

Beginning in the March 1940 Issue of the Old Paths Advocate Brothers N. L. Clark and Homer L. King started a written discussion on the plurality of drinking vessels in the Lord's Supper. The discussion continued in subsequent issues.

CLARK-KING DISCUSSION

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the Church of Christ for the Communion may use a plurality of cups (drinking-vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

N. L. CLARK, **Affirms**

HOMER L. KING, **Denies**

CLARK FIRST ARTICLE

The words, "The Scriptures teach," mean the Scriptures imply that worshippers may use a plurality of drinking-vessels in the Communion. The Scriptures do not say so any more than they say we may sit or stand to eat and drink. We must have time, place, vessels, etc., but these are no part of the Lord Supper. The only issue between me and Bro. King is the definition of "the cup of the Lord." To me the drinking-vessel is no part of the Lord cup. Bro. King believes that it is. If he is correct, he has ground for his position. If I am right, his position is dangerous to the harmony of the Lord people. Bro. King and I are close personal friends. He

is an able gospel preacher, but I am sure he is in error on the subject before us.

A meal consists of foods and drinks. The dishes used are no part of the meal. The Lord Supper is a spiritual meal consisting of bread and fruit of the vine. We eat the bread and drink the fruit of the vine. The bread is the body and the drink is the blood. Hence we have food and drink, the appointed memorials of the broken body and shed blood of our Lord. The plate on which the bread rests and the vessel containing the fruit of the vine are necessary to the orderly observance of the Supper, but they are no part of the Supper. Proof: "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it * * * and said: Take, eat; this is my body. * * I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:26-29). This clearly proves what I have just said.

I shall now lay down the following proposition: 1. I accept the definition by Thayer and others of the Greek word *poterion* (cup), meaning a drinking-vessel, just as Webster defines cup. This is the literal meaning of the word. 2. The word cup in connection with the Lord Supper is always singular. There is only one cup appointed by the Lord. In 1 Cor. 12:13, we read: "By one spirit are we all baptized into one body." In Ephes. 4 we read: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Since there is but one body and one blood,

these can fitly represent them only one bread and one cup. This means one bread and one cup for all members of the one body. Bro. King, I presume, is opposed to what he calls individual cups. At the same time, he advocates a congregational cup. I believe in one cup for all congregations Bro. King and I have apparently swapped sides on this question. I am teaching there is but one cup, while he is contending for a plurality of cups just as many as there are groups of worshippers. Here is work for you, Bro. King.

Please answer these questions: 1. Tell exactly what constitutes "the cup". Is it the container, the contents, or both? 2. Paul says (1 Cor. 11:26): "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup." Do you ever "drink this cup"? 3. In Ephes. 4 we read: "There is one body." Is this the local body? 4. When we read there is one baptism, does it mean one baptism for each locality? 5. When the New Testament churches at Jerusalem, Antioch, and Ephesus were eating the Lord Supper, did they all drink the one cup? I believe they did. What do you say?

Let us compare the Lord Supper with baptism. There is one baptism. We may baptize one or a thousand, at any hour, in running or standing water, in a house or out of doors. We must have time, place, and other things. We cannot baptize without them, still these things are no part of the baptism. Just so with the Lord Supper. It is a supper in memory of our Lord consisting of memorials appointed by Him of His broken body and shed

blood. To observe it properly, we must have place, time, vessels, etc., but these are no part of the Supper itself. It follows that we are at liberty as worshippers in keeping with decency and order to arrange details according to circumstances. We could not reasonably serve a thousand worshippers with the Lord Supper exactly as we would a dozen. I am wondering what Bro. King would do if he were facing an audience of a thousand worshippers with one drinking-cup for the fruit of the vine.

To summarize: I take position that the Lord appointed only one cup for the entire body of worshippers. If this is admitted, the matter is settled, because it would be utterly impracticable for even two congregations two miles apart to drink from one material cup at the same house of worship. Bro. King must prove by reason and the Bible that the drinking-vessel, is at least part of the Lord cup, that a man can literally drink such a cup, and that every separate group of worshippers, may have a separate cup.

I sincerely hope that Bro. King will come right up to the issue, give us plainly and unmistakably his exact position and his reasons for it, answer logically and scripturally, if he can, my arguments and questions, and strive prayerfully to show his readers the truth.

N. L. CLARK

KING'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Yes, Brother Clark and I are "close personal friends." having labored together, and I consider him one of the ablest, possibly the ablest on his side of this question, but I just as sincerely believe that he is in error and without a single passage of Scripture to prove his "plurality of cups" for "an assembly" of the church "for the Communion," as contained in his proposition.

