

**THE VOICE  
OF ONE  
CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS  
BEING A TREATISE TO RESTORE  
the  
SCRIPTURAL OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S  
SUPPER**

Second (and Revised) Edition

By

J. D. PHILLIPS

Published By  
Ronny F. Wade  
707 Pearson Drive  
Springfield, MO

Copyright by Ronny F. Wade  
1978

Printed By  
Robert Strain  
9226 S. 1st Ave.  
Harrodsburg, IN 47434

CHURCH OF CHRIST  
1012 1st Ave. N. W.  
Ardmore, Oklahoma

## **PREFACE**

This tract first appeared in 1936, some 29 years ago. For years now, it has been out of print. Because many continue to drift with the tide of digression, we feel that there is a demanding need for such literature as this. Many booklets have been published by good brethren setting forth the scriptural design of the Lord's Supper. Each in its own way has accomplished a certain amount of good. We personally feel, however, that this tract is worthy of wide circulation because of its scholarly approach to the subject at hand, hence the decision to assist in its re-publication.

Because error is easily exposed, it is in a continual state of change. Many of the arguments used thirty years ago in an effort to uphold the unscriptural practice of individual cups have been abandoned. Others continue to spring into existence. Thus the need to slightly revise this very able work, so that these "new" arguments may be seen for what they really are i.e. vain attempts to set aside the scriptural pattern of the Bible.

When contacted about the re-publication of this work, Brother Phillips readily agreed, and has cooperated in every way to that end. It is my sincere prayer that some honest heart, may be reached by the truth in this treatise, and thus be led back, all the way back, to Jerusalem.

Ronny F. Wade  
Lebanon, Mo.  
April 5, 1965

This tract was written and published 29 years ago. Many have suggested that I revise it and let it be reprinted. Accordingly, it now goes forth in this slightly revised form with the prayer and hope that it may be used of God to help many to get a clearer view of the Bible teaching and the apostolic practice in the observance of the Lord's supper.

I have used the word wine in this tract merely for the sake of convenience and not to denote the presence of fermentation.

It is not claimed that the authors we quote necessarily agree with us on how to observe the Lord's supper. We use them to show what the language of inspiration means.

J. D. Phillips

## BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

On "the day of Pentecost," A. D. 30, the Church of Christ was fully established in Jerusalem, Palestine, and it soon spread to "all Judea and Samaria, and to the uttermost part of the (then known) earth" (Acts 1:8; 2nd. chap.). It was composed of all who, believing "that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God" (Jno. 20:30), became "obedient from the heart" (Rom. 6:17) to the command: "Reform, and let each of you be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to obtain the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38); for "the Lord added" such "to the church" (Acts 2:47). They acknowledged Jesus as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). They kept "the ordinances as" they were "delivered unto" them (1 Cor. 11:2). "They were constantly attending to the teaching of the Apostles, and to the fellowship, and to the breaking of the loaf, and to the prayers" (Acts 2:42). Jesus was enthroned in every heart, and love was supreme.

But a fearful apostasy was impending. Paul says, "In later times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons" (1 Tim. 4:1). "Grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29, 30). "The time will come when they will not endure sound teaching; but, having itching ears, they will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and will turn aside unto fables" (2 Tim. 4:3, 4).

Peter testifies to the same effect. "But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers, who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that brought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of" (2 Pet. 2:1-3).

And Jude also. "But these rail at whatsoever things they know not: and what they understand naturally, like the creatures without reason, in these things they are destroyed. Woe unto them! for they went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah. These are they who are hidden rocks in their love-feasts when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves; clouds without water, carried about by winds; autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; wild waves of the sea foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved forever" (Jude 10-13).

Paul says, "For it (the coming of Christ) will not be, except the falling away (*apostasy*) come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God" (2 Thess. 2:2, 3). "For the mystery of iniquity (or, lawlessness) doth already work" (v. 7).

Mohammed and the Pope, with their death-dealing and hades institutions, have wrought most of the havoc against the Church. "And I saw (at the opening of the fourth seal), and behold, a pale horse: and he that sat upon him, his name was Death; and Hades followed with him. And there was given unto them authority over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with the sword, and with famine, and with death, and by the wild beasts (governments) of the earth" (Rev. 6:7, 8).

The pale horseman is Mohammed. His horse is pale because he spread his spiritual pestilence. His name is Death because he sought to conquer the world by the use of the sword. "His name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in the Greek tongue he hath the name Apollyon" (Rev. 9:11), "That is, **Destroyer**" (R. V. margin). **Hades** is a Greek word, meaning "the unseen,

the abode of the dead." Applied to an institution, it means the **assembly-house** or gathering place of the spiritually dead. Catholicism, as the image or shadow of Mohammedanism, came on the world stage after Mohammed made the war-cry of "**Islamism or death**." She is the tomb of the spiritually dead and is, therefore, the "**Hades**" of this seal. They both "**kill with the sword**," etc. The pope arrogated to himself the right "**to change times and the law**" of God (Dan. 7:25), while Mohammed led many to "**forsake the holy covenant**," perverting them "**by flatteries**" (Dan. 11:32).

"It is wonderfully remarkable," says Bishop Newton, "that the doctrine of Mohammed was forged at Mecca, and the supremacy of the pope was established by virtue of a grant from that wicked tyrant Phocas, in the very same year of Christ 606. 'It is to be observed,' says Dean Prideaux, 'that Mohomet began this imposture about the same time that the Bishop of Rome, by virtue of a grant from that wicked tyrant Phocas, first assumed the title of Universal Pastor, and thereon claimed to himself that supremacy which he hath been ever since endeavoring to usurp over the church. (Phocas made this grant A. D. 606, which was the very year that Mohomet retired to his cave to forge that imposture there, which two years after, A. D. 608, he began to propogate at Mecca). And from this time both having conspired to found themselves an empire in imposture, their followers have been ever since endeavoring by the same methods, that is, those of **fire and sword**, to propogate it among mankind; so that **Antichrist seems of this time to have set both his feet upon Christendom together**, the one in the East and the other in the West; and how much **earth hath trampled upon the church of Christ**, the ages ever since succeeding have abundantly experienced'."

This combination of evil institutions,—"**Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and of Abominations of the Earth**" (Rev. 17:5), — usurped the place of the Church of Christ in the world. The true church, symbolized by a forsaken and disconsolate "**woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars**" (Rev. 12:1), was driven "**into the wilderness**" where she was to remain "**for 1,260 days**" (v. 6). Truly, the pope, the "**little horn**" of the Roman "**beast**," wore "**out the saints of the Most High**" (Dan. 7:25). "**I have appointed unto thee each day for a year**" (Ezek. 4:6). **1,260 years**, then, is the period during which the church is to be "**in the wilderness**." She is there now, hidden "**in the cleft of the rock**" (Song of Songs 2:14). Consequently, many heresies and innovations (including unscriptural ways of "**breaking the loaf**" and a plurality of cups in the Communion) have been brought in, making breach upon breach in Zion's walls. But she is soon to be seen "**coming up from wilderness, leaning upon her Beloved**" (S. of Songs 8:5). She will then "**look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners**" (S. of Songs 6:10). "**For I will restore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds**," saith Yahweh to His church; "**for they have called thee an outcast, saying, 'It is Zion whom no man seeketh after'**" (Jer. 30:17).

The Restoration Movement, led by Alexander Campbell in the 19th century, has done much toward bringing about a restoration of primitive Christianity. But Campbell's work was incomplete. In the *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. 6, p. 272, the venerable Thomas Campbell, father of Alexander, says, "**We feel induced . . . to express a feeling of deep regret that a reformation, which we humbly suggested and respectfully submitted to the consideration of friends and lovers of truth and peace . . . more than twenty-five years ago, for the express purpose of putting an end to religious controversy among Christians, should appear to take the unhappy turn to which, with painful anxiety, we have seen it verging for the last ten years . . . But alas! how have we wandered from our divine premises! We have forsaken **terra firma**, and are again out at sea amidst the rocks and vortices that have absorbed every venturer from Arius to the present day.**"

"The restoration ship has gone on the rocks and broken into many pieces. The fathers of the Restoration gave up the fundamental principles,

and we have not been big enough to consummate the work; therefore, the necessity of another step, the **restoring of the Restoration**; or if we prefer, the **restoring and completing of the Restoration**" (Dr. Isaac N. Richardson).

Alexander Campbell knew another restoration movement would be necessary, for he said the work of completing the Restoration "may yet deserve the construction of a large vessel in a more propitious season" (Christian System, p. 190). Having reached this "more propitious season," we are on the job with all that we have and are to contribute our "mite" to the work!

Having wandered far from our "old moorings" and found ourselves retreating back to Babylon, we have set our faces again toward Jerusalem and a restoration of primitive Christianity. We rejoice to know that "after 2,300 days (years), then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed" (Dan. 8:14) of all of its innovations picked up during the "Dark Ages" of her wilderness journey. This time limit dates, I think, from the conquest of Alexander the Great about B. C. 328, and, therefore, we have not yet reached its termination. It behooves us, then, to do all we can to get back to the ancient landmarks of Christianity. To do this, we must among other things, restore the Scriptural manner of breaking the loaf and the use of one cup for each assembly. These practices belong to "the ancient order of things" as respects worship.

