

Proof: Cups Are Not Scriptural

by

E. H. Miller

1946 – 1952 (?)

"Those who use cups can worship with us and not go against Bible or conscience, we cannot worship with them without going against both, so what should we do about it?"

— E. H. Miller

(Mark 7:7-9; Gal. 1:8-9; Rom. 16:17-18; Deut. 12:32; Num. 22:18; Num. 24:13; Rev. 22:14-19; 2 Tim. 3:13-17.)

Prepared

by

Ellis P. Forman

THE CUP OF THE LORD

There are many people today condemning cups and classes in the church, but there are more condemning classes than cups; in fact, many who are condemning classes are trying to support cups on the Lord's Table. But why condemn one and hold to the other? When neither can be found in the blessed word of God.

"Oh!" says someone, "I am not for cups, for the container has no part in the Lord's Supper: it's the fruit of the vine that is called a cup, and it is a cup regardless of the name or number of containers it is in." Well the Bible says, 1 Thess. 5:21; "*Prove all things,*" so I want someone to prove that if they can.

Well, they say, Christ said, "This cup is my blood" and we know the container is not his blood, but the fruit of the vine is; so that is what Christ called a cup. Now that sounds convincing, but there is just one flaw; Christ did not say "**This cup is my blood.**" That statement is not to be found between the lids of the Bible, but what Christ did say can be found in Luke 22:20, "*This cup is the New Testament in my blood.*" Now the New Testament is not Christ's blood; hence, Christ's blood is not the cup of Luke 22:20 because that "*cup is the New Testament in His blood.*" But what does this mean? Let us read this verse from other versions and see if we cannot understand it better. Goodspeed version: "*This cup is the New Agreement ratified by my blood.*" The Moffatt version reads, "*This cup means the new covenant, ratified by my blood.*" And Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, in reference to this verse on page 15 reads as follows, "The meaning is, '*this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the New Testament.*'" Now, friend, be fair with yourself; was that wine in a bottle or bucket? No, it was in a cup, as all can clearly see. And Thayer said that cup was an emblem of the New Testament and the wine in the cup was an emblem of Christ's blood, and that blood ratified (or sealed) the New Testament which was represented by the cup it was in, as I have already proved by Luke 22:20.

But let us now read another verse, Matt. 26:27, "*He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it.*" Here someone says, "you can't drink of a container." Well, let us see.

CAN WE DRINK A CUP?

Often, our cups brethren refer to 1 Cor. 11:25-28 and say: "We cannot drink a container, hence the word 'cup' cannot mean a container, since it here states, 'drink this cup' and 'drink of that cup', for we could not do this if cup means a container."

Well, let us see about that matter. Turn with me to Ezek. 23 :32, and let us read: "*Thus saith the Lord God; thou shalt drink of thy sister's cup, deep and large,...It containeth much.*" Now, notice that this "cup" was "*deep and large*" and that it "*it containeth much.*" Can anyone deny that this "cup" referred to above is a **container**? Remember that "**it containeth**" and that it was "**deep and large.**" How could this be only the liquid? A later translation (Improved Edition of Baptist Translation) reads: "*Thus says the Lord Jehovah, thou shalt drink thy sister's cup, which is deep and large,*" and verse 34 says: "*Thou shalt even drink it and drain it out, and thou shalt gnaw its sides.*" From the above, no honest person can deny that a container is under consideration, for note: "*It containeth much,*" was "*deep and large,*" they were to "*drain it out,*" and it had "*sides,*" yet God said, "*drink it*" and "*drink of it.*" Could they obey God? Or did God tell them to do the impossible? No! They could do what God said, and so can we. But, how can we drink a cup? "*By drinking what is in the cup*"—Thayer, and "By drinking what it contains"—N. L. Clark, as everyone should know. They drank it by drinking what it contained, and we drink the Lord's cup as they drank their sister's cup. But back to Matt. 26:27, let us read this verse from other versions or translations, as they sometimes make it easier to understand. Diaglott version, "*Drink all of you out of it.*" Goodspeed version, "He took the wine cup—saying you must all drink from it." So you see, it was a **wine cup** Christ took, and they all drank **out of it or from it**. But now if you still doubt the word "cup" here referring to the container, let us go to Thayer (the same one the cups people go to, to learn what baptize means) and on page 510 of his Lexicon we read, "The vessel out of which one drinks, Matt. 26:27," page 533—"a cup, a drinking vessel, Matt. 26:27." So you see that this great Greek scholar to whom all go for the meaning of words, tells us, "cup", in Matt. 26:27, was "a cup, a drinking vessel," "out of which one drinks" and the Diaglott version in Mark. 14:23 reads, "*They all drank out of it.*" That prince of scholars, R. F. Weymouth, in The New Testament in Modern Speech, renders it, "*and they, all of them, drank from it*"; and remarks, in a marginal note—"(*From it*)". Implying that all drank from the same cup, as is now done at civic banquets when the 'Loving-cup' goes round.

