

## ONE CUP OR MULTIPLE CUPS DISCUSSION

Steve Melton, who believes that we must partake of the fruit of the vine from one literal cup contacted me about this issue. I think we had a great discussion on the matter, though neither one of us changed our position on the matter. I would like to present our informal email discussion exactly as it happened. Perhaps you can gain some insight from our discussion that will help you to determine the truth about this matter. Please note that we could have continued the discussion further, but all good things must to come to end at some point. Since Steve made the initial response, I decided to let him have the last response as well. I thoroughly enjoyed the discussion with Steve.

Cougan Collins

### **Steve's first email:**

Cougan, I was very perplexed by your sermon on the Lord's Supper. I do not understand why you contend for keeping the pattern and yet say the Lord allows it in the area of the "one cup"? Jesus and the apostles all used one cup, but we're excused because of metonymy? My understanding of a metonymy is a related word is used to describe the object in reference. There is no misunderstanding by Jesus example about what he drank from and what was contained therein. The burden of proof is on you to show where you have a command to use more than one cup. Please show me that proof from God's Holy Writ. Sincerely, Steve Melton

### **Cougan's first response:**

Thanks for writing me Steve. I appreciate your question. I would be more than happy to discuss this topic with you. I would like to begin with sharing a article by Wane Jackson with you that answer your questions below. If the things he says in his article is not sufficient to answer your questions, then please tell me why. I have several more logical and Biblical arguments that will show you that multi cups can be used for partaking of the fruit of the vine. Again, I will share these with you if Mr. Jackson letter is not enough for you.

In brotherly love Cougan

## **Are Multiple "Containers" Prohibited in the Distribution of the Lord's Supper?**

*by Wayne Jackson*

**Christian Courier: Questions**

Tuesday, May 18, 2004

*Are multiple cups (containers) prohibited in the distribution of the "fruit of the vine" during the Lord's day communion service? Some sincere folks so contend, but what does the evidence actually indicate? Study this question with us.*

**“Does Matthew 26:26-29 teach that the church must use only one cup (container) when the communion supper is served in the worship service of each local congregation on the Lord’s day? I am searching for the truth.”**

We appreciate all who are “searching” for the truth. The sacred text referenced above reads as follows:

“And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke it; and he gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, All of you drink of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.”

### **Drink this Cup**

Some Christians allege that *only one container* may be used in the distribution of the fruit of the vine during the observance of the Lord’s supper. Advocates of this position contend that there is great significance in the fact that Jesus took “a cup,” when he instituted the fruit of the vine. This solitary drinking container, it is claimed, sets a precedent for all time. Supposedly, it was emblematic of the New Testament itself - the *one* covenant bound by God today.

At the root of this doctrine is a lack of recognition that the container actually had no spiritual significance whatever; rather, the use of the word “cup” in this connection is a form of a figure of speech known as metonymy, i.e., “when one thing is put for another.” An extensive discussion of this symbol is found in D.R. Dungan’s work on sacred “hermeneutics,” which relates to the science of Bible interpretation (see **Hermeneutics**, Cincinnati, Standard, n.d., p. 270ff).

One form of metonymy is when a “container is made to stand for its contents.” We commonly employ this figure when we use such expressions as: “Did he enjoy his tea? Yes, he drank the whole cup.” Or, “the kettle is boiling.” When Moses declared that “the earth was corrupt” in the days of Noah (Gen. 6:11), he did not allude to this orb of dirt, but to the *people* that inhabited it. Similarly, when John wrote that “God so loved the world” (Jn. 3:16), he was not referring to the globe, but to its population. The “container” represents the “contents.”

That Christ was not placing emphasis upon the *material container* ought to be obvious from the following facts:

1. The same language is used with reference to both the “bread” and the “cup.” One was to be eaten, the other drunk. Since the bread (not a platter) was the emphasis relative to the first element, similarly, the “fruit of the vine” (not a container) was the focus of the second element. Note that in 1 Corinthians 10:21 there is a

- reference to the “cup” and the “table.” One is not to be pressed as *literal* any more than the other.
2. The disciples were instructed initially to “drink of the cup,” which expression means “of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, etc. - Mt. 26:29” (J.H. Thayer, **Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament**, Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1958, p. 191; Note also that *poterion* (cup) is used in Luke 22:20, where Thayer observes that “cup” represents its contents – p. 533). The reference is to the substance drunk, not the container.
  3. The “cup” was “poured out” (Lk. 22:20), “divided” (Lk. 22:17), and “drunk” (Mt. 26:27). All of these terms refer to the liquid, not a solid container.
  4. The logical consequence of the “one cup” doctrine reveals the fallacy of the theory. If the use of the term “cup” demands that a church be restricted to one “container” in its practice of the communion, and yet that “cup” represents the New Testament, then each church would be restricted to *one copy* of the New Testament in its teaching program. This conclusion, of course, no one accepts. The fact of the matter is, the “cup” represented the Savior’s “blood,” not the new covenant. The new covenant is mentioned simply because it was by Christ’s blood that the covenant was made operative (Heb. 9:15ff). A careful reading of v. 28 corrects the fallacious “one covenant/one cup” theory.

It is a source of great consternation that the body of Christ has been divided over such a frivolous issue, and a failure on the part of conscientious people to understand the use of a simple figure of speech.

### **Steve’s second email:**

In Lk22:17, did Jesus utilize a literal cup, or was the cup that the apostles drank from a figure of speech, meaning they didn't use a vessel? Does the metonymy in Lk 22:20 negate the use of a literal cup by Christ in v. 17? Can a congregation drink of a liquid without a container, if not how many containers did Jesus use when he instituted the Lord's supper? In 1Cor.11:25 the apostle Paul, giving us the words of Jesus says This "cup" is the new covenant in my blood. What does the cup represent in this passage? So let me get this right; we don't have a literal cup or literal table according to Wayne's article? My question is was the fruit of the vine literal?

In 1 Cor.10:21 If the Cup and the table are not literal, I have three questions for you. What do you set the cup on? What was in the cup? And what did Jesus put the fruit of the vine in?

"Logical consequence of the “one cup” doctrine reveals the fallacy of the theory. If the use of the term “cup” demands that a church be restricted to one “container” in its practice of the communion, and yet that “cup” represents the New Testament, then each church would be restricted to *one copy* of the New Testament in its teaching program."

The cup is both literal and metaphorical. The literal one container is a metaphor for the one covenant that we have. The metaphorical cup does not represent *literal physical*

*copies* of the new testament, but the testament itself. Furthermore, there is no specific command or example given to any type of restriction of the number of copies one congregation may have of the new testament, but in every instance of the Lord's supper a singular cup is mentioned.

As far as this being a frivolous issue, I must respectfully disagree. In 1Cor 8:9-13 the apostle Paul warns us against overstepping the bounds of liberty. Paul states in verse 9 that a liberty could become a stumbling block to those who are weak, and in verse 12 he goes on to say that if we press a liberty that is offensive to our brother we sin against our brother. If multiple cups is indeed a liberty (which I do not believe it is) when the division first took place, who would be responsible for the division; those who desired to follow what Jesus did and what the bible says about a "cup", or those who pressed their liberty to the point of division? Finally, we know that individual cups were introduced in the late 1800s. When was the use of one cup introduced?

I agree wholeheartedly that a misunderstanding of a figure of speech is indeed at the root of the matter, but I believe that the problem is an overutilization of metonymy when it isn't indicated.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to reading your response.

#### **Cougan's second response:**

Steve, I am going to prove to you without doubt that multiple cups are lawful. The first thing I want to do is to stick to what the Scriptures teach and not what man has said or what history says. Just for your information, your assumption that multiple cups began in the 1800's is wrong because they were used much earlier than that. In fact, here is a reference that shows multiple cups were used in the 4<sup>th</sup> century:

**XLIII. Then he distributes to the clergy; and when the deacons take the disks Or patens. and the chalices (*plural*) for distribution to the people, the Deacon, who takes the first disk, says:—**

This is a quote from the Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 7 p. 548 The Divine Liturgy of St. James, which talks about how they did communion.

There is no question in my mind that there was a container there or that the Bible only speaks about one cup. The question is, what is the cup referring to and where is the emphasis?

As you will see from the Scriptures, Jesus emphasizes the contents and not the literally cup. To put it another way, the cup represents the blood, and is to be divided and consumed, therefore the cup cannot refer to the literal cup but the content.

**Matthew 26:27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you. <sup>28</sup> "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is**

shed for many for the remission of sins. <sup>29</sup> "But I say to you, I will not drink of this fruit of the vine from now on until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom."

Notice verse 27 says he took the cup and they were to drink from it. Verse 28 clearly says that the content of that cup represents the blood of the new covenant not the cup itself. In verse 29 Jesus said He would not drink of this fruit of the vine again referring to the contents. So the cup = the blood of the new covenant which = the fruit of the vine.

The same thing can be seen in:

**Mark 14:23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. <sup>24</sup> And He said to them, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many. <sup>25</sup> "Assuredly, I say to you, I will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."**

The cup (vs. 23) = my blood (vs. 24) = the fruit of the vine (vs. 25).

Also note the following verses:

**Luke 22:17 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves; <sup>18</sup> "for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes."**

They took the cup and divided it (vs. 17). Did they divide the physical cup? No, they divided the fruit of the vine (vs. 18), which again shows the emphasis is on the content and not the cup.

Same thing can be seen in:

**1 Corinthians 11:25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." <sup>26</sup> For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes. <sup>27</sup> 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. <sup>28</sup> But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.**

The cup is mentioned. Notice "drink this cup" (vs. 26,27). Do you literally drink the cup or the contents? The contents of course. The contents are what represent the new covenant in Jesus blood not the cup. Think about it, what represents the shed blood of Jesus that made the new covenant possible, the fruit of the vine or the cup? My answer is the fruit of the vine.

To further prove that the cup, that is the literal container, does not represent the new covenant, notice the following:

**Luke 22:17 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves;**

You and I both know that they did not divide the literal cup, they divided the contents. So the cup = the fruit of the vine. If it is true in this verse, it is true in our next verse:

**Luke 22:20 Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for you.**

The cup = the fruit of the vine = new covenant not the literal cup. This same thing can be seen in 1 Cor. 11:26 where the cup obviously is referring to the contents (the fruit of the vine) and 1 Cor. 11:25 is talking about the same thing. The cup, not the literal container, but the contents is the new covenant in his blood.

The final proof that the covenant is in the blood which is represented by the fruit of the vine comes from:

**Mark 14:23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. <sup>24</sup> And He said to them, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many.**

This passage is easy to understand. They took the literal cup and drank from it. The contents not the literally cup represents his blood of the new covenant. Since the new covenant is found in His blood, which is represented by the fruit of the vine, it CANNOT be found outside the fruit of vine. Therefore, the literal cup cannot be the new covenant. Again, the emphasis is on the contents not the cup.

Steve I have no problem with your congregation choosing to divide the fruit of the vine with one literal cup. If that is how you choose to disperse it that is great, but I do have problem with you bind one cup when the Bible does not bind one cup.

**Romans 4:15 for where there is no law there is no transgression.**

You need to show where there is a law to use just 1 container because I cannot find one. Notice the following chart:

|       | Assembly                        | Evangelism                           | Fruit of Vine     |
|-------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Must: | Meet (1 Cor. 11:18; Heb. 10:25) | Go Preach the Gospel (Mt. 28:19-20). | Drink (Mt. 26:27) |

|             |                                     |                               |   |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>May:</b> | <b>Church Buildings,<br/>Houses</b> | <b>Car, Walk, Boat, etc.,</b> | <b>One Container or<br/>Multiple Containers<br/>(Lk. 22:17)</b> |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|

We are commanded to assemble with saints. If we violate that law, we sin. Where we meet is up to us (church building, houses, a tent).

We are commanded to preach the gospel to the world. If we do not preach the truth, we sin. How we go to preach is up to us (by car, walk boat, plane).

We are commanded to drink the fruit of the vine, but how we choose to dispense it is up to us (one container – glass, plastic, paper or multiple containers). Again, the fruit of the vine is that which is to be drunk and represents the blood of Jesus.