We are in the cleansing time, when the many issues are being sifted. God's people are asking the way to Zion, as never before. Let us seek and find the truth on these matters. "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way; and walk therein" (Jer. 6:16). "My people," saith the Lord, "have been lost sheep: their shepherds have caused them to go astray; they have turned them away on the mountains (in "the wilderness"—Rev. 12:6); they have gone from mountain to hill; they have forgotten their resting-place" (Jer. 50:6). But now, "they shall go on their way weeping, and shall seek Yahweh their God. They shall inquire the way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come ye, and join yourselves to Yahweh in an age-abiding agreement that shall not be forgotten" (vs. 4, 5). "Thy watchmen! they lift up their voice, together do they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when Yahweh returns (in spirit) to Zion (Isa. 52:8).

We thank one and all who contributed of their means to make the execution of this work possible. Above all, "I thank Him Who enabled me, Christ Jesus our Lord" (1 Tim 1:12).

March 2, 1936

J. D. Phillips,

## BREAKING THE LOAF

"And taking a Loaf, and having given thanks, he broke it, and gave to them, saying, 'This is that body of mine which is given for you; do this in my remembrance' (Luke 22:19: **Emphatic Diaglott**. See also Matt. 26:26 Mark 14:22; Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:24).

It is freely admitted by all that Jesus "broke" the loaf. It is as freely admitted that He commanded us to "do this" (Luke 22:19). If we can find out **how** He "broke" it, we will then know **how** He requires us to break it. This is important. "**This do in my remembrance**" (Luke 22:19). We should, then, "do this" exactly as He did it. Otherwise, we ignore the very example He set for us to follow. We are taught to "follow" or "imitate" Him (1 Cor. 11:1) and to "retain the observances" (the breaking of the loaf being one of them) as "delivered" (1 Cor. 11:2) to us in the Scriptures.

There are three ideas among the brethren of **how Christ broke the loaf**. They follow: (1) Some think He broke it into as many pieces as there were disciples present. (2) Others assume that He broke it in two in (or near) the middle, and that the one presiding at the Table must do the same to make it "represent Christ's broken body." (3) Others believe that Christ merely broke off a fragment and ate it. When, therefore, they read "this do" (Lk. 22:19) they believe our Lord meant for us (each disciple) to do the same.

Some contend for the first of three hypotheses; others contend for the second; while others contend for the third. There must be a Scriptural way to settle this, for the Scriptures "thoroughly furnish" us for "every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17). "To the law and to the testimony" (Isa. 8:20), then, should be our appeal.

The only way we can be positively certain of **how Christ "broke" the loaf**, is by considering the meaning of the word so translated. The Greek is a marvelous tongue, fitted for accurate expression. If we wish to find out just what was done when Philip baptized the Eunuch, we may do so by considering the meaning of the word ebaptisen (Acts 8:37) which is "he immersed" him. The noun form, baptisma, means "immersion, submersion." The English translations, while excellent and marvelous productions, are not so exact and accurate as is the original. Many Greek words are hard to translate perfectly into English, due to the fact that many English words do not have the same shades of meanings that their closest Greek equivalents have.

### How Did Jesus Break The Loaf?"

In every place where it is said that Jesus "broke" the loaf, the word **broke** is from the Greek word **klao**, a verb. The noun form is **klasma**. Let us notice the definition of the noun as given by a few lexicons. Arndt and Gingrich define it: "**fragment, piece, crum.**" Knoch: "**break-effect, fragment.**" "A fragment, broken piece." (Thayer). "A piece broken off, a fragment" (T. S. Green). "A morsel" (feyerabend). "That which is broken off; a piece; a fragment" (Donnegan). "A piece broken off, a splinter, a fragment" (Pickering).

Now, let us try the verb. Thayer says: "**Klao, to break: used in the New Testament of the breaking of bread.**" Green's lexicon was supervised by Thayer. He defines it: "**to break off; in the New Testament to break bread.**" "**To break; to break off**" (Donnegan). "**To break, to break off pieces**" (Vine's Expository Dictionary of N. T. Words).

It is sometimes in Classical Greek of pruning a small limb from a tree and of plucking a leaf from a tree vine. But it is never so used in the New Testament; it is used only of breaking bread. The Lord broke off a piece or bite. This is in harmony with Rabbinic and Talmudic usage. Gill

says: "The Rules concerning the **breaking of bread** are: 'The master of the house recites and finishes the blessing, and after that he **breaks**; he does not break (off) a large piece."

**We all break the loaf!** "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread (loaf) which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread (loaf), and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. 10:16, 17).

Notice the pronoun "we". "WE, being many. "WE are all partakers." "The loaf which WE break." Does that sound like one broke it for all? We have quoted Vine's definition of **break**. Now, notice his comment. He says: "We should notice the pronoun 'we.' Each believer breaks the bread for himself. There is no hint in the New Testament of the dispensing of the elements by a 'minister.' "

Since every Christian is a priest in his own rights (1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6) he has the same right to break the loaf—that he has to partake. Even when one leads in offering thanks or the blessing for the loaf and the cup every disciple present may act as his own priest by saying "the Amen" (1 Cor. 14:16).

Besides, when Jesus broke the loaf and gave it to them He said: "This do." Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. These two words are from *poieite* and Mr. Knoch gives the literal meaning as "BE-YE-DOING". Defining "ye" he says: "YE, the plural of the pronoun YOU".

Commenting on "This do" Brother J. B. Rotherham, translator of The New Emphasised Bible, says: "'This do **thou**' is a form of command which never appears in the primitive Christian documents. It is always, 'This do **ye**'".

The great commentator Godet says: "This pronoun can denote nothing but the **act** of breaking."

Whether *klao* means to break off one or more pieces must be learned from the context. For instance, in speaking of the breaking of the five loaves (Mt. 14:19), it is evident that He broke them into many pieces, for "they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full." *Klao* is used here. However, in Mark 6:41 and Luke 9:16, the word used is *kataklao*. *Kata* before *klao* "denotes separation, dissolution, etc." (Thayer). The Concordant Version renders it: "(He) **breaks up** the cakes" or loaves. So does Rotherham. In Mark 8:19 *klao* is used but *eis tines* is added. Thayer says: "With *eis tines* added, a pregnant construction, equivalent to 'to break and distribute among,' etc." Neither *kata* nor *eis tines* is used with *klao* when the breaking of the communion-loaf is spoken of.

We have shown that the entire assembly is taught to break the communion-loaf. Speaking of this matter, Frederick M. Kerby, Director of the Washington Bureau of The **Charleston Gazette**, says. "The 'breaking of bread' implies the **breaking off of a piece**, not breaking it in half."

So, when Christ broke the loaves for the great multitude, He "broke them up" or "to pieces"; but when He broke the communion-loaf, He broke off a bite for Himself. We are taught to follow His example when we break the loaf (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24; 10:17).

Dr. Vine, commenting on "This do" says: "i.e., the act of giving thanks and breaking the bread, each one for himself; see 1 Cor. 10:16, 'the bread which we break.' Any brother who goes to the table, gives thanks and divides the loaf, is not doing representative or symbolic acts. He is not representing the Lord, or taking His place."

### Did Jesus Eat the Piece He "Broke Off"?

Certainly! The **"breaking of bread"** (Acts 2:42; 20:7, 11; 1 Cor. 10:16, etc.) implies the eating. All languages have idioms or expressions peculiar to these languages. Our word **Idiom** comes from the Greek word **Idioma**, a peculiarity (from **idios**, one's own, and **idiosmos**, the common manner of speaking). It means **"The peculiar usage of Words and Phrases"** (Bullinger).

"The fact must ever be remembered that, while the language of the New Testament is Greek, the agents and instruments employed by the Holy Spirit were Hebrews. God spake 'by the mouth of his holy prophets.' Hence, while the 'mouth' and the throat and vocal-chords and breath were human, the words were Divine.

No one is able to understand the phenomenon; or explain how it comes to pass: for Inspiration is a fact to be believed and received, and not a matter to be reasoned about.

"While, therefore, the words are Greek, the thoughts and idioms are Hebrew" (E. W. Bullinger, Compiler of "The Companion Bible" and author of an excellent Greek Lexicon and Concordance, in "Figures of Speech Used in the Bible," p. 820).

Again, Bullinger says: "The New Testament Greek abounds with **Hebraisms**: i. e. expressions conveying Hebrew usages and thoughts in Greek words." Again: "What is wanted is an **idiomatic**: i. e., the exact reproduction, not of words (merely), but of the thought and meaning of the phrase." He gives many examples illustrative of this point. One of them is: "What would a Frenchman understand if 'How do you do?' were rendered literally instead of idiomatically: 'How do you carry yourself?' Or the German: 'How goes it' wie gehts)'. Remember that the New Testament was written by Jews educated to think and write in Hebrew. So they often translated Hebrew expressions. Example: Our English expression, "the first day of the week," is from the Greek **mia sabbatoon** and that from the Hebrew **echad b' shabbath** meaning, literally, "one of the sabbaths" (as in the Concordant Version). But our translators, knowing its grammatical and historical construction, correctly rendered it "the first day of the week" (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2) because the idiom could mean nothing else. The Concordant Version, although an excellent one, is certainly wrong in its rendering of this idiom literally instead of idiomatically.

