introduction of Bible classes and a plurality of cups.

14) Does the congregation where you customarily worship divide the fruit of the vine into individual cups (containers) before thanks is offered for it?<sup>149</sup>

15) In what way, if any, does the universal church worship?<sup>150</sup>

a) Only thru means of the local congregation.

b) Thru some function of the universal church itself.

16) When Paul wrote, "You are the body of Christ," (1 Cor 12:27) did he refer to the body at Corinth?<sup>151</sup>

17) Do the scriptures anywhere teach or give authority for doing anything purposefully that might be done accidentally? If so, which scriptures teach this?<sup>152</sup>

18) Is the drinking vessel for the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper specifically mentioned in any of the scriptures dealing with the communion? If so, where?

19) Are individual cups (drinking vessels) ever mentioned in the Bible in connection with the communion? If so, where?

20) Would it be scriptural for a congregation to offer communion at both the Lord's day morning and evening service?<sup>153</sup>

21) How does one, "Drink this cup," (1 Cor 11:26)?

22) What scripture teaches there was a drink element in the Passover meal?<sup>154</sup>

23) Please explain what the "cup of demons" (1 Cor 10:21) means.<sup>155</sup>

24) 1 Cor 11:25 says something is the New Testament. The New Testament was of course ratified by the blood of Christ, but what was that "something" that is the New Testament?

---

<sup>149</sup> If "YES," Lk 22:17 cannot be consistently used to justify "dividing" the juice into individual containers because the "dividing" Jesus spoke of occurred after prayer was given.

<sup>150</sup> God's people worship only on the congregational level. Because this is so, the common argument used on 1 Cor 10:16 concerning "Ephesus and Corinth" cannot be logically used. See "ARGUMENT #13: Ephesus and Corinth (version 2)."

<sup>151</sup> See "ARGUMENT #13: Ephesus and Corinth (version 2)."

<sup>152</sup> See "ARGUMENT #54: The dropped cup."

<sup>153</sup> Those believing that two communion services are scriptural cannot then argue that the Jerusalem congregation was too large to use one cup because, according to their own reasoning, Jerusalem might have had several communion services. For further discussion of this topic, see "ARGUMENT #55: Large church at Jerusalem."

<sup>154</sup> See "ARGUMENT #53: Passover cups."

<sup>155</sup> Most scholars believe this refers to a cup of water used in pagan worship. If this is true, then the "cup of the Lord" (same found in the same passage) would logically be a cup containing fruit of the vine in divine worship.

25) Can "the cup" refer to a number of cups?<sup>156</sup>

26) "And he took the cup and gave it to him and said, 'Drink of it; for this is mineral water and is good for you.'" Question: To what does the pronoun "this" refer, to the cup or what was drunk out of the cup?

27) Would it be acceptable for a brother in your assembly to drink the contents of two or more individual drinking vessels? If he drank four small cups full, would it be grammatically correct to say, "He drank the cup," or "He drank the cups."<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> If "YES," see "ARGUMENT #43: Species or categories."

<sup>157</sup> Grammatically and logically one would have to say, "He drank the cups."

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Part 2)

The following questions were submitted by Pat Donahue and answered in writing by George Battey.

---

### Battey's written responses

---

1) In which of the following places (that the communion cup is being referred to) is metonymy being used?

- a) Mt 26:27 "cup" – literal, no metonymy utilized
- b) Mk 14:23 "cup" – literal, no metonymy utilized
- c) Lk 22:17 "cup" – literal, no metonymy utilized
- d) Lk 22:17 "it" – "it" has been added by the translators; when added "it" is being used in a metonymy
- e) Lk 22:20 "cup" – "cup" actually occurs in this passage twice; first occurrence literal, no metonymy utilized; second occurrence a metaphor
- f) 1 Cor 10:16 "cup" – a metaphor
- g) 1 Cor 10:21 "cup" – a metonymy
- h) 1 Cor 11:25 "cup" – literal, no metonymy utilized
- i) 1 Cor 11:25 "cup" – a metaphor
- j) 1 Cor 11:25 "it" – "it" has been added by the translators; when added "it" is being used in a metonymy
- k) 1 Cor 11:26 "cup" – a metonymy
- l) 1 Cor 11:27 "cup" – a metonymy
- m) 1 Cor 11:28 "cup" – literal, no metonymy utilized

2) Is it possible for two people to drink "of" (from out of, out from, forth from, from – Thayer, pg. 189) a container without actually putting their lips to that container (like by pouring the contents of a pitcher or a cup into two glasses, and the people drinking from their own glass)?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No (if not, why not?)

***Battey's Reply:** No, it is not grammatically correct to say two people drank "of" (ἐκ) "a cup" (a single cup) if they actually poured the contents into two cups and drank from two cups. In this case we must say they drank from "the cups." While they may have drunken from the same supply, they did not drink from the same container.*

*Thayer, whom you cite, correctly observes that the genitive cases are distinct when discussing supply and drinking vessels. He says on page 189, "after πίνειν,<sup>158</sup> of the thing out of which one drinks [differently in II. 9 below] ... Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; 1 Cor 11:28." Under II. 9 Thayer writes, "of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, etc. ... Mt 26:29; Mk 14:25; Jn 4:13sq."*

*So, while we may say two people drank from the same source or supply of liquid, we may not grammatically say they drank from the same cup if they actually poured the contents into other cups and did the actual drinking out of several other cups.*

- 3) Which of the following verses teach that the bread represents the Lord's body?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1 Cor 10:16 (if not, please explain why not)

\_\_\_\_\_ 1 Cor 11:27 (if not, please explain why not)

*Batthey's Reply: Neither of these passages teach the bread is the body of Christ. Mt 26:27, Mk 14:22, Lk 22:19, and 1 Cor 11:24 teach that the bread represents the Lord's body. These two passages (1 Cor 10:16 and 11:27) state additional information about the bread.*

- 4) Does the fact that the word "table" is singular in Lk 22:30 and 1 Cor 10:21 mean that we must use only one literal table to place the elements of the Lord's Supper on?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No (if not, why not?)

