A SUPLIMENT TO "WHAT SAITH THE LORD", 'CUP OR CUPS"?

AN ANSWER TO M.S.WHITEHEAD'S SECOND EFFORT.

BY

J.S.BEDINGFIELD,BRYTE, CALIFORNIA.

****

In brother Whitehead's answer to my effort styled,"what saith the Lord, cups or cup"; he makes two more false charges on page one.The first, when he says,"As it shows he thinks his cause is in a desperate position". The very idea, when he has admitted one cup was mentioned and has failed to show one single place where a plurality was even mentioned in connection with the Lord's supper. O, well, he has have something to say;what else could one expect?

The second is when he accuses me of 'Bidding for the sympathy of my readers'. I need no sympathy as I have the Bible proof of one cup. O,no brother, I am not trying to paint you with the same brush you tried to paint me with;you did it yourself by misrepresenting me and taking your position without a hint of a hint where Jesus or any of the Apostles ever used two or more cups in the Lord's supper.

No, I did not qualify my statement when I accused cups brethren of trying to show Jesus did not use even one cup. And one reason is the church of Christ has always held 'no bible,no authority'. When brother Lemley said,"The drinking vessel was not remotely refered to";he ruled out all bible authority for one or more. All that is left is cups boys "GUESS"(presumption), and we don't take that.

The Brother tries to make some capital out of my statement that "I was an old worn out cow puncher with a limited education--". Well,he is welcome to it,but we will give him a little of his own sauce. On page one paragraph one, and last paragraph on page 17,he calls himself,"this scribe", "this humble scribe". In the 23 chapter of Matthew, and the seventh chapter of Mark,we have a good picture of the Scribes in Jesus' day. Verse seven shows one of the things Jesus condemned them for was," For laying aside the commandment of God,ye hold the traditions of men---". And here in these last days we see "THIS SCRIBE"(brother Whitehead) "Laying aside the commandment of God",--(In this case to all drink of the cup); to keep his own traditions--(In this case to drink of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper). Well, if he had intended to give himself a proper bible title he could not have done better. Don't blame me brother, you did it yourself

No,brother Bedingfield never tried to nail a false charge on you ;you did it yourself when you misrepresented in this last effort as well as previous ones.

Page 3, Par.2;he tries to pin his and Lemleys contradiction on me.My dear Brother, it was Lemley who said,"In every place where cup was used in reference to the Lord's supper it was figurative(Metonymy),and hasn't the remotest reference to the drinking vessel". So,if he is right,as I said, not one scintilla of evidence is there he had a cup. Just the cups boys broad ""GUESS"".

But if I am right and a part of the places the word,cup,is used literally; the CUP is NAMED. And if as I claim,some of the places the word,cup,is used by metonymy; The cup is named to suggest,symbolize,- the fruit of the vine.Hence, the CUP is NAMED. Mr. Hill,page 86 says there are TWO OBJECTS OF THOUGHT;which of course would be the CUP and ITS CONTENTS. Mr. Blair,page 154,says;-"Figures gives us the pleasure of enjoying TWO OBJECTS presented togather to our view without confusion;" (Capitals mine,J.S.B.). Sure, I am right.

Yes,he still says I "Tortured,twisted,and manhandled" the word when I said,my position as to what the,"THIS",in Mat.26:28 refered to was the preceeding command,"Drink ye all of it";making it say, This (ye all drink of the cup) is my blood.

Since writing an answer to brother Whitehead's last effort to overthrow the teachings of God's word he has sent me an "appendix" of 17 pages. Being an old worn out cow puncher I shall operate on his "appendix" in the old cow camp style we used to operate on cows when we had no Vetinary surgeons. Now, back to him and Lemly.

Since brother Whitehead tries to paralel, "Beware of the bottle with, "Drink the cup"; and since his claim is intoxicating liquors is "bottle" regardless as to the vessel that contains it; then fruit of the vine would be cup regardless as to the vessel or the number of vessels that contains it. Hence, Lemley's ""drinking vessel would be just anything that contains the fruit of the vine.

Remember dear reader I said , they tried to show Jesus never used even one""CUP"". Their casting a doubt by the above arguement as the Devil did in Eden(Gen.3:1,4,5,); they destroy the truth just as effectively as the Devil did; and as brother Whitehead is trying to clear Lemley, he is just as guilty as Lemley.

Sure, brother Whitehead said," He took a cup containing the fruit of the vine--" but this shows how often and effectively he can contradict himself.

In his "Apendix", page 1, He again makes a glareing MISREPRE*-SENTATION" of me when he said I was pleading for stmpathy. In his own expression, 'when a false position forces its advocates to such misrepresentations, the position must be false'.

Now back to my position as to what the "this" refers too. I still believe, "This(ye all drink of the cup) is (symbolizes) Christ' blood';but as I said before I am not dogmatic that I cant be wrong. The best of Schollars differ as to what exact word the, This" refers to. I offered several and ask him which he prefered. Any of them sustains our contention for one cup. He continues to argue as though if I were wrong on this gramatical relation; the one cup idea is forever lost. These poor boys hasn't one single scripture to which they can point to to "READ" a plurality of cups. Hence, they resort to "good words and fair speeches"(Rom.16:17,18); "They strive about words--"(2 Tim.2:14); "Doting about questions and strifes of words"--(1 Tim.6:4), and it results in, "envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds--", verses 5,6.

Look over the evidence given. Has he or Lemley either given one single scripture where it "reads" they used a plurality of cups? Hasn't it been a play on figures of speech, gramatical relations or other contentions about ""WORDS""? Yes, I have indulged with them to the extent to show they had no hiding place; and I am willing to leave it to the readers. However I will later give unanswerable statements from God's word as I have done in the past. Keep in mind reader, our position is proven , that is, Jesus used one cup is proven and acknowledged by brother Whitehead.

I will now quote from some schollars found in a former answer of mine to brother Whitehead.

A.T.Robinson wrote Oct. 21, 1931. "My dear brother Phillips;- In Mat. 26:27, 'poterion' clearly means a literal cup. While in verse 28, 'touto' means the contents".

That, dear friend, is all we contend for is "a literal cup" and its "contents". To get others to "pour" the contents in to drink is wholly a "PRESUMPTION", as there is not one bit of evidence here for more. So Mr Robinson sustains us.

