"WHAT SAITH THE LORD?" CUP OR CUPS?



A REVIEW OF

M. S. WHITEHEAD, ATMORE, ALABAMA

BY

J. S. BEDINGFIELD

BOX 767, BRYTE, CALIFORNIA

"WHAT SAITH THE LORD,"

CUP OR CUPS?

A REVIEW OF

M. S. WHITEHEAD, ATMORE, ALABAMA.

BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD

BOX 767, BRYTE, CALIFORNIA

F O R E W O R D:

Being 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 just an old worn-out cow-puncher, my education is limited. My speech and writings of course is not flowery. However, I intend in this review to be as kind as possible to all and at all times respect God's Holy word. It is always right. Still, I want to deal with brethren as one 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 comma and substituted a question mark. He further capitalized the words he wanted emphasized, which I did not do, thereby fixing it to suit his answer. Here is the quote as he quoted it; "Since they claim no scriptures whereby they can read <u>their</u> cups and TRY TO SHOW THAT 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.

Now to all cups brethren who admit, "He took a cup" (Matt. 26:27); means He really did take a cup, to you I apologize. 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 (Metonomy) and hasn't the remotest reference to the drinking vessel", I have no opology to make. (Above quote from Lemley page 4). If the word "cup" does not mean a cup in any of these oassages, there is not one scintilla of evidence He had one. Hence, one would have to accept their presumption for it. We take the Bible.

In a letter, 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 that 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 distribute the drink element in the Lord's Supper, can be read in the New Testament scriptures!" We will deny: "The practice as it obtains in some of the churches of Christ, in which a plurality of cups (drinking vessels) is used to distribute the drink element in the Lord's Supper, can be read in the New Testament scriptures!" Will he deny it? Nay, verily! It is a waste of time to spemd more space on such matters, as either of us could misrepresent each other many times and still tall the truth as to how many cups should be used to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's Supper.

His "review", top of page 3, he has the heading, "ABSURDITY", and under this he says; "On page 13

trying to force Matt. 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 antecedent of the "this" in verse 28. Note, he says, "I manhandled that scripture. Top of page 4 he adds these, "twists, tortures it". We will soon see how these applications fit his "absurdities". I will give Matt. 26:27 a full treatment when I get to His "the 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 drink 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 drank of their cups)---is exactly what they say is the blood of the New Testament! Tract page 14. This means my answer to Lemley.

Then he admits; "Yes, what they drink of their cups is what they say "represents" the blood of Christ". Then, as I said before, their practice admits it but with their mouth they deny it to save "cups". But he continues, "But most people know that neither what they say nor what they practice proves the whole command, 'drink ye all of it', is the antecedent of the demonstrative 'this'". But brother, it shows you can't 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 whole command nor the obedience to it, is the "this" which 'is' (represnats) the blood of Christ".

But brother, does that look more rediculous to your peculiar kind of grammar, than to say "cup" in verse 27 was literal and that the "this" had "cup" for its antecedent but refered by metonomy to the contents of the cup? Soon I will give you a string

of scholars (since you bank on them so) to prove it.

Now, note, the command denoted (stated) Is "drink ye all of the cup", since "it" refers to cup. BUT get it, the command, "drink ye all of the cup", connotes (implies) a contents in a cup. Hence it could have the command as its antecedent but logically mean the "implied" contents. But get this, I am not dogmatic about my grammatical applications as I will show later. Our best scholars differ right here. But all of them come out with "this" is 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 can agree with and some I cannot. As to "Gar" (Greek for the word "for") the word "for" can be used independent. See B. F. Sisk, page 206.

Lets see how well some of his arguments stand up. Page 3, in paragraph 4, I quote; "They were to drink of the 'it'; for (because) this (the 'it') is (represents) his blood. The 'this' refers to, 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 make it fit his false doctrine? He certainly has missed the truth.

On page II 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" (Matt. 26:27) to refer to contents, and the pronoun "this" in verse 28, refer to the "it", of "Drink ye all of it".

Lets bring out the American Composition and Rhetoric, by Donald Davidson, 3rd. edition, page 552. (This is what he calls his gun). "Every pronoun must refer plainly and unmistakably to its antecedent. There must be no confusion, no ambiguity, no vagueness of reference". Brother, did you get that?

That doesn't mean 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, "contents", is only here by implication, and it is not there present. Hence you can see that to use his grammatical application, violates in two ways his own authority (gun). Shall we now apply his own words to him?, Viz., "He manhandled twisted, 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 someone may think Davidson went too far and got too strong, I will now call out Mr. Tanner, page 256. "Reference of pronouns. A pronoun should have as its antecedent a particular person, animal, OR THING, and this antecedent should be a definitely EXPRESSED NOUN OR PRONOUN. The reference of a pronoun to its anteedent should in every instance be unmistakeably clear". Notice, there is no definitely expressed noun or pronoun there 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 a pronominal expression 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 possibly be the antecedent of the "it", in "Drink ye all of it".

Again, 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 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

mentioned, but "CUP" is; hence the "CUP" is the antecedent to the "it" in "Drink ye all of it". Therefore, the "it" is not the fruit of the vine, but the "CUP" that contains it. Tanner shot him again.

He then quotes from Mr. Savage (a quotation from one of my letters) where Mr. Savage says; "He took a cup (containing fruit of the vine), and gave 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 showed 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 sure as his man Mr. Davidson and Mr. Tanner are right; he has missed the truth.

I will again shoot him with his own gun, Mr. Davidson, and perhaps also Mr. Tanner. Davidson, third edition, page 272; "Content words posess two kinds of meaning---denotative meaning and connotative meaning. The 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 has been applied to the object, or class of objects, quality, idea to which it commonly and usually refers-----". He then states that "Dictionary definitions generally states the denotative meaning of a word". Page 273: "The connotative meaning of a word is generally regarded as being the meaning or the various meanings added to a word by the associations that it acquires from its common use, or that may be attributed to it from a figurative use". Hence, we see the "denoted" or logical meaning is the stated meaning; while the "connoted" meaning is an implied meaning. Hence, the "denoted" or stated meaning 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 to the connoted. They will say, "Drink ye all of the contents", and thereby cut off half of the meaning; and the "denoted" at that. While it really says, "Drink ye all of the cup", making it mandatory that the cup must be drank of. But by switching the command to the "implied" contents tney dodge the denoted command, "Drink ye all of the cup"; thereby destroying the stated, denoted part of God's command. What else could you do but use his own words to describe this destruction of part of God's word, except that he "manhandled it twisted, and tortured it". He asked to be shot with his own gun, and of course I would be heartless not to accomodate him. "Expressiveness". Many words have two degrees or levels of meaning. One meaning consists of what the word literally says. This is called denotation. In addition, the word may have acquired through long use an implied, or associated meaning, so that it suggests more than it specifically denotes. This we call its connotation. The expressiveness of a word or phrase depends on both its denotive and its connotative meaning.

The expression, "drink ye all of it", has both of 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 meaning does not obliterate the other. It is really unnecessary for all this, but these boys hide behind this stuff and you have to show them up. Everyone knows if I say; "I bought a calf and it died", that the "it" there meant the calf without any grammatical analysis. So, also, we know that when we see the expression; "He took a cup--------and said, drink ye all of it"; that "it" means the cup without any grammatical analysis. So, since they go there, and we have to flush them out, I will continue.

But we can see from the above authorities that 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 another 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 come now to consider what "this" in Matt. 26:28 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 as my position does; that this (we all drink of the cup) is the blood of the New Testament. And also that "CUP" is literal. So, if in some way we could settle this question and go hand in hand from now on, why not do it? Since I know from previous correspondence that Bro. Whitehead is strong on scholars, 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 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 Bro. Phillips: In Matt. 26:27, 'Poterion' means a literal CUP; while in verse 28, 'Touto' means the contents".

Professor Chas. I.Sannay, Webster Groves, Mo., wrote: "I--'Poterion' in Matt. 26:27 clearly signifies cup; that indeed, is 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 to 'haima' (the blood), a fluid were not represented by another fluid. Hence, although Touto "this" (Matt. 26:28) grammatically has as its antecedent, to 'poterion' (the cup) of verse 27, it clearly refers, by metonomy, to the contents of the "Cup". Such was the understanding of the early church".

