

## **THE HARPER - COWAN DISCUSSION**

A discussion on the number of cups to be used in the  
communion service

Reprinted from "The Truth"  
Published in March, 1931 by H. C. Harper

Published By  
**M. LYNWOOD SMITH PUBLICATIONS**  
Route One Box 151  
Wesson, MS 39191

This Discussion is the outgrowth of an oral discussion which was held a year before at Graham, Texas—1930, August 21. The propositions were the same. Of course, brethren H.C. Harper of Florida, and Brother J.N. Cowan of Texas, were the debaters.

This work that you are about to read was published in *The Truth*, brother Harper's paper, in 1931, March issue.

In giving this bit of history to you, the readers, I hope that it will prove interesting and helpful. It is a work that I did not want to see drift into oblivion.

—M. Lynwood Smith  
Route One, Box 151  
Wesson, Miss. 39191

## HARPER-COWAN DISCUSSION

### HARPER DISCUSSION

#### J. N. Cowan's first affirmative.

Proposition:— The word “cup” as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and “the fruit of the vine” are one and the same. Cowan affirms.

The reader will note that my proposition calls for the use of the word “cup.” Cup is the name of a literal vessel, but may be used to denote what is in the vessel, as “He drank the poison cup and died.” Meaning he drank the liquid which was in the cup. I contend that Christ used the word in that sense in the verse cited. “He took the cup, (meaning the liquid) and gave thanks, and gave it unto them saying, drink ye all of it, (the liquid). For this (cup-liquid) is my blood of the New Testament.” We desire to ascertain the meaning of “This is my blood.” In verse 26 we read, “And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; **this is my body.**” The pronoun “this” certainly refers to the bread he took, and may read “This (bread) is my body.” Then, the expression “This is my blood” just as certainly refers to the cup he took. We both agree that the fruit of the vine is what Jesus called the Blood of the New Testament. Therefore, He took the fruit of the vine and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, drink ye all of it, for this is my blood. Hence, my proposition is proven. Let the reader try Putting a literal drinking vessel for cup and read: He took the literal drinking vessel and gave thanks, and gave the literal vessel to them, saying drink ye all of the literal vessel, for this literal vessel is my blood of the New Testament. The antecedent of the pronoun, “this” in verse 28 is “cup” in verse 27. (Harper) Pronouns stand for nouns. “This” stands for “cup,” the same cup as mentioned in verse 27. If “cup” in verse 27 is a literal vessel, the pronoun “this” which stands for it must refer to a literal vessel, and that would make the literal vessel the blood of the N. T. But if the “cup” in verse 27 is the fruit of the vine, “this” in verse 28 refers to the fruit of the vine and is the blood of the N. T. Hence, the “cup” and the “fruit of the vine” are the same.

“FOR this is my blood” v. 28. “For” is translated from GAR in the greek. Gar is a conjunction and certainly joins verse 28 to verse 27. Thayer defines: “Truly therefore, verily as the case stands; for, the fact is, namely.” And he took the cup . . . for the fact is this cup is my blood. He took the cup . . . namely the blood of the N. T. Thayer goes on to say, under “Gar,” “Now since by a new affirmation not infrequently the reason and nature of something previously mentioned are set forth, it comes to pass that, by the use of this particle, either the reason and cause of a foregoing statement is added, whence arises the casual or argumentative force of the particle, **for**; or some previous declaration is explained, whence GAR takes on an explicative force.” This authority fully agrees with my contention that verse 28 is an explanation of what the word cup meant as used by Christ in Verse 27.

If “the cup” refers to the fruit of the vine, I can see how a sufficient quantity can be provided to serve an audience of any size; but if it refers to the container I cannot see how only one could be used to serve the congregation in Jerusalem on the day of

Pentacost. This day was the first day of the week, and before they had time to establish other congregations in the city. In fact there is no proof that there was ever more than one congregation in Jerusalem, and there were many thousand members there in a very short time. Neither is there any proof that they divided the congregation into groups in order to serve the communion; if they did do such a thing, they had as many cups in that congregation as they had groups. That would be too many for the one container advocates. It may be said that we are not discussing the number of cups, and that this argument is not on the subject; but it will be readily seen that if the "fruit of the vine" is what Jesus called the cup, that one volume of it could have been provided to serve the congregation; but if a literal vessel is what Jesus called the cup, and only one literal vessel is permitted in the distribution of the wine, it would have been an utter impossibility to serve the Jerusalem church composed of over three thousand members with only one drinking vessel. Therefore, I conclude that the fruit of the vine and the cup are one and the same.

Sept. 9, 1930

J. N. COWAN.

### FIRST REPLY

Please word the proposition as we signed it and define its terms, as the rules of honorable discussion demand.

The "cup" is used literally in Mt. 26:27, and Thayer so cites it, as does Ropes, the present Professor of N. T. Greek, Harvard University; and Goodspeed, present Professor of N. T. Greek, Chicago, University. And these scholars know fully of the use of "this" and **gar**; and "this authority" in no way agrees with your contention that "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. And while the antecedent of "this" in verse 28 is "cup" in verse 27, which is there used literally, yet the pronoun "this" is used metonymically. And if **cup** is supplied, it is so used. And your trying to read it through all literal or all figurative only gives the lie to Thayer, et al.

"Can a pronoun be used figuratively and have for its antecedent a word used literally?" Answer: "Yes."—Jas. M. Farr, Head Department of English, University of Florida. "Is 'this' (Mt. 26:28) or the noun 'cup' if supplied, used literally? or figuratively? Answer: "The latter."—Edgar J. Goodspeed.

"Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27, and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" Answer: "No. The **contents** of the cup and 'the fruit of the vine' are the same."—James H. Ropes. "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid?"—Answer: "Yes."—Ropes.

You say, "He took the fruit of the vine," etc. But the Bible says, "And he took a cup," etc. (Mt. 26:27) "Cup" is here the vessel which he took. And he said, "Drink ye all out of it; for this (figuratively, suggesting the contents (or this **cup**, if you please) is my blood," etc. It was not "the fruit of the vine" in an ordinary sense or way, as in the cluster, in barrels, in bottles, etc., but as Thayer says of I Cor. 11:25 and Luke 22:20 ("This cup is the new covenant in my blood") "in both which the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant'."—p. 15. The "cup" is not the "wine," neither is the "new covenant" the "blood." And the "cup" is no more "the fruit of the vine" than is the "new covenant" the same as the "blood."

You say, "If 'the cup' refers to the 'fruit of the vine,' etc. Well, if it 'refers' to 'the fruit of the vine,' it is not 'the fruit of the vine,' for the thing that 'refers' to a thing is not the thing referred to. And even if 'the cup' in Mt. 26:27 were used metonymically as you contend in 'He drank the poison cup and died, 'that does not make the 'cup' and what he drank the same. Here the 'cup,' one thing, is **named**, and its **contents**, another thing, are suggested. The 'cup' is not its contents. **Metonymy** 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."—Williams' Rhetoric.

After you prove that "the cup" and "the fruit of the vine" as used by Christ are one and the same, it will be time enough for you to undertake, if you wish to do so, to prove that all the disciples in Jerusalem took the Lord's supper in one assembly. But as a matter of truth, "The oldest meeting-places of Christian worship were rooms in ordinary dwellings."—Schaff-Herzog. And Pentecost was the "oldest." So "In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5, 15; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. verse 2. Jamieson, Fausset and Brown. And "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses. In large towns, where such a place of assembly could not accommodate all, it became necessary that smaller portions of the community dwelling at a distance should choose other places for their meetings."—Neander, Vol. I, p. 402. And when you prove your "cups and loaves" for a congregation, we will be ready to take **individual cups** and individual loaves. Why not? If you wish to call a "church," Rom. 16:5; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. v. 2, a "group," as some of the S. S. folks called a church a "class," you can; but the Lord provided for churches of Christ, and one "loaf" and "a" (one) cup for each. (Mt. 26:27; I Cor. 10:17). How do you have "one volume of it" without one cup to contain it? And why do you want "one volume"?

—H. C. HARPER

### J. N. COWAN'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I worded the proposition from memory, and as I have not the original at hand, cannot make correction. Let my opponent correct if he sees a discrepancy. The proposition itself is a definition. What part of this definition do you want defined?

I feel complimented on my first affirmative because the first reply utterly failed to answer my arguments. Thayer does not cite Mat. 26:27 under the head "literally," but "properly," and that does not signify literally. If it does, Thayer also cites Rev. 17:4 under the same head, and every one knows that neither the woman nor the golden cup in her hand were used literally. No attempt was made to reply to my argument on "GAR." I gave quotation from Thayer showing according to his definition, verse 28 was an explanation of what was meant by "cup" in verse 27. Yes "Thayer understood" the use of the word, but you failed to answer the argument. As to Ropes, I have not seen anything but a mutilated answer from him, and as you did not quote what he said, it deserves no reply. Goodspeed is entirely too loose in his translation to deserve recognition as an authority on this question. Will you endorse Goodspeed throughout this discussion?

The pronoun "This" is not the word which denotes the figure of speech, but the word "cup." Cup is named to suggest the fruit of vine. "Metonymy is from a Greek word which means a change of name—that is, a thing is called or described by some other

than its own name." (The World Book, vol. 6 P. 3757) In the passage in dispute, the fruit of the vine is called by some other than its own name, viz: the cup. I showed that in "this (bread) is my body," that "this" referred to the bread he took. That, "this (cup) is my blood," referred to the cup he took. This was not noticed. No man can get away from the fact that pronouns stand for their antecedents (nouns), and "this" stands for its antecedent "cup" in verse 27. If cup was used literally in verse 27, "this" in verse 28 refers to the same literal cup. You are tied fast here. My opponent has the Lord mention the bread, one element of the supper, and then abruptly change to a literal vessel which is not an element of the supper. The cup and bread are both elements of the same supper and one is as figurative as the other. Is the literal drinking vessel an element of the Lord's supper? "That which refers to a thing is not the thing referred to." Wonderful information! But in metonymy one thing is named when another is meant, as, the kettle boils. "Cup" is named when "fruit of the vine" is meant.

Concerning literal cup being an emblem of the New Covenant, I will submit the following from scripture. "For this (cup) is my blood of the New Testament." "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Do both passages refer to the same cup? When you answer this, I will take care of Thayer P. 15.

When Jesus took the cup, my opponent says it was not the fruit of the vine; when did he take the fruit of the vine? If he took the fruit of the vine at the same time he took the vessel, how do you know he did not refer to it instead of the vessel? My proposition is proven by the plain and obvious meaning of the passage itself. "And he took the cup -- for this (cup) is my blood." The Lord is my Star witness. No amount of quibbling can hide the force of such testimony.

My opponent tries to make the reader think my argument about the great number of disciples in Jerusalem is not relevant. "The oldest meeting place was in Jerusalem." Then the disciples were not in the Temple as the scripture relates but in a room in a private dwelling-house on the day of Pentecost. "They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade." Will you take that? On the day of Pentecost, the first day of the week, before they had time to establish congregations over the city, thousands observed the Lord's supper. If the cup was a drinking vessel, what was its size? I frankly admit that in other cities, they met in private houses, but not for the purpose of using the one container, but because they had no public houses for worship. If they had such houses, they no doubt would have all met together as they did at Jerusalem where they had house accommodation. If my proposition is true, one volume of wine, called "the cup" could have been provided. Let my opponent tell how he would provide for 1000 brethren who may come together at one place on Lord's day with his proposition that "cup" means container. The volume would not be altered though in more than one container. Congregations established in different house are not on par with S. S. classes, but dividing the assembly on the day of Pentecost, when they had only one congregation, in order to commune, is on a par with S. S. class division.

Oct. 1st, 1930

J.N. COWAN

## SECOND REPLY

"'The cup' as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' are one and the same. J. N. Cowan affirms." (See your letter of Oct. 10, 1925),

This is your proposition, and the rules of honorable discussion demand that you

define its terms, and make clear the issue. Are you afraid to do it?

You compliment yourself, that your so-called arguments were not met, and yet you spent your whole time in trying to patch them up after I utterly refuted them. Glad that you now see that Thayer cites "cup" here as used "properly." And if you do not know that this means "literally," you better "brush up" a little, to say the least of it. Don't make yourself laughin' stock.

Here is where Thayer cites "cup" of Rev. 17:4, too, your ignorant splurge to the contrary notwithstanding. Listen: "Is 'cup' in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively? 'No.'"—Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago University, letter Sept. 30, 1930.

I see you quote Goodspeed approvingly: "They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade," Acts 5:12. "Will you endorse Goodspeed throughout this discussion," eh? He says "cup" is used **literally** in Mt. 26:27.

I did quote what Ropes, of Harvard University said. Listen: "Is the word translated 'cup' in Mt. 26:27 there used literally?" "Yes." Again: "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27, and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" No. The **contents** of the cup and 'the fruit of the vine' are the same." Again: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid?" "Yes." And what he marked out was in regard to a supplied "it" in the Authorized version, and he says, "What I had written was crossed out by me." (Letter Sept. 6, 1930) And this refutes you.

"And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) "And they all drank out of it." (Mk. 14:23) And the plain, obvious passage imports that "cup" here is the vessel out of which they drank. And I have as my witnesses, not only the Lord, but also the scholars of the world, that your proposition is not true.

Do you know more about **pronouns** than does Jas. M. Farr, Head Department of English, University of Florida? These scholars know the force of "this" and **gar** here, and they know there is nothing in either to prevent "cup" here from being used **literally**, as they say it is. You have found only a **mare's-nest**.

