H.B.Dye 828 OAK Dr. Yuma Arizona

THE VOICE OF ONE CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS,"CRITICISED"

When we look on the title of the little book that I am about to criticise, we might think it had to do with John the Baptist when he was crying in the wilderness of Judea, but not so; it is only my old friend and brother, J.D.Phillips,lost and crying in the wilderness of his own digression.

It is with a sad heart that we look across the years and see ourselves and these brethren,fighting side by side for the cause of the Lord. But things happened that caused these brethren to forsake"the ancient paths" and follow "ways not cast up". The faithful indeed are few,so let us rally the standard and fight, as we never fought with the Spirit's sword.

"The Voice",page5, Paragraph 2,brother Phillips says;"Others assume that he broke it in two in(or near) the middle, and that the one presiding at the table must do the same to make it repredent Christ's broken body".

If I had been undicided on this Question when I sawthat statement, it would have made me skeptical of the brother's position.

A position that forces its advocates to misrepresent an o posing brother must be very weak indeed.

Who among us advocates,that the loaf must be "broke# in two in (or near) the middle"?None of us have ever contended that it should be broken in that particular place. Neither would we think the loaf was spoiled if some one should "break it in two in (or near) the middle". The fact is I have never heard any one specify any particular place "to break the loaf". This doctrine of,"break it in two in(or near) the middle"is only a hallucination of brother Phillips' over wrought ~~imagination~~ imagination.

The sentence;"And the one presiding at the table must do the same to make it represent Christ's broken body",is likewise false, as the expression,"must do the same",makes it obligatory on the one serving at the table to "break the loaf in two in(or near) the middle";for it to signify the Lord's broken body.Brother Phillips accusing us of this false doctrine, makes me think of the old adage;"a drunk man thinks every one else is drunk#.

We do teach the loaf signifies the Lord's broken body, when after thanks, it is BROKEN;but it does'nt just have to be"broken into (or near) the middle".Perhaps these poor brethren were raised under this hallucination, and of course when they saw the falacy of it,they swung to the other extreme.

Brother Phillips' infatuation of accusing of his youthful delusions, is a fair sample of what is to follow.He next raises a big smoke screen of Greekto aid him in pulling his false doctrine through;but his smoke screen is too thin to hide his antics.

Under the heading,"How did Christ break the loaf"?He says;"In every place where it is said "He broke" the loaf, the words 'he broke' are from "Eklase". The noun form is "Klasm".

If brother Phillips will read Matt.15:36,and Mk.8:6, he will see where Jeasus BRAKE (Eklase) the bread and fed 4000 people besides taking up seven baskets full of fragments (Gr.Klasmaton).Now this result of "brake"(Gr.Eklase) was MORE than one fragment.Doug says; only one can be the result of "Eklase".Wonder who is right, the bible or Doug?

The reason brother Phillips wants only ~~one~~ one fragment, and a very small one at that, is he wants Jesus to eat it,and to make Doug's contention true relative to the communion,he Must. In Matt.15:36 and Mk.8:6, if Jesus had eaten all that he broke(Eklase),he would have eaten all that 4000 people ate,besides seven baskets full off fragments(Klasmaton).

I know every body can see some one is wrong;either Matt. and Mk. used "Eklase" wrong,or brother Phillips is wrong in his contention. Now, Folks who do you suppose it is?

This forever sets the seal on the claim that "brake"(Gr.Eklase)is some kind of an idiom,always meaning "To break off and eat the piece broken off",for it does'nt take a Solomon to see Jesus did'nt eat all he broke off in the above scriptures.And don'tforget it is 'he brake'(Gr.Eklase) the same as in Matt.26:26;Mk.14:23 etc.

But after deciding on the singular noun,Klasma,he begins to define it. He finds,"fragment".one of the definitions.He then goes to Webster,and finds one of the definitions is "a small detached portion", Webster also says,"An imperfect piece", but that does'nt suit Doug,he wants a small piece for he intends to have Jesus eat it soom.

