

Wiley
&
Miller
Debate

1961



Individual Cups for Communion

The

DEBATER

WILEY-MILLER DEBATE

The Scriptures teach that each member of a congregation (in observing the communion) may drink of the fruit of the vine from an individual cup.

W. S. Wiley, Affirms --- E. H. Miller, Denies



W. S. WILEY began preaching in Grape-land, Texas in 1932. He writes for the FIRM FOUNDATION and the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. The excellence of his debate with Lester Hathaway (on classes and women teachers) resulted in his being invited to take part in this debate on the cup question. He is presently working with the church at Mt. Pleasant, Texas, having previously preached at Clovis, New Mexico. He has been active in radio and television with a weekly program in each medium. In over thirty years brother Wiley has missed the Lord's Day service only once.



ELBERT HARVEY MILLER has been very active in debate, especially in support of the one cup and no class positions. He has also debated the Pentecostal teaching that Jesus is the only person in the Godhead, the materialistic doctrine that man has no eternal spirit and thus can suffer no eternal punishment, the divorce and remarriage question and baptism in the name of Jesus only. He writes for the OLD PATHS ADVOCATE and PROCLAIMER OF TRUTH. Two of his debates are in print: SMITH - MILLER DEBATE (baptism in the name of Jesus only) and THE CUP OF THE LORD, WHAT IS IT? (a debate with brother M. L. Lemley).

<p style="text-align: center;">Subscribe to THE DEBATER Only \$2.00 brings you six complete debates. The easiest and most interesting means of keeping abreast of current religious controversy. Send check or money order to: THE DEBATER 1921 Gumwood, McAllen, Texas.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">THE DEBATER Wendle Scott, Editor Published bimonthly by The Debater Publishing House 1921 Gumwood St., McAllen Texas. Second-class mail privileges authorized at McAllen, Texas Subscription price: \$2.00 per year, in clubs of 5 or more, \$1.50 each. Foreign subscriptions, \$2.50. Single copies .25¢. In bundles of 25 or more .15¢ per copy. Price to agents on request.</p>
--	---

Order the Following Books and Tracts, Etc. From

Herschel Bass **E. H. MILLER**
metropolis, IL **P. O. Box 538**
8-12-88 **LaGrange, Georgia**

- "Tommy and His Mother" 25c
- "Which Church Is Right?" 5c
- "Which Church of Christ Is Right?" 5c
\$2.00 per 100; \$8.00 per 1000
- "Are Classes and Women Teachers Scriptural?"
(Miller's Questions — Norton Dye's Answers) 5c
- "Written Statements by Norton Dye" (for cups)—100 \$1.00
- "A Reply to M. L. Lemley 'On This Cup Of the Lord' " 5c
- "The Cup of the Lord' What Is It?—A Friendly Discussion
Between E. H. Miller and M. L. Lemley" 25c
- "Forty Questions Concerning 'Cup' or 'Cups' On the Lord's Table"
(Twenty Questions and Replies on Both Sides of the Cup
Question Between J. H. Cox and E. H. Miller) 5c
- "Forty Questions Concerning Classes and Women Teachers"
(Twenty Questions and Replies on Both Sides of the Division
Between J. H. Cox and E. H. Miller) 5c
- Photo of Church of Christ Sunday School Certificate, Saying,
"Robert Raikes Founder of Sunday Schools 1780" 15c
- The Rejected Challenge 5c Each, or 1000 for \$8.00
- "Steps Into Christ"—1000 \$6.00
- "Personal Workers' Reference List"—1000 \$8.00
- "True Facts About The Church of Christ"—1000 \$8.00
- "The Smith-Miller Debate"
(Baptism In The Name of Jesus Only) 25c
- Sermon Outline On "The Mark of the Beast" 5c
- Tracts and Folders Advertising Gospel Meetings, etc., for Any
Congregation—1000 for \$8.00
(Send 5c For Samples). All the Above Prices Are Post Paid.
- Recorded Debates On Different Subjects (at any tape speed),
For Retail Price of Tape Only
- Any Part or All of Bible on Tape (any speed) for Retail Price of Tape Only.
- "The Miller-Alexander Debate"—A Four Hour Public Debate With
Affirmative and Negative on Both Sides of the Divorce Question 50c
- "God's Truth On The Covering"—An Exegesis and Examination of 1 Cor.
11:2-16 by Frank Rester (Comment on Each of These Verses; and
Many Objections to the Other Covering of 1 Cor. 11:6 Considered) 60c

WILEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

With pleasure I affirm the stated proposition. It is my firm conviction that brethren, in observing the practice stated in the proposition, are on firm ground.

To define the proposition: The Scriptures--That which was divinely revealed and written. The scriptures teach--to make known by command, approved example and (or) necessary inference. Each member of the congregation, in observing the communion--eating the Lord's Supper. May--is within his scriptural right. Drink the fruit of the vine--the cup of the communion. From an individual cup--a vessel containing the cup of the communion.

To sustain this, we shall prove three points: 1. "The Cup", when used regarding the Lord's Supper, always refers to the contents and never to the vessel. 2. "The cup", when divided, remains the cup. 3. Expediency, in the absence of instructions concerning the vessels used in the Supper, allows distribution of the cup into individual containers.

I. Bible use of the term "cup".

The term "cup", both singular and plural, appears approximately seventy-three times in Scripture. It sometimes refers to vessels; sometimes it signifies abundance; sometimes to the contents of a vessel. The latter, without exception, is the meaning when used in connection with the Lord's Supper.

Examples of it's use:

1. A vessel. Gen. 40:11; Isa. 22:24.
2. A figure of speech. Psalm 11:6; Isa. 51:17-22.
3. Abundant blessings. Psalm 16:5; 116:13.
4. Figure of suffering. Matt. 20:22-23; 26:42.

5. Every reference made to "cup", from the institution of the Lord's Supper, to the book of Revelation, points to that within the vessel, and never to the vessel itself. The fruit of the vine, which stands for the blood of Christ, is the thing given emphasis, rather than the vessel that contains it.

6. The "cup" of the Lord's Supper.

(a) For what did the Lord give thanks?

"And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. . ." (Matt. 26:27) Was the Lord giving thanks for the contents or the container? The disciples were told, "Drink ye all of it". Surely it is clear that they were to drink the contents--not the vessel.

(b) What stood for the blood of the New Testament?