Some have suggested that it is possible that when they divided the cup that they could have poured some of the fruit of the vine into their own cups and then they drank it, but none of that really matters. If Jesus used one cup to dispense the fruit of the vine it does serve as an example that we must follow. We only have to follow the example if it is backed up by a command. If we must use one cup because that is what Jesus used, then we must also:

- Partake of it in an upper room (Mk. 14:15)
- We must have many lamps (Acts 20:8)
- We must gather around a table (Lk. 22:21)
- We must partake of it in the evening
- We must preach until midnight (Acts 20:7)

If you want to get right down to it, we would have to have the exact cup that Jesus used and each congregation would have to share that one cup. Now you might think that is ridiculous and it would be, but that is exactly what we would have to do if we want to follow the exact example of Jesus.

This brings me to my next point. When congregations gather on Sunday morning all over the world to partake of the Lord's Supper, they are all partaking of that one cup because there is only one cup. Based on your position you would have to say that there must be one cup per congregation, but that would be more than one cup. Paul proves that two different congregations can partake of the fruit of the vine in their own congregation yet it is considered one cup not two because the content = the one cup:

**1 Corinthians 10:16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?**

Paul is writing this letter to the Corinthians. He partakes of the fruit of the vine in one place and the Corinthians in another place. Even if they used one cup that would be two

physical containers, yet Paul says, we bless the cup (singular). Again, this proves that the content is what is under consideration and not a literal cup.

One last argument I want to show is that multiple cups do not change the identify of the fruit of the vine. We can see this in other places that you will agree. For example, we know that there is one body (Eph. 4:4-5), yet the body is made up of many members, and there are many congregations that come together to make that one body. Does this mean that there is more than one body? No!. So the identity of the one body is not changed even though many different people make it up in different locations.

There is one baptism (Eph. 4:4-5,) yet some are baptized in a creek, lake, or baptistery etc.. Does that take away from the identity of the one baptism. No, it does not.

Well the same thing is true when it comes to the one cup. Remember we all partake of that one cup on the Lord's day no matter how many congregations partake of it, so whether we use multiple cups, or one cup, it will not and cannot change the identity of the one cup.

There you have it. I believe all these verses and arguments I have given you proves that is acceptable to partake of the fruit of the vine from one physical container or multiple containers because the fruit of the vine is the emphasis and not the one container. The fruit of vine represents the blood of Christ which = the new covenant. I hope this information will help you, and cause you to stop binding things that God does not bind.

I Have one last question for you that I am sure you have been asked many times, but what do you do to prevent the spread of sickness? TB, flu, Meningitis and many other sickness can easily be passed from person to person when drinking from the same cup. Please do not tell me something lame like a silver cup will not transmit germs because that is not true.

I look forward to your response.

In Christian love,  
Cougan Collins

**Steve's third email:**

Cougan, First let me say you in no way proved to me you have the Biblical authority to use multiple cups. I have noticed specifically from the beginning of our discussion you avoid my questions. Within the realm of this argument you have yet to satisfy any of my inquiries!

I am utterly surprised that you use the practice of the Catholic Church to support your argument. I am almost positive that you denounce their doctrine of transubstantiation. Yet you accept the early departure from the truth of multiple cups? My question is what did they do prior to the fourth century? What did Jesus do and what did Jesus say for us to do? Mt.26:27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying,

"Drink from it, all of you.

1Cor.11:25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

What are we to do? We are to do what Jesus did. This is not a hard rule to follow. I am not convinced by your article that we have the expediency to do something other than what they did in the first century. Cougan, you still have the burden of proof to show me where that is in the Bible. You have not answered my questions in the previous letter concerning this matter. Once again I would appreciate it if you would respond to these;

1. Does the metonymy in Lk 22:20 negate the use of a literal cup by Christ in v. 17?

2. Can a congregation drink of a liquid without a container and if not, how many containers did Jesus use?

3. In 1Cor.11:25 the apostle Paul, giving us the words of Jesus says This "cup" is the new covenant in my blood. What does the cup represent in this passage?

Also do you believe the fruit of the vine represents the New Covenant and the blood?

Let me clarify my statement concerning the introduction of multiple cups. We know G.C. Brewer introduced them into the Church of Christ in 1915. In his book, "Forty Years on the Firing Line" he says: "I think I was the first preacher to advocate the use of individual communion cup and the first church in the state of Tennessee to adopt it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chatanogga, Tennessee." The modern individual communion cup service was invented by G.C. Thomas in 1894. He further states "My next work was with the church at Columbia, Tennessee, and after a long struggle I got the individual communion service into that congregation." We need to be clear who caused the division, Cougan. I think we all can agree with Alexander Campbell who said, "He makes no schism who does no more than the Lord commands."

This we know for certain; Jesus and the apostles used one cup. The word "cup" is used 12 times in reference to the Lord's supper, "the fruit of the vine" is used only twice. The Bible does not use any word repeatedly over and over unless it is important.

I do not agree the cup represents the blood. The apostle Paul leaves no doubt what the cup represents in 1 Cor.11:25 This cup is the new covenant in My blood. Did Paul say the blood stood to represent the New Testament? No! He said the cup! You may be able to convince some people that the fruit of the vine is a cup, Cougan, but not I. I know you cannot pour fruit of the vine into fruit of the vine! You must have a container. The basic question is are you going to follow the simple pattern of the Bible or what man says concerning this matter. I am sure you follow this reasoning on all other religious topics, just not this one! You state the following; "Notice verse 27 says he took the cup and they were to drink from it. Verse 28 clearly says that the content of that cup represents the blood of the new covenant, not the cup itself. In verse 29 Jesus said He would not drink of this fruit of the vine again referring to the contents. So the cup = the blood of the new covenant which = the fruit of the vine."

You are correct in that the contents of the cup represent the blood and again you are right it does not represent the cup, because the cup represents the new covenant, which is ratified by the blood. There is not one passage in the New Testament where the blood is called the New Covenant. There are two where the cup is called the New Covenant.

Lk.22:20, 1Cor.11:25.

Luke 22:17 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves;

(c)

You and I both know that they did not divide the literal cup, they divided the contents. So the cup = the fruit of the vine. If it is true in this verse, it is true in our next verse:

We both know Jesus held a literal cup in his hand and the Bible is so clear about how they divided it.

Mark 14:23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. 24 And He said to them, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many.

Cougan, you really have to try make things difficult to misunderstand this. I cannot comprehend how you can in your wildest imagination go from a single noun and pronoun to a different topic and even if you could this would not give permission to divide it.

(C)

This passage is easy to understand. They took the literal cup and drank from it. (Your words!) The contents, not the literally cup represents his blood of the new covenant. Since the new covenant is found in His blood, which is represented by the fruit of the vine, it CANNOT be found outside the fruit of vine. Therefore, the literal cup cannot be the new covenant. Again, the emphasis is on the contents not the cup.

Cougan, I am amazed at the audacity for you to make a statement that directly opposes the words of Jesus. What was Jesus referring to when he said, "This cup is the new covenant"? Once again you make a play on words to commit a practice that is not found in the Bible. I am real curious why you didn't use a metonymy here?? The fact is the thing stated in this passage is meant to represent something else. The cup is representative of the New Testament, which contained the fruit of the vine representing His blood. This is the key issue concerning our differences.

Steve I have no problem with your congregation choosing to divide the fruit of the vine with one literal cup. If that is how you choose to disperse it that is great, but I do have problem with you bind one cup when the Bible does not bind one cup.

Cougan, if Jesus had of said "take this fruit of the vine which is the New Testament and drink it in remembrance of me" I wouldn't argue this issue, but that is not what Jesus said!

Romans 4:15 for where there is no law there is no transgression.

You need to show where there is a law to use just 1 container because I cannot find one. Notice the following chart:

The fallacy of your chart is that you have change the topic from how many containers we can use to how the cup is the fruit of the vine. We are commanded to drink from the cup. Mt.26:27 27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

1Cor.11:25,28 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." 28 But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.

“This do” constitutes a command. For me to change part of what Jesus says would be to change the command. The apostle Paul further adds emphasis in verse 28. Moses used this same language;

Nu.16:6 Do this: Take censers, Korah and all your company;

When the master tells the servant to do this or this do there is not a question. I cannot understand why you use all these different arguments to show the cup is not a cup of the Lord. You believe and teach a deductive fallacy on this topic. You try several various methods to change the terms, the pretense and topic. I don't believe Jesus made it that difficult, He told the apostles exactly how to divide the contents of the one cup “Drink from it, all of you.

Relating to the argument of logical identity v. physical variety, I agree that there is a universal baptism and the physical variety of that baptism is carried out in a variety of ways. However, it is possible to practice a physical variety of baptism that does not appreciate the logical identity; for example one may not sprinkle to baptize. In applying this to the Lord's supper, the logical identity of the one cup is the new covenant. The physical variety of the cup is the utilization of one cup during the lord's supper. If we utilize more than one cup, we are not appreciating the logical identity as the Lord instructed us to do. 1 covenant = 1 cup. The Lord was with a group of people, his apostles, when he instituted the Lord's supper. He commanded them to all drink the fruit of the vine from one cup. Each group of christians that assembles on the first day of the week is to appreciate this logical identity of the new covenant by practicing the physical variety as Jesus commanded, by drinking fruit of the vine (physical variety) that represents the blood of christ (Logical identity) out of of one cup (scriptural physical variety) that represents the new covenant (logical identity) that was ratified by it's contents.

I Have one last question for you that I am sure you have been asked many times, but what do you do to prevent the spread of sickness? TB, flu, Meningitis and many other sickness can easily be passed from person to person when drinking from the same cup.

Tuberculosis is spread through air droplets which are expelled when persons with infectious TB disease cough, sneeze, speak, or sing. The main way that influenza viruses are thought to spread is from person to person in respiratory droplets of coughs and sneezes. (This is called "droplet spread.") This can happen when droplets from a cough or

sneeze of an infected person are propelled through the air and deposited on the mouth or nose of people nearby. The cup would not be the primary vector. I think this is a matter of faith. I have confidence the Lord is going to take care of me if I do his will. I would like to know how many cases of sickness or death came from drinking from one cup in a communion service have been documented. This is where the cause for division started and this in reality is where it still lies.

I look forward to your reply, Steve

### **Cougan's third response:**

Thanks for the response Steve. I was beginning to wonder if I would hear back from you. I am glad I was able to show that the multiple cups were used much earlier than the 1800's, but as I said I am more interested in what the Bible says. I will respond back to what you have written later in the week.

When I asked my last question about how you deal with sickness that is transferred by drinking after each other, I was just curious. I would agree with you that if the Bible taught that we are to drink from the same cup, which I do not, then I would do it regardless of the risks. I have no way of finding out what documented cases there are of sickness or death caused by drinking after another person, but I know that common colds, flu, and deadly viruses can be transmitted by drinking after someone. I was wrong about TB however.

Notice the following quotes:

One of the quickest ways to catch a cold, flu, or other virus is by drinking after someone else. Viruses are transmitted through saliva and mucous, and every time you drink after someone, you are running the risk of becoming ill. Although they seem harmless enough, some viruses can result in hospitalization, death, or at best, missing a few days of work. Standley Vincent

Bacterial meningitis is **contagious**, which means it can be passed to someone else by spit or snot. It can be spread when you sneeze or cough, when you share cups or utensils, or when you kiss someone. Kidshealth.org

Drinking from a communion cup, as is common in many church services, is certainly unhygienic, at least in theory. Many types of viruses can be spread in this manner, as can a variety of bacteria. Dr. Gott.

These are just a few quotes I ran across. There is no denying the increased risk of getting sick and even possible dying from sharing one cup.

Before I respond to the main part of your response, I would like to know a few things:

1. What state are you from?

2. Does your church only use one cup or one cup for each side?
3. What do you do if the cup runs out before it makes it to every member?
4. Does the last person drink the remainder of what is left in the cup?

Thanks,  
Cougan

**Steve's fourth email:**

1. What state are you from? Oklahoma
2. Does your church only use one cup or one cup for each side? One Cup
3. What do you do if the cup runs out before it makes it to every member? We chose the size of cup according to the congregation size.
4. Does the last person drink the remainder of what is left in the cup? No

I have one other question for you. Does your congregation use one loaf or more than one?  
Awaiting your response, Steve

**Cougan's fourth response:**

Thanks for the answers. Our unleavened bread is a premade sheet that is cracker like. The sheet is divided up and placed in 4 trays and is dispensed from those 4 trays.