E. E. Stringfellow writes: "In Matt. 26:28 "this" is a neuter word and must refer to 'cup' which is

neuter, but the reference is, by metonomy, to the contents of the cup, as indicated by the context".

Here is another: "Poterion" (cup) is grammatically the antecedent of 'touto' (this) in Matt. 26:28; but logically the contents of the cup is the antecedent of 'this'. The context forbids that we regard 'this' as refering to the cup literally, apart from the contents of the same". C. A. Savage.

Now if it will ease the brother any, I will agree with him that perhaps some of these professors are right. I don't disagree with them since you can see, although taking different positions as to what the antecedent is; we all reach the same conclusion, the "this" means the contents of the cup.

You will notice that not one of them said, "this" refered to the "it", in the expression, "Drink ye all of it". Not one of them, dear friends. Any of the above positions of these scholars agrees perfectly with my idea as to what the "this" really 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, Bro. Whitehead made the champion mistake of 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 attribute complement may be transposed, as, 'this is my blood'. and, 'My blood is this". How, can you beat that one? Note: "This (fruit of the vine) is (represents, symbolizes) my blood". Now transpose it, we have: "My blood is (represents, symbolizes) this, (the fruit of the vine". The very idea of transposing this trope 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", Matt. 26:26. Now

transpose as he did the other, and we have; "My body is this (bread)". We would have Jesus' body representing, or symbolizing the bread. Would it be in order to use his own words to describe this act?, that is, "he twisted, manhandled, and tortured it?" And might we add, he perverted the word? These are strong terms, but how must we describe such acts? I love Bro. Whitehead and in fact all the brotherhood. I cannot bring myself to believe a good man, as I believe Bro. Whitehead to be, would do such a thing knowingly.

I have contended with our cups brethren that when they have altered a trope in any way they destroyed the figure, but ir seems it is hard to get the idea over. But with the above example of the complete change by the brother's alteration, some will see 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". Note, the last statement; "So that if you alter the word, you destroy the figure". Even adding the "s" to 'cup' making it cups, you have altered the word; therefore you have destroyed the figure. Neither can you transpose the symbolic expression, "this (fruit of the vine) is (represents, symbolizes) my blood; by transposing the subject, "this", and the attribute complement, "my blood"; for when you do, you make it read; "My blood is (represents, symbolizes) this (fruit of the vine). Anyone knows God never intended for the blood of His son to represent, symbolize, an <u>inanimate object</u> as 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, deceiving and being deceived".

We now go to page 5, first paragraph under the heading; "ANOTHER ABSURDITY". If he were naming his own actions and arguments, he couldn't have described

it better. Now for the first quote.

"According to the one cup metonomy taught in the tract, it is impossible to 'Drink the cup of the Lord' without literally drinking (swollowing--Webster) the literal cup with the fruit of the vine in it".

Now, now, Bro 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 swollow a liquid; but Bro. Whitehead, did you ever trouble yourself to look up swallow in Webster? Well, here it is my dear brother. Webster, def. I, "to take through the gullet, or esophagus, into the stomach; to receive into the body through the mouth and throat".

Note, "To take through the gullet, or esophagus, into the stomach". If that were all the meaning to "swallow" you might have an argument as you made it. Of course you would thereby (by your interpretation) have to bypass your mouth, or else never be able to drink literally from anything. But wait a minute, read the rest of it. Now Bro. Whitehead , you get this and don't expose yourself in such a way anymore. Get the last half of the definition; "to receive into the body through the mouth and throat". Any child can see by that last half of the definition, "To receive into the body through the mouth and throat"; that when the liquid gets into the mouth, the first act of "DRINKING" has been accomplished. Now, that is the way to 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 swallow; 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 understand that, but for Bro. Whitehead's benefit, lets go over it 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 drew it into the mouth. Now, the first act of swallowing has been

accomplished. You then force down the throat by means of the fixtures in the throat made for that purpose, into the stomach, and the act of "SWALLOW-ING" has been completed. And since Bro. 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 answering Lemley, page 6) Well brother just read the above steps and you can see just how you can drink a cup. In 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. No 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 "MOUTHS" in order to "DRINK the cup of the Lord". You see brother, the lips are over the rim of the cup, and before it actually leaves the cup, it is inside the mouth. See?? In paragraph 4, page 5, he asks; "How far away from the cup can you get it, and still call it cup"? I told you and I told you, the element comes within the mouth before it entirely leaves the cup. Hence, you have drank the cup of the Lord. Hope you got it that time.

Did you know brother, your upper lip goes down into the cup, hence the element is in the first act of swallowing before it actually gets over the rim of the cup. Boy, this sure is some important stuff we are imposing on the public. But maybe they will understand a cups man has to say 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 trying my level best to answer his arguments.

On page 5, paragraph 4, under this same heading, "ANOTHER ABSURDITY", the brother makes another "ABSURD" effort to prove you can drink the cup of the Lord without it being in a cup. His effort is to parallel, "Partake of the table--" (I Cor. 10:21), with "Drink the cup". This does not look like a metonomy to me. Note, "Eat at the table--", but to avoid a long

wrangle, I will treat it as though it were. He fails to comprehend what his own authority, Donald Davidson, says about "denotation" and "connatation". He seems to fail to catch 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 associations that it acquires from its common use, or that may be attributed to it from the figurative use".

Since a cup (a drinking vessel), is usually associated with a drinkable element, (liquid), to be drank; and since it is a drinking vessel; and since to drink of a cup, the usual "use" of it is to put the lips to it and drink of its contents; then, it connotes that very act. But the "common use" of a table is different. Food is placed on it; it is lifted up to the mouth and eaten or drank. Before eating or drinking, by "common use", the elements are separated from the table, before it is either eaten or drank. Hence, to eat of a table "connotes" (implies) that very act. Again he is shot with his own gun. He shouldn't look down the barrel and beg one to shoot. You never in your life seen anyone put their mouth down to their table to eat; but the "common use" of a cup is to put your lips to it and drink of its contents. The very idea of one taking two things whose "common use" is almost opposite; and try to show by paralleling them that their "common use" is the same. Yes, he accidently put that argument un- the right heading, "ANOTHER ABSURDITY".

Now, since I have a new "star" witness, I will now introduce him to you. Meet Bro. M. S. Whitehead.

And I quote, page 10, paragraph 5, of his review. "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'. For they drank that for which the name "cup was used". Now don't forget according to the above statement, the fruit of the vine was in a cup. Hence, the name "cup" was used for the fruit of the vine that was in the

cup. But he adds more to try to "twist" in his cups. Hear him, "But when an assembly for the supper drinks the fruit of the vine from individual cups, each one 'drinks the cup of the Lord".

We will have to say, Nay, verily! Note, in the command, Matt. 26:27, they were ALL commanded to drink of the cup. Mark 14:23 says, "And they all drank of it, (the cup)", which you will note he admitted they did do in the above quote. No, brother, you will have to find a Bible quote for your 'cups'. I am not going to let you slip them in that way. Your own statement quoted above shows in drinking of the cup (and only one at that, J. S. B.) they drank the cup of the Lord. We are satisfied with what we all agree is the "cup of the Lord". You brethren take it for granted, without a scripture to say so, and use individual cups, which is a presumption. To take for granted is to presume. See Webster.

When he asserts that when they drink from their individual cups, they have drank that for which the name cup was used, he is wrong.

according to his above statement they all drank of a cup. In his practice, 'each' one drinks of a cup. In the institution of the supper, as he admitted above, the fruit of the vine that was 'the cup of the Lord', was in a cup. Yes, he said, "one cup". You will notice there is quite a difference.

Get his quotation again. "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', for they drank that for which the name 'cup' was used". And don't forget, dear friends, it was fruit of the vine in one cup; he being a witness, and the Bible also bearing witness, yes and all who hold the truth bear witness. Hence, it is agreed grounds. The grounds for unity.

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 the cup of the Lord".

And here is my proof. About A. D. 59 Paul wrote

the first Corinthian letter. I Cor. II:23, Paul says; "For I have received of the Lord, that which I also delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread-----".

I. We learn from this verse, what he was about to relate, he had received it from the Lord.

2. By reading from the 23rd. to 25th. verses we learn that it was a recapitulation as Jesus did the night he was betrayed.

As I have abundantly proven, Jesus used but one cup that memorable night. Bro. Whitehead says Jesus used one in establishing the supper. Hear him; "At the institution of the Lord's supper, the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those that drank it from that cup, 'drank the cup of the Lord".

