WHAT SAITH THE LORD ?

****

CUP or CUPS?

A Review of M.S.Whitehead Atmore Alabama.

--by--

J.S.Bedingfield Box 767, Bryte, California.

FORE WORD----Being a human I make mistakes. I have been wrong in my positions, and have changed; And if I find myself wrong I can do so again. Being an old worn out cow puncher,my education is limited. My speech and writings of course are not flowery. However, I intend in this review to be as knd as posible to all and at the same time respect God's Holy word. It is always right. Still I want to deal with my brethren as ons Christian to another.

****

"MISREPRESENTATION"?

Under the above heading Bro Whitehead makes the following quote, and accuses me of misrepresenting the cups brethren,before I make the quote, I wish to say, he cut my sentence off at a ? and substituted a question mark. He further capatalized the words he wanted emphesized, which I did not do, thereby fixing it to suit his answer. Here is the quote as he quoted it:"Since they claim no scripture where they can readtheir cups and TRY TO SHOW CHRIST DID NOT EVEN USE ONE CUP"? Here is what I said and the way I said it. " Since they claim no scripture where they can read their cups and they try to show that Christ did not even use one cup, presumption or this 'liberty'which is governed by the above law is all that they have left". Anyone can see the difference in the two quotes, and anyone can see his misrepresentation of what I said.

How,to all cups brethren who admit,"He took a cup (Mat 26:27), means he really did take a cup; to you I apologise. But to those who contend,"Every place in the word of God in connection with the Lord's supper, where the word 'cup' is used is figurative speech (Metonymy) and hasn't the remotest reference to the drinking vessel".,I have no apology to make.(Above from Lemley ,page 4). If the word,"cup",does not mean a cup in any of those passages, there is not one scintilla of evidence he had one. Hence,one would have to accept hteir presumption for it. We take the Bible.

In a letter of July 26,1955,page 4,he asserts;"I made the assertion once in the A.C.R. that the one-cup hobby was born of Miss-conception,fed on incidentals, and trained to run on contradictions", This is another,not all,of his misrepresentations of us. To show it is not true and he knows it we will affirm,"The practice as it obtains in some of the churches of Christ, in which a cup (drinking vessel) is used to distributo the drink element in the Lord's supper can be read in the New Testament Scriptures." We will deny:"The practice as it obtains among some of the Churches of Christ, in which a plurality of cups (drinking vessels) are used to distributo the the drink element in the Lord's supper can be read in the New Testament Scriptures."Will he deny? Nay,Verily! It is a waste of time to use more space on such matters,as either of us could misrepresent each other many times and still tell the truth as to how many cups should be used to distributo the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.

In his review top of page 3, he has the heading,"ABSURDITY"and under this he says;"On page 13 trying to force Mat.26:27,28 to support his theory,he manhandles the command,"Drink ye all of it",to make it appear that the whole command is the antecenant of the "this" in verse 28." Note,he says I manhandled that scripture.Top of page 4, he adds these,"twists and tortures it".We will see soon how these applications fits his "absurdities".I will give Mat.26:27 a full treatment when I get to his ,"it",a little further down.

He continues to quote:"My position is that the word'this'refers to the previous command given in verse 27,"Ye all drink of it". Since'it'refers to cup and stands for 'cup', place 'cup'in 'its'' place and we have;'Ye all drink of the cup'.Placing this statement after the word 'this' in verse 28, we have; 'this'(Ye all dri of the cup) is my blood of the new Testament. To prove I am right I prove it by everyones practice. Attend a place where they use the individual cups and This (they all drink of their cups)--is exactly what they say is the blood of the new Testament.Tract, page 14.(This means my tract answering Lemley).

Then he admits;"Yes,what they drink of their cups is that they say 'represents' the blood of Christ".But most people know that that neither what they say nor what they practice proves the whole command,'Drink ye all of it', is the antecedand of the demonstrative 'this" Then as I said before , their practice admits it but with their mouths they deny it to save their cups. But brother, it shows you cant dodge the idea,that logically it is telling the real truth as you admitted above. Then he adds;" I suspect that the most ignorant among us has sense enough to know that, neither the wholecommand nor obedience to it is 'this' which 'is'(represents the blood of Christ".

But Brother, does that look more rediculous to your peculiar kind of Grammar,than to say;'Cup' in verse 27 is literal and that 'this' had 'cup' for its antecedant but refered by Metonymy to the contents of the cup? Soon I will give you a string of schollars(since you bank on them so) to prove it.

Now,note, The command denoted (stated) is "Drink ye all of the cup",,since the 'it' refers to cup. But get it,the command "drink ye all of the cup",connotes (implies) contents in the cup. Hence,it would have the command as its antecedant but logically mean the "implied" contents But get this,I am not dogmatic about my grammatical applications as I will show later. Our best Schollars differ right here. But all come out with "this" is the contents of the cup.

Beginning with paragraph 4,page 3; down to and including a few lines on page 5,he gives us quite a lesson on English and Greek. Some I agree with and some I cannot. As to "gAr""(Greek for the word "for"),the word 'for' can be used indipendant.See B.F. Sisk page 206.

Lets see how well some of his arguements stand up. Page 3,paragraph 4, Iquote;"They were to drink of the 'it',for (because) this (the 'it') is (represents his blood. the 'this'refersto, and stands for, that which they were to drink of". Shall we apply his own terms to him here? And say."He manhandled, twisted,and tortured" this scripture to try to fit his false doctrine? He certainly has missed the truth.

On page 11 he has this heading,"Looking down our own gun barrel begging him to shoot". And here is where we use his splatter mouth on him. Anyone can see from the above quotation he has made the "it",in "Drink ye all of it"(Mat.26:27) to refer to "contents", and the pronoun "this" in verse 28,referto the "it",of "Drink ye all of it".

Lets bring out "The American Composition and Rhetoric,by Donald Davidson third ed.,page 552.(this is what he calls his gun) "every pronoun must refer plainly and unmistakeably to its antecedant. There must be no confusion,no ambeguity, or vagueness of reference." Brother,did you get that? That doesn't mean as clear as mud,but plain Now,see top of page 553(same book)."Avoid vague reference." "Do not use a pronoun which refers to an implied antecedent. The antecedent must be present". That shot got him.His antecedent "con tents" is o nly here by implication And it is not there,present. Hence,you can see to use his gramatical application violates his own authority in two ways. Hence,we see applying his own masure back to him,he "manhandled,twisted, and tortured " that scripture .

"CUP",is the only word there unmistakeably that the "it",in drink all of it" could refer to according to his own witness' statement. Hence, "it", is "cup".

For fear some might think Davidson went too far and got too strong,I will now call out Mr Tanner, page 256. "REFEREICE OF PRONOUNS. A pronoun should have as its antecedenta 'particular'person,animal or thing,and this antecedent should bea DEFINITELY EXPRESSED NOUN OR PRONOUN.The reference of a pronoun to to its antecedent should in every instance be unmistakably clear".

Notice,there is no 'definitely expressed' noun or pronoun for the "it",in "drink ye all of it" to refer to but "CUP". Hence, the "it" is the "cup".But let Tanner shoot him again on page 257. "REFERENCE TO AN UNEXPRESSED ANTECEDENT.Avoid the use of a pronoun or pronominal expressions seeming to refer to an unexpressed antecedent. use the implied antecedent instead of the pronoun".Notice, if you please,his "contents" is unexpressed---implied. Hence,his application violates this rule. The word'cup', is the only expressed noun that could posibly be the antecedent of the "it" in "Drink ye all of it". Again Mr Tanner plugs him.Now,would it be in order to use his own terms? And say he "Manhandled,twisted,and tortured" that scripture? He certainly missed the mark.But Tanner isn't through with him yet;hear him. "Indefinite use of 'it' and 'they'. Except in such impersonal expressions as ,it rains,it is cold, it seems, the use of 'it' without an antecedent should be avoided". His antecedent,"contents," is not mrntioned,but "cup" is.Hence,"cup" is the antecedent of the "it" in "Drink ye all of it".Therefore, the "it" is not the fruit of the vine,but the "cup" that contained it. Tanner got him again.Remember the Brother is a critic. He then quotes from Savage (from one of my letters), and he says; "He took a cup (containing the fruit of the vine),and gave it to them,saying,Drink ye all of it (the fruit of the vine); for this (fruit of the vine) is (represents) my blood". His ,drink ye all of it(fruit of the vine),has been wrecked by his witness,Mr Davidson,when he said the antecedent must be present,and must not be implied. The "contents"(F.O.V.) is implied. In order to try to put that across,we might say in his words;"he manhandled twisted,and tortured that scripture For as sure as Mr Davidson and Mr Tanner are right he missed the truth;and he a critic.

I will again shoot him with his own gun,Mr Davidson,and perhaps Mr Tanner also. Davidson 3rd.ed. page 272."Content words posess two kinds of meanings--denotative meaning and connotative meaning--denotative meaning is the bare logical meaning and only that.------We may speak of the denotative meaning of a word as 'the core meaning' that it has when applied to the object,or class of objects, quality, idea to which it commonly and usually refers," He states that,"The denottative meaning is usually the definition in dictionary. Page 273,"The connatative meaning of a word is generallyregarded as being the meaning,or the various meanings,added to a wordby the association that it aquires from its common use, or that may be attributed to it from a figurative use". Hence,we see the denoted meaning is the stated meaning ;while the connoted meaning is the implied meaning.

Therefore,the denoted or stated menaing is, "Drink ye all of it",the cup. The connoted,implied,thought is ,there is contents in the cup.Now,note,how slick they switch the 'denoted' command. They will say,"Drink ye all of the contents",and thereby cut off half the meaning,and the 'denoted' meaning at that.Whileit really says,"drink ye all of the cup",making it manditory that the cup must be drank of. But switching the commend to the 'mplied','contents', they dodge the 'denoted'(stated) command,"Drink ye all of the cup". Thereby destroying the 'denoted',stated,part of God's command

What else could you do but use his own words to discribe this distruction of a part of God's word;except that he "Manhandled,twisted, and tortured it?

He ask to be shot with his own gun and of course I would be heartless if I failed to accomodate him.Here is another shot from Mr Tanner."EXPRESSIVENESS.Many words have two degrees or levels of meaning. One meaning consists in what the word literally says.This is called 'denotation'. In additio n the word may have aquired through long use ,an implied,or associated so that it suggests more than it specifiacily denotes.This is called'connotation'. the expressiveness of a word or phrase depends on both its denotative and its connotative meaning".