He then turns hes attention to "morsel",and finds Webster defines it, "a little bite of food",Webster also says,it is "a small meal",but thats too much for Doug;he wants Jesus to eat it so a little bite fits perfectly.

Then he turns his attention to the verb,"Klao", which was defined by some TO BREAK; by others, "TO BREAK OFF".

We have already shown that "Eklase",from which "break"is translated in every place where the communion was instituted,was used in Matt.15:36 and Mk.8:6 in the sense of "break up"or"break in pieces".

There is a SPECIFIC TERM that has this meaning,and that term is Kata-Klao.

In Mk.6:41 and Lk.9:16, where Jesus was feeding the 5000 this word,"Kata-Klao" is translated "break".

We find another SPECIFIC term,Ek-Klao,meaning "break off".This is used in Rom.11:17 and19, where it is stated that "the natural branches were BROKEN OFF",but we see that "Klao",was defined,TO BREAK,TO BREAK OFF.And we see in Matt.15:36 and Mk.8:6, it was used in the sense of "break up", or "break in pieces".Therefore, we see that this word, Klao is a general term like our word "break",can mean;break,break off, or break in pieces; but there are two SPECIFIC TERMS"Ek-Klao", to break off; and "Kata-Klao", to break in pieces.

Since there is nothing in the text Matt.26:26;Mk.14:23;Lk.22:19 nor 1Cor. 11:23-24, to justify a specific definition,and since EVERY STANDARD TRANSLATION translates it in the general term "break"; we will have to decide against brother Phillips in giving it the specific definition. However let him have the definition he wants, it is worse for him. Matt.26:26 would read;"He broke off and gave it to them".That would forever kill the idea that the disciples each broke, as it would read"HE BROKE OFF AND GAVE IT TO THEM", and if he DID, they could not, as it was BROKE OFF AND GIVEN TO THEM.Dead,DEAD,DEAD,three times dead. Read every place,"BROKE OFF",(instead of break) and it kills him too dead to even kick.

But just merely defining that verb isn't all of it,he plays the boogy man a little on us right here.The devil added "not",in the garden of Eden to make the lie he preached,while Doug adds the noun"Klasma",and defines it "a little bite",then he assumes Jesus "ate it". Then he adds these ADDITIONS to hes verb,"break off", and this is what he has;"He took bread and blessed it,and broke off a little bite and ate it".So you see he beat the devil at his own game.The devil added one word and Doug added six.

I challenged him in an oral discussion in Calif. to show one Greek lexicon that defines the Greek verb "Klao""To break off a little bite and eat it".Well, he never did it;the reason is he can't. He also was askto produce ONE TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT that translated the word "Klao"or some of its forms "Tobreak off a little bite and ate it" neither could he do that.It is strictly an addition to God's Holy word.May the good Lord have mercy on him,and spare him time and opportunity to repent.

This smoke screen(Rev.9:1-2)must have looked awfully thin to brother Phillips,for he certainly knows if the idea,"he broke off a little bite and ate it"were in the Greek text some of the translators would have ventured to put it in a translation.They all read practicly the same; "He took bread and blessed it and break it and gave it to them".Not one says HE ATE IT.The word"Klasma"from which he gets his "little bite"is NOTin ANy Greek text where the communion was instituted.

After surveying this He asks the Question "Did Jesus eat the piece he broke off"?He then adds;"Certainly","The breaking of bread(Acts2:42; 20:7-11;1Cor.10:16 etc."Implies The Eating".He leaves the unsuspecting public to think, "break and eat" is all it implies. But on page 7,"The voice" he answers his own folly,hear him;"They fail to see that "the breaking of the loaf" IMPLIES THE WHOLE THING; giving thanks,breaking the loaf,eating;giving thanks for the cup, and drinking of it."(J.D.P.) If,when Jesus,"break"the communion loaf"means he did all that is meant in "Breaking bread"(Acts2:42;2:46;20:7)he had the whole communion service under the expression,"He break".Then what was he doing when he "took the cup"?And if,"This do"meant for them to do as he had done;each had to have an individual loaf and an individual cup, and go through with the whole service and give his "leavings"to the diciples. This is according to his own admission;he admits,"the breaking of the loaf"implies THE WHOLE THING.Therefore, for each disciple to "This do",each disciple must carry out the entire communion.