He fails to define the terms of his proposition; neither does he discuss it. Reader, you will note that he is to affirm "a plurality of cups (drinking vessels)" for "an assembly" of the church (not for the entire brotherhood) "for the Communion," yes, and the "Scriptures teach." What passage of Scripture has he offered to prove this? None! We are discussing the number of "cups (drinking vessels) as relates to "an assembly," and not what the cup is, as that would involve another proposition. I shall expect him, so will our readers, to offer some Scriptures to prove his "plurality of cups (drinking vessels)." But, reader, now turn to the accounts of the institution of the Communion, as recorded in Matt. 26:26-29; Mk. 14:22-25; Lk. 22:17-20; 1 Cor. 11:23-25. Read them carefully, and you will understand why Brother Clark evades his proposition, talking about things irrelevant. You will understand, too, why he tries to force me in the lead, in talking about my "position" and what I would or would not do, but he is logically in the lead, has the laboring oar; is to do the proving (I

denying), and I insist that he apply himself to the Herculean task of showing the "Scriptures teach" a "plurality of cups" "for an assembly" of the church for the Communion. I maintain the Scriptures do not teach his proposition and practice by statement, command, approved example, or necessary inference (and in no other way can the Scriptures teach a practice). He is long on assertions, but short on proof.

Brother Clark makes some fair and important admissions, and I compliment him for them. He admits concerning his "plurality of cups," "The Scriptures do not say so," etc. Then, he cannot "speak as the oracles of God" (1 Pet. 4: 11), when he contends for them, since the "oracles do not say so." And he cannot "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent," in contending for them. He further admits that the word "cup" in connection with the Lord Supper is always singular, which is right, but it forever settles his inability to prove that the Scriptures ("in connection with the Lord Supper") teach his "plurality of cups" for "an assembly" of the church. Can he show that the "singular" "implies" his "plurality"? Yes, "here is work for you," Brother Clark. He admits (Clark-Harper Debate, 1st Aff.) that "Jesus used only one cup in the institution of the Supper," and that "The Apostles, on that occasion, all drank from the same cup." Hence, he cuts himself off from the examples of Christ and His Apostles, and must thereby admit that he does not "follow" Him, who said: "Follow Me" and "This do." Can we follow the examples of Jesus

and His Apostles? Is it not, therefore, right and safe to follow their example? Whose example do you follow in your practice of a "plurality of cups" for "an assembly"? No, Brother Clark, my position and practice cannot be "dangerous to the harmony of the Lord people," since I follow the examples of Christ and His Apostles. Were they "dangerous"? "He makes no schism who does no more than the Lord commands * * is not he that obeyed the first commandment, but he that made the golden calf who made confusion in Israel." (Campbell). "Thou art the man."

Brother Clark cites Matt. 26:26-29; 1 Cor. 12:13; Eph. 4; 1 Cor. 11:26; but makes no claim that they "teach" a "plurality of cups" as used in his proposition. Only two of these (Matt. 26:26-29; 1 Cor. 11:26) refer to the Communion. I believe every word of them, but they do him no good. All his talk about the "one body" etc., falls wide of the mark, since his proposition specifies "plurality of cups" for "an assembly" of the church. Does he try to make us believe the church in the aggregate is the unit of worship? What about your admission (Clark-Harper Debate) that the wine must be in one vessel until after thanks, and "one volume of wine" for each group of worshipers? Yes, and what about "one speaker at a time" (1 Cor. 14)? Does this apply in the same way as your "one cup for the whole church"? More work.

To compare the sacred Communion, instituted by our Lord, with an ordinary meal of our own, with its dishes, etc., in my

estimation, is to detract from its sacredness and divine import. You may put many things on your own table, but should refrain from such presumption in things divine. Shall we take the very words and actions of our Master and compare them with mere incidentals? While baptism and the Communion are both divine in origin, yet they are not parallel in many points, especially in a sense to prove your "plurality" of vessels for one assembly of worshipers. Did Jesus take "one volume" of water, give thanks, and then pour it into a plurality of containers to baptize an individual, or individuals? It does not compare with your practice, brother. Your assertions that the "cup" is no part of the institution, etc., reminds me of the mistake of the Jews in trying to separate the temple from the gold and the altar from the gift (Matt. 23:16-22),

Your questions are not germane to your proposition. Why "wonder" what I would do about a thousand worshipers in one assembly, until you have found that number in the Bible, in one assembly for the Communion? Show us the bridge before you ask us to cross. If we may suppose, I wonder what you would do with fifty thousand? Why ask questions, when you are affirming and should be answering? The "cups" you are supposed to be affirming are defined in your proposition ("drinking vessels"). No wonder you are trying to get away from it. Yes, we drink "this cup" (1 Cor. 11:26) "By drinking what it contains and in no other way" (Clark, in Clark-Harper Debate). If each assembly is to have

"one volume of wine" and "one loaf" "before thanks," would each have a "separate" cup? Do you oppose "individual cups," and on what grounds?