The expression,"Drink ye all of it". has both these degrees or levels of meaning. It has its "denotative" (literal or stated) meaning,which is,"Drink ye all of the cup".It also has its 'connotative' meaning,drink the contents of the cup. But one of these meanings does not obliterate the other. It is really unnecessary for all of this but these boys hide behind this stuff and you have to show them up. Everyone knows if I say; "I boughta calf and 'it' died"; that the "it" there meant the calf without any grammatical analysis.So,also, we know when we see the expression, "He took a cup------and said drink ye all of it"; that the "it" means the cup, without any grammatical analysis.So,since they go there and we have to flush them out;I will continue.

But any one can see from the above authorities if we ignored the 'denoted(command to,"Drink ye all of the cup",or ####ignored the connoted command to drink of the contents of the cup;and substituted other vessels or other element to drink, we would be disobeying the command.Containers can no more be substituted for "cup" than milk can be substituted for the fruit of the vine in the cup.

We now come to what "this" in verse 28 refers to#. As I said before I believe I am right; but since men;and college men at that differ;I am not dogmatic till I can't change.

Positions of men of note, come out with the same result asmy position does. That This (we all drink of the cup) is the blood of the new Testament. Ans also that "cup" is literal. So,if in some way we could settle this troublesome question and go hand in hand from now out, why not do it? Since I know from previous correspondance that brother Whitehead is strong Schollars; I will introduce some to show,while they disagree as to the exact antecedent of "this", the result is the same and that it means the contents of the cup. So,here are a few quoted from "The Cup of the Lord".

A.T.Robinson wrote Oct.21,1931. "My dear brother Phillips;- "in Mat. 26:27,'poterion' means a literal cup. While in vesre 28'touto' MEANS THE CONTENTS" (caps mine acident).

Professor Chas.F.Sanny, Webster Grove Mo.Wrote; 1---'poterion', in Mt.26:27 clearly signifies cup; that is indeed the meaning of the greek word. But evidently the meaning is not an empty cup, But a cup with the customary contents. 2----The pronoun 'touto', (verse 28) cannot grammatically refer to anything else than to haima mou (the blood of me). Therefore, it is correct to say that the pronoun 'this' in verse 28 refers to the contents of the cup in verse 27 as my blood verse 28".

Professor Stephen j. England wrote:"It would be very strange if if to haima (the blood) a fluid was not represented by another fluid. Hence,although touto 'this'(Mat.26:28) grammatically has as its antecedent to poterion (the cup)verse 27, it clearly refers by metonymy, to the contents of the cup. Such was the understanding of the early church."

E.E.Stringfellow writes:"IN Mat 26:28- ... 'this' is a neuter word and must refer to 'cup' another neuter word, but reference is by metonymy, to the contents of the cup, as indicated by the context."

Here is another: "Poterion(cup) is grammatically the antecedent of 'touto(this) in Mat.26:28;but logically the contents of the cup is the antecedent of". The context forbids that we regard 'this' AS REFERING TO THE CUP LITERALLY, apart from the contents of the cup".(caps. an accident). This is from Mr C.A.Savage.

Now if it will ease the brother any,I will agree with him that perhaps some of these professors are right.(Which will he choose)? I don't disagree with them since you can see, although taking different positions as to what the antecedent is; we all agree the 'this' means the CONTENTS OF THE CUP.

You will notice not one of them said,"this",refered to "it" in the expression,"Drink ye all of it". Not one of them dear friends. Any of the above positions agrees perfectly with what I claim the "this" means,yet there are at least three different positions as to what is its antecedent.

In his zeal to really show me up in a bad way,brother Whitehead made the champion mistake of them all. If either of us should desire to reverse the teaching of God's word, I do not believe we could make it any worse than he has. And here it is;on page 4,par.3, we have the following quote:"Without doing any violence to the sense,in such clauses the subject and atribute complement may be transposed,as,'this is my blood,' and My blood is this". Now,can you beat that one? Note;"This (fruit of the vine) is (represents,symbolizes) my blood". Now,transpose it and we have, "My blood is (represents,symbolizes) this (fruit of the vine)".

The very idea,of transposing this trope and and making Christ's blood represent or symbolize grape juice. You can transpose a literal clause that way,as,'This is Bill's knife';and transposed,'Bill's knife is this'. How the Brother got the idea he could deal thus with that trope is a wonder in English.

Take this one,"this (bread) is my body",Mat.26:26. Transposed we would have;"My body is this (bread)". We would have Jesus's body representing,symbolizing the bread.Would it be in order to use his own words to describe this act? I love brother Whitehead and in fact all the brotherhood.I cannot bring myself to believe as good a man as I believe brother Whitehead to be,would do such a thing knowingly.

I have contended with my cups brethren all along that when they altered a trope in any way they destroyed the figure,but it seems hard to get the idea over. But with the above example of the complete change by the Brother's alteration,some one will seex the point. I will,however,give an authority on the subject and leave it at that. Mr Blair,page 148 (near the top of the page) says;" The former,figure of words, are commonly called tropes, and consists in a word being employed to signify something that is different from its primitive and original meaning;so that if you alter the word , you destroy the figure". Even adding the "s", to cup,to make cups,you have altered the word,cup; therefore,you have destroyed the figure. Neither can you transpose the symbolic expression,"This (fruit of the vine) is (represents,signifies) my blood". For in transposing the subject "this" and the atribute compliment,"my blood"; you have "My blood is (represents,signifies) this (fruit of the vine). Anyone knows God never intended for the blood of his son to represent,symbolize the fruit of the vine. No wonder Paul made the prediction he did in 2 Tim.3:13;"BUt evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse t[illegible] DECIEV* ING AND being decieved.

We now go to page 5, first paragraph, under the heading,"ANOTHER ABSURDITY". If he were meaning his own actions and arguements he couldn't have described them better.Now,for the first quote.

"according to the one cup metonymy taught in the tract,it is impoßible 'Drink the cup of the Lord' without literally drinking (swallowing Web.) tye literal cup with the fruit of the vine in it".

Now,Now, brother Whitehead, do you really believe that? or did you need some filler and thought you would get by with it? Yes,Webster defines 'drink',to swallow a liquid;but brother Whitehead, did you ever trouble yourself to look up'swallow'in Webster? Well,here it is,brother,.Webster,def.1." To take through the gullet or esophagus ,into the stomache; To recieve into the body through the mouth and throat".

Note; To take through the gullet or esophagus into the stomache."

If that were all the meaning to'sawllow'you might have an arguement as you made it. Of course you would thereby (by your interpretation) have to by-pass your mouth, or else never be able to drink literally from anything. But wait a minute;read the rest of it;.Now, brother Whitehead,you get this and don't expose yourself in such a way anymore. Get the last half of the definition; "To recieve into the body through the mouth and throat". Any child can see by the last half of that definition,"to recieve into the body through the MOUTH and THROAT; that when the liquid gets into the mouth , the first act of the DRINKING has been accomplished. Now, that is the way I swallow, the way I have always swallowed. I haven't gotten on to the way to by-pass my mouth yet. Of course Webster knowing a lot of us was in'that shape, gave us the exact way we swallowed. Viz., To take into the body through the'mouth' and 'throat". Get it; that was not something you did 'before' you swallowed; but the very act that constituted the swallowing.

I know the rest of the readers understands that, but for brother Whitehead's benifit lets go over that step by step. Here it is: You place your mouth over the rim of the cup; You tip the cup till the liquid reaches the lips; then you draw it into the MOUTH. The first act of SWALLOWING has been accomplished. You then force it down the throat by means of fixtures in the throat made for that purpose,into the stomache; and the act of SWALLOWING has been accomplished.

And since brother Whitehead said I had better answer my own question:"Please tell me how you can get that thing out of the container,and still bear the name of the container".(My tract Lemly page 6). Well,Brother, just read the above steps and you will see how you can drink a cup without swallowing the literal cup.

In the next paragraph he says something about it being cup off from the cup when it enters the mouth.Well,Brother,according to the definition you have then made the first act of swallowing.We don't need a capsule. All we have to do is to know how to swallow.And since we know,"to take into the body through the ""MOUTH"" and ""THROAT"":;we know we don't have to by-pass our "MOUTH" to drink the cup of the Lord. You see Brother,the lips is over the rim of the cup,and before it actually leaves the cup,it is inside the MOUTH. See???

In Par.4,page 5, He asks;"How far away from the cup can you get it and still call it cup"? I have told you,and told you,the element comes within the mouth before it entirely leaves the cup.Hence,in that way you drink the cup of the Lord. Hope yoou got it that time. Did you not know Brother,your upper lip goes down into the cup? Hence, the first act of SWALLOWING is accomplished before it gets over the rim of the cup.Boy,this is sure some important stuff we are imposing on the public;but maybe they will understand a cups man has to have something.;and that is about as heavy as they have.I hope no one will think I am making fun or presuming some one is ignorant.I am only answering his arguements.

On page 5 paragraph 4,under the heading,"ANOTHER ABSURDITY" the Brother makes another ABSURD effort to prove you can drink the cup of the L rd without it being in a cup.His effort is a parallel ,"Partake of the table--"(1 Cor.10:21),with "drink the cup". This does not look like a metonymy to me.Note;" Eat of the table", But to avoid a long wrangle I shall treat it as though it were.He fails to comprehend what his own authority,Donald Davidson,,says about "denotation" and "connotation". He seems to fail to cathh the point that "the common use" helps to determine the connotation of a word.(see Davidson page 273) Quote,"The connotative meaning of a word is generally regarded as being the meaning,or various meanings, added to a word by the association that it aquires from its common use,or that may be attributed to it from a figurative use".

Since a cup (a drinking vessel) is usually associated with a drinkable element,(a liquid), to be drank; and since it is a drinking vessel;and since to drink of a cup the usual "use" is to put the lips to it and drink of its contents;then it connotes(implies) that very act. But the " common use " of a table is different.Food is placed on it; it (the food) is lifted up to the mouth and eator drank.Before eating or drinking the food is separated from the table and taken to the mouth. That is its "common use". Hence, to eat of a table connotes (implies) separating it from the table before eating. The Brother should have learned that from experiance alone. . Again he is shot with his own gun. He shouldn't look down the barrel of that gun and beg some one to shoot.