Charles F. Sanny, Webster Grove Mo. Wrote, "I---'poterion' in Mat.26:27 clearly signifies cup; that is indeed the meaning of the Greek word. But evidently the meaning is not an empty cup, but a cup with the costomary contents.

2-- The pronoun 'touto'(verse 28) cannot grammatically refer to any thing else than ,'to haima mou'(the blood of me). Therefore, it is correct to say that the pronoun 'this' in verse 28 refers to the contents of the cup in verse 27 as the blood in verse 28".

We are perfectly satisfied to settle also with this statement. Think about it,"A cup with its costomary contents", could you say it any plainer? That is all we are contending for is "a cup with its costomary contents". But they "PRESUME" to use a plurality without the word of God saying so.

Stephen J. England wrote; "It would be very strange if 'to haima'(the blood) a fluid was not represented by another fluid. Hence,although touto 'this(Mat. 26:28)grammatically has as its antecedent 'to poterion' (the cup) verse 27, it clearly refers by metonymy,to the contents of the cup; Such was the understanding of the early church". This is fine and dandy with us:for "this" to have as its antecedent cup in verse 27, but BY METONYMY REFER TO THE "CONTENTS OF THE CUP". That makes only one cup and its contents. All we ask is to all be satisfied with it and be one as Jesus prayed;but ""NOT"" so with our good brother. He presumes he has a right to use a plurality without being able to "READ"it in the new testament. O,no, my dear brother, my position as to what "this " refers to does not have to be correct to make the practice of useing one cup the only way ""READ"" in God's Holy word.

E.E.Stringfellow writes;"In Mat.26:28 'this' is a neuter word and must refer to 'cup' another neuter word, but reference is by metonymy, to the contents of the cup,as indicated by the context".

How much plainer does anyone want it? One cup with its contents. That is all we are contending for;but our brother is contending for a plurality of cups to drink from,when he cannot ""READ"" them in the new testament.

Mr. C.A.Savage writes;"Poterion (cup) is grammatically the antecedent of 'touto'(this) in Mat.26:28;but logically the contents of the cup is the antecedent of it. The context forbids that we regard 'this' as refering to the cup literally, apart from the contents of the cup". Note,if you please,he makes the word cup,which names the literal drinking vessel, as the antecedent of 'this' in verse 28; but logically refer to the contents of the cup.That is,this same cup. This is fine and dandy as far as proving the use of one cup in the Lord's supper is concerned.My position as to what 'this' refers to is not the only one that substantuates the use of one cup;but the brother wants to "PRESUME" a a plurality;something he cannot ""READ"" in the new testament.

Since he cannot READ them he tries to make his position stand up by technical Rhetorical relations,or technical grammatical relations. I do not believe God hid his word from the common people under any such. As has been shown,and admitted by the brother one cup can be read in the new testament. But he has to resort for his proof of a plurality,"Good words and fair speeches"(Rom.16:17,18); a strife about words,(2 Tim.2:14); "Doting about questions and strife of words" (1 Tim.6:4).O, yes, I have been fighting our brother in that very field.That is the only place he has any argument. If he had a scripture where they used a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper,all he would have to do is to produce it and he would win an argument and a host of faithful men and women.

Brother Whitehead should remember agreed grounds are always the grounds on which unity can be attained. Of course he might believe the plurality was permisable yet he says,"At the institution of the Lord's supper the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those who drank from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord". That is the safe bridge to cross on,as a plurality is a leap in the dark,you can't "READ" them. You cannot follow the Lord too closely;with one we follow him.

O, no,Brother,I did not show up your rediculous position in transposing the subject and atribute compliment of the trope,"This is my blood", to justify any mistake I might have made grammatically; but to show that the mighty grammarian brother Whitehead made some bad "busts".

In his first reply to my criticism of brother Lemley he made the transposition thus: "My blood is this". I placed the explaining word (appositive) "represents,symbolizes", after the verb,"is", the word on which the figure turns as explanitory of the turning it did. Which would read;"My blood is(represents,symbolizes(this (the fruit of the vine). By this I showed he could not transpose a trope as he could a literal expression;and that when he did this he made the blood of the Lord to represent the grape juice. In his rediculous effort to extricate himself from this position he offers the following absurdity: "My blood is (is represented by) this (fruit of the vine)". You will note he used the verb,"is", in his explanitory of the verb,"is";which is a grave error. The idea of useing a word to define itself. And again by slipping that preposition,"by", in there he made,"this (the fruit of the vine)" , the object of the preposition,"by",and not an atribute compliment. He certainly did presume strongly on mine and the readers ignorance,or else he was himself grossly ignorant. Anyone knows the difference in an atribute compliment and a prepositional phrase modifying the verb, or a compliment of the verb.

No, Brother, this does not show any mistakes I might have made whatever they be; but it shows my master critic is making some busts and is not himself perfect on the matter. Talk about a man being in a tight; talk about a man twisting; when he has no scripture to read his cups and nothing else left him but twist and turn:and brother, he is doing a master job.

"Good words and fair speeches"(Rom. 16:17,& 18);Strife about words (2 Tim.2:14); Doting about questions and strifes of words(1 Tim.6:4); is all the poor fellow has so we will have to string along with him to show him he has no hiding place.

In another place where his "good words and fair speeches", (Rom.16:17,18);"His strife about words"-,(2 Tim.2:14);"His questions and strifes about words"-, (1 Tim.6:4) ; is not fog bank enough to hide his antics, when he tries to make the demonstrative pronoun, "this",in Mat.26;28 refer to the "it",in Mat.26:27;and at the same time denying that "cup" is the antecedent of the,"it";but tries to make it refer to "CONTENTS",something not expressed;hence,indefinite. Which would make the command of our Lord,"Drink ye all of it",indefinite as to what was to be drank of. This is preposterous as everyone knows. But he must have his idols,his individual cups. They are idols as they are not mentioned in God's wordlhence a creature of mans imagination.The very idea, of a demonstrative,"this", which must refer to something DEFINITE ,refering to a pronoun,which has no definite antecedent. It makes God guilty of giving a command so befogged that you cannot know DEFINITELY what is meant. Yes he of all men should accuse others of twisting etc.