In England, when a friend invites another to dine with him, he usually says, "Come, and take tea with me." In Arabia, "Come, and eat salt with me." The Jews say, "Come and break bread with me." The same expression is used in Greek. It is a Hebrew thought expressed in Greek words. By means of our translations, the same expression has come into our English Bible. The "breaking of bread," then, is, as Mr. Knoch has pointed out, "an idiomatic Hebrew expression, like our 'taking tea' or the Arab's 'eating salt,' and denotes an ordinary meal." "The breaking of the loaf" (Acts 2:42; Greek Text) is used of the Communion.

"BREAD is a word used in Scripture for food in general. As bread was usually made by the Jews in thin cakes, it was not cut but broken, which gave rise to the phrase, BREAKING OF BREAD, which sometimes means the partaking of a meal, as in Luke 24:35" (Wilson: **Emphatic Diaglott**, p. 876).

Under **"Idiomatic Phrases,"** Bullinger says: "To break bread; **klasai arton**, is the literal rendering of the Hebrew idiom, **paras lechem**, and it means to partake of food, and is used of eating as in a meal. The figure (or idiom) arose from the fact that among the Hebrews bread was made . . . in round cakes about as thick as the thumb. These were always broken, and not cut. Hence the origin of the phrase to break bread"



("Figures of Speech," p. 839). An example: Luke 24:30:—"And it came to pass, as He sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them." In verse 35, they speak of how Christ "was known of them in the breaking of bread," i. e., as He sat at meat with them. Peter says they "ate and drank with Him after He rose from the dead" (Acts 10:41).

The same idiom is used to denote the communion. The expression in the Greek of Acts 2:42 is "The breaking of the loaf" (*ton arton*). Wilson, after showing that "the breaking of bread" sometimes denotes an ordinary meal, adds, "Also what is emphatically styled, 'the breaking of THE LOAF' in the Lord's supper, as mentioned in Acts 2:42. See also Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:25" (Emphatic Diaglott, p. 876). It means to break and eat. Those who deny it are logically bound to go with the Pope who says that since "the cup" (Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:23), is not mentioned in connection with the "breaking of the loaf" (Acts 2:42; 20:7, 11) we have authority for "communion in one kind": i. e., to partake of the bread but not of "the fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:28, 29)! They fail to see that "the breaking of the loaf" implies the whole thing: giving thanks, breaking the loaf, eating; giving thanks for the cup, and drinking of it. Some of our brethren know that "the cup" is implied in "the breaking of the loaf," (Acts 2:42) but do not know that the eating is, too!

The full expression is used in Acts 20:11. In verse 7, it says "the disciples," Paul being among them, "came together to break bread" (to observe the Communion). The 11th verse says, "And having come up and broken the loaf, and tasting it." He "broke off" (from *kleo*) a fragment" (enough to "taste it, as we do in the Communion). The Concordant Version, closely following the original here, reads "breaking bread and taking a taste." Christ did the same. (Matt. 26:26).

In Acts 20:7, it says the disciples "came together to break bread (or the loaf)"; while in 1 Cor. 11:33 Paul says "when you come together to eat." In the former passage "the breaking of the loaf" implies the eating (for surely they did not break it and go off and leave it!); and in the latter the eating implies the breaking.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that the very fact that Jesus "broke" the loaf means that He also ate. The breaking implies the eating. "The 'breaking of bread' implies the breaking off of a piece, not breaking it in half. The eating of the piece so broken off would naturally follow" (Frederick M. Kerby, Director of The Washington Bureau of The Charleston Gazette, Information Department). "The situation no doubt implies that He also ate of it" (Carl H. Kraeling, New Testament Department, Yale University). "Does 'He broke' (*Eklese*) mean that Jesus broke, and ate (Luke 22:19)?" Answer: "Yes, though not expressly stated" (Robert H. Pfeiffer, Curator Semitic Museum, Harvard University). "Is there anything in the Greek New Testament to indicate that Jesus broke the loaf in halves and gave it to the disciples without eating of it Himself?" Answer: "No: he had to eat before the others. The Talmud prescribes that those at the Table cannot eat until the one who 'breaks the bread' partakes (Berakhoth 47a). According to the Palestinian Tosephta, Berakhoth 6. 10a, 61, 'Whenever Rab (died in 247) broke the bread (after the benediction) he partook of it with his left hand and distributed (the bread to the people at the Table) with his right hand' (i. e., he partook as soon as possible so that they could begin eating" (Robert H. Pfeiffer).

Rabbi Mayer Winkler, a native Jew, says, "*Paros lechem* means to break the bread, but it involves the idea to break and eat, because, according to the Jewish law, if you pronounce a benediction over bread, you must eat. Otherwise, you are not allowed to pronounce the benediction."

Rabbi Julius L. Seigel, a Jewish believer, says the same, and adds: "According to Rabbinic and Talmudic law, no person should pronounce a 'blessing' (see Matt. 26:26) and 'break bread' with his guests (see Luke

22:19) unless he also partakes."

The Jewish laws and customs gave to "the breaking of bread" its idiomatic meaning. **Usage gives to any expression its meaning.** The fact that Jesus "broke" the bread means that He also ate of it. The writers and early readers of the New Testament could have had no other idea in mind when recording and reading what Jesus did. See Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19. **It is folly, as the native Greek scholar and lexicographer, Sophecles, says, "to suppose that the writers of the Greek New Testament put upon words (and phrases) meanings not recognized by the Greeks" (and Hebrews)**

### He Also Drank

"I tell you, That I will not henceforth drink of this product of the vine, till that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom" (Jesus: Matt. 26:29). Mark 14:25: "I will drink of the product of the vine **no more**, till that day when I drink it new." Also Luke 22:18: "I will not drink **from henceforth** of the product of the vine, till the kingdom of God shall come." These quotations are from the **Emphatic Diaglott**. The King James Version does not have the words "from henceforth." But, remember, it was made from but few manuscripts, none of which were earlier than the 10th century. We now have over 1,000, some dating back to the 4th century. Many, including the oldest, read: "I will not drink **from henceforth**," etc. The cup mentioned here may be a passover cup. Does it mean that He would partake of that but not of the Lord's supper cup (v. 20)? The words "from henceforth" are translated from **apo tou nun**. Many, including the late Dr. A. T. Robertson, concededly the best Greek scholar of his day, render it "after today." But in Matthew 26:29 "henceforth" is from **aparti**, "from the present." It usually breaks time at the very moment, as Dr. Godby has pointed out.

Godet, in his commentary on Luke, asks and answers the question, "Did Jesus Himself drink? . . . the words 'I will not drink until . . .', speak in favor of the affirmative. Was it not, besides, a sign of communion from which Jesus could hardly refrain on such an occasion?" (It was a communal, not a sacrificial, service). This has led some to think Christ did not partake of the wine. But the revisions have, in God's good providence, brought this omission to light so that there is no excuse for any one to be misled into the absurd idea that Jesus did not partake with His beloved disciples

" . . . on that night when doomed to know  
The eager rage of every foe."

"I will not drink henceforth" (Matt. 26:29). "Henceforth" is from **ap arti** (after this time). W. B. Godby, A. M., one of the greatest Greek scholars the world has produced, and author of the Godby translation of the N. T., says, "The Greek word **aparti**, translated 'from henceforth,' means instantaneously, **from the very moment**. Hence, you see the problem is solved, and the question is settled." Prof. A. T. Robertson, A. M., LL.D., Litt. D., concededly the world's greatest scholar, says: "This language rather implies that Jesus himself partook of the bread and the wine" (*Word Pictures*, Vol. 1, p. 210).

Adam Clarke says: "We shall not have another opportunity of eating this bread and drinking this wine together, as in a few hours my crucifixion shall take place" (Commentary in loco).

"From the very moment" at which Jesus spoke He would "never again" (Mark 14:25) "drink of this fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:29) till the Kingdom should come. This shows conclusively that Jesus did drink of the "fruit of the vine" just before He said He would do so "no more" "after this," etc.

Clement of Alexandria, an early Christian writer, alludes to this, saying, "Our Lord Himself partook of wine; He blessed the wine, saying, 'Take drink; this is My Blood—the blood of the vine'" (*Paedag.* ii. c. 2).

A strong intimation that Jesus ate and drank with His disciples on the "night in which He was betrayed," when "He took a loaf . . . and broke it" (1 Cor. 11:23), is found in John 13. David says: "Yea, my own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which **did eat of MY bread**, hath lifted up his heel against me" (Psa. 41:9). Jesus quotes this prophecy in John 13 and applies it to Judas Iscariot. He makes the word "My" refer to Himself. Here is His quotation: "He that **eateth bread with Me**" refer to Himself. Here is quotation: "He that **eateth bread with Me**" (John 13:18). The Greek Version of the Hebrew Scriptures (the LXX), made a few centuries before Christ, reads: "**artous mou**," literally, "**the bread of Me**." The same form of expression is used in Matt. 16:18—"mou ten ekklesion," lit., "**of Me the church**." The English idiom, of course, requires these passages to be rendered: "My bread" and "My church."

As Christ says, "My church" (claiming it for His very own), so Paul, agreeing, says, "the churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16). Paul says, "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:21) when Christ would have said "My cup." John says "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10) when Christ would have said "My day." Paul says "the Lord's Table" (1 Cor. 10:21) while Christ says "My Table" (Luke 22:30).