But, as I said, even if "cup" were used here by metonymy, this would not make "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" the same, for if "Cup is named to suggest the fruit of the vine," as you now say, or if "the cup refers to the fruit of the vine," as you said before, then the "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" are two different things, "wonderful" as it may seem to you, and your proposition is not true. "Metonymy 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."—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220. It takes both "Container and thing contained" to constitute this kind of metonymy.—Ib. p. 220. The "container" **cup** in this case, is no more the same as the "contained," **the fruit of the vine** in this case, than **black** is the same as white. However, "cup" is not used metonymy here; but even if it were so used, your proposition is not true.

The "cup" is an "element," an essential constituent part, of the Supper, as much so as is "the fruit of the vine,"—each must drink the cup. "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way."—N. L. Clark. Drink the cup, "that is, what is in the cup."—Thayer. Then each drinks the cup by drinking what is in the cup. No one can do this without a **cup**.

We know by the **context** that the "cup" in Mt. 26:27 had "fruit of the vine" in it when he took it. Do you agree with Goodspeed, that if "cup" is supplied after "this," it

is used figuratively? You talk about "the same cup." I find but one, "a cup," and "a" is from the Anglo-Saxon, meaning **one**. Do you find cups?

Yes, "this (bread)" is "my body; and "this (cup)" by metonymy if supplied, naming, or calling, the "cup" to **suggest** "what is in the cup," as "my blood." There is nothing unusual about this. "Cup" is first used **literally** in I.k. 22:20, and then **metonymically** in its second use, as Thayer indicates. And no amount of "quibbling" can set aside the Standard Authority of New Testament Greek.

Your assumption for big assemblies for "worship" was knocked in the head by the fact that "worship" was conducted in "ordinary dwellings," "private houses," "the church" in this or that man's house," Rom. 16:5, 15; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. verse 2. You quote Goodspeed, Acts 5:12. Does he say they conducted the "worship" in the temple? Not by a long way. You can't fool us with another **mare's-nest**. It would take no longer to establish a "church" in this or that man's house" than it would take for the disciples to go to "this or that man's house." And this is what they did, as the testimony abundantly shows.

"One volume of wine." Why? again I ask. Is it "one loaf," too, or are you going to have "loaves" with your cups to drink from? And if God has no word on the number of cups, are you going to make a "creed" to limit the number and cut out the "individual cups," except one be "tubercular," and just have "two or more as you think needed? It is your "provide," now, so take up the laboring oar. Can 25,000, as a congregation, worship in one assembly according to the N.T. pattern? Since "dividing the assembly" is "on a par with the S. S. class division," are you going into the S. S. ranks? or will you show us how to conduct N. T. worship with an assembly of 25, or 50 thousand?—or will you fudge?

If "the cup" was not "a drinking vessel," no man on earth knows what it was, for **poterion**, "a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer) was the name of the vessel Jesus "took" when he instituted the Lord's Supper. And this is a "solid," and not a liquid. And "The volume" of a liquid is "altered" when converted into volumes, as much so a watch crystal is altered when broken into fragments.

Oct. 6, 1930

H. C. HARPER

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

No material change in wording of Proposition. If the reader cannot see that the proposition says the cup and the fruit of the vine are the same, and that my respondent says they are not, which is the issue, then I despair of reaching them. What needs defining? I have consulted the best dictionaries, and fail to find one that defines "properly" to mean "literally," so laugh. Thayer cites Mat. 26:27 and Rev. 17:4 under the same head. My opponent seeks to prove the latter passage literal to save his position on the former. John saw a woman with a golden cup in her hand full of her fornication. The last verse in the chapter says, "the woman is that great city." So we all know "woman" was used symbolically. Did the great city have a literal drinking vessel in her hand? Did it contain literal fornication? My opponent and Goodspeed to the contrary, notwithstanding. In a written debate, it is not fair to the debaters, nor the readers to quote authorities without furnishing copy for examination. Then, the readers cannot examine. I shall only notice standard works as authority, which may be procured by every reader, in preference to extracts from private letters. "They all drank out of it," does not prove they put their lips to the same vessel; eg. Jacob and

cattle drank out of the well; Israel drank out of the rock; they who keep a flock drink out of the flock. You cannot 'eeek out on "ek." "Pronoun"—"Gram. Lit. a word used instead of a noun or name; Used either substantively or adjectively to stand in the place of, or refer to persons or things named." (Webster) "This is used adjectively and stands for cup and refers to cup, the thing named in Verse 27. "This" is a demonstrative word. (Webster) "Demonstrative"—"Of the nature of demonstrating; or tending to demonstrate: making evident; exhibiting clearly." (Webster) In Mat. 26:28, "this" demonstrates, makes evident, and exhibits clearly what the cup is, mentioned in verse 27. This proves my proposition. Selah. All the extracts from college professors can never clear this away satisfactory. I asked you first to say if you will endorse Goodspeed. Come on. I accept William's definition of metonymy. No one denies the Lord had a container in hand when he instituted the supper, but I deny the word cup refers to it. He mentioned the fruit of the vine, not by naming it, but by naming the container which suggested it. Thanks! HEAR YE EXEGETES! "The container is an element of the supper." To eat the supper is to eat the elements which compose it. Shame! I have never understood that the dishes were any part of a supper. "HERE'S THE MARE'S-NEST" My opponent has discovered in some way that the church on the day of Pentecost organised many local congregations the same day. By actual demonstration, it has been proven that not more than one hundred can be served with one container once filled. Divide 3132 by 100 and you have more than 31 congregations established on that day. A few days later 5000 more were added which required 50 more congregations; 81 in Jerusalem, and strange to say, no mention is ever made in the Bible or history of but one. Why is my opponent driven to this? Answer, because he knows his position on what the cup is will not allow him to serve the entire number of disciples. I know how to provide for any number of disciples with one cup, for I know the cup to be the fruit of the vine; but my respondent just can't fix it. That's all. Where in Bible or history is it said they met in any private house in order to use one container? Where? "If the cup was not a drinking vessel no man on earth knows what it was." Jesus knew what it was for he said it was his blood of the N. T. "The volume of a liquid is altered when converted into volumes, as much so as a watch crystal is altered when broken into fragments." Not so. The "volumes" are but parts of the whole which was called the cup, and still just as drinkable as before; but the breaking of the crystal renders it unusable. I failed to find your answer to my question, "For this (cup) is my blood of the N. T." "This cup is the N. T. in my blood." Do both passages refer to the same cup?" Don't fail to answer in your next. My quotation from Thayer on "Gar" stands unnoticed. Webster defines "cup" under 5. "The wine of the communion." My respondent quotes from N. L. Clark on how to drink the cup. I will quote from the ablest defender of the one container I have ever met, "The cup" as mentioned by Christ in Mat. 26:27 names a certain volume of wine set apart by the church of Christ to be used in the communion service." (Frank Stark, Anson, Texas.) May I hold you to this definition? The following scriptures prove there was only one congregation in Jerusalem. Reader, read them. Act. 2:46; 5:11-14, 6:1-7; 11:26; 14:27; 15:3-5; 15:22; 15:30-31; 16:5; "Drink ye all of it for this (cup) is my blood." (Jesus)

Oct. 9, 1930

J. N. COWAN

### THIRD REPLY

Since you need "dodging room," and are afraid of spoiling it by defining the terms of your proposition, as an honest debater should (See Hedge's Elements of Logic),

it will not be expected of you; but you should at least word the proposition as we signed it.

I see a material difference between **the cup** and the **word cup**; the former is "a drinking vessel" Christ "took," as you now admit; the latter is a **word**. However, "the fruit of the vine" is neither; much less is it the **use** of either.

"Laugh"? No; I pity your ignorance; and for "good measure" will cite other standard works. See **The Form of Baptism**. And lest it be not "procured by every reader" and you could not find the place in the "work," I'll give a passage or two. Page 73: "Is the point of agreement between the 'proper or literal' meaning of **baptizo** and this metaphor found in the pouring?" Page 77: "There is enveloping in baptism as indicated by the 'proper or literal' meaning of the word." See also Bullinger on **Figures of the Bible**.

Here is the crux. If cup here is used literally, your proposition is false, and you know it. And you shall not "peek out" or sneak out on **cups**.

I have given the Head of the Department of N. T. Greek of Harvard University and Chicago University, and can now add Harry M. Hubbell, of Yale (letter Oct. 8, 1930), that "cup" in Matt. 26:27 is used literally and that Thayer so notes it by "prop."

These "scholars" are more accessible to you and "the reader" by far than are the lexicons and other "standard works." A two-cent stamp in a letter of inquiry is sufficient. But you, like the baby sprinkler, want to ignore the "scholarship" and have **dupes** take your ipse dixit and subterfuges. Why so? Because your position drives you to this. And he can go to Webster for "sprinkle" as fast as you can for "The wine of the communion." And this sectarian route is that by which you try to escape. But when you go outside of **poterion**, "a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer), for an idea not inherent in this word, I'll force you to go outside of **baptisma**, "immersion" (Thayer), for an idea not inherent in this word, and make you take "sprinkling, pouring or immersion" by Webster. Now take this slimy trail if you dare.

Rev. 17:4. Cannot a word be used literally in a symbolic Scripture? What "standard work" or recognized "scholar" gives "cup" as used by metonymy in Mt. 26:27? If "cup" in Rev. 17:4 is used figuratively, what is the figure of speech? What does Thayer mean by "prop." if not "literally"? "Furnish the goods" now. You better make at least a stagger at answering my questions if you are going to debate.

One thing "They all drank out of it" (Mk. 14:23) does prove, and that is that "cup" in this verse, as in Mt. 26:27, is "the vessel out of which one drinks." (Thayer p. 510) And "the vessel out of which one drinks" is not "the fruit of the vine." "Selah." And to "drink the cup" they must drink "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) or "what it contains." (N. L. Clark.) And no living man can refute it.

Was the "well" "the vessel out of which one drinks"? Did they drink the "well"? The "well" is conspicuous by its absence under "the vessel out of which one drinks." And "flock" (I Cor. 9:7) comes under "supply," and not "the vessel out of which one drinks." (Thayer, p. 191.) And if you will consult Winer, sec. 40, b3, as Thayer cites it, you may see where the "rock" comes.

"This" (Mt. 26:28) is used "adjectively." (Cowan) Shades of more—gall, or is it pure ignorance? "This" is used substantively, subject of "is." And **gar**, in none of its uses, as you quote from Thayer, hinders "cup" in the preceding verse from being used literally, as Thayer shows, and every other Greek scholar knows.

Your "the container which suggests it," shows that the container, cup, in this case, even if named by metonymy, is not "it" in the cup, suggested by naming the cup. It takes "Container and the contained" both to make this kind of metonymy. And one is not the other any more than black is white. More "Thanks."

"To eat the supper is to eat the elements that compose it." (Cowan) Then "eat" the fruit of the vine, brother. And not until you can "drink the cup" in some other way than "By drinking what it contains" (Clark), or "what is in the cup" (Thayer), can you dispense with the "cup" in the Supper. And this no living man can do. "Selah."

"Just as drinkable" in **cups**, eh? Then let us see them "drink the cup" in some other way than by drinking "what is in the cup," or "what it contains." Your "cups" are as "unusable" for this as is the broken crystal for your watch.

The fact that they met for "worship" in "ordinary dwellings," in "private houses," in "the church in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5, 15; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. verse 2," is proof from the bible and from "standard works" that there were no big congregations for "worship," no matter for what reason or reasons they so congregated.

At the "play" upon "congregation," I can beat you. There was but one in all the world, for "on this rock I will build my congregation," and "congregation of the first-born," and "he is the head of the body, the congregation." (L. O.)

I do not "endorse" any Revision or Translation **in toto**. Now I'm "on." Get me off if you can.

"Name" is used in a wide range of meanings now-a-days. In the sense that "the cup" could have but "one volume" of liquid in it; it points, designates, shows, or "names" "one volume, the statement is true. But the statement is not a "definition" of anything. Neither is your proposition a "definition" of anything.

If you use **cup** twice (It is used but once in any text.) in Matt., it is used literally in the first case and by metonymy in the second, just as Thayer gives it in Lk. 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25, and says, "The meaning is 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (p. 15) I answered your "same cup," saying I find but one which contained "the fruit of the vine." Oct. 15, 1930

H. C. HARPER

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

I have accepted the correction in the reading of the proposition, and offered to define anything not made clear. The word "cup" was used to designate the fruit of the vine, calling the contents by the name of the container. That is what my proposition means. It is an outrage to every candid mind to argue "cup" in Rev. 17:4 means a literal cup. **A symbolical woman with a literal cup in her hand! Preposterous!** A travesty on the word of God!!! Why say it was literal? Because Mat. 26:27 is cited under the same head, and in order to make the latter literal, the former must also be literal. Thayer is not responsible for my opponent's ridiculous conclusion. On "pino ek," Thayer p. 510, "of the vessel out of which one drinks," three passages are cited, Mat. 26:27; Mar. 14:23 and I Cor. 10:4. The last passage makes the rock the vessel out of which Israel drank. If man and beast drank out of this rock vessel without lipping the rock, then we may drink out of the vessel which contains the wine without lipping it. Thayer is my witness, not your's. Again, I say, excerpts from private correspondence is not considered proof in this kind of debate, and specially not, when your opponent has no privilege of examining the witness. Do the standard authorities fail you? You won't endorse

Goodspeed's translation, yet you call on him to help you in a private letter. My last argument on the pronoun "this" stands unassailed. Does Webster know what pronouns are: "It takes both container and contents to make this kind of metonymy." It does not take both to make what Jesus referred to when he said, "cup." Your question, "Do you eat the wine" seems like child's play. I will state it this way, we eat and drink the Lord's supper. If the vessel is a part of the supper, as you say, do you eat or drink it? You are the only man I ever met who contends that the dishes a supper is served in are a part of the supper. What next? The citation given to prove congregations worshipped in private homes do not refer to the large congregation in Jerusalem on the day of Pentacost. Come on with the proof that thirty-one were organized on that day, and fifty more a few days later. If you do not, you will have to take the position they divided the congregation in order to commune. Neither did you prove they met in private homes in other places in order to use only one drinking vessel. You claim to have proven there were no big congregation for worship on Pentacost. "All that believed were together and had all things common." "And they, continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." this breaking bread was one in which they ate meat, and was done in their homes, but their worship was conducted in the Temple, where all were together. "And great fear came upon all the church--and they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch." Many other references could be given, and were given in my last but these are enough to disprove your contention that there were numerous congregations in Jerusalem, and if there were not, you lose on the cup question. "One congregation in all the world," and one cup for this congregation, namely, the fruit of the vine when set apart for the communion. Beat me again will you? "The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 names a certain volume of wine set apart for use on the Lord's table." Harper says this statement is true. Again, he says "the word cup as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of a solid." **Both statements cannot be true.** One time he says the word as used by Christ names a solid, the next time he says it was used to name a volume of wine, a liquid. **Plain contradiction.** The truth is, the Lord took bread, called it his body, one element of the Supper; and then he took the fruit of the vine, called the cup, the other element of the supper. The vessel containing the wine is no more an element of the Supper than is the plate which contains the bread.