But this does not end His bewildering plunges about trying to find a hiding place for his cups.If the pronoun,"it",in Drink ye all of it"(Mat.26:27) is what they drank; Then,"It" is the object of the verb "drink"; another absurdity and grammatical monstrosity. In that sentence,"Drink ye all of it", the word,"it",is the object of the preposition,"of". It could not be the object of the preposition,"of",and modify the verb "drink" and at the same time be its object. Rigdon says page 126,"Not only must a transitive verb express action that terminates on an object; it must without the aid of a preposition,represent the termination of the action on the object", Se also Harvey,page 199. That cooks his twisty goose.

On page 4 he tries to save his ship by quoting Davidson's definition to a pronoun. Sure his definition had to be broad enough to cover pronouns which has a "definitely" expressed "Antecedent" and those ""indefinite"" pronouns which have no "definitely" expressed "antecedent". Mr Davidson page 550 defines indefinite pronouns as follows;"Indefinite pronouns refer to no definite antecedent. When a pronoun has no definite antecedent it is not known ""DEFINITELY"" what is meant;and I do not believe God hid his word under any such rubbish.

Sure,Brother,when he gave his general definition he would give such pronouns as, who,he, it, etc. But that doesn&t make them indefinite. Mr Davidson gives an example;"Who goes there"? Here he states "who" has no antecedent. But the idea, of the Brother trying to make "it" refer to "contents",something not "definitely"stated.

Mr Tanner says on page 257,,concerning the INDEFINITE USE of "IT", and "THEY":"Except in such impersonal expressions as, it rains, it is cold, it seems, the use of IT without an antecedent should be avoided". Any one can see the expression,"Drink ye all of it", does not remotely resemble such expressions as ,it rains, it is cold, it seems. Hence it is not indefinite;but "DEFINITELY" refers to "CUP" a definitely expressed noun. Davidson shoots him again.

I will again show that pronouns MUST have a definitely expressed antecedent for clearity.

A.S.Hill,page 72,says of pronouns, "--clearness requires that it should refer unmistakeably to one and but one antecedent.. Awriter should repeat a noun rather than substitute for it a pronoun which fails to suggest that noun unmistakably and at once". Further down he says;"No fault is more common than the obscure or ambiguous use of pronouns". Any one can see the Brother is trying to violate this rule by giving "IT" an obscure or ambiguous use by trying to make it refer to something not expressed.Hence, the "IT" is "CUP".

Gardner,Kittredge,and Arnold,page 449,says;"Pronouns should be so used that there can be no doubt to what person or thing each refers". But no,the brother casts a doubt as the devil did in Eden when he tries to make the "IT" refer "contents",something not even expressed. But as all schollars agree the definitely expressed word,"CUP" makes us know what is meant.

Clippinger,page 302, says;"Every pronoun should have a definite antecedent.--" According to my position that "CUP" is thw antecedent of the "IT", I am right by this man,and brother White - head is ""DEFINITELY""WRONG trying to make "contents2,somethi g not definitely expressed the antecedent of the "IT". HOLD YOUR HAT:

McGinnis says;"Errors are frequently caused by the use of the WRONG ANTECEDENT. The rule is that THE PRONOUN REFERS FOR ITS ANTECEDENT TO THE NEAREST NOUN WHICH HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED." (The emphesis is the authors). The word,"CUP", is the last noun that was previously mentioned;hence according to McGinnis it is the antecedent of the "IT" in"Drink ye all of it",Mat.26:27. And brother Whitehead is out on a limb. His indefinite antecedent, "contents",makes God's command indefinite.

But hear mr Davidson page 553."Every pronoun must refer plainly and unmistakably to its antecedent.There must be no confusion nor ambeguity,no vaqueness of reference". Sure, he is shot by his own gun,Davidson.

But hear Davidson again,page 553."AVOID VAGUE REFERENCE. Do not use a pronoun which refers to an implied antecedent".

Brother Whitehead's implied antecedent,"CONTENTS" would be a direct CONTRADICTION to this rule.Hence,"CUP" is the antecedent of the "IT" in,"Drink ye all of it" in Mat.26:27. Well, that shot from his own gun fixed him.

Just under this "Caution" on page 553,Mr Davidson adds this exceptio ("This caution does not apply to indefinite pronouns which have no antecedent"). Hence, the "it" refers to "cup" and not to an unexpressed antecedent as the word,"contents",would be.

Tanner,page 256,says,"A pronoun should have as its antecedent a particular person,animal,or thi ng,and that antecedent should be a definitely expressed noun or pronoun".

"CUP" is the only definitely expressed noun or pronoun to which the "it" could refer tto.Hence,""CUP""is the antecedent of the promoun, "IT" in the expression,"Drink ye all of it", Mat.26:27.

His cavil about "Doting about questions and strifes of words", (2 Tim.6:4), is awfully cheap stuff for a man of his calaber;But it is all the poor fellow has.

Yes, I violated the rules of "clearness" when I used the expression,"Common use" in connection with "putting the lips tpo a cup to drink of it. The common use of a cup is a drinking vessel,and that is the "denoted" meaning, the definition. Hence, when I said the common use of a cup was to put the lips to it and drink of it,I used the expression,"Common use" in two different meaning in the same expression,which is a violation of the law of "Clarness". I should have said the way,or the common practiceof putting the lips to a cup to drink of it,i n its common use as a drinking vessel is a connotation.But to be sure and fix it this time so there will be no quibble about words ,I will insert it right in the definition given by Mr Davidson,page 553.All in parinthesis will be mine put there to show just exactly what is meant. So, here it is:

The connotative meaning of a word(in this case cup) is generally regarded as being the meaning or meanings, added to the word (in this case ,cup) by the associations it aquires (the association it aquires in this case is with the lips of a person when they are put to it to drink of it) From its common use"(as a drinking vessel). And there you are my Brother, To drink of a cup connotes,implies,putting the lips to it to drink of it. Otherwise the definition of cup,a drinking vessel, would be meaningless.For if you used some other vessel to drink of a cup as you do a barrel, pail, or sauce pan,they would be as much "a drinking vessel" as a cup. Cant you see the lameness of that stuff you are putting up?