HOMER L. KING

CLARK-KING DISCUSSION

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the Church of Christ for the Communion may use a plurality of cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

N. L. CLARK Affirms

HOMER L. KING Denies

CLARK SECOND ARTICLE

Brother King insists that I give Bible authority for the practice I am affirming. My authority is the fact that such vessels are a matter of expediency not a matter of law. Brother King, do you use a plate for the bread? By what authority do you do it? Christ appointed the bread and wine as matters of law. The plate and cup were things of convenience, hence expedients. The upper room, tables, seats, etc., were expedients, necessary to the orderly observance of the Passover, but they were no part of the legal requirements. The Scriptures authorize expedients by implication, but they nowhere give a list of them. This distinction

between law and expedient involves the whole issue between us. Bro. King is trying to make a divine law out of an expedient. Concerning the institution of the Lord Supper, he and I agree upon every item that is clearly a matter of law. Here they are: Jesus took bread, blessed it, broke it, gave it to the apostles, and commanded them to eat it. Next he took the cup, gave thanks, gave it to them, and then said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves" (Lu. 22: 17). Here we have the Savior example and precepts. Brother King and I differ over the distribution of the wine among the eleven men present. Jesus commanded them to divide it among themselves, leaving the manner of division entirely to them! Brother King insists that he follows Jesus. He stopped and told the eleven men to go ahead and divide the wine among themselves. Not an intimation that he told or showed them how to do it. But Brother King does not even follow the apostles, for he does not know how they divided the wine! He may quote Matt. 26:27: "Drink ye all of it." This means: "All of you drink of it." Drink of what? They drank of the wine. Brother King will say: "They drank of the container." Suppose I admit they did, he cannot prove they did so directly. My point is that the Scriptures do not say that the eleven all drank wine from the vessel Jesus gave them. Even if they did, it was their choice, for Jesus left the matter to them!

In John 4:12 the words, "drank thereof" in the Greek are the same as "drink of it," in Matt. 26:27 (except the form of the

verb). Jacob, his children and his cattle drank of the well, which was 120 feet deep. How? They evidently drew the water in buckets and distributed it in troughs or vessels. They drank indirectly from the same well. So with a thousand worshipers, Brother King tries to evade my question on such a case. Acts 2:42 implies that several thousands in Jerusalem after Pentecost worshiped together. If they did not, there have been many large gatherings for such worship since. He asks what I would do with fifty thousand worshipers. I should procure enough bread and wine for all, appoint about five hundred to distribute it, and do it in decency and order. What would you do, Brother King? Answer your own question. Seriously, how would you proceed with five hundred worshipers? No dodging. Tell us plainly what you would do? This is a practical question. When any doctrine will not stand up in practice, there is something vitally wrong with it.

Next I answer his questions. "Individual cups" in most cases I consider a fad not a suitable expedient. One should speak at a time (I Cor. 14) for the sake of decency and order, exactly the reason for using more than one container for the wine. Jesus baptized no one (Jno. 4:2). Had he done what Brother King supposes, one immersed in part of the water would have been baptized. Why such a question? Then Matt. 23. Here the altar sanctified the gift. Brother King must think that the container sanctifies the wine! The material cup more important than the

blood of Christ! He cannot use an illustration that does not get him into trouble.

Brother King insists that I defend my own practice. He prefers that I let his practice alone. If he had agreed to affirm his practice, I would stick to the affirmative, but this is the only proposition to be debated. It is his practice that is causing trouble among the churches. About thirty years ago some zealous brethren in opposing individual cups went to the opposite extreme. Since then some of them in trying to explain why Jesus broke the bread, reached the conclusion that Jesus ate his own body and drank his own blood! One error has often driven men into another.

There is a vast difference between "a cup" and "the cup." "A cup" is one or any cup. In this sense, we may have a number of cups. "The cup" is a special cup. Jesus spoke of his sufferings as "the cup" (Matt. 20:22). In drinking that cup he shed his blood. In communing with him at his table, we are said to drink that blood, hence to partake of that cup. "The cup of the Lord" is, therefore, the communion of the blood of Christ of which all worshippers partake. As there is but one bread, likewise, there is but one blood, drawn from that body and one cup for that blood. As I showed in my first article, there is one cup for all congregations not one for each, as Brother King argues.

Against Brother King's position, I file the following objections:

1. It makes the container part of the Lord Supper; whereas, the body and blood of Christ, represented by the bread and wine compose all that our Savior gave for us. What more could he have given?
2. It makes it impossible for the mother church in Jerusalem to have worshiped as one body; for Brother King will not argue that three thousand disciples drank directly from one vessel. I give him credit for more reason.
3. It makes each congregation a distinct body by providing a different cup for each; whereas, the Lord gave one cup for all.
4. It assumes that the eleven apostles constituted a local church fifty days before the church was established.
5. It makes an unknown act of choice by the eleven a law of Christ; whereas, he most certainly left the manner of distributing the wine to them.

Note: To save space I have used the word "wine" Instead of "fruit of the vine," without intending to imply any special degree of fermentation. (H.K.)

SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Clark has not defined the terms of his proposition, and he declines to debate it. He has obligated himself to show that the

"Scriptures teach" a "plurality of cups" for "an assembly" (local) of the church, in the Communion. This he must do to sustain his proposition, but how can he do it, when he admits they are not mentioned in the word of God. Can the Scriptures "imply" something different or contrary to what they say? He is, therefore, without a leg upon which to stand in defense of his unscriptural practice. His difficulty is that his "plurality of cups" for "an assembly for the Communion" is not in the word of God (admitted), but his proposition obligates him to show the "Scriptures teach" it. Extricate himself from this dilemma he cannot! His plea of "convenience," "incidental," "expediency," "silence," "upper-room," "seats," "plate," etc. has been the siren song of every digressive. He makes no higher claim for his "plurality of cups" than does the "sprinkler" or the Christian Church for all of their departures. Such reasoning would open the floodgates for every innovation.