I had a right to expect my opponent to answer my question, viz: Does "this is my blood of the N. T." of Mat. 26:28 and "This cup is the N. T. in my blood" of Luk. 22:20 mean the same? If he says yes, he loses, If he says no he has two cups. I have no desire to go outside of Thayer's definition of Cup. (Poterion) It does mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." But Christ used this name to designate what was in it, and what was in it was the cup, as proven by "this (cup) is my blood of the N. T. Reading with this understanding, "He took the wine, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it. For this is my blood, etc." Now gentle reader, try the literal view. He took the vessel, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying drink ye all of it. For this is my blood, etc., "Do you think it requires the aid of a College Professor to determine which position is right? From my point of view, my opponent has solicited all the help possible to prove that Christ told a falsehood when he defined the cup in Mat. 26:28. Lord what is the cup? Answer, "This cup is my blood." Harper, and his garbled correspondence with Professors, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Oct. 21, 1930

J. N. COWAN

#### FOURTH REPLY

"Garbled," eh? "Garble, to mutilate; to say in the wrong way." Bring the proof, brother, or retract this. Such aspersion well befits the man who has not yet worded his proposition as signed, nor defined its terms. Define "cup."

These letters were in your hands at Graham, Texas; and these scholars are accessible to you for verification. You want us, like sectarian dupes, to take "Cowan says it," do you?

You say such evidence is not proof. It is. (See "The Form of Baptism" and "The Handbook on Baptism.")

I have shown by the **Standard Lexicon** and by the **living scholarship** that "cup" in Mt. 26:27 is used literally. This refutes you.

You are affirmant: answer my questions. 1. Cannot a word be used literally in symbolic Scriptures? (Your ignorance here is a "travesty" on God and man.) 2. What "standard work" or "recognized scholar" says that "cup" is used by **metonymy** in Mt. 26:27, as you do? (Cowan says it "doesn't go now.") 3. If "cup" in Rev. 17:4 is used **figuratively**, as you have tried to make it appear, what is the "figure of speech" used?

**4. What does Thayer mean by "prop," if not literally?** There are others you have not answered.

Thayer, under "the vessel out of which one drinks" (p. 510) cites three passages on the Lord's supper: Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; I Cor. 11:28, the very ones he cites under the literal use of "cup." p. 533. And this clinches it, refuting you. And he cites "W. sec. 40, 3b." for the use of "rock".

"Without liping it," "Cowan says." Listen!

Elk City, Okla., Oct. 24, 1929.

Lexicographer The New Standard Dictionary  
354-360 Fourth Ave., New York City.

Dear Sir:

Kindly submit answers to the following: 1. What would one have to do in order to drink from or out of a cup? 2. Must one put one's lips to a cup and drink in order to drink from or out of a cup?

New York, November 14, 1929.

Mr. H. C. Harper,

Elk City, Okla.

Dear Sir:—Replying to your inquiry, one drinks out of or from a cup when one places a cup to one's lips and drinks.

Certainly one must place a cup to one's lips in order to drink out of or from it.

Very truly yours,

THE LEXICOGRAPHER, B.

No, the "standard authorities" do not fail me, brother.

"This"—your "argument." You did not even know that "this" was not used "adjectively" here. I have shown that there is nothing in the use of "this" or "gar" in verse 28 to prevent the **literal** use of "cup" in verse 27, as Thayer cites it.

"Goodspeed"—you do not endorse his tr., yet you called on him for your "Colonade." "Selah."



Yes, Webster knows "what pronouns are," and you should know enough English to know that his definition does not cover all of them.

"Does not take both" container and contents as Jesus used "cup," eh? Then Jesus never used it by **metonymy**, which takes "Container and the thing contained." Williams, p. 220. But even if he did, it would not make them "one and the same."

"We eat and drink the Lord's supper," eh? Then we eat the bread and wine and drink the bread and wine, just as "John reads and writes English and Latin."

I can eat the bread without the plate. Can you "drink the cup" without the cup? Let us see you "drink the cup" without drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer) or "what it contains" (Clark).

"One congregation in all the world," and your "one cup, the fruit of the vine." Now conduct the N. T. worship without "dividing" this congregation. You "fudged" with "25 or 50 thousand, even. And when you limit, we will, too."

It reads, "And he took a cup." Now see Cowan's English: **He** took a wine. And "This cup is my blood," is a Cowan tr. It is not in the Bible.

The Bible reads, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," Lk. 22:20; I Cor. 11:25, "in both which," Thayer says, "the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'"

I answered your question on "the same cup," saying I find but one.

You've changed the language attributed to Bro. Frank Stark. Which time did you get what he said? I made it clear that "names," only in the sense I explained, makes it true, and that is, "In the sense that 'the cup' could have but 'one volume' of liquid in it." Now meet **what I said**.

**"In the temple:** They gathered there for the purpose of teaching the multitudes." Johnson, P's N. T.

**"Breaking bread from house to house** may refer to observing the Lord's Supper in private residences." Ib.

**Acts 2:44: All were together;** not all those thousands in one place (this was impossible); but as dr. Lightfoot explains it, they kept together in several companies or congregations according to their language, nations or their associations, brought them and kept them together."—Matthew Henry, Vol. VI. **Acts 2:46:** they did not think fit to celebrate the eucharist in the temple, for that was peculiar to the Christian institutions, and therefore they administered that ordinance in private houses of the converted Christians."— Ib.

"And he took a cup (**poterion**, a cup, a drinking vessel—Thayer), and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it. For this (suggesting the "wine" in the cup) is my blood," etc. Mt. 26:27, 28. In this view I am sustained by the Standard Lexicon and living scholars, what "Cowan says" to the contrary notwithstanding. Oct. 25, 1930

H. C. HARPER.

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

"Garble" also means, "to select such parts as are wanted or may serve some particular purpose." (Webster), and I have nothing to "retract." At last, after much complaint,

my opponent has found one word in the proposition he wants defined. The word "cup" as used by Christ referred to the fruit of the vine. I have given this definition several times. One of the letters displayed at Graham was considerably mutilated. The readers of this debate do not care to write personal letters to these Professors to see if you are right. You have not shown by the STANDARD LEXICON that you were right. But you have tried to force him to say Rev. 17:4 was a literal use of the word cup. You have not explained how a **symbolical** woman could hold a **literal cup** in her hand.

## Questions.

1. It is not so used in Rev. 17:4. 2. Mat. 26:28. 3. Don't matter just so it is not used literally. 4. He means cup is used properly in Rev. 17:4, but he knew and you know it was not used literally. "Of the vessel out of which one drinks" is cited I Cor. 10:4. The rock was the vessel out of which both man and beast drank. We may drink the cup precisely as they drank the rock. To drink the water which came from the rock was to drink out of it, and to drink the wine which comes from the cup is to drink out of it. "This refutes you," I freely admit that we must put our lips to what Jesus called the cup to drink from it, but we may do that without putting our lips to the vessel the cup was in. Your scholars do not contradict this. You have not shown one thing about "this" and "Gar," nor even replied to my arguments on them. You are defeated on pronouns until you bring a definition from standard authority which says they sometimes do not stand for their antecedents. "This" stands for "cup" the very cup Jesus took, and he says it is his blood. You are tied here to stay. I only quoted Goodspeed on "Colonade" and asked if you endorsed him. You turned him down, and then wrote him to help you out later. I was determined to stop so much "Goodspeed" from your pen, and I have succeeded. While it takes both container and contained to make this kind of metonymy. Jesus could and did refer to the contents when he said "cup," "for this (cup) is my blood." All your quibbling about eating and drinking bread and wine is to cover up your sad plight, in which you said the vessel was an element of the supper. You are required to tell us whether you **eat** or **drink** the vessel. If it is one of the **elements** you must do one or the other. "Come on." the "one congregation in all the world," was too much for you. Of course we all have one bread and one blood, "the bread" and "the cup." The word "congregation" from L. O. was not used in the sense of Local congregation, however. But, you are still in a muddle about the Jerusalem church. Your authorities do not help you; Johnson said they gathered in the temple to teach the multitudes, and Lightfoot says they could not do 'er, for it was impossible. "Breaking bread from house **may** refer to observing the Lord's supper." Not certain. Yet it is certain they had **meat** in these meals. Acts 2:46. Now, I ask my opponent if he is going to take the "sectarian route" through the commentators? Will you take them on Baptism? When I quote Webster on "cup"—"the wine of the communion," you cry "slimy trail," and now you have selected one more slimy. You should "go out and weep bitterly." This cup is my blood—a Cowan tr." Harper says the word "cup" may be supplied, so it is as much his tr. as mine. In Luk. 22:20 Harper says the cup is a literal vessel an emblem of the N. T. **That is one cup.** In Mat. 26:28, "For this (cup) is my blood, Harper says that is the wine. **That is another cup.** He contends that the literal cup or vessel is one emblem of the supper, and the wine, a figurative cup is another emblem of the supper. He says you drink from one, and drink the other. **Two cups as clear as day.** To be sure I am not mistaken, the reader will remember Harper has emphasized the Container-cup as being an emblem of the N. T., and the contents-cup as an emblem of the blood of Christ. These two cups cannot

be the same cup, and at the same time be emblematical of two entirely different things. Now to forever explode his theory that "This cup is the N. T. in my blood," is a literal vessel, I have but to finish the quotation, "**which is shed for you.**" The subject of the verb "is shed" is either "cup" or "blood," and in either case it everlastingly ruins Harper's position. I contend that "cup" is the subject.

For my opponents benefit, and that it may help him out of some of his difficulties, and for the sake of argument, I will say that the fruit of the vine referred to by Christ when he said cup in Mat. 26:27, was the literal fruit of the vine, a literal cup in that sense, and the same cup, fruit of the vine, was used in a figurative sense in V. 28 in the expression, "This is my blood." I will close this with the following contradiction: "The word cup as used by Christ in Mat. 27:27 names a certain volume of wine used by the church of Christ in the communion service." (Stark & Harper.) "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of a solid." (Harper.) A case of Harper meeting himself coming back.

Oct. 31, 1930

J. N. COWAN

### FIFTH REPLY

Rule 1, Hedge's "rules of honorable controversy," says, "The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined, that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them." This you have not done.

"The word 'cup' as used by Christ referred to the fruit of the vine," is not a **definition** of cup. Thayer defines thus: "**poterion**, a cup, a drinking vessel." Hence, "a cup, a drinking vessel" is **poterion**. And if "cup" (Mt. 26:27 referred to "the fruit of the vine," it and the fruit of the vine are not "one and the same," for the thing that refers to the other is not the other.

I did not "select" any "parts" of these letters, but turned them over to you, and you know it. "Garble"—your foot! And if it "mutilated" Dr. Rope's for him to mark out, you have "mutilated" every paper you have turned in on this debate. Your "opponent" has "the goods," that's all.

Thayer means "properly" by "properly," another of your definitions." Cute, if you are in the baby class. Does **properly** mean figuratively? Come on now." "Cup" (Mt. 26:27; Rev. 17:4) is cited by Thayer under properly, and I have shown by "standard works" that we may say "proper or literal." And when you learn the difference between "literal cup" and the word "cup" used literally, the "symbolical woman" will not trouble you. No wonder you can't tell the "figure of speech" in the use of "cup" here—you can't make something out of nothing, and you know it. The Bible nowhere "says" anything about "metonymy." And if you are in the **fool class**, your citing "Mat. 26:28" as answer to my question, "What 'standard work' or 'recognized scholar' says that 'cup' is used by **metonymy** in Mt. 26:27, as you do? does very well; and the Bible says, "Answer a fool according to his folly." Such a man does not want the truth! Thayer gives all about **gar** and "this," and yet cites "cup" here under the "proper or literal" use of the word; and this refutes all you may say to the contrary. The Bible does not say, "This cup is my blood," neither do I endorse it. Jesus could and did **suggest** the contents of the "cup" (Mt. 26:27) by "this" (v. 28), making the "wine" "an emblem of blood," as Thayer says when considering, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood," (Luke 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25), saying, "in both which the meaning is, 'this cup

containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant." (p. 15) "It takes both container and contained to make this kind of metonymy." (Cowan) Yes, and the cup is the New Testament, and the "contained" is the blood. And the man who cannot see it ought to be "bored for the simples." "Two cups" — your foot! And you "must" put the cup to your lips, with its contents, and drink, thus drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer) or "what it contains" (Clark), and not what **was** in the cup or what it contained, or dispute the "LEXICOGRAPHER" and the "STANDARD LEXICON." "Emblem of the supper"—your foot! Meet **what I say**.