Hence, 26 years after Jesus established the supper by using one cup; we see the Apostle Paul saying he delivered the same unto them. And furthermore, we see the apostle saying in drinking from it, they "drank the cup", verse 26; "Drink the cup of the Lord" verse 27. And besides all this, my star witness, Bor. Whitehead, says of the example Jesus set the night he was betrayed, which Paul was following here in the IIth. chapter of I Corinthians, 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". And besides this, we have the command, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ", (I Cor. II:I). And in verse 2 he tells us it is to be "as I delivered them to you". And verses 23-25shows he delivered it as Jesus instituted it; and that night Jesus used one cup containing the fruit of the vine; the drinking of which Paul calls, "Drink the cup", (verse 26); "Drink the cup of the Lord", (verse 27).

And yet, my brethren, calls a contention for it to be observed as examplified by the Lord; commanded by Paul 26 years later to be kept that way, a "false doctrine". Yes approved by 26 years apostolic practice, and a command from the apostle Paul to "be followers of me, even as I also am of Christ".

(I Cor. II:I). And a command by the Lord himself; "Drink ye all of it", Matt. 26:27. The "it", here MUST be cup, as there is no other mentioned noun or pronoun for it to refer to; and the antecedent MUST be expressed. See American Composition and Rhetoric, pages 552 and 553; Tanner's Rhetoric, pages 256 and 257.

This is Bible proof, and for those who will accept the truth, ends the matter regardless as to our different ideas as to what grammatical relation a word might have in any sentence.

On page 6, Bro. Whitehead starts an argument to show I contradicted my own objection. Before I notice it, I want to say, that trying to point out contradictions is one of Bro. Whitehead's line of argument. Of course if you contradict yourself, that is a weakening of your arguments; but it does not show the position is wrong. If the Bible teaches one cup, for me to take some rediculous position does not prove one cup wrong. Because some try to make sprinkling, baptism does not make the doctrine of being baptized by a burial wrong. Just the false position is wrong. Before I begin on his argument, I will point out a contradiction in his writings.

In a letter of July 26, 1955; in discussing Mr. Tanner's definition of metonomy; on page 5, he makes this statement; "I didn't know but what you knew that 'figurative' speech is the opposite of clearly suggesting, that is, to 'figurative' suggest, is the opposite "to clearly suggest". And notice this expression, 'clearly suggest' was used in Tanner's definition of metonomy.

In his "Dissecting Knife", pages 5, 6; he says; "Mr. Webster's Dictionary says, "Suggestion----is an indirect presentation of a matter for consideration or action", Collegiate Dictionary. Of the word 'symbol', he says; 'That which suggests something else by reason of relationship, association, convention, etc". And there is the meaning of 'suggest' in <u>this Metonomy</u>---'symbolize'. So, in the metonomy, to

'suggest' is to 'symbolize', and to 'symbolize' is to 'suggest'".

Hence, you can see in his first quotation he was trying to make "clearly suggest" (in a definition of metonomy), a literal suggestion. Where in his definitions in last quotation; "suggest" meant to "symbolize". Hence, "clearly suggest" is to clearly symbolize; which we know is true in respect to a metonomy.

But note his contradiction: First, it is literal, the last time, it "symbolized"; that is, figurative. Hence, if that mistake makes his plurality of cups wrong; and if I made one similar and that made one cup wrong; then either way would be wrong, one, or a plurality. Would he then have to use a bottle???

Again, Bro. Whitehead placed a slip in a copy of "A Hobby Hobbled", in which he said; "No, 'Drink this cup" is not a metonomy. The drink is literal drinking. You just don't know your metonomy, maybe. Maybe when I get through with Water's tract I will apply the dissecting knife to your contradictions".

Since he has admitted, "drink this cup" is a metonomy, and has argued it; our brother who is a master on finding contradictions doesn't have to leave his own writings to satisfy himself.

Now, I turn my attentions to his "assertions" on page 6. Of course it is alright to make a short quotation from one if you do not cut it loose from its connection and make it mean something he did not say. Here is what he quoted from me to make his argument; "A bottle by no means parallels a cup", and here is what I said in connection with it; which shows exactly what was meant:

"Now, we come to the bottle argument, and your bottle professor. First, I want to say, a bottle by no means parallels a cup. A cup is a drinking vessel. A bottle never was defined by any dictionary as a drinking vessel. Bottles, jugs, kegs, barrels, and the like, are vessels of storage as we well know. A temporary source to which we can go for the things stored in them. A well is a source from which we get our supply of water. It does not parallel with a cup

which is a drinking vessel. We do not drink of them alike. If we did, their uses would be the same and we would see people with a pumping device erected over their cup and trying to use their wells as drinking vessels. It is just as foolish to parallel 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 supply, different from drinking of a cup, a drinking vessel". (Quoted from my letter, J. S. B.).

You will note, I did not deny those vessels of storage could, and were used in a metonomy. Neither did I deny they came under the head (in metonomy) of container and contained. But the thing I meant is clearly stated in the quotation above. Neither did I say I never saw one drink directly from bottles 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 any 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 well known as a mathematical axiom; but since my brother is looking down his gun barrel and begging me to shoot, it would be too bad to disappoint him. So, here goes. The American Composition and Rhetoric, 3rd. edition, page 273. "The connotative meaning of a word is generally regarded as being the meaning, or various meanings, added to a word by the association it acquires from its common uses, or that may be attributed to it from a figurative use".

Note, first, "----the meaning, or various meanings, added to a word by the associations that it acquires from its common uses-----". 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. Hence, to

drink of a cup; connotes, implies, putting the lips to it and drinking of it. That is a "COMMON USE".

Not so with bottles, jugs, kegs, or barrels, or wells. The "common use" of the vessels named above is for storage; while a well is a source from which we get a supply of water. None of them are drinking vessels. To drink of any of them does not connote, imply, putting the lips to them to drink of them; that is not the "common use" of them, in drinking of them. The "common use" of those 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. Oh, yes, you can put your lips to those vessels and drink, sure you can; but that is not their "common use". Hence, to drink of them does not connote putting the lips to them to drink. Sure, you could be let down into a well and drink directly from it, but that is not its "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 asked for a rule in rhetoric that proved it, there it is, his own witness, Mr. Davidson.

To prove the importance of "connotation" (implication), I quote the following from; The American Composition and Rhetoric, page 275: "With such possibilities open to him, the writer must realize that exactness in the choice of words depends on two considerations; his words must have both the right logical meaning, or denotation, and the right associated meaning, connotation".

Hence, we see when we must notice the "---meaning or various meanings added to the word by the association that it acquires from its common use----" as I have previously shown.

Mr. Tanner says on page 319. "EXPRESSIVENESS". Many words have two degrees or levels of meanings. One meaning consists in what the word literally says". Hence, with, "drink of the well", ---and "drink of the cup"; in both cases is what the expression literally says. But hear him further: "This we call denotatation". Now hear him further: "In addition, the word

may have acquired 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, meaning as to how the drinking was done. With the well, the "common use" has been to draw out the water with some kind of device, and drink it, and thereby drink of the well. While with the cup the long "common use" has been to drink directly of it by putting the mouth to it, and thereby drinking of it. Hence, to drink of a cup, connotes, implies, putting the mouth to the cup and drinking of it. Mr. Tanner says, "This we call connotation. The expressiveness of a word or phrase depends on both its denotative and its connotative meaning". Note, from the last expression it is the same with groups of words as with 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 into a lake, river, barrel, or any 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, lakes, rivers, and wells is 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" and "House of Israel" together later.

He quotes short passages from pages 5 and 6 of my tract and he says I put bottle, keg, etc., in the same category with cup, hence he thibks he sees something bad. Had he read what I said he would have seen the purpose I had; which is to show the ridiculousness of the idea that "every place in the word of God in connection with the Lord's supper, where the word 'cup' is used is figurative apeech (metonomy) and hasn't the remotest reference to the drinking vessel". (Lemley's tract). Here is a quote from page 5; "Suppose I should say to Bro. Lemley, 'On

the table is a cup, a bottle, a sauce pan, and a jug, you drink the cup'. What would he do? What would you do under the same circumstances? Would you not drink the cup, by drinking what is in the cup? Would anyone know which vessel to drink from if the name of the vessel hasn'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 arguing 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 misapplication? Those boys are full of such capers as that. He needs something to say. He has no Bible to quote to prove "cups", so, they treat us to this kind of argument???

