

A DEFINITION.

1. WHAT 'THE CUP' IS NOT

- A. 'The cup' is the fruit of the vine (Matt. 26:27-29) B. The fruit of the vine is not the container C. Therefore the container is NOT 'the cup'.
B. 'The cup' is the blood of Christ (Matt. 26:28) B. The container is not the blood of Christ C. Therefore the container is NOT 'the cup'

2. WHAT 'THE CUP' IS

- A. 'The cup' is the blood of Christ (Matt. 26:28) B. The blood is the fruit of the vine (Matt. 26:29) **C. Therefore 'the cup' is the fruit of the vine**
B. 'The cup' is the fruit of the vine (Matt.26:27-29) B. The fruit of the vine is what you drink **C. Therefore in drinking the fruit of the vine, you drink 'the cup'**
C. You drink 'the cup' (1 Cor. 11:26) B. You drink the contents (fruit of the vine) **C. Therefore 'the cup' is the contents not the container.** (Joe Nisbet)

EXTRACT FROM THE DEEDS OF THE CHURCH MEETING IN CORBY.

POINT No. 8: "That it is the duty of members of the church to assemble together on the first day of the week to break bread and drink the fruit of the vine in remembrance of the Lord, but any theory that would obstruct the use of individual containers for the fruit of the vine in connection with this remembrance, be **REJECTED**". (Frank Worgan Bill Frisby Jack Stewart Bernard Williams)

Cup Question “Before the bad feeling with our American brethren polarised opinion there were a number of British churches who used more than one cup for example Rodney Street Wigan had 8 cups.

Many congregations had 2 cups or 1 pitcher from which the fruit of the vine was poured into 2 cups or 4 cups

Then some American brethren with a lack of sensitivity roughed up the backs of some of our British Brethren and part of that process was the introduced individual cups.

In reaction many British writers then found voice and began to look for scriptures and argument's to defend the one cup system which for many congregations had not been seen for years, as has been said, because many already used more than one cup in their services especially if they were a larger congregation.

In their dislike of the American brethren and what they saw as the imposition of American practices, they then made the cup question a problem which has continued to divide congregations to this day.

While claiming the moral high ground that they were not the ones who introduced individual cups (the speck in the eye) they misused and abused scripture to force others to accept their one cup position

(the beam in their own eye) when congregations in Britain had never had a one cup policy but rather a policy of as many cups were needed to get the job done, being a

congregation by congregation decision as opposed to having a policy thrust upon them.

It almost seems true sometimes that the scriptures can say anything if you twist them enough and many souls have been lost by making an issue out of what should have been a non issue and allowing common sense and choice to prevail in individual congregations” Graeme Morrison

METONOMY - (LITERALLY 'A CHANGE OF NAMES').

It consists of substituting one word for another in consequence of their very close and intimate connection in either time or place. For instance:

The cause is often put for the effect. "They have Moses (writings) and the prophets (writings): let them hear them" Luke 16:29.

The effect is put for the cause. "The Strength (warrior) of Israel will not lie nor relent. For He is not a man, that He should relent" 1 Sam. 15:29 (in connection with God as Israel's protector).

The sign is put for the thing signified, "...that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised" Gal.2:9 (circumcised being the sign, the Jews being that signified by it).

The abstract is put for the concrete. "For he has made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us...." 2 Cor. 5:21

The container for the thing contained. The kettle is boiling. (Kettle the container, water the contained) "Now the whole earth had one language and one speech" Gen. 11:1 (Earth the container, people the contained). "

For God so loved the world..." John 3:16 (world, people).

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the one who kills the prophets and stones the ones who are sent to her..." Luke 13:34

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood..." Luke 22:20.

Although these quotes are taken from the New K.J.V. there is no difference between them in any other translation to alter the points made.

These examples are not exhaustive, there are hundreds more, but they are sufficient to illustrate the nature of **METONOMY**, which, next to the metaphor (a figure of speech in which a word is transferred from the object to which it properly belongs, and applied to another which in some way resembles it), is the most common and important figure found in the Holy Scriptures.

Transition:- When the term 'the cup' is used, either by the Saviour or Paul in relation to the Lord's table, **WITHOUT EXCEPTION**, it refers, by Metonymy, to the contents and **NEVER** the container.

HOW MANY CONTAINERS ARE REQUIRED FOR THE LORD'S SUPPER ?

Reasons for this discussion. It is the Devil's delight to have us discuss things, unless we have good motives and purposes for discussion our adversary will have a field day. But there are good reasons to discuss this topic.