So "My (Christ's) bread." (Psa. 41:9) which Christ says Judas (and, of course, the other disciples) ate "with me"—"at My Table" (Living Oracles Tr.)—must have been the bread or "Loaf" (Emphatic Diaglott) which "He took" and of which He said: "This is My body" (Matt. 26:26). What other bread could it have been? He says: "Eat and drink at My Table in My Kingdom" (Luke 22:30). This was His only Table. The bread on it was His only bread. "Jesus saith unto them, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head" (Matt. 8:20).

Some have tried to dodge the force of this argument by assuming that Judas was not present at the institution of the Communion. But he was! See Luke 22:17-21.

So the **Lord's cup**, the **Lord's bread**, the **Lord's Table**, etc., all have reference to the Communion. The bread which Christ calls "My bread" (Psa. 41:9) and which He ate with His disciples (John 13:18) was not the Passover bread, for that pertained to Judaism, and not to the Christian System. Moreover, the Communion "is emphatically styled, 'the breaking of THE LOAF,'" (Wilson). "The loaf" in "The breaking of the loaf" (Acts 2:42) is from **ton arton** and the same expression is used in the Greek of John 13:18. Wilson's interlineary translation in the **Emphatic Diaglott** reads: "**He eating with me the loaf**" (John 13:18). And the phrase "He broke" (Eklase) means "He broke and ate," for it is the same Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek idiom used in Acts 2:42; 20:7, etc. So Pfeiffer, Knoch, Bullinger, Winer, et al.

I am not alone in my interpretation of John 13:18. The peerless scholars and exegetes, Jamison, Fawcett and Brown, in their Bible Commentary, say: "In the Psalm (41) the immediate reference is to Ahithophel's treachery against David (2 Sam. 17), one of those scenes in which the parallel of his story with that of the great Anti-type is exceedingly striking. 'The eating bread derives a fearful meaning from the participation in the sacramental supper, a meaning which must be applied forever to all unworthy communicants, as well as to all betrayers of Christ who eat the bread of His Church' (Stier, with whom, and others, we agree in thinking that Judas partook of the Lord's Supper."

### How Should We Break the Loaf

Little needs to be said on this point. David Lipscomb, of sainted memory, speaking of the idea held by many in the western part of our country that the one presiding at the Table should break the loaf in two in (or

near) the middle to make it "represent Christ's broken body," says it "is a part of Romish ritualism" (*Questions Answered* by Lipscomb and Sewell, edited by Kurfees, p. 409).

Christ "broke off" (**Klaoo**) "a fragment" or "morsel" (**klasma**) and ate it, as clearly demonstrated in the foregoing pages. In Luke 22:19, after "breaking the loaf," He said to His disciples (the Twelve), "This do"! He meant for each to "break off" and eat, Just as He had done. Paul makes the "one loaf" a type of the unity of the "one body," the church. 1 Cor. 10:17: "Because there is One Loaf, we, the many, are One Body; for we all partake of the one Loaf" (Emphatic Diaglott). Now, it is certain that, since the "one loaf" is a symbol or token of the unity of the "one body" (Eph. 4:3), the church, as Paul here affirms, the symbolism should not be marred by breaking the loaf in two in (or near) the middle and passing both sections to the disciples, and especially is it erroneous to bind this practice upon the church of God, with the claim that it must be done to "represent Christ's broken body," as we so often hear. There is no authority for it. Of the typical Paschal lamb it is said, "neither shall ye break a bone thereof" (Exod. 12:46). Of the great Anti-type, Messiah, it is prophetically said, "He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken" (Psa. 34:20). Historically, it is said, "These things were done that the Scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture, They shall look upon him whom they pierce" (John 19:32-37). There is nothing recorded in connection with the crucifixion that can be signified by breaking the Loaf in two in (or near) the middle. We do well to stay well within "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6).

Besides, when the one presiding at the Table **breaks off** (**Klaoo**) a bite, **klasma**) and eats it he has done all that the Record, either in the Greek or in any translation, says Christ did—he has "broken" it! Paul shows that all should break the loaf alike, for he says, "The loaf which WE (the congregation) BREAK" (1 Cor. 10:16). William Hurte says: "Each breaking a piece from it for the purpose of eating, is their voluntary reception of His life to be embodied and reproduced in their own" (Catechetical Commentary in loco). This shows that each was to "break off" (**klao**) for himself; for all disciples present could not break the loaf in two in the middle! And this language would be nonsense if the right way of breaking the loaf should be for the one presiding at the table to break it into a pile of fragments! The word "break" here, as in all other places where it speaks of breaking the loaf, is from **klao** and means to "break off." By metonymy, it means to "break off" and eat the piece so broken. So says Greenfield's lexicon, citing Acts 2:42; 20:7, 11, as examples. In Acts 20:11, Luke, speaking of Paul at Troas, says, "And having come up and broken bread and taking a taste (Gr., **geusamenos**). This leaves one solitary passage to be examined, namely:

#### 1 Cor. 11:24

"This is my body which is broken for you." If the word "broken" is genuine, it proves nothing for the theory we are fighting, for we all believe the loaf should be broken. The disagreement is over HOW the breaking should be done. Besides, if the word "broken" is genuine, it only shows that the actual body of Jesus, of which the loaf is a token (**eimi**), was broken for us. But HOW was it "broken"? In the middle? No! But is "broken" genuine? It is doubtful. The Greek Text called "Textus Receptus" (from which the AV was made) was compiled from some eight MSS., none of which was earlier than the 10th century. Nearly 1,000 MSS. are now known, and some of them very ancient.

None of the critical Greek texts contain the word for "broken." Nor do the latest and best versions. Nor does Jerome's Latin Vulgate translation, which is older than most MSS. Now extant. The Greek Text of Westcott and Hort (one of the best) does not contain the word. The American Standard Version, concededly the most accurate of any English

translation, following the Greek of Westcott and Hort, leaves out the word "broken" as an interpolation. The following ancient Greek MSS. do not contain the word: Sinaiticus, Aleph, 4th century; Alexandrinus, A., 5th century; Vaticanus, B., 4th century; Ephraem Syri, C., 5th century. These are the best. The editions of the greatest recent critics (Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford) omit it. The word was added to some of the later MSS. "The additions *kloomenon* (broken), *thruptomenon* (bruised or crushed), and *didomenon* (given), are attempts which have been made to complete our Lord's expression. The best MSS. have simply to *huper humon* (in your behalf)" (Frederick Kling, in Lange's "Commentary on the Holy Scriptures" in loco). He speaks of the "undoubtedly interpolated expression 'broken,' instead of which some authorities have 'given,' borrowed from Luke (22:19)."—Ibid.

That prince of scholars, Prof. A. T. Robertson, A. M., LL.D., Litt.D., concededly the world's greatest Greek scholar, says, "The correct text there (1 Cor. 11:24) has only to *huper humon* (in your behalf) without *kloomenon* (broken). As a matter of fact, the body of Jesus was not 'broken' (John 19:33), as John expressly states" (*Word Pictures in the N. T.*, Vol. 1, p. 209).

The sainted David Lipscomb says, "The expression, the body 'broken' or 'the broken body,' is found only once in the Common Version, and it is left out of the American Revised Version as an interpolation. The body of Jesus was pierced and bruised, but a bone of him was not broken" (*Questions and Answers*, p. 70).

The word "broken" (1 Cor. 11:24) is, therefore, evidently an addition to the Sacred Text. It seems to do violence to the sense of the Text. It is dangerous to supply words which the original does not justify. If a word is added, it should be *didomenon* (given.) This does no violence to God's word, since the word is used, both in Greek and in the English, of Luke 22:19. However, if "broken" were genuine, it would have to correspond with *Eklase* ("He broke off") of the same verse, which, of course, would destroy the idea that He broke the loaf in two in (or near) the middle.

### "One Loaf" (1 Cor. 10:17)

Alexander Campbell, the leader of the current movement to restore primitive Christianity, says: "On the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf. The necessity is not that of a positive law enjoining one loaf and only one, as the ritual of Moses enjoined twelve loaves. But it is a necessity arising from the meaning of the Institution as explained by the Apostles. As there is but one literal body, and but one mystical or figurative body having many members; so there must be but one loaf. The Apostle insists upon this. 'Because there is but one loaf, we, the many, are one body; for we are all partakers of that one loaf' (Cor. 10:17). The Greek word *artos*, especially when joined with words of number, says Dr. Macknight, always signifies a loaf, and is so translated in our Bibles: — 'Do you not remember the five loaves?' (Matt. 16:9). There are many instances of the same sort. Dr. Campbell says, 'that in the plural number it ought always to be rendered loaves; but when there is a numeral before it, it indispensably must be rendered loaf or loaves. Thus we say one loaf, seven loaves; not one bread, seven breads'. — 'Because there is one loaf,' says Paul, 'we must consider the whole congregation as one body' (1 Cor. 10:17). Here the Apostle reasons from what is more plain to what is less plain; from what was established to what was not so fully established in the minds of the Christians. There was no dispute about the one loaf; therefore there ought to be none about the one body. This mode of reasoning makes it as certain as a positive law; because that which an apostle reasons from must be an established fact, or an established principle" (*Christian System*, p. 305).

