



the
WADE-KNOWLES
Discussion

THE NUMBER OF DRINKING VESSELS TO BE USED IN THE LORD'S SUPPER

WADE – KNOWLES

DISCUSSION

The Number of Drinking Vessels to be Used in the
Lord's Supper

INTRODUCTION

When I first began my preaching career in the early 1900's, the practice of individual cups in the communion among congregations of the churches of Christ was not accepted. It was not until about 1915 after their introduction by Bro. G. C. Brewer that some of the larger congregations began using them. According to his own writings, this was accomplished only after a long hard struggle and after much contention. Even N. L. Clark, one of their most able debaters, states in the Clark-King Discussion, page 12 – “Individual cups in most cases I consider a fad – not a suitable expedient.” This “fad” has divided many congregations and caused untold heartache among brethren in Christ.

In the publishing of this discussion, we would urge the reader to study the arguments in the light of God's Word with the knowledge that this only will stand in the day of judgment. Compare each argument with the Bible and let that be the deciding factor. Both these men we believe to be Christian men and able writers. Bro. Wade needs no introduction to most as he has earnestly contended for the faith in numerous discussions across the country. Truth has not suffered in his capable hands. Arguments he sets forth are based on Scripture and just as they have not been met in past discussions, so even yet they stand strong and beautiful. How bright and shining is truth! We send this forth with a plea to unite on a “thus saith the Lord,” using His Word as our standard in faith and practice.

Homer L. King

2nd Edition (2020): Contains all original content with editing to formatting and cover design.

Reprinted by Five Minute Bible Study Publications. Copyright 1980 by Ronny Wade.

All scriptural references and quotations are taken from the *New King James Version* unless otherwise indicated.

PROPOSITIONS

1. The Scriptures teach that a congregation of the Church of Christ for the communion must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

Affirm: Ronny F. Wade

Deny: Victor Knowles

2. The Scriptures teach that a congregation of the Church of Christ for the communion may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

Affirm: Victor Knowles

Deny: Ronny F. Wade

PREFACE

The following discussion came about as the result of a book *The One Cup Faith* written by Victor Knowles and published by Vanguard Publications. At the conclusion of a series of articles that I wrote reviewing the book, I invited Brother Knowles to discuss these issues in a written exchange to be originally published in the *Old Paths Advocate*. Agreement was reached, and publication began with the January 1978 issue of the paper. The discussion concluded in June 1978. The original articles are here reproduced in their entirety in hope that the serious student may learn the truth on the important subject.

A word of thanks is in order to Homer L. King, publisher of the *Old Paths Advocate*, 1061 N. Pilgrim, Stockton, Ca., for permitting the original articles to appear in that journal. The *Old Paths Advocate* is \$4.00 per year and may be ordered from Brother King at the above address. It is our prayer that this publication will fill a need and will carry the blessing of God as it goes forth to be read and studied by those who are striving to serve the Master.

Ronny F. Wade
June 20, 1978

PROPOSITION NO. 1

The Scriptures teach that a congregation of the Church of Christ for the communion must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

Affirm: Ronny F. Wade

Deny: Victor Knowles

WADE'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Knowles and respected readers:

I am happy for the opportunity to present what I believe to be the truth via the means of this written discussion. While we regret that differences exist, it is good for brethren in the spirit of Christ, to discuss those differences. The proposition reads: the scriptures teach that a congregation of the church of Christ for the communion must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine. By scriptures, I mean the Word of God; by teach, that the scriptures convey the idea or meaning; by a congregation of the church of Christ, I mean a local group of Christians convened for worship; by must use one cup, we mean just that, they must use one drinking vessel to distribute the fruit of the vine when observing the Lord's Supper. I shall now offer several arguments in support of the above proposition.

WHAT IS THE CUP OF THE LORD?

In 1 Cor. 10:21 Paul declares, "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons." Also in 1 Cor. 11: 27 he says, "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." The cup of the Lord is not an empty cup or drinking vessel. Nor is the cup of the Lord the fruit of the vine. Nowhere does the Bible say, "This cup is my blood," or, "This cup is the fruit of the vine." What then is the cup of the Lord? The Bible tells us in 1 Cor. 10:16, Mt. 26:27, 1 Cor. 11:27 that it is a cup containing the fruit of the vine set apart by prayer and thanksgiving. Thus, it is neither by itself (not an empty cup—not just grape juice). When, however,

grape juice is placed in a drinking cup and thanks is offered, we may refer to it, as Paul did, by calling it the cup of the Lord.

This entire discussion would be unnecessary had the Bible said, “He took the fruit of the vine,” and nothing more. Or had inspiration recorded, “He took the cups,” then our exchange would be useless. However, what the Bible could have said, it did not. The very language necessary to prove cups is purposefully avoided by our Lord and Paul.

What the Bible does say is: HE TOOK THE CUP Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23. What is the meaning of the word cup? The scholars say: a drinking vessel – Young; a drinking cup – Berry; a wine cup – Abbot-Smith; a drinking vessel, a cup – Robinson; a cup to drink out of, a drinking cup – Parkhurst.

Since Jesus took a cup, a drinking vessel, the following syllogisms will be helpful:

1. The cup as used in Mt. 26:27 was the name of the vessel which contained the fruit of the vine. The vessel which contained the fruit of the vine, is not the fruit of the vine.
Therefore: The cup as used in Mt. 26:27 was not the fruit of the vine.
2. The word cup as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a drinking vessel which he “took.” The name of the drinking vessel which he took is the name of a solid.
Therefore: the word cup as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

These show conclusively that Christ took a literal cup, and that the word cup means a drinking vessel and not the fruit of the vine in Mt. 26:27.

ONE CUP PROVED BY COMMAND

Jesus commanded the disciples to drink of one cup. “And he took *the cup*, and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, ‘Drink from it, all of you,’” Mt. 26:27. In other words all of you drink of or “out of” or “from” it. That was the command of Jesus. The disciples understood the command and Mark tells us, “They all drank from it,” Mk. 14:23. The disciples in an assembly of the church should do the same thing.

Paul commands us to keep the ordinances as he delivered them. “Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions just as I delivered them to you,” 1 Cor. 11:2. “For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you;...in the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in My blood,’” 1 Cor. 11:23, 25. If we keep the communion as it was delivered by Paul we will use one cup because we can’t learn any other way from this example. Paul also commands an assembly to “drink of that cup.” He says, “When you come together to eat,” 1 Cor. 11:33, and commands, “But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup,” 1 Cor. 11:28. In order to obey the commands of Paul, a congregation must use one cup. My proposition stands proved by New Testament command.

ONE CUP PROVED BY EXAMPLE

Example— “A thing or person suitable to be used as a model; an instance of something to be avoided; an act especially a punishment, serving or designed to serve as a warning. A sample; specimen, an instance serving to illustrate a rule. A problem to be solved. That with which something may be compared, precedent: parallel,” (*Funk and Wagnalls Std. Dict.*). When we talk about

example, we are not talking about a mere happenstance or incident, but rather a model, illustrating a rule.

Christ used one cup. “Then He took *the cup*, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, ‘Drink from it, all of you,’” Mt. 26:27. “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.

The disciples used one cup. “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. The disciples all drank of the cup which Jesus took and handed them. We cannot use more than one cup and follow the example of Jesus.

PARRALLEL

Notice the following parallel: Acts 20:7, “Now on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread.” Mt. 26:27, “Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them.” Are we bound by one and free to break the other? Is it more important to observe the communion *when* than *how* they did? If inspiration demands that we observe the Lord’s Supper on the first day of the week because early disciples did, then by the same reasoning, we would be bound to the use of one cup. If not, why not? My proposition stands proved by New Testament example.

ONE CUP PROVED BY NECESSARY INFERENCE

In 1 Cor. 11:26 we note, “For as often as you...*drink this cup*,” and v. 27, “Whosoever...*drink(s) this cup of the Lord*.” We all know that it would be impossible to consume a literal drinking cup. Thus, when Paul says “*drink this cup*” he uses a common figure, metonymy, naming the vessel “*cup*” but suggesting or referring to the contents, fruit of the vine. Thus, the phrase “drink this cup” means to drink the contents. Paul’s usage of metonymy has

reference to the same thing Jesus took. Since He took a single cup (Mt.26:27), the metonymy used by Paul refers to the contents of only one cup. Thus, even in the metonymy of 1 Cor. 11:26-27, one cup is necessarily inferred.

We believe sufficient evidence has been presented in this first affirmative to abundantly prove our proposition. It now becomes the obligation of Bro. Knowles to find our reasoning faulty or our arguments erroneous. In order to pin-point our differences we submit the following questions for his consideration.

QUESTIONS FOR KNOWLES

1. May a congregation use one cup (drinking vessel) in the Lord's supper and be scriptural?
2. In what way, if any, does the universal church worship?
 - a. Only through means of local congregation?
 - b. Through some function of the universal church itself?
3. Please explain what the cup of demons is in 1 Cor. 10:21?

KNOWLES' FIRST NEGATIVE

I appreciate the opportunity to exchange views with a staff editor of *Old Paths Advocate* on a subject that has divided brethren from each other for years. The regrets that Ronny Wade has concerning our differences is shared by myself and should be by all true Christians. While this generation did not create the division, it ought to try to resolve it. Inherited situations are sad, but attempts should be made to conquer them. Often overlooked, however, is the fact that in many things we *do* agree. It is unfortunate that our differences have been magnified to the point that our agreements are rarely recognized. That is certainly not the work of the Holy Spirit, is it?

My friend states that he is presenting what he believes to be the truth on this subject. That, of course, will be my purpose as well. And since the majority of readers of this publication believe in the one cup practice, may I kindly ask that you “hear me out?” Please know that Mr. Wade and I are on friendly terms, and that we both signed an agreement to “conduct ourselves as Christian gentlemen” throughout this written exchange (*Propositions for Written Debate*, Agreement 4). The policy of this publication (as announced in the very first issue in 1932 and reprinted in the January 1977 issue) calls for each writer, “To manifest the spirit of Christ in dealing with all issues and controversies, thus avoiding personal thrusts and abusive language.” May I urge that all readers manifest the same spirit. I will endeavor to “speak the truth in love” (Eph. 4:15) and hope that you will be “swift to hear” (James 1:19) even though what you will be hearing will be somewhat different than what you presently believe. Jesus said that by our words we will be justified or condemned (Matt. 12:37), and so I want to be very careful of every word written in this series. I desire

heaven and fear hell too much to write anything but what I feel to be truth on this subject.