You never in your life saw one put their mouth down to their table to eat of it; but the "common use" of a cup is to put the lips to it and drink of its contents. The very idea of one taking two things whose "common use " is almost oposite and try to show by paraleling them that their "common use" is the same. Yes,he accidently put that arguement under the right heading,"another absurdity".

Now,since I have a new "star" witness, I will introduce him,to you.Meet brother M.S.Whitehead.And I quote:"At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. and those who drank from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord". Page 10 of his review). Now don't forget from the above statement that the fruit of the vine was in one cup.Hence, in 'drink the cup',the name 'cup' was applied to the fruit of the vine in that cup. But he adds more to try to twist in his cups.Hear him;"But when an assembly for the Lord's supper drinks the fruit of the vine from individual cups, each one drinks the cup of the Lord". I will have to say,Nay, Verily. Note the command in Mat.26:27;They were all commanded to drink of the cup. Mark 14:23,says,"And they all drank of it".Not ~~then~~ which you will notice in the above quotation he admitted it.

No Brother,you will have to find a Bible quotation for your cups. I am not going to let you slip them by that way. Your own statement above shows that those who drank of that cup drank the cup of the Lord. We are satisfied with what "all" agree is the cup of the Lord You brethren take it for granted and use cups. To take for granted is to presume. See Web. When he asserts when they drank from their individual cups theydrank that for which the name 'cup' was used: he is wrong. According to his above statement,they all drank of a cup.In their practice EACH ONE DRINKS OF A SEPARATE cup. In theinstitution of the supper,as he has admitted, the fruit of the vine that could be called the cup of the Lord was in a cup. Not a plurality. See the difference?? Get his quotation again;" At the institution of the Lords supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. and those who drank ~~of that cup~~ from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord". "for they drank that for which the name cup was used". And dont forget,it was fruit of the vine in one cup,he being the witness, and the bible bears witness,I also bear witness.And all who hold to the truth bears witness. Therefore,it is the agreed grounds. The grounds of unity. Grounds on which we all can stand.

And besides this we have twenty six years of apostolic practice of one cup being used and when they drank of it,it was designated as drinking of the cup of the Lord.

And here is my proof:About A.D. 59 Paul wrote the 1 corinthian letter. 1 Cor.11:23;Paul says,"For I have recieved of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed,took bread---".

First-- --We learn from this which Paul was about to relate, he had recieved it of the Lord. Second---We learn from verses 23-25 it was a recapitulation of what Jesus did when he established the Lord's supper. As I have abundantly proven ,Jesus used but one cup that memorable night. Brother Whitehead says he used one in instituting the supper.Hear him:"At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those who drank from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord".

Hence, 26 years after Jesus instituted the supper by using one cup, we see the apostle Paul saying he had delivered the same unto them. And furthermore we see the Apostle saying in drinking from it they "drank the cup"(verse 26); "Drank the cup of the Lord" (verse 27. And besides all this,brother Whitehead says;"At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. and those who drank from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord". This was the example Paul was rehersing in 1 Cor.11:23-25.

And besides this we have the command;"Be ye followers ofme even as I also am of Christ Jesus (1 Cor.11:1). And in verse 2 he tells us it is ti be ""as he delivered it "" Verses 23-25 shows he had delivered it as Jesus examplified it when he instituted it. And that night,Jesus used one cup and the drinking of it was called by Paul;"Drink the cup of the Lord" ver## 20:"Drink the cup" verse 26.

And besides a command by the Lord himself;"Drink ye all of it",Mat.26:27.The,"it", here MUST be cup as there is no other MENTION noun or pronoun for it to refer to but "cup" And the antecedent MUBT be EXPRESSED. see ,American Composition and Rhetoric page 256,257.

This is bible proof for those who will accept the truth, and should end the matter regardless as to our different ideas as to gramatical relations .

On page 6 brother Whitehead starts an arguement to show I contradict my own objections. Before I notice it I want to say that trying to show a man contradicts himself is one of brother Whitehead's long suits. If one contradicts himself ,that weakens his arguements.But it does not provee the position is wrong. If the bible teaches one cup but I take some rediculous position does not make one cup wrong. Because some try to make sprinkling and pouring baptism does not make bible baptism wrong. Just the false position is wrong. Before I begin on his arguement I will point out a contradiction in his own writings.

In a letter of July 26,1955, in discusing Mr Tanner's definition of metonymy; page 5, he made this statement;" I didn't 'know' but what you know that 'figurative' speech is the oposite of clearly suggesting. That is to 'figurative suggest' is the oposite to 'clearly suggest". And please notice this expression, "clearly suggest" was used in Tanner's definition of metonymy. In his "dissecting knife" pages 5,6 he says,Mr Webster(s dictionary says; suggestion is indirect presentation of a matter for concideration or action". Collegiate dictionary . Of the word SYMBOL ,he says,That which suggests something,also by reason of relation, association,convention etc."

"aAnd there is the meaning of suggest in this metonymy---- symbolize. So,in the metonymy, to suggest is to symbolize,and to symbolize is to suggest". You can see in his first definition he was making "suggest"(in a metonymy) mean a literal suggestion; while in the last it meant "symbolize".Or,"tis, taint".

Yes,It is literal; It is figurative. If the Brother wishes to find contradictions all he has to do is to take a look at some of his own writings.

But here is another.Brother Whitehead put a slip in a copy of a tract he had written answering brother Waters tract on the communion;and the slip read as follows;"No,'Drink' this cup,is not a metonymy. The drinking is a literal drinking. You just don't know your metonymy,maybe. Maybe when I get through with Waters' tract I will apply the dissecting knife to your contradictions".

But since he has admitted that "Drink this cup" is a metonymy;and has argued it was. hence,It is a metonymy and it isn't.

I now turn my attention to his "assertion" on page 6.Of course it is all right to make short quotations if you dont leave an impression the writer did not intend by cutting it loose from its connection. Here is what he quoted from me to make his arguement. "Abottötle by no means paralels a a cup". And here is what I said, and it says exactly what I meant." Now we come to your bottle arguement and your bottle professor.First,I want to say,A bottle by no means paralels a cup. Abottle never was defined as a drinking vessel by any dictionary.Bottles,kegs,jugs,and barrels a##/##s/ and the like are vessels of storagge as we well know. a temporary source from which we can ###go for the things stored in them. A well is a source from which we get our suply of water It does not paralel with a cup which is a drinking vessel. We do not drink of them alike. If we did the uses would be the same and we would see people with a pumping device errected over a cup and trying to use their wells as drinking vessels. It is just as foolish to paralel them in drinking as this is.

You never put your hot coffee in your cup and take your thermos bottle along to use as a drinking vessel expecting to have hot coffee for lunch. No, we know better. Then we ought to know we drink of all the vessels of storage or suply different from drinking of a cup,a drinking vessel".(quoted from my writing).

You will notice I did not deny those vessels of storage could, and were used in a metonymy.Neither did I deny they came under the head(in a metonymy) of container and contained. But the thing I meant is clearly stated in the quotation above. Neither did I say I never saw any one drink directly from a bottle etc., but I,myself , have ,and have drank from windmill lead pipes; and when starving for water, drank from a cow track;but that did not make either or all of them ""DRINKING VESSELS"".

Since we all knew the above stated facts before I mentioned them, it should be unnecessary to introduce any authorities as the above facts are as well known as a mathamatical axiom;but since the brother is looking down his own gun barrel and begging us to shoot; it would be too bad to disapoint him. So,here goes. The American Composition and Rhetoric, 3 rd.Ed. page 273."The connotative meaning of a word is the meaning,or various meanings, added to a word by the associations it aquires from its common use, or that may be attributed to it from a figurative use". Notice, First---"the meaning or various meanings added to a word by the association that it aquires from its common use------". A"common use" of a cup is a drinking vessel. As such it is associated with many drink elements. "The common use" is to put the lips to it and drink of it.Therefore to drink of a cup,"connotes"(implies) putting the l lips to it and drinking of it. That is its "common use". Not so with bottles,jugs barrels and wells.The "common use" of the vessels named above is for storage;while a well is a source from which we get a suply of water.

None of them are drinking vessels. To drink of any of them does not connote,imply, putting the lips to them and drinking of them. The "common use" of these vessels and the well is to take a portion from them and drink it; hence, that is what to drink of either of them "connotes",implies. O, Yes, You can put your lips to those vessels and drink; sure you can; but that is not theis "common use". Hence, to drink of them does not "connote",imply, putting the lips to them to drink. Sure,you could be let down in a well and drink directly from it, but that is not the "common use". Hence, to drink of a well does not "connote" putting the lips to the well to drink,While drinking of a cup does.

So, the brother ask for a rule in Rhetoric that proved it; so there it is. His own witness Mr Davidson.

To prove the importance of 'connotation'(i,plication),I Quote the following from The American Composition and Rhetoric page 275."With such posibilities open to him, the writer must realize that exactness in the choice of words depends on two conditions, his words must have the right logical meaning, or denotation,and the right associated meaning, connotation." Hence, we see we must notice the "---meaning or various meanings added to the word by the association that it aquires from its common use----". As I have previously shown.

Mr. Tanner says,page 319."EXPRESSIVENESS--.Many words have two degrees or levels of meanings. Thnemeaning consists in what the word literally says"--. Hence with "drink of the well",--and 'drink of the cup'; in both cases is what the word literally says. But hear him further;" This we call denotation". Now,hear him further;"---In addition the word may have aquired through long use, an implied, or associated,meaning, so that it suggests more than it specifically denotes"--. That is true of the two sentences given above ('drink of the well'--and 'drink of the cup'),They both have an implied,or associated ,as to how the drinking is done. With the well the "common use" has been to draw out the water with some kind of a divice ,and drink it,thereby drinking of the well. While with the cup the "common use" has been to drink directly from it by putting the mouth to it, and thereby drinking of it. Hence,to drink of a cup connoted,implies,putting the mouth to the cup and drinking of it. Mr.Tanner continues;" This we call connotation. The expressiveness of a word or a phrase depends on both its denotative and its connotative meaning". Note, from the last expression it is the same with a group of words or words.Well, there you are Brother.