1. To some it is a matter of faith or principle, therefore a condition of fellowship (inwardly felt or outwardly shown). 2. The biggest consideration is, how to handle scripture.
- a. There are two problems for those who accept God's authority through scripture: i. Either neglecting what God has requested - liberalism. Or ii. Requiring more than God has requested - extremism (or overly conservative).
- b. It is the Lord's people's concern however not to use scripture one way concerning baptism and the Lord's supper, but use it another concerning the holy kiss, or foot washing. To avoid both errors above, we must see the PRINCIPLE. The same is true of the container question. Unless we see the PRINCIPLE upon which to decide, we will be forever discussing trivialities.

WHAT ARE WE SEEKING

1. The issue to be considered: teaching concerning the Lord's supper, especially as it relates to container/containers.
2. To do that we must consider three areas, a. Search for a command concerning the number required, b. Search for an example concerning the number required, c. Consider other biblical teachings which help in making a right decision about the number required.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. Primary sources:- Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:14-23; 1 Corinthians 11:17-34.
2. Secondary sources: Acts 2:42; Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 10:14-22.

THE DISCUSSION.

1. THE SEARCH FOR A COMMAND CONCERNING THE NUMBER OF CONTAINERS REQUIRED.

Mark 14 :22-25 contains no command concerning the 'cup' (see examples later).

Matthew 26:26-29 contains a command, found in verse 27. Yet whether the container is involved in this command must be determined from the CONTEXT. Three pointers to help.

- a. "For this is my blood of the new covenant" v28. Meaning: this represents my blood. The fruit of the vine was not literally the blood of Jesus any more than a container could be. b. Container and contents do not represent 'my blood', c. In Matthew's account, the container stands for nothing, but it's contents, the fruit of the vine, does.

In consideration of those who use the King James translation: the end of v28 adds "which is poured out for many". What was poured out? That which represented the 'blood'. A container does not represent that.

There is nothing in the idea of the sacrificed or the poured out blood which required the idea of one or many containers. Jesus shows in v29 what **HE** meant. "I shall not drink again of this FRUIT OF THE VINE". Why not say ".....poured out of this container"? Because Jesus saw no significance of a container or containers. Let

Jesus interpret his own intentions. Therefore in this passage 'cup' is the fruit of the vine.

Question: But doesn't Jesus say "Drink OUT of it, all of you"? Reply: How else would one expect them to drink the fruit of the vine if they didn't use whatever contained it. To this point Jesus had not explained what was to be done with the fruit of the vine. He could have simply drank it himself.

This was his way of telling them they were meant to drink it. If they were to drink at all it would necessarily been out of whatever contained the fruit of the vine. There is nothing in this passage requiring the idea that they all had to share that container in order to do what Jesus requested, drink in memory of 1 lim.

Conclusion:- In Matthew, we find **NO COMMAND** which requires a special number of containers for the fruit of the vine.

Luke 22:14-20;. contains a command

In context the whole passage refers to 'cup' twice v!7 and v20. Yet only in v!7 is there a command to be found. "Take this and divide it among yourselves". Is the reference to a container or the contents? What was to be divided, a container or contents?

In v8 Jesus explains and has been discussing and simply calls it, the fruit of the vine. The contents.

The only conclusion one can come to here is that the 'cup' which he gave them and told them to divide, was the fruit of the vine. As far as meaning, or significance is concerned, the container had none in this passage. It stood for nothing (in command) as the bread and fruit of the vine did.

Conclusion:- In Luke's account there is **NO COMMAND** which requires the use of a specific

number of containers for the fruit of the vine. Any number could be incidental to the command 'divide'.

1 Corinthians 10:14-22. The context concerns the Corinthians' relationship to the heathen practices of their city. There is **NO COMMAND** here even though 'cup of blessing' and 'cup of the Lord' is mentioned. Consider this under examples.

1 Corinthians 11:23-32. The command in verses 1-2 requires that we determine what is involved in 'traditions' etc. We must not assume the thing to be proven.

The commands in verses 25,26. "this do" of v25 concerns the 'cup'. The leading thought is, "this do.in remembrance of me". But what is a memory of the Saviour? What is done in remembrance of Him?

Meeting in an upper room? NO. Reclining at a table? NO.

The use of any specific number of containers? Is it the drinking of the fruit of the vine, or is it the drinking of the fruit of the vine from one, two, two hundred containers which is a memory of Christ?