He refers quite often to what he calls my "quibling". Just who around here is quibling? If he can keep us off the truth by referring to what he terms "contradictions" etc., he has won out. This kind of argumentation is purely subterfuge. He is only seeking a place to hide, where he can cover up, but we are not going to let him.

To show his abuse of authorities, we quote the following from an undated letter of his written to me. Page 3, paragraphs I, 2, 3. He quotes from Reed and Kellogg: "-----And still other things stand to <u>each other</u> in some OTHER noteworthy relation THAN likeness or unlikeness (Metonomy, M. S. W.). Things long seen and associated BY US in any of these relations COME AT LAST readily to suggest each other. Figures of speech are those expressions in which, departing from our ordinary manner of speaking of things, we <u>ASSERT OR ASSUME</u> any of those relations,---------".

Again, "Metonomy is a figure of speech in which the NAME of one thing connected to another by relation other than likeness or unlikeness is brought over and APPLIED to that other, ---------that of container to the thing contained". (Reed and Kellogg). Now watch how he "manhandles, twists, and tortures"

this authority. I quote: "Notice, the relationship or connection does not have to be a real physical one. A cup does not have to be a real actual and physical accompaniment or association of the fruit of the vine at the time the metonomy is used to designate the fruit if the vine by 'cup'. At close of paragraph he says: "--------we ASSUME that relationship by designating the fruit of the vine as the "cup".

Note here, what he is "ASSUMING". Now we will let Mr. Kellogg answer for himself.

Bottom of page 112, Kellogg's Rhetoric: "A COMPARISON, OR SIMILE IS A figure of speech in which the likeness is pointed out or asserted between things in other respects unlike. In the simile, "Jim is LIKE a lion"; the likeness is ASSERTED by the word, LIKE". Hence, the way he, Bro. Whitehead ASSERTS relationship is wrong.

But we ask Mr. Kellogg, just what do you mean by "ASSERT" OR "ASSUME" A RELATIONSHIP??. And here is his answer; Kellogg's Rhatoric, 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 omitted, 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 quotation the "taking for granted or assumption" was that the reader or hearer sees the point of resemblance---" and not as he tried to do, ASSUME the relation, between a cup and the fruit of the vine, when it did not exist. And in this ASSUMPTION you merely left out the words of comparison, LIKE, AS, LIKE AS, and SO. His (Bro. Whitehead's) contention was you did not have to have a physical relationship between the cup and the fruit of the vine; you could ASSUME IT. But Mr. Kellogg exposes him by showing the assumption

was that "the reader or hearer understood the relation", and you did that by leaving out the words of comparison, LIKE, AS, LIKE AS, and SO, as I illustrated: "Jim is LIKE a bear". Here the relation is ASSUMED by the word "LIKE". But, "Jim is a lion"; here the relation is ASSUMED by leaving out the word of comparison, "LIKE". As Mr. Kellogg says, I assumed the reader understood the relation.

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, where simile is deliberate, illustrative. In the metaphor the comparison is implied. The likeness between the two objects is 'assumed' to be so that they are identified.

Note, what is ASSUMED is the likeness between the two objects is so apparent 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 argument in a letter of Oct. 26, 1955, page 3, paragraph 3. 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 someone else.

On page 7 he continues his "quibbles" about "the bottle", as though I denied, "Beware of the bottle" was a metonomy and as though I contended it did not mean strong drink. I have argued all along such expressions were "worn out METONOMIES" and had partially or altogether lost their figurativeness. This I will treat throughly later. Bottom page 7, he quotes from The American College Dictionary, that "THE BOTTLE" for strong drink. Well, I showed long ago Webster said the same. It means that regardless as to what vessel it is "associated with","A FADED METONOMY" Page 8, he cintinues as though I denoed it. Brother, that is all just as I have tried to show you all along; but because those are "FADED METONOMIES" does not make "Drink the cup", PARALLEL WITH A FADED METONOMY, NOR BE A FADED METONOMY.

On page 8, under heading, "This cup of the Lord, what is it?", he tries another twist on my answer to the question. I stated, "the cup of the Lord", was a literal cup. Every authority shows, "the object to 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 other thing, the cup. But in the expression, A METONOMY, if you please, "drink the cup of the Lord"---means---drink "that which is in the cup"; as Thayer says on page 510.

He says, "Show the "IS" is both literal and figurative". I don't need to, for it isn't. 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 in the expression, "this (fruit of the vine) is my blood", Matt. 26:28. See??

Top of page 9, he quotes a question asked a proffessor, and note exactly what is said: "In the Metonomy, 'Drink the cup', is the cup refered to, or the contents only? The answer was, "the contents". I have argued all along that the metonomy, 'drink the cup', meant exactly what Thayer said it did on page 510, "i. e. what is in the cup"; and the word 'cup' named the container to suggest its contents (see William's Rhetoric, page 220)

Same page, paragraph 3, he tries another twist, saying I made the figure turn on the literal verb, "drink". Now brother, in "Drink the cup" (I Cor. II:26); are you contending that anywhere you see the expression, "the cup" it is a metonomy?? Your argument forces you to that. It being a metonomy depends on the word or words it is associated with. Hence, drink, yes, the literal verb, drink, coupled with "the cup" makes a metonomy. Since you can't litterally drink a cup, you know the cup is put for the contents of 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 that word, STANDS FOR". Yes it STANDS FOR THE WINE, but it NAMES THE CUP TO SUGGEST

THE WINE, thereby, STANDING for the wine.

At the bottom of page 9, under "More Metonomy", he quotes from another proffessor, showing, "accompaniment, contiguity, and relation, yes, and, aspect" were words used by various Rhetoricians to express the general law by which all metonomies are governed. His authority is Mr. Knapp Malone. That's just fine; but remember brother, the manner of accompaniment, association, aspect, contiguity, and relation, are different. For example; "Drink the cup" is based on the relation, 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 work'. Lockwwod and Emerson puts it under the first heading; while Williams puts it under the second heading. If a thing is the "cause" of a certain "effect"; it is its "cause" without having to be in a literal contact. It is an "accompaniment", an "association", a "contiguity", an "aspect" as the cause of that effect, as "I read Shakespear".

While in the case under consideration; 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", an "association", as a "relation", as an "aspect"; 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 into a pot and put it on the fire and boil the water in it; I do not say, 'your radiator is boiling', but I say 'your pot is boiling'. But anywhere you find Shakespear's work; he is the author of it; it is his work.

But he tries to make us believe because millions of books, copies of Shakespear's work 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 is as the ""CAUSE"" AND IT AS THE ""EFFECT"". You cannot separate a CAUSE from its effect; as the

cause; it is always the CAUSE of that particular effect. You can separate a cup from grape juice by simply emptying it out.

If the brother would only read his books he would learn that Shakespear is "an accompaniment", is "related", is "associated", is "an aspect", the the"literature he produced", as the "CAUSE" to the "EFFECT", as the ""AUTHOR"" to his ""WORK"", while a vessel and its contents is an actual PHYSICAL CONTACT.

It is peculiar good men as I believe Bro. Whitehead head to be will make such childish illogical efforts to prove a false position. This about compliments his efforts on Shakespear. But in order to "read Shakespear", you must read the literature of which he is the "CAUSE", "AUTHOR", and it is the "EFFECT", "HIS WORK". So also, to "drink the cup", you must drink something of which a cup is the container and it is its contents. You can no mare "drink the cup" by drinking of cups or other vessels, than you can "read Shakespear" by reading Longfellow's works.

Paragraphs 2 and 3, page II, Bro. Whitehead quotes from Richbourg G. Williams, Head of the English Department, Birmingham Southern College: "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 of the Lord's supper, and you still have the cup of the Lord".

And I wonder if Bro. Whitehead should ask a number of sectarian scholars: "Since Jesus promised eternal life to those who 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 scholars that will say baptism is not essential to salvation? If not why not? It is only another sectarian doctrine like his cups he is trying to put over.

If I ask; "Is it essential to partake of the Lord's supper each first day of the week"?, I can get

him some "no" answers if he will swollow the bait as he wants us to the above. I can get a lot of sectarian doctrine backers from among scholars; but will he swallow the bait as he wants others to his above. I am of the opinion I can get him some scholars that will tell him it is impossible for a child of God to so far apostatize as to finally be lost, will he take it as truth? Why not??