Hear him again on the same subject "Voice"page 10"And the phrase'he broke' (Eklase)means 'He broke and ate'for it is the same Hebrew,Greek-Aramaic idiom used in Acts 2:42;20:7etc." But brother Phillips says;'breaking of the loaf implies the whole thing"(Voice page7). Therefore,when Jesus "break"he had the whole supper;hence,"he took the cup"was not in the communion.And when he told them "this do"he certainly intended for each of them to go through with the whole supper. This would be properly designated as foolishness gone to seed,but thats the best they can do as they have nothing to do with.

How he thought,"break"in 1Cor.10:16 implied the eating is beyond my comprehension.It plainly says;"The bread which we break,is itNot the communion of the body of Christ"?This does'nt mean they had communed,if it did the communion would be in the BREAKING and since the breaking of his body was done by Pilot and the bold thirsty mob.I envy you not in your relation to these fellows my dear brother.

Read the first part of this verse(1Cor.10:16)"The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ"?No one claims the "DRINKING"is included in the "BLESSING";therefore it is the communion of his blood but we haven't communed yet.In other words, Paul is only forcefully in a questioning way,impressing on our minds WHEN"The cup of blessing" becomes the communion of the blood of the Lord.As further proof I offer Matt.26:27;Mk.14:23. In both places it is plainly stated;"He took the cup, and blessed it and gave it to them--"AND THEN-AND NOT TILL THEN--DID HE DECLARE IT TO BE HIS BLOOD. Then the cup of blessing which we bless would be-THE BLOOD--or THE COMMUNION OF THE BLOOD; and is ready for us to COMMUNE.

Its parallel"The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ"?Not that we have communed,but it "the bread which we break",is the communion of his body,ready for us to COMMUNE. As further proff of this, we offer,Matt.26:26;Mk.14:22;Lk.22:19and1Cor.11: 23-24,"AND THEN-NOT TILL THEN-DID HE DECLARE IT TO BE THE BODY OF CHRIST. Hence when it is BROKENit is-the body-or the communion of the body-NOT THAT WE HAVE COMMUNED,but it is ready for us to commune.How the"we" broke it is shown in every place when it was instituted.

Jesus, the one at the table brake it,and they, accepted it.The same"WE" blessed the cup of blessing,but in every instance,the Lord,the one serving at the table,blessed it;and they,"The We"accepted it. Just because the institution is styled, "BREAKING BREAD",Acts2:42;2:46;20:7 they try to make it appear the Lord commanded each one to BREAK. On the contrary, every time when it was instituted, the command to the disciples was, "TAKE EAT". Suppose Peter had "taken" a piece already broke ate it,would he had obeyed the command;"TAKE EAT"?Most ABSURADLY.After this brother Phillips goes off at a tangent and tells us a lot about French,German, English,Jew,Greek and Arab Idioms.But the thing he needs to do is the very thing he fails to do;thatis,show some lexicon or other standard translations that defines or translater the Greek verb Klao,or one of its forms,Eklase is an idiom meaning to "break off a little bite and eat it".Thats the authority he needs but he has not shown it,nor never will.We all know the expression,"breaking bread",is a figure of speech in Acts2:42;2:46;20:7 etc. What is "a Part for the whole" but the simple verb "Klao"(break)is not a figure of speech when it is used in common literal language as in Matt.26:26"He took bread and blessed it, and break it and gave it to the disciples---etc."Nothing but plain simple language.