*Batthey's Reply: I am not sure that the "table" in Lk 22:30 is in reference to the Lord's supper. 1 Cor 10:21, by means of a statement does teach one literal table to place the elements of the Lord's supper upon. (See further remarks about the "table" under question #7.)*

- 5) Do you think that the "cup" referred to in Lk 22:17 was part of:

\_\_\_\_\_ the passover observance only

\_\_\_\_\_ the institution of the Lord's Supper only

\_\_\_\_\_ both

\_\_\_\_\_ neither (please explain)

*Batthey's Reply: The use of a drink element was not a part of the Passover meal as given by God. Any "Passover cup" that may have been used by Jews was added without any divine authority. There is no proof that Jesus utilized such unauthorized traditions, and there is good reason to believe that He rejected them (cf. Mt 15:9). Therefore, the "cup" referred to in Lk 22:17 was part of the institution of the Lord's Supper only.*

---

<sup>158</sup> πίνειν is the Greek word for "drink."

6) If a person was dealt a good "hand" (singular) in a card game, does that necessarily mean that he held his cards in only one literal hand (singular)?

- ☐ No  
☐ Yes (please explain)

*Battey's Reply: No, but this is not a metonymy and neither is the grammatical construction parallel to Bible language when it speaks of the "cup" in the Lord's supper. It is not right to take a figurative expression in one context and attempt to make it mean the same in a different context.*

*In the scriptures, Jesus "took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink from it, all of you.'" To make a parallel with cards you would have something like, "He took the card, gave it to the dealer and asked for another one."*

7) Which of the following items do you teach MUST be involved when Christians assemble to eat the Lord's supper?

- ☐ an upper room  
☐ one literal table  
☐ one literal drinking vessel  
☐ fruit of the vine (as opposed to coke)

If you checked one or more, but not all of them, is the distinction made because some on the list have religious significance, while some are only incidentals?

- ☐ Yes (if yes, tell the religious significance of one container)  
☐ No (if no, please explain how you make a distinction)

*Battey's Reply: An upper room is not necessary because it was a requirement Jesus gave to the disciples for observing the Passover meal (Mt 26:17-19). Because Jesus specified an upper room for the Passover it would have been sinful for His disciples to have chosen a lower story room. It does not matter that the upper room had or did not have spiritual significance. The fact that Jesus commanded it made it essential for the disciples to choose and use an upper room. No such command was given for observing the Lord's supper.*

*A literal table is necessary because whatever is necessary to obeying a command is not an incidental, but an essential item. Whether the table has spiritual significance or not, it is an essential item in obeying what the Lord said. It is essential to set the loaf and cup down on top of something in order to observe the communion the way the Lord directed. Since it is essential to have something to set these items upon, the table becomes an essential. By way of statement (1 Cor 10:21) the table was made essential.*

*One drinking vessel is necessary because whatever is necessary to obeying a command is not an incidental, but an essential item. It is essential to have a literal container to hold the fruit of the vine when it is in a liquid state. Besides being essential to obeying the command of Jesus ("Drink from it" – Mt 26:27), one literal vessel carries*

*spiritual significance of representing the one new covenant which God made with mankind (Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25).*

*Fruit of the vine is essential because whatever is necessary to obeying a command is not an incidental, but an essential item. By way of statement (as with the table – 1 Cor 10:21) the Lord required that we use fruit of the vine (Mt 26:29). The fruit of the vine also carries with it spiritual significance of representing the Lord's blood (Mt 26:28).*

8) Which of the following items may be used by God's people in their worship and/or service to God (check all that apply), and in what year was each one first used?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a radio program \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ a microphone system \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ an overhead projector \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ a plate for the bread \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ two or more drinking vessels \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ individual drinking vessels \_\_\_\_\_

*Battey's Reply:* *The last two items in this list may not be used by God's people when observing the Lord's supper because they violate specific commandments (Mt 26:27), specific examples of how to obey commandments (Mk 14:23), and necessary inferences which require one literal container (1 Cor 11:26). Radio programs, microphone systems, overhead projectors, and a bread plate do not violate any specific commands when used properly. As to the year when each of these items first began to be used I do not know. We are not opposed to individual cups because they began to be used in recent years. We oppose to a plurality of vessels because they violate scripture.*



## **SECTION 8**

### **ADDITIONAL MATERIAL**

#### **E. W. Bullinger (Figures of Speech – Metaphor, pp. 735-741)**

METAPHOR; or, REPRESENTATION

A Declaration that one Thing is (or represents) another;  
or, Comparison by Representation.

*Met'-a-phor.* Greek, *μεταφορά* (*metaphora*), *a transference, or carrying over or across.* From *μετά* (*meta*), *beyond or over,* and *φέρειν* (*pherein*), *to carry.* We may call the figure "Representation" or "Transference."

Hence, while the *Simile* gently states that one thing is like or resembles another, the *Metaphor* boldly and warmly declares that one thing **IS** the other.

While the *Simile* says "All flesh is AS grass" (1 Pet i. 24), the *Metaphor* carries the figure *across* at once, and says "All flesh **IS** grass" (Isa xl. 6). This is the distinction between the two.

The *Metaphor* is, therefore, not so true to *fact* as the *Simile*, but is much truer to *feeling*.

The *Simile* says "All we like sheep," while the *Metaphor* declares that "we are the sheep of His pasture."

While, therefore, the word "resembles" marks the *Simile*: "represents" is the word that marks the metaphor.

We have recourse to Metaphor when we say of a picture, "This is my father," or "This is my mother." The verb "is" means in this case *represents*; there may not be the least *resemblance*! The verb "is" always has this meaning and no other when used as a *metaphor*. No other verb will do.

Few figures are more misunderstood than the *Metaphor*. It is one of the few whose names are well known, and hence it has become, a general term *for any figure*; and any figurative language is commonly called "metaphorical."

Few figures have been more variously defined. But all the differences of opinion arise from not separating the figure *Hypocatastasis* (q.v.) on the one hand, or distinguishing *Simile* on the other. The same confusion is seen with reference to *Allegory* (q.v.).

