

Rom. 14:19 So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another.



THE LENEXA EDIFIER



John 8:32

"And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

APRIL 24, 2016

The Lord's Supper—Two or Three Symbols?

Jefferson David Tant, Roswell, Georgia, USA

From time to time, brethren have discussions about the Lord's Supper with respect to the "one cup" view as opposed to the practice of serving the fruit of the vine in multiple cups. I have had discussions with those of the "one cup" view through the years, and have studied the matter to the following conclusions.

One of the arguments proposed by those who maintain the whole congregation must use only one cup, one container, for the fruit of the vine, is that Christ actually taught there were three elements in the Lord's Supper, i.e., the bread (Christ's body), the fruit of the vine (Christ's blood), and the cup or container (the new covenant). Therefore, there can be only one container, since there is only one covenant. This argument, though made with all sincerity, is made with a lack of understanding of common grammar. I do not say one needs a Ph.D. in English before one can understand the Bible, but God's word is written in a language, and it does employ correct grammatical constructions, whether in the original Greek or in subsequent translations. Thus in teaching a Baptist the truth on **Mark 16:16** or **Acts 2:38**, we rightly stress the fact that "and" is a coordinate conjunction which couples words of equal rank.

Our "one cup" brethren, I believe, misunderstand or misapply the Scriptures because the various accounts of the Lord's Supper are not word-for-word the same. This is not a problem to them with respect to the varying accounts of the inscriptions on the cross, but it does present a problem when it comes to the Lord's Supper. Note Matthew/Mark compared with Luke/Paul: (M/M) *"this is My blood of the covenant"* (L/P) *"This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood"*—*"This cup is the new covenant in My blood"*.

It is the contention of the "one cup" brethren that these readings are not the same, for the passages give three symbols, not two. In other words, they believe that Matthew says, *"this"* (contents of the cup)

is my blood...," while Luke is saying *"this cup"* (literally container) *is the new covenant...*" (**Matt. 26:28** and **Luke 22:20**).

The Use of Metonymy

We need to consider what metonymy is. Webster says: "metonymy—use of one word for another that it suggests, as...the container for the things contained..." For example, I may commend my wife's cooking by saying, "This dish is delicious." What is delicious? The china? No, the contents—the Italian spaghetti. When one says, "The radiator is boiling," is the car's radiator literally boiling? No, but by metonymy the container represents the water contained. *"Noah prepared an ark to the saving of his house"* (**Hebrews 11:7**). Did he actually put his dwelling on the ark? No, for "house" stands for "family." His dwelling is not even in consideration. And so with "cup" in our texts and in other places.

"For thus says the LORD, 'Behold, those who were not sentenced to drink the cup will certainly drink it...'" (**Jeremiah 49:12**). Here is the cup of bitterness with respect to impending judgment. *"Thus says the Lord GOD, 'You will drink your sister's cup, Which is deep and wide. You will be laughed at and held in derision; It contains much. 'You will be filled with drunkenness and sorrow, The cup of horror and desolation, The cup of your sister Samaria. 'You will drink it and drain it. Then you will gnaw its fragments And tear your breasts; for I have spoken,' declares the Lord GOD"* (**Ezek. 23:32-34**).

In these two passages, the "cup" is used to stand for the contents—bitterness, pain and sorrow. In the figurative language Ezekiel uses, after "drinking the cup's contents," they would be in so much distress that they would then begin to gnaw at the drinking vessel itself. In these texts, "cup" stands for the thing contained, bitterness and sorrow, and the container

continued on page 2

itself is not included in the symbolism, it is not the cup that was drunk, but rather bitterness and sorrow was what was drunk.

When metonymy is employed, it can have only one symbol. The figure and that for which it stands cannot both be a part of the meaning. In “This dish is delicious,” either the china or the food must be under consideration, not both. One stands for the other, not along with. Thus “cup” in our texts is either the literal crockery, or it is the contents—the fruit of the vine. The same word in the same position in the text cannot refer to both.

A Parallel

Now, let us examine the statements of Matthew and Luke to see if there really is a difference in *“this is my blood of the covenant”* and *“this cup is the new covenant in my blood.”* Matthew says *“this is...”* What is *“this?”* The antecedent of the pronoun is *“cup.”* There is no violence done in substituting the noun for the pronoun, since the pronoun stands in the place of the noun. Therefore, the two passages can read thusly: *“this (cup) is my blood...”* (Matthew), and *“This cup is the new covenant...”* (Luke).

Let me give a parallel. Suppose we have a man who has been convicted of some misdemeanor. In lieu of going to jail, the judge suggests the man give a pint of blood to the Red Cross. After giving the blood, the man holds the jar in his hand and remarks, “This is my blood of freedom.” A few moments later, he repeats to another person, “This jar is freedom in my blood.” Has he said the same thing? Certainly so. In the first sentence, he said, “This (the jar in his hand) is my blood of freedom.” The literal jar is not the object, but its contents, and its contents represent his freedom, as it is the means by which his freedom is secured. Note that the literal container had nothing to do with his freedom. It was what the container held. In the second sentence, he has simply said the same thing in another construction. The “jar” is not his freedom, but by metonymy, its contents represent his freedom. Is there any problem in understanding that? How many symbols are used in his statements—one or two? Are the container and the contents both used to represent two different things? No. “Jar” is used by metonymy for “blood”—which blood is the means by which his freedom is obtained.