There is now no dispute among disciples of Christ about the "one body" (Eph. 4:4); therefore, there ought to be none about the "one loaf" (1 Cor. 10:17). To use *loaves* would mar the "picture." The same is true of breaking the loaf in two in (or near) the middle. We do well to keep well within "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6). The restoration of Christianity as it existed in Apostolic times will bring about the use of one loaf in churches of modern times. We are in the time of the "cleansing of the Sanctuary" (Dan. 8:13, 14). Let us, therefore, be busy restoring things to the Apostolic ideal!

#### POST SCRIPT

Those who contend for breaking the loaf in two say that Jesus did not partake, and ask, with an air of triumph, "Would He eat of His own body and drink of His own blood?" We answer: The loaf and the fruit of the vine were not His "own body and blood" except in a metaphorical sense. But He said He would "drink of *this* fruit of the vine" in "the kingdom of God" (Matt. 26:29; cp. Mark 14:25). Now, if He would drink that which was a figure of His own blood at some other time, why should He not have done so then? He says the loaf is His body (Mt. 26:26) and Paul says the church is His body (Col. 1:18). The church, "which is His body," is told to eat the loaf, which is His body; but He could not! (His body could eat His body but He could not!).

## THE CUP

"My golden spurs now bring to me,  
And bring to me my richest mail,  
For tomorrow I go over land and sea  
In search of the **Holy Grail**."—Lowell

There is, as all know, a controversy over whether more than one cup may be used in the Communion. There is really no room for controversy here for the cup is mentioned ten times in the New Testament, and is always in the singular, thus: "**a cup**" (Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:17), "**the cup**" (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:25, 26, 27, 28), and "**this cup**" (Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25). Standard Version. This fact in view of Paul's exhortation to be not "wise above" nor to "go beyond that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6), should settle the question as to whether **cups** (whether "two or more," which is one theory; or "individual cups," which is another theory) should be used in the Communion. "The Bible speaks" of "**a cup**" on "the Lord's table." "The Bible is silent" about **cups**, there. Let us stand by our immortal motto:—"Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent" (Thomas Campbell).

### The Meaning of the Word

The New Testament was written in Greek, and translated into English. The word rendered "cup" is "**poteerion**." The Rheims-Douay Version renders it "chalice"—i. e., **goblet**—when the Communion-cup is meant. Goodspeed often renders it "wine-cup." Note the definitions of "**poteerion**" as given by the lexicographers:

Harper (W. R.): "**cup**."  
Feyerabend: "**a cup**."  
Knoch: "**DRINK-cup, cup**."  
Berry: "**a drinking cup**."  
Young: "**a drinking vessel**."  
Bullinger: "**a drinking cup**."  
Greenfield: "**a cup for drinking**."  
Liddell and Scott: "**a drinking-cup, wine-cup**."  
Robinson: "**a drinking vessel, a cup**."  
Pickering: "**a drinking-cup, a goblet**."  
Thayer: "**a cup, a drinking vessel**."  
Parkhurst: "**a cup to drink out of, a drinking-cup**."

### Sometimes Used Figuratively

This settles the question is so far as the definition of the word is concerned. That the word **poteerion**, "cup," like the word **baptisma**, "immersion," is sometimes used in a figurative sense, no one denies. The truth of the matter is stated by Benjamin Wilson, author and compiler of that most excellent work, "The Emphatic Diaglott," for he says:

"This word (cup) is taken in both a proper (literal) and in a figurative sense" ("Emphatic Diaglott," p. 882). But it must be ever remembered that the figurative force of the word can never get us away from the literal definition; for, as

Mr. A. E. Knoch, maker of the Concordant Version of the Bible, correctly says: "The literal meaning of a term should never be deducted from its figurative usage. The figurative force depends on the literal definition. This must be fixed first" ("Course in Sacred Greek," p. 20).

## Figurative Language

Mr. Bullinger, the great authority on Biblical figures, says: "A FIGURE is simply a word or sentence thrown into a **peculiar form**, different from its original or simplest meaning or use" (Introduction to "Figures of Speech," p. 16). The context in which a word or sentence is used must be considered in order to determine whether or not it is to be taken in a figurative sense. In the statement, "He took a cup" (Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23), all scholars agree that the word "cup" is to be taken literally. In "drink the Cup of the Lord (1 Cor. 10:21) it is universally agreed that "Cup" is used in a figurative sense to denote what is in the cup. But, even then, a literal cup must actually contain "the fruit of the vine" (Mt. 26: 29, cf. v. 27). Otherwise, it could not have been said that we "drink the cup."

The only difficulty about the study of the cup question is that some have tried to get a **definition** of the word "cup" from its **figurative usage**, forgetting the grammatical rule (if they ever knew it!) that "The figurative force depends on the literal definition," and that "this (the definition) must be fixed first" (Knoch, p. 20).

It is often asked, "How are we to know when words are to be taken in their simple, original form (i. e., **literally**), and when are they to be taken in some other and peculiar form (i. e., **figuratively**)?" Let Dr. Bullinger, the peerless scholar and authority on figures of speech, answer. He says:

"Whenever and wherever it is possible, the words of Scripture are to be understood **literally**." Otherwise, he says, "we may reasonably expect that some figure is employed." He continues, saying, "All that art can do is to ascertain the laws to which nature has subjected them. There is no room for private opinion, neither can speculation concerning them have any authority."

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

No real scholar will deny what Mr. Bullinger says in these quotations. All scholars will corroborate him. Therefore, it is up to those who say "the communion-cup is always used in a figurative sense" to name, and define, and describe the figure used, and tell us what it takes to constitute it! Never found what you call good theology upon bad grammar. "Always, first and foremost, be right in your **grammar**, and then build your theology, because if you build a theological system upon a sandy foundation, the rains will fall, and the floods come, and beat upon it, and your theological house will fall down because it is founded upon the sands of bad grammar" (Joseph Parker, D. D.). This is right! And, if you will "always, first and foremost, be right in your **grammar**," when studying this question, you will see that Dr. Robertson, the greatest scholar of his day, and the author of the best grammar of N.T. Greek ever written, was right when he said, "In Matt. 26:27, **poteerion** means

## A Literal Cup,

while **touto** (this) refers to the contents." Thayer and Robinson, in their excellent N. T. Greek lexicons, after defining **poteerion**, "a cup, a drinking vessel," say that in "He took a cup" (Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:17, etc.) the word "cup" is used literally, that is, it denotes a literal cup, and Thayer says it is "the vessel out of which one drinks" (**Lexicon**, p. 510). Mr. Knoch, the translator, lexicographer and grammarian, says the same. Others who have made language a life's study and have thus become authorities on language tell us the same. The professors of Greek (Ropes, Pfieffer, Goodspeed, Saway, Hubble, Savage, England, Jernburg, Stringfellow,



Miller, et al) in the leading American universities (Harvard, Chicago, Kenric, Yale, Minnesota, Phillips, Southern Californit, Drake, Missouri, etc.) say the word "cup" in these passages is used literally and means a drinking vessel.

The Lexicographer of the **New Standard Dictionary** of the English Language says: "The word 'cup' (Mt. 26:27) is used literally." The editor of "The Standard Bible Encyclopedia" says "the cup of blessing" (1 Cor. 10:16) is "a cup of wine."

The writers among the Christians of post-Apostolic times speak to the same effect. **Justin Martyr** (A.D. 110-165) calls it "a cup of wine" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, p. 185).

**Cyprian** (died A.D. 258) speaks of the "blood" or wine "in a cup," and says it cannot be there "when the wine is absent from the chalice" (ad **Caecilium Dominici Colicis**, Ep. 63). He speaks in the same place of "the wine in the chalice."

**Ambrose** (A. D. 340-397) says: "Wine is put into the cup." He also speaks of the cup of wine as "the cup of precious blood" (*Theo Hist. Eccles.* V. 17).

**Chrysostom** (A. D. 347-407) says: "That (wine) which is in the cup" (1 Cor. Homily 24).

These quotations are from the "Greek Fathers," who spoke and wrote Greek, the very language in which the New Testament was written. They knew the meaning of **poteerion**!

**Augustine** (A. D. 354-430) says: "Receive in the cup that which was shed from Christ's side" (Ad. **Neophytos**, I.). Augustine was one of the "Latin Fathers," and one of the ripest scholars of his day.

**Facundus**, one of the lesser lights among the "Fathers," but who, nevertheless, makes a good witness on their belief regarding the cup, says: Christ's "blood is in the consecrated cup."

### "Cup" as a Metaphor

Bearing in mind what has been said under "**Figurative Language**," let us examine the figurative usage of the word "cup." It is sometimes used metaphorically. "A **Metaphor** is a trope, by which a word is diverted from its proper and genuine signification to another meaning, for the sake of comparison, or because there is some analogy between the similitude and the thing signified" (*Horne's Introduction*, p. 134).

"Jesus said unto them, . . . Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto Him, We are able. Jesus said unto them, The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized" (Mark 10:38, 39, cf. Mt. 26:39-42; Mk. 14:36; Lk. 22:42; John 18:11; Mt. 20:22, 23).