Let it then be clearly understood that a *Metaphor* is confined to a distinct affirmation that *one thing* is *another thing*, owing to some association or connection in the uses or effects of anything expressed or understood. The two nouns themselves must both be mentioned, and are always to be taken in their absolutely literal sense, or else no one can tell what they mean. The figure lies wholly in the verb, or *copula*, which, in English, must always be expressed, and never understood by *Ellipsis*.

For example, "All flesh is grass." Here "flesh" is to be taken literally as the subject spoken of, and "grass" is to be taken equally literally as that which *represents* "flesh." All the figure lies in the verb "is." This statement is made under strong feeling, the mind realizing some point of association; but, instead of using the more measured verb "resembles," or "is

like"; which would be truer to fact, though not so true to feeling; the verb "is" is used, and the meaning of one thing is *carried across* and *transferred* to the other. It is not, as some might think, a mere Hebrew idiom to use "is" for "represents"; but it is a necessity of language arising from the actual condition and character of the human mind.

We must, therefore, banish the common and loose way in which the words "metaphor" and "metaphorical" are used, and confine the figure strictly and exclusively to this, its one true and proper signification: that of *representation*.

The Representation referred to in the figure may not lie upon the surface, and may not be at all apparent in the language itself. It may be in the uses of the thing represented, or in the effects which it produces. In this case the *Metaphor* often comes as a surprise, by the discovery of a point in which two apparently unrelated objects have some point in which they really agree. Hence the same thing may be used, by a *Metaphor*, to represent two totally different objects by some different quality or character which may be referred to: e.g., a lion is used both of Christ and of the devil. We are to "cease from man" as opposed to trust in God; we are exhorted to "quit" ourselves like men as opposed to all that is effeminate.

The Latins [Cicero. *Orat.* xxvii.] called the figure TRANSLATIO: i.e., *Translation*, thus denoting the same fact: viz., *the translation or carrying across* of one thing and applying it to another which *represents* it, just as what is meant in one language is carried across and expressed or *translated* in the words of another language.

It should be observed that the Hebrew has no verb substantive or copula answering to the Greek and English verb "*to be*." Consequently the A.V. generally puts in italics the verbs "*is*," "*are*," "*were*," etc. The verb "*to be*," though it is not necessary to be expressed in Hebrew, is yet so really there that the R.V. has abandoned the use of italic type with regard to it in the Old Testament, and so the Revisers state it in their preface. We prefer the practice of the translators of the A.V., and believe it is more correct.

In the Greek, as we shall see below, whenever a *Metaphor* is intended, the verb substantative must be used; otherwise it is often omitted according to the Hebrew usage (see the Beatitudes, etc.). It is, therefore, more easy to discern a *Metaphor* in the New Testament than in the Old. In the latter we have to be guided by what is true to fact and what is true only to *feeling*. If we distinguish between these, we shall not fail to see what is a statement of fact, and what is a *Metaphor*.

**Ps xxiii. 1.**—"The LORD is my Shepherd." Here, we have a *Metaphor*; and in it a great and blessed truth is set forth by the representation of Jehovah as a Shepherd. It is He who tends his People, and does more for them than any earthly shepherd does for his sheep. All His titles and attributes are so bound up with this care that in this Psalm we have the illustration of all the Jehovah-titles: —

In verse 1. "I shall not want," because He is JEHOVAH-JIREH (Gen xxii. 14), and will provide.

In verse 2. "He leadeth me beside the waters of quietness (margin), because He is JEHOVAH-SHALOM (Judges vi. 24), and will give peace.

In verse 3. "He restoreth my soul," for He is JEHOVAHROPHECHA (Ex. xv. 26), and will graciously heal.

In verse 3. He guides me "in the paths of righteousness," for He is JEHOVAH-TZIDKENU (Jer xxiii. 6), and is Himself my righteousness, and I am righteous in Him (Jer xxxiii. 16).

In verse 4. In death's dark valley "Thou art with me," for thou art JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH (Ezk xlviii. 35), and the LORD is there.

In verse 5. "Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies," for Thou art JEHOVAH-NISSI (Ex xvii. 15), my banner, and will fight for me, while I feast.

In verse 5. "Thou anointest my head with oil," for Thou art JEHOVAH-MEKADDESCHAM (Ex xxxi. 13, etc.), the LORD that sanctifieth me.

In verse 6. "Surely" all these blessings are mine for time and eternity, for He is JEHOVAH-ROHI (Ps xxiii. 1), Jehovah my Shepherd, pledged to raise me up from the dead, and to preserve and bring me "through" the valley of death into His glorious kingdom (John vi. 39).

**Ps lxxxiv. 11 (12).** — "The LORD God is a Sun and Shield." Here, the *Metaphor* is taken from the uses and effects of the two things mentioned. He is my light and my defense. See P.B.V.

**Ps xci. 4.** — "His truth is a shield and a buckler" (R.V.). Here, we have the *Metaphor*, by which the one thing is carried over and stated as being the other. In Ps V. 12, we have the same fact stated literally as a *Simile*. See page 728 above.

*Metaphors* are so numerous in the Old Testament, that it is impossible to give more than these few to serve as specimens and examples. We add a few from the New Testament.

**Matt. v. 13.** — "Ye are the salt of the earth": i.e., ye are (or *represent*) with regard to the earth what salt is to other things, preserving it from total corruption and destruction; just as the few righteous in Sodom would have preserved that city.

When the Lord Jesus shall have returned and caught up His People (the salt) to meet Him in the air and to be forever with Him, then the corruption will proceed apace, and the harvest of the earth speedily be ripened for judgment.

**Matt. xxvi. 26.** — "This is my body" (ΤΟΥΤΟ ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου, *touto esti to soma mou*).

Few passages have been more perverted than these simple words. Rome has insisted on the literal or the figurative sense of words just as it suits her own purpose, and not at all according to the laws of philology and the true science of language.