"To eat the supper is to eat the elements that compose it," (Cowan) in "hook" at "cup an element of the Supper." Has he **eaten** the "wine" yet? The **cup** is "a drinking vessel." And a drinking vessel is **the cup**. I drink the **cup** by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer) or "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark, in Clark-Harper Debate) Now, "Come on," and **eat** the wine." **All scholars** "contradict" what you say here.

"That rock was Christ," and it was "spiritual drink" (I Cor. 10:4) Why not read what Thayer cites, and get the truth ("W. sec. 40, 3b.)?

"The vessel the cup was in." (Cowan) What word in the Greek do you render "cup" here? And what word do you render "vessel?" "Come on now."

"Pronouns." "A pronoun cannot be defined merely as 'a word used instead of a noun.'" (Swinton, p. 28) "Can a pronoun be used figuratively and have for its antecedent a word used literally?" Answer: "Yes." (Jas. M. Farr, Head Department of English, University of Florida.)

"Stark & Harper"—your foot! I **said**, and I **repeated it**, that "names" in the statement, if used in the sense that "the cup" could have but "one volume" of liquid in it, is true. Now meet **what I said!** And what you say about my writing Goodspeed is an absolute untruth. The man who makes a statement about another not knowing that it is true, is as bad as the man who makes a statement, knowing that it is not true."

You have shown yourself an ignoramus in trying to criticise Goodspeed's translation, and you have not "stopped" anything from my pen. You don't know even the parts of speech in English sentences.

Webster gives the current use of English words. The lexicons define the N. T. Greek, and they say **poterion** means, "a drinking cup," "a cup, a drinking vessel." But if you take current English, you must take sprinkle and pour for baptism, as I have shown. And when you bring the evidence (as I have done in your case) to prove that what the witnesses I have given, say, is not true, it will then be time enough for you to shout "more slimy." To take the sectarian dodge (See Campbell-Rice Debate; The Form of Baptism," et al.) "I impeach the witness," only shows "the white feather."

Johnson says they were in the temple to teach; Lightfoot says they were in separate "congregations" and so does McGarvy. You are addled. If "congregation" in L. O. "is not used in the sense of Local congregation, "congregation in Acts 2 was not a local congregation.

What ails you? You "fudged" even at 25,000. Wouldn't touch it. Why? Because you cannot worship as the N. T. directs with it, and you dare not "divide the congregation" without letting us out, per your own logic, "so you play "dog in the manger." You

can't do 'er" either way. But we can worship as the N. T. directs, for the Lord in his word provides for "churches of Christ," and we have all that are necessary to worship him as "it is written."

There may be some who are afraid of spoiling "what Cowan says" by writing to these "scholars;" but there are others who want the truth.

As a matter of truth "blood" is subject of "is shed," and I have "everlastingly ruined" your "contents-cup" theory here. And your "figure of a figure" (Mat. 26:27) caps the climax of your absurd lingo.

Nov. 5, 1930

H. C. HARPER

### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

My opponents fifth bunch of quibbles are before me as I write my last affirmative. He is the only one, I'm sure, who does not know the point at issue, and his reference to the rule is to hide defeat. I'm contending the cup is the fruit of the vine in the passage given, and he says it is the vessel. I have defined every word I have been asked to. "Poterion" is the name of a vessel, cup; but Christ referred to the contents when he used it, and that makes the fruit of the vine and the cup the same. Note, I did not say "cup" referred to the contents, but Christ did refer to the contents when he used the word.

I again say, if it will help my respondent any with his scholars, that the fruit of the vine is just as literal as the bread, and I'm sure the same scholars will say "bread" in verse 26 is used literally. Christ took two elements, bread and wine, literally, and he used them both figuratively as follows: "This is my body," "This is my blood." We eat the bread and drink the wine, and if the vessel, as you say, is one element, I would be glad you tell us which you do with it. Christ, my Standard authority and Star witness says "This is my blood," and the pronoun "this" stands for its antecedent, "cup" **There you stay.**

The "symbolical woman" has not bothered me, but she has ruined your contention, for the merest tyro in Bible knowledge knows a symbolical woman did not have a literal cup in her symbolical hand.

You are now committed to the position that the contents is not the cup, and if the wine was a cup, it would make two cups, one a solid, and the other a liquid. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this (cup) and divide it (cup) among yourselves." The wine not being called cup, they divided the vessel. **Shame!** Yes, we drink the cup and the rock, by drinking what they contain. (Thayer) But we have now learned (?) the Israelites never drink any literal water, it was "spiritual drink" that both men and cattle drank. **Can you beat it?** Was it more spiritual than drinking the Lord's cup? "The word "cup" as used by Christ names a certain volumn of wine used by the church of Christ in the communion service." Harper. "The word 'cup' as used by Christ is the name of a solid." Harper. **Contradiction.** "A pronoun cannot be defined merely as 'a word used instead of a noun,' but they always stand for their antecedents, and the antecedent of "this" in Matt. 26:28 is "cup" of the 27 verse. You said so at Graham. I remind you that the Greek word rendered cup in Mat. 26:27 is the same word rendered cup in I Cor. 10:21, and you say it means contents in the last passage. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils." So we have a cup in a cup. What you say about not writing Goodspeed

is summed up in the following from your second negative. "Is 'cup' in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively? "No" — Edgar J. Goodspeed, — Sept. 30, 1930." If you did not ask Goodspeed the above question, who did? The answer was obtained from him since our debate at Graham as the date shows. Either give the author of the question or take it back. **Lord forgive him.** You won't take Goodspeed on, "They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade," because you try to prove by commentators that it was an impossibility. You impeached your own witness. Next, you quote Johnson, "they were in the temple to teach," and Lightfoot, "They were in separate congregations." So we have the separate congregations all in the temple, or one of your witnesses lied. Imagine thirty-one congregations with thirty one cups all in the temple. (Some Sunday school.) 25 thousand can be served with one cup, the wine, but cannot with one cup, a solid. You did what I predicted, made blood the subject of "is shed," and I say so too, but this "cup" is that, and that is why I said cup was the subject, the equivalent of blood. If this debate has two-thousand readers, imagine Ropes, or Pharr receiving two thousand letters inquiring if Harper told the truth. Quote standard works in a written debate please. Thayer said too much for you in every place you quoted. No doubt some of your friends will say you skinned me alive, per the following gleaned from your last. "Your foot" five times. "Baby class"; "Fool class"; "Such a man does not want the truth"; "Bored for the simples"; "Ignoramus"; "Fudged"; "Dog in the manger"; "Absurd lingo."

I have shown if "This is my body" refers to the bread he took, "This is my blood" refers to the cup he took. This has not been met. Not one word has been said about the scripture proof I gave that there was only one congregation in Jerusalem. I gave Thayer on "Gar" tr. "for" showing it meant a further explanation of cup as used in V. 27. Also Webster on "this," referring to the last thing mentioned and demonstrating what was last said about the cup but have no reply. I have called for the Bible or history that says the disciples ever met in private homes in order to use one container. It has not been given. I have shown that the cup and the wine were the same because both are elements of the supper. The container is not. Space forbids I sum up more. "And he took the cup (wine), gave thanks, and gave it (the wine) to them saying, Drink ye all of it (wine), for this (wine) is my blood of the N. T." This proves our Lord was talking about the wine when he said cup. That is my proposition. Thanks!

Nov. 11, 1930.

J. N. COWAN

### FINAL REPLY

"The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. J. N. Cowan affirms."

He has not once given us his proposition as signed, nor defined its terms, preferring, it seems, to go down as a dishonorable debater rather than expose himself.

I have shown that Thayer cites Mt. 26:27 under the "prop." use of "cup," and not under "by meton." And this alone defeats him. And when he jumps to "metonymy" to escape this, he only "Jumps out of the frying pan into the fire."

He admits "It takes both container and contained to make this kind of metonymy." (5th aff.) And he now admits "cup" here is the "container," for he says, The Lord had a container in his hand when he instituted the supper," (3d aff.) And he says, "I have no desire to go outside of Thayer's definition of Cup, Poterion." (4th aff.)

Thayer defines: "poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel." Then wherever we find "cup," it means "a drinking vessel" in its N. T. sense, or Thayer did not define **poterion** correctly. Hence, where we find "cup" we know that "a drinking vessel" is meant and we can use the specific term "cup" instead of the generic word **container**. Hence, it takes both "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" to make this kind of metonymy. And this refutes his contention that "the cup" is "the fruit of the vine," unless he can show that the "container" is the "contained." And worse it makes the "container," which is "the cup" in this place, the "blood," for he says, "The Lord had a container in his hand when he instituted the supper." (3d aff.) And "This stands for 'cup' the very cup Jesus took." (5th aff.) Again he says, "The antecedent of 'this' in Mat. 26:28 is 'cup of 27 verse.'" (6th aff.) Then the **container**, and not the **contained**, is the **blood**. He is tied here to stay. And now he has **gar** to add an "explanation," showing the **container** is the **blood**. Now do you wonder why Thayer and these "scholars" do not put "cup" in Mt. 26:27 under "by meton."? Surely not.

"And he took a cup ('a drinking vessel' — Thayer), and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ('out of the cup' — I Cor. 11:28) — "And they all drank out of it" (Mk. 14:23) — for this (pronoun suggesting the contents of the "cup" (See Dr. Farr, 2d Reply) is my blood of the New Testament." (Mt. 26:27-8) Hence Thayer says, "This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant." (p. 15) And this gives **gar** the correct force, as Thayer has pointed out. And in "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Lk. 22:20) it is **blood** that "is shed," and not **cup** "is shed," and the "cup is the N. T.," just as Thayer points out in saying, "The meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (P. 15) And this gives the "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" each its proper use in the Communion. And since they must "drink the cup and can do this only by drinking "what is in the cup (Thayer, p. 510), they thus "divide" or "share" it, making the "cup," as well as "its contents" an **element** of the institution. And it is a "shame" that a preacher does not know this much, even when he can't "eat" the "wine." And I have not only Christ as my Standard Authority and Star Witness, but also the whole galaxy "scholars."

Yes, it is **literal** "bread" and **literal** "fruit of the vine" in the metaphors, "This is my body" and "this is my blood," just as it is a **literal** cup in metonymy. And we "drink the cup" by drinking what it contains, and in no other way. (Clark)

I never said "cup anywhere means 'contents'," and this "cup in a cup" is bred of ignorance. Neither did I say what he has my name to, as the reader can verify. And I never intimated that "a symbolical woman has a literal cup in her hand." The word cup has its "proper or literal" use here, as Thayer cites it. Now let literary critics judge "Who's who" here. Neither does Thayer cite the "rock" with "by drinking what it contains." Who said they did not drink literal water? He doesn't know what Paul is talking about, and can't "beat it" unless he has "cattle" drink "spiritual drink" for "that rock was Christ." Thayer cites "W. sec. 40, 3b" for explanation, Look it up.

I have never "turned Goodspeed down," nor written him as you say I did. And what you gave from him is in Acts 5, about the "apostles," and we were considering Acts 2 with Johnson and McHenry. And if they met in the Temple in congregations,

they met in the temple as Johnson says "to teach the people."

The Bible and history teach that they met for **worship** in their houses, not in the temple, whatever the reason or reasons for doing so matter not, it shows they did not take the Communion in the temple, nor did they have big congregations. And he must conduct the worship "as the Bible directs" with 25,000 "one speaking at a time" for if he "divides the church," we shall turn him over to the S.S. folks. And he can't "do 'er." I suggest that he write the "scholars" and incorporate it with this debate to save so much writing. The Judgment is coming: let us stand by the Bible.

Nov. 17, 1930.

H. C. HARPER, Sneads, Fla.

### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. H. C. Harper affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

"A solid is a substance having a fixed form." "A name is a distinguishing title put upon a person or thing." "As used by Christ in Mt. 26:27," that is, in its New Testament meaning exemplified in Mt. 26:27. "The word 'cup', "that is, the word which is the translation of the Greek word **poterion**, "a cup, a drinking vessel."

We are here brought face to face with the **meaning** of a New Testament word, as has been the case in the question as to "the form of baptism," and that the reader may get the issue clearly fixed in mind, the following statements are given: "We have to admit that one cup is mentioned." (W) "Sure: but the container is not mentioned at all." (J. N. Cowan, Mch. 21, 1929) Again: "I am fully convinced that when a brother takes a position that Christ or Paul referred to the container when they said cup is a heretic." (Ib.) Again: "I have never communed where there was more than one cup in the scriptural meaning of that cup." (J. N. Cowan, June 13, 1925)

This question has been mystified by importing circumstances and consequences into the meaning of the word just as the baptism question has been on "the form of baptism; and to this end figurative language has been brought to bear upon the subject.

**Poterion**, which is here translated "cup," is a New Testament word, and it is defined by the Standard Lexicon for New Testament Greek: "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer, p. 533) And this is its "scriptural meaning." And since "a cup, a drinking vessel" is the name of a **solid**, and Christ here "took" a cup, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

1. The word **poterion** as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a cup, a drinking vessel.
2. The name of a cup, a drinking vessel, is the name of a solid.
3. Therefore, the word **poterion** as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

But the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the translation of **poterion** as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27; therefore the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the vessel they drank out of.
2. The name of the vessel they drank out of is the name of a solid.

3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.  
Nov. 23, 1930.