"For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. 26:28) What, in giving them the "cup" and saying "this is my blood", did he refer to--the container or the contents? Mark shows the reference to be to the contents by recording, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until I drink it new. . ." (Mark 14:22-25)

(c) The cup of blessing which we bless.

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10:16) Are we communing (jointly partaking) of the vessel or of the contents? Do we give thanks for the communion vessels or that which stands for the body and blood of the Lord? Surely we can see that in 1 Cor. 11:25-28 Paul is referring to the fruit of the vine, and not to some sort of container.

(d) Paul's warning about eating unworthily.

Paul warns, in 1 Cor. 11:29, against eating and drinking unworthily. It is significant that in this, the only reference made to eating and drinking unworthily, he points to the lack of discernment and not to the vessels or number thereof. The inspired Apostle placed the emphasis on the purpose behind the act; the elements provided for this memorial; and not on the physical arrangements necessary for the serving of the Lord's Supper. We are sure that if the vessel for the fruit of the vine is important, then some information, as to its nature, would have been given. Why not, on the same basis, see some importance in the bread tray? As much is said about it.

Summing up:

The term "cup", when used regarding the Supper, refers to that which stands for the blood of Christ. It ill behooves us to emphasize--to the point of turning attention away from the memorial--the vessel holding the memorial. When we give thanks and drink "the cup"--it is the fruit of the vine we are thankfully drinking of. --W. S. Wiley

MILLER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Wiley gave no Bible verses which, as he said, "teach--by command, approved example--(or) necessary inference" that "each member--may drink the fruit of the vine from an individual cup." NOT ONEVERSE WHICH REFERS IN ANY WAY TO "AN INDIVIDUAL CUP." Brother Wiley said, "We shall prove 'THE CUP', when used regarding the Lord's Supper, always refers to the contents and never to THE VESSEL." Why didn't he give one Bible verse, dictionary, Greek Lexicon, or some standard book on the meaning of words, that says so? There isn't such a thing! He DIS-proves his proposition, admitting, in "the Lord's Supper--the contents" were "always" in "THE VESSEL" (NOT VESSELS). So, "each member of congregation" drank of (Thayer, "out of") "THE VESSEL," NO "INDIVIDUAL CUP" for "each member of a congregation" yet. He said, "The cup", when divided, remains the cup." Just a statement! No Bible for dividing "THE CONTENTS" of "THE VESSEL" into "VESSELS".

Brother Wiley speaks of "the absence of instructions concerning the VESSELS" after agreeing "THE CONTENTS" were "always" in "THE VESSEL." Thus he admits, there is no Bible teaching for "VESSELS" (cups) containing "THE CONTENTS"; and says, "Every reference--from the institution of the Lord's Supper, to the book of Revelation, points to that within THE VESSEL, --the blood of Christ, --rather than THE VESSEL THAT CONTAINS IT." Again, "The term 'cup', both singular and plural--sometimes refers to vessels--some-

times to THE CONTENTS OF A VESSEL. THE LATTER, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, IS THE MEANING WHEN USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE LORD'S SUPPER." Thus he agrees, the Bible teaches for "the Lord's Supper" "THE CONTENTS OF A VESSEL--WITHOUT EXCEPTION."

Hear him again, "For what did the Lord give thanks?--'He took the cup and gave thanks,'--Was the Lord giving thanks for THE CONTENTS or THE CONTAINER?--They were to drink THE CONTENTS--NOT THE VESSEL."--"The fruit of the vine--stands for the blood of Christ,"--"THE CONTENTS" were in "THE CONTAINER--THE VESSEL" (NOT CONTAINERS--VESSELS). To all of that, I agree. The Lord was giving thanks for "THE CUP OF BLESSING" (Smith's Bible Dictionary, "The cup of wine, called 'THE CUP OF BLESSING'". Robinson, "Cup of red wine--called THE CUP OF BLESSING". Bible Dictionary based on one by Robinson, "A cup of unfermented wine--called 'THE CUP OF BLESSING'"). So Jesus gave thanks for, not cups of, but "A CUP OF UNFERMENTED WINE". Brother Wiley says, "'THE CUP OF BLESSING--is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?'--Are we communing (jointly partaking) of THE VESSEL or of THE CONTENTS?" He knows it takes "THE VESSEL" and "THE CONTENTS" to make "THE CUP OF BLESSING", agreeing with Smith & Robinson.

Brother Wiley agrees, to have communion, there must be a "jointly partaking"; but there is no communion, "(jointly partaking)" from "an individual cup" which is not a communion "(jointly partaking)" cup. David Lipscomb said, "The communion--joint participation of the members--shows the communion of the many in one cup--to divide the cup--into many parts and for each to partake of his own--cup destroys the idea of communion" (Gospel Advocate, 1913.) The Gospel Advocate Commentary says, "He took the cup,--'A cup' is one, not two nor a dozen--The cup contained--a striking emblem of his own blood," Brother Wiley agrees to this by his following question and answer, which I also agree with, "What stood for the blood of the New Testament?--Mark shows the reference to be to the contents--the fruit of the vine,"

Now, WHAT STOOD FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT? We will let Jesus tell us, "THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD" "1 Cor. 11:25; Lk. 22:20--the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine--is--an emblem of the new covenant'" (Thayer, page 15). Goodspeed's Translation, "This cup is the new agreement ratified by my blood:" Moffatt's Translation, "This cup means the new covenant ratified by my blood." Twentieth Century Translation, "This cup is the new covenant made by my blood." Both the Bible & Brother Wiley's arguments disprove his proposition! (all caps mine). --E. H. Miller

WILEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Miller objects to my statement: "'The Cup', when used regarding the Supper, always refers to contents and never the vessel." He asks, "Why didn't he give one Bible verse, dictionary, Greek lexicon, or some standard book on the meaning of words, that

says so? There isn't such a thing." He then agrees with me in his third paragraph. Of my statement, "the Lord gave thanks for the contents; they drank of the contents; 'the cup of blessing' refers to the contents", he says: "TO ALL OF THAT I AGREE." Thanks! The reader need not be burdened with dictionary or lexicon references. Anyone, without opinions held as law, can see from the contexts that each reference to the Supper points to the fruit of the vine and not a container. Christ told his disciples to drink that which stood for his blood; for which he had given thanks. ((Matthew 26:27-29; Mark 14:23-25; Luke 22:17-20; 1 Cor. 10:16, 17; 1 Cor. 11:24-29) . But, since he wants lexicon evidence, hear Robinson from whom he quoted--M.S. Whitehead, Atmore, Alabama, quoted this from page 625, Robinson's Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, (August '56, American Christian Review)--"Following is what it says of the figurative use of poterion (cup): (b) Metonymy, contents of a cup, that which is presented to anyone to drink, viz., (a) SPOKEN OF THE WINE DRANK AT THE SACRED SUPPER, Luke 22:20 et 1 Cor. 11:25 touto to poterion he kaine diatheke. (this cup is the new covenant) 1 Cor. 10:16 to poterion tes eulogias, (the cup of blessing) see in pascha no. 1---So pinein to poterion to drink the cup, etc. 1 Cor. 10:21 viz, to poterion kuriou (the cup of the Lord)-kai to poterion diamoniou, i.e., the cup consecrated to the Lord--the cup consecrated to the heathen gods, 11:26, 27. Verse 28, pinein ek tou poteriou; as John 4:14. The parenthesis is mine." You will note that Robinson says the above references points to contents; that which one drinks.

Brother Miller says there can be no communion unless all drink from one container. He makes the container the thing necessary to communion. This makes it impossible for friends to "jointly partake" of a meal if the parts thereof are distributed among them. All would have to eat from one dish and drink from one vessel.

His position prohibits the eating of the "one bread" and drink' ing of the "one cup" by all Christians, since it would be impossible for them all to have access to one container. The three Clovis churches observe the supper at the same hour. Which one has "the" cup? Surely we cannot think it necessary, in order to commune, for one container to move from one church to another. Yet, that would have to be, if there is no communion unless all drink from one vessel.

Paul wrote Corinth from Ephesus. (1 Cor. 16:8) He included himself, Ephesian and Corinthian brethren in the communion of the blood of Christ. He said, "we" (the brethren at Ephesus and Corinth) bless the cup of blessing, which, as he said, is the communion of the blood of Christ. There were at least two containers used, one at Corinth and one at Ephesus. Here are at least two containers; but they communed in the one cup.

Brother Miller will agree that the Jerusalem church numbered at least ten thousand. (Acts 2:41; 5:14; 6:7) Since a quart of grape juice serves three to four hundred people, the one (?) container used by Jerusalem was very large. Five to eight gallons. Please explain this in the light of the "one cup" (vessel) theory.

"Take this and divide it among yourselves." (Luke 22:17) The

disciples did not break a container into twelve parts. The fruit of the vine was divided. They, by this action, divided the cup. Did it become something other than the cup when they had divided it? Two friends divide a bottle of pop, pouring portions into separate vessels. They are "jointly partaking" of the bottle of pop. --W. S. Wiley

MILLER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Wiley failed to meet my first paragraph argument! Read his first-paragraph dodge again; he couldn't meet my statements, but misquoted under quotation marks, falsely accusing me of saying of misquotation, "TO ALL OF THAT I AGREE." He couldn't meet statements, so misquoted, and met that.

I showed Brother Wiley disproves his proposition by speaking of "the absence of instructions concerning the VESSELS". Agreeing "THE CONTENTS" were "ALWAYS" in "THE VESSEL", "THE CONTENTS OF A VESSEL", "THAT WITHIN THE VESSEL", "THE VESSEL THAT CONTAINS IT." "THE CONTENTS" were in "THE CONTAINER--THE VESSEL" (NOT CONTAINERS--VESSELS). To all of that, I agree." Does that look like what he accuses me of agreeing to? I proved "THE CUP OF BLESSING" is "A CUP OF UNFERMENTED WINE" ("CUP CONTAINING WINE"), ETC; why didn't he meet that, or try to PROVE his assertions?

He claims to give the meaning of "CUP" from Robinson's Lexicon but what he has under quotation marks ARE NOT THE WORDS OF ROBINSON! Robinson's Lexicon says, "A DRINKING VESSEL, A CUP-Mt. 26:27 MK. 14:23-LK.22:17,20. 1 Cor.11:25-CUP-FULL, E.G. A CUP OF WINE 1 Cor. 10:16" (611). What Brother Wiley claims "Robinson says" doesn't help, but disproves his proposition! He quoted (?), "THE WINE DRANK AT THE SACRED SUPPER" is the "CONTENTS OF A CUP";not, contents of "AN INDIVIDUAL CUP" for "EACH MEMBER" as he is affirming!

He tries to prove A COMMUNION CUP doesn't mean a cup from which people "JOINTLY PARTAKE", saying, "This makes it impossible for Friends to 'JOINTLY PARTAKE' of a meal--." Notice he has, "'JOINTLY PARTAKE' of a meal" (ONE MEAL, NOT INDIVIDUAL MEALS); but he knows the INDIVIDUAL CUPS in "a meal" are not communion cups!

"The three Clovis churches" argument is weak! He thinks that proves my argument will force all three congregations to drink of the same container; but that proves one container for three congregations no more than 1 Cor.14:29-33 proves one speaker for three congregations. We can have one loaf, one cup, and one speaker at a time in each congregation.

"WE" (1 Cor.10:16-17) only includes those at Ephesus, "FOR WE ALL PARTAKE OF THE SAME LOAF" (R. S. V.). Alford's Greek Testament, English foot-note - "WE" the (assembled)". "WE--ONE BODY" at Ephesus, "YE ARE THE BODY" at Corinth (1 Cor.10:17; 12:27). Notice, he didn't just say, "WE"--"US" - "OURSELVES", but "YE" - "YOU" - "YOURSELVES" - "OUR hearts--YOUR joy--WE

then--beseech YOU" (2 Cor. 1:7-14; 6:1-7:16). "YE" are not "US", THEREFORE "WE" are not "YOU".

For the Passover, one lamb per congregation in Jerusalem; for the Lord's Supper, one loaf and one cup per congregation in Jerusalem.