In trying my vessels of storage ,he says," The camel drank the barrel". Brother, did you happen to know that a camel sticks his muzzle a lake,river,barrel or any other body of water to drink? That is the "common use" with all stock. But do you contend humans follow their practice; and that peoples "common use" of barrels,rivers, and lakes are the same as stock??You certainly presumed on our ignorance.

You will note the brother is addicted to the bottle,logically,so,I will handle his "bottle" with his attempted arguement on the "house of Israel". He quotes short passages fro m my tract .Pages 5,6; He says, I put bottle,keg etc., in the same catagory with cup,and he thinks he has found sometning. Had he read what I said he would have seen my purpose ,which was to show the rediculousness of of the idea that "every place in the word of God where 'cup(is mentioned in connection with the Lord's supper it is figure of speech (metonymy) and hasn't the remotest reference to the cup" ; as he ,Lemley and co., argue.

Here is a quotation from my tract page 5 on which he tries to make an arguement."Suppose I shoule say to brother Lemley; on the table is a cup,a bottle, a sauce pan and a jug. You drink the [illegible] the cup.What would he do? What would you do under the same circumstances? Would you not drink the cup,by drinking what was in the cup? Would any one know what vessel to drink from if the name of the vessel hadn't the remotest reference to it? Suppose I should say to him,your radiator is boiling. Does not the word,radiator, refer to his literal radiator in which the water is boiling?

Note; I was not argueing the drinking of those different vessels was performed alike; but showing that each ones name did in a sense refer to the vessel named, or you could not tell which one to drink of. See his misrepresentation? Those boys are full of such capers as that He needs something to say;he has no bible to quote to prove his"cups".So they treat us to this kind of arguement (????)

He refers quite often to what he calls my quibbling! Just who arround here is quibbling? If he can keep us off of the truth by what he terms "contradictions" etc., he has won out.This kind of arguement,tion is purely subterfuge. He is only seeking a place where he can hide, where he can cover up;but we are not going to let him. To show his abuse of authorities I quote the following from an undated letter of his written to me.page 3,par.1,2,3. He quotes from Reed and Kellogg: "----And still other things stand to each other in some other noteworthy relation than likeness or unlikeness.Things long seen or associated by us in any of these relations come at last to readily suggest each other. Figures of speech are those expressions in which,departing from our ordinary manner of speaking of things, we ASSERT or ASSUME any of these relations------". Again;" Metonymy is a figure of speech in which the name of one thing connected to another by a relation other than likeness or unlikeness is brought over and applied to tha other---.---- --That of container to the thing contained".

Now watch how he "manhandles,twists,and tortures" this authority. I quote;"Note; the relationship or connection does not have to be a real physical one; a cup does not have to be a real actual physical accompaniment or association of the fruit of the vine at the time the metonymy is used to designate the fruit of the vine by 'cup" And at the close of the paragraph he says;"we ASSUME that relationship by designating the fruit of the vine as ' cup". You will note here what he is ASSUMING. We will now let Mr Kellogg answer for himself.

Bottom page 112,Kellogg's Rhetoric" A COMPAR* ISON or SIMILE,is a figure of speech in which the likeness is pointed out or 'asserted' between things in other respect unlike".

For example,in the simile " Jim is LIKE a lion",the likeness is ASSERTED by the word,LIKE. Hence the way brother Whitehead ASSERTS relationship is wrong.

But we ask Mr Kellogg what do you mean by ASSERT or ASSUME a relationship? And here is his answer Kellogg's Rhetoric page 115."In the Comparison,the relation or likeness between things is, as you have seen,pointed out or asserted. But this relation may be ASSUMED! But what do you mean by ,"This relation may be ASSUMED"? Get his answer: "It being taken for granted that the reader or hearer sees the point of resemblance ,the words LIKE, AS, JUST AS, and SO, may be ommited , and the word or words which denotes one of the things may be brought over and applied to the other. This ASSUMPTION may be of different degrees".

You will notice from the above the taking for granted and ASSUMPTION, was that "the reader or hearer sees the point of resemblance--",and not as he tries to do, ASSUME the relation between a cup and the fruit of the vine, when it did not exist. But in this ASSUMPTION you merely left out the words of comparison, LIKE, LIKE AS, AS, and SO, While his contention was you did not have to have a physical relationship between the cup and the fruit of the vine;you ASSUMED it. But Mr Kellogg exposes him by showing the ASSUMPTION is "That the reader or hearer sees the point of resemblance" And you did that by leaving out the words of comparison, LIKE, AS, LIKE AS, and SO,. I illustrated this; "Jim is LIKE a bear". Here the relation is ASSERTED by the word, LIKE. But in "Jim is a lion"; the relation is ASSUMED by leaving out the word of comparison,LIKE..
As Mr Kellogg says,I ASSUMED the reader or hearer sees the point of resemblance"

Just to finish the job I will shoot him with his own gun,The American Composition and Rhetoric,page 291."Metaphor is immediate and often intense, in its comparison, while simile is deliberate, illustrative. In the metaphor the comparison is implied. The likeness between the two objects is 'assumed' to be so apparant that they are identified".

Note,what is ASSUMED is the likeness between the two objects is so apparant they are identified"; and NOT one of the objects may be absent and its relation with the one that is present ""ASSUMED"" as he has tried to put over He makes the same arguement in a letter of Oct. 26,1955. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. If the Brother wishes to find ""BUSTS"", all he has to do is to look over his own trail. He should say,'quibble',to some one. ""QUIBBLE"" is all they have;they know as well as any one else does they cannot even attempt to "read" CUPS.

On page seven he continues his "QUIBBLE" about "the bottle" as though I denied,"Beware of the bottoe",was a metonymy and as though I contended it did not mean strong drink. I have argued all along such expressions were "worn out METONYMIES" and had partially or all togather lost their figurativeness. This I will treat throughly later. Bottom of page seven he quotes from the American College Dictionary," the bottle for strong drink".Well, I showed long ago Webster said the same. It means that regardless as to to vessel it is "associated" with. "A faded METONYMY". Page 8 he continues as though I denied it.Brother, that is all just as I have tried to show you all along; but because those are "faded metonymies" does not make,"drink the cup",a faded metonymy nor paralel with a "faded metonymy".

On page 8,under the heading,"The cup of the Lord,what is it"? He tries another "manhandling,twisting,torturing" of my answer to the question. I stated "the cup of the Lord" was a literal cup. Every authority shows 'the object to be be brought to mind is not named,but the name of something else is used'. Hence,,"the cup of the Lord",is the name of that something else,"the cup". But in the expression, a METONYMY,if you please,"Drink the cup of the Lord",--means--"i.e. what is in the cup",just as Thayer says on page 510.

He says,"Show the "is" is both literal and figurative" I don't need to for ## it is not. But fruit of the vine is a literal substance; Christ's blood is a literal substance; nevertheless, the fruit of the vine is used figuratively to represent,symbolize, Ghrist's blood. (See Mat. 26:28)

Top of page 9,he quotes a question ask a professor,and note exactly what is said;"In the metonymy, 'drink the cup', is the cup refered to or the contents only? The answer was the "contents". I have argued all along that the metonymy,"drink the cup",meant exactly what Mr Thayer said;"i.e. what is in the cup",page 510. And the word,"cup",named the container to suggest the contents.(see Williams page 220.) Par.3,he tries another,"manhandling,twisting,torturing",, saying, I make the figure turn on the liberal verb,'drink'. Now, Brother, In "Drink the cup"(1 cor 11:26); are you contending that anywhere you see the expression,"the cup", it is a metonymy?? HEH,HUH?? Your attempted arguement forces you to it. "D#%" "The cup", being a metonymy here depends on its association with the literal verb,"drink". Since we cannot literally drink a literal cup;we know that the word "cup" is the container put for what is in the cup.

He quotes from Donald L. Clark as saying;"The 'cup of the Lord' stands for the wine which the communicants drink in memory of him." And when did I deny it??? Note,the words,STANDS FOR;yes, it STANDS for the wine;but it names the vessel 'cup) to suggest the wine in the cup.

At the bottom of page 9, under "More Metonymy", he quotes from another professor showing, "accompaniment, association,contiguity, relation,and aspect, were words used to show the various relations of different metonymies by the Rhetoricians to express the general thought. the authority he quoted was Mr Knapp Malone.And thats just fine;but remember the 'manner' of accompaniment,association, relation,and aspect,are different,as the relations differ. For example the relation in,"Drink the cup",is based on "container and the contained"; while I read Shakespear is based on the relation of 'cause and effect',or as some put it,'author and his works'. Lockwood and Emerson puts it under the first heading;while Williams puts it uner the second heading.

If a thing is the CAUSE of a certain EFFECT; it is the cause whether in literal contact or not. It is an accompaniment,association, relation, or aspect as the CAUSE of that particular EFFECT; as "I read Shakespear". While in the case under concideration;the container,the cup, is a real literal thing that contains contents; and the grape juice is a real literal liquid that is handled by being in a vessel of some kind. Hence, as an accompaniment,association, relation,or aspect,as "container and contained", The cup is real and literal to the fruit of the vine.

I tell you your radiator is boiling;that means "the water in your radiator is boiling". But we draw the water out of the radiator and put it in a pot , and boil the water in it; we would not say "your radiator is boiling"; but "your pot is boiling". But anywhere you find Shakespear's works ,he is the author of it;he is the CAUSE,it is the EFFECT.

He tries to make us believe because millions of books, copies of Shakespear's works has been written; that to read Shakespear, and he be an accompaniment(according to my position on the cup, Shakespear would have to be there personally. And,Brother he does 'accompany it' as the author and it his works;as the CAUSE and it the EFFECT.You cannot separate a CAUSE from its effect;but to separate a liquid from its container all you have to do is to empty it out. Surely,you can see that. If the Brother would only read his books he would learn that Shakespear is an 'accompaniment; is related','is an aspect, to the literature he produced as the CAUSE and it the EFFECT. Yes,He is the AUTHOR of all he produced,his WORKS,regardless as to where he is or where it is.But a cup does not qcupy the position of the container to something contained if the thing is not in the cup. It is peculiar good men as I believe brother Whitehead to be, will make such childish,illogical efforts to prove a false position.

But in order to read Shakespear,you must read the literature of which he is the "CAUSE", the "AUTHOR": and it is the "EFFECT", his "WORKS". So,also to "Drink the cup" you must drink something of which it is the container,and it the contents. You can no more "drink the cup" by drinking of cups or other vessels, than you can read Shakespear by reading Longfellow's works.