H. C. HARPER, Sneads, Fla.

### J. N. COWAN'S FIRST REPLY

My opponents last negative and first affirmative is now before me. "Final reply." I submitted to the correction in wording of proposition and defined every term I was asked to. Nothing "dishonorable." When I admitted that Jesus had a container in his hand, I did not admit he referred to it when he said cup, but to what it contained. I showed "This is my body" referred to the bread he took, and "this is my blood" referred to the cup he took. This ought to settle the whole matter. "Then wherever we find 'cup,' it means, 'a drinking vessel' in its N. T. sense, or Thayer did not define 'poterion' correctly." Reader, please note "**wherever we find cup**" it means a drinking vessel. Then we may read: "Father let this drinking vessel pass from me." "As oft as ye drink this drinking vessel." "Ye cannot drink the drinking vessel of the Lord and the drinking vessel of the devil." The woman of Rev. 17:4, while a symbolical woman, had a drinking vessel (literal) in her hand full of fornication. "I will take the drinking vessel (cup) of salvation." The above is the absurd predicament that a false theory leads a man into.

It would be somewhat amusing to hear my opponent explain how "the shedding of my blood" would render the literal container an emblem of the N. T. Thayer does not imply that the container was shed, but the shed blood of the grape was an emblem because it symbolized the shed blood of Christ. As long as the vessel is considered an element of the supper, you must tell whether you eat or drink it. "And I never intimated that 'a symbolical woman has a literal cup in her hand' " This admission gives the whole argument up. Thayer used the word "cup" "properly" in Rev. 17:4 to describe a symbolical cup, and so did Christ use the word in Mat. 26:27. He used the "proper word," to describe that which represented his blood.

### GOOD-BYE HARPER!!

Your battery has been silenced on "the spiritual drink" and the Jerusalem church." You most assuredly quoted from Goodspeed bearing date of Sept. 30, 1930. (See second reply). Why do you deny it? The Bible nor history says they met in their houses in Jerusalem to worship. Try again. The scriptures cited in my third affirmative clearly prove there was but one congregation in Jerusalem, and not a one of these has my opponent noticed.

**First affirmative.** My opponents capitol error is in allowing "cup" to have only one meaning in the N. T. I agree that in some places it means a solid, but not in all places. My opponent says "**everywhere.**" The fallacy of such may be seen by referring to quotations already given in this article. Another error is, in contending that Christ could not have spoken of the contents while he had a container in his hand. It is limiting the ability of Christ to speak of that which represented his blood because he had it in a container.

I have nothing to retract from quotations cited from my pen. Use more of them when you see fit. The issue is not whether the word "cup" is the name of a solid, but whether it was used to designate a solid in Mat. 26:27. Christ used the word "cup" which is the name of a solid to describe that which was not a solid in, "Father, let this cup pass." The definition of a word may be substituted for the word without destroying the sense. If my opponent is right, we read again, "He also took

the **solid**, and gave thanks, and give it unto them, saying drink ye all of it." Every one knows this does not make good sense, hence my opponents position is wrong.

To show the falacy of the sylogisms, we herewith submit one to compare with his first. 1. The word poterion as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a cup, a drinking vessel. 2. The name of a cup, a drinking vessel, is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word poterion as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid. And Christ was praying that this drinking vessel, a solid, may pass from him. But the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the translation of poterion. Therefore, the word "cup as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid. Next, 1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of the drinking vessel which he took." 2. The name of the drinking vessel which he "took" is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore the word "cup" as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 is the name of a solid." This is stated exactly as My opponent has it. Now notice a parallel. 1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a drinking vessel which he was to drink. 2. The name of the drinking vessel which he was to drink is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid which he was to drink. The same answer may be given to his last sylogism. They are all wrong, because they are based upon a limited and restricted definition of the word "cup."

Question: Does it change the meaning of Mat. 26:28 to supply the word "cup" after "this"? If not, is this supplied word used to name a solid?

Nov. 28, 1930.

J. N. COWAN

### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

He tries hard to patch up his defeat by another affirmative, and this entitles me to another "reply" and space also for my second affirmative.

He was asked time and time again to define the **terms** of his proposition, but did not do it. "Admitted Jesus had a container in his hand." Yes, and he admitted it was a cup. "He said cup." Where? Not in Mt. 26:27. The only way he used "the cup" there was, "He took a cup." And you admit this was a "container," and the container was not "the fruit of the vine," as you affirm. And to clinch the matter I showed that Thayer gives "cup" here under "the vessel out of which one drinks." (p. 510) And to this Christ referred, "saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) And this is the "**proper or literal**" use of the word "cup," as Thayer cites it." (p. 533) And this alone settles it against you.

You say, "This is my blood" referred to the cup he took." Then the "container in his hand," which was "the cup," and not "the fruit of the vine," is the "blood."

But to try to escape, you dispute the world's ripest scholarship, and say "cup" is here used by metonymy, "container and contained." Then the cup is not the fruit of the vine unless the container is the contained. And since "this is my blood" referred to the cup he took, "a container in his hand," is the "blood." And **gar** adds an explanation why so.

Thayer says of — "This cup is the New Testament in my blood" — "The meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (p. 15) He does not "imply" that "the

container was shed," but he says the **blood** was shed.

"Eat or drink it." I drink the cup, brother; and I do this by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) Now tell us how you dispense with the cup and yet "drink the cup." And you say the "wine" is an element of the supper, and that you eat the elements. Tell us how you "eat" the wine. This is no child's play." It is a man's job, and up to you.

Yes, the "proper word," cup, was used in Mt. 26:27 and Rev. 17:4; but that is not what Thayer's notation "prop.," under which he puts these passages, means; but he means the "proper or literal" use of the word "cup" here. Just let literary critics decide "Who's who" here, and tell who has "the argument." I stand with Thayer here.

My "battery" will play on you as long as you have "cattle" to drink "spiritual drink," for "that rock was Christ." And when you get that assembly of 25 or 50 thousand to "worship according to the N. T. pattern" without the "classes" or "churches of Christ," let us know. The disciples in Jerusalem, "breaking bread from house to house," just as the Bible and history say, and I have shown, is enough to satisfy us. And no need to say, "GOOD-BYE HARPER," for I expect to run you out of every hiding place before leaving. I did not say I did not **quote** Goodspeed. More of your "**bunk**" that I never said. You are good at making a man "meet himself" when you have to **falsify** to do it! Debaters that "know straight up" do not "reply" to citations of Scripture. What do you take me for?

Talk of "capitol error"! "**poterion**, a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer) If this is "a limited" definition, just give the unlimited with the authority for it. And just cite the passage where **poterion** does not mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." We know what Jesus meant by attaching to his words the meaning they had when the N. T. was written, and to this end we take the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, and Thayer's is the Standard. Whisper your "limit the ability of Christ" to the sprinkler. "It is limiting the ability of Christ to" say he could not have referred to **sprinkle** when he said **baptizo**. Is it? No, for N. T. words have fixed meaning. You now admit, "in some places it (cup) means a solid." It is a solid, but it "means" "a drinking vessel." The definition may be substituted for its word, but a solid is not the definition of "cup." "And he took a cup, a drinking vessel, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) And Thayer gives "cup" here under "the vessel out of which one drinks." (p. 510) This is the literal use of the word. Cup is the name of a solid here.

"Christ used the word 'cup' which is the name of a solid to describe that which was not a solid in, 'Father, let this cup pass.'" (Cowan) This is a **metaphor**, hence not "cup to describe something else," but something else (affliction in this case) "likened to a cup" to drink out of. (Thayer, p. 533) If there is no "cup, a drinking vessel" meant by "cup" here, there is no metaphor.

One more, a metonymy: "As oft . . . drink this cup" — "drink cup of Lord" — "drink cup of devils." "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way" (Clark); by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) So here is "cup, a drinking vessel," or there is no metonymy. Hence "everywhere" in the N. T., **poterion** means "a cup, a drinking vessel," the name of a solid, these three uses — literal, metaphor, and metonymy — covering all.

We don't expect you to "retract" anything, not even the "heretic" but even if we are heretics in your sight, we are glad of the opportunity to expose your false teaching on this subject.

My arguments remain unrefuted, proving that — The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. And you have conceded this in admitting Jesus used a container in his hand when he instituted the supper, and that this was a "cup."

You can find the **fallacy** in your mimic stuff on page 189, in Elements of Logic by Davis. The fallacy of **Figura dictionis** occurs when a metaphor or other figure of speech is construed literally. This seems very trifling, but is a very subtle and ruinous form of fallacy he says.

"Cup" in Mt. 26:39 is in a metaphor. You can hold these figures up as literal language and make the unlearned jeer and laugh, but to those who see your sophistry, you appear as a simpleton or a knave. "Drink a cup." Cup here is a drinking vessel, a solid. (Harper) To "drink" means to swallow a liquid. You can't "do er." And all you lack now is the "laughing committee" to jeer and ha! ha! ha!!! But to one who knows the truth, that this is metonymy and involves "a cup, a drinking vessel" and its contents, and that one drinks a cup by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer, p. 510), it is seen that cup here is "a cup, a drinking vessel," a solid. And in "Let this cup pass," your "was praying that this drinking vessel, a solid, may pass from him," to make it appear that "cup" here is not "a cup, a drinking vessel, a solid," is pure sophistry or ignorance. Of course, if the language were literal, that is it; but it is a metaphor in which he "likened" (Thayer, p. 533) his affliction to a cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion. And "cup" here is "a cup, a drinking vessel, a solid, or there is no metaphor."

Dec. 3, 1930.

H. C. HARPER, Sneads, Fla.

### J. N. COWAN'S SECOND REPLY

My opponent "takes more space" after having his attention called twice to the fact that he was going beyond the agreed limit by 200 words. If the reader wants this verified, count the words. A contract holds only as long as both parties keep its conditions, therefore I have the right to an unlimited space. He certainly needs more space to get out of the ridiculous entanglements he is in.

Honestly, I do not see anything in his last that deserves a reply. The poor fellow cannot understand how the Lord could have had a container in his hand with the fruit of the vine in it, and have talked about the contents without talking about the container. In view of the fact that "it takes both literal container and its contents to make this kind of metonymy" as my opponent says, it would be amusing to see him point out the literal container in Mat. 26:39. What literal container or drinking vessel did the Lord have his sufferings in?

Yes, "This is my blood" refers to the cup he took as much so as "This is my body" refers to the bread he took. My opponents inability to understand that he took the fruit of the vine called a cup at the same time he took the container which held it, is responsible for his confusion. And "Gar" translated "for" shows that "This is my blood of the N. T." is an explanation of the "cup" he took. "And he took a cup

... for this is my blood," etc.

Just how the literal drinking vessel was rendered "by the shedding of my blood" an emblem of the N. T. is still unexplained. What did the shedding of blood have to do with the vessel?

I have explained several times that I eat the bread and drink the wine, both elements of the supper, but the opposition has never said which he did with the vessel, cup. Paul said eat the Lord's supper, and all know that the wine was included. So when I am criticized for that expression, it is not I but Paul who is criticized. I no more have cattle drinking spiritual drink than my adversary would have them baptised in the sea. Were it possible to assemble such a large assembly, that other congregations would have to be established in order to teach them, still it would not be necessary to establish other congregations in order to serve the Lord's cup. 25 or 50 thousand could easily be served with the wine without dividing them. Let the reader remember that I have cited passages of scripture to abundantly prove there was not but one congregation in Jerusalem, to which reference has not been made. Wild and reckless assertions have been made, as, they established enough other local congregations, so that each one could use one container, and history says they took the Lord's supper in private houses in Jerusalem. Act. 2:46 is the only proof offered from the Bible that they communed in private homes, and no living man can prove that this verse refers to the Lord's supper. If it was, they had meat in it.

Some ugly statements have been made about me falsifying in regard to Goodspeed. I deny the charge. My opponent now tries to make us believe he was quoting from Goodspeed's translation; but I again call attention to the fact that he was quoting from a private letter received since our debate at Graham, Texas. Is "cup" in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively?" "No" — Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago University, letter, Sept. 30, 1930." When my opponent says he did not write to Goodspeed, since our debate at Graham, and receive the above answer, he ... Well, reader name it. The debate was in August, and the letter received in September of the same year. See Harper's second negative for the above quotation.

In every quotation from Thayer, if enough had been read, my opponent would refute his own position. For example, "under the vessel out of which one drinks," and Mat. 26:27 is cited. But I Cor. 10:4 is cited by Thayer under the same head. "They drank of that rock." This has punctured my opponents theory every time he has blown it up.

In the last negative on the first proposition we find, "**Then wherever we find 'cup' it means a drinking vessel in its N. T. sense.**" I found cup in Mat. 26:29, I. Cor. 10:16 and I Cor. 11:25-27. In these passages my opponent says cup means what was in the cup. "To drink the cup is to drink what it contains." It is then, as clear as a demonstration, that, what was in the cup was called the cup. If the container is the cup, and the contents is the cup, then we have two cups of the Lord. When Christ was talking about drinking "this cup" (Mat. 26:39) he was not talking about what some literal drinking vessel, such as goblett, glass, or chalice contained. This explodes the whole of my opponents first affirmation, and he sees this, and knows he has been made a laughing-stock, hence his remarks about "jeers" etc. So, my first reply has completely upset his affirmation.

The common reader can understand the common English of Mat. 26:27-28. "He

took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the N. T." The Lord here tells in plain language what the cup is. I wonder if the average reader will have to delve into all the scholars, on Greek and Latin, before he can intelligently observe the Lord's supper?

Dec. 16, 1930.

J. N. COWAN

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

The brother broke the limit in his first affirmative, and has done so in every other article, totaling about 800 words. And he figures for the "last speech" on both propositions, making a reply to my "final."

Proposition: "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid." Questions: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of solid." "Yes." — James H. Ropes, Harvard. "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" "No. The contents of the cup and 'the fruit of the vine' are the same." — James H. Ropes, Harvard.

The brother has not touched a single syllogism I gave in proof of the proposition, and I fully exposed his attempt, showing the **fallacy** in his mimic stuff. Thayer defines **poterion** to mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." Now see.