Hence the Latin idiom, "*agere paenitentiam*," *repent*, has been rendered literally in all her versions from the Vulgate, in various languages, "do penance," except when God is said to repent! Rome dared not translate *agere paenitentiam* literally in these cases, which proves her design in thus systematically perverting the Word of God: and the false doctrine is thus forced into the words under a show or semblance of literal translation. [Rome would not dare to translate the same Latin idiom "*agere vitam*," *to do life*, though the expression has passed into slang. It means simply to live, as the other idiom means *to repent*.] So the *Metaphor*, "This is my body," has been forced to teach false doctrine by being translated literally.

No perversion of language has been fraught with greater calamity to the human race. Tens of thousands have suffered martyrdom at the hands of Rome rather than believe the "blasphemous fable" forced into these words. The exquisite tortures of the Inquisition were invented to coerce the consciences of men and compel them to accept this lie!

Luther himself was misled, through his ignorance of this simple law of figurative language. In his controversy with Zwingle, he obstinately persisted in maintaining the *literal* sense of the figure, and thus forced it to have a meaning which it never has. He thus led the whole of Germany into his error! For, while his common sense rejected the error of

"Transubstantiation," he fell into another, and invented the figment of "Consubstantiation," and fastened it upon the Lutheran Church to this day.

What a solemn and instructive lesson as to the importance of a true understanding of the figures of language!

The whole figure, in a metaphor, lies, as we have said, in the verb substantive "IS"; and not in either of the two nouns; and it is a remarkable fact that, when a *pronoun* is used instead of one of the nouns (as it is here), and the two nouns are of different genders, the pronoun is always made to agree in gender with that noun to which the meaning is carried across, and not with the noun from which it is carried, and to which it properly belongs. This at once shows us that a figure is being employed; when a pronoun, which ought, according to the laws of language, to agree in gender with its own noun, is changed, and made to agree with the noun which, by *Metaphor*, represents it.

Here, for example, the pronoun, "this" (τοῦτό, *touto*), is *neuter*, and is thus made to agree with "body" (σῶμα, *soma*), which is *neuter*, and not with bread (ἄρτος, *artos*), which is masculine. [In violation of this law, a recent revision of the Marathi Prayer Book has deliberately changed the gender of the pronoun and made it to agree with the word for "bread"!]

This is always the case in *Metaphors*, and a few examples may be cited here, instead of in their natural order and place.

In Zech v. 8, "This is wickedness." Here, "this" (fem.) does not agree with "ephah" (to which it refers), which is *neuter* (LXX.), but with "wickedness," which is *feminine*.

In Zech v. 3, "This is the curse." "This" (fem.) agrees with "curse," which is *feminine*, and not with "flying roll," which is *neuter*, (to which it refers), (δρέπανον, *drepanon*, LXX.).

In Matt. xiii. 38, "The good seed are the children of the kingdom." Here, "these" (*masc.*) (οὗτοι, *houtoi*), [This pronoun is omitted in the English of the A.V. and R.V.] agrees with "children of the kingdom" (*masc.*), and not with seed (σπέρμα, *sperma*), which is *neuter*.

Luke viii. 14, "These are they which having heard," etc. Here, "these" (*masc.*) (οὗτοι, *houtoi*) agrees with the participle (οἱ ἀκούσαντες, *hoi akousantes*), "they which having heard," which is *masculine*, and not with the seed, (to which it refers), which is *neuter*.

All this establishes our statement that, in a *Metaphor*, the two nouns (or pronoun and noun) are always literal, and that the figure lies only in the *verb*. Another remarkable fact is that in the vast number of cases where the language is literal, and there is no metaphor at all; the verb is omitted altogether. [This rule does not apply to the Hebrew, of course, as we have said above: because it has no verb "to be."] Even when a *Metaphor* has been used, and the language passes suddenly from figurative to literal, the verb is at once dropped, by *Ellipsis*, as not being necessary for the literal sense, as it was for the previous figurative expression: e.g., in 1 Cor xii. 27, "Ye ARE the body of Christ." Here is a metaphor, and consequently the verb is used. But in verse 29, which is literal, the change is at once made, and the fact is marked by the omission of the verb, "[Are] all apostles? [are] all prophets? [are] all teachers? [are] all workers of miracles?"

Next compare other examples of *Metaphors* which are naturally used in the explanations of Parables. Note the Parables of the Sower, and of the Tares (Matt. xiii. 19-23, and 37-43).

"He that soweth the good seed is (i.e., represents) the Son of man."

"The field is (i.e., signifies) the world."  
 "The good seed are the children of the kingdom."  
 "But the tares are the children of the wicked one."  
 "The enemy that sowed them is the devil."  
 "The harvest is the end of the age."  
 "And the reapers are the angels."

In all these (as in every other *Metaphor*) the verb means, and might have been rendered, "*represents*," or "*signifies*."

The Apocalypse is full of metaphors, e.g.:

"The seven stars are (i.e., represent) the angels of the seven churches."  
 "And the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches" (i. 20).  
 The odours "are the prayers of the saints" (v. 8).  
 "They are the spirits of demons" (xvi. 14).  
 "The seven heads are (*i.e.*, represent) seven mountains (xvii. 9): etc., etc.

So in the very words that follow "this is (*i.e.*, represents or signifies) my body," we have an undoubted *Metaphor*. "He took the cup ... saying ... this is my blood." *Here*, thus, we have a *pair* of metaphors. In the former one, "this" refers to "bread," and it is claimed that "is" means *changed* into the "body" of Christ. In the latter, "this" refers to "the cup," but it is not claimed that the cup is changed into "blood." At least, we have never heard that such a claim has been put forward. The difference of treatment which the same figure meets with in these two verses is the proof that the former is wrong.

In 1 Cor xi. 25 we read "this cup is the new covenant." Will Romanist, in and out of the Church of England, tell us how this "cup" becomes transubstantiated into a "covenant"?

Is it not clear that the figure in the words, "This is my body," is *forced* into a literal statement with the set purpose and design of making it teach and support erroneous doctrine?

Other examples of *Metaphor* in this immediate connection are:

**1 Cor x. 16.** — "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not (*i.e.*, does it not represent) the communion of the blood of Christ," through which all blessing comes to us?