Now let us apply this simple parallel: “This is my blood of freedom” (prisoner) *“This is my blood of the covenant”* (Mark) and “This jar is freedom in my blood” (prisoner) *“This cup is the new covenant in my blood”* (Luke) What is the difference? There is none! Jesus said, by one account, *“This (cup-contents) is my blood of the covenant.”* The fruit of the vine represents his blood which was the means of ratifying the covenant (which, by the way, secured our freedom). By the other account, Jesus is saying, *“This cup (contents) is the new covenant in my blood.”* The cup is not the literal

covenant, but its contents represent what Christ had in mind. In order for the “one cup” view, that there are two symbols, to be true, the text would have to read, *“This cup is the new covenant and my blood.”* In that figure, there are two cups—the container (covenant) and the contents (blood). Brethren, that figure just isn’t there.

Other Considerations

In **Luke 22:17**, it is suggested that the fruit of the vine was divided among the disciples before they drank of it in the supper: *“And when He had taken a cup and given thanks, He said, ‘Take this and share it among yourselves.’”* “Share” is from the Greek “diameirizo,” and is defined: “to partition thoroughly (literally in distribution, figuratively in dissension):--cloven, divide, part.” Various translations use either “share” or “divide.”

Consider: **(17)** *“And when He had taken a cup and given thanks, He said, ‘Take this and share it among yourselves’* (Evidently they “shared,” “divided,” or “partitioned” the fruit of the vine), then they partook of the bread: **(19)** *“And when He had taken some bread and given thanks, He broke it and gave it to them, saying, ‘This is My body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me:’* and then they drank the fruit of the vine: **(20)** *“And in the same way He took the cup after they had eaten, saying, ‘This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood.’”*

What does the context suggest? (1) Christ took a vessel containing fruit of the vine, and told the disciples to share or divide it among themselves. (2) He gave thanks for the bread. (3) He divided the bread and gave each a portion. (4) Then they drank the fruit of the vine. Think about it. They divided the fruit of the vine before they ate the bread. But if the “one cup” idea is true, they drank the fruit of the vine before they ate the bread! That’s because Christ told them to share or divide it among themselves before they took the bread. The only logical interpretation of the passage is that Christ told them to each pour a portion of the fruit of the vine into their own containers, so that each could partake after the bread was eaten. One would logically assume that each would have his own drinking vessel when they sat down together to eat the Passover meal.

Consider also, if the cup is literal, when they were told to “divide” or “partition” it among themselves, that would mean that each disciple broke off a piece of the crockery as it came to him. And of course we know that’s not what happened. But that’s the logical conclusion if we say the “cup” was literal, and it was to be divided among themselves.

Then we must look at **I Corinthians 11:25-26**: *“25 In the same way He took the cup also after supper, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in My blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me. 26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until He comes.’”*

There is a problem with this passage. If the “one

cup" idea is true, then we have a literal cup in v. 25, but a figurative cup in v. 26. That is an inconsistent interpretation. There is no rule of interpretation that would allow this change of meaning from one verse to the other while in the same context.

These thoughts are presented for the careful consideration of our readers.

TELLING OTHERS THEY ARE WRONG

By J.F. Dancer

Do you think it is right to tell another person they are wrong in their religious beliefs? Before we answer that let us consider another question - do you think it is right to tell another person they are wrong about anything? Suppose they are driving on the wrong side of the road (you are riding with them in the car). Should you mention to them that they are wrong? Suppose you are in the kitchen and notice the cook about to put poison into the food instead of salt, should you just ignore it? Now, in both of these cases most (if not all) of us would say we ought to go ahead and tell them a mistake has been made. Why? Because not to tell them would be to allow them to do something that would put both your life and their's in some danger.

But when we come to religion we want to view things differently. We don't want to tell anyone they are wrong and we don't want anyone to suggest that we might be. Why the change in attitude? Is not our soul as important as our life? Are we not as interested in believing and practicing the right thing in religion as we are in driving and in cooking? Does not our religion have a greater effect upon us and our destiny than driving and cooking? I believe it does.

Paul told Timothy to "*reprove, rebuke, exhort*" (**2 Tim. 4:2**). To reprove and to rebuke means to tell folks they are wrong. It means to point out wherein people err. And Paul was talking about matters of a religious nature. This was to be done with patience and with teaching of the Bible, but it was to be done! If Timothy was to be a good servant of the Lord there would be times when he would have to say to someone, "YOU ARE WRONG".