Wade's proposition and definition of terms are understood by me but certainly not agreed with. A key word that produces this disagreement is the word *must*. I am very comfortable with the proposition I was given to defend which states that a congregation may use individual cups, but I, personally, would be afraid to contend, yea, command that a church *must* use only one cup. "Must" is an unequivocal word. In Scripture there are places where it is used appropriately. For example, "You must be born again," (John 3:7). There is no getting around that verse, and we all believe it, don't we? Another example is 1 Tim. 3:2 which, in part, reads, "A bishop then must be blameless..." We would all agree that before men are ordained as elders, they must meet God's qualifications. But, to demand that a congregation must use one cup, I simply cannot do. Why? Because God has not made such an arbitrary ruling anywhere in His divine Word. That *men* have created and imposed such a ruling cannot be questioned. We are not, however, to heed the commandments of men that are taught as doctrine (Matt. 15:9). Nor are we to slavishly follow the opinions and conjectures of men. Wade says, "The very language necessary to prove cups is *purposefully avoided* by our Lord and Paul," (*Emphasis mine.* -V.K.). That Jesus and Paul "purposefully avoided" mentioning cups is only speculation at best. Where is Scriptural proof of such purposeful avoidance?

Why not let Scripture interpret itself? Commenting on the phrase, "Drink from it, all of you," in Matt. 26:27, Wade adds this: "*In other words* all of you drink of or 'out of' or 'from' it. *That was the command of Jesus,*" (*Emphasis mine.* -V.K.). Why the need for "other words?" Was the command of Jesus that the disciples exercise great care to all drink out of the same vessel, or

was it to be sure that they drank the fruit of the vine fully aware of what it represented? Let Jesus interpret His own words. In verse 28 He said, “For this is My blood of *the new covenant*, which is *shed* for many for the remission of sin,” (Emphasis mine. -V.K.). The “this” of verse 28 points back to the “it” of verse 27 which, in turn, points back to the “cup” in the same verse. The cup of verse 27 is identified for us by the Lord Himself in verse 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,” (Emphasis mine. -V.K.). Jesus told His disciples to drink of *the same thing* that He drank of – the fruit of the vine. Yet Wade contends that, “This entire discussion would be unnecessary had the Bible said, ‘He took the fruit of the vine,’ and nothing more.” But can you not see that the fruit of the vine *is* what was taken and given to the disciples? The fruit of the vine represents the blood which was shed for the remission of our sins, and it is the drinking of it (with that sobering knowledge in mind) that creates spiritual value and impact in the observance of the Lord’s Supper.

Citing Acts 20:7 and Matt. 26:27, Wade then asks, “Is it more important to observe the communion *when* they did than *how* they did?” (Emphasis his). *When* they observed it certainly merits our attention; that is why we observe the Lord’s Supper on Sunday. Left out of Wade’s question is the matter of *why* they observed it. They did in remembrance of Jesus shedding His precious blood for the remission of our ugly sins, and it is the fruit of the vine that we partake of that represents that redeeming blood. *How* they did it cannot be overlooked, although there are several aspects of form that Wade chooses not to follow (reclining around the table, meeting at night in an upper room, etc.). Yet Wade says that an example is not “a mere happenstance or

incident, but rather a model, illustrating a rule.” As will be discussed in the forthcoming affirmatives, the disciples were not restricted to all drinking from the same vessel.

ANSWERING WADE’S QUESTIONS

(1) A congregation may use one vessel, if that is their shared conviction, and be “scriptural.” Even though I feel that individual vessels were present and in use at the Last Supper, I would not hold it against a group that chose to partake in such a manner. It falls into the realm of expediency and that is why other brethren should not be disfellowshipped by one cup churches. Making a law of “must” where God has not spoken is sinful rather than Scriptural.

(2) I don’t know if I fully understand this question or not. The worship of the Lord’s church throughout the world consists of the same elements (Acts 2:42) although the expressions of worship may vary from country to country depending upon cultural differences or preferences.

(3) Though commentators are not agreed upon this verse, the general consensus is that the cup of devils was a festal cup poured out in a libation to Gentile idols. McGarvey refers us to Aeneid on this, and it reads, in part, “...hold out goblets in your right hand: and invoke our common God...” (Aeneid, Virgil, Book VIII, Lines 268-280).

QUESTIONS FOR WADE

1. Is a congregation that drinks the fruit of the vine which is contained in individual cups drinking the fruit of the vine?
2. Can a Christian of a one cup congregation remain a Christian who drinks from the common cup but does not share your views that every church must do it that way?

3. If an example is a “model”, then why do you not follow all of the features present in the institution of the Lord’s Supper?

WADE'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I am happy to submit the second affirmative article of this discussion. The negative's objections to my first may be summed up as follows:

1. The Bible does not say we "must" use one cup, therefore if we say that, we are making a law where God has made none.
2. The fact that *cups* are not mentioned doesn't necessarily mean inspired writers *purposefully avoided* such language.
3. The cup is the fruit of the vine and not a container.
4. Reclining around the table and eating in an upper room are as much a part of the pattern as anything else.

I would like to notice these objections one by one, and show they are not valid and that in reality, the arguments of my first affirmative were not answered.

1. Does the Bible teach we must use one cup? My proposition reads: The Scriptures teach that a congregation of the church of Christ for the communion must use one cup (drinking vessel) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine. For proof of this, note the following:

- a. *Christ commanded the disciples to drink of one cup.* "Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink from it, all of you,'" Mt. 26:27. The disciples understood the *command* and, "They all drank from it," Mk. 14:23. Did the disciples have to obey Jesus? Were they free to do something else? Observe further.
- b. *Paul commands us to keep the communion as he delivered it.* "Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions *just as I delivered them to you,*" 1 Cor. 11:2.

“For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you;...in the same manner He also *took the cup* after supper, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in My blood,’” 1 Cor. 11:23-25. *Must we keep the ordinances as delivered, or may we change them?*

c. *Paul commands an assembly to, “Drink of the cup.”* Note carefully that he delivers instructions applying “when you come together to eat,” 1 Cor. 11:33. *He commands, “But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup,”* 1 Cor. 11:28. Note: *An assembly of the church which has “come together to eat” v. 33 should “drink of that cup” v. 28.* That is exactly what my proposition affirms. It must be done. If not, we are at liberty to overlook and violate Paul’s instructions to the Corinthian church.

2. The second quibble by our respondent is that even though cups are not mentioned, this doesn’t necessarily mean Bible writers purposefully avoided them. Why not? The Bible specifies *cup* not *cups*. Jesus could have as easily said “drink the cups” or if the fruit of the vine is meant and nothing more, then why is cup used at all? But note this: according to Knowles reasoning, Jesus and Paul really didn’t *purposefully avoid sprinkling* even though they used the word baptism. The same reasoning that gets *cups* out of *cup* will get *sprinkling* out of *baptism*. He asks, “Where is scriptural proof of such purposeful avoidance?” My answer: *cup is specified* Mt. 26:27, Mk. 14:23, *cups are not*; therefore, God’s silence rules against them. In reality, Knowles places more importance on what the Bible does not say than on what it says.

3. His third objection is that the “cup” is the fruit of the vine. In fact, he says the ‘cup’ of Mt. 26:27 is identified by the Lord in v.29 as the fruit of the vine. However, on p. 39 of his book *The One Cup Faith* he says, “I do not doubt at all that the Lord took a

cup, a drinking vessel. Nor do I doubt its material literalness.” Is this man trying to tell us that Jesus took a literal cup Mt. 26:27 and called that literal cup the fruit of the vine in v. 29? Surely not! The fruit of the vine was in the cup that Jesus took – it was not the cup.

4. Finally, our brother offers the upper room, reclining at the table, etc. as proof that we do not follow the Bible in every aspect, thus implying we may use cups. Knowles’ speech betrays him. It is apparent he doesn’t know the difference between an example and an incident. One (example) is a pattern, the other (incident) happens beside the main design. The upper room illustrates nothing. It is not an example for us to follow. I know that because Jesus loosed the place in Jn. 4. The question is where did Jesus or anyone else loose the cup?

Unless I have overlooked something, this covers the gentleman’s article. I should now like to point out some of the things that were completely overlooked by the negative.

1. He did not challenge or disprove that the cup of the Lord is a drinking vessel containing the fruit of the vine sanctified by prayer and thanksgiving. Although he implies the cup is the fruit of the vine, in answer to my question, “What is the cup of demons?”, he answers, “A festal cup poured out in a libation to Gentile idols.” If he can see that the cup of demons was a cup with something in it that was poured out, why can’t he see that the cup of the Lord is a cup containing the fruit of the vine, a glaring inconsistency.

2. He completely ignored my two syllogisms on Mt. 26:27.

3. He did not challenge or deny the definitions of the scholars on cup.

4. He said not one word regarding my argument on necessary inference in 1 Cor. 11. It is abundantly clear that the negative has failed to disprove the truthfulness of the proposition.

ASSERTIONS OF THE NEGATIVE

1. The cup is the fruit of the vine – no proof.
2. The disciples were not restricted to all drinking from the same vessel. Again, no proof, no scripture.
3. Individual cups were used in the last supper. Again, no proof, no scripture.

ADMISSIONS OF THE NEGATIVE

1. A congregation may use one cup and be scriptural.
2. It does make a difference how we observe the Lord's Supper.
3. The use of cups falls into the realm of expediency, yet for a thing to be expedient, it must first be lawful. Something our brother has not and cannot prove.

ANSWERING KNOWLES' QUESTIONS

1. Yes, but in an unscriptural manner.
2. Yes, so long as he neither teaches or practices error in the matter.
3. Because everything that happened surrounding the institution of the Supper is not an example. Only those things serving to illustrate a rule, as I pointed out in my first affirmative.

QUESTIONS FOR KNOWLES

I think you misunderstood my second question. I wanted to know if the Lord's Church (universally- in some form of action) could observe the Lord's Supper, or if this was only done in local churches?

1. Do you believe we must use unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper?

2. Would it be scriptural to use Coca-Cola as the drink element? If not, Why?
3. If “the cup” is the fruit of the vine, what figure of speech is this?

A FINAL ARGUMENT

WHAT DID JESUS DO? He *took* the *cup*. *Took*— “To take with the hand,” *Thayer*, p. 870. *Cup* — “A drinking vessel, a cup,” *Thayer*, p. 533. He *Gave* the *Cup*. *Gave* — “Reach out, extend, present,” *Thayer*, p. 145. Thus, Jesus took with the hand the cup, drinking vessel, and reached out the hand, extended, presented the cup to the disciples, with the command, “Drink from it, all of you.” They understood and according to Mark, “They all drank from it.” We submit that this is what happened in Mt. 26 and Mk. 14. If not, let our respondent show otherwise.

KNOWLES' SECOND NEGATIVE

As we conclude the second exchange of articles, let us remember the words of the apostle Paul: "Let no corrupt word proceed out of your mouth, but what is good for necessary edification, that it may impart grace to the hearers.; Let all bitterness, wrath, anger, clamor, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice. And be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God in Christ forgave you," (Eph. 4:29, 31-32).