Tell us what you mean by "plurality of cups." Is it limited or unlimited? If unlimited who makes the law telling when to use or not use "individual cups," and in what "cases" they are not a "fad"? Are there "extra ordinary circumstances," when it is all right to use this "innovation"? If limited, where is the law of limitation? You have not made yourself clear here. I do not "try to make a law out of an expedient," but you try to make a law that sets aside the very words and examples of Christ and His Apostles, when you put in your "plurality of cups."

He argues that we do not know how the "wine" was distributed among "the eleven men present," etc. But hear him in his debate with Harper: "I concede that Jesus used only one cup in the institution of the Supper," and "the Apostles, on that occasion, all drank from the same cup." "Eleven men seated around a table, partaking of a common meal, would naturally drink the memorial wine from the same vessel. No reason appears for their doing otherwise." Can he refute himself here? He refers to Lk. 22: 17, where Jesus, after taking a cup and giving thanks, said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves." He insists that Jesus left the dividing to His disciples, without telling them how, etc. If this refers to the Communion, it forever ruins Brother Clark's contention and practice, for in this case Jesus did not say, "Take what has been divided for you" (the practice of "a plurality of cups"), or "Take what the deacons divided for you." But, notice it was still undivided, when Jesus gave thanks and handed it to the disciples. This is not the practice of the cups advocates, but the practice of one cup. Did Jesus tell them how to "divide it"? "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. 26:27). Did they obey? "And they all drank of it" (Mk. 14:23). Could anything be plainer?

What if the language in the Greek in Jno. 4: 12, "drank thereof," and in Matt. 26:27 are the same? Does it necessarily follow that the significance is the same? Is it not true that Thayer cites Matt.26:27, "with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks," while not so in Jno. 4: 12? Even a school boy should

understand that we do not drink of a well in the same sense as we drink of (out of) a cup. You would never think of trying to pick up a well to drink from it, nor of setting up a pulley, bucket, etc. over a cup to draw from it. I wonder if he is trying to make us think "a plurality" of wells were involved?

Acts 2:42 does not even intimate that "several thousands" met together in one assembly to "break bread," but verse 46 does say, "breaking bread from house to house" (in their homes"97R. V., et al), and so does history. It is a mere assumption that such crowds met in one assembly for the Communion. The weight of evidence is to the contrary. Now talk about "decency and order" with his handling an assembly of fifty thousands! "One loaf and one container before thanks to show the unity," then pouring his "wine" from his "one container before thanks" into his "five hundred" "after thanks"! How large would the one loaf and one container be? Reader, the truth is no such condition or practice obtains in the Bible.

I deny the assertion that my practice is causing the division, but thus it has been with every innovator to place the blame on the conscientious objector. Your "plurality of cups," for "convenience", is a wedge of division, and you who drive it cause the division. I wonder if there are not conscientious brethren in your city, who cannot meet with you in worship, because of your unscriptural practice of a "plurality of cups"?

You "seem to prefer" that I take the lead in discussing my practice, when you are in the affirmative. You could not consistently deny my practice, since you practice the same (when in meetings for such churches). If you did not want to lead, you should not have suggested it at the first.

"A cup" and "the cup," but he admits "a cup" is "one cup." The R. V., et al, translations render Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:17 "a cup." Are they right? In his desperation he refers to a figurative reference in Matt. 22:20, which has no more reference to his "wine" than it does to his "plurality of cups." But, if he could connect this cup with the Communion, it would be too much for him, since here Jesus drinks this cup, which idea he tries to ridicule. He did not tell you that "baptism" is mentioned in this passage in the same connection, and that some sects go here to try to make all baptism figurative and non-essential. Anyway, like all other references "cup" is "singular" and what he needs is "plurality." Since you admit your "cups" are not in the Scriptures, are the above passages for or against your proposition?

While his objections are not germane to his proposition, yet I notice No. 3. To show the fallacy of them, as this is a fair sample. In his discussion with Showalter on the class question, he gives seven points of distinction between the local and the general church, placing "Worship congregational, public," as local. Is the

Communion in that worship? Of course, he was objecting to an innovation then, but now trying to defend another.

Homer L. King

CLARK-KING DISCUSSION

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the Church of Christ for the Communion may use a plurality of cups (drinking vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

N. L. Clark affirms.

Homer L. King denies.

Clark's Third Article

My proposition is too simple to require further definition. I am affirming a proposition that is called for by Bro. King teaching. Logically, I am in the negative. He insists that the law of Christ restricts us to one drinking-vessel, regardless of the number of worshippers, or other circumstance. I affirm that two or more vessels may be used on the ground that the vessel is a convenience, an expedient, whose use is necessary but not prescribed by the law of Christ. If he could show by the Bible that Jesus meant by word or act to restrict us to one vessel, he would establish his contention. So far he has made little effort to do this. I, therefore, claim that I have proved my proposition by the

following arguments: 1. The Scriptures say that we drink the cup (I Cor. 10:21; 11:26-27). We do not drink the container.