Brother Wiley said, "(Lk.22:17)--The fruit of the vine was divided." He knows it wasn't divided when given to the disciples, SO HE DOESN'T FOLLOW HIS OWN BIBLE REFERENCE! He admits, "THEY--DIVIDED IT". How? "He took the CUP (Thayer, "A DRINKING VESSEL")--gave it to them: and they all drank OF (Thayer, "OUT OF") it" (Mk. 14:23). Thayer and Robinson both say, "A DRINKING VESSEL--Mt. 26:27--Mk. 14:23--Lk. 22:17,20, 1 Cor.11:25". What do those verses teach "THE CUP" and "THE CONTENTS OF THAT CUP" are (or what does each represent)? Brother Wiley said, "THE CONTENTS" - "stood for the blood of the New Testament" . AMEN! Jesus said (Mt.26:28) "This (verse 29, "This fruit of the vine") is my blood of the new testament" - Williams' Translation, "This is my blood which ratifies the covenant;" So the fruit of the vine (the contents of the cup) is CHRIST'S BLOOD "WHICH RATIFIES THE COVENANT". Now, what is "THE CUP"? Williams' Translation, "THE CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT RATIFIED BY MY BLOOD." Now we know "THE--COVENANT RATIFIED BY MY BLOOD" and "MY BLOOD WHICH RATIFIES THE COVENANT" are not the same, so the fruit of the vine (contents), and the cup (container) are not the same! See last paragraph - negative 1. What standard Lexicon or Dictionary defines "CUP" in Mt.26:27 - Mk.14:23 as "CONTENTS", or "INDIVIDUAL CONTAINERS"? What verses "TEACH each MEMBER--MAY DRINK--FROM AN INDIVIDUAL CUP"? --E. H. Miller

WILEY'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

I am accused of misquoting. My argument--"The Lord blessed contents; they drank contents; 'cup of blessing' refers to contents." If this is not his agreement, (Par. 3, 1st. Neg.), let him enlighten us. Will he say the Lord blessed a vessel; that they drank a vessel; that the "cup of blessing" (1 Cor.10:16) is a vessel?

The statement of Robinson, (Par. 1, 2nd. Aff.) Our readers may check for its accuracy.

Friends "jointly partake" of a meal, even though they divide it among several eating and drinking vessels. THEY eat THE MEAL.

Does the "WE" (1 Cor.10:16,17) include only Ephesus? Paul was writing to Corinth about matters, concerning the Supper, applying to ALL christians. Will Brother Miller say that ONLY Ephesus ate of the 'one bread' and drank of the "one cup"? Although three congregations in Clovis meet in separate places, they partake of the "one cup" emblematic of Christ's blood. There is only "one cup", emblematic, throughout the world, of the blood of Christ.

The argument on Luke 22:17 was not on WHEN the fruit of the

vine was divided; but that AFTER it WAS divided, they drank "the cup".

If the expression "the cup" forbids dividing the fruit of the vine into separate containers--how can Brother Miller countenance more than one copy of the New Testament; when, (as he says) the expression "the cup" represents the New Covenant? He refers to 1 Cor. 11:25, and tells us that the New Testament is represented by the container. BUT, verses 26, 27, 28, all tell us that "the cup" is what we drink. Are we drinking the New Testament? WE ARE DRINKING THE CONTENTS--THAT WHICH STANDS FOR THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

Matt. 26:28 defines Matt. 26:27 as contents. Christ told them to drink what He had blessed, (they consumed what they drank), and then identified what they drank as--"My blood of the covenant". (The fruit of the vine, of course, stood for the blood.) Mark 14:24 defines Mark 14:23, in the same way, as contents.

Expediency requires an arrangement for serving the Lord's Supper. The same passage of scripture allowing a tray for the loaf, (or a basket for the contribution) allows the necessary means of serving the fruit of the vine. Placing our contribution in baskets does not change its nature or purpose. The loaf remains a memorial to Christ's body when placed on a tray. We could show by Brother Miller's reasoning that the loaf should be passed from hand to hand, which would be neither expedient nor decent. Nothing is added to, (nor taken from) that which stands as the blood of Christ when, for the sake of expediency and decency, it is divided into separate containers.

Expediency required more than one cup in the Jerusalem church. Note these facts: Acts 2:41, 3,000 added; Acts 4:4, 5,000 men alone; Acts 5:14, multitudes added; Acts 6:7, number multiplied exceedingly. All agree to at least 10,000 members. BUT, they were TOGETHER, (Acts 2:44). Multitude of disciples involved in work done out of one treasury, (Acts 6:1-3). One container for communion service would have held five to eight gallons. Can we imagine it being passed from hand to hand? Brother Miller tried to dismiss this by intimating that there were several congregations in Jerusalem. He cannot find them.

Note the following parallel:

1. The Lord commanded us to go and preach the Gospel. (Mark 16:15)
2. The action, (go and preach the gospel) is specified. The way of going is not specified.
3. Therefore, the law of expediency allows any mode of transportation best designed to accomplish the going.

This law of expediency applies, in like manner, to the arrangement for serving the Lord's Supper.

1. The Lord commands all Christians to eat the Supper.

2. The elements, (bread and fruit of the vine) are specified. The method of distribution is not specified.
3. Therefore, the law of expediency allows the method of distribution best designed to insure all of the opportunity of eating.--W. S. Wiley

MILLER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Questions (Par. 1), answered in advance (Par. 3, Neg. 1; misquoted, but unanswered. First two paragraphs, negative 2 still unanswered. First affirmative and first 3 paragraphs in reply disprove his proposition.

Robinson's Lexicon doesn't have quotation in affirmative 2, par. 1 (See neg. 2, par. 3). Brother Wiley, admit your mistake.

"THEY eat THE MEAL" - THEY drank THE CUP - "jointly partake" ONE EACH! Paragraphs 4, 5, neg. 2 unanswered.

Paragraph 6, negative 2 answers most of paragraph 4, aff. 3 . Wiley, "'one cup' emblematic of Christ's blood." Jesus, "THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT (Heb. 9:18 "TESTAMENT-- DEDICATED) IN MY BLOOD," (Thayer 15, "The meaning is, 'this cup containing wine--is--an emblem of the new covenant'"). Shall we believe Wiley or Jesus?

Paragraph 6 negative 2 unnoticed!

Who said, "AFTER it WAS divided, they drank 'the cup'" ? See par. 8, neg. 2; then the reply (?), paragraph 5, affirmative 3.

Brother Wiley gave a good question & answer, "Are we drinking the New Testament? WE ARE DRINKING THE CONTENTS-- THAT WHICH STANDS FOR THE BLOOD OF CHRIST." He agrees, we don't drink "THIS CUP" called "THE NEW TESTAMENT" (Lk. 22:20), but "THE CONTENTS" called THE "BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT" (Mt. 26:28-29).