I will get back to you very soon.

Cougan

**Cougan's fifth response:**

Steve I will post my comments in blue after your comments.

Cougan, First let me say you in no way proved to me you have the Biblical authority to use multiple cups. I have noticed specifically from the beginning of our discussion you avoid my questions. Within the realm of this argument you have yet to satisfy any of my inquiries!

I may not be able to prove anything to you Steve no matter how logical my arguments are (2 Tim. 3:7) because sometimes you want to believe what you want to believe. You can say the same about me except I wasn't raised in the church or any religion. I did not become a Christian until I was 20. While I have certainly been influenced by the doctrine taught in the congregations I have attended, I have always done my best to prove all things and test them against the Scriptures.

I felt like I answered all of your questions in my previous response. Since you seem to think I have avoided your questions, I will make sure and answer everyone of them specifically.

I am utterly surprised that you use the practice of the Catholic Church to support your argument. I am almost positive that you denounce their doctrine of transubstantiation. Yet you accept the early departure from the truth of multiple cups? My question is what did they do prior to the fourth century? What did Jesus do and what did Jesus say for us to do? Mt.26:27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

1Cor.11:25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." What are we to do? We are to do what Jesus did. This is not a hard rule to follow. I am not convinced by your article that we have the expediency to do something other than what they did in the first century. Cougan, you still have the burden of proof to show me where that is in the Bible. You have not answered my questions in the previous letter concerning this matter.

Where did I say that agreed with the Catholic church? As I told you, I do not care when multiple cups were used, I am only interested in what the Bible says. I simply corrected your blunder on when multiple cups were used for communion. You said the 1800's, but history shows the 4<sup>th</sup> century. If you want to play the accusation game, I could say that you are practicing what Catholics do because many of them drink out of one cup, or since you seem to think that you cannot catch a sickness, which could lead to death by drinking from the same cup I could claim that you believe that God is working a miracle over that one cup so that your brethren cannot get sick, but I am not going to do that.

In both of the verses you mentioned above their emphasis is on the contents not the literal cup. The cup he used has to be used because the fruit of the vine cannot be divided any other way that I can think of unless you want to freeze into ice cubes, which they could not do in the first century. Since we cannot drink the cup or divide the cup, even you would have to admit that the fruit of the vine is what Jesus commanded us to partake.

You keep saying that I have the burden of proof, but you have the same burden of proof to prove that only one literal cup is to be used. Don't forget, you are the one that wrote me. Show me the Scripture that says that we must drink the fruit of the vine out of one literal cup.

Once again I would appreciate it if you would respond to these;

1. Does the metonymy in Lk 22:20 negate the use of a literal cup by Christ in v. 17?

Jesus had a literal cup in verse 17 that contained the fruit of the vine, but the emphasis was on the fruit of the vine and not the literal cup. Even you would agree that they did not divide a literal cup. Instead, the cup was used as a metonymy to say divide the fruit of the vine. In verse 20, He is not saying that the literal cup is the covenant, He using it as a metonymy because the fruit of vine represents the blood of the covenant.

**Matthew 26:27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you. <sup>28</sup> "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.**

## Hebrews 10:29 ... counted the blood of the covenant

Steve I agree that there is only one cup of the Lord and that every church can partake of that one cup by partaking of the fruit of the vine because it is what represents Jesus shed blood that made the new covenant possible. When you make the one cup out to be a literal cup per congregation then you have more than one cup of the Lord.

2. Can a congregation drink of a liquid without a container and if not, how many containers did Jesus use?

Of course you cannot drink anything without a container. Jesus used one cup, but He did not command us to use one literal cup.

3. In 1Cor.11:25 the apostle Paul, giving us the words of Jesus says This "cup" is the new covenant in my blood. What does the cup represent in this passage?  
Also do you believe the fruit of the vine represents the New Covenant and the blood?

The cup is being used as a metonymy for the contents, which represents the New Covenant. As I said in my last response, "Since the new covenant is found in His blood, which is represented by the fruit of the vine, it CANNOT be found outside the fruit of vine. Therefore, the literal cup cannot be the new covenant. Again, the emphasis is on the contents not the cup." Also see Hebrew 9:15-20

Let me clarify my statement concerning the introduction of multiple cups. We know G.C. Brewer introduced them into the Church of Christ in 1915. In his book, "Forty Years on the Firing Line" he says: "I think I was the first preacher to advocate the use of individual communion cup and the first church in the state of Tennessee to adopt it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chatanogga, Tennessee." The modern individual communion cup service was invented by G.C. Thomas in 1894. He further states "My next work was with the church at Columbia, Tennessee, and after a long struggle I got the individual communion service into that congregation." We need to be clear who caused the division, Cougan. I think we all can agree with Alexander Campbell who said, "He makes no schism who does no more than the Lord commands."

This we know for certain; Jesus and the apostles used one cup. The word "cup" is used 12 times in reference to the Lord's supper, "the fruit of the vine" is used only twice. The Bible does not use any word repeatedly over and over unless it is important.

Again, I don't care when someone started using multiple cups, I am only concerned if it is allowed based on what the Bible says. I am sorry Steve, but your argument about the use of words several times is a weak argument. The Bible uses many words over and over again, it does not necessarily make them more important. It wouldn't matter if the Bible used the word cup 1000 times, if there is no command to use one literal cup, than it is not binding as I already explained in my previous response. I notice you completely avoided what I said in my previous response:

If we must use one cup because that is what Jesus used, then we must also:

- Partake of it in an upper room (Mk. 14:15)
- We must have many lamps (Acts 20:8)
- We must gather around a table (Lk. 22:21)
- We must partake of it in the evening
- We must preach until midnight (Acts 20:7)

If you want to get right down to it, we would have to have the exact cup that Jesus used and each congregation would have to share that one cup. Now you might think that is ridiculous and it would be, but that exactly what we would have to do if we want to follow the exact example of Jesus.

I do not agree the cup represents the blood. The apostle Paul leaves no doubt what the cup represents in 1 Cor.11:25 This cup is the new covenant in My blood. Did Paul say the blood stood to represent the New Testament? No! He said the cup! You may be able to convince some people that the fruit of the vine is a cup, Cougan, but not I. I know you cannot pour fruit of the vine into fruit of the vine! You must have a container. The basic question is are you going to follow the simple pattern of the Bible or what man says concerning this matter. I am sure you follow this reasoning on all other religious topics, just not this one! You state the following; "Notice verse 27 says he took the cup and they were to drink from it. Verse 28 clearly says that the content of that cup represents the blood of the new covenant, not the cup itself. In verse 29 Jesus said He would not drink of this fruit of the vine again referring to the contents. So the cup = the blood of the new covenant which = the fruit of the vine."

You are correct in that the contents of the cup represent the blood and again you are right it does not represent the cup, because the cup represents the new covenant, which is ratified by the blood. There is not one passage in the New Testament where the blood is called the New Covenant. There are two where the cup is called the New Covenant. Lk.22:20, 1Cor.11:25.

Luke 22:17 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves;

Steve I am beginning to wonder if you even read my response where I clearly showed how the cup was used over and over again as metonymy. Consider this verse:

**1 Corinthians 11:26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup,**

Using your logic, Paul is saying that we are drinking the new covenant or that we are drinking the literal cup if the cup does not represent the contents.

**1 Corinthians 11:25** In the same manner *He* also *took* the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

If the cup cannot represent the fruit of the vine, then we must drink that literal cup.

**Luke 22:17** Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves;

Again, based on your logic, we must divide the literal cup since it cannot mean the fruit of the vine. Surely you can see how silly your argument it is. The blood of Jesus is what made the new covenant possible (Heb. 9:15-20; 10:29; 13:20). Just as we consume the bread, we consume the fruit of the vine not the literal cup. You keep on denying it, but the fruit of the vine is what we are commanded to drink and it represents the blood in the covenant.

You and I both know that they did not divide the literal cup, they divided the contents. So the cup = the fruit of the vine. If it is true in this verse, it is true in our next verse:

We both know Jesus held a literal cup in his hand and the Bible is so clear about how they divided it.

Mark 14:23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. 24 And He said to them, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many.

Cougan, you really have to try make things difficult to misunderstand this. I cannot comprehend how you can in your wildest imagination go from a single noun and pronoun to a different topic and even if you could this would not give permission to divide it.

I could say the same thing Steve. How can you misunderstand that the emphasis is on the contents and not the literal cup. Just because Jesus used one cup when He instituted the Lord's Supper does not mean that we have to drink from one cup because we were commanded partake of it, but we are not commanded to partake of it out of one cup.

This passage is easy to understand. They took the literal cup and drank from it. (Your words!)The contents, not the literally cup represents his blood of the new covenant. Since the new covenant is found in His blood, which is represented by the fruit of the vine, it CANNOT be found outside the fruit of vine. Therefore, the literal cup cannot be the new covenant. Again, the emphasis is on the contents not the cup.

Cougan, I am amazed at the audacity for you to make a statement that directly opposes the words of Jesus. What was Jesus referring to when he said, "This cup is the new covenant"? Once again you make a play on words to commit a practice that is not found in the Bible. I am real curious why you didn't use a metonymy here?? The fact is the thing stated in this passage is meant to represent something else. The cup is

representative of the New Testament, which contained the fruit of the vine representing His blood. This is the key issue concerning our differences.

I already told you that I have no problem with Jesus using one literal cup to divide the fruit of the vine. I am not opposing the words of Jesus, I am agreeing with them, but you want to make the literal cup to be the new covenant, but that is not what Jesus is saying. You need to look at the verses I showed you in my last response again where I clearly showed the cup being used as a metonym for the fruit of the vine. The literal cup is just that a cup that is used to hold the fruit of the vine. How else could the fruit of the vine be divided other than using a vessel or vessels?

Steve I have no problem with your congregation choosing to divide the fruit of the vine with one literal cup. If that is how you choose to disperse it that is great, but I do have problem with you bind one cup when the Bible does not bind one cup.

Cougan, if Jesus had of said “take this fruit of the vine which is the New Testament and drink it in remembrance of me” I wouldn’t argue this issue, but that is not what Jesus said!

Romans 4:15 for where there is no law there is no transgression.

You need to show where there is a law to use just 1 container because I cannot find one. Notice the following chart:

The fallacy of your chart is that you have change the topic from how many containers we can use to how the cup is the fruit of the vine. We are commanded to drink from the cup. Mt.26:27 27 Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

1Cor.11:25,28 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." 28 But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.

“This do” constitutes a command. For me to change part of what Jesus says would be to change the command. The apostle Paul further adds emphasis in verse 28. Moses used this same language;

Nu.16:6 Do this: Take censers, Korah and all your company;

When the master tells the servant to do this or this do there is not a question. I cannot understand why you use all these different arguments to show the cup is not a cup of the Lord. You believe and teach a deductive fallacy on this topic. You try several various methods to change the terms, the pretense and topic. I don’t believe Jesus made it that difficult, He told the apostles exactly how to divide the contents of the one cup “Drink from it, all of you.

Steve you have not given a command that shows that we are to drink from one cup, The verses you use all emphasize drinking the fruit of the vine. That is what we are

commanded to do. If there was a passage that said, you must drink the fruit of the vine from one cup when you gather together or something similar I would agree with you, but that is not what the Scriptures teach and I think you know that.

Relating to the argument of logical identity v. physical variety, I agree that there is a universal baptism and the physical variety of that baptism is carried out in a variety of ways. However, it is possible to practice a physical variety of baptism that does not appreciate the logical identity; for example one may not sprinkle to baptize. In applying this to the Lord's supper, the logical identity of the one cup is the new covenant. The physical variety of the cup is the utilization of one cup during the lord's supper. If we utilize more than one cup, we are not appreciating the logical identity as the Lord instructed us to do. 1 covenant = 1 cup. The Lord was with a group of people, his apostles, when he instituted the Lord's supper. He commanded them to all drink the fruit of the vine from one cup. Each group of christians that assembles on the first day of the week is to appreciate this logical identity of the new covenant by practicing the physical variety as Jesus commanded, by drinking fruit of the vine (physical variety) that represents the blood of christ (Logical identity) out of of one cup (scriptural physical variety) that represents the new covenant (logical identity) that was ratified by it's contents.