Therefore, the cup of the Lord is the wine; 2. The Lord Supper is a meal, consisting of food and drink. The bread is the memorial of Christ body; the wine, the memorial of his blood. We use the plate and the cup as expedients as we use a songbook to convey the song. Why doesn't Bro. King give us his authority for these, or at least show what the drinking-cup represents? I have repeatedly shown that Jesus gave one bread and one cup for his entire body. He did not appoint as many cups as there are congregations. Each congregation is a partaker of the body and blood of one Savior. The amount of bread and wine used at one place and the manner of its division among the members have been left by Christ to his disciples. He did this with the eleven when he said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves" (Luke 22:17). "It" refers to the wine, for that is what they divided. "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. 26:27); "They all drank of it" (Mark 14:23); "I will not drink of this fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:29). The preposition "of" in these passages is the same in Greek and English. I conclude that "it" in Matt. 26:27 and Mark 14:23 refers to "the fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:29). This is what they drank. Bro. King says: "It was undivided when Jesus handed it to the disciples." Do you mean, Bro. King, that the man who now "waits on the table" represents Jesus Christ? Say Yes or No! Here is a serious objection to Bro. King's theory. He would have a

congregation dramatize the scene in Jerusalem with a man posing as the Lord! I repeat: Jesus left the manner of dividing the cup to his disciples. He did not tell them how to do it. This is the whole issue between us.

Bro. King says that I admit all innovations through the door of expediency. Where the Lord has shown his will by precept or example, we dare not go beyond it, for such act would be presumption dangerous thing. I now prove that Bro. King is guilty of this very thing. Read Matt. 26:26-29 and Luke 22:14-20 and hear Bro. King interpret them: 1. Jesus took bread; 2. Blessed it; 3. Broke it; 4. Ate of it (?); 5. Gave the remainder to the apostles (on a plate?); 6. Told them to eat it; 7. Took a cup of wine; 8. Gave thanks; 9. Drank of it (?); 10. Gave the remainder to the apostles; 11. Told them all to drink from the same cup (?). I do not mean to misrepresent Bro. King. If I should do so, and he will show my mistake, I will gladly apologize. Notice his presumption:

1. Nothing said about a plate, but he uses one. If the vessel for the wine is part of the Supper, why not the one for the bread? 2. Jesus ate his own body and drank his own blood! But Jesus said to the eleven: "Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you" (1 Cor. 11:24). His body was broken for them not for himself! Bro. King in breaking the bread breaks it for himself, for he eats it; 3. Whereas, Jesus told the eleven to take the cup and divide it among themselves, Brother King says in effect that Jesus

told them all to drink of one vessel. Yet Bro. King thinks this is the way to avoid division. Yes, Bro. King, we have some good brethren in Fort Worth who insist upon your practice. We have a fine group of brethren in Waco, Texas, who contend that in public worship we must pray first. Others say that Acts 2:42 contains the divine order, and this puts prayer last. How can we obtain unity in such cases? I answer: Consider prayerfully all the Scriptures reveal, add nothing, subtract nothing, allow for necessary expedients; above all, be sure not to make laws for the Lord.

Bro. King says I admitted in debate with Bro. Harper that the eleven apostles drank from the same cup. I am still of this opinion, but no man can prove it. It is entirely appropriate for small groups of worshipers to use one container. That is their privilege not a law of the Lord, as Bro. King contends. I again insist that he tell us how five hundred disciples should worship. He guesses that the church in Jerusalem divided into small groups to worship. This is pure guesswork. If true, we have no law telling us to do so. Bro. King, is it wrong for five hundred to worship together? If so, tell us why? If not, tell us how they should take the Lord Supper.

I repeat some of my objections to Bro. King's doctrine. 1. It makes the drinking-cup part of the Lord Supper; whereas, the bread and wine represent all the Savior gave us his body and

blood; 2. It makes it impossible for the mother church to have worshiped as a body; 3. It assumes that eleven disciples constituted a local church fifty days before the church was established; 4. It makes an unknown choice by the eleven disciples a law of Christ; 5. It implies that our Lord in giving an ordinance to be kept by all his followers till his return failed to specify by word or act an essential feature of that ordinance. What a reflection upon the wisdom of our blessed Savior!