But that has ever been the tactics of one who leaves the old Jeruselam paths for the broad way.They take the figurative use of a word or phrase as in Acts2:42 etc. viz."break bread", (apart for the whole)and apply it as the literal definition of a literal expression as in Matt.26:26 "He break", hence they decide break is not a literal expression. The "Cups" brethren do thesame thing,they can't literally drink a literal cup,they decide "cup" is figurative every time.Hence when Jesus "Took the cup"(Matt.26:27 etc.)they decide this is also figurative language. All these poor souls seem to think the Lord must use either all figurative or all literal language, especially with their particular hobby.

On Page 7 last paragraph he says"The full expression is used in Acts20:11. 'The disciples',Paul being among them,'came together to break bread' (to observe the communion service)".Note he places "to break bread" and "(to observe the communion service" as being the same thing; and he is right in doing this.But when he makes "break" in Matt.26:26 and "to break bread" Acts 2:42 etc.mean the same thing, it is equivilant to making "break" in Matt.26:26mean observe the communion service. If they do mean the same,Doug, what was he doing when he "took the cup"?seeing as per your reasoning "break", included the whole communion service. If you don't mean that why do you parslel "break" in Matt.26:26 and"break bread" in Acts2:42?Behold the legs of the lame are unequal. But notice Acts20:11 (he quotes from another translation. I shall quote from the authorized version). "When he therefore had come up again, and had broken bread, and had eaten,--"He says this is the full expression. Yes, bless your soul so full you can't make "break"include the"eat". The fact is since "eat" is mentioned along with "break" and they are tied together with coordinate conjunction, "and" they are of equal rank in this particular sentence. You nor no other man can SUBORDINATE the "eat"to the "break". Yes sir, you know, and I know they are both mentioned here of EQUAL rank, so therefore in this sentence neither could include the other. If the word"break" did mean to break and eat the Holy Spirit would not have said"BROKEN AND"EATEN", but would have used the word in its true sense and said,"BROKEN",the trouble is,it just don't mean that. If it did Bro.Phillips would have found it without so much circumnavigating. If he had the proof in plain words it would have been starring us in the face long ago.

BROKEN

At the top of page eight, we have this;In Acts 20:7 it says,'The disciples came together to break bread(or the loaf)'while in 1Cor.11:33 Paul says; 'When you come together to eat'. In the former passage the breaking implies the eating,(for surely they didn't break it and go off and leave it);And in the latter the eating implies the"breaking". Is "eating"all the former "breaking"implies? If so, didn't they have any cup at that meeting? Did they give thanks for the bread and cup?Did they drink of the cup as well as eat of the bread? If so doesn't the expression "break bread"imply too much for your lame doctrine? Each individual went through with all the items of the Lord's supper did they? "THIS DO"?
Didn't the 'eating' in first Cor.11:33 also imply all of the Lord's supper?Since the Lord's supper is to be eaten, how did you imagine there was a chance for some one to think they might have gone off and left it?Since "break bread"in the former and"eat"in the latter each implies the whole thing;by what authouity do you PRUNE them down only,"break and eat"?The reason you did it was, you needed something to make someone think you were proving your doctrine, wasn't it Doug?
Get the next rich and racy joke;"---The very fact that Jesus 'broke' the loaf means that he also ate".Now folks Doug has been telling us all the time that "break"was an idiom that meant 'to break and eat'.Wonder why he said ALSO ATE?Looks like he knew that EAT was not included in that "break",doesn't it?If I had a doctrine like that,and could'nt consistantly use a word in the sense I claimed for it;I believe I would cut loose from it.How do you feel about it dear reader?
After thus exposing himself,brother Phillips next brings forward a newspaper man,a couple of school teachers, and a couple of Jews,AS EVIDENCE OF HIS POSITION.
His news paper man,Mr.Frederick M.Kirby,says;"The breaking of bread implies the breaking off apiece,not breaking it in half.The eating of the piece so broken off would naturally follow".
According to Mr.Kirby's statement, we would have to miss the middle a little.Well thats allright, I don't know of any one who claims it should be broken"square dab" in the middle.But notice, he didn't say "break" MEANT NOT TO BREAK IN THE MIDDLE/but it implied the breaking off a piece, not breaking it in half.Nice way to whip the devil around the stump.I suppose if I should break a loaf in the middle it would not be broken at all.Wonder what would be the matter with that loaf folks? I believe the word"break"would cover it even if it were broken in the middle. Yet we do not advocate that it must be broken in the middle. In Mr.Kirby's second statement he says;"The eating of the piece broken off would naturally follow".So if Jesus had followed NATURE when he "break"(Gr.EKlase)the bread in Matt.15:36;Mk.8:6 he would have eaten all the 4000 ate and besides the seven baskets full of fragments.But since we see he didn't,we will have to reject Mr.Kirby;for he is either wrong or else Jesus didn't do as he should because he didn't eat what he broke off.I believe Jesus knew,how about you dear reader?And don't forget that the Greek verb "Eklase"here in Matt.15:36Mk.8:6;is the same word translated "break"in Matt.26:26;Mk.14:22;Lk.22:19;1Cor.11:24.So we see it sure didn't to MEAN "break and eat" in this case or else Jesus didn't do what the word meant. Doug should have been there and told him, so he could have done it according to "Hoyle".