The first part of your argument is flawed. You cannot change the identity of baptism by using those that are actually considered baptism. Baptizing in creek, lake baptistry are all different varieties of baptism which do not change its identity. You introduced sprinkling, which has an identity of its own and it cannot be part of baptism. Therefore it cannot be used as a variety of baptism.

As for the second argument, I would agree that multiple cups could not be used as a variety of the cup if Jesus had commanded us to use one literal cup per congregation, but since that was not the command there is nothing wrong with using multiple cups. Since the emphasis is the fruit of the vine, dispensing the fruit of the vine can be down in any number of cups in different shapes and sizes and does not destroy the identity of the one cup/fruit of the vine.

I still believe that I answered all these questions you asked in my last response, but now I will point out what you did not answer or even attempt to deal with in my last response.

*This brings me to my next point. When congregations gather on Sunday morning all of over the world to partake of the Lord's Supper, they are all partaking of that one cup because there is only one cup. Based on your position you would have to say that there must be one cup per congregation, but that would be more than one cup. Paul proves that two different congregations can partake of the fruit of the vine in their own congregation yet it is considered one cup not two because the content = the one cup:*

***1 Corinthians 10:16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?***

*Paul is writing this letter to the Corinthians. He partakes of the fruit of the vine in one place and the Corinthians in another place. Even if they used one cup that would be two physical containers, yet Paul says, we bless the cup (singular). Again, this proves that the content is what is under consideration and not a literal cup.*

Steve this above argument is solid and cannot be broken by you. It proves that one cup does not mean one literal cup per congregation as you like to teach. Consider the additional two arguments from Gary Workman:

Second, the fact that the disciples drank "of it" -- Mark 14:23) as they were commanded (Matt. 26:27) does not have to mean that they all put their lips to one vessel. For it is the identical expression found in John 4:12 of Jacob's well. The Samaritan woman said that Jacob and his sons and his cattle all drank "thereof". But who can believe that any of them actually put their heads into the well itself and lapped the water from it? The expression "of it" is a genitive of source regardless of how many containers were used.

Third, when Paul said that we "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 11:26) or "drink this cup" (KJV, Textus Receptus), he referred to a liquid, not a container! By metonymy, the word "cup" stands for the contents -- the fruit of the vine. Nor does it mean the contents of a single container any more than the figurative reference to "the cup" in Matt. 20:22-23 means that Jesus and James and John were all going to die on the same cross or at the same time. Too, Jesus did not mean in Matt. 23:25 that the Pharisees (plural) were in the habit of cleansing just one Vessel -- "the cup" (singular). Thus, "the cup" no more refers to one container than "the fruit" or "the vine" (Mark 14:25) refers to one grape or one grapevine! Paul's reference to "the cup" (as in the case of "the bread") is to the only such cup (drink) that has spiritual significance in the worship of Christians. It is "the cup" which. "we" (Christians everywhere -- 1 Cor. 10:16) bless.

Steve I appreciate your zeal and sincerity about using one literal cup, but I honestly believe you are sincerely wrong. I believe I have shown you the truth on this matter and I hopefully you will see it now. I will continue to discuss this matter with you, if you would like, but I want you to deal with the last argument that you did not deal with from my last response and also the last two arguments as presented by Gary Workman.

Your brother in Christ,

Cougan Collins

**Steve's fifth email:**

Cougan, which argument in particular do you want me to address? Steve

**Cougan's sixth response:**

I would like for you to specifically address these 4 arguments below and any other thoughts you might want to add from previous response.

If we must use one cup because that is what Jesus used, then we must also:

- Partake of it in an upper room (Mk. 14:15)
- We must have many lamps (Acts 20:8)
- We must gather around a table (Lk. 22:21)
- We must partake of it in the evening
- We must preach until midnight (Acts 20:7)

If you want to get right down to it, we would have to have the exact cup that Jesus used and each congregation would have to share that one cup. Now you might think that is ridiculous and it would be, but that exactly what we would have to do if we want to follow the exact example of Jesus.

I still believe that I answered all these questions you asked in my last response, but now I will point out what you did not answer or even attempt to deal with in my last response.

*This brings me to my next point. When congregations gather on Sunday morning all of over the world to partake of the Lord's Supper, they are all partaking of that one cup because there is only one cup. Based on your position you would have to say that there must be one cup per congregation, but that would be more than one cup. Paul proves that two different congregations can partake of the fruit of the vine in their own congregation yet it is considered one cup not two because the content = the one cup:*

***1 Corinthians 10:16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?***

*Paul is writing this letter to the Corinthians. He partakes of the fruit of the vine in one place and the Corinthians in another place. Even if they used one cup that would be two physical containers, yet Paul says, we bless the cup (singular). Again, this proves that the content is what is under consideration and not a literal cup.*

Steve this above argument is solid and cannot be broken by you. It proves that one cup does not mean one literal cup per congregation as you like to teach. Consider the additional two arguments from Gary Workman:

Second, the fact that the disciples drank "of it" -- Mark 14:23) as they were commanded (Matt. 26:27) does not have to mean that they all put their lips to one vessel. For it is the identical expression found in John 4:12 of Jacob's well. The Samaritan woman said that Jacob and his sons and his cattle all drank "thereof". But who can believe that any of them actually put their heads into the well itself and lapped the water from it? The expression "of it" is a genitive of source regardless of how many containers were used.

Third, when Paul said that we "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 11:26) or "drink this cup" (KJV, Textus Receptus), he referred to a liquid, not a container! By metonymy, the word "cup" stands for the contents -- the fruit of the vine. Nor does it mean the contents of a single container any more than the figurative reference to "the cup" in Matt. 20:22-23 means that Jesus and James and John were all going to die on the same cross or at the same time. Too, Jesus did not mean in Matt. 23:25 that the Pharisees (plural) were in the habit of cleansing just one Vessel -- "the cup" (singular). Thus, "the cup" no more refers to one container than "the fruit" or "the vine" (Mark 14:25) refers to one grape or one grapevine! Paul's reference to "the cup" (as in the case of "the bread") is to the only such cup (drink) that has spiritual significance in the worship of Christians. It is "the cup" which. "we" (Christians everywhere -- 1 Cor. 10:16) bless.

### **Steve's sixth email:**

Cougan, I highlighted my response in red.

You keep saying that I have the burden of proof, but you have the same burden of proof to prove that only one literal cup is to be used. Don't forget, you are the one that wrote me. Show me the Scripture that says that we must drink the fruit of the vine out of one literal cup.

I have the poof. You even agree that Jesus and the apostles used one cup, but you have nothing but the writings of the Catholics in the fourth century to uphold your belief. You continually say you want only what the Bible says, yet you fail to implement its teachings. When Jesus says "this do" or "do this" this command circumferences the context and applies to all that he has instituted concerning the Lord's supper. You have yet to give me one instance where the Bible even remotely refers to individual cups??? The practice, the idea and the actual wording are all unfounded in the Bible, yet you say show me in the Bible? I can show you where Jesus took cup, I can show you where Jesus refers to the cup as the New Testament and where they all drank from it from the Bible. You can show me none of these concerning individual cups!

I see no logic when you use a figure of speech when one is not necessary. The word cup is not always used by metonymy in the Lord's supper passages. Even when the word "cup" is being used by metonymy, a literal cup (drinking vessel) is still in view. Notice the following definitions of metonymy:

1. Metonymy – A figure of speech by which one name or noun is used instead of another, to which it stands in a certain relationship.
2. .Metonymy- A figure of speech consisting of the use of the name of one thing for that of another of which it is an attribute or which it is associated.
3. A figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind not by naming I, but by naming something else that readily suggest it.

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

1 Corinthians 11:26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the

Lord's death till he come.

Applying the above definitions of metonymy here is what we have:

1. The thing named--- a literal cup (drinking vessel)
2. The thing suggested--- literal fruit of the vine(contents of the cup)
3. A relationship between the two objects--- the fruit of the vine is contained within a literal cup.

Even in a metonymy a literal cup is used.

The above definitions clearly indicate five facts about metonymy:

1. The object named is not the thing suggested.
2. There is a real object, not an imaginary one, named.
3. Both the thing named and the thing suggested must exist.
4. In the metonymy of the container for the contained, the container named must contain the thing suggested.
5. One can only suggest the contents of as many cups as he names.

Because of these facts, here are the conclusions that must be drawn relative to the communion cup:

1. Paul named “this cup” or “this cup of the Lord” to suggest its content, the fruit of the vine.
2. Since the object named is not the thing suggested, “this cup” is not the fruit of the vine.
3. There is a real cup named.
4. Both the cup, which is named, and the contents, which are suggested must exist.
5. The cup, which is named, must contain the thing which is suggested, the fruit of the vine.
6. Since one cup was named, the contents of only one are is suggested.

In metonymy the drinking vessel is just as literal as the fruit of the vine which it suggest.

1. If the fruit of the vine is literal, then the drinking vessel named to suggest it must be literal.
2. If the fruit of the vine is not literal, neither is the drinking vessel.

Fruit of the vine can only be called “cup” when it is in a literal cup. It is improper and illogical to call grape juice a cup ( singular) if:

- It is still in the cluster
- it is still in the bottle
- it is in a plurality of cups

To illustrate this point:

1. Paul could have written “ as often as you eat this bread and drink these cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death till he comes. ( This is not what the Bible say, but what it should have said if plurality of drinking vessels were used.)
2. Paul wrote “as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death till he comes. ( This is what the Bible actually says and it implies the use of only one literal drinking vessel called a cup.)

I am sorry Steve, but you argument about the use of words several times is a weak argument. The Bible uses many words over and over again, it does not necessarily make them more important. It wouldn’t matter if the Bible used the word cup 1000 times, if there is no command to use one literal cup, than it is not binding as I already explained in my previous response. I notice you completely avoided what I said in my previous response:

There is a command and you continue to ignore it. You repeatedly say the Jesus placed the emphasis on the “fruit of the vine”, but that’s not true, because the word for the literal cup is used many more times.

(Mt.26:27) Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

“Drink from it” is a command . All the disciples present were expected to obey and share the contents of that one cup by each drinking from the same cup Jesus handed them. They understood exactly what Jesus said and obediently drank from the same cup.

(Mk.14:23) Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

The one cup was consistently used by the churches and disciples during apostolic times. There is a pattern that is easily seen.

1. Matthew states that only one cup was used (Mt.26:27-29).
2. Mark states that only one cup was used (Mk.14:23:23-25).
3. Luke states that only one cup was used (Lk.22:17-20)
4. Paul states that only one cup was used (1Cor.10:16-17, 11:23-29).

Cougan, you may feel safe doing something other than what you can read in the Bible, I do not. I believe there is a reason for words to be used especially when they are in the same context repeatedly. I will not base my salvation upon what someone thinks it means as opposed to what the word says.

Cougan, I am not ignoring your response, although I am becoming weary of your ignoring the Bible. I believe words are important, you believe that too or else you would not have use fruit of vine in the place of cup as many times as you have. Jesus used one cup. They were told to “do this” or “this do”, What were they to do? The apostle Paul

commands one cup and no matter how many times you say it, fruit of the vine does not mean cup! Nowhere does Jesus say take the fruit of the vine and drink ye all of it. He took the cup (a literal-drinking vessel) and they all drank from it. I understand you never do anything by example or nor do you not believe an example is binding. Every example in the Bible show us exactly what items were present and what items were used and what spiritual significance each one has, but you fail to see the importance even though God's word uses it in every instance. You say the Bible teaching is important, yet you fail to apply it. This becomes more apparent in your departure from the truth by using more than one loaf. Please, don't go down the road that Jesus broke it into pieces. The difference between you and I are clear. You believe all we have to do is keep the concept, not the literal principles.

If we must use one cup because that is what Jesus used, then we must also:

- \* Partake of it an upper room (Mk. 14:15)
- \* We must have many lamps (Acts 20:8)
- \* We must gather around a table (Lk. 22:21)
- \* We must partake of it in the evening
- \* We must preach until midnight (Acts 20:7)

If you want to get right down to it, we would have to have the exact cup that Jesus used and each congregation would have to share that one-cup. Now you might think that is ridiculous and it would be, but that exactly what we would have to do if we want to follow the exact example of Jesus.