1. The word **poterion** as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a cup, a drinking vessel. 2. The name of a cup, a drinking vessel, is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word **poterion** as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. But the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the translation of **poterion** as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. Again:

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the drinking vessel which he "took." 2. The name of the drinking vessel which he took is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. Again:

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the vessel they drank out of. 2. The name of the vessel they drank out of is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

We know what the Lord "talked about" by the meaning of the words used. "And he took a cup ('the vessel out of which one drinks, Mt. 26:27 — Thayer, p. 510), and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." — Mt. 26:27. And we know by the context that the "cup" had "the fruit of the vine" in it. But if "this is my blood" (v. 28) "refers to the cup," then "the vessel out of which one drinks," is the "blood." Escape you cannot.

Mt. 26:39 is a **metaphor**, not a **metonymy** of "container and its contents," and it would be amusing to see you dispose of this metaphor without involving a "cup" from which to "drink a bitter or poison potion," to which Jesus "likened" (Thayer, p. 533) his sufferings. And the metonymy, "drink the cup," does not give "a demonstration, that what was in the cup was called the cup." The "contents" are not named in metonymy, but the "container" is. And in "drink the cup," "cup" is the name of the container. And we "drink the cup" by drinking "What is in the cup."

(Thayer, p. 510) And what is in the cup is not the cup, neither is it called the cup by any law of language. And there must be "a cup, a drinking vessel" indicated by "cup" in this metonymy and in this metaphor, or there is no metonymy or metaphor.

The Lord gave the "cup" a place in the communion, as well as "the fruit of the vine"; hence we have "the cup of blessing," "the **consecrated** cup (I Cor. 10:16), "this cup containing wine." (Thayer, pp. 15, 260, 533)

Your "opponent" does not say "cup means what was in the cup," and never said it of any passage.

You never "explained" even once how you "eat" the "wine," — you simply "bit off more than you could swallow" in trying to get rid of the "cup" to drink from in the communion, and to do it made Paul out a simpleton in "eat the supper."

Cattle did not drink "spiritual drink." Good. Why bring them up here then? And if "cup" (Mt. 26:27) was not "the vessel out of which one drinks," just give "enough" from Thayer to refute Thayer, if you can. It is up to you.

It would be **more** than "amusing" to see the brother take "a cup" (Mt. 26:27) as Jesus did, and "one volume" of "wine" (See his 1st aff.), and "one loaf" as Paul says (I Cor. 10:16) and have the communion with his 50-thousand congregation. But we will let him off, for when he comes to "teach them," he steers clear of "the S.S. and classes," just as we do in the **communion**, with his "other congregation."

"Breaking bread." Listen: "In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16: 5, 15; I Cor 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. v. 2." — Jamieson, Fausset and Brown.

"The oldest meeting-places of Christian worship were rooms in ordinary dwellings." — Schaff-Herzog.

"The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses." — Neander. "The disciples came together to break bread." — Acts 20:7. "Breaking bread from house to house." — Acts 2:46. And while they at first had a "common meal" when they met for communion, yet Acts 2:46 does not indicate that they did any more than that they ate in the temple. Three distinct things are set forth: "And daily attending with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they partook of food with gladness," etc.

Thayer defines **poterion** "a cup, a drinking vessel." If this is not the correct definition, just cite the lexicon that refuted it.

You can "deny" as much as you please. When you say, "My opponent now tries to make us believe he was quoting from Goodspeed's translation," you say what is not true. Neither have I at any time ever "turned him down," nor "and then wrote him to help you out later. "Neither have you "succeeded" when you "determined to stop so much 'Goodspeed' from your pen." And you will not get far with "Cowan said it" either.

Dec. 28, 1930.

H. C. HARPER

### J. N. COWAN'S THIRD NEGATIVE

My opponent said, "Wherever Poterion was used in the N. T. it meant a drinking vessel." Then in Mat. 26:39 it must also mean a drinking vessel, and Christ was

praying for this drinking vessel to pass. His last article is nothing more than a rehash, and has been fully answered in previous replies. I have not disputed any standard authority on the definition of "cup." It does mean a solid. But the name of a solid is sometimes used to designate a liquid, as in "He drank the poison cup and died." Or, "The cup of blessing . . . is it (the cup) not the communion of the blood of Christ?" In metonymy, there is a changing of names; the name of one thing is put for another. The name "cup" is used in Mat. 26:27; 26:39, and I Cor. 16, but the contents are designated by this name.

I have exploded his syllogisms in my first reply, and will give only one sample here. Take his first one and substitute Mat. 26:39 for Mat. 26:27, and you will see the falsity of his conclusion. 1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of the vessel he was to drink out of. 2. The name of the vessel is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word cup as used by Christ in Mat. 26-39 is the name of a solid. But every one knows this conclusion is false, because it was his sufferings he called a cup, and not a solid. This completely capsizes his syllogistic efforts.

In his further efforts, he says we cannot have the metaphor without the cup or vessel. Then tell us what vessel it was that could be described by "poterion"? He also denies that "This is my blood" refers to the cup Jesus took. Then, it is possible that "This is my body" does not refer to the bread he took, but to the container. Shame! Please point out the "poterion" literal drinking vessel in, "Let this cup pass from me."

"The Lord gave the 'cup' a place in the communion, as well as "the fruit of the vine"; hence we have "the cup of blessing." Here, "The cup of Blessing" is used by my opponent in contradistinction to the "fruit of the vine." Paul says of this cup of blessing, "Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" Now he has the Lord's cup a literal vessel and the communion of the blood of Christ. I believe the fruit of the vine is the communion of the Lord's blood. "Your 'opponent' does not say 'cup means what was in the cup,' and never said it of any passage." Then, "cup" in I Cor. 10:16 does not mean what was in the cup, but the vessel itself, and Paul said it was the communion of the blood of Christ. **The vessel the communion of the blood of Christ!** This absurd position is further verified by, "Wherever 'poterion' is used in the N. T. it means the drinking vessel." It is found in I Cor. 10:16, therefore, it, the vessel is the communion of the blood.

"Element" means a part, an ingredient. My adversary says the drinking vessel is an element of the supper. Paul says, "Eat the Lord's supper." Paul is not the "simpleton," but it seems to me the one who takes a position that the vessel is an element of what Paul said to eat, an ingredient of the supper, would be the simpleton. I leave it to the reader.

I have no desire to refute Thayer, and he does not refute me. We drink the cup by "drinking what is in it"; just like Israel drank the rock by "drinking what is in it." Both passages are cited under the same head. I brought up the cattle to show that both men and cattle drank from the rock although they used different drinking vessels. And to show that we may drink from the same cup, even though it be divided into different vessels. Luk. 22:17.

So far, not one proof from the Bible or history has been offered to prove there were a large number of congregations organised in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. The scripture proof I offered in my second affirmative has never been



noticed, which showed there never was but the one congregation in Jerusalem. I showed that it was possible to prepare enough of the one bread (unleavened) and the fruit of the vine to serve the 3120 on Pentecost, or 50,000 for that matter. No testimony offered said they had church in ordinary houses for the purpose of using one vessel in the communion in any other locality. One authority cited is Jamison-Faucet & Brown to prove Act. 2:46 had reference to the communion, and the same Authority says they sprinkled for baptism on the day of Pentecost. See Comments on Act. 2:21-46. The commentator route is "slimy," Brother. When I cite Webster on "cup" Def. 5 "The wine of the communion," you cry "Slimy trail," and then turn round and take one more slimy.

**Goodspeed:** — My opponent could settle this matter by telling the reader how came Goodspeed to write the letter from which he quotes in his second negative. The letter was in answer to questions someone had asked him, and that, too, since our debate at Graham. The debate was held the latter part of August, 1930, and the letter from Goodspeed is dated Sept. 30 of the same year. I cannot see why my opponent would deny writing to Goodspeed. Every one knows he is caught and should confess. I asked a question at the close of my first negative which has not been answered. And don't forget that I accept Thayer's definition of **Poterion**, but in metonymy one thing is called by the name of another. And don't fail to tell us about how the symbolic woman held a literal cup in her hand. Rev. 17:4. Dec. 27, 1930.

J. N. COWAN

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid."

He has not touched my syllogisms. He repeats his **fallacy** as if he had not been made aware of it. This is a **metaphor**, and Christ "likened" his sufferings or death to a cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion. (Thayer, p. 533) And it takes both to make this "comparison." "The metaphor implies a comparison between what is said and what is meant." — Williams, p. 221. What is said? **Poterion**, "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer) What is meant? Deep suffering or death, which he prayed might pass from him as a cup containing a bitter or poison potion might pass a person and not be drunk. And Davis in his Elements of Logic exposes this fallacy of "Christ was praying for this drinking vessel to pass," saying, "The fallacy **Figura dictionis** occurs when a metaphor or other figure of speech is construed literally. This seems very trifling, but is a very subtle and ruinous form of fallacy." (p. 189) This sophistry "capsizes" him with any man of sense. And his "opponent's capitol error" in allowing 'cup' to have only one meaning in the N. T." has vanished. When put to it, he accepts Thayer's definition, "poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel." And since we can substitute the **definition** for the word, wherever we find **poterion** in the N. T., we can read it — "a cup, a drinking vessel," and that is "everywhere" we find "cup."

"And he took a cup, a drinking vessel." (Mt. 26:27) And Thayer says of "cup" here, "The vessel out of which one drinks, Mt. 26:27." And Cowan says, "This stands for 'cup' the very cup Jesus took." (5th aff.) Then the "vessel" is the "blood." Here he

is tied. This is another "sample."

He calls Mt. 26:27 "metonymy. He does not know a **figure of speech** from a hog track. Thayer gives this under "prop.", and not under "by meton." But take it by metonymy. "Container and contents." What is the container? "Cup is the name of a literal vessel." (C's 1st aff.) "No one denies the Lord had a container in his hand when he instituted the supper." (C's 3d aff.) "**(Poterion)** It does mean 'a cup, a drinking vessel.'" (C's 4th aff.) So it is **cup**. The "contents" are not named in metonymy, but the "container is," so "cup" (even if this were metonymy) is here the name of a solid, as I affirm. To your question, — Yes.

When Jesus took "a cup" and said "drink ye all out of it," we know by the language that "this" refers to "the contents of the cup," and when he took "a loaf" and said "eat," we know likewise that "this" refers to the bread; and we find ourselves in accord here with those who have made a life study of language, and it is a "shame" that any preacher does not know this much.

Thayer cites "cup" in I Cor. 10:16 under "prop.", not under "by meton." And it is the "common cup," which all drink "By drinking what it contains" (N. L. Clark), by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer, p. 510), that makes it the communion; just as it is "one loaf" (of which all partake that makes it the communion. (Thayer, pp. 260, 259) And it is not "cup" in "contradistinction" from the "fruit of the vine," but "cup" containing "the fruit of the vine." And the "cup" has a place as well as "the fruit of the vine."

I say the word "cup" is used literally in Rev. 17:4, and I say Thayer so cites it, as he does in Mt. 26:27 (p. 533), and I say the fact that you cannot tell by what figure of speech it is used, if figurative, is positive proof that you do not know what you are talking about.

Paul was not the "simpleton," but it seems to be the one who asked me to "eat" the "cup" because Paul said "eat the supper," and then fall down when I called on him to "eat" the "wine," an "element" of "the supper," and I leave it to the reader. I "drink the cup," "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark) And you cannot "drink the cup" without the "cup" in the communion. "Both men and cattle drank from the rock," I Cor. 10:16. Then the "cattle" drank "spiritual drink," for "that rock was Christ," I Cor. 10:4. Better look up Thayer's reference. But where are the "different vessels" here? Maybe I can find "individual cups" here. How many do you find? We have passed the "big congregation" in this debate: we just have "other congregations" to commune as you do to "teach them." Does this "Authority" say **baptizo** means **sprinkle**? From what you say, they are like "cups advocates," who know **poterion** does not mean **cups**, but when they get "big crowds," they need "cups for convenience," just as the other fellow needs **sprinkling**, or "more sanitary," or for "clinics," regardlessly. And I take the slimy trail" of neither party. However, they were not quoted on Acts 2:46. They cited the Scriptures for what they said, and you've not noticed a single one of them.

Dec. 31, 1930.

H. C. HARPER

#### J. N. COWAN'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Mat. 26:39, a Metaphor. "The metaphor implies a comparison between what is said and what is meant." (Williams) "What is said? Poterion. What is meant? Deep

suffering or death." FINE. In Mat. 26:27, what is said? Poterion. What is meant? "This is my blood." Verse 28 begins with "for" (Greek Gar) which means a further explanation is being given of what was just said in verse 27, and "this" is a demonstrative, demonstrating what was meant by "cup" in verse 27. I have tried to get my opponent to notice that metonymy is from a word which means a changing of names, and that one thing is said when another is meant, the same as in a metaphor. Jesus said cup when he meant contents as explained by the demonstrative.

"It takes both container and contents to make this kind of metonymy." "It takes both (container and contents) to make this comparison." (metaphor) In the first, my opponent says to drink the cup is to drink what it contains while it is in the literal poterion. So, in the latter, Christ must drink the sufferings while in the literal cup, or drinking vessel. I am still asking for the literal vessel of Mat. 26:39. "Wherever poterion is used it means a cup, a drinking vessel." **POINT IT OUT!** I am not the man who construed Mat. 26:39 literally. You are the one who contends that the figurative poterion is a literal drinking vessel in Mat. 26:39. You say wherever poterion is used it means a drinking vessel, and it is used in the above passage. Now swallow your "Figura dictionis."

No, Cowan don't make the vessel the blood because he admitted Jesus had a vessel in his hand when he took the cup. I deny that the vessel was what the word cup signified in the passage, and that, too, because Jesus said it was his blood, and "a preacher should have enough sense to know" it was the wine and not the vessel that represented his blood. "The contents are not named in metonymy but the container is so cup (even if this were metonymy) is here the name of a solid."