Next comes Mr.Carl H. Krealing of Yale University.Question;"Does he broke (Gr.Eklase)mean that Jesus broke and eat"?Answer;"Yes,though not expressly stated".Please tell me dear reader, how "break"can mean "break and eat"and it be stated that some one"break";and yet it is not expressly stated that he "ATE"?If it also means "Eat"why isn't the "EAT"as expressly stated as the "BREAK"?The trouble is it doesn't mean "ATE"and Mr. Krealing has let the cat out of the bag when he said that the "EAT" was not expressly stated.We claim Mr.Krealing as our witness although he believes that Jesus ate still he doesn't think that when Matt.26:26 says "BREAK"it expressly states that HE"ATE".And if it is not expressly stated it is not of faith;Rom.10:17---"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God";and therefore is sin to claim that it does; "For whatsoever is not of faith is sin".Rom.14:23.The next witness he puts on the stand is Mr.Robt.H.Pfeiffer of Harvard University.Question, "Is there any thing in the Greek new testament to indicate that Jesus broke the loaf in halves and gave it to the disciples without eating of It himself"?Answer;"No he had to eat of it before the others.The Talmud prescribes that those at the table cannot eat until the one breaks the bread pertakes".

Now we have it in a nut shell,THE TALMUD PRESCRIBES THAT THOSE AT THE TABLE CANNOT EAT TILL THE ONE WHO BREAKS IT PARTAKES.Well what is the Talmud?Answer;It is the Jewish TRADITION.SUCH AS JESUS CONDEMNED when he was here.Mk.7:7-9."Howbeit in vain do they worship me,teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.For laying aside the commandment of God,ye hold the tradition of men as the washing of pots and cups:and many other such like things ye do.And he said unto them Full well ye reject the commandment of God,that ye may keep your own traditions". This applies to brother Phillips also,for he is laying aside the commandment of God,to keep those old Jewish TRADITIONS.And he is trying to bind them on God's people.Brother Phillips you should be ashamed of yourself,you should rise abovethat,you are too big a man to indulge in things of that caliber.