From what Jesus told Paul, v26 is an explanation of both the bread and the cup. We see the drinking of the contents of the cup, the fruit of the vine, to be the memory referred to. It is this which shows forth His death, not the drinking from a particular number of vessels.

A parallel:- If we pass the bread on one, two or two hundred plates. Or even without a plate at all, we do not change the meaning of the bread. We eat of it in memory of the Lord. So too then the fruit of the vine, it is partaking of it that is a memory, not any cup or cups.

Conclusion:- The commands found in 1 Cor.11 are **NOT** commands which require the use of an exclusive or specific number of containers for the drinking of the fruit of the vine.

Transition:- IF there is a requirement to use one cup in passing the fruit of the vine, it must come from something other than a command! It may come from a binding example, or it may arise from some significance attached to the container itself. But NOT through a command!

2. THE SEARCH FOR AN BINDING EXAMPLE ON THE NUMBER OF CONTAINERS.

A lot of unsound and illogical thinking can be done about biblical examples, so we must be careful. Some good examples are not obligatory (we are not obliged to follow). For example:

Appealing to civil government Acts 25:1 1

Baptizing in the open John 3:22ff; Acts 8:35-38.

Washing feet John 13:5

Giving away of common goods among Christians Acts ch 5.

The list could go on obviously.

Other examples are considered to be obligatory, binding, required of all Christians.

How do we decide which are or are not required of us? In the same way, we must approach the example of the Lord's supper with some sense of discretion and discernment. Otherwise we will find ourselves perverting biblical teaching on this matter.

What actually happened at the institution of the supper?

Perhaps it was on a Thursday - some bind this!

At night - some bind this (even some of our brethren!).

ONLY MEN were present - some bind this. Tell that to our sisters!

One table - some bind this.

An upper room - some bind this.

One portion of bread - some bind this. (You couldn't use Matzos!)

They sang a hymn then went out - some bind this.

We shall assume one container (but Luke 22 may indicate more) - some bind, insist on one container.

Are all of these binding? If so, we are ALL SINNING! If not, how do you distinguish between which are and which are not and yet be totally consistent in exegesis? We can't, unless it is purely opinion.

But to insist on something, to make it binding and required of all we MUST have something more than opinion!! And if opinion insists on one vessel, then to be totally consistent all that happened MUST be binding. The bottom line is, that in all honesty we do not know how the bread was passed, on a plate or not, in how many containers the fruit of the vine was passed.

NOTES on the examples we have.

Matt. 26:27; and Mark 14:23-24; are parallel and so taken together. For an example to be binding, there must be some significance attached to the act itself. This is sometimes called an inferred example, or that which is necessary to the carrying out of a command. Can we find one hint at all that the container itself had significance? Or was it purely incidental to the drinking of the fruit of the vine, and therefore incidental to the supper and its purpose?

Note:- the 'cup' He took and of which He told the disciples to drink; that 'cup' is the 'cup' of which they drank. The 'cup' that Jesus himself calls 'the fruit of the vine' Matt.26:28; Mk 14:25;

Conclusion:- For all the disciples knew, Jesus may not have intended for them to partake of the fruit of the vine at all. His simple statement for them to drink it necessitates they drink it from something, it proves nothing else. We find absolutely NO SIGNIFICANCE attached to the container itself in Matthew or Mark.

Therefore the example found here, as some would insist, of the use of one container is NOT A BINDING EXAMPLE and should not be made one. To insist on this is to make a pretext out of scripture, an action we rightly and strongly insist other religious people not do!

Luke 22:17-18;. Which 'cup' here has significance? The answer is plain, the 'cup' which was DIVIDED among them. Which 'cup' was that? Obviously the 'cup' which was the fruit of the vine. NO SIGNIFICANCE is attached to the container/s here. Nor can it be proved one way or the other that there was one cup divided, or that one vessel was used to pour a portion into numerous containers. Nor that numerous containers alone were used.

Conclusion:- There is no evidence whatsoever in Luke that a significance was attached to one or many containers, so that a specific number is involved in remembering the Saviour.

1 Cor. 11:23-26. "this cup is the new covenant in my blood" What is being referred to here is obviously the contents rather than any container, as seen in the last part of v25 "drink it".

The same point is made in v26 "drink the cup". Paul declares that the cup they drink is the cup which is the new covenant in Christ's blood. Consider v25. "This do....in remembrance of me".

Again the question is asked, what is the memory or" the Saviour? What is there, in drinking 'in memory of me' which requires for its meaning the use of one,two or two dozen containers?

