

The Mind of Christ

The Memorial of Love

Part Five

INTRODUCTION:

- I. Over the past few weeks, we've been examining the last Passover meal Jesus celebrated with His disciples, during which He instituted the Lord's Supper.
 - A. He two elements commonly used in the Passover meal and giving them an entirely new meaning – a new SYMBOLISM.
 1. Jesus said the UNLEAVENED BREAD would now represent His body which is given for us. **(Matt 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24)**
 2. Jesus also said the FRUIT OF THE VINE would now represent His blood of the new covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins. **(Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25).**
 - B. Last week we examined the view held by some that only ONE LOAF of round, flat, unleavened bread should be used in the Lord's Supper.
 1. Time won't allow me to review the points we made in that lesson, so if you didn't have a chance to hear it, feel free to request a recording from Doug Simmons. They're available on CD's.

- C. However, this morning I want to take a look at the view that **ONLY ONE CUP** of fruit of the vine must be used in the observance of the Lord's Supper.
1. There are **MANY** fine brethren, including members of my own family, who sincerely believe this.
 2. So let's take a moment to examine the Scriptures to see if there is **ANY** support any of this belief.
 3. Time won't allow us to examine **ALL** the arguments made by these brethren, so we'll focus on the ones most **OFTEN** used.

BODY:

- I. The first argument for **ONE CUP** is what I'll call the, "**Modern Invention**" argument.
 - A. This argument says the use of **MULTIPLE** containers in the Lord's Supper is a **MODERN INVENTION** – invented and patented in 1894 by John G. Thomas, and first introduced into the worship of churches of Christ in 1912 by G. C. Brewer in Chattanooga, Tennessee.
 1. Those defending the use of only **ONE CUP** say that prior to the introduction of multiple cups by G. C. Brewer, churches of Christ all over the world followed the pattern of using only **ONE CUP** in the Lord's Supper.

2. And to further SUPPORT their claim, these same brethren quote from several historical sources which THEY SAY prove that the use of one cup was universally practiced from the time of Christ.
 - a. Unfortunately, these brethren have seriously misquoted and intentionally forced their OWN interpretation on the writings of the so-called early church fathers.

- B. But let me briefly reply to the question about multiple containers being a MODERN invention, by asking THIS question: "When did the practice of individual SONG BOOKS find it's way into the church? And who invented the BAPTISTRY and when was it introduced in the church?"
 1. I think you can see where I'm going with all this. Individual song books and a baptistery are JUST AS MODERN as individual containers for the fruit of the vine.
 2. But NONE of these things CHANGE or ALTER a SINGLE New Testament teaching about singing OR about baptism. Therefore, the use of individual song books and a baptistery are purely a matter of PREFERENCE (PERSONAL CHOICE) – where God grants us to liberty to USE them or NOT use them.
 3. On the other hand, if we add an instrument of music in our worship, that addition DOES change or alter the command for us to all SING and MAKE MELODY IN OUR HEARTS to the Lord.

God does NOT grant us to liberty to choose whether or not we want to use an instrument of music. It's simply not authorized.

4. The fact that someone invented and patented individual communion cups has absolutely no bearing WHATSOEVER on whether or not they're scriptural.
5. So, the MODERN INVENTION argument has absolutely no merit at all.

II. The second argument given to support the One Cup position is what I will call the, "**Jesus Used One Cup**" argument.

A. They say Jesus used only ONE CUP in the institution of the Lord's Supper, and further commanded His disciples, "*THIS DO, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.*" (**1 Cor 11:25**)

1. If Jesus DID, in fact, use only one cup in the institution of the Lord's Supper (and I'll concede that He probably did), and all the disciples DRANK from that one cup, (and I'll concede that they probably did), the practice doesn't obligate US to use only one cup.

a. The REASON we're not obligated to use only one cup is because it's completely IRRELEVANT, and therefore NOT a binding example.

there are no examples of Christians CONTINUING the practice because it had some sort of symbolic religious significance.

- a. There was NO SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE to the fact that Jesus and His disciples met in an upper room. Upper rooms were simply a convenient place for several people to get together.
- b. And while there WAS spiritual significance to the washing of His disciples' feet, Jesus didn't COMMAND the practice of foot washing to continue as a practice for the Lord's church, NOR did New Testament Christians CONTINUE the practice as a religious observance.

C. There are ONLY TWO things to which Jesus gave a SOLEMN, SYMBOLIC MEANING – the BREAD, and the CUP (the CONTENTS of the cup, or fruit of the vine).