So Mr. Pfeiffer told EXACTLY why he thought Jesus ate first,"BECAUSE THE TALMUD PRESCRIBES THAT THOSE AT THE TABLE CANNOT EAT TILL THE ONE WHO BREAKS THE LOAF PARTAKES".Well an honest confession is good for the soul. No doubt this is what Mr.Krealing meant when he said,"the eat"was not expressly stated"/

Next comes Mr.Myer Winkler,a Jewish rabbi.He states;"'Paras Lechem'means to break the bread,but it involves the idea to 'break and eat',because, according to Jewish Law,if you pronounce a benediction over bread, you must eat,otherwise you are not allowed to pronounce the benediction". Did you get that"THE JEWISH LAW PRESCRIBES IT".If that isn't trying to Judeaise the church,pray tell me what you call it.

This Jew came out bold and said the "JEWISH LAW PRESCRIBER IT".And Doug put it in his book.Well, a man that cuts his own throat that way,sure does need matter to put in his book.

We find a lot of stuff in this book against the doctrine Doug is trying to prove.If you want to kill these fellows doctrine,just read their own literature.They sure do wallop themselves some good ones.

/I couldn't have accused them of following Jewish TRADITIONS any stronger than Doug has indicted himself in this evidence. This is running awfully short on evidence,to have to use something that indicts yourself. But poor fellow,blindness is an awfull thing.

The next man he puts on the stand is another Jew,Mr.Julius L.Seigel another Rabbi.Hear him;"According to Rabbinic and Talmudic law,no person should pronounce a 'blessing'and break bread with his guests unless he also partakes".

Yes sir, Its not according to the new Testament teaching,but"its according to RABBINIC AND TALMUDIC LAW."Another effort to bind the Jewish traditions on us,but his smoke screen is to thin,his own evidence claims no higher authority than the Jewish Rabbies and the Talmud.After trying so hard to bind Jewish notions,opinions,and usages on us,then he kills the whole thing in the end by quoting from Sophocleae,a Greek schollar and lexicographer,hear him;"It is folly to suppose that the writers of the Greek new testament put upon words meanings not recognized by the Greeks".And yet he is doing his level best to make the Greek verb "Klao",take a Hebrew practice for a definition.Poor fellow wonder if he doesn't really know any better.

They also have another joke that they call the unanswerable arguement on "this do".

"This"is a demonstrative pronoun;and a demonstrative prounoun refers to the last thing mentioned,or to the principle thought although more remote.They always work their,"this do",on Lk.22:19because it doesn't say any thing about"take eat",and their hope and effort is to make it refer to "break",or as they say;"the action named by the word break".

Take the text of Lk.22:19,"And he took bread and gave thanks, and break it and gave unto them,saying, this is my body which is given for you: this do in rememberance of me".

Brother Phillips asserts the breaking is the principle thought although more remote than the last thing mentioned,which is;(he)"gave unto them saying,this is my body,which is given for you".

Note the points,giving of thanks,was an act;the breaking was an act.After doing these two acts to this bread he"gave to them saying THIS IS MY BODY which is given for you".Therefore these two acts were of EQUAL IMPORTANCE in qualifying the bread as the Lord's body:therefore,neither could be of more importance than the other.The breaking was of no more importance then the giving of thanks,for without either one of them the bread would not qualify as the Lord's body in the communion service.Then it couldn't be either of these as they are of EQUAL IMPORTANCE,and neither is the LAST THING MENTIONED.But the qualified bread,that which signified the Lord's precious body was very important:Hence, the giving of it to them a memorial of his body was of more importance than either of the qualifying acts alone;and besides, the giving of it to them that they might eat of it and thereby signify their fellowship in hes body, was the only thing it could refer to,and besides it is THE LAST THING MENTIONED.

We will take it another way, we are going to find out the whole truth that is revealed,that was said and done that memorable night.The way we would do this in court,we would call in all the credible witnesses and take all of their evidence as the whole truth to the matter under concideration.This is the proper way to treat any subject.Anything that either of the witnesses mentioned is of importance,and if some other witness should leave it out of his testamony,doesn't mean that the statement wasn't made.So,now we will call the witnesses one by one and put it all together and we will then know all the Lord intended for us to know,and we should be satisfied with that.