Par.2,3;page 11; brother Whitehead quotes from Richbourg g. Williams as follows:"Basing my opinion on language,and figurative language at that, I should say, that I can see no cause to force the wine of the Lord's supper into one cup ----. Use a plurality of cups for the service of the wine in the Lord's supper, and you still have the cup of the Lord".

And I wonder if brother Whitehead should ask a number of sectarian schollars; "since Jesus promised eternal life to thosewho believe in Christ (Jno.3:16); is baptism necessary to obtain that eternal life?" I believe he would get a flat NO for an answer a great many times. Will the Brother,agree to preach it if I get him some schollars who will say baptism is not necessary to obtaining that "Eternal life"? If not,why not? it is only another f alse doctrine like the one he is trying to put over. They will read ,eternal life predicated on belief many times before he finds ""CUPS"" even one time. Or even a hint of it.

If I ask,"Is it essential to partake of the Lord's supper each first day of the week"? I am sure a lot of present day schollars would give a ,""NO"", answer off the reel. Will he swallow the bait as he wishes us to swallow the one he is putting out?

I am sure I could get him some schollars that would say a child of God could not so far apostasize as to finally be lost.Will he accept it for the truth if I will get him the answers?? Just keep in mind when I get through with this 'weighty' stuff I will show some who contradict it.

Brother Whitehead, provided those schollars should say they were basing their answers on either literal or figurative language;yes, in some cases both ;will you swallow the bait as you wish us to do? If they are to be accepted on one point of doctrine,why not on all points? Brother, your questions and their answers are a far cry from defining words and figures.

Par.4,same page, he quotes a similar quotation from Professor Knapp Malone. Tere is nothing to be gained,but fill up space,in quoting it;but will say the above applies to it also.

Webster gives sprinkling or pouring water on a person as ways to baptize other than immersion.Will you accept ot as valid?? He is a schollar and a good one.You might get a job circuit riding,and you might make a good one; who knows? No,Brother,you wont accept such,and why? You know as I do the Bible is always right. When a schollars definition or opinion on a point differs from the Bible: we know that schollar is wrong and not God's holy word.

That is the reason I will not swallow your schollars "opinion" on these language differences; they contradict the bible. The Bible says,"Burried with him in baptism"---,our dictionaries says by their definitions it can be performed either by sprinkling, pouring,or immersion. They contradict God,hence,I take what God says and turn them down

Brother Whitehead says,"At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those who drank it from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord". The bible says the same.What more do I need? My star witness,Bro. Whitehead and the Bible Realizing the Bible is always right,when some ones idea of a grammatical relation contradicts a plain statement in the Bible,that grammatical relation is wrong.

On pages 15,16,under the heading "expert Testamony", Brother Whitehead asks mr A.E.Knoch the following questions: 2----"The Apostle Paul having already used the metonymy,'Drink the cup of the Lord'(1 Cor.11:27) to refer to the wine of the Lord's table, is there anything in the rules governing metonymy that makes it necessary that the wine be in only one literal cup each time the institution is observed to call it the cup of the Lord". 3---"If the wine of the Lord's table is in one container ,which by metonymy is refered to as the cup of the Lord,and is poured from that container to other containers to be distributed to the assembly, can it be correctly refered to as the cup of the Lord after having poured it into them".

Here is Mr Knoch's answer to question ---2." Not necessarily, but preferably".

In a general statement Mr Knoch said:" The form or method is not essential, so long as the spirit is observed. If for instance the company is too large that one cup would be too large,or,in these days when some object on sanitary grounds,yet the emblems are there, it may be best not to press the literality of the figure. Personally,I prefer to do so."

Brother Whitehead tries to get quiet a bit of consolation out of Mr Knoch's answer;but his consolation is slim.Note, in answering question--2, he says,"Not necessarily but preferably". He seems to think there is a way arround it yet,he for some well founded reason,prefered the one.

Note;he said in his general statement,"The form or method is essential, as long as the spirit is observed". With this I heartily disagree, and brother Whitehead wont take it as a general law to apply on all subjects.

Paul told the Roman brethren,"But God be thanked,that ye were the servants of sin,but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness"". (Rom.6:17,18.). You will note here ,Paul said it was a FORM OF DOCTRINE-- that had made them free from sin--. So, we can see ""FORM"" sure did count here. Yes, and Brother, it does in the Lord's supper too.

2 Tim.1:13; Paul tells Timothy th "hold fast the form of sound words----". You will note, it is a ""FORM"" off sound words,Timothy was to hold fast. Sure,Brother,it sure does count when it comes to the ""FORM"" of sound words--- One cup is what Jesus used in instituting the supper,brother Whitehead being the witness, and he said when they drank the fruit of the vine from that cup 'they drank the cup of the Lord". So,then, one cup is a thing to hold fast too.

But he continues,"But if for instance the company is so large the cup would be too large, or in these days when some object on sanitary grounds----". Note; "company be too large that the cup would be too large---" O,Yes, change God's law to fit our conditions instead of changing our conditions to fit God's law. Some reason. On the same hypothesis if we were away from water and a man wanted to be baptized, and he might die before we reached water; we could change God's law to fit our condition and sprinkle him from the jug. You know a schollar,yes lots of them, says sprinkling is one way to baptize. You don't believe it? Look up 'baptize' in any good dictionary. If we can change God's law in the case of the Lord's supper in regard to the cup why not the ""FORM"" of doctrine(baptism); the obedience to which we are made free from sin,(Rom.6:17,18). Remember his witness said ""FORM"" or ""METHOD"" was not necessary.

O,Yes, that "SANITATION". I know a lot of people who think of SANITATION and a lot of little bugs when they drink in the Lord'S supper,but I did not know it was a "REASON" for changing God's law to fit those peoples desire to 'drink' to sanitation or a lot of little bugs instead of memory of the Lord.Will you please excuse me when I tell you I still do not believe it?? Last,but not by any means least,he says;"---it may be best not to press the literality of the figure. Personally, Iprefer to do so ".

What is,""LITERALITY OF A FIGURE""? Mr Webster says of "literality"--" state or quality of being literal; also, a literal meaning or interpretation". Then the literality of a figure would be the literal meaning of it. And he said he prefered to do so. Hence, he knew to drink the contents of a cup was to drink the cup of the Lord.(in the Lord's supper,of course). Just as brother Whitehead says;"IAt the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those that drank from it 'drank the cup of the Lord". Now,isn't that nice we found both those boys witnessing for us.

He quotes William d.Templeton of the University of southern California,as follows:" It is my opinion the figurative language to which you refer in the New Testament does not make it necessary that only one cup be used whenever the sacrament of the Lord's supper is celabrated. Also it seems clear to me that the wine of the Lord's supper can properly be called 'the cup of the Lord' regardless as to the number of containers used for it in the distribution of the sacrament".

You will note, it seems clear---my opinion---- sacrament----containers for cup. All of these are marks of identity of a false theory.

Every one knows that meanings of words and usages of language changes with the use and meanings the best writers and speakers put on it. And everyone knows that the prepondrance of schollaeship is with sectarian doctrines and practices that teach against Bible doctrine.

So,wil it be on the cup question; usages and meanings will change to fit popular theories of the day; and we can see the pendelum swinging from the truth. And so will it be till Paul's utterances in 2 Tim.3:13 and Amos prophecy of Amos 8:11,12,are literally fulfilled It has happened with baptism and can happen with this question we are discussing. Everyone knows the majority is usually with error as far as the bible is concerned, and here is a question that is not different. I will now introduce some authorities to show how the pendelum is swinging away from the truth as far as the Bible and logic is concerned. Here is a copy of a letter I wrote to the University of Southern California and the answer i recieved.

Bryte Calif.,Oct. 3,1955. Head of the English Department of the University of Southern Calif; Los Angeles California. Dear Sirs;- I would very much appreciate it if you would give me the answers to the following questions:

1----In the metonymies,'The kettle boils', and 'Drink this cup'; does the same law of container and contained apply to both? 2-----If there were two kettles with water in them boiling; would you say the 'kettle boils', or the 'kettles boils; if you wished to bring both to notice? 3---If the same law of container and contained does not apply to both the metonymies above;would please state the difference? J.S.B."

And here is the answer. This letter was written on,Southern California letter head. And you will note it crosses the above authorities.

"University of Southern California 1518 University Avenue Los Angeles 7 . November 8,1955.Mr.J.S.Bedingfield,box 767,Bryte California.Dear Mr Bedingfield; the metonymies that you have named --'The kettle boils',and 'drink this cup(----are similar,since 'ket TLE' and cup are substituted for the thing contained in each.The ordinary rules concerning plurals apply to these forms, and it would be necessary to to say of two kettles,'the kettles boil', not 'the kettles boils'. Similarily one would say ,' both kettles are boiling'' I hope,that this explaination answers your questions satisfactorially.Your's sincerely,Julia Norton McCorkle Committee on Information Department of English."

The above letter is clearcut and concise.Notice; 1---'Kettle' and 'Cup' are substituted for the thing contained in each".Hence,that would not be out of each. Hence we see the thing must be in the kettle or cup as the case might be to bear the name of the one named,cup or kettle. It is also made plain as the noon day sun that the common rules of plurals apply to each of them. And exemplified by saying if it were in two kettles boiling ,we would say the kettles boil". So,also,for the fruit of the vine to be in two or more cups,we would say "Drink the cups" , and not "drink the cup",as they contend. Hence,if it were the Lord's fruit of the vine in two or more cups,it would be) 'the cups of the Lord,not 'cup of the Lord'. However, I do not believe a departure from the Lord's exampoe,it would be the Lord's.

You will notice in asking my questions nothing is used that that would cause the one who answered to think it was a religious question; and thereby arrouse their own 'ideas' of the thing regardless as to the true meaning. I think the Brother made a mistake in useing the questions as Bible questions. Although he ask for it not to be colored by Theological ideas;yet th y enter in. however in some cases it is imposible to do otherwise.But not so here.

So we see here are two letters from the University of southern California that contradict one another. What is wrong? I believe the one I recieved was written to show the true answers as used.

While the one to brother Whitehead (not questioning his honest intent) could see the Lord's supper as it is commonly practiced by religious men, and the vast majority at that, permitted himself to be swayed. You can usually get tghe answer you want provided you frame your question accordingly.