What I meant in the previous article was:"The connotative meaning of a word (cup) is generally regarded as being the meaning or meanings, added to a word (cup) by the associations it aquires (in its common use of putting the lips to it to drink of it) from its common use*,(as a drinking vessel). In the thought there is no error.but an error of ""words"" used in two different meanings which is a violation of clearness.

Now, get it, a "CUP" is a drinking vessel,because its common use is as a drinking vessel. But because of its association of lips to drink of it; the connoted meaning would be 'a vessel to put the lips to to drink of it'. Otherwise,if all vessels were drank of alike;there would be no drink-vessel or all of them would be drinking vessels. Then, the definition of "cup", a drinking vessel, would be foolinshness gone to seed.

The well, is the same preecdure. A well is a source from which we get water. Hence, that would be the "denoted" thought, the definition. But it has ""Associations"" as pumps, buckets,etc., to procure the water from it, from its common use (as a source). And then we drink of the water from some vessel.That is a common practice in its "Common use" as a well. Hence to drink of a well,

DOES NOT CONNOTE,IMPLY, PUTTING THE LIPS TO IT TO DRINK OF IT FOR NOT A COMMON PRACTICE IN DRINKING OF A Well AS A SOURCE,ITS COM* MON USE. If cups and wells were drank of alike; a well would be as much a drinking vessel as a cup; and a cup would be as much a source from which to get water as a well; and we know that is foolishness.

Now, dear reader you can see why he wasted sp much paper trying to show I had the wrong things "denoted" and the wrong things "connoted". If th ose boys can do away with the idea that in,"Drink ye all of it (cup)"; it "denotes" drinking of the cup, but connotes,implies, a contents; they can presume they can pour it into other cups,or use a plurality to begin with and put it over. And "PRESUME", it is f or God has never commanded them to speak "CUPS" in the Lord's supper.Hance, a presumption.Deut 18:20.

Therefore, "Drink ye all of the cup,is the "denoted", stated, command.The contents is "connoted",implied. He cant dodge it.

On page 9 he makes an effort to show that my application of Herrick and Damon's definition of Metohymy where he says;" Asimilar substitution occurs when an accompliment is taken for the thing it accompanies"; is wrong. Because I urge that the literal cup must accompany the fruit of the vine; he urges on the same grounds the man Shakespear must accompany his works when you "read Shakespear". He ignores the fact while in both cases there is an "Accompaniment; yet they are each based on different "relationships". The metonymy,"Drink the cup", is based on "container and the contained; and that of a liquid which "MUGT" have something to contain it. While the Metonymy,"I read Shakespear" is based on the "Author and his works". The volume of thoughts which he created by mental acts, which are called his works;are his works regardless as to where he is or the works are. "The accompaniment is not a physical act, but by him being the creator of it. You can no more "drink the cup" by drinking of cups or containers than you can read Shakespear by reading Longfellow's works. It is peculiar a man of his mental stature cant see the difference between a physical accompaniment based on a physical relation,as "container and contained; and a mental creation as an author and his works which does not require his presence to identify it; but accompanies it in the knowledge he was its author.

Scott and Denny, Page 177; Says;"In a Metonymythe image used to represent the object is an accompaniment of it, as for example, what contains it, What causes it,what stands for it etc." Any school child in their first days of English can understand that definition,and it leaves him out in the cold without a quibble.BUT THEY WILL.

Then he introduces an example of taking a cup of coffee and dipping a spoon in the cup and sipping it from the spoon; claiming he is drinking of the cup. He is drinking something that once was in the cup;but he himself said he sipped it from the spoon. No Brother we wo nt let you get by with a raw a deal as that. He should learn the difference of a vessel and what once,at a time might have been its contents,where a cup is involved.

On pages 6,7, he tries to dodge arround a misapplication he made on the word,"ASSUME" as defined by Reed and Kellogg. I introduced Mr Kellogg himself the one who was in with in editing the higher English by Reed and Kellogg. He dismissed with "Bosh".After all he and I have written each other that a "metaphor" was based on the relation of ""LIKENESS"": he is trying to make some one believe I am argueing both objects of comparison must be there present. All on account of the fact in the metonymy ,"Drink the cup" the cup must accompany the contents

Page 8 was completely blank in the copy we scanned
And...
We had no other copy to get it from

In order to dodge this arguement he introduced a presumption saying;"there were MANY of the Corinthians that were christians,and by this imagined "PROBAbility, POSIBILITY,orCIRCUMSTANCE HE WISHES TO CAST A DOUBT THEY DID AS Paul commanded them. See the following authorities:

Webster's Internat. Dict. 2 nd. Ed. Def 4. " -To take or suppose to be true, or entitled to belief,without examination or proof, or on the strength of a PROBABILITY; to take for GRANTED;INFER;SUPPOSE;ASSUME." (CAPITALS MINE,J.S.B.) Doesn't that finish off his presumption? Doesn't it Show it is a presumption. I forgot to say, the above definition is of "PRESUME".

The Encycleopediac Dict.--PRESUME--Def. B -1."To INFER or ASSUME on PROBABLE or REASONABLE grounds but without direct or positive evidence".(Emph. Mine. J.S.B.). Isnt he trying to prove this by"INFERING OR ASSUMING IT ON PROBABLE OR REASONABLE GROUNDS? To be sure; there is no DIRECT EVIDENCE THEY USED A PLURALITY OF CUPS: HENCE, A PRESUMPTION,JUST AS IN EVERY ATTEMPT TO PROVE CUPS, IT IS A PRESUMPTION.

Same author;defining,'Presumptive' def. 2." "Grounded on probable or reasonable grounds, though not directly nor positively proven; proving circumstantially not directly". This needs no comment it describes his arguement on ,"MANY", together with every arguement they have to slip in their "CUPS". They havent one single statement of direct or positive statement where anyone at any time in the Apostolic age used a plurality of cups. It is all "PROBABLE, POSABLE,orCIRCUMSTANTIAL , just as the above definitions describes a presumption.How awful the consqquence.

He made a pitiful effort to cover his bust asking me,"Just how far can that fruit of the vine get away from that cup and still be cup"? He knew to swallow a liquid was to drink;but he had failed to take into account that to swallow was to,"to take into the body through the mouth and throat",(WEB.). Of course the upper lip being down below the rim of the cup,when the fruit of the vine was drawn up into the lips it was there before it passed over the rim of the cup. Hence the first act of drinking was accomplished before it really left the cup.