"The bread which we break, is it not (*i.e.*, does it not represent) the communion of the body of Christ?" *i.e.*, does it not signify the fellowship of all the members of Christ's mystical body, who, being many, are one body (1 Cor xii. 12)? "For we being many are one bread, and one body," as 1 Cor x. 17 declares.

It is because those who eat of that bread do not "discern" or discriminate that "one body" (*i.e.*, Christ mystical) that they are said to eat to their own condemnation; for they witness to the fact of that "great Mystery" and yet are ignorant of its truth! And hence they condemn themselves.

Further, the verb, εἰμι (*eimi*), *I am*, or the *infinitive* of it, *to be*, means *to be* in the sense of *signifying*, *amounting to*. And that this is one of its primary senses may be seen from the following passages, where it is actually translated "*to mean*," and not merely *to be*:—

"But go ye and learn what that is" (*i.e.*, *meaneth*, as in A.V.), Matt. ix. 13.  
 "But if ye had known what that is" (A.V., *meaneth*), Matt. xii. 7.  
 "He asked what these things were" (A.V., *meant*), Luke xv. 26.  
 "What is this?" (A.V., "What meaneth this?") Acts ii. 12.

## XII FORTY YEARS ON THE FIRING LINE

will preach better than I can ever preach and, in fact, he can do things now that I cannot do." Castleberry preached from notes and would have been totally lost without his outline. This was what Castleberry meant when he said I could do things that he could not do. I quoted Scripture and gave chapter and verse. This had launched me, and my work began in defending the truth and exposing error. If, therefore, my life has been given to religious controversy, it need be no matter of surprise to anyone who knows this story.

The matter that composes this present book will speak for itself, but it may be seen that I have engaged in controversy both oral and written through the whole years of my life. I am glad to be able to report that all my work has not been controversial. I have preached on practical lines, devotional and inspirational lines, and I have endeavored to build up the church and to cause the brethren to be just what the Lord wants his followers to be. I early realized that one could become a sectarian in contending against sectarianism. I have preached, therefore, against this tendency and endeavored to overcome any temptation to become a partisan in my own feeling and preaching. A good many of the fights that I have made have been with my own brethren on points where I believed them to be in the wrong. I think I was the first preacher to advocate the use of the individual communion cup and the first church in the State of Tennessee that adopted it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chattanooga, Tennessee, then meeting in the Masonic Temple. My next work was with the church at Columbia, Tennessee, and, after a long struggle, I got the individual communion service into that congregation. About this time, Brother G. Dallas Smith began to advocate the individual communion service and he introduced it at Fayetteville, Tennessee; then later at Murfreesboro. Of course, I was fought both privately and publicly and several brethren took me to task in the religious papers and called me digressive. Brother Smith came to my rescue and, in the year 1915, Brother David Lipscomb wrote a short paragraph in the Gospel Advocate saying that he had changed his view in reference to the communion cup and

## INTRODUCTION

### XIII

that he did not believe it was any digression or in any way a corruption of the service to use as many cups as might be demanded by the occasion. This brought that controversy to an end and, from then on, the churches began using the individual communion cup everywhere.

Churches for which I preached in the early day did not even have a church treasurer or a church treasury. They had no money with which to do anything, and when a preacher held a meeting, if he obtained anything, it was handed to him on the last night of the service by individuals—twenty-five cents, fifty cents and one dollar each. The whole amount did not ever run, in my experience, above twenty-five dollars; often times came under ten dollars. I began advocating that the brethren should meet every Lord's Day for worship and contribute of their means; that they should have a treasurer and that he should keep an account of the money and check it out on the authority only of the elders or of the congregation. Again I ran into opposition and again I was branded as digressive and again many religious writers found a theme that gave them an opportunity to indulge their desire for writing. But time went on and brethren saw that this was the sane and scriptural way of doing things and the idea gained favor and the controversy died.

In more recent years, I began advocating the "budget system," or that a church should have a financial program with the various items to which the church purposes to contribute listed and submitted to the church for approval, and that these items should be numerous enough to take all the funds that the congregation could contribute for the year. But again I started a controversy and the writers in various papers again had their inning. They took me to task; they branded me as digressive; and, in every way they could, tried to defeat this plan of work. But again people saw that this was a sane and scriptural way of doing things and, wherever it was tried, it was proved to be the most successful way that churches have ever tried, and again the controversy is dead. Most of the churches of the present day are using the budget system.

**J. G. Thomas' letter to E. H. Miller**

USED BY THOUSANDS OF CHURCHES IN ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD

**THOMAS COMMUNION SERVICE CO.**

ORIGINAL OF THE

**THOMAS  
INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION SERVICE**

BREAD AND COLLECTION PLATES, CUPS, BOWLS ETC.

**LIMA, OHIO, U.S.A.**

April 22, 1950

E. H. Miller,  
Dr. A. R. McMullen  
809 Butternut  
Abilene, Texas.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of April 17, 1950 has been received and we are pleased to inform you that the writers grandfather, John G. Thomas, who was both a physician and a minister invented the first individual communion outfits. The first patents were issued to him in 1894. The Market Street Presbyterian Church, of Lima, Ohio is believe to be the first church to use individual communion cups in a communion service. This also occurred in 1894. What is believed to be the original individual communion service used by this church is on display in the Allen County Historical Museum in Lima, Ohio.

Under separate cover we are making shipment today of an old style pewter common cup. You may have it with our compliments.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS COMMUNION SERVICE CO

## **APPENDIX A**

### **ANALYSIS OF KEY WORDS**

The following is an analysis of the figures of speech used in the Lord's supper passages:<sup>159</sup>

<b>Scripture</b>	<b>Key word or phrase</b>	<b>Literal or Figurative</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<u>Matthew 26:26-29</u> <i>26 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to the disciples and said, "Take, eat; this is My body."</i>	this is my body	metaphor <sup>160</sup>	bread represents body
<i>27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you."</i>	Cup gave it (cup) Drink from it (cup)	Literal Literal literal <sup>161</sup>	A description in literal language by Matthew without any spiritual or figurative meaning attached <sup>162</sup>
<i>28 "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."</i>	this <sup>163</sup> is My blood	metaphor <sup>164</sup>	fruit of the vine represents blood
<i>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."</i>			

<sup>159</sup> This analysis was primarily written by Raymond Fox, "An Analysis Of The Figures Of Speech Used In The Lord's Supper," unpublished research paper, Nd. Only slight revision has been made to his original work.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Thayer, op cit, p. 533; Arndt & Gingrich, op cit, p. 702.