Arguing "one copy" doesn't disprove Christ (Lk. 22:20)! Christ gave nothing for copies, but ONE "CUP" = "NEW TESTAMENT" (Heb. 8:7 to 10:16).

Wiley, "But verses 26, 27, 28 all tell us that 'the cup' is what we drink." Wrong, 27 "DRINK THIS CUP" (Thayer 553, "BY METONYMY OF THE CONTAINER FOR THE CONTAINED, 1 Cor. 11:27") . This kind of "METONYMY" names the container and means the contained; like BOIL THE POT refers to the contents in one pot, so "DRINK THIS CUP" refers to contents in one cup (compare Ezek. 23:32-34 R. S. V.). 28 "DRINK OF THAT CUP." Don't DRINK THAT, but "OF THAT CUP" - Thayer 510, "The vessel OUT OF which one drinks, 1 Cor. 11:28." 27 names the container DRANK OUT OF, and means ITS contents; 28 names the container, and means the container DRANK OUT OF.

Wiley, "The fruit of the vine, of course, stood for the blood" Mt. 26:28-29-Mk. 14:24-25: That's right. And the "CUP IS (Wiley, "STOOD FOR") THE NEW TESTAMENT" Lk. 22:20-1 Cor. 11:25; That's PLAIN!

Since neither of us know Christ didn't use "a tray for the loaf." I won't force what Brother Wiley says is not "decent."

Wiley, "The necessary means of serving the fruit of the vine" is mentioned; Negative 1, par. 3, still unanswered. He says, "For the sake of expediency and decency--separate containers." But affirms (?) "The Scriptures teach--individual cup." Where do "The Scriptures" refer in any way to "an individual cup" in observing the communion" ? ? ? ? ? ?

Do "The Scriptures teach each member--an individual cup" "in the Jerusalem church" ? ? ? ? ? ? He tells size of the container, but not size of "loaf" (preceding paragraph). He hasn't found 100 in one congregation, so dis-proof of "10,000" un-necessary (Acts 2:5-11 & 42-44). He mis-applies "TOGETHER." -I'll let The Gospel Advocate Commentary explain for him; "IN ONE HOUSE -- IMPOSSIBLE -- IT SIMPLY MEANS THAT THEY 'WERE TOGETHER' IN MIND, IN PURPOSE, IN FAITH, AND IN HEART." Clarke's Commentary, "Not in one house; for where was there one at that time, that could hold such a multitude of people?" Matthew Henry's Commentary, "They did not think fit to celebrate the eucharist in the temple -- therefore they administered that ordinance in private houses, -- houses that had churches in them, and there celebrated the eucharist with those that usually met there to worship God."

1. "He took a cup" (Thayer & Tobinon, "a drinking vessel--Mt. 26:27").
2. The vessel ("cup") is specified. The size is not specified.
3. Therefore, the law of expedience allows any size necessary; but demands "cup", not a bottle or cups.

1. (Proposition)--"Each member of a congregation" "The Lord commands--to eat the Supper"--(Aff. 3).
2. The necessities ("a loaf", "a cup" & "the fruit of the vine") are specified.
3. Therefore, obedience forbids LOAVES, MILK, or "EACH MEMBER--AN INDIVIDUAL CUP" as Brother Wiley affirms (?) "The Scriptures teach".

WILL BROTHER WILEY FILL IN THE BLANKS WITH BIBLE VERSES TEACHING PROPOSITION BY: Statement _____, Command _____, Example _____, Necessary Inference _____, Any Way _____ --E. H. Miller

WILEY'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

In the absence of instructions about handling the bread, Brother Miller scripturally exercises the privilege of using trays. He errs by

making a law, where none exists, in distributing the cup.

We "jointly partake" of "a Meal" when it is divided among us. It does not become many meals.

Again we ask: What were they dividing among themselves, (Luke 22:17) a vessel or contents? Miller quotes Gospel Advocate Commentary on Jerusalem church. Will he accept same on division of the cup among the disciples? (Matt. 26:27) "There were as many as "five cups" passed during the Passover Feast; the wine was kept in a large container and was passed around and each filled his own cup with such portion as was desired; scriptures were recited and a pause was made in the feast as the cups were replenished." Was not "the cup" still "the cup" after it was divided?

Brother Miller's reference to 1 Cor. 10:16, 17 is a dodge. He knows that the pronoun "we" includes Paul, the Corinthians and Christians everywhere. "We", (verse 17) is said to be "one body", which is the church. It is not made up of many bodies.

One hundred New Testaments, would still contain the ONE COVENANT. One hundred vessels, into which distribution of the cup is made, still contain one fruit of the vine; nothing added; nothing subtracted. It still represents the blood of Christ; is consumed in remembrance of Him. Otherwise, the container, (not what is consumed) makes the difference in communion.

Identical phrases found in 1 Cor. 11:28: "Eat of that bread"; "Drink of that cup". If "Cup" means the "container drank out of", "bread" must mean the "container eaten out of". If verse 25 means the "container", it has the container within the contained. "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."

Brother Miller ignores distinctions between incidentals and commands. Songbooks are incidental to singing; hours of meeting to worship; serving vessels to communing. He does not recognize the law of expediency in serving the cup. He will say: "The scriptures teach, each may use a song book; the church may build a house; it may contain a baptistry; the bread may be served on a tray." Will he deny the scriptures teach these on the basis of expediency? Scripture, in the same manner, teaches that each may drink of the "cup" from an individual vessel. He illustrated as follows: "1. 'He took a cup (Thayer & Robinson, 'a drinking vessel--Mt. 26:27') 2. The vessel ('cup') is specified. The size is not specified. 3. Therefore, the law of expediency allows any size necessary; but demands "cup", not a bottle or cups." The passage itself will not allow his conclusion drawn from the stated premises. According to his contention that "cup" means the container, it would be: 1. "He took a cup". 2. The vessel ("cup") is specified. 3. They drank what "he took", i. e. a vessel.

Brother Miller again accuses me of misquoting, Par. 1, Aff. 2 gives the quotation from Robinson, with its source. Brother Whitehead quoted the lexicon by Robinson, bearing the Imprimatur dated "twelfth day of September A. D. 1825 the fiftieth year of the Independence of

the United States of America."

We refer you again to Neg. 1, Par. 3; you may determine what it was of which he said, "To all of that I agree."