He made a like rediculous bust when he paraleled,"Eat of the table" with Drink the cup". everyone knows the "Common practice" of drinking of a cup is to put the lips to the cup and drink. That is the way all cups boys do when they drink in the Lord's supper,me and everyone else. But when you "eat of a table you do not put your mouth to the table;nay,verily:but the "Common practice is to take the food from the table with the hands ,transport it to the mouth. Hence, you see like all the rest of his paralele;it misses the mark a mile.

In giving what he believes Mat. 26:26 means he is very positive to let me know in his "appendix" he said;"He took a cup (containing the fruit of the vine"----. Now thats fine since Luke 22:20 is the same act told by a different author we can place it there and we have:" -- ---- -This cup(containing the fruit of the vine is the New testament-----". Do the # Same to 1 Cor.11:25, we have;"--- ---This cup (containi ng the fruit of the vine is the New Testament in my blood". Now that is fine; just wait till Brothers Waters and Miller finds this out and you will be in worse shape than you are. Note,folks, according to this the "CUP" really does signify the new Testament. That makes the literal cup really nesessary.O, but he may say, Thayer says those are metonymies Yes, and brother Lemley says Mat.26: 27 is a metonymy also; so now that hole is stopped up. Do all your "Good words and fair speeches"(Rom 16:17,18), stuff; and your "strife about words"(2 Tim.2:14); your ""doting about questions and strifes about words", 1 Tim.6:4you can;you will only "HOBBLE YOUR HOBBY".

This is twice he has HOBBLED THAT HOBBY;once when he tried to answer brother Waters tract,and this time. He called it,"A hobby hobbled", and he sure did name it right for his own hobby.

But just here before I forget I wish to say a little more about his arguement about "MANY CORINTHIANS".The idea is ,Maybe too many for one cup and they "PROBABLY"or "POSIBLY" used a plurality(which you will note is a presumption). If the good brother will look at the R.S.V. on Acts 9:31 he will see the singular,"CHURCH" used for the Assemblies in Judea, Gallilee, and Samaria; and if he will trouble to look he will see it is singular,"CHURCH", in the Greek in Acts 9:31. Just as we do when we say the Church in Texas;meanall the assemblies in Texas. This takes care of Jerusalam,and Antioch,BIG CHURCHES". Remember brother, in those days the brethren changed their circumstances to fit God's word,and not change God's word to fit their circumstances as is common now a days.

Now to his "DARE" on pages 9,10. I really thought I had cared for that "DARE" in a letter but not being certain,and not careing to tax my old eyes looking it up I will give it a once over.

Herrick and DAMON says;"The distinction between Syneodoche and Metonymy still lingers in some school rooms; but it is obviously of no practical value, for the force of tropes belonging to either class lies in the fact that we single out a quality of the object, or a circumstance connected with it, and fix the attention upon that."---.You will notice it did not say take something SUPERIOR to the OBJECT: but a "QUALITY or CIRCUMSTANCE" connected with the OBJECT. So the fruit of the vine is still SUPERIOR to the mere quality or circumstance. Any school child can see that. But you "fix the attention on that quality or circumstance";not above the "OBJECT", the fruit of the vine;but above any other quality or circumstance that might be connected with it. hear him further;"The quality or the circumstance thus emphesized should, of course, be the real center of interest". Not emphesized above the object, the fruit of the vine; but above any other quality or circumstance. The quality of the object or circumstance connected with it is is "NOT" the center of interest above the "OBJECT"; for this figure heightens the thought,and the object of thought is the object itself; and not a quality or a circumstance connected with it.

If a number of vessels were togather containing different liquids,and you were told to "drink the cup"; in the act of sellecting the right thing, the cup would have to be uppermost. These boys hate to give up that the cup is emphesized for that alone lifts it above their # incidentals. Yes, that puts the cup up a little heigher than they want it to be. Any thing "EMPHESIZED" is of more value than things not emphesized. The above quote from Herrick and Damon is page 494. His man he calls his gun says also it is EMPHESIZED SYMBOLICALLY, page 295. Hichcock says;"It is a useful figure in that we often focus the attention on some one detail "-------- -- As bayonets for Soldiers----. That got him.

See Hichcock's Rhetoric page 349.

As to my reversing my premisis in the second sylogism I quote from Javons logic page 125."In a strictly correct sylogism the major premise always sta nds before the minor premise, but in ordinary writing and speaking the rule is seldom observed; and that premise that contains the major term still remains the major premise, whatever might be its position."

and thus we see the error is of no consequence as far as the conclusion is concerned. The conclusion is the same regardless as to where you might place the major premise. Thats a sample of a lot of their objections.

Below you will see the premises of my no.2 sylogism with his conclusion. Notice how wild he is.

1---The disciples drank the cup of the Lord when Jesus instituted the Lord's supper.
2----But the disciples did not drink of a plurality of cups.
3----Therefore, the cup of the Lord may be drank without useing a plurality of cups".

You will notice his verb phrase, "May be drank" expresses a possibility, of drinking the cup of the Lord without useing a pluralityof cups. Thus indicating that a plurality was the real way, yet it "may be drank" otherwise, one cup. Take this:

1 ---People were baptized when the Apostles preached the gospel.
2---- But the people were not sprinkled.
3---Therefore, People may be baptized without sprinkling.

"May be baptized without sprinkling", places imersion in the doubtful list. It may be performed that way. However sprinkling is emphesized. The same with his conclusion with the cup.

The trouble is ;having one negative premise, "But the disciples did not use a plurality of cups"; his conclusion should have been negative. Mr Javon says page 128; "If one premise is negative the conclusion must be negative". Therefore my conclusion was right. And here it is, "Therefore, you cannot drink of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supperand drink the cup of the Lord". Brother, that was presuming a lot on mine and the public's ignorance. You certainly beat that.