The upper room argument proves nothing except that is where they began meeting, but it in no way proves an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion. This certainly does not prove that we may use individual cups in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

The fallacy of this argument is easily seen. All this proves is that Jesus commanded the apostles to prepare a upper room for the Passover (Mk.14:15). The fulfilled that command (Mk.14:16). There is no question, that Jesus loosed the place of worship (Jn.4:21), but he never loosed the items on the table. Must we use the same loaf Jesus used? Must we use the same fruit of the vine Jesus used? If not why not? With that being said, I suppose I can partake of the Lord's supper on whatever day I want to? If not why not? Do you use unfermented fruit of the vine and unleavened bread? If so, why?

Acts 20:7 Gives us incidentals that were in the upper room. The lamps, partaking in the evening, preaching until midnight, but 1 Cor.11:23-26 give us specific instructions pertaining to the Lord's supper. Oh yes, you never said what you use to set your individual cups and loafs on?

This passage is easy to understand. They took the literal cup and drank from it. The contents not the literally cup represents his blood of the new covenant. Since the new covenant is found in His blood, which is represented by the fruit of the vine, it CANNOT be found outside the fruit of vine. Therefore, the literal cup cannot be the new covenant. Again, the emphasis is on the contents not the cup.

This argument is based on a lack of understanding of the Greek preposition (en) translated “in” when used in 1 Cor.11:25 This preposition (en) is used with both the locative and instrumental cases.

- a. Locative case- to indicate the location or position.
- b. Instrumental- to indicate the means by which something is done.

When Jesus said “This cup is the new testament in my blood: (1Cor.11:25) He was using the instrumental case and was indicating the means by which the new covenant came into force. Notice the language concerning the dedication of the Old Testament:

Hebrews 9:18-20 18 Therefore not even the first covenant was dedicated without blood.  
19 For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people,

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

When Moses said “This is the blood of the covenant” he meant according to verse 18.

“This is the blood which dedicates the covenant.” The blood of the animals was the instrument used to dedicate or ratify the first covenant. Likewise when Jesus said “This cup is the New Covenant in my blood,” He meant as Moses worded it “This is the New Covenant dedicated or ratified by my blood.” The blood of Christ was the instrument used to dedicate or ratify the New Covenant. Jesus was not saying the New Testament was located or positioned inside the blood.

Now here is my question to you. How is the New Covenant in the blood?

Since we cannot drink the cup or divide the cup, even you would have to admit that the fruit of the vine is what Jesus commanded us to partake.

“The cup” is what we drink only if what we drink is in the cup! Fruit of the vine can be called a “cup” only when it is in a cup.

- a. When we drink fruit of the vine out of one cup we are drinking “the cup” (singular) This is what the Bible says in regard to the communion (1Cor.11:26).
- b. If we drank fruit of the vine out of individual cups we would be drinking cups (plural). The Bible never says this.

Steve I agree that there is only one cup of the Lord and that every church can partake of that one cup by partaking of the fruit of the vine because it is what represents Jesus shed blood that made the new covenant possible.

**NO the fruit if the vine is not the cup! Yes the fruit of the vine does represent blood. You**

have the fruit of the vine representing two things.

When you make the one-cup out to be a literal cup per congregation then you have more than one cup of the Lord.

This is not true and I really think you know this. Let me see your church building has a baptistery our building has a baptistery that makes it multiple baptisteries?

Again, based on your logic, we must divide the literal cup since it cannot mean the fruit of the vine. Surely you can see how silly your argument it is. The blood of Jesus is what made the new covenant possible (Heb. 9:15-20; 10:29; 13:20). Just as we consume the bread, we consume the fruit of the vine not the literal cup. You keep on denying it, but the fruit of the vine is what we are commanded to drink and it represents the blood in the covenant.

We are commanded to drink the fruit of the vine out of one cup. Once again you cannot consume the literal fruit of the vine without the literal cup, to do what Jesus did. Jesus said do this! What did they do Cougan, up until the fourth century when the Catholics started doing something different?

Again, I don't care when someone started using multiple cups, I am only concerned if it is allowed based on what the Bible says.

I do care when people started using cups, because this shows us clearly when the departure from the truth began. This practice of individual cups is a teaching that neither Jesus nor the apostles ever practiced in the Bible. I know when this practice started and it was not with Jesus! You continually say the emphasis is on the fruit of the vine even though the Bible places the importance on the cup by the number of times it used, yet you ignore that fact. Both the Hebrew and Greek writers knew the word cups (2 Sa.17:28,1 Chr.28:17,Isa.22:24,Jer.35:5,Jer.52:19, Mk.7:4, 7:8)but never used it concerning the Lord's supper. Do you think they were just to ignorant and unlearned to know what Jesus meant? When Jesus says "This do" that is a command. This is a command to do it exactly as he instituted it.

The point of division that was brought about by the use of individual communion cups in the church of Christ came about in the 1800's. This doesn't matter to you that brethren prior to that time used one cup? This does not even concern you? This does not even strike your curiosity that for all those years they practices the use of one cup and then because of hygiene found a need to change what they had practiced for centuries. You know I am correct about this. Oh what about the space before the fourth century?

I could say the same thing Steve. How can you misunderstand that the emphasis is on the contents and not the literal cup. Just because Jesus used one cup when He instituted the Lord's Supper does not mean that we have to drink from one cup because we were commanded partake of it, but we are not commanded to partake of it out of one cup.

I like your flawed logic. NO it doesn't mean you have do anything, but to do what Jesus said and what the apostles did you have to. We cannot pick and choose which part of the commandment we partake of. I suppose it really doesn't matter if I partake of the loaf

(singular) either. Even though we know for certain the Corinthians did.

I clearly showed the cup being used as a metonymy for the fruit of the vine. The literal cup is just that a cup that is used to hold the fruit of the vine. How else could the fruit of the vine be divided other than using a vessel or vessels?

By each person sharing the cup just as the Bible says. Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. (Mk14:23)

1 Corinthians 10:16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?

Paul is writing this letter to the Corinthians. He partakes of the fruit of the vine in one place and the Corinthians in another place. Even if they used one cup that would be two physical containers, yet Paul says, we bless the cup (singular). Again, this proves that the content is what is under consideration and not a literal cup.

I am amazed when the Bible calls it a cup you say it's not a literal cup. And yet you call it fruit of the vine.

Cougan, if you come over to my house and I am standing by the coffee pot facing you and I take a literal cup out of the cabinet and ask you if you want a cup of coffee and you say sure. I pour the coffee in the one cup. What is the coffee in and what is in the cup? So when Jesus took the cup containing the fruit of the vine and told the apostle to all drink of it, do you really think they were perplexed as you seem to be? When you go to the store for grape juice, do you ask for a cup? Is grape juice still a cup when it is in a bottle?

This proves to me that Paul took a literal cup. The Corinthians took a literal cup.

Steve this above argument is solid and cannot be broken by you. It proves that one cup does not mean one literal cup per congregation as you like to teach.

This is not correct Cougan they each had one single cup per congregation, this makes one per congregation! No matter how much you would like to change number, this is not logical.

Lets apply this reasoning to the Jewish Passover:

Exodus 12:3-4"Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his father, a lamb for a household.

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

Would it have been reasonable for the Israelites to argue “ There's a lamb in my neighbor's house and there's a lamb in my other neighbor's house. That makes two lambs. If there's two I can have two hundred in my house.

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

Each house was to have only one lamb and one basin (Ex.12:3,22).

Likewise, each congregation is to have only one loaf and one cup containing the fruit of the vine (1 Cor.10:16-17).

Second, the fact that the disciples drank "of it" -- Mark 14:23) as they were commanded (Matt. 26:27) does not have to mean that they all put their lips to one vessel. For it is the identical expression found in John 4:12 of Jacob's well. The Samaritan woman said that Jacob and his sons and his cattle all drank "thereof". But who can believe that any of them actually put their heads into the well itself and lapped the water from it? The expression "of it" is a genitive of source regardless of how many containers were used.

Cougan, this is old. The Greek word ek ("translated from or of") is used with the genitive case, but there are many different kinds of genitives. Thayer list 6 different kinds of genitives with various meanings Arndt & Gingrich also list 6 different genitives. Both Thayer and Arndt & Gingrich specifically state that the genitive connected with the communion cup is different than the genitive connected with Jacob's well.

1. When the Lord told the disciples to "Drink from it, all of you" (Mt.26:27) He was using the genitive of "the thing out of which one drinks."
  2. But when the Samaritan woman said "Jacob gave us the well and drank from it himself" (Jn.4:12), she was using the genitive "of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, ect.
- There may be a thousand unconventional ways to drink from a cup, but in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we must conclude Jesus and his disciples used the standard method.

If the idea of picking up one literal cup and drinking out of it seems absurd, try this line of reasoning. Keep this in mind there was one well!  
Men picked up Jacob's well and poured it into individual well. Each man drank out of his own well. Then a passage would need to say all these men who drank from these individual wells drank from Jacob's one well.  
Notice the inconsistency, as you have argued the cup is the blood. If this is true, then I must ask, is the well the water? Is the well literal? How many wells were there? Was the well the water or were the well and the water two separate items?  
Is the cup literal? How many cups were there? Was the cup the blood or were the cup and the blood two separate items?

Cougan, You have yet to give me one documented case where someone has become sick or died from drinking out of one cup. In all this you have yet to show me where you have the command, example or an inference to use multiple cups.

Thank you for taking the time to show me what you believe. I do not agree with your practice, but I do understand why you hold to it. In the love of Christ, Steve

**Cougan's seventh response:**

Steve,

I appreciate you taking the time to have this discussion with me. It is good to see that there are some in this world that are willing to take a stand on what they believe and try to defend it. Though I do not agree with your teaching that we must use one literal cup or we sin, I do respect your concern for wanting to do things according to Scripture. Hopefully, in this response, (highlighted in blue) I might open your eyes to the fact that you are trying to bind something that the Bible does not.

Cougan, I highlighted my response in red.

You keep saying that I have the burden of proof, but you have the same burden of proof to prove that only one literal cup is to be used. Don't forget, you are the one that wrote me. Show me the Scripture that says that we must drink the fruit of the vine out of one literal cup.

I have the poof. You even agree that Jesus and the apostles used one cup, but you have nothing but the writings of the Catholics in the fourth century to uphold your belief. You continually say you want only what the Bible says, yet you fail to implement its teachings. When Jesus says "this do" or "do this" this command circumferences the context and applies to all that he has instituted concerning the Lord's supper. You have yet to give me one instance where the Bible even remotely refers to individual cups???

The practice, the idea and the actual wording are all unfounded in the Bible, yet you say show me in the Bible? I can show you where Jesus took cup, I can show you where Jesus refers to the cup as the New Testament and where they all drank from it from the Bible. You can show me none of these concerning individual cups!

The only thing you have proof of is that the Jesus used one literal cup to divide up the fruit of the vine. You have not shown a command that says that we must use one literal cup to partake of the fruit of the vine. Again, if you are going to make one literal cup per congregation binding because that is what Jesus used then you need to partake of the Lord's supper in a upper room and at low table etc.

As I have continued to point out the emphasis is on the contents and not the literal cup. Steve please cut and past from my previous responses where I ever said that what others did in history proves that I can use more than one cup. Go back and look and you will see that I said that I do not care what history says, I am only concerned what the Bible teaches on the matter. The only reason I gave you the 4<sup>th</sup> century example of people using more than one cup was to show you that others had used more than one cup before the 1800's, which was the earliest reference you said you could find them being used. If you are going to accuse me of something, please be accurate and don't put words in my mouth.

Unlike you, I believe that there is one cup of the Lord and one bread of the Lord.

**1 Cor. 10:17** For we, *though many*, are one bread *and* one body; for we all partake of that one bread.

**1 Corinthians 10:21** You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons;

Notice, there is just one bread that represents the body of Christ, and each individual Christian represents that one bread/one body even though there are numerous Christians and congregations, yet when we partake of the bread on the first day of the week with thousands of loafs being used on Sunday, we are only partaking of the one bread.