--------METONYMY-------

I wish now to take up some of our Rhetoric books that are concidered as authority and show how some of the Brother's schollars have drifted from the true idea of metonymy. I do not wish any one to think I am smart;I am not. As the Brother has said;those schollars knows higher English better than I do my A,B,C's. And I might add;he also would be in the A.B.C. class. But remember this we do not take all that schollars tells us as to their idea of a religiOus nature. And why? We know they are men as we are and will permit their decisions to be colored by their religious ideas. If anyone denies this I can get him some rather bitter pills to take.

Welch's Composition,page 71."Metonymy is the substitution of one name for another when the relation between the objects is not mere resemblence". "It put the container for the thing contained--'drink the cup".

It is positively stated the 'name is substitutes for another'; not a literal change. Hence, the name,'cup',is only 'substituted';when the 'relation' of container and contained exists. Otherwise the word,'relation' would be superfulious. Note, It puts the container for the thing contained;does not sound like it could be in any number of any kind of vessels. Nay,Verily, Just left alone anyone can understand that language, it takes a smart man to help misunderstand it.

Notice he says there must be a relation,and names one,'container and the thing contained'. Ask youself the simple question; 'Does the relation exist if the contained is not in the container, in this case a 'cup'? Brother, you know it does not. There is the rule; who is violating it?

Hills Rhetoric,page 86,says;A METONYMY (from the greek,meta, indicating a change, and onyma,name) is a designation of an cbject by one of its accompaniments". If you accompany one some place, you certainly must have been right along ,would you not? Then to call fruit of the vine "cup", it must be a real accompaniment,must it not? Most certainly it must. In my younger days when I accompanied a lady to a place, I went along did you not also?? There is the rule ,I will take care of the 'exceptions' later.

Herrick and Damon says;"----A similar substitution occurs when an accompaniment is taken for the thing it accompanies,as cause for effect,sign for the thing signified, etc., This trope is called a metonymy".

Note, an ACCOMPANIMENT is is taken for the thing it ACCOMPANIES---. In this case "the cup"(the ACCOMPANIMENT) is taken for the thing it ACCOMPANIES, the fruit of the vine. Had young Ladies only allowed the Brother to accompany them as he wants the cup to accompany the fruit of the vine,he never would have gone with his wife. Could you say "CUP" ACCOMPANIES the fruit of the vine if it were not there?could it be the container without containing the contents???

Lockwood and Emerson,page 438,says;"Metonymy means a change of name. The thing spoken of and the thing meant may be wholly unlike but the relation between them is such that the mention of one suggests the other." And he gives as an example,the 'Container for the contained';-----' The kettle boils(meaning the water in the kettle)." You see,showing the relationship,'container and the thing contained',he gives the example:"The kettle boils"and adds the explaination,""meaning the water in the kettle"". Therefore, we see the water must be in the kettle to say,the kettle boils. So, also, the fruit of the vine must be in 'a cup' to be able to say, "Drink the cup" If that isn't plain;will some one say it plain? That is the rule.Of course there are exceptions to come later.

Mr.Kellogg,page 127 says;"Metonymy is a figure of speech in which the name of one thing connected to the other by some bond not of likeness or unlikeness is taken to denote the other.---4-- as the CONTAINER and the thing CONTAINED".

Notice, he says, "---One thing is connected to another by some bond----"; then he names one of the 'bonds(,CONTAINER and the thing CONTAINED. Hence, the bond must exist to use the 'container' for the thing 'contained',that is, the 'cup' must contained the 'contained',the fruit of the vine.

Mr. Blair, page 157,says"To tropes founded on these several relations, cause and effect, container and contained, sygn for the thing signified.is given the name of metonymy". He then gives the following latin phrase;"Ille impiger hausit spumantum pateram et plano se proluit auro". Then he adds:" Where everyone sees that the cup and the gold is put for the liquor contained in the golden cup".

Can you say any plainer that the liquor was in the golden cup?? And mind you, that was the 'relation',CONTAINER and THE CONTAINED mentioned above; and he specifically states the liquor was in the golden cup. Then, to 'drink the cup', the fruit of the vine must be in the cup. Does that sound like some of the professors quoted by the Brother? I will attend to the 'exceptions' later on; there is the rule.

Mr Tanner---page 324,says;"Metonymy is a figure of speech in which the name of one object is used for that of another which it clearly suggests". Note, he says clearly suggests". To <u>suggest</u> is to 'symbolize'. Therefore,the one object which its name is used must 'clearly symbolize" the object for which it was used. You can't alter a symbolic word without destroying the figure.(see Blair page 148). If you add an "s", to "cup", and make it "cups";you have altered the ,word cup; therefore,you have destroyed the figure. Besides he gives an interesting example which seals the issue. And it is:" The kettle boils(that is the water in the kettle boils)". Notice he exp;ains the expression, "The kettle boils",by adding the explainatory phrase," that is the water in the kettle boils". Hence,it sure has to be in the kettle. Therefore,to 'drink the cup',in the Lord's supper, the fruit of the vine must be in the cup.

Mr Williams,page 220,says;"Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind,not by naming it,but by nnaming something else that readily suggest it". Notice,the object brought to the mind (fhe fruit of the vine) is not named, but something else(the cup) is named that readily suggests it. Hence, the word,cup,is not the name of the fruit of the vine; but the name of something else (the cup) that readily suggests it.

Webster,says;"symbol---That which suggest something else by reason of relation,association, convention, etc.;) So,we see since "the cup" suggests the fruit of the vine; it "symbolizes" it. Therefore, the word ,"cup",cannot be altered without destroying the figure. Mr. Blair says on page 148;"The former,that is figure of words, are commonly called tropes, and consists in a word being employed to signify something that is different from its original and primative meaning; so,that if you alter the word,you destroy the figure".

We learn from mr. Blair and mr. Webster, that the expression,"drink the cup" ; "the cup" symbolizes the fruit of the vine; and as Mr. Blair says,if you alter the word you destroy the figure" When you add the ,"S", to the word,'cup',to make it "cups". have ALTERED the word CUP, therefore,you have destroyed the figure the Lord used to designate othe fruit of the vine that was in the cup by saying,"Drink the cup". How would anyone dare to tamper with God's Holy word? Back to page 11 of his review to shoot him withhis own gun. The American Composition and Rhetoric,3 rd. ed.Page 295, Says;"Synecdoche and metonymy are forms of indirect statement in which a part of an object or some important association connected with the object is used to symbolize the object itself".

Note 'the cup' is an important 'association' connected with the fruit of the vine; "the object itself",in that it contains it. And the cup is used to symbolize "the object itself",(the fruit of te vine), in the statement,"Drink the cup". We say the 'cup is the fruit of the vine', not literally but 'symbolically'.
In "Drink the cup",'the cup'--is--(symbolizes) the fruit of the vine.
Mat.26:26;--"this"(bread)-----is--(symbolizes) my body".
Mat.26:27;--"this"(F.O.V.)-- is--(symbolizes) my blood--".

If we have a right to "alter" the word,'cup',and make it 'cups' to symbolize the fruit of the vine: we can "alter" the word,'bread', and make it 'beefsteak' to symbolize Christ's body: and we also can "alter" the expression'fruit of the vine' and make it 'milk' to symbolize Christ's blood. God is the author of all three symbols.Yoou have no right to tamper with either of them. As Mr Blair says,if you alter the word you destroy the figure.(Blair page 148).

Here is his definition of Metonymy(The Amer.Comp. and Rhet). "Metonymy (from the greek words META OiNYMA,meaning change of name) substitutes some quality or aspect of the object for the object itself".

In the expression,"Drink the cup", 'cup' is an 'aspect' of the 'object itself' (the fruit of the vine) it contains. The Brother defines,'aspect',as, appearence to the eye or mind. All right. When we say,"Drink the cup", the 'appearance' of a cup containing the fruit of the vine enters the mind;but when we go to obey the command the appearance is literally to the eye,to locate it and grasp with the hands and drink. His own gun backfires on him and shoots him too.

But cups brethren claim the cup is not remotely refered to. Mr Hill,page 86,speaks of them as "two objects of thought". Hence , 'the cup' must in some way be refered to in the expression,"Drink the cup".

Mr.Blair says,on page 154;"In the third place,figures give us the pleasure of enjoying two objects presented togather to our view without confusion; the principle idea,which is the subject of the discourse, along with its accessory which gives it its figurative dress". And we see Mr Blair had a sneaking idea that the cup also was under concideration Same page,Blair quoting from Aristotle says,"We see one thing in another".

The name ,'cup,' is only borrowed in the metonymy,"Drink the cup". Blair,page 152,says;" But still for reasons before given,,borrowed words, or as Rhetoricians call them,tropes, must continue to ocupy a conciderable place".

Yes,and bless your soul, the cup,is even EMPHESIZED. Herrick and Damon,page 494,says;" The distinction between synecdoche and metonymy,still lingers in some school rooms;but it is obviously of no practical value, for the force of tropes belonging to either class lies in the fact that they single out a quality ofthe object, or a circumstance connected with it,and fix the attention on that. The quality or circumstance thus emphesized ,should,of course be the real center of interest". You will notice the 'circumstance',the cup containing the fruit of the vine, is emphesized . How?It is named to suggest,"symbolize",the fruit of the vine.Hence, the word cup not only names the cup,but it stands for the fruitof the vine it contains.to symbolically express it.

It seems cruel to shoot him with his own gun but he said to do it;so,here goes

The American Composition and Rhetoric,page 295,says:" Generally metonymy differs from synecdoche in emphesizing symbolically some larg significant aspect of an object". Bad business,Brother,to have your own gun backfire and shoot you too. The 'cup' is a large significent aspect,of the fruit of the vine.Therefore according to his own witness ,Davidson, the 'cup' is symbolically ""EMPHESIZED"".

Alfred M.Hitchcock ,page 349,says;"It is a useful figure in that it often 'focuses attention on some 'one detail',of a picture intensefying the impression.To say the General advanced with a force of bayonets conveys a more vivid picture that to say he advanced with a force of soldiers".

Notice the attention is focused on one detail,"bayonets",which were there,"period",which included the whole army.Therefore,we see the attention is focused on the cup,by naming it and symbolically 'emphesizing it to suggest the fruit of the vine.