He takes care of them, but how? In attempting to answer my third sylogism he forms the following premise;" But to teachone cup only is the law of Christ and a test of fellowship----". First---The expression, "one cup", limits to one. The word, "only", would have to limit to one particular cup, which we do not believe. They know, "one cup", means one; they put their pet word, "only" there for a place to hide their cups. Second--- We are not the ones who cuts the fellowship; they are the boys who do that. 1 Jno.1:7; Shows unmistakably , that when we cease to "walk in the light"(God's word, Ps.119:105) we are out of fellowship with God, See 1 Jno.1 :6. Therefore when we are out of fellowship with God, we are out of fellowship with all who are in fellowship with God. But when you use a plurality of cups in the Lord'ssupper you are not walking in the light for God's word no where mentions them in the Lord's supper. Hence you automatically put yourself out of fellowship with God and his children; and we reluctant, but sorrowfully accept it by obeying the Lord and withdrawing from you. See 2 Thes.3:6; Rom. 16:17,78; 1 Tim.6:3-6.

My fourth sylogism is as follows:

1---"But without faith it is imposible to please God". Heb.11:6.
2----But a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord' supper is not of faith. Not in God's word.
3---Therefore a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not pleasing to God.

And here is his sylogism as a rebuttal to mine.

1---But without faith it is imposible to please God". Heb.11:6.
2---But the use of a plate to distribute the bread in the Lord's supper is not of Faith.
3---Therefore, the use of a plate to distribute the bread in the Lord's supper is not PLEASING TO GOD.

You will notice he paraleled , "plate". with "cup". Not counting Luke 22:17: "the cup" is mentioned 11 times in connection, and in the Lord's supper; while his plate is not mentioned one single time. If there were nothing else this would be enough to show his inconsistancy. However, later I will show how he has HOBBLED HIS OWN HOBBY.

My fifth sylogism reads as follows:
1----"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" Rom.14:23.
2----But the use of # a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is not of faith".Rom.10:17.
3----Therefore, the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper is sin.
As a rebuttal he makes an exact copy of my sylogism except he puts "PLATE" in the second premise instead of the words,"A plurality of cups". Hence he makes exactly the same error as in the above. And dont forget that "CUP" is mentioned in the Lord's supper,in the new testament,and his ""PLATE"" is not even hi nted at.And yet he presumes to paralel them. More later on all his wonderful answers.

My fifteenth sylogism reads as follows:
1-- --"Those things ye have both learned recieved heard and seen in me do, and the God of peace shall be with you".
2--------But nowhere in the gospel of Christ have we learned, recieved,heard and seen in Paul , the use of a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper to distribute the fruit of the vine..
3----Therefore , we cannot use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper,and obey the command Those things ye have both learned,recieved, heard and seen, in me do and the God of Peace shall be with you.
In his "apendix" page 16 he makes a duplicate on the above only on the bread useing "PLATE" instead of "cup". Here he makes the same mistake as on the previous sylogisms. that is,paraleling "PLATE" something not even hinted at in the new testament with the Lord's supper, with the "CUP"; something named 11 times in the Lord's supper.

Pages 15,16;"his apendix"; he makes a paralel on the above sylogism number 15,only he uses "eating the Lord's supper in an upper story"(Acts 20:8,9). He at least has something this time mentioned in the new Testament where the brethren did eat the Lord's supper.

Did he not know Jesus showed the Jews before they crucified him that the ""PLACE"" of worship would amount to nothing;but they were to worship him in Spirit and truth ,Jno.4:21-24. Nw, let him show where the Lord said the same about the "cup" in the Lord's supper and he will have a paralel. But now I will show you where he hasHOBBLED HIS HOBBY.

Paul was very specific in 1 Cor.6:12, to let us know there was a certain class of things which he ter ms,"All things", that he would not be brought under the power of any. The R,V.S says,"--But I will not be enslaved by anything". Certainly thi s "all things", does not include the things commanded as Mat.28:19,20p or Mark 16:15,16. Neither does it include the Things"Forbidden" as 1 Jno.2:15-17. Then we know it neither means the ""THINGS commanded"" nor the ""things forbidden"" But Paul says in 1 Cor.8:9;"But take heed lest this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak". Then there is no other conclusion than those "All things" Paul would not be enslaved to(1 Cor.6:12) was no other than those things wherein we have liberty(1 Cor.8:9). Paul says,Rom.14:13:" But judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way". This could mean none other thing$s than those in which we have "LIBERTY". For we cannot leave off any of God's appoint$ments to please men. Hence we see there a direct command from the Lord for me nor anyone else to put a stumblingblock or occasion to fall in our brothers way. So if brother Whitehead's cups or my meeting down stairs becomes a stumbling block or occasion to fall in our brother's way; we are obligated by this command from God to not "be enslaved by anything".R.S.V.

Rom.14:21;"It is right not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that makes your brother stumble". Again,we know he is not talking about things commanded nor things forbidden,but those things in which we have "LIBERTY". So,if my meeting down stairs, or useing a plate, or brother Whitehead's cups makes a brother stumble we must leave them of ;For the first part of this verse says, "It is right not--" to do those things that makes a brother stumble. Remember, Brother Whitehead put his cups under this head by paraleling them with the things that come here. I really believe they are directly contradictory to God's word but let him take either horn he wishes he would have to leave them off.

1 Cor.8:12;"But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ". And so, if my meeting down stairs and useing a plate for the bread ,or brother Whitehead's cups "wounds the weak consicience of the brethren; we not only sin against those brethren but we thereby sin against Christ. Hence we would have to leave it off as Paul said he would do about the meat. Otherwise according to the above scripture we are in sin.

1 Cor.10:32;"Give none offence, neither to the Jews,nor to the Gentiles, nor th the church of God". Of course the Apostle intended,and commanded us to keep God's commands,whether "things commanded" or "things forbidden";but in those things in which we have liberty,we MUST NOT OFFEND. If we do we break the above commandment.Then,whether it is my meeting down stairs,useing a plate, or brother Whitehead's Cups; we are bound by the above command to leave them off as Paul said he would about the meat. Otherwise we would break the above commandment. Remember dear reader, it was brother Whitehead who put his cups under this law by paraleling them with things that came under it. As for me, I believe they are a direct substitution of the one Jesus exemplified. So, either horn he takes he must leave them off or be condemned by those commands we have quoted which govern our liberties.

1 Cor.10:33;"--just as I try to please all men in everything I do, not seeking my own advantage, but that of many that they be saved" This is too plain for quibble; a plain example for the saving of souls;and this same Paul commanded us to follow his example. See Phil.4:9; 1 Cor.11:1; 1 Cor.4:16. And so his"HOBBY IS HOBBLED".