Mr. Ronny Wade continues to affirm that a congregation must use only one drinking vessel in the observance of the Lord's Supper. For proof he offers Matthew 26:27 saying that, "Christ commanded the disciples to drink of one cup." If Jesus had demanded that each disciple be very sure that they all drink out of the same cup, then we should have no disagreement. However, one of the cardinal rules of Bible study is to ask, "What was the purpose of the author?" Was Matthew's reporting of this incident designed to produce a doctrine of all disciples drinking out of the same cup? Was Jesus' purpose to set up a pattern whereby Christians would be restricted to drinking from the same container whenever they assembled together for the Lord's Supper? Or was the Lord telling His disciples to *drink* the fruit of the vine *with the knowledge in mind* that it represented His precious blood which was soon to be shed for the remission of sins? When Paul writes about the events of the night that the Lord was betrayed, he does not leave us in the dark concerning the *purpose* of the Lord's Supper. He wrote, "For he who eats and drinks in an unworthy manner eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body," (1 Cor. 11:29). The command is to *drink* the fruit of the vine, doing it *in*

remembrance of Jesus (1 Cor. 11:25). The purpose is important; the procedure is left to our discretion.

To place inordinate emphasis on the *method* of drinking (all using one cup) is to relegate to second place the meaning of the Supper. Do I hear a voice of protest from those who practice the one cup form? Then I would refer you to the writings of your own leaders J. Ervin Waters, for many years a leader and debater for the one cup cause, devoted 28 pages to the container and only nine paragraphs to the contents in his book *The Communion*, a work designed to, “Set forth the Scriptural design and observance of the communion.” Saying that Mr. Waters is no longer a “faithful” Christian in the one cup movement will not alter these facts. The one cup doctrine was greatly aided by his book and arguments it advanced in favor of the one cup form. Look at writings of Mr. Ronny Wade in his book *This Do in Remembrance of Me*, a work intended to be, “A treatise on the Lord’s Supper, setting forth its Scriptural design and purpose.” Wade spends eight pages on the container and six paragraphs on the contents (some of which, like Waters, concerns whether or not it may be wine or grape juice).

My respondent wonders whether we “*must* keep the ordinances as delivered, or may we change them?” (Emphasis his, V.K.). Of course we are to keep the ordinances. The ordinance of the Lord’s Supper has a very spiritual significance, and so we eat and drink in memory of Jesus (Luke 22:19), discerning His precious body (1 Cor. 11:29). The use of one cup or many, a bread plate or none, in no way detracts from the spiritual significance of the Supper. Mr. Wade and other one cup proponents evidently do believe that ordinances may be changed for the presence of a bread plate in their own communion service bespeaks it. Paul commands Christians to, “Greet one another with a holy kiss,” in Romans 16:16 and 1 Corinthians 16:20. The altered handshake is evidence

of more change. Wade contends that if a congregation does not insist on the “must” in using one cup then, “We are at liberty to overlook and violate Paul’s instructions to the Corinthian church.” I wonder if that applies to the aforementioned 1 Corinthians 16:20 as well?

Mr. Wade continues to contend that the Lord and the Bible writers avoided the mention of “cups.” He says, “The Bible specifies *cup* not *cups*,” (emphasis his, V.K.). In view of the spiritual significance of the passages in dispute, was cup being specified or was drinking the fruit of the vine in a discerning manner being specified? When words can be put under the microscope of legalism and thus be interpreted (to the obvious oversight of the real or intended meaning), Bible study becomes a farce. Jesus once said, “My food is to do the will of Him who sent Me, and to finish His work,” (John 4:34). One could do with this verse what the one cup advocates have done with the cup passages and that is mutilate it’s real meaning. “Broma” is the Greek word for “meat” in John 4:34 and it means “food, solid food in contrast to milk” (*Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, Vol. 3, p. 52, W.E. Vine). That is the technical meaning of the word, but we all know that its intended meaning would be along the lines of “desire.” Jesus’ desire was to do the Father’s will, etc.

Is it not somewhat inconsistent to say that “God’s silence rules against” cups, and yet use the silence of the Scriptures to approve of a bread plate? Is it not somewhat inconsistent to say that the Bible specifies a cup and yet something that is not specified – a bread plate?

The argument of getting “sprinkling” out of baptism does not hold water. Wade believes that this writer is trying to get “cups out of cup.” Not so. That can be gotten from an understanding of the Passover context. What I have gotten out of the word and what

I am trying to get across in this exchange is the real meaning of the word.

It seems quite difficult for Mr. Wade to believe that Jesus took a cup and called it the fruit of the vine. Yet that is what Matthew tells us in his 26th chapter. Jesus took the cup and gave it to His disciples (v. 27). He told them to drink it (v. 27). He told them what it represented (v. 28). He told them He would not drink of it again until a certain day in the future (v. 29). Is that so difficult to understand?

Wade wonders if I know the difference between an example and an incident. Let's call it precedent and incident. In baptism the precedent is immersion in water for the forgiveness of sins. The incident would be whether or not the candidate was immersed forward or backward (remember the Campbell's humorous experience?). The precedent in the Lord's Supper was partaking of it in a worthy manner. The incident would be whether we use one cup or many, a bread plate or not, passing it from front to back or vice versa, etc.

"Where did Jesus or anyone loose 'cup'?" wonders my respondent. The answer is simple. It was never bound. Jesus' identification of "cup" (Matt. 26:27-29) proves that. My respondent also pointed out some things I "completely overlooked." Surely he knows that it is humanly impossible to re-quote and respond to everything in an article. His six-month "review" of my book in this journal is proof of that. Dozens of points were completely overlooked.

Wade admits that those who drink from individual cups are drinking what Jesus asked us to but adds, "but in an unscriptural manner." To be "scriptural" then I assume we must be sure that the lips of every saint have been pressed to the rim of the same vessel? Wade admits that one could still be called a Christian who

drinks from one cup but really doesn't believe it is a "must." But, Wade adds, he cannot teach or practice error in the matter. You mean he isn't practicing error? And where is the Scripture that bars a man who drinks from one cup but doesn't believe it is a "must" from teaching? Surely this is a commandment of man that is not to be given heed to (Titus 1:14). Does this mean a man who has submitted to baptism but doesn't really believe it is necessary could still be considered a Christian as long as he doesn't get up and teach?

ANSWERING WADE'S QUESTIONS

1. The Bible does not say we "must"; since that is what was evidently used, we use it.
2. It would not be "scriptural" to use Coca-Cola because what was used was the fruit of the vine.
3. Metaphor.

QUESTIONS FOR WADE

1. If an example "illustrates a rule," as you stated, then why do you not follow John 13:1-17 where a certain act of Jesus, just prior to the Supper, seemed to illustrate a rule?
2. If we are to use only those things specified, where is your authority for the bread plate?
3. If more than one cup can be used because of unfortunate circumstances (dropped cup) why cannot more than one be used because of fortunate circumstances (large crowd)?

WADE'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

I am thankful for the opportunity to submit the final affirmative of this proposition. By reading my first two articles you will be able to clearly see the negative has utterly failed in his obligation to examine the arguments I have set forth. A number of them he hasn't even noticed, much less answered. Our brother tries to excuse himself by saying it is impossible to "re-quote and respond to everything in an article." Bro. Knowles, I know that. I also know that it is possible to notice and deal with a man's arguments. You have written several pages thus far, much of which is irrelevant, while completely ignoring the thrust of my affirmation. The readers can see this.

In my last installment I pointed out your failure to deal with these two syllogisms on Mt. 26:27.

1. The cup as used in Mt. 26:27 was the name of a vessel which contained the fruit of the vine. The vessel which contained the fruit of the vine, is not the fruit of the vine. Therefore: the cup as used in Mt. 26:27 was not the fruit of the vine.
2. The word cup as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a drinking vessel which he took. The name of the drinking vessel which he took is the name of a solid. Therefore: the word *cup* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

Will you continue to overlook these? The truth herein presented is germane to the issue.

Again, *not one word* regarding the scholar's definition of cup: a drinking vessel – Young; a drinking cup – Berry; a wine cup

– Abbot-Smith; a drinking vessel, a cup – Robinson; a cup to drink out of, a drinking cup – Parkhurst. Will you deny the definition given “cup” Mt. 26:27 by the scholarship of the world?

My last argument of the first affirmative on necessary interference and the use of metonymy stands completely untouched. So also with the last argument of the second affirmative. My respondent completely overlooked and said not one word about it. Yes readers, this is the man who wrote an entire book on *The One Cup Faith*, but when faced with the task of really examining the cup question in discussion, he refuses to meet the issue. It is always easy to write a one-sided article or book when you don’t have to face and meet the opposition but not quite so easy when real arguments have to be met.

Please notice this again: *What Did Jesus Do?* He *took* the cup. *Took* – “To take with the hand,” *Thayer*, p. 870; *Cup* – “A drinking vessel, a cup,” *Thayer*, p. 533. He *gave* the cup. *Gave*— “reach out, extend, present,” *Thayer*, p 145. Thus, Jesus took, with the hand, the cup, drinking vessel, and reached out the hand, extended, presented the cup to the disciples, with the command, “Drink from it, all of you.” They understood and according to Mark, “They all drank from it.” We submit that this is what happened in Mt. 26:27 and Mk. 14:23. If not, let our respondent show otherwise. Bro. Knowles has neither denied our contention nor submitted evidence to contradict its truthfulness.

Oh, he says, “It’s not possible to respond to everything in an article,” but he had time and space to tell you how many pages Ervin Waters devoted to the discussion of the container in his booklet *The Communion* (and he didn’t even get that right. It’s only 19 pages not 28). But he didn’t have time or space to notice the arguments he was obligated to answer. Bro. Knowles, if I debated

in such a manner, my brethren would hang their head in shame and rightly so.

I should now like to turn my attention to some of the careless statements and apparent contradictions in the second negative. Bro. Knowles says with regard to the communion: “The purpose is important, the procedure is left to our discretion.” Where does the Bible say this? What inspired writer teaches such an idea? Now notice carefully how our respondent contradicts himself. In my last article, I asked him, “Would it be scriptural to use Coca-Cola as a drink element?” He replied, “It would not be scriptural to use Coca-Cola because what was used was the fruit of the vine.” But if the purpose is the important thing, as you claim, then please explain to the readers why a change in the drink element would make that much difference. The minute you demand fruit of the vine instead of Coca-Cola because Jesus used fruit of the vine, just that quickly will I demand cup for the same reason.

The negative has made several references to the plate, trying to equate its use with cups. In so doing he indicates a lack of understanding regarding generic and specific authority. A precept both includes and excludes. We may illustrate as follows. The precept to build an ark of gopher wood Gen. 6:14 included certain things such as tools to be used, where the wood was obtained, how many hours a day spent working on the ark, etc. None of the above violated the precept to build an ark of gopher wood. However, there were also things excluded by the very nature of the command itself, such as another building, pine or oak wood etc.