In the same way, there is only one cup of the Lord. Though thousands of cups are being used on Sunday across the world, we are only partaking of the one cup of the Lord, which is the fruit of the vine and not one literal cup. Since there is one cup of the Lord, even those who hold your view are using multiple cups. You have one cup in your congregation and your sister congregation in another town is using a cup that makes two cups. I have already shown you how Paul confirms this idea of how two different congregations can partake of the fruit of the vine from two or more cups and yet it is still considered one cup:

**1 Corinthians 10:16** The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?

I see no logic when you use a figure of speech when one is not necessary. The word cup is not always used by metonymy in the Lord's supper passages. Even when the word "cup" is being used by metonymy, a literal cup (drinking vessel) is still in view. Notice the following definitions of metonymy:

1. Metonymy – A figure of speech by which one name or noun is used instead of another, to which it stands in a certain relationship.
2. .Metonymy- A figure of speech consisting of the use of the name of one thing for that of another of which it is an attribute or which it is associated.
3. A figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind not by naming I, but by naming something else that readily suggest it.

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

1 Corinthians 11:26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.

Applying the above definitions of metonymy here is what we have:

1. The thing named--- a literal cup (drinking vessel)
2. The thing suggested--- literal fruit of the vine(contents of the cup)
3. A relationship between the two objects--- the fruit of the vine is contained within a literal cup.

Even in a metonymy a literal cup is used.

The above definitions clearly indicate five facts about metonymy:

1. The object named is not the thing suggested.
2. There is a real object, not an imaginary one, named.
3. Both the thing named and the thing suggested must exist.
4. In the metonymy of the container for the contained, the container named must contain the thing suggested.
5. One can only suggest the contents of as many cups as he names.

Because of these facts, here are the conclusions that must be drawn relative to the communion cup:

1. Paul named "this cup" or "this cup of the Lord" to suggest its content, the fruit of the vine.
2. Since the object named is not the thing suggested, "this cup" is not the fruit of the vine.
3. There is a real cup named.
4. Both the cup, which is named, and the contents, which are suggested must exist.
5. The cup, which is named, must contain the thing which is suggested, the fruit of the vine.
6. Since one cup was named, the contents of only one are is suggested.

In metonymy the drinking vessel is just as literal as the fruit of the vine which it suggest. 1. If the fruit of the vine is literal, then the drinking vessel named to suggest it must be literal.

2. If the fruit of the vine is not literal, neither is the drinking vessel.

Fruit of the vine can only be called "cup" when it is in a literal cup. It is improper and illogical to call grape juice a cup ( singular) if:

- It is still in the cluster
- it is still in the bottle
- it is in a plurality of cups

To illustrate this point:

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

The information that you have given is not completely true. For example, if I say that apple juice will cure cancer and then I pour a cup of apple juice and tell someone if they will drink the cup their cancer will be cured. What does the cup stand for? It stands for the apple juice. Does this mean that a person is limited to drinking the apple juice out of one cup to cure cancer? No, because the cup is referring to the apple juice. I could have 50 people sitting around a table and have 50 cups before them and I could make the same statement, "if you will drink the cup your cancer will be cured. This example shows that a metonymy is not limited to one drinking vessel as you have listed above. The same thing can be clearly seen from the Scriptures.

Luke 22:17 Then He took **the cup**, and gave thanks, and said, "**Take this and divide it among yourselves;** <sup>18</sup> "for I say to you, I will not **drink of the fruit of the vine**

*1 Cor. 11:* <sup>26</sup> For as often as you eat this bread and **drink this cup,**

I have already showed this to you before Steve. The cup stands for the fruit of the vine because they were dividing the contents and not the cup. One cannot divide a literal cup nor drink a literal cup. Since there is only one cup of the Lord (1 Cor. 10:21) and Paul clearly states that more than one literal cup was being used, yet he still calls it the cup of the Lord (10:16).

I am sorry Steve, but your argument about the use of words several times is a weak argument. The Bible uses many words over and over again, it does not necessarily make them more important. It wouldn't matter if the Bible used the word cup 1000 times, if there is no command to use one literal cup, then it is not binding as I already explained in my previous response. I notice you completely avoided what I said in my previous response:

There is a command and you continue to ignore it. You repeatedly say the Jesus placed the emphasis on the "fruit of the vine", but that's not true, because the word for the literal cup is used many more times. (Mt.26:27) Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you.

"Drink from it" is a command . All the disciples present were expected to obey and share the contents of that one cup by each drinking from the same cup Jesus handed them. They understood exactly what Jesus said and obediently drank from the same cup.

(Mk.14:23) Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

The one cup was consistently used by the churches and disciples during apostolic times. There is a pattern that is easily seen.

1. Matthew states that only one cup was used (Mt.26:27-29).
2. Mark states that only one cup was used (Mk.14:23:23-25).
3. Luke states that only one cup was used (Lk.22:17-20)
4. Paul states that only one cup was used (1Cor.10:16-17, 11:23-29).

Cougan, you may feel safe doing something other than what you can read in the Bible, I do not. I believe there is a reason for words to be used especially when they are in the same context repeatedly. I will not base my salvation upon what someone thinks it means as opposed to what the word says.

Cougan, I am not ignoring your response, although I am becoming weary of your ignoring the Bible. I believe words are important, you believe that too or else you would not have used fruit of vine in the place of cup as many times as you have. Jesus used one cup. They were told to "do this" or "this do", What were they to do? The apostle Paul commands one cup and no matter how many times you say it, fruit of the vine does not mean cup! Nowhere does Jesus say take the fruit of the vine and drink ye all of it. He took the cup (a literal-drinking vessel) and they all drank from it. I understand you never do anything by example or nor do you not believe

an example is binding. Every example in the Bible show us exactly what items were present and what items were used and what spiritual significance each one has, but you fail to see the importance even though God's word uses it in every instance. You say the Bible teaching is important, yet you fail to apply it. This becomes more apparent in your departure from the truth by using more than one loaf. Please, don't go down the road that Jesus broke it into pieces. The difference between you and I are clear. You believe all we have to do is keep the concept, not the literal principles.

I believe I have already dealt with what you have offered here with my comments above. However, I want to point out that not even you would follow everything they did in first century just because certain words were mentioned several times. For example, I doubt that you wash the saints feet just because Jesus did it. I doubt that you only travel by foot, horse or boat because you know as well as I do unless there is command to follow the example it is not binding.

If we must use one cup because that is what Jesus used, then we must also:

- \* Partake of it in an upper room (Mk. 14:15)
- \* We must have many lamps (Acts 20:8)
- \* We must gather around a table (Lk. 22:21)
- \* We must partake of it in the evening
- \* We must preach until midnight (Acts 20:7)

If you want to get right down to it, we would have to have the exact cup that Jesus used and each congregation would have to share that one-cup. Now you might think that is ridiculous and it would be, but that exactly what we would have to do if we want to follow the exact example of Jesus.

The upper room argument proves nothing except that is where they began meeting, but it in no way proves an assembly of the church of Christ, for the communion. This certainly does not prove that we may use individual cups in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

The fallacy of this argument is easily seen. All this proves is that Jesus commanded the apostles to prepare a upper room for the Passover (Mk.14:15). The fulfilled that command (Mk.14:16). There is no question, that Jesus loosed the place of worship (Jn.4:21), but he never loosed the items on the table. Must we use the same loaf Jesus used? Must we use the same fruit of the vine Jesus used? If not why not? With that being said, I suppose I can partake of the Lord's supper on whatever day I want to? If not why not? Do you use unfermented fruit of the vine and unleavened bread? If so, why?

Acts 20:7 Gives us incidentals that were in the upper room. The lamps, partaking in the evening, preaching until midnight, but 1 Cor.11:23-26 give us specific instructions pertaining to the Lord's supper. Oh yes, you never said what you use to set your individual cups and loafs on?

Just as you have see the fallacy of not being restricted to partaking the Lord's Supper in an upper room as they did in the first century, you should also see the fallacy of being restricted to one literal cup. The only two examples that mention where the Lord's Supper took place was in an upper room and it was done in the

evening. We could follow that example, but it is not binding no more than drinking out of one literal cup is binding.

You know as well as I do that it does not matter how your cup or cups are transported to each Christian or if the unleavened bread is transported on a tray. These are all expediciencies like having a song leader and song books. They do not add or take away from the command to partake of the Lord's Supper, which consists of unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine. Whether you use one cup or multiple cups to partake of the fruit of the vine is also an expedience. We partake of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week because we are commanded to partake of it by Jesus and the example of when to take it is given in Acts 20:7. If it was acceptable to partake of it on any day, then Paul would not have waited those 7 days to partake it with the Christians on the first day of the week. As you said, this example does not mean that we have to partake of the Lord's Supper in an upper room, and whether they used one literal cup or multiple cups is not stated, so it cannot be proven either way.

This passage is easy to understand. They took the literal cup and drank from it. The contents not the literally cup represents his blood of the new covenant. Since the new covenant is found in His blood, which is represented by the fruit of the vine, it CANNOT be found outside the fruit of vine. Therefore, the literal cup cannot be the new covenant. Again, the emphasis is on the contents not the cup.

This argument is based on a lack of understanding of the Greek preposition (en) translated "in" when used in 1 Cor.11:25 This preposition (en) is used with both the locative and instrumental cases.

- a. Locative case- to indicate the location or position.
- b. Instrumental- to indicate the means by which something is done.

When Jesus said "This cup is the new testament in my blood: (1Cor.11:25) He was using the instrumental case and was indicating the means by which the new covenant came into force. Notice the language concerning the dedication of the Old Testament:

Hebrews 9:18-20 18 Therefore not even the first covenant was dedicated without blood.

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

20 saying, "This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded you." When Moses said "This is the blood of the covenant" he meant according to verse 18. "This is the blood which dedicates the covenant." The blood of the animals was the instrument used to dedicate or ratify the first covenant. Likewise when Jesus said "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood," He meant as Moses worded it "This is the New Covenant dedicated or ratified by my blood." The blood of Christ was the instrument used to dedicate or ratify the New Covenant. Jesus was not saying the New Testament was located or positioned inside the blood.

Now here is my question to you. How is the New Covenant in the blood?

You keep trying to say that literal cup represents the covenant. I do not completely disagree with that because the one cup is referring to the fruit of the vine, which not

only represents the blood of Jesus, but the new covenant as well (Heb. 10:29). In this instance, I do not even have to the Greek to prove it.

Notice what the gospels say about this:

Mt. 26:27 Then He took the **cup**, and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, "**Drink from it**, all of you. <sup>28</sup> **For this is My blood of the new covenant**,

Mk. 14:23 Then He took **the cup**, and when He had given thanks He gave *it* to them, and they **all drank from it**. <sup>24</sup> And He said to them, "This is **My blood of the new covenant**,

Both Matthew and Mark agree that the contents of the cup (the fruit of the vine) is Jesus' blood of the new covenant. Luke and Paul say the same thing, but they word it differently:

Luke 22:17 ... "**Take this and divide it among yourselves**; <sup>18</sup> "for I say to you, I will not **drink of the fruit of the vine** until the kingdom of God comes." <sup>20</sup> Likewise He also *took the cup* after supper, saying, "**This cup is the new covenant in My blood**."

*1 Cor. 11:25* He also *took the cup* after supper, saying, "This **cup is the new covenant in My blood**. This do, as **often as you drink it**, in remembrance of Me."

To prove that these are saying the same thing and are not saying the literal cup is the new covenant all you have to do is look at what Paul said, "This do, as often as you drink it." Drink what? The cup or fruit of the vine? The answer is obvious since you cannot drink the cup. We can only conclude that the cup represents the fruit of vine, which is the new covenant and not the literal cup.

Since we cannot drink the cup or divide the cup, even you would have to admit that the fruit of the vine is what Jesus commanded us to partake.

"The cup" is what we drink only if what we drink is in the cup! Fruit of the vine can be called a "cup" only when it is in a cup.

- a. When we drink fruit of the vine out of one cup we are drinking "the cup" (singular) This is what the Bible says in regard to the communion (1Cor.11:26).
- b. If we drank fruit of the vine out of individual cups we would be drinking cups (plural). The Bible never says this.

I have already shown in my above comments how you can drink from multiple cups and still be the one cup of the Lord.

Steve I agree that there is only one cup of the Lord and that every church can partake of that one cup by partaking of the fruit of the vine because it is what represents Jesus shed blood that made the new covenant possible.