<sup>162</sup> Jesus will indeed attach spiritual meaning to the cup and its contents, but no such meaning has been attached yet. At this point we are reading strictly narrative by Matthew. Spiritual significance will come in other verses and passages. The language in this verse is completely literal.

<sup>163</sup> "This" is a near demonstrative pronoun referring by indefinite pronoun reference to the fruit of the vine. Mt 9:28 provides an example of indefinite pronoun reference.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.



<b>Scripture</b>	<b>Key word or phrase</b>	<b>Literal or Figurative</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<u>Mark 14:22-25</u> <i>22 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them and said, "Take, eat; this is My body."</i>	this is my body	metaphor <sup>165</sup>	bread represents body
<i>23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.</i>	the cup gave it (cup) drank from it (cup)	Literal Literal literal <sup>166</sup>	A description in literal language by Mark without any spiritual or figurative meaning attached <sup>167</sup>
<i>24 And He said to them, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many."</i>	this <sup>168</sup> is my blood	metaphor <sup>169</sup>	fruit of the vine represents blood
<i>25 "Assuredly, I say to you, I will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."</i>			

<sup>165</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Thayer, op cit, p. 533; Arndt & Gingrich, op cit, p. 702.

<sup>167</sup> As in Matthew's account, spiritual meaning will be attached to the cup and its contents, but no such meaning has been attached yet. At this point we are reading strictly narrative my Mark. Spiritual significance will come in other verses and passages. The language in this verse is completely literal.

<sup>168</sup> "This" is a near demonstrative pronoun referring by indefinite pronoun reference to the fruit of the vine. Mt 9:28 provides an example of indefinite pronoun reference.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<b>Scripture</b>	<b>Key word or phrase</b>	<b>Literal or Figurative</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<u>Luke 22:17-20</u> <i>17 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves;</i>	took the cup Take this (cup) divide it (cup)	Literal Literal metonymy	divide contents
<i>18 "for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes."</i>			
<i>19 And He took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, "This is My body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me."</i>	This is My body	metaphor <sup>170</sup>	bread represents body
<i>20 Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which<sup>171</sup> is shed for you.</i>	the cup this cup is the new covenant	Literal metaphor <sup>172</sup>	cup represents new covenant

<sup>170</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<sup>171</sup> "Which" is a relative pronoun and agrees in gender with blood which is neuter (τὸ αἷμα). Thus, it is clearly the blood that is shed. For a comparison, see the Greek rendering of Hebrews 9:20 (τὸ αἷμα). Also, see Ellis Lindsey's research paper, *The Meaning of "Cup" in Lk 22:20b and 1 Cor 11:25b*. This research paper is posted on [www.WillOfTheLord.com](http://www.WillOfTheLord.com).

<sup>172</sup> As pointed out by Bullinger, a metaphor involves a comparison of two literal nouns. Just as literal bread is compared to Jesus' literal body, and literal grape juice is compared to His literal blood, so here a literal cup is compared to a literal new covenant. (See Bullinger, op cit, pp. 735-743.); Thayer comments, "1 Cor 11:25; Lk 22:20 ... in both which the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant' ..." op cit, p. 15.

<b>Scripture</b>	<b>Key word or phrase</b>	<b>Literal or Figurative</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<u>1 Cor 10:16-17</u> 16 <i>The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?</i>	The cup of blessing ... is it not the communion of the blood?  The bread ... is it not the communion of the body?	metaphor <sup>173</sup>  metaphor <sup>174</sup>	cup of blessing represents a communion of the blood  bread represents a communion of the body The entire verse is an erotesis <sup>175</sup>
17 <i>For we, though many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of that one bread.</i>	we ... are one bread and one body	metaphor <sup>176</sup>	we represent one bread and one body
<u>1 Cor 10:21</u> 21 <i>You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the Lord's table and of the table of demons.</i>	drink the cup	metonymy	drink the contents

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<sup>175</sup> An "erotesis" is an interrogation; asking a question without waiting for an answer.

<sup>176</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<b>Scripture</b>	<b>Key word or phrase</b>	<b>Literal or Figurative</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<u>1 Cor 11:23-28</u> <i>23 For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you: that the Lord Jesus on the same night in which He was betrayed took bread;</i>	bread	literal	
<i>24 and when He had given thanks, He broke it and said, "Take , eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me."</i>	this is my body	metaphor <sup>177</sup>	bread represents body
<i>25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."</i>	took the cup This cup is the new covenant drink it	Literal metaphor <sup>178</sup> metonymy	cup represents new covenant drink contents
<i>26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes.</i>	drink this cup	metonymy	drink contents
<i>27 Therefore whoever eats this bread or drinks this cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.</i>	drinks this cup	metonymy	drink contents
<i>28 But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.</i>	drink of the cup	literal	

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. Bullinger, op cit, p. 741; Thayer, op cit, p. 15.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISMS**

A syllogism is a deductive argument composed of three elements:

- a) A major premise
- b) A minor premise
- c) A conclusion

An example of a syllogism is:

- a) All mammals are warm-blooded.
- b) All dogs are mammals.
- c) Therefore, all dogs are warm-blooded.

In this example, the sentence, "All mammals are warm-blooded," is called the "major premise." The sentence, "All dogs are mammals," is called the "minor premise." Finally, the sentence, "Therefore, all dogs are warm-blooded," is called the "conclusion." If the major and minor premises are true, and the rules for syllogisms are correctly followed, then the conclusion will also be true.