Tropes do not always turn from their literal meaning to symbolize something else to the same degree; and taking advantage of this and trying to paralel a trope of less "degree" with one of "greater" degree is one of the holes these boys try to hide their "cups" in.

Herrick and Damon,page 493,says;"A figure of speech or trope is a word or a phrase turned in a greater or less degree from its original or literal meaning". Hence we see some are 'turned' in a 'greater' and some in a 'less' degree. Blair,page 156,says;" These relations,some more,and some less,intimate, may all give rise to tropes". Therefore,we can see the practice of picking out tropes that are turned on a less degree;and paraleling them with tropes that are turned on a greater degree is a falacy of logic they indulg in.

To show exactly what lexacographers say about the metonymies,"Drink the cup",and "drink the cup of the Lord",in connection with the Lord's supper Iquote thefollowing authorities: J.H.Thayer page 533 " by meton. of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup,what is offered to be drunk",(Luke 22:20). J.H.Thayer, page 510," i.e. what is in the cup", 1 cor 10:21; 11:27. Harper,page 325," meton. the contents of a cup,liquor in a cup,Luke 22:20; 1 Cor.10:16. Green,page 153, says;"meton. the contents of a cup,liquor in a cup",Lk.22:2o; 1 COR. 10:16." There is not a hint of a hint that the liquor,fruit of the vine,in the above quotations could be otherwise than in a "CUP".

Brother Whitehead says;"At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those who drankfrom it 'drank the cup of the Lord". So, that should settle the matter. In answering my arguement made on FADED METONYMIES, based on Blair pages 152,153,he missed my point. Maybe I was not definite enough;if so, I will try to make it plain this time.

-------FADED METONYMIES-----.

First, I want to say that the word,metaphor,is used in the extended sense to include all figures.The American Composition and Rhetoric,page 289,says;"In modern literary criticism there is a tendancy to make ,metaphor, a broad,inclusive term,applicably to figurative language and constructions in general". See also first paragraph under 'figures of speech',page 288,same author. See also Blair bottom page 158. also page 156. Since figures of speech or different degrees or intimacy where they differ THEY DO NOT PARALEL.

"These relations some more and some less intimacy,may all give rise to tropes,"Blair p.156.See Kellogg's Rhet.page 115.

Even from this standpoint we can see the falacy of trying to paralel'Kellogg's,'beware of the bottle",and "the house of Israel",and "the house of Jacob";which included every Jew whether he ever lived in a house or not with ,"Drink the cup" in the Lord's supper which according to brother Whitehead was in a cup.Hear him, "At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup.And those who drank from that cup'drank the cup of the Lord". That alone takes care of all his "quibbles". All authorities agree such expressions as "Beware of the bottle",means intoxicating liquor whereever you find it.

Paul commanded the Corinthians to follow him,1 cor 11:1; and verse 23 shows of the Lord what he had exemplified 26 years before,(see verses 23-25); and in verse 26 Paul refers to it as "the cup"; in verse 27 he refers to it as,"the cup of the Lord".Never in any place do we have the fruit of the vine in a plurality of cups as "the cup of the Lord". Hence,we can see one cup containing the fruit of the vine is all that is ever refered to in the new Testament,as "the cup of the Lord". Aclose degree of intimacy,while"beware of the bottle",there is scarcly if any relation to a literal bottle. AFADED METONYMY."The house of Israel" and "the house of Jacob";does not necesitate any degree of intamacy with a literal house to include all Jews, FADED???

Hence,his paralels cannot be paraleled with "the cup of the Lord", which every time we have Bible reference to it,we see a very close degree of imtimacy between one cup and the fruit of the vine. So close the cup always contained the fruit of the vine. This alone kills his attempt to paralel,"beware of the bottle","the house of Israel","The house of Jacob",with "the cup of the Lord". Now,to &faded metonymies'--.Mr.Hill says;"The way language grows is that of figurative expression.All mental operations are expressed figuratively, that is, through material forms and processes related to them in some way.-------Most of the words used to express mental action are 'fossil metaphors"The American Composition and Rhetoric,pag92,says; "The language is full of metaphorical expressions that have lost their meaning as metaphors as the sense of imagined comparison has 'FADED OUT".(Emp. mine.J.S.B.)

Kellogg's Rhetoric(printed 1882), Page 115,says;"In almost every sentence that that drops from pen or tongue,there are words whos metaphorical significense has so 'faded out of them we fail to detect it".

Notice,Brother,we can hardly write or speak a sentence without useing one of these "faded metaphors". That should remove all doubt that "faded metaphors" are numerous in our language,and not just a few as some of those boys would have us believe.

Blair,page 152,153,says;"In every language,too,thereare a multitude of words,which, though they were figurative in theirapplication to certain objects-- --".Now,take the word,'piercing',when applied to sword,or spear, it is purely literal. 'piercing sword', 'piercing spear',expresses a literal act. While "piercing judgment", once was figurative. At that time the word,'piercing',was "turned" from its literal meaning to express a quality or operation of the mind; but has 'faded' as we shall see by reading further. Hear him, "----yet by long use, lose their figurative power wholly and come to be concidered simple and literal expressions. In this case,are the terms I refered to before, as transfered from sensible qualities (qualities observed by one or more of the senses.J.S.B.) to operations or qualities of the mind, as,'a piercing' judgment"---. And thus,we see the word,'piercing',having once been 'turned' away fron its original and literal meaning to express a quality or operation of the mind,figuratively,has so faded out to become a literal meaning. (See bottom page 156,same Author).

But at the top of page 153 we have a "fading" of less degree with we have to deal with in dealing with figures. Hear him;"There are other words which remain in a sort of a middle state; which have neither lost wholly their figurative application; nor yet retain so much of it as to imprint any remarkable charectar of figured language or style-----". Here we have another condition. Take for example,"Beware of the bottle",which means beware of intoxicating liquors. Originally,did that expression mean,'beware of intoxicating liquors' without being in a bottle? Or did it mean beware of that which was contained in a bottle? And by long use "FADED" to mean,"beware of intoxicating liquor"? Inneither case it does not paralel with ,"Drink the cup of the Lord"; at the institution of which ther was one cup containing the fruit of the vine. 26 years later Paul recapitulates the scene of the institution and speaks of drinking of the fruit of the vine in that one cup,as, "Drink the cup",1 Cor.11:26; "Drink the cup of the Lord", 11:27. We see the "DEGREE" was "more","strong","intimate" in this case.

Hence,cannot paralel with such expressions as,"Beware of thebottle", "the house of Israel", tThe house of Jacob"; for they all stand on a less 'degree' than the bible metonymy,"Drink the cup of the Lord". That is a common distructive violation of of logic. As additional evidence that words do "turn" on a greater or less degree; thus forming different levels of comparison Iquote the following. Alfred M. Hitchcock,page 345,says;"There are many kinds of figures,one investigator recognizes over two hundred varieties. But not a few of these are so common,and represent departures so slight,that they may be disregarded."

Herrick and Damon,page 493,says"Afigure of speech or trope is aword or phrase ,turned in a greater or less degree from its original or literal meaning". So,we see,figures are "turned" on a greater orless degree,and will not paralel where the "degree" of "turn" is not the same.

Brother Whitehead,after trying to get Thayer on page 441 to back up his false position on the cups issue, advised we one cup boys to stay away from Thayer. But thinking he might not mean all of it I ventured another peep,and this is what I found. The first definition of,'oikos',(house) under metonymy is,"The inmates of a house, all the persons forming one family,a household". Under that definition he gives a lot of scriptures where 'house'(sing no) is used all of which shows plainly that the word 'house' in each case refered to the "inmates of a house,all the persons forming one family,a household", just as Thayer defined it. But we come down to where it is plural and we find , 1 Tim.3:12;speaks of Deacons(plural number) ruleing ----their own 'houses'(plural number) well. That looks funny since brother whitehead has been telling us 'house' meant 'houses'.Lets try Thayer again. Tit.1:11;# Here agai we have subverting whole houses (plural number).Paul was still like we poor old one cup folks ;thought when we refered to a thing,or things in a plurality of places or containers should be represented by the plural number. Brother Whitehead should have been there and toldhim better. Lets try again. Next he tells us that the word ,house, in Gen, 7:1,is plural in the Hebrew.We'll take a peep at Gen.7:1 and see who there had a plurality of houses. "And the Lord said unto Noah,come into the ark thou and all thy houde;#(Hebrew,HOUSES). Wait a minute; there were three families of Noah's boys and Noah and his wife. Well that was a plurality of families living in a plurality of houses. And remember we are under the definition;"all the inmates of a house,allthe members forming one family,a household". Brother, that fits us to a tee. But says one the King James tr.,says 'house' not houses. Yes I know it,and not being a mind reader and the translators not being present to ask them; I am unable to tell you why. However,it does not hurt the translation unless some one is hunting a hole to hide in.

But says one,read Heb.11:7 ,and you will see Noah prepared an ark to the saving of his 'house'.Yes,but the word household means those who dwell under one roof. When Noah and his wife, his sons and their wives went into the ark,they were under one roof, that was all the house they had.They fulfilled the definition of 'house',as a metonymy. They were,"The inmates of a house,all thepersons forming one family,a household". They were really dwelling under one roof. It was all the house they had. In the ark was where salvation was;he prepared an ark to the saving of his house.

Now,lets take a look at definition 3.(Thayer)."Stock,race, decendants of one", And here are a few examples listed.Luke 1:27, "----of the house of David". Verse 69,"---in the house of his servant David. Luke 2:4,"---because he was of the house and lineage of David". Mat.10:6,"----the house of Israel", Acts 2:36,"---house of Israel". Acts 7:12,---O,ye house of Israel".

And on and on,wesee "the house of Israel","the house of Jacob",,"the house of David", under the heading;"stock, race, decendants of one." Regardless as tp whether in a house or ever saw a house; if they were "the stock, race,decendants of one";they were designated as the 'house' of that party. Whether it be Israel,Jacob, or David,.While under def.2 under metonymy,they were "Inmates of a house,all the persons forming one family, a household";in every case a literal house was involved. Even when two families were involved,two houses were involved and named. Webster backs this up Def.4,he says,"Those who dwell in te same house, a household". This is exactly like thayer's metonymyDef. And under it,all are listed where a literal house, and people who dwelt there were involved.Def. 5,"A family of ancestors, decendants and kindred; a race of persons from the same stock; a tribe;especally a noble family,as, the house of Hanover".