1. When Jesus commanded His disciples to, "*DO THIS in remembrance of Me,*" He was speaking of simply EATING and DRINKING: EATING the unleavened bread and DRINKING the fruit of the vine (the CONTENTS of the cup).
 - a. **1 Cor 11:23-25** – The apostle Paul REAFFIRMS this: *For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you: that the Lord Jesus on the same night in which He was betrayed took bread; 24 and when He had given thanks, He broke it*

and said, "Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me." 25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

2. Jesus gave a SOLEMN, SYMBOLIC MEANING to the BREAD saying it represented His BODY. He also gave a SOLEMN, SYMBOLIC MEANING to the FRUIT OF THE VINE saying it represented His BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT, or THE NEW COVENANT IN HIS BLOOD.
3. And when they ATE the bread and DRANK the cup, they were THINKING about what the bread and the fruit of the vine REPRESENTED – they needed to DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE of Jesus – THAT’S where their FOCUS needed to be.
4. So, the fact that Jesus used only one cup is COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT! The cup has NO solemn, symbolic meaning. OR DOES IT?

III. And this brings me to the THIRD argument typically used to require the use of ONLY ONE CUP in the Lord’s Supper, and it’s I will call the, "**One Cup = One Covenant**" argument.

- A. This argument says there are actually **THREE** elements in the Lord's Supper, not just **TWO**.
1. It says the **THREE** elements of the Lord's Supper are:
 - a. The **One Loaf of Unleavened Bread** – which represents the **One Body of Jesus Christ**.
 - b. The **Fruit of the Vine** – which represents the **Blood of Jesus Christ**.
 - c. And the **One Cup** – which represents the **One New Covenant** that was ratified by the blood of Jesus Christ.
- B. We've already dealt with the fallacy of the **ONE LOAF** argument. But, let's go back and look at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and see what the Lord **REALLY** said about the **CUP**:
1. **Matt 26:27-28** – *Then He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you. 28 For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."*
 2. **Mark 14:23-24** – *Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. 24 And He said to them, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many."*
 3. **Luke 22:20** – *Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for you."*

4. **1 Cor 11:25** – *In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."*
- C. Matthew and Mark's account make it ABSOLUTELY CLEAR that Jesus was referring to the CONTENTS of the cup when He took the CUP and said, *"Drink from it, all of you. For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,"* or *"This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many."* (**Matt 26:27-28; Mark 14:23-24**)
1. We know Jesus was speaking about the CONTENTS of the cup because He told the disciples *"THIS [CUP] is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many."*
 2. This is a simple figure of speech known as **Metonymy**: defined as the rhetorical or metaphorical substitution of a one thing for another based on their association or proximity.
 - a. We use Metonymy all the time: We might say, "my wife's a real peach!" She isn't REALLY a peach – we're using the word "peach" as a metaphorical substitution for her inner character.
 3. Jesus used the CUP in the same way – to rhetorically or metaphorically substitute CUP for FRUIT OF THE VINE.

- a. Beside, that's what the disciples DRANK – fruit of the vine, not the CUP, but rather the CONTENTS of the cup.
4. There are NUMEROUS examples of **Metonymy** in the Scriptures:
 - a. A really good example of Metonymy is: **1 Cor 10:1-4** –
Moreover, brethren, I do not want you to be unaware that all our fathers were under the cloud, all passed through the sea, 2 all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, 3 all ate the same spiritual food, 4 and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.
 - (1). Paul is not saying the Rock from which they all drank WAS ACTUALLY Christ, but rather the rock from which they all drank in the wilderness REPRESENTED Christ – the one true source of living water.
 - (2). The ROCK represented Christ because Paul used the figure of speech we call Metonymy – a rhetorical or metaphorical substitution of a one thing for another based on their association. He substituted

the ROCK that brought for life-giving water in the wilderness for the life-giving SPIRITUAL water we receive from Jesus Christ.

5. And so, during the institution of the Lord's Supper, when Jesus took THE CUP and said, "*THIS IS My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many,*" He was referring, by means of Metonymy, to the CONTENTS of the CUP, not the CUP ITSELF – the CUP does not represent His BLOOD. Only the fruit of the vine represents His blood.

D. But here's where the problem of interpretation gets all confused. The words of the Lord in Luke and Paul's account of the Lord Supper read a little different.

1. In both accounts, Jesus said, "*This CUP is the new covenant in My blood. . .*" **(Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25)**
2. One brother who has written extensively in support of the One Loaf, One Cup position, says this: "*The concept of a symbol for a covenant is not new to the diligent Bible student. After the flood, God said, 'This (rainbow) is the token of the covenant which I have established between Me and all flesh that is upon the earth.'* (Gen. 9:17). . . *The cup is a symbol of the Covenant **by faith** because Jesus said, 'This cup is the*

New Covenant." (Alfred L. Newberry, p. 17, The Divine Pattern Advocate)

