IT IS WRITTEN

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT CARLSBAD, NEW MEXICO

EDITORS

COY GARRISON.....533 S. Center St., Grand Prairie, Texas
L. E. ATCHLEY.....625 Happy Valley, Carlsbad, New Mexico

FEBRUARY, 1952

THE CUP

I have been hoping that someone more able than I would write on this subject, but so far no one has done so. Cup is indeed a small word, but human beings seem to get rather confused over it. It is used both figuratively and literally in God's word. We read in Matt. 26:27, Mark 14:23, and Luke 22:17,20, where Jesus instituted the communion. Cup was something that Jesus took, something takeable; hence, literal. Now suppose we read Matt. 26:27, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, "Drink ye all of it." 28 verse, "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 scriptures prove that Jesus took the takeable, and the disciples drank the drinkable. Matt. 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 tell us 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. (Matt. 26:27 singular one volume) And he took the cup, fruit of the vine, and when he had given thanks, he gave it (singular one volume) cup, fruit of the vine to them, and they all drank of IT. (singular one volume Mark 14:23.) Suppose we notice Luke 22:17, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, take this and divide it among yourselves." It was undivided, one volume when he gave it to them.

Does the cup represent any thing in the communion? Answer, Luke 22:20, "This cup is the new testament." (Standard Revised Version says new covenant.) When Jesus said THIS, (referring to the prepared bread) is my body, Matt. 26:26, we understand it

is an emblem of his body. When he said THIS, (referring to the prepared fruit of the vine. Matt. 26:27) is my blood, we understand it is an emblem of his blood. Then 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. One might say, if cup is new testament, 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 had one. Testament is covenant; God only has one. 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, new testament, and that is what Christ had reference to. You could drink into your mind all that is in your new testament book, and it would still contain all that was ever in it, but you drink all that is in your individual new testament cup, and there is nothing left in it. Paul tells us in I Cor. 11:25,28, the cup described new testament, is the cup we drink of in the communion. The 28 verse says, "Drink of it."

We reach the blood of Christ through the one covenant. We all are, or should be jointly participating in obedience of God's covenant, hence, 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 covenant, cup. I Cor. 10:16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" Matt. 10:42, "A cup of cold water." Every one understands this to refer to a cup containing cold water. Then it is just as simple to understand 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 bless is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" 17 verse "For we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." Paul said we were all partakers of that one bread, and he paralleled it with the cup of blessing; hence, we are all partakers of that one cup of blessing. Now the 18 verse, "Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they that eat of the sacrifice, have communion with the altar?" American Revised Version.) (King James.) "Are not they that eat of the sacrifice partakers of the altar?" (Smith-Goodspeed Tr.) "Do not those who eat what is sacrificed, have fellowship at the sacrificial altar?" Paul is again paralleling with the cup of blessing, and teaches we have communion of the cup as well as the blood. Matt. 23:16, "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." 17 verse, "Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold" 18 verse, "And whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty." 19

verse, "Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?"

Jesus makes the altar and the gift of equal importance, and Paul parallels it with the cup of blessing. The gift or sacrifice was just a lamb until it was put on the altar, that sanctified, set apart. The fruit of the vine is just fruit of the vine, until it is put in the cup that sanctifies it, and when thanks is given, it then becomes the communion of the blood of Christ, I Cor. 10:16, and we can contact the emblematic blood, through the emblematic covenant.

I Cor. 10:21, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils." Now some people tell us we can't drink a literal cup, because we couldn't swallow it. 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 solid. But we can do as Paul said, I Cor. 10:21. Drink the cup 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 pure and simple. Maybe this 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 go to I Cor. 11:25,28 you will see that it was the cup described in new testament that Paul said, "Let a man drink of." Paul, when he said "drink of that cup," had just described cup identical with Luke 22:20, where Jesus said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood," that Paul said drink of.

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: just as we use a well established language, as when I ask a friend to have a cup of coffee with me, and he says, "thanks, I just got through drinking a cup." Or as my wife informed me, when I passed my cup for the second cup of coffee, "you have already drank one cup." You can see that cup is named to suggest its contents, just as we say the kettle is boiling, or my radiator is boiling. Meaning that the water in them is boiling. Suppose we put that water in several kettles, we would not say the kettle is boiling, but would say the kettles (plural) are boiling. What is in kettles is not in kettle, and what is in cups is not in cup. Fruit of the vine in cups, bottles, or bottle cannot logically be suggested by the word cup. (singular.) When we drink a bottle of pop we never 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 a cup, you wouldn't 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 it's relationship in such containers. The place where a thing originates holds to it, and can only be suggested by other containers while contained in them. For example, I am an Arkansan by birth, and will always be that, but when I moved to Oklahoma I was no longer called an Arkansawer, but an Oklahoman, because of my relationship in that particular state. When I moved to Texas I was no more Oklahoman, but a Texan, because of that particular state. So we suggest the contents by naming the thing that contains it.

