IT IS WRITTEN

 CAVE JUNCTION OREGON, MAR. 15, 1947.

COMMUNION 5, CUP 3.

F

FOLLOWING J.L.MUSGRAVE IN HIS MEANDERINGS, TRYING TO FIND SOMETHING MORE TANGABLE THAN THE PRACTICE OF DEVILS FOR A PRECEDENT; ON PAGE 12 UNDER, "NEGATIVE ARGUEMENTS", HE SAYS; ""IF THE DESCIPLES HAD RECEIVED THE LITERAL BLOOD IN DIFFERENT VESSELS AND DRANK FROM THEM, WOULD THEY ALL HAD DRANK HIS BLOOD, OR WOULD JUST ONE HAVE DRUNK HIS BLOOD AND THE OTHERS SOMETHING ELSE"? ETC.

SURE JESUS' BLOOD IS JESUS' BLOOD ANYWHERE YOU FIND IT. BUT WOULD IT CLEANSE YOU IF YOU DID NOT REACH IT IN GOD'S APPOINTED WAY?

IS "FRUIT OF THE VINE" HIS BLOOD ANYWHERE YOU FIND IT; IN A COLD DRINK STAND, SALOON, OR WHAT NOT? JESUS' BLOOD WOULD BE HIS BLOOD ANYWHERE.

YOUR SMOKESCREEN IS TOO THIN TO HIDE YOUR ANTICS.

THE REASON OLD TESTAMENT BLOOD IS OLD TESTAMENT BLOOD IN BASONS-A PLURALITY-, IS GOD MADE IT SO.

THE REASON "THE CUP OF BLESSING WHICH WE BLESS" IS THE COMMUNION OF THE BLOOD OF THE LORD, 1 COR. 10:16; IS GOD MADE IT SO.

IF YOUR QUESTION WAS GROUNDED ON FACTS-; YOU WOULD HAVE TO SPRINKLE ON NEW TESTAMENT BLOOD AND NOT DRINK IT; AS THAT IS THE WAY THEY DID IT IN OLD TESTAMENT TIMES. IF NOT, WHY NOT?

JESUS' BLOOD IS HIS BLOOD ANYWHERE YOU FIND IT.

WINE IS HIS BLOOD BY CERTAIN BIBLICAL REQUSITES. VIZ, BUP OF BLESSING-BLESSED, 1 COR. 10:16; MATTH. 26:27-29; MARK 14:23-25.

WINE IS "CUP", WHEN IN A CUP. SEE "CUP QUESTION" BY J.L.MUSGRAVE, PAGE 22; FIRST PARAGRAPH. THAYER, PAGE 510; ALSO 533 UNDER HEADING OF METONYMY. AND ANY GOOD DICTIONARY.

ON PAGE 13 ; IN ORDER TO TRY TO DEFEAT THE IDEA THAT WE MUST DO AS JESUS DID; FOLLOW HIS EXAMPLE; HE SHOWS, "THEY SAT DOWN (LK. 22:12) WE STAND (HE THINKS); THEY WERE COMMANDED TO MEET IN AN UPPER ROOM (MK. 14:15; LK. 22; 14); AND SAYS, WHY NOT CONTEND FOR THAT TODAY"?

WHY NOT YOU J.L.M? YOU DEMAND BREAD AND FRUIT OF THE VINE AS JESUS DID? THE SAME JESUS THAT SAID OF THE WINE," THIS-------IS ------MY BLOOD" SAID ALSO OF THE CUP -- - --- "THIS CUP--------IS -----THE NEW TESTAMENT"--. THE SAME JESUS THAT SAID OF THE BREAD, "THIS ---IS -----MY BODY", SAID ALSO OF THE CUP------ - - ----- "THIS CUP----IS ----THE NEW TESTAMENT--1 ANSWER YOUR OWN QUESTION BROTHER--; AND THIS ONE ALSO, WHEN DID THE CHURCH OF CHRIST QUIT DOING AS JESUS DID, FOLLOWING HIS EXAMPLE?