Just keep in mind when I get through all this weighty matter I will show some who contradict this stuff. Bro. Whitehead, provided those scholars should say they were basing their opinion on either literal or figurative language, yes, and sometimes both; will you swallow that bait of the sects and make it unanimous? If they are to be accepted on one point of doctrine, why not on all points? Brother, your questions and their answers is a far cry from defining words and figures.

Paragraph 4, same page, he quotes a similar quotation from Mr. Knapp Malone, Proffessor of English Literature, John Hopkin's University. There is nothing to be gained but fill up space by quoting it; but will say the above applies to it also.

Webster gives sprinkling and pouring water on a person as ways to baptize other than immersion; will you accept it as valid?? He is a scholar and a good one. You might get a job circuit riding, and you might make a good one, who knows? No, brother, you wont and why? You know as I do the Bible is always right. When a scholar's definition or opinion on a point of language contradicts the Bible, we know the scholars are wrong and not God's holy word.

That is the reason I will not swallow your scholars "opinion" on these language differences; they contradict the teaching of the Bible. The Bible says "Buried with him in baptism". Our dictionaries say by their definitions it can be performed by sprinkling or pouring water on a subject. They contradict God, hence I take what God says and turn them down.

Bro. Whitehead says: "In 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 someone's idea of a grammatical relation contradicts a plain statement in the Bible, that grammatical relation is wrong.

On pages 15 and 16, under the heading, "EXPERT TESTIMONY", Bro. Whitehead asks Mr. A. E. Knoch, a translator and publisher, the following questions:

2. "The Apostle Paul having already used this metonomy, 'Drink the cup of the Lord', (I Cor. II:27) to refer to the wine of the Lord's table, is there anything in the rules governing this metonomy 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 metonomy is refered to as 'the cup of the Lord', and is poured from that container into other containers to distribute to the assembly, can it be correctly refered to as 'the cup of the Lord' after being poured into them?".

Here is Mr. Knoch's answer to question number 2; "Not necessarily, but preferably". Mr. Koch's general statement: "The form or method is not essential, so long as the spirit is observed. If for instance the company be so 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. Personaly I prefer to do so".

Bro. Whitehead tries to get quite a bit of consolation out of Mr. Koch's answer, but his consolation is slim.

Note, in answering question number 2, he says; "Not necessarily, but preferably". He seemed to think there was a way around it; yet he, for some well founded reason, prefered the one.

Note in his general statement he said, "The form or method was not essential, so long as the spirit is

observed". With this I heartily disagree, and Bro. 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 deliveded you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness". Rom. 6:17-18.

You will note here, Paul says, it was a FORM OF DOCTRINE they had obeyed which made them free from sin. So we can see ""FORM"" sure did count here. Yes, and brother, it does in the Lord's supper.

2 Tim. 1:13, Paul tells Timothy t "hold fast the form of sound words---". Note, it was the ""FORM"" of sound words to be held fast by Timothy. Sure, brother, it sure does count when it comes to sound words. One cup is what Jesus used, Bro. Whitehead being the witness, and he said when they drank the fruit of the vine from it, they 'drank the cup of the Lord'.

But he continues; "But if for instance the company be so large, the cup would be too large, or in these days when some object on sanitary grounds-----". Note, "company be so large the cup would be too large ----". Oh yes, change God's laws to fit our condition, instead of changing our condition to fit God's law; some reason. We can 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 conditions and sprinkle him from the jug. You know a scholar, 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---. Oh yes, that "sanitation". I know a lot of people ~~think~~ of sanitation and a lot of little

bugs when they drink in the Lord's supper, but I did not know it could be a "REASON" for changing God's law to fit those peoples desire to drink in memory of sanitation and bugs instead of the Lord. Will you please excuse me, if I tell you I still do not believe it.

Last but not by any means the least, he says; "----it may be best not to press the literality of the figure. Personally, I prefer to do so". Wonder what "literality of a figure" is? What about it Webster? "LITERALITY"---Definition I. 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; just as Bro. Whitehead said. Hear him; "in the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And when they drank it from that cup, they 'drank the cup of the Lord'. Now isn't that nice we found both those boys "witnessing" for us?

He quotes Mr. William D. Templeton, of the University of Southern California, who said; "It is my opinion that 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 celebrated. 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 celebration of the sacrament".

You will note, "It seems clear"---,"My opinion"-"sacrament"--- "containers" for cup. All of those things are marks of the identity of a false theory.

Everyone knows that meanings of words and usages language changes with the use of the best writers and speakers put on it. And everyone knows the preponderance of the scholarship is with the sectarian doctrines and practices which they practice and teach against Bible doctrine.

So will it be on this "cup question"; usages and

meanings will change to fit the popular theories of the day; and we can see the pendulum swinging from the truth. And so will it be until Paul's utterance in 2 Tim. 3:13; and Amos prophecy of Amos 8:11-12 are literally fulfilled. It has happened to the word "baptize", it can in this question we are discussing. Everyone knows the majority is usually on the 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 pendulum is swinging away from the truth Biblically and languistically. Here is a copy of a letter I wrote the University of Southern California and the answer I received.

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

I In the Metonimies, '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 I say, 'the kettle boils', or, 'the kettles boils', if I wished to bring both to notice?

3. If the same law of container and contained does not apply to both the metonomies above, would you please state the difference?

J. S. Bedingfield.

And here is the answer. This letter was written on University of Southern California's letter heads. And you will notice it crosses the above authorities.

University of Southern California,
3518 University Avenue.
Nov. 8, 1955.

Mr. J. S. Bedingfield,
Box 767, Bryte, California.
Dear Mr. Bedingfield: The metonomies that you have named; 'the kettle boils' and 'drink this cup' are similar, since KETTLE 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 say of two kettles, 'The kettles boil', not 'the kettles boils'. Similarly one would say, 'Both kettles are boiling'. I hope that this explanation answers your questions satisfactorily.

Julia Norton,
McCorkle Committee on Information, Department of English".

The above letter is clearcut and concise. Notice;

I. "Kettle and cup are substituted for the thing contained in each of them".

Hence, we see that the "thing" must be in the cup or kettle to bear the name of cup or kettle, as the case might be.

It is made plain as the noonday sun that the ordinary rules of plurals apply to each of these forms. And exemplified by saying for it to be two kettles bioling, we would say, "the kettles boil". So, also then, for the fruit of the vine to be in two or more cups we would say, 'Drink the cups' and not 'drink the cup'. Hence, if it were the Lord's fruit of the vine in a plurality of cups, would be the 'cups of the Lord'. (However, I do not believe a departure from the Lord's example would be the Lord's)

You will notice in asking my questions nothing is used that would cause the one who answered, to think it was a religious question; and thereby arouse their own ideas of a thing regardless as to the true meaning. I think the brother made a mistake in using the questions as Bible questions. Although, he asked for it not to be colored by theological ides, yet they enter in. However, in some cases it is impossible to do otherwise. But not so here.

So we see, here are two letters from the University of Southern California which contradict one another. What is wrong? I believe the one I received was written wholly to show the true answers as generally used. While the one to Bro. Whitehead (Not questioning his honest intent) could se 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 the answer you want if you will frame your question accordingly.

----------METONOMY----------

I wish now to take up some of our rhetoric books that are considered as authority and show how some of the brothers scholars have drifted from the true idea of metonomy. I do not wish anyone to think I am smart, I am not. As the brother has said; those scholars know higher English batter than I do my ABC'S. And I might add, he also would come in the A B C class. Bur remember this; we do not take all scholars tell us as to their ideas 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 swallow.

Welch's Composition, page 71: "METONOMY is the substitution of some name for another when the relationbetween the objects is not mere resemblance".

It is positively stated the name is 'substituted' for that of another, not a literal change. Hence, the name 'cup' is only substituted on certain conditions; when the 'relation' is not mere resemblance. In giving the examples he says; "It puts--------#4 Container for thing contained-------drink the cup".

Note, "It puts the container for thing contained ------drink the cup". Does that sound like the drink element could be in any number of any kind of vessels? Nay, verily. Just left alone anyone can understand that language, but it takes a smart man to help misunderstand it.