He leaves the Bible to prove (?) many congregations in Jerusalem; quoting from some Gospel Advocate commentary, not designating which. Lipscomb's Commentary, The Acts of the Apostles, published 1896 by Gospel Advocate, on Acts 2:44: "The believers came together and acted as one body, and had all things common." (P48) He quotes Clarke. Will he accept Clarke's paraphrase of Luke 22:20 ?-"This cup which is poured out for you, signifies the blood of the New Covenant." Clarke properly makes "cup" refer to contents-not a container. The passage (Acts 2:44, 45) "All that believed were together" also says, they "had all things common". Appointees (Acts 6) distributed to widows. Did many (?) congregations have one "common treasury"? We can find "many" when it suits our purpose.--W. S. Wiley.

MILLER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Not "TRAYS" for one "LOAF". Bible law specifies, "CUP is the new testament" (Lk. 22:20); "ALL drank of it" ("a drinking vessel--Mk. 14:23" Thayer - Robinson); "1 Cor. 11:25; Lk. 22:20--This cup containing wine--is--an emblem of the new covenant" (Thayer, P. 15) Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:2&23-25 IS "A LAW".

Christ said, "Drink all of you out of it" (Mt. 26:27, Wilson's Translation); so "CONTENTS" of "A VESSEL" were DIVIDED AMONG THEM when "ALL DRANK OF" (Thayer, P. 510 "OUT OF--Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23") IT. "Grape juice served in "FIVE CUPS" at "A MEAL" cannot be referred to as "A CUP" or "FIVE MEALS", but "FIVE CUPS"!

Neither history nor the Bible agrees with his quotation; yet those "CUPS" were not said to be used in "the communion" (PROPOSITION). (Gospel Advocate Adult Quarterly, 1952), "According to the best authorities--the master of the feast took one of the cups--tasted the cup--then passed it to the others.--then the second cup was drunk,--a third cup--was drunk--and the fourth--. Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper--one of the four cups used in the passover feast was utilized." "He took a cup,--'A cup' is one, not two nor a dozen--the cup contained wine" (Gospel Advocate Commentary, Mk. 14:23).

Who dodged? Why did he "DODGE" "WE" here, and par. 6, neg 2?

Two "Testaments"=two covenants (2Cor. 3:6-14; Heb. 8:7-13); so "One hundred--Testament=100 COVENANTS! "CUP" called "TESTAMENT" - Nothing called copies of "the ONE COVENANT."

"OF" doesn't mean the same in loaf OF bread, cup OF wine, eat OF bread, drink OF cup; he rejects authorities on the meaning of "OF" -First & last paragraphs, negative 1, 2. "CONTAINER WITHIN-CONTAINED" (?), Last paragraphs, neg. 1, unanswered. "He took the cup (Thayer, P. 510 "the vessel out of which one drinks, Mt. 26:27")--

and gave it to them, saying, This cup (Thayer, P. 533 "drinking vessel--Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25") is the new testament (Thayer, P. 15 "is an emblem of the new covenant") in my blood (Goodspeed & Williams Translations, "ratified by my blood") which is shed for you."

Brother Wiley implies "The Scriptures teach--individual cup" BY NOT SAYING ANYTHING ABOUT IT! He couldn't meet my reply to his "PARALLEL"--so rejected Thayer's definition of "CUP"! Brother Wiley's "contention" would have them drinking "what 'he took'"; "VESSEL" & "CONTENTS" - Par. 3, neg. 1 proves he agrees Jesus took "THE CONTENTS" in "THE VESSEL"! He couldn't deny what he agreed with me on in those two places.

From PREFACE to "Robinson's -- Lexicon", "The Author's earliest effort--was a translation of the first edition by Wahl's Clavis Philologica--in 1825." That's what Brother Wiley quoted from, so he WASN'T quoting from "Robinson's--Lexicon"! For the next words of PREFACE are, "This was followed in 1836 by his own Greek and English Lexicon". I have "HIS OWN--LEXICON" 1836 first edition; its PREFACE says of the other men's Lexicon Brother Wiley quoted from, Robinson "found occasion on every page to distrust their judgment and accuracy."

Negative 1, paragraph 3, still unanswered!

"Gospel Advocate Commentary" was specified! The one he quotes is not that commentary; but it doesn't say, "EACH MEMBER--IN OBSERVING THE COMMUNION--MAY DRINK--FROM AN INDIVIDUAL CUP" as he affirms (?); or had all things in "ONE COMMON TREASURY"!

Not affirming his proposition, and not being able to fill in the blanks at end of neg. 3, proves Brother Wiley CANNOT PROVE HIS AFFIRMATIVE! Clarke's paraphrase has "CUP" as a metonymy - Robinson, "Metonymically--a cup of wine--Lk. 22:20". Teachers Commentary (G. A. 1952), "While holding this cup Jesus said, This is my blood"--obviously he spoke of the contents of the cup which he held in his hand." "He took the wine-cup (Thayer - Robinson, "A DRINKING VESSEL")--and gave it to them, saying, You must all drink from (Thayer, "OUT OF") it--This cup is the new agreement (Thayer, "AN EMBLEM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT") ratified by my blood" (Mt. 26:27 - 1 Cor. 11:25, Goodspeed Translation). "COMMUNION CUP--The cup used in common by all the communicants at the celebration of the Lord's Supper; also, any one of individual cups recently introduced into this service" (Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary). --E. H. Miller

WILEY'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

1. "CUP" refers to contents, not vessel.
2. "CUP" when divided remains the "cup".
3. Expediency allows distribution of the fruit of the vine into individual containers.

No man can properly understand Bible teaching without giving attention to the contexts of its statements. The contexts of statements regarding the Lord's Supper show reference to, and emphasis on, the fruit of the vine.

Mt. 26:27, 28: "Took the cup"--"This (the cup he took) is my blood".

Mk. 14:23, 24: "Took the cup"--"They all drank of it"--"This (what they drank of) is my blood".

Lk. 22:20: Refers to same event, same statement, same supper as referred to in Mt. 26:27, 28; Mk. 14:23, 24. Therefore, what is meant in latter passages, exactly the same as in former passages.

The banks of a stream, the dam of a pool, the walls of a baptistry, the sides of a bathtub are incidentals to, and not a part of that which constitutes baptism. One hundred people might be baptized in one hundred separate places. All would receive the one baptism. The containers used in serving the Lord's Supper are incidentals; and are no more a part of what constitutes the Lord's Supper than does the table on which it rests before being served.