ON PAGE 15, HE "FIXES" MATTH. 26:27 TO READ -THIS CUP IS MY BLOOD-, AND PLACES IT ALONG WITH THE LORD'S STATEMENT IN LUKE 22:20; AND 1 COR. 11:25, " THIS CUP ---IS --- THE NEW TESTAMENT--": THEN ASKS, "DOES THE LORD HAVE TWO CUPS"? "SURELY THESE PASSAGES MEANS THE SAME THING, GODDSPEED SAYS THEY DO"

NOPE-THE LORD NEVER SAID -THIS CUP IS MY BLOOD---; J.L.M. SAID THAT. THE LORD SAID; "THIS CUP ------IS ----THE NEW TESTAMENT--", LK. 22:20; 1 COR. 11:25. READ YOUR BIBLE BROTHER.

HE SEEMS TO TAKE CONSOLATION IN GOODSPEED SAID----, WELL GOODSPEED SAID, "HE TOOK A WINE CUP"--; HOW DO YOU LIKE THAT

PERSONALLY I DONT CONCIDER GOODSPEED STANDARD.

ON PAGE 18 HE SAYS; "THERE IS ONE CHURCH IN ALL THE WORLD. WE CAN TAKE CARE OF IT BUT THEY CAN'T. ONE BREAD- UNLEAVENED BREAD; ONE CUP--THE FRUIT OF THE VINE".

IS HE HERE TRYING TO MAKE US BELIEVE, AND KID HIMSELF INT BELIEVING; THAT THE CHURCH "ALL OVER THE WORLD", IS THE UNIT OF WORSHIP.

"FRUIT OF THE VINE", IS A BROAD STATEMENT; IT INCLUDES THE "FRUIT OF THE VINE" IN CHURCHES, COLD DRINK STANDS, SALOONS, AND OTHER PLACES.

DOES HIS -"CUP" INCLUDE IT ALL? IF NOT HOW DOES HE LIMIT IT? BY BLESSING IT AS LOCAL CHURCHES, OR AS ONE CHURCH ALL OVER THE WORLD?

I CAN HAVE UNLEAVENED BREAD AND GRAPEJUICE ON MY TABLE,ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK;AS A MEAL.YET THEY ARE NOT THE LORD'S BODY AND BLOOD.BROTHER,IT TAKES CERTAIN BIBICAL REQUSITES FOR THEM TO QUALIFY AS HIS BODY AND BLOOD,--ONE OF THESE IS AN ASSEMBLY OF DISCIPLES,AND THE ELEMENTS PROPERALLY PREPARED BY THEDOES HE DENY THIS,AND HAVE ONE TO PREPARE THE ELEMENTS FOR ALL THE DISCIPLES ALL OVER THE WORLD?

ON PAGES 19-20,HE TRIES TO DO AWAY WITH THE FORCE OF SINGULAR NOUNS PRECEEDED BY THE WORD "THE",BY PARALELING THEM WITH CLASS NOUNS PRECEEDED BY THE ARTICLE "THE".
"THE FRUIT OF THE VINE".WHICH INCLUDES ALL OF THE FRUIT COMING FROM "THE VINE"(GRAPEVINES).
"THE MAN OF GOD"2 TIM.3:16-17;WHICH INCLUDES ALL MEN OF GOD.
" THE BIBLE",WHICH INCLUDES ALL BIBLES.
THE FORD CAR",WHICH INCLUDES ALL FORD CARS.
"THE HEREFORD COW",WHICH INCLUDES ALL HEREFORD CATTLE.
"THE ROSE",WHICH INCLUDES ALL ROSES.
DOES HE WISH TO MAKE US BELIEVE WHEN THE LORD "TOOK THE CUP",HE TOOK ALL THE CLASS OF VESSELS NAMED CUP? IF NOT HOW DOES HE PARALEL IT WITH "THE MAN OF GOD"(2 COR 3:16-17)?
A CLASS NOUN ALTHOUGH SINGULAR,INCLUDES ALL THE INDIVIDUALS OF THAT CLASS. THE SINGULARITY IS THE CLASS-NOT THE INDIVIDUALS.
IT WOULD BE AMUSING INDEED,TO SEE J.L.M. -AT HIS HOME CONGREGATION,TAKING ALL THE SINGLE CLASS,"THE CUP"1 TO GIVE THANKS---.
HE CERTAINLY WOULD HAVE "CONTAINERS" TO HIS HEARTS CONTENT.ALL THE CUPS IN THE WORLD-. HOW CAN ANYONE PRESUME ON THE IGNORANCE OF THE PUBLIC, THIS WAY;MUCH LESS GOD'S HOLY WORD?
IN HIS BEWILDERMENT HE GOES TO THE GREEK ON PAGE 24 AND DISMISSES IT BY SAYING,""THE GREEK CAN BE USED FIGURATIVE AS WELL AS THE ENGLISH-SO WHY GO TO THE GREEK"? THIS IS TRUE BROTHER.
SO IF IT IS USED LITERALLY;JESUS TOOK THE CUP;HOW MANY CUPS BROTHER?
IF FIGURATIVELY BY METONYMY;"HE TOOK THE CUP",NAMING THE VESSEL TO SUGGEST ITS CONTENTS. "CUP",SINGULAR IN NUMBER;AND NOT CUPS OR ALL OF THE CLASS OF VESSELS NAMED CUP;IS WHAT HE TOOK.HENCE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE CUP" SINGULAR IN NUMBER. YET HE CLAIMS THE SCHOLLARSHIP.

LET IT BE KNOWN NOW ;WE DO NOT CLAIM SE CTARIAN SCHOLLARS AGREES WITH US IN THEIR PRACTICES;BUT THEIR DEFINITIONS AS SCHOLLARS DOES BACK US UP;WHILE THEIR SECTARIAN PRACTICES ARE THE SAME AS A RULE AS THAT OF BROTHER J.L.M.
ON PAGES 24 TO 30,HE GOES ALL OVER WILSON,GOODSPEED,AND PHILLIPS,BUT ENDS UP BY USING GOODSPEED FOR A WITNESS.AFTER TRYING SO HARD TO REFUTE GOODSPEED AS A COMPETANT WITNESS TNEN USE HIM.IS HIS POSITION NO BETTER THAN HE WOULD HAVE YOU TO THINK OF HIS WITNESS?
SURE,GOODSPEED THINKS AS A THEOLOGIAN,DRINKING WINE OF CUPS IS DRINKING THE CUP.MOST ALL THESE SECTARIAN SCHOLLARS THINKS AS A THEOLOGIAN; PEOPLE IN ANY AND ALL CHURCHES COMPOSE THE CHURCH TOO; DO YOU? YOU SHOULD STAY WITH YOUR CROWD.
TO SEE HOW THESE SCHOLLARS WILL GIVE THE PROPER DEFINITION TO A WORD THEN CONTRADICT IT IN THEIR PRACTICE SEE S.J.ENGLANDS DEFINITION HE GAVE PHILLIPS AS A SCHOLLAR;AND HIS EFFORT TO DESTROY THE FORCE OF IT IN HIS ATTEMPT TO SAVE HIS AND MUSGRAVES PRACTICE ON PAGE 30 "CUP QUESTION.
PAGE 31 GIVES N.O.CASEY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME;STATMENT THAT, "A CUP IS A MATERIAL THING AND CANNOT BE DRUNK;HENCE,IN NONE OF THE PASSAGES IS THE WORD USED LITERALLY".SUPPOSE HE IS RIGHT;THE FIGURATIVE USE NAMES THE VESSEL TO SUGGEST ITS CONTENTS,BY METONYMY.
THE VESSEL NAMED IS "CUP";AND "ITS" CONTENTS IS SUGGESTED-
IF USED LITERALLY THE VESSEL IS NAMED AND IT IS "CUP".
IF IT IS FIGURATIVELY BY METONYMY,THE VESSEL (NOT THE CONTENTS9IS NAMED;AND THE VESSEL HERE NAMED IS "CUP"-SINGULAR NUMBER-ONE CUP. HENCE A SCRIPTURAL EXAMPLE,A PRECEDENT FOR ONE BY THE LORD AND HIS APOSTLES:WHILE THE ONLY PRECEDENT HE HAS GIVEN FOR A PLURALITY IS THE PRACTICE OF DEVILS.(SEE FORMER ARTICLE)

ALSO ON PAGE 4",R.R.HARREL,AUSTIN COLLEGE,SHERMAN TEXASSAYS; "-----BY A FIGURE OF SPEECH THE WORD CUP IS PUT FOR WHAT IS IN THE CUP--". AGAIN THE LITERAL CUP IS INVOLVED;IT IS NAMED;IT IS PUT FOR WHAT IS IN THE CUP:HENCE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE (A) CUP" SINGULAR NUMBER,ONE CUP.

ON PAGE 32 HE GIVES PROF.A.T.ROBINSON'S DEFINITION TO "CUP" AS HE GAVE IT TO BRO.PHILLIPS;AND HERE IT IS;"IN MATTH.26:27 MEANS A LITERAL CUP, WHILE IN VERSE 28,THIS,MEANS THE CONTENTS". THIS HURTS;HERE J.T. ROBINSON SAYS "THIS",MEANS THE CONTENTS OF THE CUP,WHILE J.L.M. SAYS "THIS",REFERS TO CUP. GREAT MEN DO DIFFER. SO J.L.M. PUTS IN THE FOLLOWING FROM ANOTHER LETTER. "THE GREEK INDICATES NOTHING AT ALL ABOUT THE POINT RAISED BY YOU,BUT COMMON SENSE DOES,WE DO NOT DRINK THE CUP (THE MATERIAL),BUT WHAT IS IN THE CUP. WHAT EARTHLY DIFFERENCE CAN IT MAKEIF IT IS IN ONE OR A HUNDRED CUPS".SIGNED,A.T.ROBINSON.

FIRST,HE ADMITS WE DRINK WHAT IS IN THE CUP--AND NOTE,IT IS SINGULAR NUMBER,JUST ONE. JUST AS WE HAVE CONTENDED ALL ALONG.

BUT LIKE J.L.M. HE CANT SEE WHY HE CANT PRESUME 99 MOREWE HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR ONE ; THAT IS WHY.THE OTHERS ARE PRESUMED.

THE LEXICOGRAPHERS EASY CHAIR",HAD GIVEN BRO.PHILLIPS A PROPPER DEFINITION--SO THEY WENT AFTER HIMFOR SPOILING THE PUDDING,AND SUMMING UP HERE IS WHAT HE SAYS; "-----BUT TO DRINK OF THE FLUID THAT HAD ITS ORIGIN IN THAT IT EMINATED FROM-THAT CUP".

THEN,"THE (A) CUP" HAD TO BE THERE FOR THE FLUID TO HAVE ITS ORIGIN IN THAT IT EMINATED FROM-THAT CUP.NO OTHERS ARE MENTIONED;HENCE PRESUMED.

STILL IN ANOTHER LETTER HE STATES IN A PARALEL HE GIVES TO MATTH 26:27-28;THAT "THIS REFERED TO THE CONTENTS OF THE DIPPER;WHICH WOULD BE IN THE PARALEL-,"THIS" WOULD REFER TO THE CONTENTS OF THE CUP,AND NOT CUP AS CLAIMED BY J.L.M. AND THIS SPOILS THE IDEA THAT THE CUP IS THE BLOOD.AND THIS IS BY HIS OWN WITNESSES TESTIMONY.

WHILE TRYING TO PARALEL " CUP" WITH RIVERS,WELLS ETC,IS A WRONG APPLICATION;STILL IT GETS THEM NOWHERE.

EVERYONE KNOWS THE USES OF CUPS,RIVERS,AND WELLS ARE DIFFERENT. THEIR USES WOULD HAVE TO BE THE SAME OR SIMELAR IN ORDER TO PARALEL THEM.

YOU NEVER THINK OF ERRECTING A WINDMILL OR OTHER PUMPING DEVISE OVER YOUR CUP IN ORDER TO GET A SUPLYV OF WATER;OR CUTTING A DITCH FROM IT TO GET WATER FOR VARIOUS USES-BUT YOU DO WELLS AND RIVERS RESPECTIVLY. YOU NEVER PICK UP A RIVER OR WELL AND GO TO YOUR CUP,TO DIP OUT,AND DRINK WATER. NO BROTHER, THE USES OF THOSE THINGS ARE KNOWN TOO WELL FROM ANTIQUITY FOR ANY OF US,HOWEVER IGNORANT,TO DO SUCH A THING. THEN WHY BE DECIEVED BY THIS SOPHISTRY TRYING TO PARALEL THEM IN ORDER TO DESTROY THE FORCE OF GOD'S HOLY WORD?

ALL OF J.L.M.7S SYLOGISMS ON PAGES20 AND 21 ARE WRONG,BEING BASED ON THE FALSE PREMISE,-"THE CUP OF THE LORD IS A METONYMY". THE CUP OF THE LORD IS A LITERAL-SOMETHING;AND NOT A FIGURE OF SPEECH; A METONYMY IS A FIGURE OF SPEECH.ANYONE CAN SEE THIS.

HOWEVER THE WORD ,CUP, CAN BE USED IN A FIGURE OF SPEECH KNOWN AS A METONYMY.

ALL OF THESE SYLOGISMS EITHER CONTAIN THIS FALSE EXPRESSION AS ONE OF ITS PREMISES OR A CONCLUSION DRAWN FROM ANOTHER SYLOGISM IN WHICH IT WAS A PREMISE.HENCE A SCHOOL BOY CAN SEE THE FALACY.

NOPE,WE DON'T HAVE TO SHOW THAT THOSE BIG CHURCHES "DIVIDED UP" AND WENT SOME OTHER PLACE TO COMMUNE.WE HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE (A) CUP",WHETHER YOU TAKE IT LITERALLY OR FIGURATIVELY;IN MATTH. 26:27;MARK 14:23;LUKE 22:17 AND 20;1 COR 11:25.

IT IS UP TO THE "CONTAINERS" BOYS TO SHOW BY DIRECT STATEMENT,AND NOT BY CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT THOSE BIG CHURCHES ACTUALLY MET AND HAD THE COMMUNION SERVICE IN ONE PLACE;OR IT IS A PRESUMPTION.

FOR PRESUMPTION IS BASED ON PROBABLE GROUNDS,OR CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE; AND NOT ON DIRECT PROOF OR EVIDENCE.

SHOW US THIS BRIDGE BY THE BIBLE AND WE WILL CROSS IT BIBICALLY.

WE HAVE FOLLOWED BROTHER J.L.MUSGRAVE THROUGH HIS SMOKESCREEN OF SPECULATION TRYING TO MAKE OUT DIVERS AND SUNDRIES PARALELS: TO BRING IN HIS "CONTAINERS" THAT WAY.
NOT ONE TIME HAS HE EVEN ATTEMPTED TO SHOW FROM THE BIBLE;BY STATEMENT BY COMMAND,OR BY EXAMPLE;A PLURALITY OF CUPS WERE USED,OR COMMANDED , TO BE USED BY ANY CHURCH. DON'T FORGET THAT.
IF SOME ONE WHO BELIEVED IN ONE CUP HAD MADE ALL THOSE FALSE STATEMENTS HE ACCUSES OF BELIEVING AND ARGUEING;IT WOULD NOT PROVE ONE CUP WRONG. HE MIGHT HAVE BELIEVED AND ARGUED ALL OF THOSE FALSE POSITIONS,HE STATES IN HIS BOOK,WHEN HE WAS A ONE CUP MAN,BUT THAT EAVEN WOULD NOT MAKE OUR POSITION WRONG THAT ONE CUP IS WHAT THE LORD USED. IT TAKES THE BIBLE TO PROVE THAT.AND WHERE O,WHERE,HAS HE SHOWED WHERE JESUS OR ANY OF THE APOSTLES USED MORE THAN ONE OR COMMANDED THAT MORE THAN ONE BE USED? N-O-T O-N-E HAS HE GIVEN.
I MIGHT TAKE A HUNDRED FALSE POSITIONS ON IMMERSION AS BAPTISM;BUT THAT WOULD NOT PROVE IMMERSION WRONG.ONLY MY FALSE POSITIONS WOULD BE PROVEN WRONG.
TO TAKE ALL THOSE SILLY POSITIONS HE MIGHT HAVE BELIEVED AND ARGUED, WHEN HE WAS A ONE CUP MAN,OR THAT SOME ONE ELSE MIGHT HAVE ARGUED AT SOME TIME;DOES NOT PROVE THE ONE CUP IDEA WRONG
EVERY TRUTH IN THE BIBLE ALMOST,SOME ONE HAS A FALSE IDEA ABOUT IT: DOES THAT MAKE THOSE TRUTHS WRONG? NAY VERILY.IT TAKES PROOF THEY ARE WRONG.
HE HAS TRIED TO SHOW THAT NOT ONE CUP WAS TO BE FOUND IN CONNECTION WITH THE COMMUNION SERVICE:YET,HE WANTS MANY "CONTAINERS".AND ALL OF THIS FROM A MAN WHO CLAIMS TO READ HIS DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES IN THE BIBLE.
AND THAT IS NOT ALL;THEY STOUTLY DEMAND OF ALL WHO OPPOSE THE TRUTH; THAT THEY READ THEIR DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES. HOW INCONSISTANT!
NO CUP MENTIONED;THEREFORE,HE CAN USE ALL HE WANTS.BY THE SAME BRAND OF PROOF WE CAN ALL SAY; NO INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC,NO AIDS,NO SOCIETIES,NO SUNDAY SCHOOLS MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE:HENCE,WE CAN USE ALL WE WANT.
STRANGE PROOF INDEED FOR A PEOPLE WHO <u>READS</u> _ THEIR PRACTICE.

HIS CLAIM IS THERE IS NO LAW ON THE CUP (HE SAYS CONTAINER).
THERE ARE MANY EARNEST CONSCIENTIOUS PEOPLE WHO BELIEVE THERE IS,SUCH A LAW,AND THEIR CONSCIENCE ARE WOUNDED BY THEIR USE BY J.L.M. AND HIS ASSOCIATES. AND YET HE USES THEM IN THE FACE OF PAULS STATEMENTS: "BUT WHEN YE SIN SO AGAINST THE BRETHREN,AND WOUND THEIR WEAK CONSCIENCE,YE SIN AGAINST CHRIST" 1 COR 8:12.
"GIVE NONE OFFENCE, NEITHER TO JEWS,NOR TO THE GENTILES, NOR TO THE CHURCH OF GOD"--.1 COR 10:32.
ONE MAY SAY:THEN,YOU CLAIM TO BE A WEAK BROTHER,DO YOU?
NO. WE BELIEVE WE HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE (A) CUP",MATTH 26:27;MK.14:23;LK. 22:17 AND 20; 1 COR 10:16; 11:25. BUT IF YOU WERE RIGHT IN YOUR CLAIM THERE IS NO LAW;THEN THIS LAW OF CONSCIENCE WOULD BE APPLICABLE;REGARDLESS OF WHAT I BELIEVE.AND TO OBEY GOD'S LAW YOU WOULD HAVE TO OBEY IT OR BE GUILTY OF TRANSGRESSING THE ABOVE COMMANDS.

ALL AGREE THAT ONE IS ALRIGHT;OTHERWISE YOU COULD NOT CONTEND FOR A PLURALITY WITHOUT A STATEMENT,COMMAND,OR AN EXAMPLE,WHERE THEY USED A PLURALITY.HENCE,ONE IS THE GROUNDS OF UNITY AMONG GOD'S PEOPLE.
WHEN YOU ARE DRIVING THIS WEDGE OF DIVISION,"CONTAINERS";YOU ARE NOT KEEPING THE COMMAND: ""ENDEAVOURING TO KEEP THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE".EPH.4:3.
FIRST--.IF THE WIRD,"CUP",IS USED LITERALLY:WE ARE RIGHT;FOR THE WORD, "CUP" IS SINGULAR NUMBER--ONE.MORE IS A PRESUMPTION.
SECCOND--.IF AS SOME CLAIM;IN EVERY PLACE THE WORD "CUP" IS USED FIGURATIVELY,BY METONYMY: WE ARE STILL RIGHT. FOR THE VESSEL IS NAMED TO SUGGEST ITS CONTENTS.(SEE DEF.OF METONYMY AND APPLICATION OF MATTH.26; 27;IN "CUP QUESTION" BY J.L.MUSGRAVE.)
HENCE ONE VESSEL,"CUP",IS NAMED AND "ITS" CONTENTS IS SUGGESTED.
THEREFORE,A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR ONE CUP ;ALL OTHERS ARE PRESUMED.

THREE--.IF THE LORD WAS DEFINING TERMS IN MATTH.26:27-28; MARK 14:23-24; LUKE 22:20; 1 COR.11:25;THEN,WE_ARE_RIGHT._
FOR THE SAME LORD WHO SAID OF THE WINE,
"THIS - - - - - - -IS - - - - - - - - - MY BLOOD";AND WHO SAID OF THE BREAD,
"THIS- - - - - - - -IS - - - - - - -MY BODY"; SAID ALSO OF THE CUP;
"THIS CUP - - - - -IS - - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT".
BROTHER LOOK AT THESE STATEMENTS,AND SEE HOW THEY PARALEL.
IF ONE IS A DEFINITION,THEY ARE ALL DEFINITIONS.IF ONE IS AN EMBLEM, THEY ARE ALL EMBLEMS. IF ONE IS TO BE "FIXED",THEY ARE ALL TO BE "FIXED".IF ONE IS TO BE LEFT ALONE,THEY ARE ALL TO BE LEFT ALONE. IF ONE IS TRUTH,THEY ARE ALL TRUTH.AND WE KNOW THEY ARE.
REMEMBER MEN SAID;"THIS CUP IS MY BLOOD",AND ACCUSED OUR LORD OF SAYING IT. THE LORD DID SAY OF THE CUP;"THIS CUP--IS --THE NEW TESTAMENT"--. LK.22:20;1 COR.11:25.
HENCE,MEN CONTRADICT OUR LORD,AND THEY_;NOT OUR LORD;ARE WRONG.

FOURTH--.IF AS MANY SAY THE CUP IS THE WINE;WE_ARE_RIGHT_ANYWAY.

LUKE 22:17 JESUS SAID;"--TAKE THIS,AND DIVIDE IT AMONG YOURSELVES"--. THEREFORE WE SEE AT THE TIME THE WINE OF COMMUNION WAS RECIEVED BY THE DISCIPLES-"IT"- WAS UNDIVIDED,ONE VOLUME OF WINE. BUT THE DISCIPLES WERE TOLD HOW TO "DIVIDE IT";FOR THEY WERE COMMANDED TO,"DRINK YE ALL OF IT". BROTHER DID THEY DO IT?OR DID THEY POUR IT INTO OTHER CONTAINERS? LET THE WORD OF GOD SETTLE IT FOR US.MARK 14;23; "----AND THEY ALL DRANK OF IT".
BROTHER THIS IS THE SAME GIVING,THE SAME "IT",ONE VOLUME OF WINE;AND TH THERE IS NO ESCAPE FOR IT IS POSITAVELY STATED--"---AND THEY ALL DRANK OF IT".
YOU JUST CAN'T HAVE ONE VOLUME OF ANY LIQUID AND HAVE IT IN TWO OR THREE,OR A HUNDRED PLACES.TO BE ONE VOLUME,IT MUST BE IN ONE PLACE; AND WE HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE (A) CUP". ANY WAY YOU TAKE IT;ONE CUP IS RIGHT AND A PLURALITY CANNOT_BE PROVEN.

SAYS ONE,DO YOU MEAN TO DRAMATIZE THIS SCENE EACH LORD'S DAY,AND ONE OF YOU BE THE LORD? NO,BROTHER,BUT WE ARE TO IMITATE,FOLLOW THE LORD ; 1 COR 11:1.
2 JNO.6 SAYS "----THIS IS THE COMMANDMENT,THAT,AS YE HAVE HEARD FROM THE BEGINNING,YE SHOULD WALK IN IT".
WILL YOU FOLLOW THE PRESCEDENT SET BY JESUS IN THE "BEGINNING"AND FOLLOWED BY THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES AND USE "THE (A) CUP? OR WILL YOU FOLLOW ANOTHER PRESCEDENT?
REMEMBER FRIENDS,J.L.M. SAID IN HIS BOOK,"THE CUP QUESTION",PAGE 12: "IF THE CUP OF DEVILS , CAN BE IN A PLURALITY OF VESSELS, IN HOW MANY VESSELS CAN THE CUP OF THE LORD BE?"

YES,HERE IS HIS "SCRIPTURAL" PRESCEDENT,THE CUP OF DEVILS.
IS THIS THE PRESCEDENT YOU WILL FOLLOW? WHITHER GOEST THOU BROTHER?
THE JUDGMRNT IS COMING.
MAY GOD BLESS US ALL TO DO HIS WILL AS IT IS WRITTEN.

YOURS IN CHRIST
J.S.BEDINGFIELD.

* *

PS.
THIS ISSUE CONCLUDES THE COMMUNION FOR THE PRESENT.
J.S.B.