Jesus took bread, there is no specification as to its shape or size or whether a plate was used. Thus, we are not restricted in these matters. However, if we take steak, cheese, or loaves, we violate loaf or bread. In the same way Jesus took “the cup.” Here

again no specification is given as to size, color, material it is made of, etc. We have liberty in these matters. But if we take cups or use an eye dropper instead of a cup, we violate what the scripture specifies.

This is essentially why we may use a plate but not cups. The comparison of our brother is not parallel. His objection will not stand. He will have to come up with better than this to disprove our affirmative arguments.

Regarding question number 2 of the first negative. Had you read my answer carefully, you would not have become sidetracked. I said, “Yes, so long as he neither teaches or practices error *in the matter*. I did not say he would be barred from teaching. I said he could not teach error in this matter.

ANSWERING KNOWLES’ QUESTIONS

1. I do not believe feet washing was ever practiced as an ordinance of the church. I do not object to its use as an individual act of humility and would readily agree that it is one way of illustrating or showing the act of humility or service.
2. Already answered.
3. There is a vast difference between accidental occurrence and purposeful action. To illustrate, I offer the following: suppose I have an accident on the way to church next Sunday and am unable to attend. I could not conclude from this that missing every Sunday would be permissible. In other words, I could not purposefully stay away from service even though because of an accident I was allowed. More than one cup for a congregation is not authorized in the scriptures; however, we do have authority for more

than one congregation, thus eliminating the “big crowd” problem.

QUESTIONS FOR KNOWLES

1. What scripture teaches there was a drink element in the Passover?
2. Would it be a sin to use cheese instead of unleavened bread in the Lord’s Supper?
3. If “the cup” in Mt. 26:27 is a metaphor, was there a real literal cup present? If so, how do you know?

A FINAL ARGUMENT

Paul delivers instructions applying, “When you come together to eat,” 1 Cor. 11:33. He commands, “But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and *drink of the cup*,” 1 Cor. 11:28. Here we have an assembly of the church come together for the purpose of observing the communion. In such a gathering the command is to “drink of that cup” not *cups*. Where is the authorization to do otherwise? My proposition states that, “A congregation for the communion must use one cup.” That is exactly what Paul taught in 1 Cor. 11. My proposition is proven.

KNOWLES' THIRD NEGATIVE

With the curtain falling on the first half of this discussion we might consider the following words which, hopefully, will create the proper atmosphere for the readers and proper attitude for the writer. “And a servant of the Lord must not quarrel but be gentle to all, able to teach, patient, in humility correcting those who are in opposition, if God perhaps will grant them repentance, so that they may know the truth,” (2 Tim. 2:24-25). “Do not speak evil of one another, brethren. He who speaks evil of a brother and judges his brother, speaks evil of the law and judges the law. But if you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge.” (James 4:11). “Finally, all of you be of one mind, having compassion for one another; love as brothers, be tenderhearted, be courteous; not returning evil for evil or reviling for reviling,” (1 Pet. 3:8-9).

It is unfortunate that my respondent feels that this writer “hasn’t even noticed, much less answered” a number of his arguments. Naturally – and I say this with kindness – the same could be said of him. Anyone who is involved in any kind of a discussion where opposing views are being exchanged is going to feel that all his arguments were not answered. I stated honestly that, “Surely he knows that it is humanly impossible to re-quote and respond to everything in an article.” Ronny Wade’s failure to respond to a number of my points is obvious but expected. When we start insinuating that the other man’s failure to answer absolutely everything is positive proof of one-sidedness or cowardice, the spirit of healthy discussion has deteriorated into the deplorable spirit of debates and strife (2 Cor. 12:20).

It is also unfortunate that Mr. Wade feels that much of what I have written has been “irrelevant” and that I have ignored the

thrust of his affirmation. Wade's affirmation is that a congregation *must* use one cup. This I have denied.

The proposition itself is irrelevant since we are talking about incidentals and expediency. The charge that I refuse to "meet the issue" is also unfortunate. Though my book speaks for itself and though I would rather be studying another subject and be out soul-winning, I agreed to discuss this issue with Ronny Wade at his request.

Wade's first "syllogism" is rendered invalid because in order for a syllogism to be true, the minor premises must be true. The second premise is not true. Jesus' manner of speech indicated what the "cup" was – the fruit of the vine. The "cup" that was given to the disciples was to be drunk of (Matt. 26:27). It was the same thing that Jesus drank of – the fruit of the vine: "*I will not drink of this fruit of the vine,*" (Matt. 26:29).

The second "syllogism" is also inoperative by virtue of specious reasoning. One could point out that the Greek word for "cup" (poterion) is also used in Matthew 26:39 where Jesus prayed, "Let this cup pass from me." According to the logic of legalism, one would therefore conclude that the cup of Gethsemane was a "solid."

Anyone who has taken the time to read my book will know that I do not dispute the literal meaning of "poterion." "No one that I know of disputes the fact that the literal meaning of the word denotes anything other than a drinking vessel," (p. 37). References were given to *both* literal and figurative meanings of the word. I objected then, as I do now, to the incorrigible practice of literalizing the word "cup" throughout the Supper accounts with total disregard to rhyme or reason in order to establish and maintain the one cup method and doctrine.

Wade's contention that the disciples all "drank of it" ("it" meaning a single drinking vessel) contradicts the clear teaching of Scripture. Consider the following: (1) Jesus said, "Drink from it, all of you", Matt. 26:27. (2) The disciples "all drank from it," Mark 14:23. (3) Jesus said, "I will not drink of this fruit of the vine," Mark 14:24; Matt. 26:29. What was the command? To drink of the fruit of the vine. What did they do? They drank of the fruit of the vine just as Jesus did. Luke's account mentions that this cup was to be "divided" among the disciples. If one would continue to insist upon a literal interpretation – flying in the face of credulity – he would have to conclude that they somehow divided the actual container among themselves. Now that "logic" should make my respondent and his friends "hang their heads in shame, and rightly so." Yet Wade wonders where any inspired writer gave such an idea of leaving the procedure to our discretion. Good brother Luke, the beloved physician, mentioned it.

The explanation of that which is generic and that which is specific is unsatisfactory. The only things specified in the Lord's Supper are bread and the fruit of the vine. It has always impressed me that God chose these two, perishable, humble items to symbolize the greatest memorial in the world. But man has cheapened the divine by insisting on a third monument – using only one container to contain that fruit of the vine. The idea that a single container for the fruit of the vine is as specified as the two true elements is therefore bound upon all men. Surely this is a commandment of men that is taught as doctrine and therefore constitutes vain worship (Matt. 15:9).

Does it not seem strange to you that a "doctrine" this important did not crystallize until around the year 1930 – nineteen hundred years after the Supper was instituted? Reference was made earlier to J. Ervin Waters, the acknowledged "hero" and

leader of the one cup movement in its early days. Few men were held in higher esteem than he among one cup advocates. But hear him now concerning this man-made rule: “At one time I could apply thirty or more laws of hermeneutics and exegesis, some of which could be found in no standard texts. These I refined and distilled in true pharisaical fashion, using them to perpetuate our sinful divisions... But I soon staggered under the weight of my own legalism and sickened with the divisions which I helped to produce as a partisan debater whose sword tasted the blood of many dear brethren in the polemical arena... How shall I make a test of fellowship of these things or anything that God has not made a condition of salvation? It was not until 1930 that plurality of cups became a test of fellowship. Some congregations used one cup and others a plurality of cups, each recognizing the other’s autonomy. This division was still in the making when I began to preach, and I helped to make it in the state of California...” (*Restoration Review*, March, 1971, Vol. 13, No. 3). I’m not sure what the middle word should be below, so I didn’t want to guess at it. “A” or “no” are my guesses.

To be dogmatic, in calling upon all to partake of the fruit of the vine by a method that is dubious to say the least and yet make a concerted effort to get people to wash feet – even if it would be in their homes – is rather strange. Much ado is made over the fact that Jesus “took a cup” but the silence is deafening when these brethren are reminded that Jesus “took a towel” (John 13:4) and, “Poured water into a basin and began to wash the disciples’ feet,” (John 13:5). And to top it off, we find these words in John 13:14 – “If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another’s feet.” Is it not more than odd that some correctly interpret the spirit of the passage in John but will incorrectly interpret the letter of the law in Matthew?

I maintain that if more than one cup can be used because of unfortunate circumstances (a dropped cup), then more than one cup can be used because of fortunate circumstances (a large crowd). Frankly, I was disappointed with Ronny's answer to this question. If only one cup is allowed, then that is it – no exceptions. After all, “must” means “must” doesn't it? And to say that we should eliminate the “big crowd problem” defies both reason and scripture. The Lord wants His house to *be filled* (Luke 14:23). Where is the teaching that we should start a new church on the other side of town because there are now too many people to drink out of one cup? I have never heard of a poorer reason to establish another work in my life.

In answer to Wade's questions: (1) Scriptures that teach there was a drink element in the Passover are Luke 22:11-18 and 1 Cor. 10:16. Defining “cup,” W.E. Vine says, “The cup of blessing, 1 Cor. 10:16, is so named from the third (the fourth according to Edersheim) cup in the Jewish Passover Feast, over which thanks and praise were given to God. This connection is not to be rejected on the ground that the church in Corinth was unfamiliar with Jewish customs. That the contrary was the case, see 1 Cor. 5:7,” (*Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, Vol. 1, p. 261). (2) Asking if we can use cheese instead of bread in the Lord's Supper borders on “foolish questions” (2 Tim. 2:23) especially in view of the fact that Mr. Wade already said, “If we take steak, cheese, or loaves, we violate loaf or bread.” He knows the answer so why ask the question? Of course, it would be a sin to willfully substitute cheese for the bread. Who has ever done it? Why would anyone want to do it? These kinds of questions are dreamed up in the minds of those who are embroiled in strife. (3) Naturally, there was a literal cup present. No one has ever denied this to my knowledge. Anyone who can read can see it; however, the trouble

starts when someone pounces on that incidental with the fervor of a mouse leaping on a piece of (forgive me) cheese and heralding to the world that this means that a church can only use one cup in the communion and elevating that theory to the lofty realm of the seven “ones” in Ephesians 4:4-6.

The validity of Wade’s final argument must also be called into question. Citing 1 Cor. 11:28 he contends that “the command is to ‘drink of that cup’ not *cups*,” (emphasis, his). But verse 27 clearly shows that the bread represents the *body* of the Lord and the cup represents the *blood* of the Lord. “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.” Therefore, the command is to eat bread and drink the fruit of the vine. There is no support for the pseudo-doctrine of “a congregation for the communion must use one cup.” To make such an arbitrary ruling is to create a new law that adds to the Word of God. Those who have created and perpetuated this law should repent of this sin, refuse to make it a test of fellowship, and seek to make reconciliation with those that have been refused full fellowship because of their “failure” to adhere to the doctrine of one cup.