Would they like it? Probably many of them would not. But it had to be done anyhow. Why? For the same reason you would tell the driver they were on the wrong side of the road. It is dangerous to continue going the wrong way - in religion as well as on the highway. This is why people should be of the disposition to consider what another has to say in spiritual matters. We ought not refuse to listen when someone disagrees with us. We ought to listen.

There is only one way to heaven (**Jno. 14:6**). There is only one power of God unto salvation (**Rom. 1:16**). There is only one faith (**Eph. 4:5**). Do you want to please God?

MISJUDGING OURSELVES?

Jim Stauffer

Paul uses three metaphors to illustrate the shallow thought process of the Corinthians in chapter 4 and verse 8 of the first epistle. He first says, *already you have all you want*. The indication is they are satisfied spiritually just as one who had eaten a complete meal would be physically. They think their current situation has yielded for them the spiritual maturity one should have as a child of God. However in the following verses Paul describes for them the kind of suffering one will eventually endure for the cause if he is truly committed and takes a stand for the truth. He says the apostles, in comparison to the Corinthians, *hunger and thirst, we are poorly dressed and buffeted and homeless*.

The next charge he issues is, *Already you have become rich*. Compared to the perceived position of wealth held by the Corinthians, Paul says the apostles who have been their teachers, *labor, working with our own hands*. The indication is the apostles, again, place the defense of the truth and their devotion to it at such a level they suffer materially from such spiritual devotion. In each of these accusations, Paul is deriding their lack of commitment to the things he taught them while in their presence. They give the impression there is no further need for them to learn and practice the submission to God's will Paul attempted to instill in them. They have put themselves and their personal happiness above the principles of the Lord, Himself.

His last comparison is, *Without us you have become kings!* You behave as if you are actually reigning while we as your mentors have set an example of devotion you are ignoring. In each of these accusations, Paul is attempting to illustrate their failure to follow his lead by using irony as his method of portrayal. He pictures them as brethren who have completely misunderstood the teaching he presented when he *decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified*. (**1 Cor. 2:2**) He then completes his point to them by reminding them of his close personal association with them as a spiritual father in introducing them to Christ. He reminds them of the message sent to them by his *beloved and faithful child in the Lord*, Timothy. They have become an arrogant, self satisfied people who believe in their own power. Maybe this was due to spiritual gifts given by the apostle (**see chap. 12**). Whatever the reason, Paul is concerned about their unwillingness to commit to a faithful stand for the truth. They must deny self as Paul had done in their presence as he taught them.

There is no doubt this can happen to any and all who come to a knowledge of the truth and obey it. One can and should feel very special to be called a child of God (**1 Joh. 3:1**). But as Paul is describing in this text, being a child of God is as Jesus said, understanding we are not *greater than our Master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him*. (**Joh. 13:16**)

Eph. 2:19 *So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, 20 being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; 21 in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord;*

1Pet. 2:9 *But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:*

Psa. 1:1 *Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the wicked, Nor standeth in the way of sinners, Nor sitteth in the seat of scoffers: 2 But his delight is in the law of Jehovah; And on his law doth he meditate day and night. 3 And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, That bringeth forth its fruit in its season, Whose leaf also doth not wither; And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. 4 The wicked are not so, But are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. 5 Therefore the wicked shall not stand in the judgment, Nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. 6 For Jehovah knoweth the way of the righteous; But the way of the wicked shall perish.*

HOURS OF WORSHIP

Sunday A.M. 9:30 Bible Study

Sunday A.M. 10:20 Assembled Worship

Sunday P.M. 5:00 Assembled Worship

Wednesday P.M. 7:00 Bible Study and Worship

Visitors welcome

We conduct in home Bible Studies

We offer Correspondence Courses

OUR ADDRESS IS:

7845 Cottonwood Dr.

Lenexa, Kansas 66216

913-764-9170

Check out the following websites

facebook.com/LenexaChurchofChrist

lenexachurchofchrist.org

Editor: Evangelist Jim Stauffer
Elders: Ron Peck and Jim Stauffer

NEWS AND NOTES:

SICK IN NEED OF PRAYERS: MARY CZIRR, JAN PATRICK, GRANT CLOTHIER AND J.R. DANIEL. PAT GAINES - POSSIBLE BACK SURGERY BOTH DERRICK GAINES AND THE SISTER-IN-LAW OF WENDY TAYLOR RECUPERATING FROM TRANSPLANTS.

OUR BIBLE CLASS ON SUNDAY - THE BOOK OF ACTS - BYRON TAYLOR. WEDNESDAY - THE BOOK OF JAMES - JOE HURD.

SUNDAY MORNING SERMON: THE PRAYER OF FAITH



What Must I Do To Be Saved?

Hear the gospel - Romans 10:17

Believe in Jesus Christ - Hebrews 11:6

Repent of sins - Acts 17:30

Confess Christ as Lord - Romans 10:9,10

Be Baptized for remission of sins - Acts 2:38

Be Faithful unto death - Revelation 2:10