N. L. CLARK

THIRD NEGATIVE

Rules of honorable controversy obligate Brother Clark to define the terms of his proposition, but he refuses. There must be a reason. I asked him to define "plurality," whether limited or unlimited. If limited who makes the law; if unlimited who can say when to use "individual cups" and decide in "what "cases" they are a "fad," also when he may use this late "innovation," but no answer. He seems to prefer to talk about irrelevant things rather than discuss his proposition. We are discussing one point only a plurality of cups" for "an assembly" (local). Not whether Jesus ate and drank in the Communion, order of worship at Waco, songbook, nor plate, etc. If my use of a "plate" offends, I will give it up. Will he do the same with his "cups," which he contends parallel? They offend many. If all I endorse is unscriptural it does not make his cups scriptural. He is "logically" in the lead, since he

affirms, and it is his practice that is called in question and is causing the division. All must agree that the use of one cup is safe, scriptural, and the only basis of unity, for all will never discard the word of God for man ipse dixit of "a plurality of cups" for "convenience." He makes about all the old digressive arguments in favor of his "innovation," for they all come in through the same door. When he shows us how we can use his cups in this manner, he will have shown us how we can have the piano, S. S., societies, "individual cups" regularly.

Yes, we drink the cup (1 Cor. 11:26, 27) "By drinking what it contains and in no other way" N. L. Clark, and by drinking "what is in the cup" Thayer. Therefore, not by drinking from cups, as that would be "another way." By what law of language do you call a liquid "a cup," when not in a cup? Can you drink "the cup" without a cup?

I deny that Jesus left the dividing (Lk. 22:17) to "an unknown choice" of His disciples, for He plainly told them how "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. 26:27), and they obeyed, "And they all drank of it" (Mk. 14:23. And Thayer cites both references as examples of "With a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks" (p. 510). "Share it among you" (Lk. 22:17, Twentieth Century and Goodspeed Trs.) Even if his contention that the pronoun "it" refers to "wine" only were right, it would still be against his practice of cups, for "it" was still undivided when Jesus handed

"it" to the disciples, or there would have been no sense in His telling them to divide it.. In your practice of cups the dividing is done before it gets to the body of worshipers they do not have a chance! If "it" in Lk. 22:17 refers to one volume of "wine," the same is true in the other passages, hence we would have "Drink ye all of it" (one volume of "wine), but one volume necessitates one cup, and "They all drank of it" (one volume), hence one cup. His "plurality of Cup" are not here, just as he conceded and is "still of the same opinion" that "Christ used only one cup in the institution of the Supper, and "The disciples on that occasion all drank from the same cup." I never intimated that we "represent Christ," but we can and must "follow" (imitate) Him (Matt. 16:24; 1 Pet. 2:21; Jno. 10:4; 1 Cor. 11:1). It is just as plainly stated (Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:17, 20; 1 Cor. 11:25) that Jesus "took a cup" as it is that He "took a loaf," or "gave thanks," and they who use "a plurality cups" do not follow Jesus and Paul. This "ordinance" was delivered with one cup (admitted), but Paul says, "I praise you that you keep the ordinances as I delivered them," "follow me as I follow Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1, 2). I gave no such interpretation of Matt. 26:26-29 as he charges. In trying to show me guilty of "presumption," because I use a plate, he shows himself doubly guilty of presumption, for he uses both plate and cups (claiming parallel).

Brother Clark objections: 1. If the drinking cup is of no significance, why his contention that the "wine" must be in one

cup until after thanks? Why did Jesus say, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood" (Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25)? And why do Thayer, Meyer, et al, say the same? 2. If all Christians were compelled to meet in one assembly in a community, there might be something to this objection, but not so. The Bible (Acts 2:46; Rom. 16:5, 14, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. 2) shows that early disciples broke bread in private houses; so does history. "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses" (Neander, vol. 1, p. 402; See also Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 86). Hence, small enough for one cup and one loaf. 3. It no more assumes this than his going to the same accounts for the other examples of "a loaf," "giving thanks," etc. Paul bound the same on t h e church at Corinth (1 Cor. 11:23-25). Will he file an objection against Paul? 4. "Unknown choice," eh? If "unknown" how do you know they did not choose "individual cups"? This is a plain contradiction of your proposition ("The Scriptures teach"), for if "unknown" they do not "teach."_ But if a "choice," it was because the disciples chose to obey their Lord Drink ye all of (out of) it." 5. But this has been your contention all along that "Christ failed to specify by word or act and essential feature of this ordinance," hence your assumption of "liberty," "incidental," "unknown choice," etc. "Thou art the man," brother. This is Clark against Clark. My contention has been that Christ did specify by both word and act, "a cup" (Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:25-28).

Objections against Brother Clark "plurality of cups": 1. they are both unscriptural (not in the Scriptures) and anti-scriptural (set aside the examples of Christ and Apostles). Therefore, add to and take from the Bible, incurring the curse of Rev. 22:18, 19. 2. They are a wedge of division, having divided the Body of Christ, hence the advocates do not "endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit" (Eph. 4:3). 3. Not being in the "doctrine of Christ (admitted), to advocate them is to transgress that doctrine. "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" (2 Jno. 9). 4. They render the worship vain, as they belong to the doctrine of men. "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:9). 5. They are not "of faith" ("unknown choice"), hence cannot be proven beyond a doubt, "And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith" (Rom. 14:23). 6. They offend many, and "It is evil for that man who eateth with offence" (Rom. 14:20, 21).

