The Cup

By W. E. Daniels — Broken Bow, Oklahoma

Cup is indeed a small word, but people seem to get rather confused over it. Men of scholarship seem to be agreed that "cup" is a small drinking vessel regardless of shape or material. God used the word cup both figuratively and literally. Some places in scriptures where God uses the word "cup" figuratively are Ps. 116-13, "I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord." Zech. 12-2, Behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about." Matt. 26-39 where Jesus prayed "let this cup pass." Folks it doesn't take a Solomon to see that in all the places where God used "cup" figuratively that the drink or contents were just as figurative as the cup. We can not have a figurative cup and a literal drink. If we dispensed with the cup in the communion because "cup" was figurative we would also dsipense with the drink. We read in Matt. 26-27, Mark 14-23, and Luke 22-17 and 20 where Jesus instituted the communion that "cup" was something Jesus took; hence literal, something takeable.

Now we read Matt. 26-27, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, (blessed) and gave it to them, (diciples) saying, Drink ye all of it." Verse 28, "For this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Mark 14-23, "And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it." The above scripture proves Jesus took the takeable, and the diciples drank the drinkable. Matt. 26-27 says Jesus gave it, singular, one volume, to them saying, "Drink ye all of it," singular, one volume. Mark says, "they all drank (past tense) of it," singular, one volume.

Some try to make us believe fruit of the vine is cup. So we will try it that way. Jesus took fruit of the vine, cup, and gave thanks, and gave it (singular, one volume) fruit of the vine cup to them saying, "drink ye all of it," but it was singular, one volume. So we read again Mark 14-23, "and he took the cup (fruit of the vine) and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, (but it was singular, one volume) and they all drank of it" (cup, fruit of the vine.) But it (cup, fruit of the vine) was singular, one volume. So instead of gaining they lose for they would all have to drink of it (singular, one volume) just as Mark 14-23 said they did.

Now we will read Luke 22-17, "And he took the cup" (standard American revised version and Smith-Goodspeed both use the term "a cup" in Luke 22-17.) So we read on: "and gave thanks and said take this, and divide it among yourselves." Some argue if the **diciples** were to divide it among themselves we can divide it among ourselves as we see fit. To that, I ask, who would be the authority on how it was divided since man is divded on that very point? Some say into two or three volumes, some say into as many volumes as there is participants, and we would not have unity as there would be no standard of authority as to how many volumes it could be divided into. So we will see what divine authority says, "divide it among yourselves." It is singular, one volume, and it was to be divided after given to the diciples. So it is undisputabley one volume when Jesus gave it to the diciples, and furthermore Jesus did not tell them to drink it or of it in Luke 22-17.

Does cup represent anything in the communion? The answer is Luke 22-20, "This cup is the new testament" (Standard Revised Version says 'new covenant in my blood'). When Jesus said, "this (referring to the prepaired bread) is my body" Matt. 26-26, we understand it is an emblem of his body. When he said, "this (referring to the prepaired fruit of the vine) is my blood" Matt. 26-27, we understand it is an emblem of his blood. Now dear reader, why can't we understand the same Lord using the same law of language when he said "this cup is the new testament (covenant) in my blood," that cup is an emblem of the new testament or covenant. Smith-Goodspeed translation in I Cor. 11-25 says, "This cup is the new agreement ratified by my blood." Well one might say if cup is new testament (covenant) then since each of us can

have our individual new testament book, we can have our individual new testament cup. Well the old saying is pretty true, "A drowning person will grab at a straw." Testament, is will, God only has one. Testament, is covenant, God only has one; the new one, Heb. 8-8-13. You could pile up all the new testament books in the world and you would just have God's will or covenant, the mind of God that was active long before we had the book, the written mind of God, new testament; and the new testament in the mind of God is what Christ had reference to for the new testament book was not written when Jesus made the statement. You could drink (imbide) into your mind all that is in your individual new testament book and it would still contain all that ever was in it, but you drink all that is in your individual new testament cup and there is nothing left in it. Quite a difference isn't it. I Cor. 11-25 Paul repeats Luke 22-20 that Jesus said "this cup is the new testament in my blood," and goes on and says, "this do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me." And in the 28th verse, "let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." One of Websters definitions of "that" is denoting the person or thing mentioned. Could anything be plainer that the cup described new testament, Luke 22-20, and I Cor. 11-25 is the cup we drink of in the communion. No one need get confused as clear as that is. The 28th verse says, "drink of that cup" (singular.)