PROPOSITION NO. 2

The Scriptures teach that a congregation of the Church of Christ for the communion may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

Affirm: Victor Knowles

Deny: Ronny F. Wade

KNOWLES' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

It is with genuine hope that I approach this first affirmative—hope that there will be good and honest hearts who will consider these words and re-evaluate the foundation of sand that the one cup doctrine is built upon. I have no hate in my heart or malice in my mind when I write these words – only a love for the truth and for the souls of men. May God use these humble words to cause some precious soul to repent of the grievous sin of adding laws to God’s perfect law. May there be those who will have the courage to reject the *position* of one cupism. I do not say (and never have) that one must give up the *practice* of one cup. I firmly believe, however, that one should relinquish the coercive concept that all Christians everywhere must use only one container in the communion.

The proposition that Ronny Wade prepared for me to affirm reads as follows: “The scriptures teach that a congregation of the church of Christ for the communion may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.”

Do the sacred Scriptures make allowance for individual communion cups? Assuredly, yes! Since the Scriptures clearly reveal that the “cup” is an expression of metaphorical language the question of the number of containers is baseless. It is my strong conviction, and I shall endeavor to verify this in this series of affirmative articles, that individual cups were both present and in use at the Lord’s Supper; but for now let us consider the true meaning of “cup” in Scripture.

The best “rule” for interpreting Scripture is not that hackneyed trio of “command, example, and necessary inference” that men have devised (and divided over) but rather good old

common sense. Let this be our measuring stick as we approach the Scriptures in question.

Mr. Wade insists that because the word for cup (poterion) means “drinking vessel,” we must use only one cup. Let us then substitute this definition that he has given us in every place of Scripture where metaphorical language is used in the Supper accounts. This is an excellent way to determine the meaning of a word in dispute. D. R. Dungan says that, “The proper definition of a word may be used in the place of the word. If the trial be made in this way, and the definition is wrong, the sense of the passage will be so destroyed as to make it apparent,” (*Hermeneutics*, p. 188-189).

THE RESULTS OF SUBSTITUTING WADE’S DEFINITION FOR THE WORD:

“Then He took the DRINKING VESSEL, and gave thanks, and gave it (DRINKING VESSEL) to them, saying, ‘Drink from it (DRINKING VESSEL), all of you. For this (DRINKING VESSEL) is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,’” (Matt. 26:27-28).

“Then He took the DRINKING VESSEL, and when He had given thanks He gave it (DRINKING VESSEL) to them, and they all drank from it (DRINKING VESSEL). And He said to them, ‘This (DRINKING VESSEL) is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many,’” (Mark 14:23-24).

“Then He took the DRINKING VESSEL, and gave thanks, and said, ‘Take this (DRINKING VESSEL) and divide it (DRINKING VESSEL) among yourselves...’ Likewise He also took the DRINKING VESSEL

after supper, saying, ‘This DRINKING VESSEL is the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for you,’” (Luke 22:17, 20).

In the same manner He also took the DRINKING VESSEL after supper, saying, ‘This DRINKING VESSEL is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it (DRINKING VESSEL), in remembrance of Me.’ For as often as you eat this bread and drink this DRINKING VESSEL, you proclaim the Lord’s death till He comes. Therefore whoever eats this bread or drinks this DRINKING VESSEL of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the DRINKING VESSEL,” (1 Cor. 11:25-28).

There is an old saying that a word is to be considered figurative when the literal meaning involves a manifest contradiction, impossibility, or absurdity. It does not take a Solomon to see the problems that mount when one insists on the literal meaning of “cup” in these passages. The Bible says we drink the cup (1 Cor. 11:26). We cannot drink the container. Therefore, the cup is the contents which represents His blood. The Bible says to divide the cup (Luke 22:17). We cannot divide the container. But we can easily divide the contents; therefore, the cup is the contents. The Bible says the cup is the blood (Matt. 26:27, 28; Mark 14:23, 24). The container in no way represents Christ’s blood. But the dark red juice of the grape, that had to give up its life by being crushed, vividly represents Christ’s blood; therefore, the contents (grape juice) represents the blood. Since the cup is the illustration of the blood, it does not make any difference whether we use one container for the fruit of the vine or many containers. Some churches choose to use just one. Fine. But let them not insist that

every other congregation on the face of the earth follow their choice!

THE GOSPEL WRITER'S EXPLANATION OF THE WORD:

Not only should we interpret Scripture according to the known purpose of the writer (as we pointed out in our negative articles), we should also take the writer's own explanation as being the proper way to determine the true meaning of a word in dispute. In every case of the three gospel accounts, the writer explicitly explains or identifies what the "cup" is!

Matthew's testimony: *"He took the cup...and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you...I will not drink of this fruit of the vine..." (Matt. 26:27, 29).*

Luke's testimony: *"Then He took the cup...and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves...I will not drink of the fruit of the vine..." (Luke 22:17, 18).*

Follow the antecedents in each gospel account. In Matthew's account it looks like this: cup, it, it, blood, fruit of the vine. Mark's record is: cup, it, it, blood, fruit of the vine. Luke's description is: cup, this, it, fruit of the vine. They all start out with the word cup and end up with the fruit of the vine. I believe they knew what "cup" meant.

Let us form a composite questionnaire of the three narratives. What was taken? A cup containing the fruit of the vine. What was blessed? The fruit of the vine. What was given? A cup containing the fruit of the vine. What was divided? The fruit of the vine. What was commanded? To drink the fruit of the vine. What was drunk? The fruit of the vine. What did Jesus drink? The fruit

of the vine. The emphasis in those narratives is on the fruit of the vine because of what it symbolized. The fact that he picked up (“received a cup,” Luke 22:17, American Standard Version) one of the Passover containers and handed it to one of his disciples is of no spiritual significance. The importance to us is that the fruit of the vine which was contained in that vessel was blessed. The disciples were asked to drink it with the realization of what that glossy liquid represented—the precious blood of Jesus which would be shed for many for the remission of sins! Praise God for the blood of His only begotten Son which we see mirrored in the juice of the grape each Lord’s Day!

THE APOSTLE PAUL’S EXPLANATION OF THE WORD:

Perhaps the most graphic and clear picture of what the cup is may be found in 1 Corinthians 11:27. That verse says, “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.” Paul’s parallel is plainly seen: the bread is a symbol of the body of the Lord; the cup is a symbol of the blood of the Lord. I don’t see how those who insist on the cup being a container can explain their position in the light of this verse. Worse yet, I don’t know how they can possibly “discern the Lord’s body” during the time of communing if they fail to understand the tenor and spirit of the emblems. The oneness of a juice container has nothing to do with a proper Lord’s Supper service. The breaking and partaking of one bread (unleavened bread) reminds us that Jesus gave His body to make us one (1 Cor. 10:16, 17). The drinking of the juice reminds us that Jesus shed His blood for the remission of our dark and evil sins (Matt. 26:28). The significance of the bread and grape juice lie in the fact that before both could exist, they had to die—be crushed. The crushing of the grain of wheat and the crushing of the grape

are good reminders that our Lord gave Himself for us. That is why coke and cookies would have no *real* or *spiritual* import. And that is why it makes no difference whether a congregation uses a bread plate or not, one cup or individual cups. Containers for the emblems merely aid us in eating that bread and drinking that cup.

QUESTIONS FOR WADE

1. Will a congregation that does not use one cup in the communion be saved?
2. Is there any limitation as to the size or capacity of the container in the communion service?
3. What is the Greek word for “cup” in Matt. 10:42 and Mark 9:41?

WADE'S FIRST NEGATIVE

I am happy to respond to the affirmative article you have just read. The proposition under discussion states: "The scriptures teach." Brother Knowles failed to define the terms of his proposition. We do not know what he means by, "The scriptures teach...individual cups." He virtually throws command, example, and necessary inference out the window; calling them a "*hackneyed trio*" that men have devised. If this be so, then pray tell how does he go about establishing scriptural authority? He then has the audacity to tell us that we should use "good old common sense" as a measuring stick to interpret the scriptures in question. I wonder if he would be so kind as to define "good old common sense?" Good old common sense (as defined and used by man) has led to every innovation and departure from truth conceivable to the human mind. To think that a purported preacher of the gospel would advocate such a thing staggers the imagination. Most of the "first affirmative" is really a negation of the one cup belief, with very little said by way of support for individual cups. Even though Bro. Knowles says, "Individual cups were both present and in use at the Lord's Supper," he fails to offer one scripture or argument to prove that assumption.

The entire article is written to prove that "cup" does not mean "cup," but rather "contents" or "fruit of the vine." The exercise of substituting "drinking vessel" for cup is fruitless and misses the point entirely. In my first affirmative I stated, "Thus it (the cup of the Lord) is neither by itself (*not an empty cup* – not just grape juice)." Thus, when Jesus "took the cup," Mt. 26:27, He did take a drinking vessel; however, it was not empty but contained fruit of the vine. When He commanded the disciples to drink of it, they understood that they were to drink from the cup.

This they did by drinking a portion of the fruit of the vine. In the phrase, “For this is my blood of the New testament,” *this* refers not to the cup or drinking vessel, but to the fruit of the vine, as the following quotes show: “Poterion (cup) in Mt. 26:27 means a literal cup, while in verse 28 *this* means the contents.” A.T. Robertson—“Although *this* Mt. 26:28 grammatically has as its antecedent the cup v. 27, it clearly refers, by metonymy, to the contents of the cup,” Prof. England Phillips University.

KNOWLES LOGIC (?)

Our respondent now tries his hand at some syllogisms: the Bible says we “drink the cup” 1 Cor. 11:26. We cannot drink the container. Therefore, the cup is the contents which represent his blood.

First of all, the syllogism is scripturally unsound because when the Bible says “drink the cup” the figure of speech “metonymy” is used. The cup named, the contents suggested. If the reader will review my first affirmative, he will find that I advanced an argument on this very point that has never been noticed by Brother Knowles. Secondly, the syllogism (number 1) is logically unsound, in fact all the syllogisms advanced by our brother violate “The Rules of the Syllogism.” In his book *Elementary Lessons in Logic*, W. Stanley Jevons says under Rule 6, “If one premise be negative, the conclusion must be negative.” Re-read carefully all three of our respondents attempts at constructing logical arguments. In each one, the minor premise states a negative fact. The rule demands a negative conclusion, yet in each Knowles comes up with a positive conclusion. Logistically they all fall flat.

It is noteworthy that Knowles says, “The Bible says the cup is the blood,” (Mt. 26:27; Mk 14:23, 24). I ask each of you to read those passages carefully. Underline the words the cup is the blood.

Does the Bible say that? It certainly does not. If it did this discussion would end here and now.