Several basic rules must be observed when composing categorical syllogisms. These rules are as follows:<sup>179</sup>

**Rule 1:** A valid standard-form categorical syllogism must contain exactly three terms, each of which is used in the same sense throughout the argument.<sup>180</sup>

**Rule 2:** In a valid standard-form categorical syllogism, the middle term must be distributed<sup>181</sup> in at least one premise.<sup>182</sup>

**Rule 3:** In a valid standard-form categorical syllogism no term can be distributed in the conclusion which is not distributed in the premises.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> The first six rules are taken from Irving Copi's, *Introduction to Logic*, Macmillan, 1982, pp. 170-175.

<sup>180</sup> When one term is used in two different senses there are four elements in the syllogism rather than three.

<sup>181</sup> **distributed** – "To say that a term is distributed means that we have referred to all of the members of the class designated by that term. Thus, when we say 'All dogs are animals,' the term 'dogs' is distributed because we have referred to all. We have referred to each and every member of the class 'dogs.' In 'Some books are texts' we have referred to only part of the class of 'books,' and the term 'books' is undistributed." (Copi, op cit, pp. 171-172).

<sup>182</sup> The classic example of not distributing the middle term given by Copi is as follows: (a) All dogs are mammals, (b) All cats are mammals, (c) Therefore, all cats are dogs. The middle term "mammals" is not distributed in either premise.

<sup>183</sup> For example, consider the following syllogism given by Copi: (a) All dogs are mammals, (b) No cats are dogs, (c) Therefore no cats are mammals. The conclusion is making an assertion about all mammals when neither the major, nor minor premise made any remarks regarding all mammals. The word "all" was distributed in the conclusion, but not in either of the premises.

**Rule 4:** No standard-form categorical syllogism is valid which has two negative premises.

**Rule 5:** If either premise of a valid standard-form categorical syllogism is negative, the conclusion must be negative.

**Rule 6:** No valid standard-form categorical syllogism with a particular conclusion can have two universal premises.<sup>184</sup>

**Rule 7:** A negative conclusion cannot be drawn from two affirmative premises.<sup>185</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup> The example given by Copi is this: (a) All household pets are domestic animals, (b) no unicorns are domestic animals, (c) Therefore some unicorns are not household pets. The conclusion is making a particular statement based upon universal premises and the conclusion is therefore false.

<sup>185</sup> Lionel Ruby, Logic, An Introduction, Lippincott Co., 1958, p. 181.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **FINAL ARGUMENTS**

Brother Ervin Waters gave nineteen good reasons why congregations ought to use one cup in distributing the fruit of the vine during the communion. Those reasons are as fresh and pertinent today as when first given. I list them here for your consideration.<sup>186</sup>

- 1) Christ took "one cup." (Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25).
- 2) Christ gave only "one cup" to His disciples. (Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23).
- 3) He commanded His disciples to drink from "one cup." (Mt 26:27).
- 4) His disciples obeyed and drank from "one cup." (Mk 14:23).
- 5) He called the contents of "one cup" His blood. (Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24).
- 6) Paul delivered "one cup" for an assembly. (1 Cor 11:2,23,33,25,28).
- 7) Brethren can use but "one cup" and walk by the same rule.

#### **Philippians 3:16-17**

16 Nevertheless, to the degree that we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us be of the same mind.

17 Brethren, join in following my example, and note those who so walk, as you have us for a pattern.

That one rule by which Christians are to walk says nothing about a plurality of cups in the distribution of the fruit of the vine. To the contrary, every reference uses the word "cup" in the singular.

- 8) Brethren can use "one cup" and speak as the oracles of God.

#### **1 Peter 4:11**

11 If anyone speaks, let him speak as the oracles of God. ...

The oracles of God say "cup," but they say nothing whatsoever about the use of individual cups.

---

<sup>186</sup> Ervin Waters, Porter-Waters Debate, op cit, pp. 19-21.

- 9) "One cup" is a plant of God.

**Matthew 15:13**

13 But He answered and said, "Every plant which My heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted.

The heavenly Father in His word planted the use of "one cup" in the conveyance of the fruit of the vine to an assembly, but He has not therein planted the use of a plurality, and consequently we cannot jeopardize the salvation of our souls by using them.

- 10) The use of "one cup" in the distribution of the fruit of the vine is a good work.

**2 Timothy 3:16-17**

16 All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,

17 that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work.

The Scriptures furnish us the use of "one cup" in an assembly of disciples for the communion, but nowhere do they furnish us the use of a plurality.

- 11) The use of "one cup" is of faith.

**Romans 10:17**

17 So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

The word of God conveys to us the use of "one cup" in an assembly. Nowhere does it convey to us the use of a plurality.

- 12) "One cup" in such an assembly can be used and its users endeavor "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph 4:3).

- 13) Only the use of "one cup" in an assembly "pertains to life and godliness."

**2 Peter 1:3**

3 as His divine power has given to us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who called us by glory and virtue,

- 14) Brethren can use "one cup" and have unity because division is condemned (1 Cor 1:10), but the advocates of "cups" cannot find their use in the word of God.



- 15) Brethren can use "one cup" and be safe.
- 16) Brethren can use "one cup" and worship God in truth.

**John 4:23**

23 "But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father is seeking such to worship Him.

That truth "which came by Christ Jesus" (Jn 1:17), and which is God's word (Jn 17:17), teaches the use of "one cup" but says nothing about a plurality.

- 17) "One cup" is taught by the Spirit.

**John 16:13**

13 "However , when He, the Spirit of truth, has come, He will guide you into all truth; for He will not speak on His own authority, but whatever He hears He will speak; and He will tell you things to come.

**John 14:26**

26 "But the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all things that I said to you.

**Romans 8:14**

14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God.

But the Spirit of God through the word teaches us the use of "one." It nowhere teaches us the use of a plurality.

- 18) "One cup" for an assembly is found in the truth. (Jn 1:17; 16:23; 17:17).
- 19) "One cup" for an assembly is found in the counsel of God.

**Acts 20:27**

27 "For I have not shunned to declare to you the whole counsel of God.