The communion, (joint partaking) of 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, not dependent on all lips touching one container. When all drink of one fruit of the vine, emblematic of one blood, there is communion. Common expressions: "We had a cup of coffee"; "We ate a dinner". No one understands that we drank from one container or ate from one dish.

The idea that "we . . . are one body" (1 Cor. 10:17) refers only to Paul and the church at Ephesus is a forced interpretation. Expressions elsewhere, conveying same idea as 1 Cor. 10:17, are admittedly references to all Christians. (See Heb. 13:3; Rom. 12:5; 1 Cor. 12:13; Eph. 1:22, 23; 2:16; 3:6; Col 1:18, 24) No limitations as to locality. This interpretation would not be forced on 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, except for the necessity of a denial of truth that Ephesus and Corinth are pictured as drinking one cup. One container impossible.

1 Cor. 11:25, 28: "Ye . . . drink it". (To drink is to consume) "Ye drink (consume) this cup? "Drink (consume) the cup of the Lord". No consumption of vessel possible.

Law of expediency requires an arrangement for serving the Supper. Same scripture allowing ONE tray, allows TWO. Size of Jerusalem church requires an arrangement allowing all to drink the cup. We haven't found a second congregation. Acts 4:32-37 tells about the common treasury.

Brother Miller's concern for incidentals would necessitate eating the Supper in a borrowed upper room, preaching until midnight with many lights burning, (Matt. 26:18; Acts 20:7, 8), going outside the building to baptize (Acts 16:33, 34). He can recognize the law of expediency for song books, bread trays, baptistries in the building and building a meeting house. Expediency, in the same manner,

allows for individual containers. Perhaps, if the "container" is the important thing, he will describe the "cup" for us. Metal? Pottery? Wood? One or two handles?

Brother Miller's insistence that the "cup" is the New Testament is not consistent with the practice of having many copies of the Testament in the assembly. There is one Testament, though in a thousand copies. There is one fruit of the vine, emblematic of the one blood, though in a thousand containers. --W. S. Wiley

MILLER'S FIFTH NEGATIVE

Brother Wiley's proposition demands "Scriptures" for "an individual communion cup" for "each member of congregation", but he's claimed no "Scriptures" for such, but has argued CUP IS BLOOD! If so, he disproves proposition in first affirmative, saying, "THE CONTENTS OF A VESSEL--(not vessels, but "VESSEL") WITHOUT EXCEPTION, IS THE MEANING WHEN USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE LORD'S SUPPER." See first affirmative and negative.

Brother Wiley says, "This (the cup he took) is my blood" - "Miller's insistence that the 'cup' is the New Testament is not consistent". He rejects Christ's words, "THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT".

LK. 22:20 or 1 COR. 11:25 TELLS WHAT "THE CUP" IS:

KING JAMES VERSION

"THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD"

GOODSPEED TRANSLATION

"THIS CUP IS THE NEW AGREEMENT RATIFIED BY MY BLOOD"

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS TRANSLATION

"THIS CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT RATIFIED BY MY BLOOD"

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

"THIS CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT SEALED BY MY BLOOD"

THE AMPLIFIED NEW TESTAMENT

"THIS CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT
RATIFIED AND ESTABLISHED IN MY BLOOD"

THAYER, PAGE 15

"1 COR. 11:25; LK. 22:20 IN BOTH WHICH THE MEANING IS,
'THIS CUP CONTAINING WINE--IS RENDERED BY THE SHEDDING
OF MY BLOOD, AN EMBLEM OF THE NEW COVENANT' "

So "THIS CUP" IS NOT "MY BLOOD," but "IS THE NEW COVENANT RATIFIED BY MY BLOOD." And in "THIS CUP" IS "THE FRUIT OF THE VINE" which "IS MY BLOOD WHICH RATIFIES THE COVENANT," as we will now prove!

MT. 26:28-29 or MK. 14:24-25
TELLS WHAT THE FRUIT OF THE VINE IS:

KING JAMES VERSION
 "THIS(V. 29 "THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE") IS MY BLOOD OF THE
 NEW TESTAMENT"

GOODSPEED TRANSLATION
 "THIS IS MY BLOOD WHICH RATIFIES THE AGREEMENT"

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS TRANSLATION
 "THIS IS MY BLOOD---WHICH RATIFIES THE COVENANT"

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE
 "THIS IS MY BLOOD, THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT"

THE AMPLIFIED NEW TESTAMENT
 "THIS IS MY BLOOD WHICH RATIFIES THE NEW COVENANT"

THAYER, PAGE 15

"CHRIST'S BLOOD--BY THE SHEDDING
 OF WHICH THE COVENANT SHOULD BE RATIFIED,
 MT. 26:28; MK. 14:24"

Thayer defines "CUP" as follows, "A cup, a drinking vessel--
 Mt. 26:27--Mk. 14:23--Lk. 22:17, 20; 1 Cor. 11:25--1 Cor. 11:28"--"The
 vessel out of which one drinks, Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23" (pages 533; 510).
 Thayer also says of two verses, "What is in the cup, 1 Cor. 10:21;
 11:27" (page 510). This metonymy is explained in negative 3--con-
 tainer is named, contents meant; we "DRINK THIS CUP" by drinking
 "WHAT IS IN THE CUP--1 COR. 11:27" (not in INDIVIDUAL CUPS).

Brother Wiley rejects, or has failed to reply to translations,
 dictionaries, and lexicons on the meaning of Bible words I've given,
 but I've also showed by King James Version "THIS CUP IS THE NEW
 TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD," and "THIS ("FRUIT OF THE VINE")
 IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT."

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING LINES FROM THE BIBLE AND
 NOTICE HOW MANY NUMBERED LINES MEAN THE SAME!

LUKE 22:20 or 1 COR. 11:25 TELLS US WHAT "THE CUP" IS:

- (1) "THIS CUP IS
- (2) THE NEW TESTAMENT
- (3) IN MY BLOOD
- (4) WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU."

MT. 26:28-29 or MK. 14:24-25 TELLS US WHAT "THE FRUIT OF THE
 VINE" IS:

- (3) "THIS IS MY BLOOD OF
- (2) THE NEW TESTAMENT
- (4) WHICH IS SHED FOR MANY FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.
BUT I SAY UNTO YOU, I WILL NOT DRINK HENCEFORTH OF
- (5) THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE UNTIL THAT DAY WHEN I DRINK IT
NEW WITH YOU IN MY FATHER'S KINGDOM."