KNOWLES COMPOSITE QUESTIONNAIRE

It is hard for me to believe the following quote comes from our respondent-novice: “What was taken? A cup containing the fruit of the vine.” Brother Knowles, how do you know this? You have already said the cup is the blood. You said the cup is the contents. You say the cup is not the container. Please tell us how you know there was a cup containing the fruit of the vine? What does cup mean in that sentence? Could it be that you are saying Jesus took a *drinking vessel* containing the fruit of the vine? If so then *cup* is not the blood as you claim. Sir, you have yourself in a mess! This is where your “good old common sense” has led you. You might have been better off had you stayed with that “hackneyed trio” that you kicked out the window. Your problems are further compounded when you take the position *cup* Mt. 26:27 is a metaphor. Yet in the next breath you declare, “Naturally there was a literal cup present.” Victor why did you ignore the latter part of my question number 3 (third affirmative)? I repeat, if cup is a metaphor and means the blood, then please tell us how you know from Mt. 26:27 that “cup” means a literal drinking vessel as you claim in your composite questionnaire? Talk about a man meeting himself coming back! This takes the cake.

The truth of the matter is plain. Individual cups are not taught in the Bible either by command, example, or necessary inference. Bro. Knowles knows this. So, he tried to get them in under “good old common sense,” but that didn’t work either.

Individual cups are of recent origin. “Until near the end of the nineteenth century, the chalice, or cup, was used in the distribution of the wine at the Lord’s Supper. At that time more

attention began to be paid to hygiene, and the use of a common cup began to be unpopular with communicants. Rev. J. G. Thomas, who was both a minister and a physician was the originator of the idea of individual cups. From his medical practice he learned the uncleanliness and danger of the common cup and felt that the Lord's Supper could be made more attractive and beautiful by the use of individual cups. His first patent was granted in March 1894. The first individual cup service was held in a little Putnam Co. church in Ohio." *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* by Thos. H. Wagner, pp. 237-8 in Church Management Feb. 1938. You can appeal to no higher source than a Presbyterian preacher as authority for their use and can go no farther back than around 1894. For Bible believing folk, that is just not enough.

"COMMON SENSE" VERSUS BIBLE AUTHORITY

Our respondent contends that bread, not cheese, must be used in the Lord's Supper. How does he know this? Common sense? Of course not, because the Bible says it, that's why. He also says we must use fruit of the vine, not Coke. How does he know this? Common sense? No. He knows this because this is what is specified in the scripture. However, when the Bible specifies cup, which our brother even admits means a drinking vessel, he hurriedly jumps the track and calls on "good old common sense" in order to get his individual cups in. Who can believe it?

ANSWERING KNOWLES' QUESTIONS

1. I am not the judge. A congregation that uses more than one cup in the communion does so without scriptural authority.
2. Only those imposed by "decency and order" 1 Cor. 14:40.
3. Poterion

QUESTIONS FOR KNOWLES

1. In the sentence, “He picked up the cup and drank it, and said, this is good coffee, he then set the cup down on the table,” is *cup* used literally?
2. How does one establish scriptural authority?

KNOWLES' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I would like to go right into this second affirmative, but Mr. Wade's first negative raises some points that must first be answered.

Ronny Wade feels that I "failed to define the terms" of my proposition, and therefore he does not know what I mean by the phrase "the scriptures teach." Frankly, this puzzles me since Wade himself wrote the proposition for me to affirm.

He also had much to say in defense of command, example, and necessary inference charging that I threw them out the window. The careful reader will have noted that I wrote that they were not the best rule for interpreting Scripture. And they aren't! Some groups have applied this trio to things like foot washing and communal living and, *technically speaking*, you cannot fault them. That is what I meant when I wrote that men have divided over this trio. A good dose of common sense would clear up these passages in John 13 and Acts 4 just as it would if carefully applied to the Supper accounts. When command, example, and necessary inference are appealed to in nearly every circumstance—to the obvious exclusion of common sense in some instances—they indeed become "hackneyed" (to make common or frequent use of).

"Individual cups are not taught in the Bible either by command, example, or necessary inference. Bro. Knowles knows this," wrote Wade. Now, really. If I knew it, wouldn't I admit it? I'd be dishonest if I didn't. Is this what Wade wants readers to think of me? He has gone on record by charging me with "misrepresentation" and "manipulation" in his review of my book (*Old Paths Advocate*, April 1977). Implying that I "know" something that I honestly do not believe and am, in fact, opposing in this exchange,

is a violation of our signed agreement (4. Both men shall conduct themselves as Christian gentlemen) to say nothing of Scripture.

My respondent also found it necessary to tell readers that I “failed” to offer one scripture or argument to prove that individual cups were present and in use at the Lord’s Supper. Again, the careful reader will note that what I wrote was, “It is my strong conviction, and I shall endeavor to verify this in this series of affirmative articles, that individual cups were both present and in use at the Lord’s Supper; *but for now* let us consider the true meaning of ‘cup’ in Scripture.” (Added emphasis mine. V.K.) That is what this second affirmative will accomplish if I can clear away all the smoke and rubble of my respondent’s first negative.

Mr. Wade says that he is not the judge on determining whether or not a church will be saved if they don’t use one cup. This, more than anything else, shows that the one cup doctrine is completely worthless. We preach, with the authority of Christ behind us, that a man **MUST** be born again or he cannot enter the kingdom (John 3:5). No problem there. But, Wade’s weak “I am not the judge” reveals that the “must” in his proposition, when put to the final test, is not to be taken seriously. Listen! If I am going to hell because I have not been baptized, I want to know it because I don’t want to go to hell! And if I am going to be eternally lost because I use individual cups, then I want someone to show me from the Scriptures and stand up and say so and not beg off by saying, “I’m not the judge!” If the one cup doctrine was clearly taught in Scripture, like Mark 16:16 for instance, there would be no question about it. But it is not. The doctrine of “*a church must use one cup*” is a binding, grievous burden that those who make and impose on others are not willing to back up.

His response to the second question shows that “common sense” is not so bad after all. Asked if there was any limitation as

to the size or capacity of the container, Wade replied, “Only those imposed by ‘decency and order’.” Doesn’t a little common sense have to be used here? Where is the command, example, or necessary inference that will determine this? An extra-large crowd at a one cup church recently had to send some people scurrying home to find a larger container. A large Tupperware pitcher and a big, rose vase were taken back to the building as substitutes. Whichever one was finally used was determined by something other than command, example, necessary inference and, perhaps, common sense itself!

Wade does admit that the Greek word for “cup” in Matt. 10:42 and Mark 9:41 is the same as those appearing in the Supper accounts. Will our one cup friends now be willing to go to the ends of the earth to insist upon the literalness of “cup” in those accounts as they have done with the Supper accounts? And will they limit “cup” to being just one or else lose their reward? I forewarn you in all good humor: don’t hold your breath!

Yes, the Scriptures teach that individual cups were in use at the institution of the Lord’s Supper. Therefore, we may use them today. We do not *have* to, however, anymore than we have to sell our lands and houses like the early Christians did (Acts 4:34). I am not about to add to God’s Word by saying that we *MUST* use individual cups just because they happened to be utilized in the institution of the Supper. This simply shows that the exclusive doctrine of one cupism is false.

First, let us draw a comparison of the gospel accounts:

MATTHEW 26:27– (1) Then He took the cup, (2) and gave thanks, (3) and gave it to them, (4) saying, “Drink from it, all of you.”

MARK 14:23– (1) Then He took the cup, (2) and when He had given thanks (3) He gave it to them, (4) and they all drank from it.

LUKE 22:17– (1) Then He took the cup, (2) and gave thanks, (3) and said, “Take this (4) and divide it among yourselves.”

Now, let us draw up a composite of the three accounts: (1) He took the cup, Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23. (2) He gave thanks, Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23. (3) He gave it to them, Mark 26:27; Mark 14:23. (4) He said, “Take this,” Luke 22:17. (5) He said, “Divide it among yourselves,” Luke 22:17. (6) He said, “Drink from it, all of you,” Matt. 26:27. (7) They all drank of it, Mark 14:23.

How did they divide the cup? By chipping the container into pieces? Or by dividing the *contents* – the fruit of the vine? The latter, most assuredly. “But, how did they divide the contents?” some may still wonder. Let us use some common illustrations. If I gave you a candy bar or an apple and told you to divide it among your friends, what would be the obvious way to do it? By passing it around and having everyone take a bite out of it? Or would you cut it into separate slices or pieces and thereby divide the treat? If a cook at roundup hands a boiling pot of coffee to the hardworking cowboys sitting around the campfire and tells them to divide it among themselves, how are they most likely to do it? By all drinking from the spout? Or by pouring a portion of the coffee into their tin cups? It is foolish to think that with each disciple having his own vessel at the Passover table that they would divide it any other way (for documentation of ancient and modern practice at Passover, see chapter 6 of my book). The *only* way they could *divide* it was by pouring a portion into their own vessel. The Greek word for “divide” is DIAMERIZO which is defined as “*dia* , through,

and No. 6, to divide through i.e. completely, to divide up, is translated divide in...Luke 22:17..." (*Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Vol. 1, p. 327). The "No. 6" that Vine mentions can mean "to share with" but this does NOT appear in Luke 22:17. The only thing that could have been divided was the drink element—the fruit of the vine. The only way it could have been divided was by pouring it into separate vessels. The dividing was not done by drinking *because that was a different command* (see the gospel comparisons above).

Let us make one more comparison. In the feeding of the 5,000, Jesus (1) took loaves and fishes, (2) blessed them, (3) broke them, (4) gave them, (5) and they all ate of them, Matt. 14:19, 20. In the institution of the Lord's Supper, Jesus (1) took the cup, (2) gave thanks for it, (3) told them to divide it, (4) gave it to them, (5) and they all drank it. Is it reasonable to think that every one of the 5,000 bit into the original five loaves and two fishes? No. Why? Because they were *broken* (and, of course, miraculously produced more). Is it any more reasonable to think that each disciple drank out of the same vessel? No. Why? Because it was *divided!* In view of the fact that Christ told the disciples first to divide the cup and then to drink of the cup, it becomes apparent that individual cups were present and in use at the Lord's Supper; therefore, we have every Scriptural right to use them today. The drinking was not the act of dividing. If "divide" means "drink" (which it does not), then they drank the cup in Luke 22:17, ate the bread in v. 19, and drank the cup again in v. 20!

ANSWERING WADE'S QUESTIONS

1. Yes.
2. Cup.
3. A "thus saith the Lord."

QUESTIONS FOR WADE

1. Can there be a transgression where there is no law?
2. Does the term “cup of blessing” in 1 Cor. 10:16 originate from the Passover?
3. What would be done if the cup was dropped and broken halfway through the communion service in a one cup church?