To be sure, "cup" here is the name of a solid, but the name was **used** to name a liquid, the wine. "This is my blood" proves that. Don't forget that your proposition says "as used." "He drank the poison cup and died." Cup here is the name of a solid but it means a liquid. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." Cup here is the name of a solid, but it is used to designate a liquid. Christ took the cup the name of a solid, but designated the fruit of the vine which he called his blood. **USED THE NAME CUP TO DESCRIBE SOMETHING ELSE.** Question: — "Does it change the meaning of Mat. 26:28 to supply the word 'cup' after 'this'?" "If not, is this supplied word used to name a solid?" Answer, "Yes." Who could get any sense from such an answer? Tell us if the supplied word changes the meaning of the passage cited, and if not, does the supplied word name a solid. What were you saying "yes" to? In our debate at Graham, and in some of the questions you ask the Professors, you said the word may be supplied, even supplied it yourself. "We know by the language that "this" refers to "the contents of the cup." With the word cup supplied we read, "for this cup is my blood." The antecedent

of "this" is "cup" of verse 27. The word supplied is the antecedent of the pronoun. Therefore, the "cup" of verse 28 is the same cup of verse 27. **This settles the question forever.** Amen! Question: — Is "the fruit of the vine" any part of the Lord's cup? If not, do you not use it in contradistinction to the cup?

Rev. 17:4. "Cup" is used literally" (Harper) "The woman which thou sawest is that great city." Rev. 17:18. This woman had a golden cup in her hand. v. 4. A city with a literal drinking vessel in her hand! In this cup was the filthiness of her fornication.

v. 4. Of course every one knows symbolical fornication could not be had in a drinking vessel that was literal. Shame on such a man, who will thus handle the word of God, to save a pet theory on Mat. 26:28. I possibly should have said Lord, pity the man who is so blinded with materialism that he cannot see his own absurdities. Paul said "eat the Lord's supper." Harper says, the vessel is an element of that supper. Element means an ingredient, or part. Selah!

The people were baptised in the cloud and sea, while the cattle were not, even though they passed through the same water. The people did drink spiritual drink, and the cattle did not though they drank the same water. Cattle had no faith, people did. Yet they all drank from (ek, out of) the same rock, just as we all drink from, or out of, the same cup. I'm sure some people who actually drink out of the cup, do so with as little spirituality as cattle. For instance, the man who has his faith in the container instead of the contents. The point you are seeking to cover up is, they all drank out of the rock, even though several containers were used. The same is true of the well, and is true of the cup.

The reader can now take his pencil and mark out all my opponent has said about or quoted from the commentators and dictionaries. He has admitted its all a slimy trail. He used Jam. Fau. & Brown until I showed they taught sprinkling on the day of Pentecost, now he vomits them up.

I will close this article with the scriptures which prove there was never but one congregation in Jerusalem, on Pentecost, or any other time. And remember, this proved, my opponent's proposition is overthrown Act. 2:46; 5:11-14; 6: 1-7; 15:22; Reader, don't forget that 31 congregations had to be organized on the day of Pentecost, for my opponents position to work with one container to the congregation. Jan. 2, 1931.

J. N. COWAN

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Mt. 26:27 is neither metaphor nor metonymy. And "this" (v.28) refers to the "contents of the cup" as Thayer and these scholars say, and not to the cup. You deny "that the vessel was what the word cup signified," but you are just "too short" on the meaning and use of language for us to take "Cowan said it," against the scholarship of the world. Where are your scholars that say Mt. 26:27 contains a metonymy? You can't produce them. Your **ipse dixit** does not fill the bill now. Thayer cites "cup" in Mt. 26:27 under "prop.," and not under "by meton." (p. 533) And on page 510 he says the word "cup" in Mt. 26:27 **as used** here signifies "the vessel out of which one drinks." **And this settles the question forever against you,** for he is backed by the other scholars who have made a life study of language. Listen: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid." "Yes." — James H. Ropes, Harvard; Harry M. Hubbell, Yale; Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago. Again "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" "No. The **contents** of the cup and "the fruit of the vine" are the same."

James H. Ropes, Harvard. And this is just as Thayer cites it — “wine, an emblem of blood,” the **Contents** of the cup. (p. 15) And **gar** sustains this as these scholars know.

Thayer’s **definition** is “a cup, a drinking vessel,” and this definition can be substituted for the word anywhere.

“Drink the cup of the Lord.” It takes the fruit of the vine in the cup to make this metonymy. And we “Drink the cup of the Lord” “by drinking what it contains, and in no other way.” (Clark, Thayer)

Mt. 26:39. Christ in this **metaphor** was praying that his sufferings might pass as a cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion might, through entreaty, pass. And the cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion is the “cup, a drinking vessel” here, and without it there is no metaphor, for there could be no comparison between his sufferings and such a cup. And you again commit the fallacy **figura dictionis** in saying, “Christ must drink the sufferings while in a literal cup, a drinking vessel.” You simply can’t touch the proof of my proposition in my syllogisms.

“**Metonymy** 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.” — Williams. “I accept William’s definition of metonymy.” (Cowan, 3d aff.)

“Drink the cup.” Here we have “Container and the thing contained.” — Williams. “Cup” is the container, and we **drink the cup** “by drinking what it contains, and in no other way.” And if “this” refers to “cup,” the container is the “blood” in “this is my blood.” “Cup” is here the “drinking vessel,” and so is it in “drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils.”

“Yes” disposed of both questions. There is not a manuscript of Greek text or Bible tr. that contains your supplied word. “In some of the questions you ask the Professors, you said the word may be supplied.” I did not, brother.

“‘With the word cup supplied we read, ‘for this cup is my blood.’ The antecedent of ‘this’ is ‘cup’ of verse 27.” And this is more “Cowan said it.” But “this” is an adjective here, and adjectives do not have antecedents. “The word supplied is the antecedent of the pronoun.” But there is now no pronoun, brother. And this shows your caliber on language. You do not know the parts of speech in sentences, much less the “figures of speech,” yet you want us to take “Cowan said it,” and turn down scholars who know language.

I have no “pet theory” to save, brother. I have consulted the ripest scholars on Rev. 17:4, who say the word “cup” here is used in its “proper or literal” sense, and Thayer cites it under his “prop.” Your spludge amounts to nothing.

“To eat the supper is to eat the elements that compose it.” (C’s 3d aff.) Then “eat” the “wine,” an element of the supper. I **drink the cup** in the supper, and I do that “by drinking what it contains” (Clark), by drinking “what is in the cup.” (Thayer) Let us see you **drink the cup** without “the cup,” or by drinking what **cups** contain.

Since the “vessel” (Thayer, p. 510) was the “rock” (1 Cor. 10:4) and “that rock was Christ,” if they drank out of vessels, how many Christs did they have? And if the “cattle” drank out of this “rock” Paul is talking about, and “this rock was Christ,” how did “cattle” do this without drinking “spiritual drink”?

The “well” is conspicuous by its absence here (Thayer, p. 510), not being “the

vessel out of which one drinks.” And it seems that the point you are trying to cover up here is the point that Thayer says that the **use of cup** in Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; and 1 Cor. 11:28 is “the vessel out of which one drinks.” And this kills all your effort to refute my proposition.

I am certain that brethren who use cups do not take the communion as directed in the Bible. And as to **our** motive and faith, we stand or fall before God, not J. N. Cowan. And while sectarians twit us as having our faith in the water when we follow the Bible in **baptizo**, immerse, some cups advocates jerr us as having our “faith in the container” when we follow the Bible in **poterion**, “a cup,” not cups. And it seems that “Birds of a feather” do “flock together.” And “All digression is alike.”

One authority cited is Jamison, Faucet & Brown to prove Acts 2:46 had reference to the communion.” (Cowan) Falsehood, No. 1. “The same Authority says they sprinkled for baptism on the day of Pentecost.” Falsehood No. 2. “You turned him (Goodspeed) down, and then wrote him to help you out later.” (Cowan) Falsehood, No. 3. And when you say I did so “write to Goodspeed, since our debate at Graham,, and receive the above answer,” you —, well, do not tell the truth, brother.

“In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as ‘the church’ in this or that man’s house, Rom. 16:5, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. v. 2.” — Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown. “The oldest meeting-places of Christian worship were rooms in ordinary dwellings — Schaff-Herzog. (Under Altar) The day of Pentecost was the “oldest.” “The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses.” — Neander. Pentecost was “at first.” “**Acts 2:46**: They did not think fit to celebrate the eucharist in the temple, for that was peculiar to the Christian institutions, and therefore they administered that ordinance in private houses of the converted Christians.” — Matthew Henry.  
Jan. 8, 1931.

H. C. HARPER

### J. N. COWAN’S FIFTH NEGATIVE

According to my opponent, I have played the part of the ignoramus in this debate. I leave that to the reader. It is a well known fact that our oral debate at Graham was the latter part of August, 1930. Now read: “Is ‘cup’ in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively? “No” Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago University, **letter** Sept. 30, 1930.” This is quoted from Harper’s second negative. Just why he will continue to deny getting this letter, after quoting from it is a puzzle. If such a letter was not received, then a bogus one was quoted from. Something wrong in Denmark!

Jamieson-Faucett & Brown, another one of my opponents’ witnesses says, “It is difficult to say how 3000 could be baptised in one day, according to the old practice of a complete submersion . . . the difficulty can only be removed by supposing they already employed sprinkling, or baptised in houses in large vessels . . . Formal

submersion in rivers, or larger bodies of water probably took place **only** where the locality conveniently allowed it." The above is Harper's witness.

It is also well known by all who heard the Graham debate that Harper said "this" in Mat. 26:28 was a pronoun and "cup" in verse 27 was its antecedent. In the first negative of this debate he cites Professor Pharr of Florida on the use of pronouns. He also admits in the second and fifth negatives that it is so used, and in the Sixth negative he says "For **this (pronoun)** suggesting the contents of the 'cup' (See Dr. Pharr, 2nd reply) is my blood of the N. T." This constitutes positive proof that he took the position "this" was a **pronoun**. Now note this from his fifth Aff. "But 'this' is an **adjective** here, and adjectives do not have antecedents . . . But there is **now** no pronoun. And this shows your caliber on language." Since when is there no **pronoun**? Since you changed your mind? This is a complete somersault I have turned you. There can be but one reason why you have changed on what part of speech "this" is in Mat. 26:28, and that is you are completely whipped, if it is a pronoun, therefore you have decided to say it is an adjective. An adjective is a word used to qualify, limit or define a noun. (Winston). Now, when you tell what noun "this" modifies you will be in as bad a fix as when you said "this" was a pronoun. It qualifies, limits and defines the noun "cup" of verse 27, and hence "this cup is my blood of the N. T." refers to the cup of verse 27. "And while the antecedent of "this" in verse 28 is 'cup' in verse 27, which is there used literally, yet the **pronoun 'this'** is used metonymically." "But **NOW** there is no pronoun," EH? (For above quotation see Harper's first neg.) How does all this sound from H. C. Harper, the "Master Grammarian," who accuses his opponent of being an ignoramus on language?

In his second negative, he uses "cup" as a supplied word freely on Mat. 26:28, and calls it the second use of the word "cup." Now he says it is a matter of "Cowan said it." He seems to have "striven about words to no profit," until the poor fellow is so mixed, he cannot remember from one speech to the next what he said.

He quotes from me, "the antecedent of 'this' is 'cup' of verse 27." And replies, "And this is more of "Cowan said it." Harper said the same in his first Neg.

To say that "cup" in Rev. 17:4 is used literally, a literal drinking vessel in the hand of a symbolical woman, is a travesty on the word of God; and to accuse Thayer of teaching such is an insult to his intelligence; and to try to prove it by Goodspeed is futile. Goodspeed said Enoch, the seventh from Adam wrote a book, and that it has been found within the last 150 years. But why contend that "cup" is used literally in Rev. 17:4? Because it is cited in connection with Mat. 26:27, and under the head "properly." There is not a dictionary on earth that defines "literally" and "properly" to mean the same, neither are they synonyms.

I am still relying on the word of God as to the number of congregations in Jerusalem, while my opponent is rambling through history and commentaries to try to disprove it. The scriptures cited have never been noticed.

The cattle did not drink spiritual drink any more than they were baptised in the sea, but they drank from the same rock, and went through the same water in the sea. The point is, they all drank from the rock even though they drank the water from different vessels, just as we all drink from the same cup, though it is from different vessels.

"Thayer's **definition** is a 'cup, a drinking vessel' and this definition can be substituted for the word anywhere." Of all the absurdities, this is the climax. We will now substitute the meaning in the following: "Father, let this cup a drinking vessel pass from me." "I will take the cup a drinking vessel of salvation." "For this cup a drinking vessel is the N. T. in my blood." "Take this (cup) a drinking vessel and divide it among yourselves." My cup a drinking vessel runneth over." The cup a drinking vessel which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" "Ye cannot drink the cup a drinking vessel of the devil and the cup a drinking vessel of the Lord." "As oft as you drink this cup a drinking vessel . . . ye show his death till he come." I have substituted the definition in every passage above quoted which makes complete non-sense. It fairly represents my opponents position.

"I drink the cup by drinking what it contains." But you must remember "the cup is an element of the supper," and this is one element you neither eat nor drink. You might as well say the dishes a supper is served in, are elements of the supper.