## **WORKS CITED**

- Albert H. Morehead, Richard L. Frey, and Geoffery Mott-Smith, The New Complete Hoyle, Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1947.
- Alford, Henry, Alford's Greek New Testament, Baker Book House, 1980 reprint edition.
- American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition, 1996 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Electronic version licensed from INSO Corporation.
- American Standard Version (ASV), Star Bible and Tract Corp., 1901 edition. (Date of reprint not given.)
- Arndt, W. F. and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, University of Chicago Press, 1975 edition.
- Bailey, Allen and Tommy Thrasher, The Bailey-Thrasher Debate, published on audio and video tapes by Contending for the Faith Publications, 1993.
- Bailey, Alton B. and James D. Orten, Sanitation In Communion, An Informer Publication, 1983.
- Bales, James D., *"The New Covenant and the Bible,"* Firm Foundation, July 17, 1973.
- Barnes, Albert, Barnes' Notes on the New Testament, Kregal Publications, 1980 reprint, one volume edition.
- Boren, Maxie B., *"Reflections on 'Making Issues' Over Matters of Inconsequence,"* an unpublished sermon preached to the Westhill Church of Christ in Corsicana, TX in 1983.
- Brewer, E. Cobham, Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, Harper & Row, Publishers, Revised by Ivor H. Evans, 1970 edition.
- Brewer, G. C., Forty Years on the Firing Line, Old Paths Book Club, 1948.
- Bullinger, E. W., Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, Baker Book House, 1981 edition.
- Campbell, Alexander, Christianity Restored.
- Cogdill, Roy E. and Guy N. Woods, Woods-Cogdill Debate, published by The Cogdill Foundation, 1976.
- Cogdill, Roy E., Walking By Faith, Cogdill Foundation Pub., 1976.
- Colliers Encyclopedia, Colliers Encyclopedia, (New York: P. F. Collier), 1988 edition.
- Copi, Irving, Introduction to Logic, Macmillan, 1982.
- English Standard Version (ESV), Crossway Bibles, A Division of Good News Publishers, (Wheaton, IL), 2002.
- Fox, Raymond, "An Analysis Of The Figures Of Speech Used In The Lord's Supper," unpublished research paper, Nd.
- Franklin, Benjamin, The Gospel Preacher, Gospel Light Publishing Co., Nd, Vol. 2.

Frost, Gene, *"Elements of the Lord's Supper," Gospel Anchor*, January 1983.

Fudge, Benjamin Lee, *The "One-Cup" Doctrine*, C. E. I. Publishing Co., Nd.

Greenfield, William, *The Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, Regency Reference Library, 1970.

Hardeman, N. B. and Ira Boswell, *Boswell-Hardeman Discussion on Instrumental Music in the Worship*, Guardian of Truth Foundation Pub., 1981 reprint edition.

Hastings, James, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Hendrickson Publishers, 1988 reprint edition.

Highers, Alan E. and Given O. Blakely, *The Highers-Blakely Debate on Instrumental Music*, Valid Publications, Inc., 1988.

Hogland, George A., "The Cup Of The Lord" Is It The Fruit Of The Vine Only?, published by the author, 1982.

Hogland, George A., *Did Jesus Use Individual Cups?*, published by the author, Nd.

Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, *A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical on the Old and New Testaments*, Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976 reprint edition.

Knowles, Victor, *The One Cup Faith*, Vanguard Books, 1976.

Lindsey, Ellis and George Dickson, *Lindsey-Dickson Debate*, published by Ellis Lindsey, 1975.

Lindsey, Ellis, *The Meaning of "Cup" in Lk 22:20 and 1 Cor 11:25*, unpublished research paper, 1970.

Martyr, Justin, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson editors, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, Vol. 1, 1973 reprint edition.

McGarvey, J. W., "Microbes," *Christian Standard*, March 31, 1900.

Moffitt, Jerry and Malcomb Kniffen, *"The Kniffen-Moffitt Debate on One Cup," Thrust*, published by the Southwest Church of Christ, Austin, TX, Jerry Moffitt ed., Vol. IV, Issue I, Nd.

Moore, Elmer, *"The Impact of Opposition to Cups and Classes," Guardian of Truth*, January 2, 1986.

New American Standard Version (NASV), Thomas Nelson Publishers (Nashville, TN), 1977.

New International Version (NIV), Zondervan Bible Publishers (Grand Rapids, MI), 1978.

New King James Version (NKJV), Thomas Nelson Publishers (Nashville, TN), 1988.

Newberry, Alfred, *The Divine Pattern Advocate*, published by the author, 1987.

Odom, Leon, *What is the Cup of the Lord*, McDonald's Books & Bibles, Nd.

*Oxford English Dictionary*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2nd Edition, 1989, Vol. VI.

Phillips, J. D., *The Cup of the Lord*, published by Ronny Wade, 1976.

Porter, W. Curtis and Ervin Waters, *Porter-Waters Debate*, Lambert Book House, 1952.

Quirk, Randolph, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman Inc., 1985.

*Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, Second edition, Unabridged, Random House, 1987.

- Roberts, Paul, Understanding Grammar, Harper, 1954.
- Ruby, Lionel, Logic, An introduction, Lippincott Co., 1958.
- Smith, J. T., "*Using Great Plainness of Speech*," Guardian of Truth, Nov. 1982.
- Thayer, Joseph H., Thayer's Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament, Zondervan, 1974 edition.
- Thomas, John G., U.S. Patent No. 516,065 for the Individual Communion Set, March 6, 1894; via Newberry, Alfred, The Divine Pattern Advocate, published by the author, 1987, p. 21.
- Turner, Nigel, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. 3: Syntax, T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Wade, Ronny and Elmer Moore, "The Wade-Moore Debate," *Old Paths Advocate*, March – August, 1987
- Wade, Ronny, Old Paths Pulpit No. 2, M. Lynwood Smith Publications, 1978.
- Warren, Thomas B., When Is An Example Binding?, National Christian Press, 1975.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, G. & C. Merriam Co., 1979 edition.
- Williams, William, Composition and Rhetoric by Practice, (Boston & New York: D. C. Heath & Co.), 1923.