HOMER L. KING

CLARK-KING DISCUSSION

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that an assembly of the Church of Christ for the communion may use a plurality of cups (drinking-vessels) in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

N. L. Clark affirms

Homer L. King denies

CLARK'S FOURTH ARTICLE

My proposition says we may use a plurality of drinking-vessels. Bro. King believes that all worshipers in any group **MUST** drink directly from the same vessel. His only argument thus far amounts to this: 1. Jesus meant to set an example in every detail for all bodies of worshipers till the end of time; 2. Jesus made the drinking-vessel an essential part of the Lord Supper; 3. When he said: "Drink ye all of it," he meant to command all eleven men to drink directly from the same cup; 4. This commandment was to be transmitted by them to all other groups of his disciples. The rules of debate forbid the introduction of new argument in a closing negative. Should Bro. King violate this rule, I would have the right to a reply.

The only difference between us here pertains to the distribution of the wine among worshipers. I have argued that the essential thing is to give the wine to the worshiper. Whether he be standing, sitting, or kneeling; comes to the table or receives it from another; drinks directly from the original vessel or from another are matters of circumstance to be governed by the law of expediency, which requires all things to be done decently and in order. To me, the plate for the bread, the cup for the wine, and the table for both are all of the same importance. Bro. King argues that the plate and the table are expedients, but he makes

the cup an essential part of the Supper. He and I could conscientiously take the Supper without plate or table; but his conscience would demand the cup. A bottle or a jug would not do. Besides, he would require everybody else to drink from the same cup.

To establish my position, I have made the following argument: 1. The Lord's Supper consists of the bread and wine, representing the body and blood of Christ. The body and blood were all he gave in death. The Supper shows his death, hence there was nothing for the vessel to represent; 2. Jesus used the word cup for the wine just as he used the same word in Matt. 10: 42, "a cup of cold water." Here it is the water that is given. The cup is not under consideration. To prove this, I have shown from the Scriptures that we drink the cup, divide the cup, partake of the cup; that it is called the blood of Christ, and that the wine is called the cup; 3. In eating the Supper, we commune with Christ by eating his body and drinking his blood (1 Cor. 10: 16). Here "the cup of blessing" is the wine representing the blood. No room here for the vessel; 4. I have shown that we may drink from any vessel either directly or indirectly. Most of us drink water from a bucket by using a dipper. Jacob, his children, and cattle drank from one well. No doubt it was divided before they drank it. When I give thanks for the wine in one vessel on the table, then pour it into two or more other vessels, the worshiper who drinks from one of these drinks the wine as truly as if he had drunk it before

it was divided; 5. In Bro. King's practice, the wine is divided before it leaves the table, for the man serving drinks first. In any case, each worshiper divides the cup when he drinks. No one except the first; gets it undivided. Why object to its division before the first drinks? 6. Jesus gave the cup to the eleven and said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves" (Luke 22:17). He left the manner of its division to them. Bro. King says: "Not so, for Jesus told them all to drink of it." To put these two quotations together, Bro. King makes Jesus speak nonsense. In the one passage, Jesus leaves the division to them. In the other, according to King, he tells them how to divide it. The only choice they had was in the amount of wine each drank. If we take Jesus to mean for all to drink some of the wine, leaving its distribution to them, we have perfect sense. I conclude that they divide the wine as they chose to it. My opinion is that they all drank from the same cup, but it was their choice not Christ commandment. At that time the apostles did many things that are not binding as examples now. Jesus washed the feet of the twelve and said unto them: "I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." (Jno. 13:15). There is ten times as much authority for foot washing as a church ordinance as there is for Bro. King one container practice; 7. Reason requires that a large congregation use more than one cup. For one hundred disciples to drink from one vessel would often be a severe strain on their preparation of mind to commune with Christ. For five hundred,

the practice will not work. Bro. King's answer is that certain groups met in private houses. Like the advocates of all wild theories, he must resort to strained application of Scripture and history. There is not intimation in the Bible that the Lord has limited the number of disciples who may worship together. Here Bro. King's theory dies in practice.

I now answer his objections to my practice. He says: 1. It is "anti-Scriptural." Impossible, for the Scriptures nowhere require all the worshipers to drink directly from one vessel; 2. "Cause of division." No religious body was ever divided over this question till men began to advocate Bro. King's practice. They sowed the seeds of discord; 3. "Transgresses the doctrine of Christ." To do things decently and in order is part of Christ doctrine (1 Cor. 14: 40). The plate, drinking vessels, and other expedients are necessary in obeying this doctrine; 4. "Vain worship." Bro. King's doctrine is a commandment of men substituted for liberty in Christ. He makes a law of an expedient; 5. "Not of faith." One whose mind and heart are fixed on the blood of Christ will not have time to consider the size, shape, or number of vessels that contain it; 6. "They offend." Yes, where Bro. King erroneous doctrine has perverted the conscience.