Christ took bread, one element of the supper, and he took the fruit of the vine the other element of the supper, and no living man can prove there ever was, or ever will be more than these two elements of the supper. We look for one more juggling of authors.  
Jan. 12, 1931 J. N. COWAN

### FINAL AFFIRMATIVE

"The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid." "And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) The word "cup" is here used as the name of the vessel out of which they drank, hence the name of a solid, just as I have shown in my syllogisms, which he cannot refute. And he has admitted it in saying:

"Christ took the cup the name of a solid." (His 1st neg.) Again: "It does mean a cup, a drinking vessel." (His 4th aff.) Again: "Cup is the name of the literal vessel." (His 1st aff.) "The cup and bread are both elements of the same supper and one is as figurative as the other." (2nd aff.) "I'm sure the same scholars will say bread in verse 26 is used literally." (6th aff.) Yes, they do and cup, too. "Is the word 'cup' used literally in Mt. 26:27?" "Yes."—James H. Ropes, Harvard; Harry M. Hubbell, Yale; Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago. Again: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid?" "Yes." (Same scholars) Again: "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" "No." (Same scholars) And Thayer cites the word "cup" hereunder "the vessel out of which one drinks, **ek tou poteriou**, Mt. 26:27," **out of the cup**. (p. 510) And on page 533 he cites "cup" in Mt. 26:27 under "prop.," and not under "by meton." And I have shown that we may say "proper or literal." (See "The Form of Baptism, pp. 35, 72-77) And the Rhetoric use "ordinary, usual, proper, natural, literal" to distinguish that which is not figurative. And the same scholars cited above say that "this" in verse 28 "refers to the **contents** of the cup," as **gar** logically shows, and not to the cup, as you have it, making the **container** the blood. You say, "He drank the poison cup and died," and say, "I contend that Christ used the word in that sense in the verse cited." (Mt. 26:27) But your sentence is no more like that of Mt. 26:27 than black is like white. That sentence is **ek tou poteriou**, drink **out of the cup**, as Thayer points out. (p. 510) But **yours** is **drink the cup**, like that in I Cor. 10:21; 11:27. But even in this metonymy "drink the cup," "cup" is the name of the drinking vessel, the name of a solid. "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what

it (the cup) contains, and in no other way.” (Clark) Just as Thayer says “by drinking” what is in the cup.” (p. 510).

Here “cup” is the name of the “container.” **Metonymy** 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.”—Williams, p. 220. “Object, it, it” here is “contents” in “drink the cup,” and the “something else” named is “cup,” the drinking vessel, the name of a solid. And if “this” in v. 28 refers to “cup” in v. 27, the “container” is the blood.

“The definition of a word may be substituted for the word without destroying the sense.”—Cowan. (1st neg.) And I said, “Yes,” for this is one of the most cardinal laws of language, and he has upset himself by running into himself. It has kept him dodging. When the language is literal, he dodges to figurative to make a showing; and when it is figurative, he dodges behind literal. This fallacy has been exposed, and now he has trapped himself. Shall we break this law of language to let him out. Never. He must come across and construe the language figuratively. “The fallacy **Figura dictionis** occurs when a metaphor or other figure of speech is construed literally. This seems very trifling, but is a very subtle and ruinous form of fallacy.”—Davis. (Elements of Logic)

One of each will suffice. Metonymy; “Oft . . . drink cup.” How? “By drinking what it contains” (Clark), “what is in the cup.” (Thayer) And one drinks “a cup, a drinking vessel,” by metonymy, “By drinking what it contains.” And “cup” here is the drinking vessel, too. Metaphor: “Cup runneth over.” Metaphor is an implied comparison, a contracted simile. The Psalmist likens his joy to a cup from which one drinks an overflowing, delightful potion. And without this “cup and contents” with which to compare his joy, there is no metaphor. It is not so strange as I once thought: I do not think he knows any better, from all we have seen on this line of fallacy. Again:

“This.” It is your “somersault,” brother. I change not but the “part of speech” changes, and I keep my solid footing. I called “this” in Mt. 26:28 a “pronoun,” and so it is; but in your sentence where you supply a word not in the inspired Scriptures, “this” is an “adjective,” just as I said: but when you say, “It modifies, limits and defines the noun ‘cup’ in verse 27, you say what is not so. I used your word just enough to expose your error.

If the “cup,” a drinking vessel, is not an element, “an essential part,” of the communion, let us see you obey the command, “drink the cup,” without the cup to drink from. I drink the cup by drinking what is in the cup.” (Thayer) But you never did “eat” the “wine,” an “element of the supper.”

You say the word “cup” (Rev. 17:4) is used figuratively, but when called on, you could not name the figure nor produce the man that can. Thayer cites its use under “prop.” with Mt. 26:27, and not under any figurative use, and so the other scholars say it is used “literally.” And you have not refuted this by juggling with the symbolic presentation.

If you quote what I said, and someone should say Cowan said it, wouldn’t that be “juggling authors”? Well, you quote what Olshausen said, and you said Jamieson, Fausset and Brown said it. But Olshausen’s language is far from saying, “They sprinkled for baptism on the day of Pentecost.” He modifies his statement by “supposing,” which expresses uncertainty; besides he gives an alternative, “employed

sprinkling, or baptized in houses in large vessels.”

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown say: “In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as ‘the church’ in this or that man’s house, Rom. 16:5; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. v. 2.”

And no “scripture” you cited shows a big congregation for communion, nor cups used. You fudged on conducting N. T. worship with 25,000 and had “other congregations” to “teach them.” Jerusalem, with 500,000, had 40,000 Christians and your “never had more than one congregation,” is but idle talk.

You falsified in saying of me, “You turned him (Goodspeed) down, and then wrote him to help you out later.” (5th aff.) And the fact that I quoted his letter, written since the Graham debate, in no way shows that your falsehood is the truth. And I hoped that you, for your own good, would retract it.

“That rock,” 1 Cor. 10:4, “was Christ.” And the fact that Thayer cites the use of the word “cup” in Mt. 26:27 here under “the vessel out of which one drinks,” utterly refutes you in trying to make it “the fruit of the vine.” And your dodge to “vessels” will not cover this fact up. But as a matter of truth “that rock was Christ,” and they had but one. Neither did the “cattle” drink the “spiritual drink.”

The sprinkler can make just as good a showing for his practice from the Bible as the cups man can for his. The Bible says **poterion**, a cup, a drinking vessel, not **cups**, just as plainly as it says **baptizo**, dip, immerse, not sprinkle. And it says “a (one) cup” just as plainly as it says “one loaf,” or “one immersion,” not loaves or trine-immersion. Hence **one cup, one loaf, one immersion**, as “The Bible speaks,” is the **common ground** for keeping “the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, the **unity** our Savior prayed for, “that the world may believe,” the unity Paul commanded (1 Cor. 1), and which we must “endeavor” to keep if we walk worthy of our vocation (Eph. 4). Here I take my stand, and for this I plead. And I shall meet you all at the judgment-bar or God for the final decision on the matter. And now praying the blessing of God upon all lovers of the truth—“thy word is truth,” I plead with you to study the matter candidly and prayerfully, and may we “be one.”

Jan. 23, 1931.

H. C. HARPER.

#### J. N. COWAN’S FINAL NEGATIVE

“This (cup) is my blood of the New Testament” or its parallel in Luke, “This cup is the new Testament in my blood,” is enough to satisfy any unbiased mind as to what the cup is. The fact that I admit that the word “cup” does sometimes mean a literal vessel, does not imply that I said Christ used the word to convey such an idea. He used the word “cup” to convey to the mind the second element of the supper which was the fruit of the vine. He took the bread and said this is my body; He took the cup and said this is my blood. Literal bread and literal fruit of the vine to symbolize his body and blood. Every one knows that the vessel does not symbolize either, and the communion was not given to commemorate anything; but the body and blood of the Lord.

“Metonymy 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.” I heartily endorse this definition. Christ presented an object to the mind (the fruit of the vine) not by

naming it, but by naming something else (cup) which readily suggested it. Mat. 26:27.

"I called 'this' in Mat. 26:28 a pronoun and so it is." (last negative) "But there is now no pronoun brother." This is a complete contradiction, and you turned the somersault.

My opponent drinks the cup by drinking what it contains, while I drink the cup by drinking what Jesus called the cup. "This (cup) is my blood of the N. T." I have repeatedly shown that Jacob and all his cattle drank from the well, or out of it, and Israel and cattle drank out of the rock, even though they drank from different vessels filled with water from the well and rock. The argument of the One container brethren is, to drink out of a cup all must drink from the same vessel. So I argue, if that be so, that the people and cattle all drank out of the same vessel, which is preposterous. But if they all drank out of the rock by drinking water that came from the rock in different vessels by drinking of the supply which came from the rock, then we all drink out of the cup by drinking of the supply which the cup affords. This has never been met fairly. My opponent tried to cover it up by asking if cattle drank spiritual drink. I say no, because they had not the power of spiritual discernment, but they did drink water out of the same rock the people did. Cattle went through the same water of the Red Sea, but were not baptised. Some people today drink out of the same cup that others drink out of, but they do not discern the Lord's body, any more than the cattle understood the rock was a type of Christ.

If all the scholars in the world should tell me that a symbolical woman had a literal cup in her hand I would not believe it. That is an utter impossibility. Away with such stuff!

You have at last admitted getting the letter, and the letter was an answer to a query asked Goodspeed since the Graham debate, and you used the letter to try to refute my position. You certainly thought it would help you, and that is what I said about it. So I have not "falsified," but you have kept something under cover about it through this debate, when you could have cleared the matter up with an explanation.

I stand for the one bread (unleavened bread), One cup, (fruit of the vine) one baptism (Immersion) and for this I plead.

It is an admitted fact, that if there was only one congregation in Jerusalem, that more than one container was used to distribute the cup of the Lord. My opponent has plead for at least eighty congregations organized in Jerusalem within a few days. Reader, please note the following scriptures which have been cited ever since my second negative, and which have never been noticed by my respondent. "And all that believed were together . . . And they continued daily with one accord in the Temple." Act. 2:44-46. How many churches was this? "And they were all with one accord in Solomon's Temple." Just one congregation here. In Act. 6:1-7, we find the apostles calling the multitude of the disciples together, and seven deacons appointed. These deacons were over the entire multitude of disciples, which proves they had but the one congregation. "And when they come to Jerusalem they were received by the church." Act. 15:4. "Then it pleased the apostles and elders with the whole church." Only one congregation in these passages. Act. 15:22. I readily concede the fact, that in many cities where they had no place of meeting, their private homes were used, and it became known as the church is this man's home. But not so at Jerusalem. They had only one congregation at Jerusalem, and they met in Solomon's

Temple as the record shows. History nor the Bible knows but one congregation in Jerusalem at any time. This fact clearly proven, it became an absolute necessity to have more than one container to distribute the wine of the communion. I submitted in a former article that One Hundred disciples were all that could be served with one vessel, and it has not been disputed. My opponent was forced, against the teaching of the scriptures, to plead for thirty-one congregations on the day of Pentecost, and fifty more a few days later. From this absurdity he has not extricated himself. Adding to this the absurd position that the vessel was an element of the supper, and that the vessel was an emblem of the New Testament, we see H. C. Harper involved in such absurd predicaments, as to render him obnoxious to all rational minds. Talking about the Judgment, after the seclusion of the truth about the Goodspeed letter, and after being caught in a positive misrepresentation about it, is certainly an appropriate subject for my opponent. Especially so, when he will divide congregations over a matter so trivial as to how the cup be distributed among the members. He has raked and scraped among worldly scholars, both Baptist and Pedo-Baptist to escape the force of the language of Christ. When he said, "This is my blood of the New Testament." "This" is a pronoun and has for its antecedent "cup" of Mat. 26:27. If "cup" is used to mean a literal drinking vessel, and "this" stands for its antecedent, as all pronouns do, then "This is my blood" means that the vessel was his blood. But if the "fruit of the vine" is what Jesus had reference to when he said "cup," then "This is my blood" means that the fruit of the vine was what he called his blood. This argument has caused my adversary much trouble, even to change his mind about what part of speech "this" is. As my space is consumed, I here bid the reader farewell, with a prayer that the "One container Advocates" will see the folly of their contention and cease to trouble the church with such foolishness.

Yours for harmony among the disciples of Christ,  
Feb. 4, 1931.

J. N. COWAN

## *Tracts*

**HARPER - TRAIL DISCUSSION** A reprint from the file of "The Old Paths advocate" 1933. A twenty-five page debate on the Wine question. Price — \$1.00 each (50¢ each to churches in lots) plus postage.

**THE HOLY SPIRIT** by John F. Rowe. A fifty page tract. Price — \$1.00 each (50¢ each to churches in lots) plus postage.

**THE "REVIEW" AND BAPTISM, or Daniel Sommer Answered on Sect Baptism.** By H. C. Harper. A twenty-four page tract. Price — \$1.00 each (50¢ each to churches in lots) plus postage.

**BOOKS — OLD PATH PULPIT** A book of 33 Sermons and Essays by Evangelists of the church of Christ. (Pictures and biographies included). A 231 page, hard-back book. Copyrighted in 1945. Published by the Old Paths Advocate. Price — \$5.00.

**OLD PATH PULPIT NUMBER TWO** A book of 61 Sermons and Essays by Evangelists of the church of Christ. (Pictures and biographies included). A 413 page hard-back book. Copyrighted in 1978.

**THE CHURCH . . . STILL IT STANDS** A 134 page hard-back book containing fourteen sermons by evangelists of the church of Christ. Price — \$4.00.

**OLIPHANT - RICE DEBATE** on Return of the Jews to Jerusalem; Personal Reign of Christ at Jerusalem; Baptism for Remission of Sins; Apostasy. This debate was conducted at Dallas, Texas in January, 1935. 572 pages. Paper-back. Price — \$6.50 postage paid.

**Order the above from:**  
**M. Lynwood Smith**  
**Route 1, Box 151**  
**Wesson, Mississippi 39191**