There are some that think they win a victory in favor of a plurality of cups, 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; the Bible, all the books of the Bible; the cup, all the cups, etc. Poor fellows, well educated, but try to make us 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 wouldn't think that all the ants stung me, no of course not. Should I say, I took the ant to the laboratory, you wouldn't understand that I took all the ants. I took the man of God into my house, doesn't mean that 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 the Bible through.

They, by their use of the cup, would have Jesus taking all vessels known as cup, when he took the 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 the cup, to 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. Some talk of individual communion cups. Well, that will do for the funny papers. 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, must be in the Methodist, to be called by that name, etc. 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 any 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, then, people in the different denominations of the churches, are the church, **one church.** If wine is cup without being

in a cup, and you can drink it in the container of your choice, then, people are Christians without being in Christ. You can join the church of your choice. Both are governed by the same law of logic.

If the fruit of the vine can be called cup without being in a cup, then, I can be called an Oklahoman without being in Oklahoma. If not why not? Paul said, "Let a man drink of that cup," I Cor. 11:28. But what is in cups, or other containers is not in CUP, or THAT CUP.

With brotherly love, I remain yours in Christ,

W. E. Daniels, Ozone, Ark.

R. C. CLEMENTS WILL REPLY TO CLUMSY WATERS, SINCE HE HAS CLAMORED

First, I will notice his accusing me of writing the most insulting letters to brethren that he had ever read. Brother Waters, if you will come by I will show you letters from your so-called faithful that will make you ashamed, if you can be made ashamed.

Now Bro. Waters, if I make these wild accusations I know nothing about, why do you not show me up, instead of abusing me? That's not the spirit of a Christian. That's the spirit of malice, hate, envy, and of the wicked one. Now clumsy tells us he will take his gloves off to handle Clements, so I will leave mine on, because I don't want to make any more blisters than I am forced to. I think clumsy needs a little more milk, meat is too strong for clumsy, not much anyway, poor little thing. I am sure that he has overestimated himself, I'll keep my gloves on for clumsy.

Now brethren, I have just handed this to Brother Waters, so he can get a good look at himself, and see himself just as he is.

Now I will make it plain to Brother Walters, as to me not believing that Acts 20:7, 2:42 was not the Lord's supper. Sure I believe it was the Lord's supper. I believe that they had the Lord's supper there as much as any one does. But my challenge still stands to you to prove that it was the Lord's supper by Acts 20:7, or 2:42. Just either of them, and leave out other scriptures. I challenge you, Bro. Waters, to prove that Christ ever instituted such as the Lord's supper, by either of those scriptures. I challenge you, Bro. Waters, to prove that you ever ate the Lord's supper by those scriptures. You say that you all speak where the Bible speaks, and you take those scriptures for your proof on the breaking of the bread. I want you all to keep in mind that they say that they speak where the Bible speaks. That was my warning in my article I had in the *(IT IS WRITTEN)* of October issue. I challenge Bro. Waters to give the pattern of the Lord's supper from either Acts 20:7 or 2:42. He will have to go to Matt. 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; or I Cor. 11, to find the pattern. In all of them Christ brake the bread, and gave it to the disciples, and commanded them to eat. Not one time did Christ tell them to break before they ate. Oh, Bro. Waters tells us if we do that we are taking the place of

Christ. Question, Bro. Waters, are we taking the place of Christ any more than you? You say that he brake off a piece of the bread and ate it, and told them to break it, or you say, (this do) means to break. You say that is the way, the pattern, all break, all eat.

I said you wouldn't stick to your stick, I said you would not speak where the Bible speaks, and I have nothing to take back. Now Bro. Waters tells us that if Clements is intellecually honest, is not a hypocrite, he does not believe that Acts 2:42, and 20:7 alludes to the Lord's supper. Oh, yes! Bro. Waters, I do, and you know it. Certainly it alludes to the Lord's supper, but you can't get a pattern of the Lord's supper from it and you know it.

Now you tell Bedingfield, McCay, and Stringham, why don't they teach Clements a little sense. Now I know that they can do it, and if you think that you can give the pattern of the Lord's supper with those two scriptures, I can teach you, unless you are in one of two classes. One is that can't be taught, and the other the smart aleck class. It appears to me that the second class is the one you are in, if so that is where I take out.