Conclusion:- There is **NO** evidence in 1 Cor.1 11 which indicates the use of any specific number of containers to be a **BINDING EXAMPLE** all Christians must adhere to.

1 Cor. 10:14-22;

The point of the passage is this: It is wrong to participate in demon worship and service. A difficulty in insisting on the rigid view of one cup.

If 'the cup' means there is but one container used for the fruit of the vine, then we are **BOUND**, by terms of consistency and true biblical exegesis, to say there was but one cup used in an idol's temple (v21). Also that there was only one table to be found in an idol's temple (v21). Who in all good conscience would insist on that? What does one do when he drinks the cup of the Lord? Consume a container?

Question:- Does this passage not show the significance of the one container in stressing the unity we are to have? **NO!** Fellowship with fellow Christians is not being contemplated, it is communion with Christ that is the issue here (v!6). Remember Paul is in Ephesus and the Corinthians in their own city! They were one (unity) although eating a different portion of bread and drinking different volumes of the fruit of the vine. Yet they were one by their mutually having communion with Christ!

Transition:- Neither command nor example obligates Christians to use a specific number of containers during the Lord's supper. Therefore it is **NOT JUSIFIABLE TO INSIST** on one, two or two hundred containers.

OTHER BIBLICAL TEACHING AND CONSIDERATIONS.

The case of the Jerusalem congregation. It was a very large one, 7,000 members easily, Acts 4:4 states "and the number of the men came to about 5,000". No women are accounted for! The congregation was **ONE**, seven times referred to as 'church' Ch 5:1 1; 8:1,3; 11:22; 12:1,5; 15:4, never as churches.

Some say they met in smaller groups most of the time. If so, what did they do about the Lord's supper? If they all met together was there **ONE** cup? How large a cup, how long a cup? If they met in smaller groups and yet are called one church, how many cups? There is certainly no authority in scripture for many small churches.

The point is this: Any way one takes the Jerusalem situation he has difficulties by insisting that only one container was used. One cup for 7,000, is a problem of absurdity, a plurality of cups, or a completely unfounded assumption.

The case of Paul and the Corinthians shows that the 'one cup' is maintained even when brethren are separated and drinking from different containers 1 Cor. 10:16;.

Paul in Ephesus and the Corinthians in Corinth, yet Paul states "the cup of blessing which WE bless (v 16) Therefore the idea of blessing a container and then pouring from it is also a great difficulty to insist upon. There had to be at least two containers, one in Ephesus and one in Corinth.

Which one would be the 'cup' the Lord used? For if there was any remote significance to the cup that Jesus blessed, surely he would have insured it was passed on. Again this shows the absurdity of insisting on one cup. Paul explains, he calls the fruit of the vine 'the cup' which WE (both congregations) bless.

IMPORTANT NOTE: If unity arises from sharing a container, then how could the Ephesians feel unity with the Corinthians when they both used different vessels?

CONCLUSION:

What have we seen?

1. There is **NOT ONE direct COMMAND** in scripture for the use of only one cup. So as far as a command is concerned there is none which requires a particular number of containers. Nor can anyone insist there is a command, to do that would be to put words into God's mouth.
2. There are **NO EXAMPLES** which indicate the container had any significance. Therefore as far as examples are concerned, there are none which require the use of any particular number of containers.
3. The consideration of the Jerusalem situation **FORBIDS** our concluding that it used but one container in its assembling together.
4. Paul's remarks to the Corinthians indicates that the emphasis on the cup was due to the meaning given to the contents, without regard to the contents being divided for Corinth and Ephesus. And Paul "received from the Lord" instructions to pass on to the Corinthians, instructions concerning the significance of the bread and the fruit of the vine, not anything about containers. Ye You may rightly ask: What has this to do with individual containers?
 - A. It means there is **NO SCRIPTURAL BASIS** for insisting on the use of multiple containers (individual containers included) instead of one cup. That there is **NO SCRIPTURAL BASIS** for insisting on the use of one instead of more than one. Therefore, individual containers **CAN NOT BE BOUND** on anyone, **NOR** 'one cup'.

B. It means that the local assembly must decide for itself what is best, for whatever reasons, for that assembly in regard to this 'expedient' or 'incidental', just as it must in the case of a bread plate/s.

C. This means then that:

1. We **MAY** meet in an upper room, but we would not be right in insisting that the supper could not be observed in any other place.