But let us now go to the Bible Dictionary by William W. Rand, D. D., of 1859, "cup—This word is taken in scriptures both in a proper and in a figurative sense. In a proper sense, it signified a common cup of horn or some precious metal (Gen. 40:30; 1 Kings, 7:26), such as is used for drink out of at meals; or a cup of ceremony, used

at solemn and religious meals, as at the passover, when the father of the family pronounced certain blessings over the cup, and having tasted it, passed it round to the company and his whole family, who partook of it (Luke 22:16; 1 Cor. 10:16).” Now what was this cup of ceremony that they drank of at the passover? Let us go a little farther into this same book and see, “Jewish writers give us a full description of the passover feast, from which we gather a few particulars. Those who were to partake having performed the required purifications and being assembled at the table, the master of the feast took it cup of unfermented wine, and blessed God for the fruit of the vine of which all then drank.” So we see at the Passover Supper where Christ instituted the Lord’s Supper they all drank from one cup of wine, and this cup and its contents was called the cup of blessing as I will now show. Let us notice a statement in “The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah” by Alfred Edersheim, M. A. Oxon, D. li, Ph. D., pages 497 and 511—“Christ seems to have passed the one cup round among the disciples—This was called as by St. Paul, (1 Cor. 10:16) the cup of blessing.” So, my friend, you see the cup of blessing of 1 Cor. 10:16 was a cup of wine out of which all drank. Here I might also quote from Dummelow’s Commentary, 1 Cor. 10:16, “Cup of blessing the cup of wine upon which a blessing was pronounced.” [According to Jewish customs and history there were four cups of unfermented grape juice at the passover table; the Jews all drank from the first three of the cups; they did not drink from the fourth cup at all; it was placed at an empty plate that was reserved for the Messiah (some say reserved for Elijah, whom they believed would return before the coming of the Messiah). The first cup used was called the *Kiddush*, which means sanctification. The second cup used was called the *cup of plagues*. The third cup was called the *cup of redemption*. The fourth cup that was reserved for the Messiah was called the *cup of blessings*. Paul knew the Jewish customs and Law, having learned at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts 22:3); that’s why he referred to the cup we use in the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 10:16) as the *cup of blessings*, because that is the one the Lord used when He instituted the His Supper from the passover — Ellis Forsman].

Want more proof? Okay, turn with me to the “New Testament History” by Harris Franklin Roll, President of Liff School of Theology, page 155—“If we follow the suggestions of Paul’s words written but a score of years later (1 Cor. 11:23-25), the leader would take a cup of wine and add: *‘in like manner also the cup, after supper saying, this cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me’*.” So you see the one who waited on the Lord’s Table in Paul’s day took a cup of wine, not a bottle of wine, or some cups of wine.