In all these references, our Lord uses "cup" and "baptism" **metaphorically**. He compares His approaching death to the drinking of a cup of poisoned contents. It was the custom in those days to give criminals such a cup of poison, at their execution. Violent death was often expressed, metaphorically, under the figure of a cup. **Robinson** says under "**poteerion** (cup)" as a metaphor, "from the Hebrew, **lot**, **portion**, under the emblem of a cup which God presents to be drank . . . . In the N. T. cup of sorrow, i. e., the bitter **lot**, which awaited the Savior in His sufferings and death, Matt. 10:22, 23; 26:39; Mk. 10:38, 39; 14:36; Lk. 22:42; John 18:11. . . . Arabian writers use the same figure, e. g., 'cup of death' Hamasa ed. Schult. 440; 'cup of destruction' Abulf. Ann. I. 352. See Gesen. Hebrew Lexicon."

Our Lord compares His death to drinking a poisoned cup, a "cup of sorrow," a "cup of death." No reference is here made to the communion-cup. Yet, many brethren have used these Scriptures to try to prove that our Lord did not literally take "a cup" when the New Testament writers say He did (Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23, etc.). The cup of our Lord and His disciples drank (Mt. 10:22, 23; Mk. 10:38, 39, etc.), being used metaphorically of death and sufferings, can be drunk only in suffering and death.

He mentions baptism in the same sense. It denotes His being overwhelmed in sufferings on the cross under the figure of a baptism, an immersion, an over-whelming, in sufferings.

"Judge" Rutherford of so-called "Jehovah's Witnesses" fame, argues that since our Lord uses baptism in these Scriptures (Mark 10:38, 39, etc.) in a metaphorical sense, the baptism authorized by Christ (Mt. 28:19) and commanded by Peter (Acts 2:38) and Ananias (Acts 22:16) and taught by Paul (Gal. 3:27) is not baptism in water! Thus, he spins his soul-destroying theory in order to avoid teaching that water baptism is essential to salvation.

Many of our own beloved brethren have fallen into this pit-fall of Satan, for they say the metaphorical use of cup in the Scriptures shows that our Lord and the Apostles had no reference to a literal cup when instituting and referring to the communion! "He took a cup" (Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:17, etc.) cannot possibly be metaphorical. Nor can it be metonymical. The "cup" which "He took" is as literal as the "loaf" which "He took." It is as literal as "the fruit of the vine" which it contains. Truly, it is a "cup containing wine" (Thayer, p. 15), "the vessel out of which one drinks" (Thayer, p. 510). To be consistent, those who teach that "there is nothing literal about the Lord's table" (teaching this in order to evade the literal cup idea) would have to dispense with the loaf, which is literal, and the wine which is also literal. But they use both, and also a cup, or cups,—yes, a literal cup or cups! "Oh, consistency! thou art a jewel."

### "Cup" as a Metonymy

The word "cup" is sometimes used by the figure metonymy, when the communion-cup is meant. In 1 Cor. 10:21 and 11:27 Paul speaks of our "drink (ing) the cup of the Lord." We know that no one can literally swallow a cup, and hence the word is here used figuratively. What, then, is the figure, and what does it take to constitute it? This is the important question. By the common consent of all scholars competent to judge in such matters, the figure **metonymy**. But what does this word mean? "**Metonymy** is a figure of speech by which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it" (Williams: "Composition and Rhetoric," p. 220). There are four kinds of metonymy, namely: (1) of the Cause, (2) of the Effect, (3) of the Subject, and (4) of the Adjunct. (See Bullinger, or any good authority on figures of speech).

In "drink the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:21; 11:27) the **metonymy** used is of the **Subject**: for in this kind of metonymy "**The CONTAINER**" is put "**for the CONTENTS**: and the **PLACE** for the **THING PLACED IN IT**" (Bullinger, p. 573). Examples: "Basket" is put for its contents (Deut. 28:5). "Wilderness" is put for the people and animals that inhabit it (Psa. 29:8, 9, cf. Deut. 8:5). "Islands" are put for their inhabitants (Isa. 41:1; cf. 42:4; 51:5). "World" is put for its inhabitants (John 3:16). "Ships" are put for the people in them (Isa. 23:1, cf. v. 14). "Cup" is put for "the fruit of the vine" it contains (1 Cor. 10:21; 11:27). But if the wine is not in a cup, you cannot call it a cup. We use the same figure when we say "the radiator," or "the kettle, is boiling." We name the vessel to suggest to the mind the contents.

The professors of language (England, Farr, McCowan, Stringfellow, Savage, Morro, Pfeiffer, Kraeling, et al) of the leading universities (Phillips,

Florida, Southern Californit, Drake, Minnesota, Texas Christian, Harvard, Yale, etc.) say "cup" (1 Cor. 10:21; 11:27) is "put for the wine it contains."

Robinson says (Lexicon, under *poteerion*): "My metonymy, *cup* for the contents of a cup, *cup-full*, e. g., *cup of wine*, spoken of the wine drank at the Eucharist," citing 1 Cor. 10:21 as an example.

Thayer says: "By metonymy of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk." Green says the same, in his lexicon.

The word "cup" as such, never means wine or "the fruit of the vine" (Mt. 26:29). The "cup" of Mt. 26:27 is clearly distinguished from "the fruit of the vine" of the 29th verse. Indeed, "We do not interpret the word 'cup' to mean 'sign,' 'symbol,' or 'figure' of cup; but because a literal cup actually contains and conveys its literal contents, so that you cannot receive the contents without receiving the cup, nor the cup, without receiving the contents; they are so identified, that, without dreaming of a departure from the prose of everyday life, all the cultivated languages of men give the name 'cup' both to the thing containing and the thing contained. There is, however, this difference—that the thing designed to contain bears the name 'cup' even when empty, but the thing contained (in a cup) bears the name 'cup' only in its relations as contained. A wine-cup may hold no wine; a cup of wine involves both wine as contained, and a cup as containing" (Charles P. Krauth: "The Conservative Reformation," p. 778).

Speaking of Luke 22:17, Mr. Krauth says: "He took the cup containing, and through it the contents" (Ibid). "In the words, 'Divide it among yourselves,' the cup is conceived of in the second sense (wine contained in a cup)—divide the contained (wine), by passing from one to the other the containing cup, with its contents" (Ibid). Yes, the Lord said, "Drink ye all of (ek, out of) it" (Mt. 26:27); and, obeying, "they all drank of (ek, out of) it" (Mk. 14:23). Thus, they divided it among themselves—it was not divided for them, by being put into cups!

So, there must be a literal cup, even in metonymy! Thayer is, therefore, right, when he says we "drink the cup" by drinking "what is in the cup" (Lexicon, p. 510). N. L. Clark says we drink it "by drinking what it contains, and in no other way."

### The New Covenant Signified

We have always looked upon the bread as being Christ's body and the fruit of the vine as His blood, for He says so (Mt. 26:26-28; Mk. 14:22, 23). But He just as plainly says, "This cup (*poteerion*), 'a cup, a drinking vessel'—Thayer) is the New Covenant in (en "ratified by"—Thayer) my blood, which is poured out for you" (Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25); meaning, "This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the New Covenant" (Thayer, p. 15).

Bro. William Hurte, the commenator, says: "God made a covenant, and Jesus sealed it with His blood, and gave to them the cup out of which they were to drink—the cup being a pledge to them that all the privileges of the New Covenant were conferred upon them" ("Catechetical Commentary" in loco).

Yahweh made a covenant with Isreal, and ratified it with the blood of animals. The blood was sprinkled "on the people," and Moses said, "Behold the blood of the covenant, which Yahweh hath made" (Exod. 24:1-8).

The New Covenant, the anti-type, was ratified by the blood of Yahweh's Son,—Messiah,—"the messenger of the covenant" (Mal. 3:1—by the blood of Him whom Yahweh has "given for a covenant of the people" (Isa. 42:6, 49:8).

Since the above was written (in 1936) attempts have been made to show that Thayer did not mean what his language evidently means when he says: "This cup containing wine . . . is . . . an emblem of the new covenant." Still, no one, as far as I know, has tried to tell us what he did mean. Some good scholars are of the opinion that he did not mean it that way. Some say he is wrong in what he says. Regardless of what he meant, opposition to the individual cups does not depend on his comment. Our chief interest is in a restoration of the practice of the apostolic church. Individual cups were unheard of in the days of the apostles!

While some scholars do not agree with Thayer's comment, others do! "Poteerion (cup) occurs twice in the passages from Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25. The first time it is apparently the literal cup; the second time it is apparently 'the cup with its contents.'"—Walter Miller, College of Arts and Science, University of Missouri.

Professor F. R. Gay, who began teaching Greek in Bethany College in 1910, said: "This cup (that is, the cup and its contents) represents the New Covenant (and Testament: both ideas are included) which is ratified by my sacrificial death."

In another letter he said: "In the expression *touto to poteerion* ('this the cup'—JDP), the *touto*, 'this,' (demonstrative) would cause the reference to be to a definite literal cup."

In still another letter he said: "The word cup is used literally in Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25, i.e., it refers to an actual material cup, and it is used to symbolically represent the New Covenant."

(These quotations from Professors Miller and Gay are from letters to J. D. Phillips, written in 1931).

Neander says in Lange: "The cup, then, with the wine it contains, symbolizes the New Covenant, and this covenant is established in the blood of Christ, which the wine poured into the cup . . . sets forth as shed for the expiation of sinful men and to be appropriated by those who drink of the cup."