2. We CAN use a plate for the bread, or we may use none, but we cannot insist on either way.
3. Likewise, we MAY use one, two (plus a decanter of sorts), three or any number of containers appropriate to the assembly; but we CANNOT INSIST on one way rather than another as a matter of principle.
4. With the principle of handling the scriptures by which these conclusions are reached, stand or fall, our views on washing feet, meeting in an upper room, the holy kiss etc MUST be given the same pride of place!

(Unknown Author)

UNIFORMITY IN WORSHIP PROBLEM.

- I. **Compulsory uniformity follows a familiar pattern in church history.** Men have often confused the **divine pattern for unity** with their **personal preferences for a compulsory uniformity of methods.**

State churches have tried to accomplish this by force. Other churches have tried to compel by pressure and dis-fellowship, free churches of Christ to conform to their preferences and prejudices.

2. **"One-loaf and one-cup"** churches of Christ are seen advertised in a newspaper. In many instances when most of our churches were very small, only one or two containers were used in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

As congregations grew in size additional containers were secured. To some the container itself was the cup of the Lord. In contending for one container, or three at most, they even adopted high church attitudes toward the Lord's supper

3. **There is only one cup now which all of the Lord's people drink.** It is the same cup which the Lord's people have been drinking since the church began.

There have been thousands of containers, and there are thousands of containers, but there is only one cup. This is because THE CUP is the CONTENTS not the CONTAINER.

The term, "cup" is a figure of speech. We drink the cup. (1 Cor.11:26). We divide the cup. (Lk.22:17-18). His blood of the covenant is the cup. (Mt.26:28). The fruit of the vine is the cup. (Mt.26:26).

Do these references to the cup refer to the container or the contents? Most certainly the contents.

4. **"Individual cups"** are not the issue. Multiplicity of containers is the matter being opposed. Since many these "one-cup" churches, use two containers which they pass, and a third container from which they pour the contents, manifestly they are inconsistent and their arguments are made impotent by their own practice.

5. **There is only one loaf.** Paul, writing from Phillipis to Corinth said that they were partaking of the same loaf. "We who are many, (millions, now) partake of one bread." (1 Cor.10:17).

A local congregation is not the body of Christ. Its members, along with the members of all other congregations, make up the one body. (Col.1:24, ICo.12:20) Hence, no congregational loaf stands alone.

THE RIGHT TO NON-CONFORMITY

No church, or group of churches, was given the right to bind a law which God has not made, on another congregation. There are been two general ideas of church government.

1. **Unscriptural Connectionalism** which binds either, loosely, or tightly together, all congregations into a denominational scheme which logically culminates in an universal apex, such as the Pope of Rome.
2. **Scriptural Independently**, the New Testament pattern, consists of autonomous congregations with no regard as to district, national or international conference or committee.

Unity among brethren with reference to what Jesus has commanded does not demand uniformity in matters that are incidental in carrying out those commands. **NO MINORITY RULE.**

Minority rule is no more Scriptural than **majority rule**. There are those who would obstruct the work of the church by saying, "If anyone objects to anything we ought not do it."

This argument is neither Scriptural or reasonable.

In spite of the fact that good Christians often believe it, it is the favourite device of the sluggard, the covetous and the prejudiced. It enables a minority to rule.

KEEPING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Several congregations in Britain use more than one communion container. Whether they use two or thirty-two, it is their liberty and privilege to do so.

When our only congregation in Edinburgh was set up in 1966 it was publicly announced that this would be our practice. It was forced on no one.

I am still ready to meet in public debate, anyone who will affirm that:-

"The Scriptures teach that it is sinful to use more than one container for the fruit of vine when observing the Lord's supper"

<p>Acts Commanded or Exemplified. "Make all things according to the pattern." Heb 8:5;</p>	<p>Aids Required or permitted. "Let all things be done decently and in order." 1 Cor 14:40;</p>	<p>Alterations Forbidden Going onward and not abiding in teaching of Christ." 2 Jn.9</p>
<p>Give through One Collection. ICor 16:2; 2Cor 9:5-7;</p>	<p>Choice of nature of containers, as to size, number, shape, etc. Manner of passing, etc.</p>	<p>Giving at all meetings, or only under pressure, money from aliens</p>