Now Bro. Waters you remind me of the old Negro woman's first dog. It stayed under her coat tail most of the time, but once in a while it would run out and Bow wow wow, and then run back. Maybe you are liken to the little Guinter, he has two long legs on one side, and two short ones on the other. He runs round and round a little hill all the time. One way there is a little hole in the hill, and when you get after him he will run in the hole any say, queak, queak, queak, and go to sleep. Now you run around Acts 20:7, and when someone gets after you, you run in the hole and all that you can say is break bread, break bread, break bread, and go to sleep.

R .C. Clements, Box 731, Broken Bow, Okla.

THAT CHRISTIAN LOVE

Brethren, I have read the article of Brother Waters, in the November issue of *OLD PATHS ADVOCATE,* and of course you have all seen the one in this issue by Brother Clements in reply to Brother Waters.

We are striving to build a paper that is upbuilding to humanity, as well as to bring out the truths of God, but such Spirit as has been shown in these two articles surely won't help. I fail to see much Christian love shown by either of them. Why not turn right now and read the entire fourth chapter of I John? There is a very good lesson there on love. Not only our love of God, but the LOVE OF OUR BROTHER as well.

I am not trying to get out of publishing any article from the brotherhood, but on the contrary. I am more than glad to have all articles, no matter what side they are on, so long as the writer will stick to his subject, and don't try to run those down who don't

believe as they do, by using insulting, and slurring remarks. If we will only stop and reason, we can see that this doesn't help in presenting the truth to the public. Neither does it help you in the sight of the readers.

Brethren, let's have at least enough love for our brother to just present the facts as you see them, and give chapter and verse to back you up. Then let the reader judge whether someone is clumsy, intellectually honest, a hypocrite, a smart aleck, a Negro woman's dog, or the such like. Please turn with me to Gal. 6:1. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." Now let us read from II Tim. 2:16. "But shun profane and vane babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness." Now we read, beginning at the 23 verse, "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will."

Please send in all the articles you like, but let's stick to the Bible, and our subject, leaving out all slurring remarks about our opponent, thereby showing respect, and love God and our fellow men.

Brethren, I have not written this to hurt, or criticize any one, but rather that we may have, and show more love for each other, and be able to reason on the Bible in a Christian like manner. By doing this, we can surely come to an understanding on any Bible difference we may have.

With Christian love,

L. E. Atchley

CHURCH ACTIVITIES

I have just returned from Stilwell, Okla., where I conducted an eleven nights meeting. Two accepted Christ, and were baptized, and several others confessed that they were wrong in the way they had been worshipping, and returned to be with the faithful. I also challenged Brother Edwin Morris to meet me or another man in a discussion on the breaking of the bread, and it still stands that way. The church here at Broken Bow is about as usual, but if it be the Lord's will be hope to see improvements in the future.

Yours in the one faith,

Lloyd Treat, Broken Bow, Okla.

Dear Bro. Garrison:

Enclosed you will find a check to help with the paper. I can't see to read any more, but I always get someone to read it to me. I enjoy the paper very much, and I always hand out all the copies you send me. I am not doing much except handing out the paper. There is a Sunday school church in a block of me, a cups and music church in three blocks, but I cannot endorse any of them. What has become of Brother John Bedingfield? I haven't heard from him in a long time.

Your brother in Christ,

J. Y. Morgan, New Castle, Texas

Thanks a lot, Bro. Morgan, for the kind letter with the encouraging words, and also for the support of *IT IS WRITTEN*. I certainly hope you are enjoying life.—C.G.

I received a nice long letter from Brother Buckner telling of the wonderful meeting at Stilwell, Okla. Brother Buckner states that two were baptized into Christ, and ten restored to the faith. He wants to thank all the brethren for their efforts in supporting the meeting there. Brother Buckner says they had a glorious meeting for the Lord. I know they did and only hope and pray that many more such meetings be held.—L.E.A.

Dear Brother Atchley:

I am sending a little help for *IT IS WRITTEN*. My wife and I appreciate the good work you brethren are doing, and hope you can continue with it.

The paper is a medium by which we may all know where the good work is going on. We believe that one of the most important things the paper can do is to let congregations know where assistance is needed for holding meetings and establishing new congregations. It is well also that congregations stay in touch with each other that one may encourage the other.

The church here wishes to extend a welcome to all the brethren to stop and worship with us when they are in this part of the country.

Curtis Teague, Rt. 2, Nocona, Texas

May we express our thanks to the following for their support of *IT IS WRITTEN:* The churches at La Habra, Calif., Somerton, Ariz., and Elk City, Okla.; Brother R. C. Clements, Broken Bow, Okla.; Bro. J. Y. Morgan, New Castle, Tex., and Bro. Curtis Teague, Nocona, Tex.