The very scholarly H. M. Paynter says: "'This cup is the New Covenant.' Not itself; surely for the two things are distinct. Its contents, then, cannot be the blood itself. One fact shows this. Just after saying, 'This is my blood,' He called the contents 'this fruit of the vine.' The substance, then, in the cup remained unchanged. The *esti*, 'is,' therefore, can be only the copula of symbolical relation. The cup symbolizes, and is the seal of, the new covenant. 'The fruit of the vine,' then, must symbolize the blood of that covenant."—The Holy Supper, p. 182.

'The Phrase is not, 'This is the cup,' but '**This cup is the new covenant.**' '**This**' qualifies '**cup**'. Nor is the cup put for its contents. It is not the contents but the '**cup**,' including its contents, that is the 'new testament.' "—Ibid., p. 163.

In the ratification of the Old Testament, both the book and the people were sprinkled with blood. "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament (covenant) which God hath enjoined unto you" (Heb. 9:19-21; cp. Exod. 24:8).

Both the covenant and the blood were visible. The blood was sprinkled on both the covenant and the parties to the covenant (the people). On the Lord's table there are the loaf, the cup, and the fruit of the vine. As the blood of the old Covenant was sprinkled on the covenant, so in the Lord's supper the blood of the New Covenant is in the cup which represents the covenant. And, as the blood of the Old was sprinkled on the people, so in the Lord's supper the people (Christians) are commanded to drink the symbol of the blood from the cup which is the symbol of the Covenant. Why should it be thought incredible that the cup is a symbol of the New Covenant?

In my judgment the strongest point ever made against the view that the cup represents the New Covenant is the fact that the New American Standard Bible: The New Testament renders Luke 22:20 (but not - Cor. 11:25): "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood." It is evident that this rendering is in harmony with the common laws of grammar. But since Matthew and Mark say very definitely that it was the blood, rather than its representative (the fruit of the vine), was "poured out for you" (or "for many") "for the remission of sins," how could the cup have been poured out for the same purpose? Was the fruit of the vine shed, or poured out, for our redemption?!

Of the more than 60 translations of the New Testament in my collection, the New American Standard (a very excellent work, taken as a whole) stands alone in its rendering of this passage!

Weymouth renders it: "This cup," he said, "is the New Covenant ratified by my blood which is to be poured out." In a footnote he says: "Which) Grammatically 'which cup' (cp. Rev. 16:1, 2). But there can be little doubt this is an hypallage, and that 'which blood' is meant, as in Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24."

In Robertson's revision of Weymouth's version, no mention is made of hypallage but the rendering is not changed. Another great scholar, Dr. A. T. Robertson, ridiculed the idea of there being such a figure as hypallage. This figure is little known in America, but much better known in Great Britain. However, Maurice H. Wesson, Associate Professor of English in the University of Nebraska, in his book, *Dictionary of English Grammar*, published in New York (1928) by Crowell says:

**'Hypallage.** A figure of rhetoric in which the ordinary and accepted relationship between two things are reversed, as when we say, 'This book made the author' instead of 'The author made this book.'

Bullinger says: "A word logically belonging to one connection is grammatically united to another." In his (*Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*) he devotes considerable space to a discussion of this figure and gives many examples from both the Old and the New Testament. In most cases the translators, evidently recognizing the figure, translated so as to make the sense plain to the English reader.

Bullinger says Bengel was the only commentator who took figures of speech seriously into consideration. Bengel notices and defines hypallage and deals with it in numerous passages. See his *Gnomon*.

Thayer, who says, " . . . the meaning is, 'This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant,'" lists cup in "He took the cup" under "properly," meaning it is used literally; and in "This cup is the new covenant" he indicates that it is used by metonymy of the cup for its contents. This is why some think he did not mean to say what he says about the "cup containing wine" being "an emblem of the new covenant." Of course, the fruit of the vine would have to be in the cup before the cup would have any meaning. I think the difficulty is more imaginative than real. The cup was there! It takes both the cup containing and the fruit of the vine as contained to represent the new covenant ratified by His blood. Of the loaf, Christ says "This is my body." Of the fruit of the vine, He says "This is my blood." Of the cup He says "This cup is the New Covenant." Three things are symbolized. Why should there not be three symbols?

### Early Meetings

The idea that there were such large crowds at communion in Jerusalem, Corinth, etc., that one cup would have been impossible is worthless. It is purley an imagination without the slightest possible foundation. The disciples in Jerusalem "attended constantly to . . . the breaking of the loaf"

(Acts 2:42), it is true; but "the breaking of the loaf" was "from house to house". There is room to doubt Acts 2:46 being a reference to the Lord's supper, but there is no reason to think the Jews would have allowed meetings for formal worship of Christians in the Temple. Besides, history abundantly shows they met from house to house. We have many references in Acts and the Epistles of gathering for worship in the homes of the brethren, as the following will show:

"In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house. Rom. 16:5, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:5; Phil. verse 2" (Jamison, Faussett and Brown).

Let those who contend that any of the large churches in New Testament times all met in one place to commune try to locate the Scripture or history that says so. It cannot be done! They should learn that "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses" (Neander's *Church History*, vol 1, p. 402). Yes, "Every city had a congregation of Christian worshippers. They met, not in the synagogues, as did the Jews, but in private houses" (Webster's *Early European History*).

This arrangement made it possible for all to stay well within "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6) on this question, namely: "a cup" (Matt. 26:27) for each assembly. Paul taught this (1 Cor. 11:23-28) "everywhere in every church" (1 Cor. 4:17; 1:2).

### Unity

The unity of the church should have some consideration, especially in these days of division and strife. No one will deny that the use of one cup is Scriptural. It is, therefore, the only common ground of unity. Thousands cannot conscientiously worship where more than one cup is used. Therefore, those who put in the cups and thus divide the church, do not walk according to love. Rom. 14th chapter. The fact that the "cup is the New Covenant" (1 Cor. 11:25) shows that we cannot use the cups without spoiling the "token of the covenant." Cf. Gen. 9:16,17.

### Ek, Out Of, From

Ek means "out of" and is the exact antithesis of eis, "into." "Ek" is rendered "out of" 160 times in the King James Version; "from" 177 times. In Matt. 26:27, we are commanded to "drink ek (out of or from) the cup." In Mk. 14:23, it says the disciples "all drank ek (out of or from) it." The Diaglott reads "out of in both places. In 1 Cor. 11:28, Paul says "pino ek tou poteerion," which Wilson translates, "drink out of the cup." Thayer says, "pino ek, with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks" (Lexicon, p. 510), "the vessel" being "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel" (Ibid, p. 533). To add the cups, and drink from them, is to stand on dangerous ground. Such a practice is wholly unauthorized by anything that is either said or exemplified in the New Testament.

### The Primitive Church

The following quotations from the "Fathers" show that the use of one cup by each congregation was the almost universal practice during this period (A. D. 70 to 430). Our attention has been called to one exception. (See below under "The Common Practice"). Was the primitive church wrong? "Credat Judeaeus Appella! non Ego," as Alexander Campbell used to say — "Let Judeaeus Appella believe it, not I!"

### A.D. 70 to A.D. 107

Ignatius, a bishop of the church at Antioch, where "the disciples were first called Christians" (Acts 11:26), from A. D. 70 till his martyrdom in A. D. 107, just one year after John's death, writing to the church at Philadelphia, a church established in Apostolic times, says:

"There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity (Greek, *henoosis*) of His blood" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, p. 81). Again "One loaf is broken for them all, and one cup is distributed among them all." (*Henoosis* here is rendered "unity," "uniting," etc. It "points distinctly to that specific idea which Paul expressed when he says, 'The cup is the communion of Christ's blood' (1 Cor. 10:16)," says Charles P. Krauth).

#### A.D. 100 to A.D. 165

**Justin Martyr** was born about the year A.D. 100, and died a martyr for Christ A. D. 165. Doubtless he heard the apostles preach, and worshipped with church established by them. He says:

"There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, p. 185).

That each church in Justin's day used one cup is evident, for, in speaking of the matter with Trypho, the Jew, he says:

"So he speaks of the Gentiles, that is, of us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, i. e., the Bread of the Eucharist, and also the Cup of the Eucharist" (*Trypho*, c. 41). Again: "The sacrifice which we offer in His name, according to the commandment of Jesus Christ, i. e., in the Eucharist of the Bread and of the Cup, and which are offered by Christians in all places throughout the world" (*Trypho*, c. 117).

'The Apostles in the memoirs composed by them . . . have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them: that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, 'This do in remembrance of Me, this is my body'; and that after the same manner, having taken the cup, and given thanks, He said, 'This is my blood'; and gave it to them alone. Which the wicked demons have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same thing to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, p. 185).

#### A.D. 130 to A.D. 258

**Irenæus**, believed to have been a native of Smyrna, where there was a church in apostolic times (Rev. 1:11), in his youth acquainted with Polycarp, a student of the Apostle John, was born about the year 130 A. D., and was a bishop in Lyons in Gaul after the death of Pothinus in the year 177. His great work "Against Heresies" was written between the years 182 and 188. He died about the year 202. He speaks of "the Bread" and "the Cup" as "the pure sacrifice" observed in his day. He speaks, in "Against Heresies," of "the bread and the mingled cup" ("a cup of wine mixed with water"—Justin Martyr), in his argument against the Marcionites. Still arguing against them, he speaks of "the cup of the Eucharist, the communion of his blood." He speaks of "the Bread," "the Cup," and "the Wine," thus distinguishing between "the cup" containing and the "wine" contained in "the cup." Again, he says, "When the mingled cup and the . . . bread received the word of God, the Eucharist becomes the body and blood of Christ" ("Against Heresies," v. v., 2). He also speaks of "the cup of His blood."