FROM THE ABOVE LINES
 YOU CAN SEE THOSE BIBLE VERSES TEACH:

"THIS CUP" (number 1) "IS THE NEW TESTAMENT" (number 2),
BUT "MY BLOOD" (number 3) IS NOT "THE NEW TESTAMENT"
(number 2), BUT "THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE" (number 5) "IS MY
BLOOD" (number 3); THERE FORE "THIS CUP" (number 1) WHICH
"IS THE NEW TESTAMENT" (number 2) IS NOT "THIS FRUIT OF THE
VINE" (number 5) WHICH "IS MY BLOOD" (number 3) "WHICH IS
SHED FOR YOU" OR "FOR MANY" (number 4), BECAUSE "THIS CUP"
(number 1) WHICH "IS THE NEW TESTAMENT" (number 2) WAS NOT
"SHED FOR YOU" OR "FOR MANY FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS"
 (number 4)

I PRAY ALL WHO READ THIS
 WILL ACCEPT WHAT "THE SCRIPTURES TEACH"--E. H. Miller

WILEY'S REJOINER

We must be careful, lest we wrest the scriptures to fit a
 theory. Brother Miller's position requires that vessels, in the
 Supper, be accorded an importance inconsistent with God's Word.
 The careful reader will see that Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; Mt. 26:28, 29;
 Mk. 14:24, 25 are records of one statement of explanation by the
 Lord. In view of the following, it is evident that "cup" in these
 means fruit of the vine:

1. Bread-Wine---Representing body-blood.
 2. Don't have literal body and blood.
 3. Therefore, need representatives for memorial.
1. "Cup"--Representing Covenant???
 2. HAVE literal Covenant.
 3. Therefore, no need (or place) for representative.

May God bless all who read.--W. S. Wiley

BOOK REVIEWS

GREAT PREACHERS OF TODAY SERIES. Each year this new series
 will add to our brotherhood literature two new volumes of outstanding
 sermons. We highly recommend that every preacher read abundantly
 of the best examples of the preachers' art. Volume I of this series is
 now ready. It features 30 sermons by Batsell Barrett Baxter, each
 worthy of study as an example of homiletic excellence. 250pp., Bib-
 lical Research Press, \$3.50.

YOUNG'S CONCORDANCE. No Christian should be without a concor-
 dance to help him locate scriptures. Of all the concordances on the
 market today none is more complete than this one. Every word, even
 those of least importance, is listed and every verse in which that
 word occurs is given, the original Hebrew or Greek word is given in
 its original form, then transliterated, after which the meaning is
 given in English. This is the concordance which Wendle Scott has
 used for years. We recommend it to all Bible students. 1253pp.,
 Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Thumb Indexed, \$14.50, Regu-
 lar, \$12.75.

YOU NEED THIS BOOK; AND IT IS ONLY 30c FROM

E. H. Miller—P. O. Box 538—LaGrange, Georgia

"THE WOMAN'S HEAD"

LEARN THE ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS!

1. How long should a woman's hair be?
2. Must women wear an artificial head covering in worship?
3. Which head is honoured or dishonoured when a woman prays or prophesies, with which head covered or uncovered, with what? This book contains over 50 translations and versions of 1 Cor. 11:3-7 & 13-16; also quotations from Bible Commentaries, Dictionaries, and Greek-English Lexicons of New Testament Words: all of this to help you learn the answers to the above questions, and others.

NOTICE A FEW VERSES OF A FEW TRANSLATIONS

"Charles B. Williams' Translation" of 1 Cor. 11:6

"For if a woman will not wear a veil, let her have her hair cut off too. Now if it is a dishonour for a woman to have her hair cut off, or her head shaved, let her wear a veil."

"The Twentieth Century Translation" of 1 Cor. 11:6

"Indeed, if a woman does not keep her head covered, she may as well cut her hair short. But, since to cut her hair short—marks her as one of the shameless women, let her keep her head covered."

"R. F. Weymouth's Translation" of 1 Cor. 11:6

"If a woman will not wear a veil, let her also cut off her hair, but since it is a dishonour to a woman to have her hair cut off—let her wear a veil."

Does failing to "WEAR A VEIL" and "HAVE HER HAIR CUT OFF TOO" mean the same thing? How can she "HAVE HER HAIR CUT OFF TOO" after she fails to "WEAR A VEIL" if "HER HAIR CUT OFF TOO" was the "VEIL she failed to "WEAR"?

"Benjamin Wilson's Translation of verse 15 says, "Her hair has been given to her instead of a veil (Wuest's Translation, "A PERMANENT COVERING")."

"H. B. Montgomery's Translation" says, "Her hair is given her instead of a veil." Let us analyze this: IF I GIVE YOU WATER INSTEAD OF TEA, YOU HAVE THE WATER BUT NOT THE TEA! So since "HER HAIR IS GIVEN HER INSTEAD OF A VEIL," SHE HAS THE HAIR BUT NOT THE VEIL! But verse 6 of those translations read, "IF A WOMAN DOES NOT WEAR A VEIL LET HER ALSO CUT OFF HER HAIR;" AND "IF A WOMAN BE UNVEILED, LET HER HAIR ALSO BE CUT OFF." So she should wear BOTH OF THEM in worship as the following translations also show:

"Goodspeed's Translation" of 1 Cor. 11:6 & 16

"For if a woman will not wear a veil, let her cut off her hair too. But if it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her wear a veil—But if anyone is disposed to be contentious about it, I for my part recognize no other practice in worship than this, and neither do the churches of God."

"Moffatt's Translation" of Cor. 11:6 & 16

"If a woman will not veil herself, she should cut off her hair as well. But she ought to veil herself; for is it disgraceful that a woman should have her hair cut off—If anyone presumes to raise objections on this point—well, I acknowledge no other mode of worship, and neither do the Churches of God."

God gave woman long hair as "A PERMANENT COVERING" (Wuest's Translation). but requires her to wear an artificial head covering in worship, showing she is in subjection to, and recognizes she "is the glory of the man"—"the head of the woman"—But man being "the head of the woman"—"and glory of God" "ought not to cover his head" Like "a woman—ought to veil herself" (verses 4-7).