In his VERY BOLD CHALLENGE, he wants me to affirm;"ONLY one cup". The word,"cup", designates one cup;but when it says,ONE CUP, there should be no doubt as to what is meant. Hence the word, "ONLY",adde to the expression,"ONE CUP",is only good for a chance for those boys to find a place to hide their cups.I've heard them say, when you read,"ONLY one cup" I will read "CUPS". see. Besides they are the ones who cuts the fellowship,when they fail to "walk in the light"(1 Jno.6,7). When they use cups they are not walking in the light(PS.119:105) they put themselves out of fellowship with God and his children.We have to accept their decision and obey the Lord in 2 Thes.3:6.

As to guarenteeing him a hearing,or getting my brethren to endorse me: I find no such proceedure in the new testament for any such actions.

So, if he hasn't the Idea of denying we can "read" one cup in the Lord's supper in the new testament I do not intend to get off bible grounds just to stand with my brother in order to have a discussion. If he has the least idea I am being bluffed;let him come ahead and if my health fails me I will furnish a man able to take care of him. If his position is so far foreign to the Bible he cant ""read"" it, I have little patience with it.

I know of no scripture that requires a man to furnish reference that he is a representative man,or agree to furnish a crowd before he could defend the truth against error. Is mans addition.

In a former article I introduced the following paralels:
In "Drink the cup",*"cup" --is- (symbolizes) the fruit of the vine.
In Mat.26:26; This (bread)---is--(symbolizes) my body.
In Mat.26:28;This (fruit of the vine)-is-(symbolizes)my blood.

All of these are bible figures and are not to be tampered with. If you can substitute,cups,or containers,in number one; ~~you can~~ you can substitute pie for bread in number two; or milk for fruit of the vine in number three. And here his clock stops running.

In his effort to destroy this arguement he called attention to Welch and Lockwood and Emerson as saying;"Metonymy is a change of name"; and that the word,cup" symbolized the fruit of the vine.

Of course,in the figure,metonymy, where the "WORDS" qare being concidered: the word,"This"(bread) would symbolize the words"My body" in verse 26. And likewise the word "This"(fruit of the vine) would symbolize the WORDS,"My Blood" in verse 27. But in the metonymy,Drink the cup"; the WORD,"Cup", would symbolize the words,fruit of the vine. That is where you are studying the "WORDS" and EX* PRESSIONS and their RELATIONS TO ONE ANOTHER.

But when the OBJECTS themselves are under concideration,as in the Lord's supper: the real literal fruit of the vine symbolizes the Lord's blood. The real literal bread symbolizes the Lord's body, and the literal cup symbolizes the fruit of the vine.

When you go to "drink the cup of the Lord, your eyes searches for a cup containing the fruit of the vine. Not the platter,not the bottle or jug but the "CUP". If you are totally blind and know there is the "cup of the Lord to be drunk" ;your hands do not seek just any old vessel but a cup. To either of those senses that "cup" symbolizes the thing it contains, the fruit of the vine. In the supper literal things and not the relations of words are the things concidered.

His own"GUN",Donald Davidson says,on page 295;"---Some important association connected with the object is used to symbolize the object itself." The "CUP" is an important association with the object(the fruit of the vine). Hence, the cup is used to symbolize the object itself (the fruit of the vine. He should cry, "SOPHISTRY".Other authorities could be given but these are sufficiant.

Now as to,"WASH IN THE JORDON", he says he always understood the water was the river. On his own hypothesis I ask him; If Namaan had takek some of the water from Jordon and put it in the bed where the waters,of Abanna,or Pharpar ran, and "WASHED IN IT THERE,WOULD HE HAVE BEEN HEALED???ECHO; WOULD HE??

But to dodge the force of this he wants to take a cup of water from Jordon and drink it and know if he was drinking of Jordon? Sure,Mike THE COMMON PRACTICE of drinking of a river is to take a portion from it and drink it. To drink of a river neither "DENOTES# nor "CONNOTES" Putting the lips to a river to drink;but to drink of a cup does.When cups boys have the supper they put their lips to the cup to drink,that is a common practice even with them.

Everyone knows we do not drink of a river and a cup alike. If we did their uses would be identical as far as drinking is concerned. And we would expect to see brother Whitehead and other cups brethren erecting a pumping device over a cup and attempting to use a river as a drinking vessel Sure it is foolish,but their wild claims puts them in that rediculous position.

Yes, I love and respect brother Whitehead and the rest of my brethren,but I cannot afford to barter my eternal welfare on such flimsy positions.

The brother on the last half of page 16 fails to realize when a direct stated,denoted command is given;to get the entire meaning; all connoted thought that "go along" with the denoted command is a part of. This is the cause of his effort to show I crossed myself on the last half of page 16. For example I said:" the denoted,stated command to 'drink ye all of the cup',makes it obligatory that we realy drink of the cup and not transfer the fruit of the vine to another container or containers and drink from them." I ask why is that true? the answer is to get all the meaning of a word,statement, or command,we must not only take into account "THE DENOTED,STATED," command but all of its connotations; And all taken togather makes all that is either DENOTED(STATED), or CONNOTED (IMPLIED) the complete thought. See Tanner page 319; Herrick and Damon page 307; Davidson page 273, 275. Others could be given but this is sufficient. He certainly did do some twisting and turning to try to get his CONTRADICTION. Reader, read page 24 of my,"What saith the Lord, cup or cups"? And then read page 16 of his answer and see how far he missed the thought. But he misses "CUP" and finds "CUPS" when the Bible says nothing about "CUPS" in the Lord's supper;so, no great wonder he can find so many imaginary things. I accept what his authority says at the bottom of the page;but it does not contradict me.

As to his Schollars,I have already answered them in a previous effort.But I will say,we all know language changes with the use made by the best writers and speakers. We all know there are many many times more of what is termed the best writers and speakers among those with false ideas about religion than there is who hold strictly to the truth.Of course we expect to see language to swing from the truth rather than to the truth.