**NO the fruit if the vine is not the cup! Yes the fruit of the vine does represent blood. You have the fruit of the vine representing two things.**

I would agree that the fruit of the vine is not the literal cup, but the cup used as a metonymy is the fruit of the vine. I don't have the fruit of the vine representing two

things the Bible does. As, I already showed you from Lk. 22:17 and 1 Cor. 11:25 that cup used as metonymy for the fruit of the vine, which represents Christ blood and the new covenant.

When you make the one-cup out to be a literal cup per congregation then you have more than one cup of the Lord.

This is not true and I really think you know this. Let me see your church building has a baptistery our building has a baptistery that makes it multiple baptisteries?

I do believe this is true and you proved my point. Yes, we have a baptistery in our building and you have a baptistery in your building that makes two baptisteries just as you have stated, but guess what there is only one baptism. Whether someone is dipped in your baptistery or mine there is only one baptism just like there is only one cup of the Lord. Thank you for making agreeing with my point of view.

Again, based on your logic, we must divide the literal cup since it cannot mean the fruit of the vine. Surely, you can see how silly your argument is. The blood of Jesus is what made the new covenant possible (Heb. 9:15-20; 10:29; 13:20). Just as we consume the bread, we consume the fruit of the vine not the literal cup. You keep on denying it, but the fruit of the vine is what we are commanded to drink and it represents the blood in the covenant.

We are commanded to drink the fruit of the vine out of one cup. Once again you cannot consume the literal fruit of the vine without the literal cup, to do what Jesus did. Jesus said do this! What did they do Cougan, up until the fourth century when the Catholics started doing something different?

No, we are commanded to drink of the fruit of the vine. No where in Scripture does it say that we are to drink it out of one cup and you know it. You want to know what they did up until the 4<sup>th</sup> century, they partook of the Lord's Supper. Maybe they used one cup or multiple cups. Again, I am not concerned what man has done in history, I am only concerned what the Bible says is acceptable to God.

Again, I don't care when someone started using multiple cups, I am only concerned if it is allowed based on what the Bible says.

I do care when people started using cups, because this shows us clearly when the departure from the truth began. This practice of individual cups is a teaching that neither Jesus nor the apostles ever practiced in the Bible. I know when this practice started and it was not with Jesus! You continually say the emphasis is on the fruit of the vine even though the Bible places the importance on the cup by the number of times it used, yet you ignore that fact. Both the Hebrew and Greek writers knew the word cups (2 Sa. 17:28, 1 Chr. 28:17, Isa. 22:24, Jer. 35:5, Jer. 52:19, Mk. 7:4, 7:8) but never used it concerning the Lord's supper. Do you think they were just to ignorant and unlearned to know what Jesus meant? When Jesus says "This do" that is a command. This is a command to do it exactly as he instituted it.

Well, I guess that is the difference between you and me. Your more concerned about what man has practiced in the past then what the Scriptures actual say. I have shown from the Scriptures in my above comments that the fruit of the vine is what is

being emphasized and how that there is only one cup of the Lord. Since there is only one cup of the Lord, the Scriptures would not call it cups of the Lord no more than it would say that there are Gods, faiths, baptisms that save. Again, the command was to partake of the fruit of the vine not partake of the fruit of the vine from one literal cup.

The point of division that was brought about by the use of individual communion cups in the church of Christ came about in the 1800's. This doesn't matter to you that brethren prior to that time used one cup? This does not even concern you? This does not even strike your curiosity that for all those years they practiced the use of one cup and then because of hygiene found a need to change what they had practiced for centuries. You know I am correct about this. Oh what about the space before the fourth century?

I always find history interesting, but what our brethren did in regards to the Lord's Supper prior to 1800's does not change what the Bible teaches on the matter. I have no problem with them using one cup, but I would have problem with them teaching that only one cup could be used because that is not what the Scriptures teach, I have proven this in my above comments. Since one cup or multiple cups are expedience, it doesn't matter to me what reason they started using multiple cups.

I could say the same thing Steve. How can you misunderstand that the emphasis is on the contents and not the literal cup. Just because Jesus used one cup when He instituted the Lord's Supper does not mean that we have to drink from one cup because we were commanded partake of it, but we are not commanded to partake of it out of one cup.

I like your flawed logic. NO it doesn't mean you have do anything, but to do what Jesus said and what the apostles did you have to. We cannot pick and choose which part of the commandment we partake of. I suppose it really doesn't matter if I partake of the loaf (singular) either. Even though we know for certain the Corinthians did.

Just saying the logic is flawed does not make it flawed. I am not picking and choosing anything. As I have already shown you there is one cup of the Lord and the emphasis is on the fruit of the vine. No matter how many cups are used, a person is still partaking of the fruit of the vine/one cup of the Lord. The same goes for the bread. It does not matter how many loaves there is because there is only one bread of the Lord.

Think about this. If your congregation decided to have a lectureship, which included Sunday morning worship and you had 5,000 Christians come to be part of it, it would be impossible for you to have a big enough cup for each Christian to put their lips to and divide the contents of that one cup. The same would be true about the bread. You couldn't make one loaf big enough to divide between that many people. There are a few congregations that have this many people in their worship service every Sunday, so do not say that a crowd that big would never happen. Based on your view, some would be left out of partaking the Lord's Supper or you would have to say, I am sorry we can only serve 500 with one cup and the one loaf we have, so the rest of you will have to go home or go somewhere else.

I clearly showed the cup being used as a metonymy for the fruit of the vine. The literal cup is just that a cup that is used to hold the fruit of the vine. How else could the fruit of the vine be divided other than using a vessel or vessels?

By each person sharing the cup just as the Bible says. Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. (Mk14:23)

I said, How else could it be done, yet you agree with what I said, that it can only be divided by a vessel or vessels.

1 Corinthians 10:16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?

Paul is writing this letter to the Corinthians. He partakes of the fruit of the vine in one place and the Corinthians in another place. Even if they used one cup that would be two physical containers, yet Paul says, we bless the cup (singular). Again, this proves that the content is what is under consideration and not a literal cup. I am amazed when the Bible calls it a cup you say it's not a literal cup. And yet you call it fruit of the vine.

Cougan, if you come over to my house and I am standing by the coffee pot facing you and I take a literal cup out of the cabinet and ask you if you want a cup of coffee and you say sure. I pour the coffee in the one cup. What is the coffee in and what is in the cup? So when Jesus took the cup containing the fruit of the vine and told the apostle to all drink of it, do you really think they were perplexed as you seem to be? When you go to the store for grape juice, do you ask for a cup? Is grape juice still a cup when it is in a bottle?

This proves to me that Paul took a literal cup. The Corinthians took a literal cup.

If you pour coffee into a cup, I have a cup and I have coffee. These are two different things, but if you ask me if I liked the coffee and I said yes, I drank the whole cup, then the cup is metonym for the coffee. I do not think the apostles were perplexed because they knew that He wanted them to divide up the contents not the actual cup. When I go to the store I do not ask for a cup of grape juice, I simply ask where is the grape juice. No, grape juice is not a cup when it is in a bottle. Grape juice is not a cup just because it is in a cup. However, when its container is used as a metonym, then cup or the bottle can represent the grape juice.

Thank you for agreeing with me that Paul and the Corinthians both had at least 1 literal cup at each location, which means proves that they used more than one drinking vessel, yet it was still considered the cup of the Lord.

Steve this above argument is solid and cannot be broken by you. It proves that one cup does not mean one literal cup per congregation as you like to teach.

This is not correct Cougan they each had one single cup per congregation, this makes one per congregation! No matter how much you would like to change number, this is not logical.

Lets apply this reasoning to the Jewish Passover:

Exodus 12:3-4"Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying: 'On the tenth day of this month every man shall take for himself a lamb, according to the house of his

father, a lamb for a household.

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

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

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

Each house was to have only one lamb and one basin (Ex.12:3,22).

Likewise, each congregation is to have only one loaf and one cup containing the fruit of the vine (1 Cor.10:16-17).

Why are you trying to justify a New Testament practice by looking at Old Testament practice? What they did during the Passover has no bearing on what we do during the Lord's Supper. When Paul said "we" in 1 Cor. 10:16, he was including two different congregations who had at least two different containers for partaking of the fruit of the vine, yet he said that both cups being used in two different congregations was the cup (singular). As I said before, I believe in the one cup just as Paul did.

Second, the fact that the disciples drank "of it" -- Mark 14:23) as they were commanded (Matt. 26:27) does not have to mean that they all put their lips to one vessel. For it is the identical expression found in John 4:12 of Jacob's well. The Samaritan woman said that Jacob and his sons and his cattle all drank "thereof". But who can believe that any of them actually put their heads into the well itself and lapped the water from it? The expression "of it" is a genitive of source regardless of how many containers were used.

Cougan, this is old. The Greek word ek ("translated from or of") is used with the genitive case, but there are many different kinds of genitives. Thayer list 6 different kinds of genitives with various meanings Arndt & Gingrich also list 6 different genitives. Both Thayer and Arndt & Gingrich specifically state that the genitive connected with the communion cup is different than the genitive connected with Jacob's well.

1. When the Lord told the disciples to "Drink from it, all of you" (Mt.26:27) He was using the genitive of " the thing out of which one drinks."

2. But when the Samaritan woman said " Jacob gave us the well and drank from it himself" (Jn.4:12), she was using the genitive " of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, ect.

There may be a thousand unconventional ways to drink from a cup, but in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we must conclude Jesus and his disciples used the standard method.

BDAG says that use of ek is the same in those verses:

of the object fr. which one drinks (X., Cyr. 5, 3, 3): evk t. pothri,ou Mt 26:27; Mk 14:23; 1 Cor 11:28; cp. 10:4; J 4:12.

I not for sure where you are getting your information because Thayer also says the word ek is used the same way in those verses:

of the thing out of which one drinks (differently in II. 9 below): evk tou/ pothri,ou, Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28; evk pe, traj, 1 Cor. 10:4; evk tou/ fre, atoj, John 4:12;

Here is the entirety of what Thayer says about what you claim in your point 2 (the ellipses are taking the place of the Greek words written in a Greek font):

of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk, etc. (cf. Winer's Grammar, sec. 30, 7 and 8; Buttman, 159ff (139ff)): ..., John 1:16; 16:14f; ..., Matt. 25:8; John 6:11; 1 John 4:13; ..., 1 Cor. 9:7; 11:28; ..., John 6:26,50f; Rev. 2:7; ..., 1 Cor. 10:17 (but see ...); ..., Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; John 4:13f; Rev. 14:10; 18:3 (differently in I. 1 above); ..., John 8:44; ..., Matt. 12:34; ..., Matt. 12:35 (this belongs here only in case ... is taken in the sense of treasure not treasury (the contents as distinguished from the repository); cf. I. 1 above, and under the word ...);... (a part), Mark 12:44; Luke 21:4.

Steve I want you to notice that Thayer does say that Jn. 4:13; Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25 are used the same way as of the supply out of. So, no matter how you look at it, my argument stands.

By the way, I could not find where Arndt& Gingrich makes the statement you claim. If you're going to say that these Lexicons states something then back it up with a quote.

If the idea of picking up one literal cup and drinking out of it seems absurd, try this line of reasoning. Keep this in mind there was one well!  
Men picked up Jacob's well and poured it into individual well. Each man drank out of his own well. Then a passage would need to say all these men who drank from these individual wells drank from Jacob's one well.  
Notice the inconsistency, as you have argued the cup is the blood. If this is true, then I must ask, is the well the water? Is the well literal? How many wells were there? Was the well the water or were the well and the water two separate items? Is the cup literal? How many cups were there? Was the cup the blood or were the cup and the blood two separate items?

The answer to this is simple. There was one well, yet the people and the animals drink from it without having to put their lips to it. They drew up water from various buckets and divided the water in different ways. It proves that one can drink from it without it having to be drunk from one container.

Was there one literal well? Yes. Does it have water in it? Yes. Can the well be the water? Yes when used as metonymy. Such as, don't drink the entire well. In a similar way, I have already shown you that the cup is talking about the fruit of the vine (please see my earlier comments).