We reach the blood of Christ through the one covenant. We all are jointly participating in obedience of God's covenant; hence we have communion of that one covenant. God never gave us individual covenants, only one for all. How simple it is that we all contact the emblematic blood of Christ through the emblematic cup, new testament. I Cor. 10-16 "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And suppose we notice the cup of blessing is singular. I believe all would agree with me if I say the blessing is the blood of Christ and Christ's blood is singular, one blood, his blood; hence one blessing for all. Now suppose we parallel Matt. 10-42. A cup of cold water. Every one understands this quotation to refer to a cup containing cold water. Should I say a, or the cup of juice, every one would agree it was a cup containing juice. Then it is just as simple to understand I Cor. 10-16. The cup of blessing is a cup containing a blessing. The blessing being the blood of Christ, one blood. The cup being the emblem of the new testament (covenant), and the fruit of the vine being the emblem of the blood of Christ. We contact the emblematic blood of Christ (one blood) through the emblematic new testament (covenant) cup, but there is just one covenant.

I Cor. 10-16 "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Verse 17 "For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." And he paralleled it with the cup of blessing, therefore, we are all partakers of that one cup of blessing. Now the 18th verse, "Behold Israel after the flesh: Have not they that eat of the sacrifice have communion with the alter." I quoted Standard American Revised Version. King James translation, "Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the alter?" One of Websters definitions of partake is, to share in common with others. Now suppose we see some of the later translations. Smith-Goodspeed, "Do not those who eat what is sacrificed have fellowship at the sacrifical alter?" There it is folks, and Paul is paralleling the sacrifice and alter with the cup of blessing I Cor. 10-16. No getting around it folks. We must all partake (share in common with others) the cup of blessing, and Paul said cup (singular.) And in Paul's parallel teaches we have communion of the cup as well as the blessing (blood.) To further strengthen what Paul has said I Cor. 10-18, we will turn to Matt. 23-16 to 19, Jesus speaking, "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, whosoever shall swear by the alter, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the alter that sanctifieth the gift?" Jesus

makes the alter and the gift of equal importance. One is just as essential as the other, and Paul parallels it with the cup of blessing I Cor. 10-16.

The gift or sacrifice was just a lamb until it was put on the alter; that sanctified, set apart. The fruit of the vine is just fruit of the vine until it is in the cup, the emblefatic new testaments that sanctifies, sets apart, and thanks is given or blessed, it then becomes the communion of the blood of Christ: cup of blessing, I Cor. 10-16. We can contact the emblematic blood through the emblematic new testament or covenant. I Cor. 10-21, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." Let me note here that Paul said, cup, singular not cups plural. Now some people tell us we can't drink a literal cup because we couldn't swallow it and give that for logic that cup of the Lord is not a literal cup. Some joke isn't it? Well if some poor cups fellow should believe he had to swallow the vessel known as the cup, he still wouldn't drink the cup by so doing as Webster gives drink to swallow a liquid, and a literal cup is a solid. But we can do as Paul said, I Cor. 10-21, drink the cup of the Lord. He tells us, and he didn't stutter, "let a man eat of that bread and drink of that cup." Webster gives the definition for the word "of" from, out of, belonging to, according to, proceeding from. So you see Paul gives the identical how we drink the cup. "Drink of" I Cor. 11-28. So there it is friends, pure and simple, may be that will save some poor cups brother from getting choked trying to swallow a literal cup thinking he had to do so to drink the cup of the Lord.

If you will turn to I Cor. 11-25 to 28 you will see it was the cup described new testament that Paul said let a man drink of. Paul when he said, "drank of that cup" (Webster's definition of 'that': first, denoting the person or things mentioned. Second, indicated or understood) he had just described cup identical with Luke 22-20. So that cup was denoting the thing mentioned, "This cup is the new testament in my blood." How could God have made anything plainer, and that cup, I Cor. 11-28 is singular, one. It was the same as Luke 22-20 where Jesus said "This cup is the new testament in my blood" that Paul said drink of, I Cor. 11-28.