WADE'S SECOND NEGATIVE

In regard to the affirmative article you have just read, I would like to notice the repeated charge by Victor that, "I wrote the proposition," for him to affirm. You would think he was totally powerless in the matter. Sir, you voluntarily signed the proposition. You didn't have to do so. You could have worded one of your own but didn't. Now, if you are sorry you signed this one, just say so, or if you want to "back out" just indicate that is your wish. However, as long as you are "in," we want to know what you mean by "the scriptures teach" and it is your responsibility to tell us.

Your charge that "technically speaking" we cannot fault those who apply command, example, and necessary inference to such things as foot washing and communal living is ridiculous. It only underscores the real difference between us: How to Establish Scriptural Authority. And as I pointed out in my last article, your "good old common sense" approach has led to numerous departures from the Word of God.

Brother Knowles doesn't like my answer to his first question. Victor, I didn't expect you to like it. But nevertheless, that doesn't change my answer. He wanted me to say a congregation using cups will be lost. Sir, I do not have the right to pass judicial sentences on anyone. That belongs to God. As I told you in my answer, such a congregation worships in a manner that is not authorized in the Bible. But God will judge them, not me. I must admit, however, your maneuver here surprises me. In your book beginning on page 9, you deal with attitudes. In this chapter, you speak of the one cup folk having the worst attitude imaginable. Now you turn around and get upset because I didn't exercise judicial powers on a congregation using cups.

Regarding the “must” in my affirmative proposition, I ask, must we obey Christ? Must we obey Paul? If so, we must use one cup. Jesus said, “Drink from it, all of you,” or “All of you drink out of it,” Mt. 26:27. Did the disciples obey? Yes, “They all drank from it,” Mk. 14:23. Paul said, “When you come together to eat...” 1 Cor. 11:33. “Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup,” 1 Cor. 11:28. May we use steak instead of bread? Knowles says no. We *must* use bread. By the same token, if we obey Bible teaching, we *must* use one cup.

Let us now notice the proof (?) given to show individual cups were used at the institution of the Lord’s Supper. Brother Knowles gives Luke 22:17 as authority for individual cups saying, “The *only* way they could *divide* it was by pouring a portion into their own vessel.” Says who? Why could they not have each drank from a common cup, and divided the cup in this fashion? There is nothing in the meaning of *diemerizo* (divide) that makes individual cups necessary. The word basically means “to divide out” or “distribute” – Robinson. And they certainly could have “divided out” the contents of the cup by drinking from it. So, the affirmative’s conclusion just does not follow. It’s back to the drawing board, Victor. You’ll have to try again. In fact, I will now show that your supposition can’t be right. (1) What Jesus took was undivided. (2) That for which He gave thanks was undivided. (3) That which He gave to them (the disciples) was undivided. (4) He told them to drink of this *undivided* something, “Drink from it, all of you,” Mt. 26:27. In this command, we have the how of dividing. *They divided the contents by drinking*. This is evident by noting v. 17-18, “...Take this and *divide* it among yourselves; for...I will not *drink*.” The dividing was done by *drinking*. The command “Drink from it, all of you,” Mt. 26:27 and “divide it” Luke 22:17 are the same. Knowles asserts, “Christ told the disciples first to divide the

cup and then to drink of the cup...” Where? I challenge you to show where Christ ever told the disciples to first *divide* and then secondly, drink. It’s not there. That’s some more of your “good old common sense.”

A FALSE CONCLUSION

Knowles says, “If divide means drink (which it does not), then they drank the cup (Luke 22:17), ate the bread in v. 19, and drank the cup again in v. 20!” Now how did you reach that conclusion Victor? Did it ever occur to you that Luke just might have mentioned the cup twice? And that the order of mention is not necessarily the order of occurrence. For example, in 1 Cor. 10:16 Paul mentions cup first, bread last, but that doesn’t indicate the cup was taken first, for Matt., Mk., and Paul in 1 Cor. 11 show otherwise.

KNOWLES’ INTERPRETATION ADDS AN ADDITIONAL ACT

Matthew—1. took cup 2. gave thanks 3. gave to disciples 4. commanded to drink

Mark— 1. took cup 2. gave thanks 3. gave to disciples 4. they all drank

Luke—1. took cup 2. gave thanks 3. gave to disciples 4. commanded to divide

If the dividing was not done by drinking, an additional command is added. From the above, we can easily see that either Luke adds an additional command, or the “dividing” was equal to “drinking.” Notice carefully that nothing is said in Luke’s entire account about the disciples *drinking* unless that is what is meant by the command

to divide or share the contents of the cup. Thus, Knowles has come up with an additional command. What next?

PROBLEMS OF KNOWLES FALSE INTERPRETATION

1. He has Jesus giving thanks for the cup before the bread which contradicts Mt. and Mark's accounts. Something he himself does not do. 2. Even if "divide it" means pour into individual cups, Knowles doesn't even do this. It has already been divided at the giving of thanks in congregations where he preaches. In Luke's account, the dividing took place after the giving of thanks. 3. His position puts him in disobedience to divine commands. Jesus commanded the disciples "divide it among yourselves" which Knowles says cannot mean anything but individual cups, yet he says, "I am not about to add to God's word by saying that we must use individual cups..." In other words, we don't have to do what Jesus commanded His disciples to do.

He then turns around and says we cannot use cola because Christ used fruit of the vine, we cannot use cheese because Christ used bread, but we don't have to follow Jesus' instructions regarding dividing the cup. Who can believe it?

In his first Affirmative, our brother said "What was taken? *A cup containing the fruit of the vine.*" Since he contends that the cup is the blood and that the cup is the contents, I begged him in my first negative to tell us how he knew there was a cup containing fruit of the vine present when Jesus instituted the Supper. He was as silent as the tomb on this. Said not one word about it. Now, Victor, you have only one article remaining, please tell us. The readers want to know. If Jesus took a cup containing the fruit of the vine, then the cup was not the fruit of the vine. You cannot have it both ways, and it is only fair that you explain this to us before this exchange ends.

In answer to my question, “In the sentence—He picked up the cup and drank it, and said, this is good coffee, he then set the cup down on the table—is cup used literally? Our brother said yes, and he also said “cup” was the antecedent of “it” in that sentence. Now note carefully this parallel: Matt. 26:27, “Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, ‘Drink from it, all of you.’” He picked up the *cup* and drank *it*...” In the last sentence, Victor has no trouble seeing that *cup* is literal and that it grammatically refers back to the literal cup. Yet, in the first sentence (Mt 26:27), he has difficulty seeing that *cup* is literal and that it refers back to the literal cup. I wonder why? I believe the readers of this exchange can understand that Jesus took a literal cup with fruit of the vine in it, gave it to his disciples, and commanded them to all drink out of it. Certainly the disciples understood, for Mark tells us they “all drank from it.”

ANSWERS TO HIS QUESTIONS

1. No.
2. Not necessarily, although it may.
3. If I were present, I would suggest another cup be filled, thanks given, and the entire congregation served.

KNOWLES' THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

I would like to thank the publisher of this journal for printing this written exchange. May it aid in the noble quest for oneness for which Christ prayed (John 17:21). May we soon come to realize that the distinguishing mark of Christians is *not* that we partake of the Lord's Supper in a certain way or that we can debate the issue, but that we "love one another" for it was our Lord who said, "By this all will know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another," (John 13:35).

Several references to my book, *The One Cup Faith*, have been made during this exchange. Any who would like to obtain a copy may do so by sending \$3.95 to Vanguard Publications, Box 162, Oskaloosa, Iowa, 52577.

Mr. Ronny Wade continues to press for a definition of "the scriptures teach," a phrase which he himself drew up for this discussion. Though it seems self-explanatory, I will explain that by "scriptures" I mean the Word of God, and by "teach" I mean "to cause to know a subject" (*Webster Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*, p. 904). A careful examination of the Bible reveals that it is indeed permissible for a congregation to utilize individual cups.

Wade also feels that I have somehow "come up with an additional command" by merely quoting from Luke 22:17 that Jesus told the disciples to "divide" the cup. The thoughtful reader surely realizes that in the plan of salvation, no one verse in the Bible contains *all* that one must do to be saved. In like manner, no single account of the Supper has the exact pattern. But when a composite is formed, the sequence of events become clear. Would the reader be so kind as to refer back to my second affirmative where this composite appears? Thank you.

Again, I am a bit perplexed by my respondent's assertion that I have "said not one word about" how I knew there was a cup when Jesus instituted the Supper. Both in my book and in the third negative I made it clear that naturally there was a literal cup present. Anyone who can read the Bible can see that. I just don't insist on a literal cup the rest of the way. I am content to take the Lord's identification of what the "cup" was — the fruit of the vine (Matt. 27:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:18). This I have repeatedly stressed.

Concluding his negative, Mr. Wade reassures his readers that Jesus commanded the disciples to drink *out* of the cup. This is a bit odd. I am somehow charged with adding the command to "divide" the cup. But, of course, that is simply Luke's observation (Luke 22:17). Yet Wade assures us that Jesus told the disciples to drink *out* of the cup! Who made this observation? None of the *gospel* writers, I can assure you!

Ronny Wade agreed that there can't be a transgression unless there is a law. Yet he explains the law of "must" in his proposition like this: "By 'must use one cup,' we mean just that they must use one drinking vessel to distribute the fruit of the vine when observing the Lord's Supper." If this isn't a humanly devised law, then I haven't seen one. It is a doctrine of man that has come about through unnecessary inference. Or should we say necessary *interference* with proper interpretation of God's Word?

This is a very serious business. *Jesus* said, "You **MUST** be born again," (John 3:7). *Peter* said, "Nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we **MUST** be saved," (Acts 4:12). *Paul* said, "And a servant of the Lord **MUST** not quarrel," (2 Tim. 2:24). But in contrast with these sacred and majestic truths, we find this: "By 'must use one cup,' we mean just that, they must use one drinking vessel..." Who

said this? Ronny Wade and many others of the one cup faith. Please remember that the Lord Jesus really laid into a group of people once that exalted human traditions concerning things like drinking vessels! “And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men.’ For laying aside the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men—the washing of pitchers and cups, and many other such things you do... All too well you reject the commandment of God, that you may keep your tradition,” (Mark 7:7-9).

As is often the case, in the midst of tragedy there is humor. Though it is tragic that men elevate opinions and traditions to the realms of divine commands, it is amusing to note Wade’s answer to the question as to what he would do if a cup were dropped halfway through a communion service. He suggested that another cup be filled and the *entire* congregation served. In *Porter-Waters Debate*, I got a bang out of Porter’s reply to Waters on this point. Waters, a one cup man, had asked Porter what he would do if in immersing a man he only half immersed him. Porter said he would re-immersing the man, and then added: “But Brother Waters, if I had immersed the fellow right in front of him, I would not grab him and put him under too,” (p. 92). What Mr. Wade has actually admitted is this: under certain circumstances, more than one vessel may be used. However, isn’t it ironic that more than one cup may be used when *misfortune* occurs (the dropped and broken cup), but cups may *not* be used when *good* fortune occurs (a large crowd to hear the Gospel)? The “must” position is reduced to dust when put to the test.