Under this,like Thayer's definition number three,no literal 'house' was at the present involved. It just meant "Race,tribe,decendants of one". The idea of them being dwelling in a 'house' has completly "FADED "out. And with it brother Whitehead's arguement on"The house of Israel", "The house of Jacob", "The house of David", also faded out. And all the dizzy whirl of his,""the bottle"" which all cups brethren are (logically) addicted to", has "FADED"out/.

I have used quite a bit of space showing the different metonymies, variations from the beginning,and their "fading" partialy or wholly to a literal meaning. But this is one of the places the cups boys try to hide their "golden wedge"(cups) and I have endevored to pull the cover off.

As I have shown only one cup wasinvolved in the establishment of the Lord's supper,and he has admitted it I have shown 26 years after ,Paul in the 11 th Chapter of 1 Corinthians recapitulating the scene when Jesus instituted the supper,and speaking of drinking of that one cup said,"Drink the cup",verse 26. "Drink the cup of the Lord",verse 27. Thus making 26 years of apostolic practice of one cup of the fruit of the vine, which,when they drank of it, They drank the cup of the Lord".Andnot a hint of a hint that ever a plurality was used.

Jesus,in Mat.26:"& commanded the disciples to all drink of it,the cup. For there was nothing else for the "it" to refer to except the word "cup". His own witness,Davidson, stated plainly that the antecedent must be there and stated. The denoted command was,"Drink ye all of the cup". The connoted(implied thought) drink of the contents of the cup. They make a cute switch here and make the "denoted"(stated) command, "Drink ye all of the cup",to mean, drink ye all of the contents;thus destroying the "denoted"(stated) command to all drink of the cup. Of course if they admitted this undenyable fact their whole theory would be forever destroyed. But to save a theory more precious to them than God's Holy word; they make themselves the violators of one of the simplest rules of logic.

And in addition to this,Paul commanded the disciples, 1 Cor. 11:1, To follow him as he did Christ; and later recapitulated the establishment of the supper as Jesus instituted it with one cup of the fruit of the vine; and on this setting he made the remarks;"Drink this cup",verse 26; "drink this cup of the Lord",verse 27 And this he admitted also. Quoting from one of my letters he says;"In a letter after citing 'Paul's' recapitulation , 1 Cor.11:24,25, he triumphantly(?)asserts;' So we see the setting; the very act on which Paul's metonymy is basedwas a physical cup accompaning the actual physical fruit of the vine" Then he adds;"Well,so be it". He also said more which is alreadyanswered.

Then,we see two commands relative drinking of a cup.one by the Lord,Mat.26:27; the other by Paul 1 Cor.11:1,2; and yet theycry, "INCIDENTAL".

This cup is (not literally,but figuratively)the fruit of the vine. Then we have these paralels:
In"Drink the cup"; the cup -------is (symbolizes-the fruit of thevine,
In Mat.26:26;"this"(bread)-------is (symbplizes) my body.
iIn Mat.26:27;"this"(F.O.V.)---is (symbplizes) my blood.
You can no more substitute in one of these symbols than you can in the other.God is the author of them all.If you can substitute cups or containers for cup in the first;you can substitute beefsteak for bread in the second;or milk for fruit of the vine in the third. Brethren,for truths sake,and to please God,and obey his will,and for your eternal good;wake up.

Paul says,1 Cor.10:16;"The cup of blessing which we bless,is it not the communion of the blood of Christ"? But in verse 21 he calls ### drinking of the cup of blessing which we bless;drinking the cup of the Lord.

Therefore,to drink the cup of blessing which we bless,is to drink the cup of the Lord.

If we alter the word used figuratively we destroy the figure. See Blair page 148, quoted previously. Hence, if we add an "s", the the word 'cup' making it 'cups'; we have altered the word; therefore we have destroyed the figure.

In the fifth chapter of second Kings we have a fair paralel with our cups brethren. This man Naaman had the leporsy and went to the prophet Elisha to be cured. In the tenth verse the Prophet told him to "Go wash in Jordon seven times,---"(Just as we are commended to "drink of the cup", Mat. 26:27). But Naaman was a 'containers' man, for he named over a couple of other rivers which would be better. (Just as some of our brethren are 'containers' men and wants a plurality of cups instead of 'a cup' as the Lord ordained). Verses 13, 14, Teaches us the servant of Naaman reasoned with him, and showed him it was the command to "wash in the Jordon" so he repented and went and washed and was made clean. (So, also, some of our cups brethren, when they are shown to "drink of the cup" is a command, repent and obey). However, many of them do not do as well as Naaman, and have never repented to obey the Lord to "drink of the cup". So, for their benifit I wish to ask a few questions and make a paralel.

Since there was water in those other rivers which Naaman named over, could he havve washed in one of them and been made clean? I say, NO. If it was the water in Jordon that had the cleansing power, could he have taken some of the water out of Jordon and put it in another 'container' and washed in it and been cleansed?? Ans., NO. Then the 'container', Jordon, did have a part in the command in Naaman's obedience. (You better look out; God respects no person). The "denoted" (stated) command to Naaman was, "Wash in Jordon seven times" The "denoted" (stated) command to us is, "Drink ye all of the cup". The "connoted" (implied) thought to Naaman was, there was water in Jordon in which he could wash. The "connoted" (implied) thought to us is, there is a drink element in the cup to drink.

But the "denoted", stated, command to Naaman, "Go wash seven times in Jordon", made it obligatory that he really wash in Jordon, and not transfer the water to some other 'container' and wash in it. So, also, the "denoted", stated, command to "drink ye all of the cup", makes it obligatory that we really drink of the cup and not transfer the fruit of the vine to another 'container', or 'containers' and drink from them. If not, why not??? Neither could he have used other water than that in Jordon. So, neither could we drink another element than that which is in a cup. The common law that governs language governs both circumstances.

1----The disciples drank of a cup containing the fruit of the vine when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper. (Admitted).
2---- But the disciples drank the cup of the Lord, when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper. (Admitted).
3----Therefore, to drink of a cup containing the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper, is to "drink the cup of the Lord.

1-----The disciples did not drink from a plurality of cups containthe fruit of the vine, when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper.
2---- But the disciples "drank the cup of the Lord" when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper.
3-----Therefore you cannot drink of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper and "Drink the cup of the Lord",

1----- To speak a word in the name of the Lord which he has not commanded us to speak, is a presumption. See, Deut. 18:20.
2-----But to teach the use of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper is scriptural; is to speak a word in the name of the Lord he has not commanded us to speak.
3-----Therefore, to teach the use of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper is scriptural, iis a presumption.

1-----But without faith it is imposible to please God--"Heb.11:6.
2----But a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vinein the Lord's supper is not of faith.(Not mentioned in God's word), Heb.11:6.
3--------Therefore a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not pleasing to God.

1-----Whatsoever that is not of faith is sin.Rom. 14 :23.
2-----But the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruitof the vine in the Lord's supper is not of faith; not being found in the word of God.Rom.10:17.
3----Therefore ,the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper ,is sin.

1-----"We walk by faith" 2 Cor.5:7.
2------But the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not of faith.Not being found in the word of God. Rom. 10:17.
3-------Therefore we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper and walk by faith.

1-----The scriptures given by inspiration of God throughly furnish the man of God to all good works. 2 Tim. 3:16,17.
2----But the scriptures given by inspiration of God no where says anything about a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
3-----Therefore the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not a good work.

1----But foolish and unlearned questions avoid knowing they do gender strife. 2 Tim 2:23,
2-----But the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is an unlearned question. Not taught in God's word. Rom. 10:17.
3----Therefore we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper,and obey the command, foolish and unlearned questions avoid.

1-----Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ,hath not God. 2 Jno. 9.
2------But a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not in the doctrine of Christ.
3---Therefore, the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is to transgressthe doctrine of Christ and have not God.

1----According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness. 1 Peter 1:3.
2-----But nowhere in his divine power (the gospel,Rom.1:16) arewe given the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
3----Therefore,the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper does not pertain to life and godliness.

1-----And this is love that we walk after his commandments,and this is the commandment,that as ye have heard in the beginning ye should walk in it. 2 Jno.6.
2----But nowhere have we a record,in the beginning,when the Lord's supper was instituted,where a plurality of cups was used to distribute the fruit of the vine.
3---Therefore ,we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper ,and obey the command that as ye have heard in the beginning ye should walk in it.

1----For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me to make the gentiles obedient in word and deed.Rom. 15:18.
2----But we have no record where Christ wrought by Paul the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
3--------Therefore,If we use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper,we will do a thing Paul would not dare to speak of.

We are to hold fast the faithful word as we have been taught. Tit.1:9.
2------But no where in the faithful word are we taught the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
#3-----Therefore, we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper and obey the command,hold fast the faithful word as ye have been taught.

1----Only let your conversation be as becometh the gospel of Christ. Phil.1:27.
2------But nowhere in the gospel of Christ do we find the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
3--- ---Therefore,we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper and obey the command,only let your conversation be as becometh the gospel of Christ.

1--- Those things ye have both learned recieved heard and seen in me do,and the God of peace shall be with you.Phil.4:9.
2-------But no where in the gospel of Christ have we learned,recieved,heard and seen in Paul,the use of a plurality of cups to distribthe fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
3-----Therefore,we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper and obey the command, those things ye have both learned,recieved,heard and seen,in me do and the God of peace shall be with you.

1----We are to stand perfect and complete in all the will of God, Col.4:12.
2-----But in all the will of God we are not taught the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.
3-----Therefore,we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper and obey the command stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

1---Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the later times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocracy;;havtheir conscience seared with a hot iron".1 Tim.4:1,2.
2-----But the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not of faith.Not found in the word of God. Rom. 10:17.
3------Therefore,If we use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper ,we have departed from the faith,giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrins of devils;speaking lies in hypocracy;having our conscience seared with a hot iron.

I hope I have said nothing to offend anyone. My whole aim is to get the brotherhood to study God's Holy word on this subject that we all might be one.

It may be later than we think. At most my time is short to finish my sojourn here. So,may God bless us all to attain to, and maintain that unity for which our Lord so earnestly prayed in the garden of Gethsemane, is my prayer.

As ever,Your's in Christ,
J.S.Bedingfield.

Box 767,Bryte,Yolo county, California.

J. S. Bedingfield