We could quote numbers of scholars on "drink the cup" that would tell us that we drink the cup by drinking what is in the cup, but Paul being a scholar himself has told us in no uncertain terms how we drink the cup, "drink of that cup," and Webster backs him up. So I am willing to take Paul's authority. How about you dear reader? Suppose we just except bible terms of language as we use a well established law of language, as when I ask a friend to have a cup of coffee with me and he says, "Thanks, I have just drank a cup," or as my wife informed me when I passed my cup for the second cup of coffee she replied, "You have already drank one cup."Anyone can see, cup, is named to suggest its contents just as we say the kettle is boiling, or my radiator is boiling, meaning the water in them is boiling. But suppose we put the water in several kettles (plural) we would not say the kettle s boiling, but would say the kettles, plural, are boiling. What is in kettle is not in kettles, and what is in cups is not in cup. Fruit of the vine in cups, bottles, or bottles cannot logically be suggested by the word cup, singular. When we drink a bottle of pop, we nver say we drank a cup of pop. Some fall for the idea that we can take water from a well and put it in various containers and drink the well because it was well water. That involves another law of language which we have just been dealing with. If you drink well water from a jug, bottle, or cup you would not drink of the well but would drink of the jug, bottle, or cup, as Paul said I Cor. 11-28 "Drink of that cup." It would be well water because of its origin but would only be suggested by bottle, jug, or cup, by its relationship in such containers. The place where a thing originates holds to it always and can only be suggested by other containers while contained in them. For example, I am an Arkansain by birth and will always be that, but when I moved to Oklahoma I was no longer called an Arkansawyer but an Oklahomian, because of my relationship in Oklahoma. When I moved to Texas I was no more an Oklahomian, but a texan because of my residence in that particular state. We suggest the contents by naming the thing that contains it. If wine were in a jug, a bottle, or cup we could get either of them by naming the vessel containing it, but we would never say jugs, bottles, cups,

in the plural if we just wanted the jug, the bottle, or the cup, singular. There are some that think they win a victory in favor of a plurality of cups in the communion service by going to Prov. 6-6, "Go to the ant thou sluggard." Then they contend all the ants. The man of God, all the men of God. The bible, all the books called bible. The cup, all the vessels known as cup, etc. Poor fellows well educated, but try to make us poor uneducated people believe a class noun applies to individual. The ant used in one sense includes all species of insects known as ants, but should I say the ant stung me, you would not think all the ants stung me. No, of course not. Should I say I took the ant to the laboratory, you wouldn't understand I took all the ants to the laboratory. I took the man of God into my house, doesn't mean I took all the men of God into my house. I read the Bible through, but I didn't read all the books known as bibles through. I took the cup, but my wife affirmed there were several left in the china closet. Guess I didn't know the trick? They, by their use of the cup would have Jesus taking all the vessels known as cup when he tookthe cup. Matt. 26-27. I wonder how they would like to quote from American Standard Revised Version, "a cup." Matt. 26-27.

Now let's go back to I Cor. 10-16. "The cup of blessing which we bless." The blessing must be in a cup to be the cup of blessing. What is in cups cannot be the cup of blessing. "Drink the cup of the Lord" I Cor. 10-21. We drink the cup by drinking the contents of the cup, as Paul shows I Cor. 11-28, "Drink of that cup." There is no law of language that I have been able to find that the fruit of the vine can be suggested by the word "cup" unless it is in a cup. What is in cups or other containers is not in cup, and can't be the cup (singular)of blessing I Cor. 10-16. Some talk of individual communion cups. Now wouldn't that stump you? There is no such thing as individual communion since communion is a joint participation or fellowship. Then how can one commune with his individual cup or how would an individual cup be a communion cup? Fruit of the vine must be in a cup to be called by the name cup. People must be in the Baptist order to be called by that name. People must be in the Methodist order to be called by the name Methodist. Jesus used the very terms of language we have been dealing with in this little article and we accept them as Jesus used them until we come to cup, then Oh! Oh! Oh! The top blows off. Jesus didn't know how to say what he meant. We can go to Matt. 23-21 for an example of Jesus usage of the language we have been dealing with, and I think all will agree with Jesus, "Woe unto thee Chorazin, woe unto thee Bethsaida." Everyone knows cities are mentioned to suggest the people in them, and it didn't include anyone not in the city named. You had to be in that city to be called by that name, and what is in city is not in cities. If there is a law of language that a thing can be suggested by the name of another object without any relation to it, that is if wine can be suggested by the word cup without relation to a cup, then people can be called body, Church of Christ, without any relation to the body of Christ; that is they can be the church of Christ without being in the church. If volumes of the fruit of the vine in the different denominations of containers are the cup, one cup, then people in the different denominations of churches are the church, one church. If wine is cup, one cup, without being in a cup, and you can drink it, of the container of your choice, then people are christians without being in Christ, and you can join the church of your choice. Both are governed by the same law of logic. If fruit of the vine can be called cup without being in a cup then I can be called an Oklahomian without being in the state of Oklahoma. If not, why not?

Paul said, "Let a man drink of that cup." I Cor. 11-28. But there has to be something in that cup before we can drink of that cup since drink is to swallow a liquid. But what is in cups or other containers is not in cup or that cup. Now what would be the sensible conclusion? Well, Jesus took the takeable, the disciples drank the drinkable. Matt. 26-27, Mark 14-23.

With brotherly love I remain

Yours in Christ, W. E. DANIELS, Broken Bow, Oklahoma