The proposition I was given to defend stated, “The scriptures teach that a congregation of the church of Christ for the communion may use individual cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.” In the first affirmative, I

endeavored to show that “cup” was not to be taken literally throughout the accounts because of (1) the use of metaphorical language, and (2) the writer’s own explanation of the word. Therefore, a congregation is certainly within their right to implement individual cups. Since Mr. Wade finds it difficult to believe that figurative language was used, I include the following quote from a respected brother of bygone years, D.R. Dungan.

When the Savior gave the institution of the supper, He did it in the most beautiful of metaphorical language (Matt. 26:26-28)...Paul presents this thought without the use of the metaphor (I Cor. 10:16)...But in 11:23-25, he employs the same figure that the Lord did in instituting it. This shows that they regarded the one form of expression as containing the same as the other. To say this is the communion of the body and blood of Christ is metonymy of the agent; to say that these are like the body and blood would be a simile, but the beauty and strength would have been removed in that way; hence the Master chose the form of the metaphor as the most expressive (*Hermeneutics* , p. 253).

What a sad thing it is to see men make spectacles of themselves and shambles of the Scriptures by failing to accept the obvious fact that figurative language rules out the legalistic, literalistic doctrine of one cup. It would be a good thing for the one cup advocate to study some of Dungan’s guidelines for determining figurative language in the Bible. A word is figurative when the literal meaning involves an impossibility. Drinking a cup (container) involves just that. By the way, did you know Brother Dungan included in that chapter something Wade has really ridiculed?

Common sense! “Rule 8. Common Sense. Figures of speech sometimes occur when we have to depend on the things we know, in order to decide if the language is figurative or literal,” (p. 202). My friends, it doesn’t take a Solomon to see that to “drink of the cup” (1 Cor. 11:28) means to drink of the *contents* which symbolize the blood (v. 27).

Dungan also points out how we can know figurative language by the “sense of the context.” That was our point in the second affirmative. Careful contextual consideration showed that the “cup” that was divided in Luke 22 was the contents and not the container. The studious reader will go back to the second affirmative and read carefully Vine’s definition of “divide.” In no way can that be applied to a dividing of the *container*.

In view of the fact that “cup” is figurative and that the context shows that the fruit of the vine was divided and not the actual container, it is simply a matter of Scripture’s “teaching” (or causing us to know on this particular subject) that the number of drinking vessels is left to expediency. For a thing to be a scriptural expedient, it should facilitate in the accomplishment of God’s will and be in harmony with His work. Individual cups facilitate us in doing what the Lord said to do—drinking the fruit of the vine. A church might want to use just one cup. Fine. But let them not insist on everyone also following their pattern of partaking.

Since Ronny evidently forgot to include three questions for me to answer, I will not take advantage of having more questions to ask than he in this exchange.

I close with this story. In 1495, Duke Ludovico of Milan asked the Florentine artist Leonardo DaVinci to portray the dramatic scene of Jesus’ Last Supper with His disciples as they gathered in the Upper Room before His crucifixion. The scene was to be painted upon a larger wall of the dining hall at Santa Maria

delle Grazie monastery in Milan. DaVinci, then already famous as a painter, sculptor, and architect, agreed to take on the assignment. Working slowly and with great care for detail, he spent three years completing the painting. The disciples were grouped in threes, two groups on either side of the figure of Christ, who sat in the center of the table. His arms stretched before Him. In his right hand He held a cup, painted with marvelous realism. At last the painting was ready, and DaVinci called in a friend to see it. "Give me your honest opinion," DaVinci said. "It's wonderful," the friend told him in open admiration. "That cup is so real I cannot keep my eyes off it." DaVinci immediately took a brush and drew it across the sparkling cup. "If it affects you that way, it must not remain," he exclaimed. "Nothing shall distract attention from Christ!"

WADE'S THIRD NEGATIVE

We are thankful for the opportunity provided us in this written exchange with Victor Knowles. In the last three articles, it has been his obligation to show that the scriptures teach the use of individual cups. A task at which he has been an utter failure. After much prodding, he finally tells us what he means by “the scriptures teach.” In his own words, “the Word of God” and “to cause to know a subject.” So in other words, the Bible causes us to *know* that individual cups may be used. The question is *where*? Knowles’ explanation of his obligation is as follows: “In the first affirmative I endeavored to show that ‘cup’ was not to be taken literally throughout the accounts because of (1) the use of metaphorical language, and (2) the writer’s own explanation of the word. Therefore, a congregation is certainly within their right to implement individual cups.” So that’s his scriptural proof! His *problem* lies in proving the word “cup” is used metaphorically in the Lord’s Supper accounts. This he has not done and cannot do. We pointed out in our first affirmative that “cup” is defined by the scholars as being “a drinking vessel,” “a drinking cup,” etc. We do not know of a single lexicon that places “cup” Mt. 26:27 under figurative usage, and certainly not metaphorically. Even Bro. Knowles himself says, “There was a literal cup present.” How does he know this? What leads him to believe this? Unless of course it is the fact that Matthew said, “He took the cup.” The truth is, the Bible does not “cause to know” in any place that individual cups may be used. They are without scriptural authority.

LUKE 22:17

This passage demands careful consideration. The problem Knowles faces here will not go away. He has taken the position

that, “The *only* way they could *divide* it was by pouring a portion into their own vessel.” In the first place, his conclusion is wrong. The contents of the cup could be shared or divided by each disciple drinking from the same cup, as Mk 14:23 shows. Secondly, his interpretation of this passage *adds* an additional command. When we form a composite of the sequence of events involved in the accounts of the Lord’s Supper, we find the following:

Matthew

1. He took the cup
2. gave thanks for cup
3. gave to disciples
4. commanded to drink

Mark

1. He took the cup
2. gave thanks for cup
3. gave to disciples
4. they all drank of it

Luke

1. He took the cup
2. gave thanks for cup
3. gave to disciples
4. commanded to divide

In order to harmonize Luke’s account with that of Matt. and Mark, we must conclude that either “divide” refers to the “drinking” or Luke gives a command not noticed by Matt. and Mark. Since Luke does not mention “drinking” and Matt. and Mark do, we conclude that the command “divide it among yourselves” had reference to

their all sharing the fruit of the vine, by drinking from the cup. Knowles has come up with an additional command in order to try and prove individual cups. A man is hard pressed when he takes such a route as this.

DRINK “OUT OF”

In Mt. 26:27, Jesus commanded the disciples to, “Drink of it, all of you.” *Of* is from *Ek* meaning “out of” or “from,” and some versions translate it thus. To say that Jesus commanded the disciples to drink out of the cup is adding nothing but merely defining the word “of” in accordance with the laws of language.

MUST

Our brother has spent a great part of his affirmative space talking about the wording of my affirmative proposition. That should have been discussed in his negative articles. He completely overlooks my arguments in the last negative showing that any command of God *must* be obeyed, even though the Bible does not use the word *must* with the command. He wants us to contrast “must” in Acts 4:12 and 2 Tim. 2:24 with the *must* of my affirmative proposition. Implying that *must* is not included in the command to drink of one cup. We note in Jn. 3:3 that Jesus says, “...unless one is born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” In v. 5, “...unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.” Yet in v. 7 Jesus said, “Do not marvel that I said to you, ‘You *must* be born again.’” In other words, “Unless one is born again,” is equal to, “You *must* be born again.” Any command of God is a *must*. The command, “Drink from it, all of you,” is a *must*. The command, “When you come together to eat...let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup,” (1 Cor. 11:28, 33) is a *must*. When a congregation gathers for the communion, we

are commanded to “drink of the cup.” Yes, we *must* do what is commanded or disobey. To cap it all off, however, in my third affirmative article I asked, “Would it be a sin to use cheese instead of unleavened bread in the Lord’s Supper?” His answer: “Of course it would be a sin to willfully substitute cheese for the bread.” But where does the Bible say, “You *must* use bread?” It doesn’t, but Bro. Knowles knows when Jesus took bread, that made it imperative that we take bread also. By the same reasoning, we must use “a cup.”

DROPPING THE CUP

I never cease to be amazed at the limit to which the cups advocate will go in order to justify his practice. Of all the arguments we advanced in defense of “one cup,” our respondent exploits the *possibility of an accident* in order to get more than one cup in use. In this connection, he refers to the *Porter-Waters* debate. He has spent almost as much time during this exchange dealing with Ervin Waters as he has me. I think his cause would have been better served had he discussed my arguments rather than referring to books and debates by other men. Accidental occurrences prove nothing. I might accidentally miss worship. That does not prove I can willfully miss worship. I might accidentally drop the cup and get another one, fill it, and serve the congregation. That does not prove I may willfully use cups and be scriptural. Should Knowles drop a tray of cups before the congregation had been served, would he fill another tray? If so, would he give thanks? If he did, would this prove it is scriptural to offer thanks twice? Would this mean he could spiritually offer thanks twice every Sunday even though no accident occurred? That is where his kind of reasoning leads. Nowhere. It proves nothing.

KNOWLES' STORY

I ask that you re-read the story at the end of the previous article and note the following: 1. the artist from reading the Bible accounts of the Lord's Supper concluded Christ took one cup. 2. He apparently was unaware that individual cups were used as claimed by Knowles. 3. Knowles implies that contending for one cup distracts attention from Christ. 4. If so, would contending for unleavened bread or grape juice distract from Christ. The truth is, as far as using one cup is concerned, the story proves nothing.

WHAT DID JESUS DO?

I believe we all can see the truth on this subject if we bear in mind what Jesus did at the institution of the Supper. 1 He *took* the cup. *Took* – “to take with the hand,” *Thayer*, p. 870. 2. He took a *cup*. *Cup* – “a drinking vessel, a cup” *Thayer*, p. 533. 3. He *gave* the cup. *Gave*— “reach out, extend, present,” *Thayer*, p. 145. Thus, Jesus took with the hand the cup, drinking vessel, and reached out the hand, extended, presented the cup to the disciples with the command, “Drink from it, all of you.” They understood and according to Mark, “They all drank from it.” We believe this is what happened on that night long, long ago when Jesus was eating the Passover with His disciples.

You will notice that the Bible did not say, “He took the cups.” Had it, this exchange would have been unnecessary. The Bible did not say, “He took the fruit of the vine,” and nothing more. Had it, this exchange would have been unnecessary. The very language that would have rendered this discussion useless, was purposefully avoided by the Holy Spirit. The Bible did say, “He took the cup.” May God give us the courage to accept it, believe it, and preach it. In so doing, nothing shall distract attention from Christ and His commands.

A Five Minute Bible Study Publication
by Aaron Battey



fiveminutebiblestudy.com