"Irenæus means in Greek 'the Peaceable'; and early church writers love to remark how fitly the illustrious bishop of Lyons bore this name, setting forward as he so earnestly did the peace of the Church, resolved as he was, so far as in him lay, to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Trench: "The Study of Words," p. 38. :

**Cyprian**, a "glorious martyr, whom to read is to know, and to know is to love," was martyred in the year 258 A. D. Reasoning with one who had used water instead of wine, he says:

"Since Christ says: 'I am the true vine,' the blood of Christ is not,

therefore, water, but wine; nor can His blood appear to be in the cup by which we have been redeemed and made alive, when the wine is absent from the chalice by which the blood of Christ is shown forth" (**Ad Caecilium Dominici Calicis**, Ep 63). He speaks of "the wine in the chalice" (**Cypr. Ep. 62**). Again he says, "Seeing that they drink the cup of Christ's blood" cup" (**Cypr. Ad Caecil. c. 16**).

#### A.D. 258 to A.D. 340

I find nothing directly stated on this subject during this period. At some early date, **Facundus** says Christ's "blood is in the consecrated cup." The churches from A. D. 30 to 258 held to the one-cup idea. Ambrose comes on the scene in A. D. 340 and shows that the churches of his day were one-cup churches. So we are quite sure that the churches used one cup during this period.

#### A.D. 340 to A.D. 397

**Ambrose**, one of the most renowned of the early Christians writers, was borned at Traves, Gaul, A. D. 340, and was bishop at Milan from 370 till his death in 397. He was exceedingly sound for a man of his day. He was one of the most eloquent of all those who protested against the corruptions of the rapidly developing Church of Rome, or "**Mystery, Babylon the Great**." The renowned Augustine was his pupil. Both acknowledged but two ordinances: Baptism and Communion. Ambrose denied the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, and openly denounced the worship of images as Paganism. He says:

"We, receiving of one loaf and one cup are receivers and partakers of the body of the Lord." Again: "With what rashness dost thou (the Emperor Theodosius) take with thy mouth the cup of precious blood, when by the fury of thy words innocent blood has been split" (**Theodorst Hist. Eccl. v. 17**). Again: "Wine is put into the cup" (**Book on the Sacraments, L. IV. ch. 4**).

**Dionysius** of Egypt gives similar testimony. He lived about the same time that Ambrose did.

#### A.D. 347 to A.D. 407

**Chrysostom**, a bishop of Constantinople, was born about the year 347, and died in 407. He says:

"One body (compare 1 Cor. 10:17—J. D. P.) is now available for all, and one cup" (**Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Antioch**, translated by Mr. Hammond). Again: "That which is in the cup is that which flowed from His side" (1 Cor. **Homily 24**). Again: "The Table was not of silver the chalice was not of gold in which Christ gave His blood to His disciples to drink, and yet everything there was truly fit to inspire awe" (**Homily on Matthew**, no. 1).

#### A.D. 407 to A.D. 430

**Augustine**, admittedly the greatest of the four "Latin Fathers," "more profound than Ambrose his spiritual father, more original and systematic than Jerome, his contemporary and correspondent," born A. D. 354 and died A. D. 430, says:

"Receive in the cup that which was shed from Christ's side" (**Ad Neo-phytos, I**).

Therefore, each congregation used one cup in its Communion service during the first few centuries of the Christian era. Near the close of the 7th century, a picture was drawn on a golden book cover, representing a



communion scene. Doubtless it was based on the way the communion was observed at that time. The one serving at the Table had in one hand "the bread, and in the other the chalice" (Waal: "Romische Quartalschrift," 1888). It was found in the tomb of a bishop at Singigaglia, and was acquired by the Cavaliere de Rossi. So far as all evidence shows, one cup was used in those days.

#### THE COMMON PRACTICE

We have shown that the common practice in the early church was one cup for each congregation. However, in this (revised) edition, I wish to say that my friend and brother, Ellis Lindsey, in reviewing the one-cup position, quotes the following from the Liturgies of Mark and James, dating from about 200 A. D.:

"The priest (notice the word "priest"—JPD) says the prayer of the Oblation. . . .

"We pray and beseech Thee, O Lord, in Thy mercy, to let Thy presence rest upon this bread and these chalices on the all-holy table. . . ." (The Ante-Nicene Fathers to 325 A. D., Vol. VII, p. 544; Erdmans Publishing Co.)

Again: "Then the Priest breaks the bread, and holds the half in his right hand, and the half in his left. . . . And when he gives a single piece to each chalice, he says . . ." (Ibid., p. 548).

This shows that, with many other departures from "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6), at least one congregation departed from the scriptural form in observing the Lord's Supper, in an early day. Both the "Priest" and the cups were departures!

That more than one cup made their way into some of the congregations in the United States before the invention of the individual cups is not questioned. But to say they were used by divine authority is another matter!

Individual cups were invented by the "Rev." J. G. Thomas, M. D., a Congregational preacher, who was granted a patent in 1894. He and his "church elders" held a service in which they were used before any congregation adopted the practice. The first congregation to purchase a set was the Market Street Presbyterian church in Lima, Ohio. There was bitter opposition to their use in about all denominations. It is quite natural that our brethren, who were trying to be true to their time-honored motto, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," would oppose the innovation, for a while.

J. W. McGarvey wrote against individual cups as early as 1900. That was about the time they began to make their way into the churches of the Restoration Movement which had adopted the use of instrumental music in worship. The brethren who opposed instrumental music in worship were slow about considering adopting the innovation.

The late Brother G. C. Brewer (baptized in 1900) tells how the individual cups began to make their way into the non-instrument churches of Christ. He wrote: "I think I was the first preacher to advocate the use of the individual communion cup and the first church in the State of Tennessee that adopted it was the church for which I was preaching, the Central Church of Christ at Chattanooga, then meeting in the Masonic Temple. My next work was with the church at Columbia, Tennessee, and, after a long struggle, I got the individual communion service into that congregation. About this time, Brother G. Dallas Smith began to advocate the individual communion service and he introduced it at Fayetteville, Tennessee; then later at Murfreesboro. Of course, I was fought both privately and publicly and several brethren took me to task in the religious papers and called me digressive." **Forty Years on the Firing Line, 1948.**

The Christian Standard published articles by McGarvey against individual cups during the years 1900, 1902, 1904, and 1910. In 1904 he wrote:

"Whatever may be the special pleading in excuse for this innovation, it is perfectly clear that it aims to avoid that which the Lord enjoined in instituting the Supper; that is, the use of the same cup by a number of individuals. He could have directed each of the twelve to drink from his own cup, had he adjudged that to be the better way. But he did not, and we shall be far more likely to please him by doing what he did than by doing what he avoided."

There has been opposition to the individual cups among many Lutherans from the very beginning. The following quotations are from the great scholar, Lenski (Lutheran), in his commentary:

"... The point is that Jesus instituted the sacrament with a common cup that was used for all the disciples. Any change in what Jesus did, which has back of it the idea that he would not do the same thing today for sanitary or esthetic reasons, casts a reflection on Jesus which is too grave to be allowed when he is giving us his sacrificial blood to drink."—On Luke 22:20.

"The point is that Jesus instituted the sacrament with the use of one cup and that he bade all the disciples to drink out of this one cup."—On Matt. 26:27.

"... Jesus instituted the sacrament with the use of one cup, that he bade all the disciples drink out of this one cup (Matthew), and that 'they all did drink out of it' (Mark)."—On Mark 14:23.

#### Matt. 26:27, 28

"He took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of it; for this is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission sins.'"

"Cup" here, as elsewhere, is from *poterion*, "a cup, a drinking vessel," used literally as 'this cup containing wine' (Thayer, p. 15), "the vessel out of which one drinks" (Thayer, p. 510, 533).

"Of" is from *ek* which means "out of." It is so rendered 160 times in the Authorized Version. Thayer says, *Pinoo ek*, with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks, *ek* (out of) *tau* (the) *poteerion* (cup)" (Lexicon, p. 510).

"This" is a pronoun referring, by metonymy, to "the fruit of the vine" (of verse 29) in "the cup" (v. 27). This is the interpretation given by the lexicographers, who certainly know language.

Robertson (died in 1934), the greatest linguist of his day, says, "*Poterion* (cup) in Matt. 26:27 means a *literal cup*, while in verse 28 'this' means the contents."

Stringfellow, professor of Greek in Drake University, says, "'This' (in Greek) is a neuter word, and must refer to 'cup,' which is also neuter; but the reference is, by metonymy, to the *contents* of the cup."

England, professor of Greek in Phillips University, says, "Although 'this' (Mt. 26:28) grammatically has, as its antecedent, the 'cup' (v. 27), it clearly refers, by metonymy, to the *contents* of the 'cup'."

Eureka! It is here—this cup which thou  
Didst fill at the winery for us; but now  
"This loaf is My body which is for you,"  
"This cup the New Covenant 'twixt you and Me,"  
"This wine is His blood Who died on the tree";  
Thus, Scriptural Communion is kept indeed!