<p>Drink the One Cup This is "fruit" of the vine"- Matt 26:27-29, Which we drink, ICor 11:26; and is His blood. Matt 26:28;</p>	<p>Choice as to number, size, etc, of containers, Manner of passing,etc., Matters of choice of the local congregation.</p>	<p>Use of other than fruit of vine, use as a mass and altar, using a third element, one member acting as priest, etc.</p>
<p>Function as members of One body, to which we were added by the Lord, Acts 2:38-42. Consists of local congregations helpful to each other but independent of each other, only obligated by law of love. Elders and deacons in each congregation qualified. Acts 14:23; Phil 1:1; Eph 3:21;.</p>	<p>Choice as to who shall speak, time and location of services, contributing or not contributing to work of various other congregations, kind of hymnals used, seating and lighting of meeting house, publications distributed, etc.</p>	<p>Organisation of groups as conferences or committees binding churches, guilds, aids, brotherhoods, etc, larger or smaller than the local congregation, fellowshipping sectarians or digressive, brethren.</p>

Careful study of the above chart will reveal that plural vessels used in the communion are purely optional so far as Scriptures are concerned.

Instrumental music is quite a different matter. It is a kind of music God has not authorised. It is not a **manner** of doing a thing which God has commanded but an entirely unauthorised act.

Any manner of using the instrument would be unscriptural.

THE CUP OF THE LORD

There is but one cup of the Lord. There has never been more than one cup.

When at Philippi, Paul drank the one cup, brethren at Corinth drank of that one cup at the same time. 1 Cor 10:16; 3,000 at Jerusalem drank of that only cup.

Acts 2:41-42, 4:3. Today we all partake of that one cup.

What is the "cup of the Lord"?

It is not a container. We divide it. Lk.22:17

It is not a chalice, or "holy grail".

It is no container. We drink it. 1 Cor 11:26;

It is not imitation fruit juice. It is the "fruit of the vine, (grape) Matt 26:29;

It is the blood at the covenant, Matt 26:28;

It is, therefore, the use of the fruit of the vine without reference to containers.

What is the "bread which we break"?

It is unleavened bread. No other kind of bread could be found in the house at that time.

Exod 12:15-20; Luke 22:7;

It is not a congregational loaf. It is shared by the one body, the entire church of Jesus.

Col 1:24; 1 Cor 12:20; 1Cor 10:16-17;

What containers were used for bread and fruit of the vine?

We are not given the pattern as to size, number, shape, or appearance. Plates were not even mentioned.

We conclude, therefore, that containers are incidental and are no part of the divine pattern.

We are told that the preview of the Lord's Supper took place following the Passover which was a family style meal. Exod 12:1-15; Luke 22:7; to 23;.Hence it is likely that each member had his own cup as we have at our meals and as practiced in restaurants and hospitals.

<p>Acts Commanded or Exemplified. "Make all things according to the pattern." Heb.8:5;</p>	<p>Aids Required or Permitted. "Let all things be done decently and in order." -1 1 Cor 14:40;</p>	<p>Alterations that are Forbidden" "Going onward and abiding not in the teaching of Christ." 2 John 9;</p>
<p>Go into One world Mt 28:18-20; Mk16:15-16; Lk.24:46 -49;</p>	<p>Use of means of travel such as ships, chariots, planes, etc.</p>	<p>Sent out by district committees or missionary societies, or not going at all.</p>
<p>Preach only One gospel. 1 Thess 1:3-9; Rom 1:16-17; 6:3-5, 16-17;; 1 Cor 15:1-5;</p>	<p>Use of Bibles in various languages blackboard, chart, tracts, radio, TV advertising, etc.</p>	<p>Preaching other gospels. Gal 1:8-9;</p>
<p>Baptize with One baptism Eph 4:5; Rom 6:3-5; Acts 2:38, 8:12; 8:36-40; 10:47-48; 18:8; 22:16;</p>	<p>Use of rivers, lakes, pools, warmed water, convenient garments all matters of judgement.</p>	<p>Christening infants, use of sprinkling, pouring, "trine" immersion, immersion into denomination, not for remission of sin</p>
<p>Teach the One doctrine. John 16:13; 17:20-21;</p>	<p>Use of class work, printed helps, debates, discussion, lectures, etc.</p>	<p>Doctrines of men. Mt 15:9; doctrines of demons, 1 Tim 4:1;</p>
<p>Pray in One Name Jn 16:23-24; Col 3:16, 1 Cor 14:15;</p>	<p>Choice of standing or kneeling, leader selected' or volunteering, etc.</p>	<p>In name of Mary or saints, prayer wheel or instrumental music while praying.</p>
<p>Praise with One music, Col 3:16; 1 Cor 14:15; Heb 2:12; 13:15;</p>	<p>Choice of standing or sitting, leader selected or volunteering, use of hymnals. Leader among audience</p>	<p>Instrumental music not authorized, not actually an aid to singing.</p>