Notice, he says <u>there must be a relation</u>, then gives one; "Container for thing contained". There is the relation, container and thing contained. Ask yourself the simple question; Does that relation exist if the <u>contained</u> is not in the <u>container</u>, in this case, <u>a cup</u>----?

Mr. Hill, page 86;says; "METONOMY (from the

Greek meta, indicating a change, and onyma, name, is a designation of an object by one of its accompaniments". If you accompany one to a place, you certainly must have been right along, would you not? Then to call fruit of the vine, 'cup', it must be an accompaniment, must it not? Most certainly it must. Now, that is the rule; we will take care of the 'exceptions' later on.

Herrick and Damon says; "A similar substitution occurs when an accompaniment is taken for the thing it accompanies, as cause for effect, a sign for the thing signified etc. This trope is called metonomy". Note, "similar substitution occurs when an accompaniment (in this case a cup, J. S. B.) is taken for the thing it accompanies (in this case, the fruit of the vine, J. S. B.). Could you say a cup "ACCOMPANIES" the fruit of the vine if it were not there? Then can't you see the impossibility of their position according to this rule? Read it again, and you will see in this case the cup must accompany the fruit of the vine. Could you say the fruit of the vine was accompanied by a cup if it were in a hundred, and tell the truth?

Lockwood and Emerson--page 438; "Metonomy 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 us an example, "Container for the thing contained, "The kettle boils (meaning the water in the kettle") You see showing that relationship", "Container for the thing contained", in his example, "the kettle boils", he added the explanation, "meaning the water in the kettle". Therefore we see the water must be in the kettle to say, 'the kettle biols'. So, also, the fruit of the vine must be in a cup for you to be able to "Drink the cup". If that isn't plain, will someone say it plain? That is the rule; of course there are exceptions which we will notice later.

Mr. Kellogg--page 127, says; "Metonomy is a figure of speech in which the name of one thing connec-

ted to another by some bond not of likeness or unlikeness is taken to denote the other", "(4) as the CONTAINED and the THING CONTAINED".

Notice he says, "---one thing is connected to another by some bond----". Then he names one of the "bonds" that "connects" objects, "CONTAINER for the THING CONTAINED". Hence the "bond" must exist to use the CONTAINER for the THING CONTAINED. And of course to "Drink the cup" the "bond" must exist, the cup must contain the contained.

Mr. Blair---page 157, says; "To tropes founded on these several relations, cause and effect, container, and contained, sign for the thing signified, is given the name of metonomy". He then gives the following Latin phrase; "Ille impiger hausit spumantum pateram et pleno se proluit auro". Then he remarks of it "Where everyone sees, that the cup and the gold are put for the liquor contained in the golden cup". Can you say any plainer the liquor was in the golden cup?? And mind you that is the "RELATION", ,CONTAINER AND 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 those professors quoted by the brother? We will attend to the exceptions later. There is the RULE.

Mr. Tanner---page 324, says; "METONOMY. Metonomy 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 suggest is to symbolize; therefore the one object whose name is used must clearly symbolize the object for which the other name was used. You can't change a symbolic word without destroying the figure. See Blair, page 148. If you add an "s" to "cup" and make it cups; you have changed the word cup to cups, hence destroyed the figure. Besides he gives an interesting example which seals the issue. Here it is; "The kettle boils (that is the WATER in the kettle boils)". Brother could you make it any stronger? He explains the expression, "the kettle boils", by

saying, "that is, the water in the kettle boils". It sure has to be in the kettle. Therefore to "drink the cup" the element must be in the cup, just as the water had to be in the kettle, to say 'the kettle boils'.

Mr. Williams---page 220, says; "Metonomy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it". Note, the "object" brought to the mind (the fruit of the vine) is not named, but something else (the cup) is named to readily suggest it. Hence cup in the singular number is the name of the drinking vessel. And notice, it "readily suggests the fruit of the vine.

Webster says of SYMBOL; "That which suggests something else by reason of relationship, association, convention, etc." So, we see since, "the cup" suggests the fruit of the vine, according to Webster's above definition; the "cup" symbolizes the fruit of the vine. Hence the word, "cup" cannot be changed without destroying the symbol. See Blair, page 148; "The former, figures of words, are commonly called tropes, and consists in words being employed to signify something that is different from its original and primitive meaning; so that if you alter the word, you destroy the figure". (Emphasis mine J.S.B)

We learn from Mr. Blair and Mr. Webster that in the expression, "Drink the cup", the cup symbolizes the fruit of the vine and, as Blair says, "If you alter the word you destroy the figure". When you add the "s" to the word, cup, and make it cups, you have altered the word, cup; therefore you have destroyed the figure the Lord used to designate the 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 II to shoot him with his own gun.

The American Composition and Rhetoric (3rd. ed.), page 295; "Synecdoche and Metonomy are forms of indirect statement in a part of an object or some important association connected with the object is used to symbolize the object itself". The "cup" is an impor-

tant association connected with the fruit of the vine, "the object itself", in that it contains it. And the cup is used to "symbolize" the fruit of the 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. Matt. 26:26, "----------this (bread) is (symbolizes) my body".

Matt. 26:27, "-----this (fruit of the vine) is (symbolizes) my blood".

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

Here is his definition of Metonomy. "Metonomy, (from the Greek words METE and ONYMA, meaning change of name) substitutes some quality or aspect of the object for the name of the object itself". In the expression, "Drink the cup", the word, 'cup', is an aspect of the 'object itself', fruit of the vine, it contains. The brotner defines 'aspect', as, appearance to the eye or mind. Alright; when we say, "Drink the cup", the appearance of a cup containing a liquid enters the mind; but when we go to obey the command, the 'appearance' to the eye must be real and literal to the 'eye', in order to be able to grasp the cup and drink of it. Thus we se his own gun backfires and shoots him to.

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 be in some way considered.

Mr. Blair says on page 154; "In the third place,

figures give us the pleasure of enjoying two objects presented together to our view, without confusion; the principle idea, which is the subject of the discourse, along with its accessory which gives it the figurative dress". (Emphasis mine, J. S. B.) And we see Blair had a sneaking idea the cup, was also under consideration. Same page, Blair quoting from Aristotle says: "We see one thing in another".

The name, cup, is only "borrowed" in a metonomy. See Blair, page 152; "But still, for reasons before given, borrowed words, or as Rhetoricians call them, tropes, must continue to occupy a considerable place". Yes, bless your soul, the cup is even ""EMPHASIZED"".

Herrick and Damon, page 494, says; "The distinction between synechdoche and Metonomy 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 of the object, or a circumstance connected with it, and fix the attention on that. The quality or circumstance thus emphasized should, of course, be the real center of interest". You will notice, "the circumstance", the cup containing the fruit of the vine, is emphasized. How? It is named to suggest (symbolize) the fruit of the vine. Hence, it not only expresses its own name, but takes the place of the fruit of the vine to symbolically express it.

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

The American Composition and Rhetoric, (3rd. Ed.) page 295 says; "Generally metonomy differs from synecdoche in emphasizing symbolically some large significant aspect of the object". "The cup" is a large significant aspect of the object (the fruit of the vine). Therefore, according to The American Composition and Rhetoric, (his own gun), the ""cup"" is emphasized symbolically. Bad business brother, to have your own gun backfire and shoot you to.

Alfred M. Hitchcock page 349 says; "It is a useful figure in that it often focuses attention on some one detail of a picture, intensifing the impres-

sion. To say that the general advanced with a force of bayonets conveys a more vivid picture than to say he advanced with a force of soldiers". Notice the attention is focused on the one detail "bayonets", which were there, "period", which included the whole army. Therefore we see the attention is focused on the cup that contained the fruit of the vine and is made to symbolically stand for the fruit of the vine.

Tropes do not all turn from their literal meaning in the same "degree"; and taking advantage of this and trying to parallel 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 phrase turned in a greater or less degree from its original or literal meaning". Hence we see some are "turned" in a "greater" degree and some in a "less" degree.

Blair, page 176 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 the relationship is "less" intimate, and try to parallel it with one "more" intimate, is a logical fallacy they indulge in.

To show exactly what Lexicographers say about the metonomies "Drink the cup", "Drink the cup of the Lord", when connected with the Lord's supper, I quote the following: J. H. Thayer, page 533, "by metonomy, of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk". (Luke 22:20). Thayer, page 510, "i. e. What is in the cup", (2 Cor. 10:21; 11:27). Harper, page 525, "metonomy, the contents of a cup, liquor contained in a cup" Lk. 22:20; I Cor. 10:16.