- a. This brother goes on to say there were THREE DISTINCT THINGS that took place at the death of Christ: (1) His body was sacrificed; (2) His blood was shed; and (3) the New Covenant was ratified.
 - b. Therefore, he concludes that the elements in Lord's Supper need to reflect these same three events: (1) the bread to represent the Body of Christ; (2) the fruit of the vine to represent the Blood of Christ; and (3) the cup to represent the New Covenant ratified by His blood.
3. Actually this brother is completely wrong. There were not THREE things that happened at the crucifixion, there were only TWO: (1) His body was sacrificed, and (2) His blood was shed to ratify the new covenant.
- E. But, I want us to stop here for a second and think this through very carefully.
1. Matthew and Mark record Jesus taking the CUP and saying, *"this is My blood of the new covenant."* (**Matt 26:27-28; Mark 14:23-24**)

2. Luke and Paul record Jesus taking the CUP and saying, "*This cup is the new covenant in My blood.*" (**Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25**)
3. So, which is it? Does the CUP represent His BLOOD, or does the CUP represent the NEW COVENANT?
 - a. These brethren try to get around this seeming contradiction by saying Jesus spoke about the CONTENTS of the cup in Matthew and Mark, but spoke about the CUP ITSELF in Luke and 1 Corinthians.
 - b. In other words, Jesus said the FRUIT OF THE VINE represents His BLOOD in Matthew and Mark's account, but said the CUP represents the NEW COVENANT in Luke and Paul's account – two completely different topics.

F. Was Jesus REALLY saying the CUP represented the NEW COVENANT?

1. I believe the problem is that our One Cup brethren STOP TOO QUICKLY when they read Luke and Paul's account.
2. Jesus said, "*This cup is the new covenant IN MY BLOOD. . .*" (**Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25**) What did Jesus mean when He said, "in My blood?" How is this cup the new covenant IN His blood?

3. The preposition "*in*" (Ἰν) is defined various ways, including:
 - a. Strong – "*instrumentality. . .*" (New Exhaustive Strong's Numbers and Concordance with Expanded Greek-Hebrew Dictionary)
 - b. Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich – "*casual – introducing the means or instrument. . .*" (Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament)
 - c. Thayer – "*Akin is its use of the instrument or means by or with which anything is accomplished. . . where we say 'with,' 'by means of,' 'by (through)'*" (Thayer's Greek Lexicon)
4. Therefore, when Jesus said, "*This cup is the new covenant in My blood. . .*" He is saying "*This cup is the new covenant IN (by means of, through, or which is accomplished by) My blood. . .*"
5. Matthew and Mark ALREADY told us that Jesus was speaking about the CONTENTS of the cup representing His BLOOD.
6. And Luke and Paul are telling us the VERY SAME THING! There is no CONTRADICTION, nor are there TWO DIFFERENT TOPICS!
 - a. Jesus said it is by means of, or through the CUP (by means of, or through His blood) that the New Covenant EXISTS or was brought into BEING.

- b. The CUP isn't the New Covenant, nor does the cup REPRESENT the New Covenant.
 - c. Rather, the cup (the CONTENTS of the cup – the BLOOD of Jesus Christ) is the means by which, or through which the New Covenant is brought into existence or ratified.
 - d. Jesus said the New Covenant is "*IN MY BLOOD*" – meaning the New Covenant is by means of, through, or accomplished by HIS BLOOD.
 - e. There is NO relationship, NO symbolism, NO association between a CUP and the New Covenant. But there is a GREAT relationship, GREAT symbolism, and a GREAT association between the BLOOD of Christ and the New Covenant. Because, without the BLOOD of Christ, there would be NO New Covenant – they are INSEPARABLE!
7. Therefore, the belief that we must use only ONE cup to symbolize the ONE NEW COVENANT simply has no basis in Scripture whatsoever.

IV. I want to close this discussion by showing that Christians in New Testament times not only DID NOT, but COULD NOT, use ONE LOAF of unleavened bread and ONE CUP to celebrate the Lord's Supper.

A. When the church began on the day of Pentecost, three-thousand souls were baptized into Christ.

1. **Acts 2:42** – "*And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers.*"
2. **Acts 2:46** – "*So continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they ate their food with gladness and simplicity of heart,*"
3. The term "*breaking of bread*" is used two ways in Scripture: (1) to refer to the Lord's Supper, and (2) to refer to the eating of a common meal. The only way to determine which way the phrase is being used is to consider it IN CONTEXT.
4. The CONTEXT of **Acts 2:42** is WORSHIP in the temple (they were listening to the apostle's doctrine, having fellowship, breaking of bread, and they offered prayers).
5. The CONTEXT of **Acts 2:46** is the sharing a COMMON MEAL in a private home (they breaking bread from house to

house, and ate their FOOD with gladness and singleness of heart).