FOURTH NEGATIVE

It is strange that a man of Brother Clark ability will take a position in trying to defend an unscriptural proposition, which will

not allow him to define its terms, lest his already apparent inconsistency be the more exposed, when the rules of honorable controversy require such definition. I repeatedly asked him to define "plurality of cups," telling whether limited or unlimited, if limited who "makes the law"; or if unlimited who says when the "individual cups" are a "fad," but no answer. In my three negatives I have asked 45 questions, 41 of which were never noticed. He warns against new arguments in my final negative and his right to reply. I have no desire to violate this rule, but if I should, it would be no more than he has done in refusing to define his proposition. He has never been able to extricate himself from his contradictory predicament of affirming "The Scriptures teach a plurality of cups," and then arguing that they are not mentioned in the Scriptures. He has signally failed to show precept, approved example, or necessary inference, for his practice, and in no other way can the Scriptures teach. It is now obvious to all that his first effort was to try to force me in the lead, but failing, he began running away from his proposition, discussing things irrelevant, This is a tacit admission of his inability to prove his proposition.

One of Brother Clark chief errors is his failure to distinguish between things specified and things not specified things that belong to precept and example and mere incidentals. The things Jesus and His Apostles said and did in the institution of the Supper are vital, and we must not tamper with them. Jesus "took

a cup, gave thanks, gave it to them, saying drink ye all of (out of) it," "And they all drank of (out of) it" (Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:17-20; 1 Cor. 11:25-28). "A cup" belongs to the things specified, and if we may substitute" a bottle or a jug" for it, we may substitute beefsteak for "a loaf," or if "cups" for "a cup," then "loaves" (like Catholics) for "a loaf." Who can afford to leave the word of God, "a cup," for man ipse dixit of "a plurality of cups" for "convenience"? Thousands will never!

I notice his attempted arguments by number: 1. But, Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood" (Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25), and Thayer says the same (p. 15); Brother Clark to the contrary, notwithstanding. In this he contradicts his own contention that the "wine must be in one container until after thanks." What inconsistency! 2. If no vessel is "under consideration" in any reference, where did you get your information that Jesus "gave His disciples a vessel" (2nd Articles)? Where did you get your "opinion" that "Jesus used only one cup in the institution of the Supper" and "the Apostles on that occasion all drank from the same cup"? And, why did you say, "I accept the definition by Thayer and others of the Greek word poterion (cup), meaning a drinking vessel"? Eh? A plain contradiction! 3. But you failed to show us how you could drink your cup without "a cup," or how you could call a liquid "a cup," when not in "a cup," by any law of language. It cannot be done! 4. If assertions would prove anything, you might have "shown"

something, but they do not go here. I showed according to Thayer and reason that you are wrong here (2nd Neg.), for Thayer cites Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23 as examples of "With a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks," while not so concerning the well. But, when you "give thanks for the wine in one vessel on the table, then pour it into two or more other vessels," you do what you cannot read in the Bible and what is contrary to the practice of Christ and His Apostles, as much so as "individual cup" or sprinkling for baptism. 5. Then, you do admit that the dividing in Lk. 22:17 was by "drinking of it" just as I have contended, but the dividing you practice is done before it gets to the participants by "pouring into other vessels." Thanks for the admission. 6. But, it is only your assertion that Jesus left the dividing to the "unknown choice" of the disciples, for, no such idea in the passage is there. Anyway, you admitted in No. 5, that the dividing is done by drinking, which is not the practice you are trying to bolster up. It is the division into a "plurality of cups" before the drinking that you need, which is not there. The division was done just as I pointed out in Mark 14:23, "And they all drank of it." The passage is against you!

"Ten times as much authority for foot washing as a church ordinance as there is for one container practice," eh? But you have admitted that one cup is Scriptural in "It is entirely appropriate for small groups of worshipers to use one container" (3rd Aff.) and other statements, admitting the Saviour used one

cup, hence you go on record as making foot washing very necessary. That was a very reckless statement for a gospel preacher. I am ashamed of you, Brother Clark, but I shall excuse you, for I know you are hard pressed. That must have been a "slip" of the pen. 7. I showed from the Bible (Acts 2:46; Rom. 16:5, 14, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. 2) that early disciples "broke bread in their homes." Also, from history "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses" (Neander Vol. 1, p. 402; Mosheim Vol. 1, p. 86), hence small enough for one cup and one loaf. You gave nothing but your presumption of large assemblies for the Communion, and fell down on trying to serve your crowd of 50,000 with one container before thanks and pouring into 500 after thanks, "in decency and in order." Therefore, it is your "theory" that "dies in practice" without Scripture to sustain it.

My objections to his "plurality of cups" remain unanswered: 1. they are both unscriptural (not in the Scriptures) and anti-scriptural (set aside words and examples of Christ and Apostles). Therefore, "add to" and "take from" the Bible, incurring the curse of Rev. 22:18, 19. 2. They are a wedge of division, having divided the Body of Christ, hence the advocates do not "endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit" (Eph. 4:3). 3. Not being in the "doctrine of Christ (admitted), to advocate them is to transgress, and "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" (2 Jno. 9). 4. Being doctrine of men, they

render the worship vain. "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:9). 5. They offend many, and "It is evil for that man who eateth with offence" (Rom. 14:20, 21). And, it is not a "perverted" conscience, being founded on Bible examples and precepts. May the truth prevail.

HOMER L. KING