Green, page 153, "metonomy, the contents of a cup, liquor contained in a cup", Lk. 22:20; I Cor. 10:16.

There is not a hint of a hint that the liquor (F. J. V.), in the above scriptures could be otherwise than in a cup.

Bro. Whitehead says; "At the institution of the Lord's supper, the fruit of the vine was in one cup,

And those that drank from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord". (Review, page 10). So, that should settle the matter as far as he is concerned.

In answering my argument on "faded" metonomies based on Blair, pages 152, 153, he missed my point.

"FADED METONOMIES".

First I want to say, Metaphor, is used in an extended way meaning all figures in speaking of figures in general. The American Composition and Rhetoric, page 289; "In modern literary criticism there is a tendency to make, Metaphor, a broad, inclusive term, applicable to figurative language and constructions in general". See also first paragraph of figures of speech, page 288, same author.

See also Blair, bottom of page 158. Therefore, when I use the word, 'Metaphor', in the extended sense, I mean any or all figures.

Again, figures of speech (tropes) are of different degrees of imtimacy. Hence, where they differ, they do not parallel. Blair, page 156; "These relations, some more, and some less intimate, may all give rise to tropes". See Kellogg's Rhetoric, page 115.

Even from this standpoint we can se the fallacy of trying to parallel Reed and Kellogg's, 'beware of the bottle', which means intoxicating liquors in a bottle or anything else: or the 'house of Jacob', the 'house of Israel', which includes all Jews whether they ever lived in a house or not; with 'the cup of the Lord', which never, never, was spoken of except in the Lord's supper. And Bro. Whitehead has admitted that "At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those who drank from it 'Drank the cup of the Lord".

Paul commanded the Corinthians to follow him as he was of Christ, I Cor. 11:1. And in the 23rd. verse shows he received of the Lord just as the Lord exemplified it 26 years before, see verses 23-25. And in verse 26 Paul refers to it as 'the cup', WHILE IN

VERSE 27 HE REFERED TO IT AS, "THE CUP OF THE LORD". Never, in any place in the Bible, is the fruit of the vine in a plurality of cups refered to as "the cup of the Lord". Hence we can see one cup and the fruit of the vine refered to by Paul as "the cup of the Lord". A close degree of intimacy; while with, "beware of the bottle", "the house of Jacob", "the house of Israel", has a less degree of intimacy, between the word in either case that was meant, and the word used to suggest it. Hence, cannot be paralleled with "The cup of the Lord", in which every time we have Bible reference to it, shows a very close degree of intimacy between one cup and the fruit of the vine. So close it always contained the fruit of the vine. This alone kills their attempt to parallel the above with the "cup of the Lord".

Now to "Faded Metonomies". Mr. Hill says "The process by which 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, page 292, (3rd. edition) says; "The language is full of metaphorical expressions that have lost their meaning as metaphors as the sense of imagined comparison has faded away".

Kellog's Rhetoric, (printed 1882), page 116 says; "In almost every sentence that drops from pen or tongue, there are words whose metaphorical significance has so faded out of them that we fail to detect it". Notice brother, we can hardly write or speak a sentence without using one of these "faded" metaphors. But hear him further; "Richter has called language 'a dictionary of faded metaphors".

That should remove all doubt that "faded metaphors" are numeraous in our language; and not just a few as some would have us to believe.

Blair, pages 152, 153, says; "In every language, to, there are a multitude of words, which, though they were figurative in their application to certain

objects,---". 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 will see by reading further. Hear him; "-----yet, by long use lose their figurative power wholly and come to be considered simple and literal expressions. In this case, are the terms which I refered to before, as transfered from sensible qualities (qualities observed by one or more of the senses, J. B. S.) to operations or qualities of the mind, as a 'Piercing' judgment-----". And thus, we see, the word, 'piercing' having once been turned away from its original, literal meaning to express a quality or operation of the mind; has become a literal meaning of that condition of mind. As the rhettoricians have said, the figurative sense has "faded" out. See also bottom of page 156, same author.

But at the top of page 153 we have a "fading" of less degree with which we have to deal in dealing with figures. Hear him; "There are other words which remain in sort of middle state; which have neither lost wholly their figurative application; nor yet retain so much of it as to imprint any remarkable character of figured language or sryle------".

Here we have another condition: For example; take "Beware of the bottle", which means, beware of intoxicating liquor. Was the original meaning of it, 'beware of that which was in the bottle', and by long use faded down to mean, beware of strong drink? Or, was it so in the beginning? That is the word, bottle, with "less degree",used "less intimate", when the figure was made?

In either case it does not parallel with, "Drink the cup of the Lord"; at the institution of which, there was one cup containing the fruit of the vine. Twenty-six years after, 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" (I Cor. II:26); "Drink the cup of the Lord" I Cor. II:27. We see the degree was "more", "strong", "intimate". Hence cannot be paralleled with such expressions as "beware of the bottle", "the house of Israel", "the house of Jacob", for they all stand on a less degree than the Bible metonomy, "Drink the cup of the Lord". This is a common and destructive violation of logic. As additional evidence that words do "turn" on a greater or less degree; thus forming different levels of comparison, I quote the following authors.

Alfred M. Hitchcock, page 345, he says; "There are many kinds of figures, one investigator recognizes over two hundred varieties. But not a few of these are so common, and represemts departures so slight, that they may be disregarded".

Again, Herrick and Damon, page 493, "A figure of speech or trope is a word or phrase turned in a greater or less degree from its original or literal meaning".

Bro. Whitehead, after trying to get Thayer on page 441 to back up his false position on the cups issue, advised us one cup boys to stay away from Thayer; but not thinking he might mean all of it I ventured one more peep and this is what I found. The first definition of, Oikos (house) under metonomy is, "The inmates of a house; all the persons forming one family, a household". Under that definition he gives a lot of scripture where "house", (singular number) is used, all of which shows plainly that the word "house" in each case refers to the "inmates of a house, all the persons forming a family, household", just as Thayer defined it.

But we come down to where they are plural and we find; I Tim. 3:12, speaks of Deacons (plural number) ruling-----their own houses (plural number) well. That looks funny. Bor. Whitehead has been telling us "house", (singular number) meant houses. Lets try Thayer out again. Titus I:11; here again we have some subverting whole "houses" (plural number). Paul

was still like the poor old one cup folks, thought when he refered to a thing, or things, in a plurality of places or containers should be represented by the plural. Bro. Whitehead should have been there and told him better.

Lets try again. Next he tells us the "house" in Gen. 7:1, is plural in the Hebrew. We will just go there and see who had the plurality of houses. "And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house (Hebrew, "HOUSES")---------". Wait a minute; there were three families of Noah's boys and he and his wife. Well that was a plurality of families living in a plurality of houses. And remember we are under the definition, "The inmates of a house, all the persons forming one family, a household". Brother, that fits us to a tee. Bur says one, the King James translation says house, not houses. Yes, we know it; and not being a mind reader, and not having them present to ask them, I am unable to tell you why. However, it does not hurt God's word without some one is hunting a hole to hide in.

But says one, read Heb. II:7 and it says Noah prepared an Ark to the saving of his house. Yes, but the word, household, means, "Those who dwell as a family under one roof". When Noah and his wife and three sons and their wives went into that Ark, that was all the 'house' they had. They fulfilled the definition of, house, as a metonomy. Notice definition. "The inmates of a house, all the persons 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 the Ark to the saving of his house.

Now, lets take a look at definition 3; "stock, race, decendants of one". And here are a few examples listed: "Luke I:27; "of the house of David". Ver. 69, "-------in the house of his servant David". Luk. 2:4; "--------because he was of the house and lineage of David". Matt. IO:6; "------the house of Israel". Matt. I5:34, "------house of Israel". Acts 2:36; "--------house of Israel". Acts 7:42; "----Oh ye

house of Israel----". And on and on, we see "the house of David" and the "house of Israel" under the heading of, "stock, race, decendants of one". Regardless as to whether in a house or never saw a house, if they were of the "stock, race, or decendants" of David, they were of the house of David and the same relative to the "house of Israel", while under definition 2, under Metonomy, "they were the 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 named, a plurality of houses were involved, and named.