I have ask the Brother if he would accept and preach all I would get Schollars to to sanction but some how he fails to take me up.WONDER WHY? We all know why. If he did he would preach some very rotton doctrine. That is why I will not accept what he offers under Schollarship. They are human as we all are and have their false ideas as well as we. I do not believe God hid his word from the common people under a fog of technecal logical,grammatical, or Rhetorical applications oand relations. No sir. As I have said before;that is all these boys have and I have tried to pull the cover off their cups and I leave it with the readers as to whether I did or not.

We must remember all the Apostles but Paul were ignorant unlearned fishermen, and they shook the learned world from center to circumference by the power of God's word; and it can be done again if we are willing to tie ourselves to the wisdom and knowledge he has revealed to us. In all their writings we do not see them relying on Rhetorical or Grammatical relations for the truth of God's word. It was plainly stated and all men understood it without showing it grammatical relation or its rhetorical relations. The first discussion on the cup question the cups man went into(1 Heath) Rhetoric,saying every place was a metonymy and preceed to tell us all about it. I began studying Rhetoric to get this wonderful truth and found it failed to back them up;but woke up to the fact all the truth was in God's holy word.

"For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent". (1 CO.1:19). Any one can see God's word is not hid under a pile of worldly wisdom.

"Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world"?(1 Cor.1:20).Notice,the wisdom of the world,even including the scribes;their wisdom is foolishness.Brother Whitehead denotes himself as a "SCRIBE".

Verses 21-24 shows us ,"The world cannot know God through its wis-- dom"; verse 25 tells us why,"Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men". But verse 26 gives us an idea as to how those wise men are generally lined up as far as the truth is concerned. Hear it:"For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called;".Now we can see why we can always find plenty of help on the wrong side of a question,because they are lined up that way. That is why so many words and expressions have changed for the good of error,; baptism for example.

1 Cor.2:1-4; We are shown Paul did not come with "Excellency of speech" or "wisdom", "Enticing words of mans wisdom"; and in vesre five he tells us why. Get it: "That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God". Dear Reader, stop and think:these boys havent one single statement where a plurality of cups were ever used,or commanded to be used in the Lords Supper. Hence, It stands wholly in their manipulations of grammatical relations,and Rhetorical relations. If all this wisdomstood with them they would still be wrong having no scripture on which to base faith. But I believe I have shown that they are about as destitute of proof as any false doctrine that ever was perpetrated on the Church.

1 Cor.3:18;" Let no man decieve himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise,let him become a fool that he may be wise"; There you are brother, divest yourselves of all that worldly wisdom and be fill with the true wisdom from the gospel. Verse 19, "For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written,He taketh the wise in their own craftiness". Do you see any consolation here for a man whose doctrine has no statement of his practice in the new testament and has to depend wholly on manipulations of grammatical,or Rhetorical relations?

Verse 20," And again, the Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain". Is that enough? Here comes some more.

Now, to reiterate an arguement already made. Since these brethren do not have even a statement in the new testament where either Jesus or any of the Apostles ever used a plurality of cups in the Lord's supper;" Good words and fair speeches"(Rom.16:17,18); "Strive about words to no profit"(2 Tim.2:14); "Doting about questions and strifes of words"(1 Tim.6:4),"whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds destitute of the truth----". And there you are;that is all they have.

We all know when words or terms are used with a certain meaning in the Bible we have no right to use another definition other than as the Lord or the Apostles used. For example,the word baptize originally meant immersion,submersion. But religious teachers used it to mean "to sprinkle or pour water on the candidate or immersio n. And now our best authorities defines baptize to immerse or tp sprinkle or pour water on the candidate. We do not accept,and rightly so for both the candidate and the administrator went down into the water and he baptized him(Acts 8: 38. It was a burrial, Rom.6:4; Col.2:12; And a resurrection, Rom.6:4,5; Col.2:12.

Even though the baptism of the Holy Spirit, Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16; was performed by "a pouring out" Acts 2:17,18; "Fell on" Acts 10:44,45; we do not use that method of performing water baptism in the obedience to the gospel. In 1 Cor 10:1,2; The people were passing through the sea,with the water on either side, and were under a cloud; and they were thereby baptized unto Moses. Even ## though that was a baptism;yet we would not leave the example set by the apostles and use a fog bank to baptize men into Christ/

Neither should we with the "Cup of the Lord". When we see how it was instituted and how it was still used 26 years later; we should never try to substitute on the Lord any more than we would on the baptism. We know Jesus used one cup containing the fruit of the vine and they all drank of it. Brother Whitehead makes that very forceable in the following quotation. Quote;"At the institution of the Lord's supper, the fruit of the vine was in one cup. And those who drank from that cup 'drank the cup of the Lord".(M.S.W.) And there you are my dear reader, the "Cup of the Lord" was instituted with one cup containing the fruit of the vine. And when they drank from that cup they"drank the cup of the Lord".

But 26 years later Paul recapitulated the instit tion of the Lord's supper by Jesus,1 Cor.11:23-25; saying in the 23 verse that he had recieved of the Lord as he did it the night he was betrayed. Hence it is the exact thing as Jesus did it that night.

And we remember the brother has admitted that the fruit of the vine was 9in one cup. And those that drank of that cup drank the cup of the Lord". And on this very setting Paul said in verse 26, "Drink this cup"; Verse 27," Drink this cup of the Lord"/ 26 years of recognizing drinking from one cup containing the fruit of the vine, as "Drinking the cup of the Lord: And not one place where they ever "drank the cup of the Lord" by drinking from a plurality of cups or containers. If you can change the meaning of drinking from one cup containing the fruit of the vine as drinking "the cup of the Lord"; to drinking from a plurality of cups or containers; you can also change scriptural baptism from immersion to sprinkling or pouring water on the candidate. Nay verily my dear brother.

Here I will accept brother Whitehead's invitation to end this too long discussion. He said his previous effort ended his part,so, this will end mine."""IF""""" he dont shoot at me.

I love and appreciate brother Whitehead for his great ability and courage to fight for what he believes to be right. May God bless our efforts to the extent others will with an open mind investigate these problems which divide God's people is my Prayer. I will close with the following verse.

If we'll follow the example Jesus set,
And as he did,use one cup yet;
We'll be one as Jesus prayed,
And by his Holy will be staid;
And thus in joy and peace and love,
We'll travel to our home above;
And while eternal ages roll,
We will his blessed name extol.

Your brother in Christ,J.S.Bedingfield.

Box 767, Bryte, California.