Let us now turn to “Cruden’s Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testament, “Cup—This word is used (1) literally, for a material cup from which one drinks; and (2) figuratively, for the

contents of a cup (1 Cor. 11:27).” So again, we find **a cup** and not a bottle or some cups used in the Lord’s Supper. But hold on! Says someone, didn’t you notice he said the cup of 1 Cor. 11 :27 meant the **contents of a cup**? Yes, I notice that, “the contents of a cup”, not the contents of a bottle or some cups. So if you want to call the wine a cup, it will have to be the **contents of a cup**. And this can be further proved by going to “Webster’s Universal Dictionary.” Why do we have dictionaries? To learn what words mean, don’t we? Well, let us go to it and see what “*cup*” means. “Cup—1. a small vessel, used commonly to drink out of; as, a pewter cup; a wine cup; especially a vessel of pottery usually furnished with a handle and used with a saucer; as, a teacup; a coffee cup. 2. The contents of a cup; that which is contained in a cup; as, a cup of coffee. 3. The chalice from which the sacramental wine is dispensed; also, the wine itself.” So here again we find a cup is a literal cup or the contents of a cup. Coffee is called a cup **when in a cup**, but if in a pot and boiling you would say the pot is boiling just as you say the car radiator froze, referring to the water in the radiator. So, cup in connection with the Lord’s Supper means the cup or chalice that holds the wine, and the wine in this cup or chalice is called a cup because it is the contents **of a cup**. But what is a chalice? We will let this same dictionary tell us, “Chalice—a drinking cup or bowl; particularly a communion cup.” So you see we always end **with a container** in connection with the Lord’s cup, and that container is **a cup**, not some cups or a bottle for the wine would be called a bottle if it was in a bottle. Want proof? Okay, look up bottle in this same dictionary, “Bottle—1. a hollow vessel of glass, wood, leather, or other material, with a narrow mouth, for holding and carrying liquids. 2. The contents of a bottle.” So wine in a bottle is called a bottle but in a cup it is called a cup, and the Bible tells us in Mark 14 :23, “*He took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it.*” Please notice he took the cup. **It was a cup before he took it**, and he gave them what he took and “**they all drank of it.**”

Now remember, I’ve already showed how they drank of it but I will give more proof by quoting this same verse from other translations. First, Diaglott version, “*and taking a cup, having given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank out of it.*” Now from the Goodspeed version, “**He took the wine-cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, and they all drank from it.**” Friends, please notice that Christ took “**a cup**”, “**the wine cup**”, “**and gave it** (the wine-cup) **to them**”, “**and they all drank out of it**”, out of the wine cup he took and gave to them. **He gave them one cup and they all drank out of it.**

Perhaps it would be impossible to find a more scholarly work than the Commentary on Matthew by that specialist in Greek, John A. Broadus. Here is his comment on “*He took the cup*” — ‘*a cup*’ is the correct text in Matthew and Mark, while it is ‘*the cup*’ in Luke

and Paul. There was a cup on the table for drinking wine according to the custom of the paschal meal; ‘*a cup*’ does not say there were others.” [Again, there were four cups at the passover, but only one was reserved for the Messiah. —Ellis Forsman].

Now you see how simple and easy it is to prove the safety of one cup on the Lord’s Table by the Bible, Dictionary, or History; and since it cannot be proved at all that a bottle or cups are safe, let us continue in the things we have learned and been assured of (2 Tim. 3:13-19).

For the benefit of those who are still not satisfied, let us go a little deeper into this subject. In the New Century Dictionary, vol. 1, page 361—“cup...the chalice used in the eucharist;...also, a cup with its contents; the quantity contained in a cup.” The foot notes by Thomas Scott, D. D., in the Holy Bible printed in 1818 reads as follows under 1 Cor. 10:16, “The cup of wine, which was used in the Lord’s Supper to represent spiritual blessings; Matt. 26:27, The wine in that cup represented his blood, as shed to make way for the New Covenant; and to ratify it.” No comment is needed to show how many cups were used.

Now turn to The Encyclopedia Americana, vol. 6, page 252: “Chalice — The ecclesiastical cup in which the consecrated wine is administered. The first of these usually had handles, as **they were very large and heavy.**” They would not have been **large and heavy** if churches then had used individual cups. Let us read of one of these cups in The Modern Concise Encyclopedia under the word “chalice”—“Ecclesiastical cup in which wine is administered — Charlemagne gave a gold chalice weighing 53 lbs. to St. Peter’s in Rome.” Maybe that was for a congregation of many thousands of members which the cups brethren talk so much about.

But we will now turn to the Greek New Testament with English Notes by J. A. Spencer, A. M., published by Harper & Brothers, 1868. Under Mark. 14:23 we read, “At the passover the guests all drank out of the same cup.” The Greek word for cup here is “**poterion**,” and we will see what Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon says this word means here. On page 533, “**Poterion—a cup, a drinking vessel**—Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:17, 20; 1 Cor. 11:25.” Thayer says “cup” in these verses means a drinking vessel. On page 510, “the vessel out of which one drinks, Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23”. Again he says on page 189, “**the thing out of which one drinks**, Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28”. Once more on page 15, “1 Cor. 11:25; Luke 22:20 **in both which the meaning is, This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the New Covenant.**” So he tells us the cup of Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; and 1 Cor. 11:28 is a “**vessel containing wine**”, the wine being an emblem of Christ’s blood, and the vessel out of which they drank an emblem of the New Covenant.

Smith's Bible Dictionary by William Smith, D. C., L. L. D., in which so many people trust for definitions of Bible words, in the complete unabridged edition which consists of three volumes with a total of 4,156 pages, says under Passover, "There is no mention of wine in connection with the Passover in the Pentateuch: but the Mishna strictly enjoins that there should never be less than four cups of it provided at the paschal meal even of the poorest Israelite (Pes. 10:1). The cups were handed round in succession at specified intervals in the meal. Two of them appears to be distinctly mentioned in Luke 22:17, 20. The cup of blessing (1 Cor. 10:16) was probably the latter one of these and is generally conceded to have been the third [fourth, of which they didn't drink, but was reserved for the Messiah — Ellis Forsman] of the series." So you can see that the cup of blessing (1 Cor. 10:16) was a cup of wine. But someone may ask if they didn't use four cups in the Passover. Yes, but Christ used only one of them in the Lord's Supper, the cup of blessings, the third [fourth - EF] cup of wine from which all drank at the Passover [only used by the Lord - EF]. All drank from each of the four [three - EF] cups in the Passover and they all drank from the one cup of blessing in the Lord's Supper. In vol. 2, page 139-140, Smith says concerning the observance of the passover—"The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing for the day and the wine, pronounced over a cup. (not a bottle—EHM) of which he and the others, drank." Note, they all drank of that cup. Now continue, "The table was then set out with the paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as charoseth.

The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the charoseth and ate them. The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought—and the cup was passed round and drunk. Note, this was a **"cup of wine" and they drank the cup.**

After this they ate the flesh of the paschal lamb, with bread [only unleavened bread was allowed at the passover — Ellis Forsman], etc., as they liked; and after another blessing, a third cup. known especially as the 'cup of blessing,' [cup of blessings was the fourth cup and was not passed around — Ellis Forsman] was handed round. This was succeeded by a fourth cup." All drank of each cup at the passover, and the third cup of which they all drank was called "the cup of blessing." That cup was the only one used in the Lord's Supper. [Note, there were some Jewish groups that did refer to the third cup as the cup of blessings, but these groups did not follow the custom of placing the cup of blessings at the Messiah's empty plate — Ellis Forsman].

The Bible Dictionary by William W. Rand, 1859, says it was "a cup of unfermented wine." So while here we might add, for the benefit of those contending for strong fermented wine, that the Bible does not teach us to use strong wine in the Lord's Supper. Yet, I have before me an article by W. F. Jones in the Footprints of Time

of October, 1941, in which he contends for strong wine. He says, "They had the prescribed drink, the strong wine, the fruit of the vine, the unleavened drink used in all O. T. feasts, sacrifices, and the passover, and by the Lord on His Table on the night he was betrayed... So we cannot have unfermented grape juice in the holy communion... The Jews - our type - were forbidden to have leaven in their houses during the feast which typified our passover, Ex. 12" (Emphasis mine—EHM). Notice how he contradicts himself. He first said they had the fruit of the vine, the unleavened drink used by the Lord on His table on the night He was betrayed...so we cannot have unfermented grape juice.(???) Then we cannot have what Christ used?? He must not know that unleavened means unfermented and unfermented means unleavened. We will Jet Webster's Dictionary tell him: Unfermented — "not fermented;...not leavened." Ferment — "leaven." Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. defines it thus: "to leaven, to mix leaven with dough so as to make it ferment." Young's Analytical Concordance, page 596, gives us this definition of the Greek word for leaven: "anything leavened or fermented." Since the children of Israel could not use or have leaven during the passover but had to use things unleavened or unfermented, they used unfermented wine as that Bible Dictionary said. Read Matt. 26:29 in Goodspeed's Translation, "*I shall drink the new wine with you in my Father's Kingdom.*" What is new wine? Isa. 65:8, "*Thus saith the Lord, as the new wine is found in the cluster.*" That would be unfermented grape juice.

The footnote of the New Testament translated by Ferrar Fenton, M.R.A.S., M.C.A.A., under Matt. 26:27-29, "It should be noted that no fermented wine might be used by the Hebrews during the passover week." Fenton also says in his book on The Bible And Wine, "Philip Sidersky, a Christian Jew, told Mrs. Hamilton that at the passover supper the Jews squeezed the juice from a bunch of grapes into the chalice." The Ferrar Fenton translation of 1 Cor. 5:6-8 reads, "*Do you not know that a little ferment ferments the whole mass? Clean out the old ferment, so that you may be a sweet mass, and thus you will be unfermented, for Christ, our passover, was sacrificed for us, so that we may keep a festival, not with an old ferment, neither in a ferment of feast and wickedness, but on the contrary with unfermented purity and truth.*" **Leaven** and **ferment** is the same, and **unleavened** and **unfermented** is the same, and are used interchangeably. W. F. Jones further writes in his article, "*For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us*" (1 Cor. 5:7). Hence, in verse 8, gospel people are enjoined to keep the communion table unleavened." And that means unfermented as just shown. Therefore he should give up his contention for strong fermented wine or change his argument.

I now call your attention to "The Cup Question" by J. L. Musgrave. In the tract he contends for cups and on page 1 makes the broad assertion, "The one container brethren are wrong in

everything, the Bible, history, and the scholarship of the world.” In view of the Biblical, historical, and scholarly evidence which I have presented, and which I shall present in favor of one cup, I will let the reader judge as to whether we are wrong in everything.

On page 13 he pretends to quote Jesus, “This (cup) is my blood,” but Christ did not say that. Jesus said, “*This cup is the new Testament*”, and we all know that the New Testament is not His blood, so the cup is not His blood, but it is the New Testament (sealed) in Christ’s blood; and Moffatt’s Translation thus renders Luke 22 :20, “*This cup means the new covenant, ratified by my blood.*” On page 15 Musgrave mentions this as follows, “*This cup (container) is the new testament.*” Let us consider it: “*This (cup) is my blood of the new testament*” (Matt. 26:28). Note that he has the first verse right (Luke 22:20) but in Matt. 26:28 “*this*” is not “*cup*”. Verse 29 says “**this fruit of the vine**”. So “*this cup (container) is the new testament in (ratified by) my blood*” (Luke 22:20), and “*this fruit of the vine is my blood of (Goodspeed’s version “which ratifies”) the new testament*” (Matt. 26:28). Here Musgrave says. “Certainly the blood of the New Testament and New Testament blood are one and the same”. Yes, but the **New Testament ratified by the blood** and the **blood that ratified the New Testament** are not the same. Christ said the cup was the New Testament (Luke 22:20) and the fruit of-the vine was the blood (Matt. 26:28-29). As proved already the blood was in the cup but was not the cup itself.

Now hear Musgrave again on page 15, “In Exo. 24:6-8 the blood was in basins (plural); however, it was still the blood of the covenant! Why can’t New Testament blood be in containers and still be the blood of the covenant?” I answer, because Jesus had it in a container and said, “**You must all drink from it**” (Matt. 26:27; Goodspeed’s Version). But what about the (plural) basins for the Old Testament blood? Let us study this a little. The King James Version does say basins, but the original Hebrew Word here translated basins is “aggan”, and in Song of Solomon 7:2 we read, “*Thy navel is like a round goblet.*” Goblet is from the same Hebrew word “aggan.” If it is singular here, it could be in Exo. 24:6. And sure enough in the Myles Coverdale Version of 1535, which I have, the first English translation ever printed, we read as follows: “And Moses toke the half parte of the bloude, and put it in a basen, the other half sprenkled he upon the altare” (Exo. 24:6). You can see that a basin or goblet (chalice or cup) was used as a container in both the Old and New Testaments.

We will now read from the “Commentary and Critical Notes of the New Testament” by Adam Clark, L.L.D., F.S.A., M.R.I.A., under Matt. 26:28—“The confirmation of the old covenant was by the blood of bulls and goats—the confirmation of the New was by **a cup of wine**. Christ, having published all the articles of the New Covenant, **he takes the cup of wine**, and gives them to drink, and saith, ‘*This is the new testament in my blood.*’” In the preface to this

gospel he says, “In the celebration of his last supper, Christ calls the cup, “*This cup is the new covenant in my blood*”; i. e., **an emblem of representation of the new covenant, ratified by his blood**, see Luke 22:20.” The cup was an emblem of the New Covenant, and the New Covenant was not the blood but was ratified by the blood. Adam Clark comments of Luke. 22:20, “It does not appear that our Lord handed the bread or the cup to each person: he gave it to him who was next to him, and by handing it from one to another, they shared it among them, verse 17. In this respect, the present mode of administering the Lord’s Supper is not strictly according to the original institution”. Passing cups was not the original way. Under Luke 22:17 he say, “Divide it among yourselves. Pass the cup from one to another.” This gives a blow to Musgrave’s argument on page 19 of his tract.

On pages 20-23 he crosses himself up on metonymy. First, he gives a good definition of metonymy, and then he falsely represents the one container argument. We do not say the cup of the Lord is a metonymy. We say the cup of the Lord is a cup of wine. The word cup is sometimes used as a metonymy, as in 1 Cor. 11:27, “*Drink this cup of the Lord.*” Paul here named the container to suggest the contents. Note, he didn’t name the contents but named something else that readily suggested it. This is according to Musgrave’s definition of metonymy on page 20, “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.” So the word “*cup*” in 1 Cor. 11:27 is used as a metonymy, a container named for the contained, but it’s being used as a metonymy here does not make it a metonymy everywhere, for in Matt. 26:27 the word cup means a drinking vessel (a container), Thayer—pages 510, 533 and 189. Cup here is literal.

In 1 Cor. 10:16 both container and contents are meant as previously shown. Next Musgrave jumps on the Greek on page 24. “To the Greek! To the Greek!”, shout our friends. The cup is taken from *poterion*, which means a drinking vessel, a vessel out of which one drinks. Seldom, if ever, do they tell anyone “*cup*” in Matt. 26:39 is from the same Greek word *poterion*. *Let this poterion (cup, a drinking vessel, a vessel out of which one drinks) pass from me.*” Hear Clark’s Commentary on this, “It seems to be an allusion to a very ancient method of punishing criminals. **A cup of poison was put in their hands and they were obliged to drink it.** “...*Pass from me...*” Perhaps, there is an allusion here to several criminals standing in a row, who are all to drink of the same cup, but the judge extending favor to a certain one, the cup passed by him to the next.” So, there seems to be a literal cup involved here also in this metaphorical comparison.

J. L. Musgrave, in his tract “The Cup Question,” on page 33 tries to get someone to help him out. He thinks it is wonderful proof; and it is for me, but not for him. Notice the letter from The

Lexicographer: "In the King James Version, the word cup is used to mean the contents thereof, just as one says, 'He drank the dipper in a single swallow,' or again one might say, 'He passed the dipper around and everyone took a sip of it and said, How good this is', in which case the pronouns "**it**" and "**this**" refer to the contents of the dipper and not to the dipper itself." (Signed), The Lexicographer.

Now that hurt him and helped me. All drank of one literal dipper. There was only one literal dipper involved here, and all who drank its contents drank the dipper. Well, that is what I say about the Lord's cup. Pass the cup around and let everyone take a sip of it. Everyone who drinks of it drinks the cup. "*This*" in Matt. 26:28, refers to the contents of the cup and not to the cup itself. I did not need this help, but it is appreciated anyway. I wish Musgrave would start passing the cup (not cups) around and let everyone take a sip of it. In Mark 14:23, "*He gave it to them: and they all drank of it.*" The Lexicographer said "*this*" referred to the contents of the dipper and not to the dipper itself. So Musgrave on page four of his tract was wrong when he said, "*This (cup) is my blood.*" "*This*" would refer to the contents of the cup and not to the cup itself. If a dipper is used Musgrave can see how "*this*" can refer to its contents, but he can't see it that way if a cup is used. Maybe if he would put "*cup*" where the letter says dipper he could understand it. He can understand that to "drink the dipper" one must drink the contents of a literal dipper, but when we insist that an assembly must drink the contents of a literal cup to "drink the cup" he says, "Well, you will have to swallow the container." Are his eyes blinded?

While he is catching his breath, we will notice some more Bible, history, and the scholarship of the world, which he thinks is against us. Eadies Biblical Cyclopedia by John Eadie, D.D., L.L.D., under 1 Cor. 10:16, "The master of the feast took a cup of wine in his hand and solemnly blessed God for it and for all the mercies which were then acknowledged. It was now passed to all the guests, each of whom drank of it in turn." "It" was taken in his hand, "it" was passed to all, and each drank of "it" in turn.

Now for good measure we will return to the original word which Christ used, **poterion**, the word translated "*cup*" in the English. We will go to the Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament by Edward Robinson, D.D., L.L. D., and see if he agrees with Thayer. "Poterion, 1. a drinking vessel, a cup; Matt. 10:42; 23:25; 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:17, 20; 1 Cor. 11:25. 2. Meton, a cup for the contents of a cup, cup-full, e.g. a cup of wine; so of the wine drank at the eucharist; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:16." So there is in the communion "*a cup*" and the "*contents of a cup*"; "*a cup of wine*" (literal and metonymy both given). You can have the literal without the metonymy, but you cannot have the metonymy without the literal.

Why do the cups brethren use more than one container? They say because of large crowds and the danger of spreading diseases.

They depart from the New Testament example for these reasons. Did you know that in the fifteenth century the Catholics for these same reasons changed the communion and withheld the cup from the laity? I have before me two of their books, "The Faith of Millions" and "The Faith of our Fathers." Beginning on page 223 of the first and page 306 of the latter we read as follows: "Why do you give the communion to the laity", asked an inquirer recently, "under the form of bread and not under the form of wine as well?" Grave and just reasons enumerated by the Council of Trent were: "the danger of spilling the precious blood; the difficulty of reserving the Sacrament under the species of wine; and the danger to health from partaking of a chalice touched by infected lips. As the question involves merely discipline, the church exercises her right as the guardian of the Sacrament to adopt her methods of administering them to the changing conditions of the times. It would be very distasteful, besides, for so many communicants to drink successively out of the same chalice, which would be unavoidable if the Sacrament were administered in both forms; so in the fifteenth century she withdrew the cup. While Protestants consider the cup as an indispensable part of the communion service, they do not seem, in many instances, to be very particular as to what the cup will contain." So there you have it. The Catholics gave the cup to one man instead of to all as Jesus did (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23) because if they do as Jesus did it would be **dangerous and very distasteful, besides, for so many communicants to drink successively out of the same chalice which would be unavoidable.** The Catholics knew that Jesus used one cup, but for these reasons they changed the method of administering it. They are at least open with their admission that they did change it. The cups brethren agree with the Catholics on the danger and the distastefulness of using one cup, but they just take a different step in changing the communion. They introduce individual cups to get around the common cup. They have as much Bible (none) for their way as the Catholics do for theirs, but I had rather follow the way of Jesus (John 14:6). I do not think it dangerous to do as he said.

But for those who trust man more than God, I give the following:

SANITARY COMMUNION

(Quoted from The Pathfinder Magazine, Washington D. C., March 20, 1944).

"Sacred tradition of the common communion cup which dates back to the "upper room" in Jerusalem has been freed of the oft repeated charge of being a "germ carrier" by scientific research of two University of Chicago professors.

In a report of the Journal of Infectious Diseases, Dr. William Burrows, associate professor of bacteriology, and Dr. Elizabeth Hammons, instructor in the Walter G. Zoller Dental Clinic, point

out that heavy metals, particularly silver, have long been known to have a bactericidal effect, and are self-sterilizing, so that common cups do not spread disease.

“Significant differences between the usual restaurant tableware, and the silver communion cup,” the scientists stated, “were, the bacteria-killing action of silver, and the care with which the Sacrament is administered.”

(If the cups brethren could give as much proof that cups were safe as I have for one cup, we would have yielded long ago. If there is a cups man who can give as much Biblical, historical, and scholarly proof that Christ used cups as I have given in favor of one, I will not only yield to him, but I will make him a present of one hundred dollars.

Let us notice some of the references to the communion in translations other than the King James Version. But some will protest that they do not believe in other translations. Why? “Oh!” they say, “it was the first and must be the one God wanted us to have.” Well, they are wrong, for I have four translations in English older than the K.J.V., and perhaps there are others. Let us read from these.

(Wycliffe Version, 1389 A. D.)—Matt. 26:27, “And he takynge the cuppe, dede thankynge, and gave to hem, seyinge, Drinke yee alle herof.” Mark 14:23, “And the cuppe takun, he doynge gracis gaf to hem, and all drunken therof.” Luke 22:20, “Also and the chalys, after that he hadde soupid, seyinge, This cuppe is the newe testament in my blood, which schal be sched for you.”

(Tyndale Version, 1526 A. D.)—Matt. 26:27, “And toke the cuppe, and gave thanks, and gave it them, sayinge, drink of it every won.”

(Myles Coverdale Version, 1535 A. D.)—Matt. 26:27, “And he toke the cuppe, and thanked, and gave it the, and sayde; Drynke ye all thereof.” Mark 14:23, “And he toke the cuppe, thanked and gave it the, and they all drank thereof.”

I left the spelling as it is in these old Bibles. It is old English. If anyone cannot read it, I will be glad to spell the words the modern way for them.

Chailover.Rheims Version, 1582 A. D.—Mark 14:23, “And taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it.”

(Goodspeed’s Version)— “And **he took the wine cup** and gave thanks and gave it to them **and they all drank from it.**” 1 Cor. 11:25, “This cup is the new agreement ratified by my blood.”

(Moffatt’s Translation)— 1 Cor. 11:25, “**This cup means the new covenant ratified by my blood.**”

(Twentieth Century Translation)—Mark 14:23, “**Then he took a cup - and they all drank from it.**” Luke 22:20, “**This cup is the new covenant made by my blood.**”

(American Standard Revised Version)—Mark 14:23, “**He took a cup - and they all drank of it.**”

(The Revised Standard Version of 1946)—Mark 14:23, “**He took a cup - and they all drank of it.**”

With all this proof that Christ took a cup and they all drank from it, how can we say we are following Christ when we take cups and drink from them? (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Matt. 28:20; 2 John :6-9; 2 Tim. 3:13-17).