Mr. Webster baxks this up. Webster's International Dictionary, 2nd. Edition, definition 4, "those who dwell in the same house, a houshold". This is exactly like Thayer's metonomy definition. And under it all are listed where a literal house and people who dwelt there were involved.

Get definition 5, "a family of ancestors, decendants, and kindred; a race of persons from the same stock; a tribe; especially a noble family, or illustrious race; as the house of Hanover". Under this, like Thayer's definition 3; no literal house was at the present involved. It just meant, "race", "tribe", decendants etc. The idea of them being dwellers of the same house has completely "FADED" out. And with it, Bro. Whitehead's argument on "the house of David", "the house of Israel", also faded out.

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

As I have shown only one cup was involved in the establishment of the Lord's supper, and he has admitted it, I have shown 26 years later Paul in the IIth. chapter of I Corinthians recapitulated the scene when he 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 it, they "drank the cup of the Lord". And not a hint of a hint that a plurality was ever used.

Jesus in Matt. 26:27 commanded the disciples to all drink of it, the cup. For there was nothing else for the "it", in "Drink ye all of it" to refer to. His (Bro. Whitehead's) own authority stated plainly the antecedent of a pronoun must be there and stated. The denoted command was; "Drink ye all of the cup". The connoted (implied thought) drink of the contents the cup. They make a cute switch here and make the "denoted" 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 the admitted this undeniable fact, their whole theory would forever be destroyed. So to save a theory more precious to them than God's holy word; they make themselves the violator of one of the simplest rules of language and logic. And in addition to this, Paul commanded the disciples, in I Cor. II:I, to follow him as he did Christ. Later he recapitulated the establishment of the Lord's supper as Jesus established 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 (Bro. Whitehead) admitted also on page IO, paragraph 3, of his tract, quoting from one of my letters, he says; "In a letter after citing 'Paul's recapitulation', I Cor. II:24-25, he triumphantly (a) asserts: 'So we see the setting; the very act upon which Paul's metonomy is based was a physical cup accompaning the actual physical fruit of the vine', Well, so be it".

You will note his answer to my statement was, "well, so be it". He also said more which is already answered.

Then we see two commands, one by the Lord in Mat. 26:27; the other by Paul in I Cor. II. Yet they cry "INCIDENTAL".

Thsi cup is, (not literally but figuratively) the

fruit of the vine in the expression, "drink the cup". Then we have the parallels; In, "Drink the cup"; the cup is (symbolizes) the fruit of the vine.

In Matt. 26:26, "This (bread) is (symbolizes) my body".

In Matt. 26:27-28, "This (fruit of the vine) is (symbolizes) 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 in the first; you can substitute beefsteak in the second for bread; and milk in the third for fruit of the vine. Brethren in the name of truth and for God, his word, and your eternal welfare, wake up.

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

"If we alter the word used figuratively we destroy the figure". See Blaid, page 148, quoted previously.

Hence if we add an "s" to the word 'cup' making it 'cups', we have altered the word; therefore destroyed the figure.

In the fifth chapter of 2nd. Kings we have a fair parallel with our cups brethren. This man Naaman had the Leprosy and went to the prophet Elisha to be cured. In the 10th. verse the prophet told him to "go wash in Jordan seven times------", (Just as we are commanded to "drink ye all of the cup", in Matt. 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 want 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 it was the command to "wash in Jordan", so he repented and went and washed and was made clean. (So, also, some of our cups

brethren, when they are shown to "drink ye all of the cup" is a command, repent and obey). However many of them do not do as well as Naaman, and have never repented and obeyed the Lord to "drink ye all of the cup". So, for their benefit I wish to ask a few questions and make a parallel.

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

But the denoted (stated) command to Naaman, "Go wash in Jordan seven times", made it obligatory that he really wash in Jordan and not transfer the water to another place and there wash. So, also, the denoted (stated) command to us to "Drink ye all of the cup", makes it obligatory that we drink of the cup and not transfer the element to some other place and drink it there. If not, why not?? Neither could he have used other water than that in Jordan. So, neither could we drink another element than that in the cup. The common law that governs language, governs both circumstances.

I--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'.

I--The disciples did not drink of a plurality of cups when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper. (Admited)

2--But the disciples 'drank the cup of the Lord' when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper. (Admitted)

3--Therefore the disciples cannot drink of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper and 'drink the cup of the lord'.

I--To speak a word in the name of the Lord which he has not commanded us to speak, is presumption. Deut. I8:20.

2--But to teach that 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 a presumption.

I--"But without faith it is impossible to please God----": Heb. II:6.

2--But a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine to an assembly, is not of faith, (Not mentioned in God's word) Rom. I0:I7.

3--Therefore a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine to an assembly in the Lord's supper is not pleasing to God.

I--"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin", Rom. I4:23.

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, Romans I0:I7.

3--Therefore a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is sin.

I--"We walk by faith", 2 Cor. 5:7.

2--But 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. I0:I7.

3--Therefore we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of thevine in the Lord's supper and walk by faith.

I--The scriptures given by the inspiration of God,

throughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works, 2 Tim. 3:I-I7.

2--But the scriptures given by the inspiration Of God nowhere says anything about using 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.

I--But foolish and unlearned questions avoid for they do gender strife, Phil. 3:I6.

2--But a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is an unlearned question.

3--Therefore, we cannot use a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper to distribute the fruit of the vine, and obey the command, foolish and unlearned questions avoid.

I--Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God, 2 John 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 to use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is to transgress the doctrine of Christ and have not God.

I--"According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertains to life and godliness", I Peter I:3.

2--But nowhere in his divine power (the gospel, Rom. I:I6) are we given a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper.

3--Therefore a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper does not pertain to life and godliness.

I--"And this is love that we walk after his commandments, and this is the commandment, That as ye have heard from the beginning ye should walk in it".

2--But nowhere, in the beginning, when the Lord's supper was instituted, have we a record where a plurality of cups was used 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, "that, as ye have heard in the beginning ye should walk in it".

I--"For I will not dare to speak 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 do a thing Paul would not dare to even speak of.

I--We are told to hold fast the faithful word as we have been taught, Titus 1:9.

2--But nowhere in the faithful word have we been 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 we have been taught.

I--"Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ", Phil. 1:27.

2--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.

I--"Those things ye have both learned, received, heard and seen in me do, and the God of peace shall be with you", Phil. 4:9.

2--But nowhere have we learned, received, heard or seen in the apostle Paul the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in 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, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do, and the God of peace shall be with you".

I--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 in the Lord's supper.

3--Therefore, we cannot use a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper and stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

I-"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron", I 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. (See 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 doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy; 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 word on this subject that we might all 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, yours in Christ,

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

GENERAL INDEX---------- PAGE

A Misrepresentation---------- I.
Christ Did Take A Cup---------- 2.
Propositions---------- 2.
The Word "This"---------- 3.
The Command Denoted---------- 4.
A Pronoun Must Refer To Its Antecedent--------- 4.
"It" Is Cup---------- 5.
Denotative And Connotative Meaning---------6, I2 & 48.
Containers Cannot Be Substituted For Cup------- 8.
"This", In Matt. 26:28---------- 8.
Transposing A Sentence---------- 9.
Swallowing Or Drinking A Literal Cup---------- II.
Definition Of "Swallow"---------- II.
Drink"The Cup Of The Lord" Without It Being In A Cup--- ---------- I2.
Apostolic Practice----------I4 & I5.
Suggestion In A Metonomy---------- I6.
Vessels Of Storage---------- I7.
Bottle Not Parallel With Cup---------- I7.
Common Usage---------- I8.
Expressiveness---------- I9.
Implied Or Associated Meanings---------- 20.
"Drink The Cup"---------- 20.
Asserted Or Assumed Relationships----------22 & 23.
WORN-OUT METONOMIES---------- 23.
"Cup Of The Lord" Is A. Literal Cup---------- 24.
The Manner Of Accompaniment---------- 25.
Cause And Effect---------- 25.
When A Scholar's Definition Is Wrong 26, 27, 29, 30 & 32----------& & 33.
Form, Can We Change It?---------- 28 & 29.
Literality Of A Figure---------- 30.
METONOMIES---------- 33 to 40.
Degrees Of Intimacy---------- 40.
"FADED METONOMIES"---------- 4I to 45.
Paul's Recapitulation---------- 45 & 46.
"It", The Cup, & Parallels---------- 46 & 47.
Destroying The Figure---------- 47.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES