Logans

IT IS WRITTEN

EDITOR

COY GARRISON, Editor ..... 509 Chickasaw Trace, Grand Prairie, Texas
R. C. CLEMENTS, Business Manager ..... Broken Bow, Oklahoma

JULY, 1954

Brethren,

In order that we may know more about what the Church is doing in other localities, I am writing this. I was with the good brethren of Crosbyton, Texas on May 1 through the 11. We had fair attendance and some outside interest. There were no visible results, other than the Church being edified and some were caused to read their Bibles. Though some of the Brethren live at Lorenzo, they are all working for the cause, and the Cups and Sunday School Brethren realize it. I enjoyed being with those good brethren, and I am sure that anyone else passing that way would enjoy being with them, just as they would enjoy having visiting brethren. May God bless all his faithful children is our prayer.

Yours in Christ, W. E. Daniels, Broken Bow, Oklahoma

—o—

To the Church of Christ everywhere:

We, the managers of IT IS WRITTEN would be glad to have the names of every gospel preacher everywhere who endorses this paper. Also, we would like to know of every Church of Christ and of their localities. This is very important to the welfare of the Church and it is also important that every Gospel preacher write to the paper as often as possible, telling us of the conditions in the various churches. It is now the time for meetings at various places and the paper should be informed of such. The whole purpose of the paper is to keep the churches informed of the work of the gospel. There should be many mission meetings held everywhere it is possible and each and every preacher of the gospel should, if possible, be in the field of work some where. The churches should get behind them and push instead of shirking our duties. If the church at Broken Bow, at this very time wanted a meeting held, we would not know just where to find a preacher to hold it, unless we would have the ones here. It is very seldom that any of our gospel preachers write to the paper and it makes us wonder if they are even interested or that maybe we are not pleasing them. If such be the cause, you are at liberty to have my job. I am not in this for money, neither

the name. If those were the things I wanted, I could make more out of and get more praises by working in the world. The thing I am trying to do is to get the churches and preachers to become more interested in the work. You know, and so do I, that the Church has a hard battle to fight. Each of us has our part to do, and we each have to carry our own load. We must bear our own burdens.

This is written in the love of the Church everyweher. R. C. C.

—o—

THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES

"I am the vine; ye are the branches: he that abideth in one, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without one ye can do nothing." Jno. 15:5. Our Lord was talking to his disciples of the close relationship that should exist between him and them and the love that he had for them, And that they ough to have for him. "I am the vine, ye (the individual Christian) are the branches". It is often taught that Christ is the vine and the denomination are the branches, but they were not even in existance for many hundreds of years after Christ spoke these words. And every branch of a vine will produce the same kind of fruit, while no two denominations teach the same things. The apostle Paul teaches the same thing writing to Christians in I Cor. 6:15. "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?" And in Romans 12:4, 5 he said, "For as we have many members in one body and all members have not the same office, so we, being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of the other". Again, he said in I Cor. 12:13, For by one Spirit (through the teaching of the Holy Spirit) are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not the body: Is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? Where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath plased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you." Then in Col. 1:18, speaking of Christ, we read, H is the head of the body, the Church." That is the same as saying that Christ is the vine and all the individual Christians are the branches. Jesus said, "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned". Jno. 15: 6. It is not enough to become a Christian, a branch in the vine, in order to enjoy the blessings of eternity with God. We must remain in the vine. Yet how many teach that when a person becomes a Christian, it is impossible for him to be lost. Jesus said, "He that endureth to the end shall be saved. Matt. 10-22. Also in I Cor. 10:12, Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall. (Selected)

A WARNING TO ALL

Be not deceived, you may tremble at the word as Felix. Acts 24:25. And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee.

Hear preaching gladly as Herod. Mark 6:20. For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and a holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things and heard him gladly.

Have zeal for God as Israel. Rom. 10:2. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

Make long prayers as Pharisees. Matt. 23:14. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye devour widow's houses, and for a pretense make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.

Be almost persuaded as Agrippa, Acts 26:28. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.

And after all perish.

—o—

A CHANCE FOR ALL

Be not deceived, you may be a blasphemer as Peter. Matt. 26:74. Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew.

Be a persecuter as Paul. Acts 9:1, 2. And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.

Not understand as the Ethiopian. Acts 8:30, 31. And Phillip ran thither to him, and heard him read the Prophet Esaias, and said, Understand thou what thou readest? And he said, "How can I, except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him.

And yet seek Christ and be saved.

—o—

SOUND DOCTRINE

There have been many lessons, in years gone by, on this particular subject. However, could we say that there has been enough of this kind of teaching? Would you say that we are wrong when we write on such a timely subject, when there are many, and some among our own, who seem to be anxious to teach things which are not all taught in the New Testament? There surely must have been the same situation existing when Paul wrote for we are reminded in

Titus 2:1—Paul said, BUT SPEAK THOU THE THINGS WHICH BECOME SOUND DOCTRINE. Could you say that there are any among us who have reached that high plane as to say that we need so such correction. Paul said, THAT THE AGED MEN BE SOBER, GRAVE, TEMPERATE, SOUND IN FAITH, IN CHARITY, IN PATIENCE. Titus 2:2—How many men that are termed aged, could you name who are called one of sound doctrine? And when one is named, does he stand out as one who is found in charity? And more expecially, is he one who is called patient in all things? Now Paul said to SPEAK THOU THE THINGS WHICH BECOME SOUND DOCTRINE—THAT THE AGED WOMEN, LIKEWISE, THAT THEY BE IN BEHAVIOR AS BECOMETH HOLINESS, NOT FALSE ACCUSERS, NOT GIVEN TO MUCH WINE, TEACHERS OF GOOD THINGS. First, we note the term LIKEWISE, they are to be likewise as is found in men, first in SOUND DOCTRINE—behave as women, teachers of good things—Now in these good things that Paul speaks about are noted, THAT THEY TEACH THE YOUNG WOMEN TO BE SOBER, TO LOVE THEIR HUSBANDS, TO LOVE THEIR CHILDREN—TO BE DISCREET, CHASTE, KEEPERS AT HOME, good, obedient to their husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. We note that the older women are to teach these things to the younger women and when they fail, they have overlooked God and have gone astray from the teaching of the word. I believe that you will agree that Paul here is teaching that which is truthfully called SOUND DOCTRINE. But, we note, too, that the young man is not excused in this matter for he said, YOUNG MEN LIKE WISE, EXHORT TO BE SOBER MINDED, in all things showing thyself a pattern of good works, in doctrine, showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerety, SOUND SPEECH THAT CANNOT BE CONDEMNED, THAT HE WHICH IS OF THE CONTRARY PART MAY BE ASHAMED, having no evil thing to say to you. The advice is, EXHORT SERVANTS TO BE obedient to their masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again—not purloining, but showing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things. Brethren, I believe you can say that it is good to note the scriptures which have gone before, and in conclusion, Paul said in Titus 2:11—For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, Teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lust, we should live soberly, righteously, and Godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God; and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. We note the last verse, THESE THINGS SPEAK, EXHORT, AND REBUKE WITH ALL AUTHORITY, let no man despise thee.

Your Brother in the Lord, Coy Garrison

Grand Prairie, Texas
May 30, 1954

To all the Brethren:

The Church here is meeting at S. W. 23rd St. and San Antonio St. We have at last found a place which we can call our own for a time. We have, and are in the process of remodeling a garage into a church building. We realize that this is not the most desired place, but we are too, very thankful for the same. Our membership is about the same. We baptised a young woman today and of course we are happy. I believe that we can, and will, build a strong church here, but I can realize that it will take time. Brother Glen Maddox, a devoted disciple of the Lord, is with me, or I should say was with me from the beginning of our efforts here. He has developed into a good and steady teacher of the word. I think that the church needs good men, men who are able to teach and uphold the truth. May IT IS WRITTEN be sent to every reader who is interested in the whole truth. Brother Clements, keep up the good work and may the Lord bless every effort for good there.

Yours in Christ, Coy Garrison

I am sending a check from a Sister in Christ at Plainview, Texas. She also has some names for the paper to be sent. Please send at least two copies to Mr. T. J. Toon, Box 194, Blyth, California.

—o—

I AM NOT A PREACHER — I AM JUST A LEARNER

I wish to ask just a few questions, just simple questions, not hard ones. You know that we have many educated preachers today. Some of them think they are smart, and then of course, some of them really are. But I will not ask any questions that even a fourth grade child could not answer. 2 Tim. 3:16, 17 tells us that the scriptures perfectly furnishes the man of God to all good works. If it does, I am sure that some one can give me chapter and verse for the way they carry the church they belong to. I want the lesson. You should be honest enough to give me chapter and verse for my question. My first question is this:

Where did the Church of Christ ever have instrumental music in it, or was given the authority to have it, and where was it accepted by the God of Heaven in the New Testament?

No. 2. Where were women teachers given the authority to teach or preach in the Church of Christ. In the New Testament?

No. 3. Where did any of the Apostles ever have, or authorize such as a Sunday School in the Church, to teach God's word to children?

No. 4. Where did Christ or the Apostles, either, authorize individual cups in the Communion services?

No. 5. Where does the scripture say THIS DO, in that it meant to brake the bread in the Communion?

No. 6. Where did Christ brake off a piece of the bread in the Communion services and eat it, on the night of his betrayal?

No. 7. Where did Christ tell the Disciples to brake the bread in the Communion services, each one of them before they ate it?

No. 8. Where did Christ, or the Apostles either of them, tell us to use fermented wine in the Communion? Isaih tells us that wine is found in the cluster. If it is new in the cluster, or wine in the cluster, would it not become old wine out of the cluster?

Brethren, those are questions that need answering, and we need to let God's word do the answering, not man's ideas. Man has assumed to much authority today and has put God's word far from him. The word of God is our guide, THE NEW TESTAMENT, and none other will be permissable. You may think that you can get by on your own ideas, but you are going to be fooled in the judgment. The scripture tells us that there is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end of the way thereof, is the way of death. R. C. C.

—o—

COL. 3:17, AND WHAT-SO-EVER YE DO IN WORD OR DEED, DO ALL IN THE NAME OF THE LORD.

Brethren, this has become a very popular passage of scripture of late, yet one that is abused more than any other It is used only when it suits the speaker. I remember not long ago I was listening to one of our digressive brothers. He was quoting this passage to another man on the subject of baptism, and declared that baptism must be done in the name of the Lord, and to do it in the Lord's name is to do it by the Lord's authority. Not long after this, I heard another brother use this same passage on him, asking him for his authority for the S. S., women teachers, and cups which he is useing in his church. Did Brother A. give him the scripture for his practice? No. They are always ready to use Col. 3:17 on the other person, but they don't want to be called on to give scriptures for their practice. So we are going to try another scripture. Brethren, be fair; don't shun the scriptures. If you do God is going to reject you. 2 Tim. 3:16-17 tells us that the Scripture perfectly, thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works. Are you guilty of having works in the Church you belong to that you are not furnished by the Scriptures? Are you not continually jabbing at the other person about his unscriptural practice, and that the Church you are a member of is just as unscriptural as his? Brethren, I want to drop you a thought right here. Just because you wear the name of the Church of Christ does not make you a member of that church. Isa. 4 tells us that in the last days there will be seven women wearing one man's name to hide their reproach. That one man referred to is Jesus Christ. Luke 6:42. How can you say to

your brother "Let me pull the mote out of thy brother's eye, when you beholdest the beam in thine own eye? Brethren, you had better be careful. I am sure that there are many so called Churches of Christ today that have their eyes full of beams. They, themselves, are all the time trying to pull a mote out of some other person's eye, all the time trying to teach some one else when they are in darkness and need to be taught. Again some have the idea that big crowds are what count with God. Brothers, if that be case, these man-made churches have it over the Church of Christ badly, and are gaining ground every day. You are so far behind that you have no chance to catch up. God has even left you. But it is not so with God, for he tells us that "broad is the gate and wide is the way that leads to destruction and many go there-in. But straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leads to life and few there be that find it. I am just as sure that there is many good honest people who have been deceived and are going that broad way today. May God have mercy is my prayers. Roy C. Clements

Dear Brother Clements, As I see that you are not afraid to give what you believe the Bible teaches, I want to ask you a few questions. 1. What kind of a preacher would you call a man that's all the time changing his religion?

Answer: I would call him a heretic or a turn coat. I would compare him to a fence breaking brute, all the time breaking out of one pasture into another, whereever the grazing is best. My father had a mule that we called Jim. Old Jim was a good old work mule, but as long as the grazing was good in one pasture there's where you would find Jim, but if the grass was better across the fence there's where you would find Jim also. So I say it's the same way with some of our preachers. They will make a jump just as soon as the almighty dollar is put in their sight, or they will break the fence or tear it down as preachers are doing the Church today. This is the worst sin that can be committed against the Church of Christ. But regardless of how great a sin it is they that will do just such, jump the fence just as old Jim did.

—o—

THINGS TO HAPPEN

In order that those who read this article may better understand its nature, the writer was at Crosbyton, Texas, and the night of May 6 preached on the Communion. A Brother Drake was present, and he announced that he would preach on why they used individual cups, why they had Sunday School, why they had women teachers. On Wednesday night of May 12, a number of us were present at their place of worship eagerly listening for the "why", but to our disappointment the "why" never came. Brother Drake never gave us one reason for the use of individual cups—neither did he give scripture for its use. I wish to call your attention, Brother Drake, to the statement I make in my lesson the night of May 6, that the fruit of the vine required a vessel to handle it, and that the only

thing mentioned in the institution of the Communion that could have contained anything was a CUP. I also quoted Phil. 4:19, But my God shall supply all your needs, according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus. Then, I commented that the only thing God supplied by Christ Jesus in the instituting of the Communion that could contain the fruit of the vine was the CUP. Then on the night of May 12, you quoted me as saying that CUP was the only thing that could contain anything. As you remember, I called your attention to your misquoting me. It makes quite a difference when you quote all, or just a part. I inquired of a number who were present, and you were the only one who minunderstood my quotation. Now, Brother Drake, you do not lack that undestanding—if the word honestly could be substituted for the word intentionally, I would say that you honestly misquoted my statement. Brother Drake accuses of us that we are legislating where God has not, and of having an unwritten law and of dividing the Church. To this, I reply. We have a scriptural precedent for THE CUP, A CUP. Matt. 26, 27—Mark 14, 23 Luke 22, 17, 20—I Cor. 11, 25. Now Brother Drake, unless you can give us chapter and verse for the apostles' use of individual cups in the Communion, or where an Apostle authorized them, you are the one who has the unwritten law. You are the one who is legislating where God has not. You are dividing the church. I challenge you to give the scripture where any church in the apostles time ever used individual cups in the communion. I'll even give you $10.00 for that passage of scripture pertaining to such. Brother Drake tried to demonstrate to us in a nice way just how we could divide it among ourselves whether in one cup or in a number of cups. While money in a cup is no parallel to liquid, the first demonstration was fair, in that he put a number of pieces of money in a cup and gave it to a group of boys, and told them to divide among themselves. I suppose, Brother Drake, that you intended for them to divide the contents of the cup, and that proves that you understood that Jesus meant for the disciples to divide the contents of the cup, also, Lk. 22, 17, when he said take this and divide it among yourselves. Yet, when we speak of a literal cup in the communion, you say that we would have to divide it, THE LITERAL CUP, among us. But, each of those boys took a portion of the money out of the cup and had the money been a true parallel to a liqiud to be drank, the demonstration would have demonstrated our practice perfectly.

Demonstration No. 2. Brother Drake puts a piece of money—one piece in each of a number of individual cups arranged in a tray, and gives it to a number of boys, and says "take this and divide among yourselves. But, Brother Drake, you had already divided it for them when you put each boy's share in a separate cup. In your first demonstration, you showed that you believed and understood that to divide among yourselves meant to divide the contents of the cup. How, in the name of reason could you expect those boys to divide it among themselves when you had already divided each boy's share by setting each share apart in a separate cup? I never saw anyone of them share his with the other. Brother Drake thinks,

also, that he has found a definition of cup—that fruit of the vine can be CUP in a tin can or whether it is in anything or not. Yet, he didn't give us a full definition. So, I quote Webster's unabridged dictionary. A Cup is a drinking vessel. The contents of a cup is the liquor contained in a cup—or that it may contain as a cup of beer. So you see, Brother Drake, that it must be in a cup, and as you say, you would have to explain more fully to me. You say that the fruit of the vine is a cup because it is in a cup, and if that be the case, Brother Drake, you will have to drink your cup out of a cup! That brings us right back to demonstration No. 1. That to take this and divide it among yourselves means to divide the contents of the cup. Brother Drake thinks we have a literal cup in the Communion services, so we would have to take a hammer and pound it up really fine to drink it. Brother Drake, your demonstration No. 1 kills your idea. Just as you divide it among yourselves by dividing the contents, so you drink the cup by drinking the contents of the cup. Mr. Thayer (The Standard Greek Lexico Grapher, on page 533) defines the Greek word poterior, the word that is translated Cup, as a drinking vessel, and he lists Matt. 26, 27, Mark 14, 23—Luke 22, 17, 20 and I Cor. 11, 25. Under the proper (literal) use, also, on page 510 speaking of the Metanymy of, I Cor. 10, 21 and also 11, 27. He says, that which is in the cup. Now, we see that it could not be that (which is in the cup) if there was no cup. Again, Brother Drake seems to be bothered as to how a literal cup could be an emblem of the New Testament. Mr. Thayer, in his Greek Lexicon, concerning both Luke 22, 20 and I Cor. 11, 25, the meaning of both are—this cup containing wine an emblem of blood is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the New Testament. (See J. H. Thayer, Gr. Lex. on page 15). In trying to dodge the thought that the cup is an emblem of the New Testament, they contradict both Jesus, Paul and Mr. Thayer. Brother Drake gets confused while thinking of wells and the cup and can't understand that we don't drink them in the same way. Now, Brother Drake, since you think that we drink the cup and the well alike, the next time I am out there, I want to see you with a windmill erected over your cup, pumping water into your well to use your well for a drinking vessel. Such would have to be permissable if we drink the cup and the well alike.

Brother Drake seems to be bothered over I Cor. 11, 28. Eat of that bread and drink of that cup. He tries to reason that if drink of the cup means to drink something out of it, then eat of the bread would mean to eat something out of the bread. Now, suppose we reason the other way around. If eat of that bread meant to eat a portion of that bread, wouldn't drink of that Cup mean to drink a portion of that Cup? Do you eat and drink alike? The man of God, the Sec. of State, the man of Irish descent, I want one of them, I'll take one of them, this is one of my cows. Brother Drake, try using the word OF in these sentences to be the same as you used them in I Cor. 11, 28 and see just what a mess you have. Also, with regard to the figurative cup and the literal cup, Brother Drake wants to know if Jesus was praying for a literal cup to pass

from him (Luke 22, 42). He reasons there, then it must be figurative that if the cup is figurative in all the places where cup is mentioned in the Communion. Now, Brother Drake, you know that the drink in Luke 22, 42 is just a figurative as the cup.

Much more could be said in reply to Brother Drake, but to shorten this article, I'll give him one more chance. You said that we were the ones dividing the Church, causing division, causing the disunity of the brotherhood. I challenge you to produce the scripture to show that any church in the days of the apostles used individual cups. If you can't do it, then you are the ones who are in the wrong. The scripture furnishes the man of God unto all good works, I Tim. 3, 17. You pretend that you are interested in the unity that Jesus prayer for, John 17, 20, 21. If you are able to show us scriptures endorsing your practices we can have that unity, and unless you can do that, you are causing disunity. We have a scriptural percedent for THE CUP. Will you give one scriptural percedent for your individual cups? Written in the defense of the truth and the love for the brotherhood. May God help us all to come to that same unity which Jesus prayed for.

Yours in Christ, W. E. Daniels, Broken Bow, Oklahoma

—o—

Cave Junction, Oregon
Route 1, Box 100
May 8

Dear Brother Hines:

The Review came yesterday with your answers to my queries. I had confidence in your ability but your answers leave me puzzled. To my 1st query you reply, "who said they had wine in them?" You and Brother Watson said it. In your former article (quoting Watson) you used the expression "bowls of wine". What else could you mean? Besides, Watson's next statement said "the bowls were plural in number (Ex. 25:29; Num. 4:7-9) and contained the drink offering". You and he said those bowls contained the drink offering. You then ask me "are you self-condemned?" Bless your soul, no. For they were there and plural. But the lame place in your argument is—you can't show they used them to drink from, nor that they drank the drink offering (which would have to be, to make your "shadow" fit). And that kills your "shadow" for the shadow cast would not be a likeness of the true as we drink the drink element in Communion.

To my second query you answer "would you condemn more more than one?" (meaning the loaves). I am not here to condemn or judge anything; but the Spirit said, I Cor. 10:17, "we all partake of that one bread" (Authorized Version) The Standard Revised (from which you usually quote) says "we all partake of the same loaf." So let's be satisfied with what is written, and "partake of the same loaf."

To No. 3 you said "plurality of cups is all that is debated." If that be true, why do you not say "cup" or "cups" as the case may be, instead of generalizing and saying "containers"? Just "common sense"?

To No. 4 you say "He handled a container but the contents were called "the cup." You use the container (singular, just one). In No. 3 you say "cups" instead of your usual containers. Hence that "container" must have been a "cup". Brother, you are doing nicely. And you say He called the contents "the cup". We admit contents of a cup may be called "cup" by metonymy; but both are involved and related. You admitted this when you said "the contents of the container". Then how on earth do you get contents of containers?

To No. 5 you say, "See above answer. They did not drink the container". Well, in above and here you use "container" (singular, just one). Now do you agree "the container" was a cup? Or do you contend it might have been a bottle, barrel, jug, or the Jorden river?

To No. 6 you say, "We try to use common sense. They drank 'the cup'." You use common sense and I use the Bible. But was that 'cup' (you say they drank) in a cup, bottle, barrell, jug, or the Jordan river?

To No. 7 you say 'read Heb. 10:22 and be ashamed'. I did: and who must I be ashamed of: you or me? I see nothing here that tells the symbolic blood was sprinkled; that is what the question was about. Dodging is not answering.

To No. 8 you reply, "who said they did? Or did they?" Well, if they did not drink the drink element from those bowls, your shadow is mightly out of joint. For in the true we literally drink the drink element of the literal cup. As too "did they"? I say No.

To No. 9 you say "because Jesus said 'drink' (Matt. 26:27)". Thank you brother. That is why we use one cup to distribute the drink element. You admit Jesus used one (you say "container").

To No. 10 you say "Yes, I suppose so". Thanks again, bro. You and I know there is no record that those Jews ever drank the drink offering from those bowls. Hence as to the drink element your "shadow" does not reflect the true, for we literally drink the drink element from the literal cup (you say "container").

To No. 11 you say "both; but everyone knows the 'vessel' was not drunk." But brother, did that vessel (which we both place singular) accompany the drink element? And when they drank the drink element, was it in a cup, bottle, barrel, jug, or the Jordan river?

To No. 12 you say "the container's wine was and is a figure of Christ's blood". Thank you very kindly, my dear brother. Now let's put cup where you have container, and you have exactly what we contend for. The cup's wine was and is a figure of Christ's

blood. "Was" covers the past; "is covers the present. Let's shake hands and sing the Doxology.

To No. 13 you say "containers were incidental, but bread and wine are not". Your mere assertion that the containers (you say) were incidental, is not proof. Further, do you insinuate those bowls, dishes and spoons were incidental? Remember, the Lord commanded them. If you make your individual cups incidental, you again show your "shadow" does not fit the true from your own standpoint; for those 'bowls' were not incidental: they were commanded. Was the "cup" commanded?

Since you ask several questions, I deem you will be fair and print my entire article (I have been as brief as possible). How would you like to continue discussion with stated bounds as to number of words in each article, or unstated, as you wish? I do not believe you have a leg to stand on in this case. May we continue it and see who has the truth: an old worn-out cow puncher, or one of the ablest preachers of the Church today?

God bless us all to at all times deal honestly with His word, one another, our Heavenly Father.

Your Brother in Christ, J. S. Beddingfield