B. We also know the saints in Jerusalem frequently assembled in the area of Herod's Temple to worship AS A CHURCH.

1. **Acts 5:12-13** – *"And through the hands of the apostles many signs and wonders were done among the people. And they were all with one accord in Solomon's Porch."*

a. Solomon's Porch itself was a covered portico, 175 feet long, 35 feet across and 175 feet high.

b. You would only be able to get a few hundred people under Solomon's Porch, but Solomon's Porch was adjacent to the ENORMOUSELY huge COURT OF THE GENTILES, which was somewhere between 26-to-35 acre acres in size! You could accommodate THOUSANDS there!

2. Furthermore, the Scriptures go on to tell us that following Pentecost, the church in Jerusalem grew tremendously.

a. 3,000 on Pentecost (**Acts 2:41**)

b. 5,000 men – not counting women (**Acts 4:4**)

c. Multitudes of both men and women (**Acts 4:14**)

- d. Number of disciples was multiplying (**Acts 6:1**)
3. Therefore, the CHURCH in Jerusalem at one time must have had, at the VERY least, between 8,000 to 10,000 members.
- C. So, let me a few questions. And I'm not trying to be factious here, because I really want to know.
1. How BIG was the ONE LOAF and the ONE CUP these 8-to-10,000 saints used to observe the Lord's Supper?
 2. How many men do you think it took to CARRY a single loaf of bread and a single cup of fruit of the vine LARGE enough to accommodate these 8-to-10,000 saints?
 3. And finally, how did people DRINK from that HUGE cup?
- D. The brethren who support the One Loaf, One Cup position try to give a rebuttal by saying it's an assumption for us to say the saints in Jerusalem all met together at the same time.
1. They say there were NUMEROUS churches in Jerusalem, all worshipping in the homes of members, making it POSSIBLE to use one loaf and one cup.
 2. In an attempt to further prove their point, they say the Lord limited the size of homes celebrating PASSOVER. One of their favorite expressions is, "the house had to fit the pattern

of one loaf for one house." Therefore, they say, the Lord wants US to limit the size of OUR assembly to allow for the pattern of ONE LOAF and ONE CUP for each congregation.

3. However, the THEORY that the saints in Jerusalem met in "house churches" is CONTRARY to the fact that the church in Jerusalem is always spoken of as "*the CHURCH*" (**Acts 2:47; 5:11; 8:1-3; 11:22; 15:4-22**) – NEVER "*the CHURCHES*."
4. PLUS, this THEORY contradicts the fact that these Jerusalem saints, "*were all with one accord in Solomon's Porch.*" (**Acts 5:13**)
5. So who's making the ASSUMPTION HERE?

E. The bottom line is simply this.

1. There is not a SINGLE shred of evidence ANYWHERE in the Scriptures that in ANY WAY requires the Lord's church to use only one loaf of unleavened bread, and only one cup of fruit of the vine, when observing the Lord's Supper.
2. Therefore, for anyone to BIND that practice as LAW, and then force brethren to COMPLY with the practice or severe FELLOWSHIP with them, is NOT ONLY HURTFUL to the peace and unity of the church, IT'S A SIN!

3. The number of loaves and the number of containers is purely a matter of choice – an expedient – and you would be perfectly in the right to use one loaf and one cup in the Lord's Supper AS LONG AS you don't try to BIND that practice on others.
4. If it makes someone feel more comfortable using one loaf and one cup because it was part of their family heritage, or because it makes them feel better, then I would DEFEND their right to do so.
5. But brethren, even though you have a RIGHT to use one loaf and one cup as a matter of conscience, there still remains one very HUGE problem.
 - a. If you feel this practice is the ONLY WAY it can be done, and therefore MUST be done this way, then I must tell you that you're FOCUSING ON THE WRONG THING.
 - b. Your focus is NO LONGER on the SOLEMN, SYMBOLIC MEANING of the unleavened bread, nor on the SOLEMN, SYMBOLIC MEANING of the fruit of the vine.

- c. Rather, your focus is the ONE LOAF and the ONE CUP and what THEY allegedly represent – and THAT’S the wrong FOCUS because you’ve given them the WRONG MEANING.
- e. And THAT’S what the apostle Paul calls eating the bread and drinking the cup in an *"unworthy manner."*

CONCLUSION:

- I. So, let me ask you this.
 - A. When you partake of the Lord’s Supper, where is your focus?
 - 1. Are you focusing on the TRUE meaning of these two elements, or have you attached a DIFFERENT meaning to the bread and the fruit of the vine – not to mention that you’ve also UNSCRIPTURALLY added a THIRD element to the Lord’s Supper?
 - 2. I hope you focused on the TRUE and CORRECT meaning of the body and blood – BOTH of which were given for you.
 - B. And let me ask you this. How do you feel knowing Jesus gave His live and shed His blood for YOU – shed His blood for the remission of YOUR sins? Does it MOVE you?