Think about this Steve. Jesus said,

**Luke 22:18 "for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes."**

Jesus says that He partakes of the fruit of the vine with us when we partake of it on the first day of the week because the church is the kingdom. My question is, which cup does Jesus drink from? Does He have His own cup, or does He drink from your cup or from another congregation's cup or from all of them? The simple answer is that He drinks from the one cup of the Lord, which is the fruit of the vine because it does not matter how many literal cups you drink from, it is still considered to be the cup of the Lord. This proves that emphasis is on the fruit of the vine and not a literal cup.

Cougan, You have yet to give me one documented case where someone has become sick or died from drinking out of one cup. In all this you have yet to show me where you have the command, example or an inference to use multiple cups.

Thank you for taking the time to show me what you believe. I do not agree with your practice, but I do understand why you hold to it. In the love of Christ, Steve

When doctors state the cause of death, they do not say he got the flu from drinking after someone, they simply say he died from the flu. Common sense tells us that some die from drinking after someone because that is one way you can catch the flu. When you consider that 36,000 people die each year from flu, of that number, some would have caught their flu from drinking after someone else [http://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/disease/us\\_flu-related\\_deaths.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/disease/us_flu-related_deaths.htm) Bacterial meningitis is deadly and can be transmitted by drinking from the same cup. While this bacteria is rare in the USA, it still happens from time to time. In Africa, many people die from it every year <http://www.dhpe.org/infect/Bacmeningitis.html>.

Certain viruses and even colds can be devastating to someone that has a compromised immune system, which can lead to their death by them drinking from the same cup. You can live in denial and think that God will keep you safe from catching something just because you're partaking of the fruit of the vine, but you would have to claim that He is doing something miraculous, which I know you do not believe. The fact of the matter is that you can catch sickness from drinking from one cup and in some cases it can lead to death.

I do not know if you missed it or not, but you never did deal with the following argument:

Third, when Paul said that we "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 11:26) or "drink this cup" (KJV, Textus Receptus), he referred to a liquid, not a container! By metonymy, the word "cup" stands for the contents -- the fruit of the vine. Nor does it mean the contents of a single container any more than the figurative reference to "the cup" in Matt. 20:22-23 means that Jesus and James and John were all going to die on the same cross or at the same time. Too, Jesus did not mean in Matt. 23:25 that the Pharisees (plural) were in the habit of cleansing just one Vessel -- "the cup" (singular). Thus, "the cup" no more refers to one container than "the fruit" or "the

vine" (Mark 14:25) refers to one grape or one grapevine! Paul's reference to "the cup" (as in the case of "the bread") is to the only such cup (drink) that has spiritual significance in the worship of Christians. It is "the cup" which. "we" (Christians everywhere -- 1 Cor. 10:16) bless.

I don't really have anything new to add to this discussion. So, unless you give me a new argument to deal with or have some specific question, I will make this my last response. I have enjoyed the discussion, and I hope that I have opened your eyes to the truth so that will stop binding things the Bible does not bind.

Your brother in Christ,

Cougan Collins

**Steve's seventh email:**

Cougan,

This will be my last response. I too am happy that you are willing to discuss these spiritual matters with me. I believe what I practice with all my heart and I do believe the Word of God will judge us. I believe the words were written for us to follow in principle and practice. I believe in God's providential hand just as the patriarchs of old did and I walk by faith and that requires me to walk according to His word (Ro.10:17). If I die let it be for practicing what I can find written on the pages of holy writ and nothing else.

(My comments in red)

You agreed that Jesus used one cup. And you say it's okay to use one cup but don't bind it on anyone. You have yet to give me one scripture for proof of the use of more than one literal-drinking vessel!

This would be true if the Lord, himself, had not set up the institution, using one cup, and commanded, "This do in remembrance of me". (Luke 22:19). Are we legislating for God when we urge all persons coming into the church to go down into the water and be buried with the Lord in baptism? No! Why? Because the Bible teaches that. Christ made the law, himself! By insisting that brethren should use as many, and no more, cups than are mentioned in the scriptures, one is not making laws for God.

You know as well as I do that it does not matter how your cup or cups are transported to each Christian or if the unleavened bread is transported on a tray. These are all expediencies like having a song leader and songbooks. They do not add or take away from the command to partake of the Lord's Supper, which consists of unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine. Whether you use one cup or multiple cups to partake of the fruit of the vine is also an expedience. We partake of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week because we are commanded to partake of it by Jesus.

You meet on the first day of the week based on an example, not a command and reject musical instruments in worship based upon a statement, but receive neither when it comes to the teaching of the Lord's supper. I agree the plate, which the loaf is on, songbooks, chalkboards are expediencies because they are not specified, although this is not true of the cup. Jesus and the apostle explicitly state the cup in every instance where the teaching of the Lord's supper is put forth.

The Bible clearly states that there are three literal objects involved in the Lord's supper (Mt.26:26-29). You agree in other instances, but reject it when it goes against your practice. This is what Jesus and the apostle used and you agree one cup is safe when it comes to Biblical authority, you cannot say without a doubt this about cups or loaves, because these are words not used in the Bible and never observed when Jesus institutes the Lord's supper.

Paul clearly states that more than one literal cup was being used, yet he still calls it the cup of the Lord (10:16).

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

Paul never made a statement that there were more than one literal cup being used and you are literally adding to God's word. You make the assumption that the apostle Paul was at Ephesus and sent this letter to Corinth and that there was a cup at each congregation, so that makes two? I will put forth my perspective on this issue. The apostle Paul was simply referring to their actions as a congregation in Ephesus. Which I believe is the truth of the matter. The universal church does not bless the cup, neither is the cup drunk by the universal church. The cup is blessed by a local congregation.

Jesus says that He partakes of the fruit of the vine with us when we partake of it on the first day of the week because the church is the kingdom. My question is, which cup does Jesus drink from? Does He have His own cup, or does He drink from your cup or from another congregation's cup or from all of them?

The church is the body of Christ; He is the head (Eph 1:22-23). Whatever the Head does, the body does. Whatever the body does, the head also does (participates in). In Jn 4:1-2 the scripture says, "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus Himself did not baptize, but His disciples)." So when the disciples of Jesus baptized, Jesus is said to have baptized – though He did not actually baptize. With this thought in mind, consider Lk 22:18. When the body of Jesus (the church) partakes of the Lord's supper, the Lord is partaking – though Jesus Himself did not actually drink literal fruit of the vine in heaven nor did He eat literal unleavened bread in heaven. (a) Just as He did not actually baptize, but His disciples did (yet the scripture says "Jesus baptized"), even so it is with Lk 22:18. (b) Jesus does not actually eat bread and drink fruit of the vine in heaven (yet the scripture says "I eat it new with you"). How could both (a) and (b) be true? These statements are true because of the principle of agency. When the body (the agent of the Lord) does something, the Lord is said to have performed the action. So Jesus is not drinking from a literal cup, nor is He drinking literal fruit of the vine. However, the Lord's body does eat bread and drink from a cup. How? Through each local congregation. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor 10:16). Wherever the cup is blessed, that is where the cup is drunk. The cup is not blessed by the universal church. The cup is not drunk by the universal church. The cup is blessed by a local congregation. The cup is drunk by a local congregation. The bread is blessed by a local congregation, not the universal church.

Why are you trying to justify a New Testament practice by looking at Old Testament practice? What they did during the Passover has no bearing on what we do during the Lord's Supper. When Paul said "we" in 1 Cor. 10:16, he was including two different congregations who had at least two different containers for partaking of the

fruit of the vine, yet he said that both cups being used in two different congregations was the cup (singular). As I said before, I believe in the one cup just as Paul did.

The Old Testament is something we can look to for example. It is something that assists us in understanding and appreciating the new covenant we now enjoy. Ro.15:4 For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

1Co 2:13 Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

When we give thanks for the cup in the Lord's supper, we have a literal cup just like they did in every account in the New Testament. I know you didn't like argument of the Passover, which incidentally foreshadows and is typical of the Lord's supper. The reason you don't like it is because it is a like figure and you cannot dispute what the children of Israel did. They did exactly what the Lord said without any question. Ex 12:3 Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house: {lamb: or, kid}

Ex 12:4 And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb. Ex.12:50 Ex 12:50 Thus all the children of Israel did; as the LORD commanded Moses and Aaron, so they did.

The information that you have given is not completely true. For example, if I say that apple juice will cure cancer and then I pour a cup of apple juice and tell someone if they will drink the cup their cancer will be cured. What does the cup stand for? It stands for the apple juice. Does this mean that a person is limited to drinking the apple juice out of one cup to cure cancer? No, because the cup is referring to the apple juice. I could have 50 people sitting around a table and have 50 cups before them and I could make the same statement, "if you will drink the cup your cancer will be cured. This example shows that a metonymy is not limited to one drinking vessel as you have listed above. The same thing can be clearly seen from the Scriptures.

Yes if you specify 50 cups that is acceptable, the Lord did not give that permission when He instituted the Lord's supper. He specified one cup, containing fruit of the vine. Which cup, Cougan? The Lord said this cup, the one-cup he was holding. The one-cup then represented the one New Covenant which is still representative of it today.

Third, when Paul said that we "drink the cup" (1 Cor. 11:26) or "drink this cup" (KJV, Textus Receptus), he referred to a liquid, not a container! By metonymy, the word "cup" stands for the contents -- the fruit of the vine. Nor does it mean the contents of a single container any more than the figurative reference to "the cup" in Matt. 20:22-23 means that Jesus and James and John were all going to die on the same cross or at the same time. Too, Jesus did not mean in Matt. 23:25 that the Pharisees (plural) were in the habit of cleansing just one Vessel -- "the cup" (singular). Thus, "the cup" no more refers to one container than "the fruit" or "the vine" (Mark 14:25) refers to one grape or one grapevine! Paul's reference to "the cup" (as in the case of "the bread") is to the only such cup (drink) that has spiritual significance in the worship of Christians. It is "the cup" which. "we" (Christians

everywhere -- 1 Cor. 10:16) bless.

This is only more of the same of using figurative to represent literal. Jesus and the apostle Paul both referred to the cup as representing the New Testament, which is one! (Lk.22: 20,1Cor.11: 25).

Notice, there is just one bread that represents the body of Christ, and each individual Christian represents that one bread/one body even though there are numerous Christians and congregations, yet when we partake of the bread on the first day of the week with thousands of loafs being used on Sunday, we are only partaking of the one bread.

There is not one place where the church in the New Testament worshiped in the universal sense you are trying to use. Other than individuals worshiping in their private lives I am unaware of this practice you are putting forth that the whole world wide church is blessing one cup. Especially when in fact there is a tray full of individual cups and wafers, which is foreign to the meaning of the word loaf & cup.

Think about this. If your congregation decided to have a lectureship, which included Sunday morning worship and you had 5,000 Christians come to be part of it, it would be impossible for you to have a big enough cup for each Christian to put their lips to and divide the contents of that one cup. The same would be true about the bread. You couldn't make one loaf big enough to divide between that many people. There are a few congregations that have this many people in their worship service every Sunday, so do not say that a crowd that big would never happen. Based on your view, some would be left out of partaking the Lord's Supper or you would have to say, I am sorry we can only serve 500 with one cup and the one loaf we have, so the rest of you will have to go home or go somewhere else.

This is the same argument made by the infusionists that sprinkling or pouring must be right, because three thousand people could not have been immersed in one day. But we answer by showing that it was not necessary for one man to do all the baptizing. There is no reason for believing that all the brethren in Jerusalem ever tried to break bread in one assembly.

Also, we might ask, If, as you suggest, all in the Jerusalem church met in one assembly, did they use individual communion sets with over three thousand containers? We must remember that these were not invented until nearly two thousand years later!

Since we cannot drink the cup or divide the cup, even you would have to admit that the fruit of the vine is what Jesus commanded us to partake.

I have dealt with this argument already. He did command us to partake of the fruit of the vine from one literal-drinking vessel. We cannot divide a cup without a literal cup. You can divide and/or all drink of a literal cup if want to do what the apostles did. Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it.

To make this cup something besides a cup, which the Bible calls it you have to do language, hula-hoops. I sorry Cougan the Bible still calls it a cup no matter how many times you call it the fruit of the vine!

Cougan, I have enjoyed this discussion about these very important doctrinal matters.

I will continue to practice the use of one loaf and one cup in the lord's supper, because I am convinced this is the truth as found in God's word. I hope you will examine the scriptures and apply them as the Lord spoke them, for by them we will give an account.

In the Love of Christ, Steve