The first witness will be Matt. in Chapter26,verse 26,"And as they were eating,Jesus took bread,and he blessed it,and he break it,and gave it to the disciples, and said,take,eat;this is my body".Note the points; No.1He tookbread--",No.2.He blessed it--. No.3.He break it.**No.4.He gave it to the disciples--.No.5.And said,take,eat,this is my body.

The next witness is Mk.14:22."And as they did eat,Jesus took bread,and blessed,and break,and gave to them,and said,Take,eat;this is my body". Note the points;No.1/~~Jesus~~ Took bread/--No.2/He blessed.--No.3.He break.--No.4.Gave to them.--No.5.Said,take,eat;this is my body.These two witnesses agree on points perfectly.

Call Lk. for the next witness,22:19."And he took bread,and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them saying,this is my body which is given for you;this do in rememberance of me".

Note the points;No.1 Jesus took bread.--No.2 He gave thanks.--No.3He break.--No.4He gave unto them.--No.5(take eat;--left out)and said,this is my body which is given for you.--No.6"Thisdo"in remembrance of me". We will note Lk. left out part of point No.6,viz."take eat";but he adds another command which is very important,No6.viz."this do in rememberance of me".

Next witness is 1Cor.11:23-24"--That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks,he break it,and said,take,eat;this is my body which is brokenfor you;this do in remembrance of me".

Note the points;No.1 Jesus took bread.--No.2--gave thanks.--No.3He break. No.4(omits,"gave to them") No.5 Take,eat;this is my body which is broken for you".No.6"This do in rememberance of me."

You will note Matt. and Mk. leaves out;"THIS DO IN REMEMBERANCE OF ME." Lk. leaves out;"TAKE,EAT;".Paul in 1Cor.11:23-24,leaves out;"AND HE GAVE IT TO THEM".

Shall we leave those passages out because some of the witnesses leave them out? No, in no wise;the witnesses are all credible,and their testamony is ALL TRUE. By summing up allof the evidence, this is what we have;"No1 Jesus took bread. No.2 he gave thanks(blessed).--No.3Jesus break it.--No.4 He gave it to them.--No.5 He said,take,eat;this is my body.--No6 he said,"this do in rememberance of me".

The point we wish to settle is,what does "this do", refer to.The first thing we would think of when we see,"this do",would be,WHAT DID HE COMMAND THE DISCIPLES TO DO? Then beyond any shadow of a doubt,"this do" would refer to(you)take,eat;this is my body.Because "TAKE EAT" was the only thing he had commanded them todo.The thing for them to "TAKE EAT" (this do) was bread with the requsites "thanks and break"for it takes "thanks and break" for the bread to qualify to signify the Lord's body in the communion service.

Every time,He took bread,blessed,and break, and gave unto them,--THEN and not till-THEN- did he declare it to be his BODY.

1Cor.11:26 "For as often as ye eat this bread,and drink this cup,you do show the Lord's death till he comes."When do we "SHOW"THIS DEATH" or MEMORALIZE, the Lord's death?The Lord says;"as of ten as ye EAT this bread, you show or memoralize his death. Hence "this do",couldn't refer to anything else but (you) "take,eat;this is my body which is broken for you".

PAUL SHOWS--EATING THE BREAD AND DRINKING THE CUP--ARE THE PRINCPLE THOUGHTS OF THE COMMUNION.

1Cor.11:26"For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup,you do show the Lord's death till he comes."

Again-EAT BREAD AND DRINK CUP--THE PRINCIPLE THOUGHT.

1Cor.11:27."Wherefore,whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

Again,EAT BREAD-DRINK OF THAT CUP--is the PRINCIPLE THOUGHT.

1Cor.11:28 "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup"

Again,EATETH AND DRINKETH--THE PRINCIPLE THOUGHT.

1Cor.11:29 "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthly eatheth and drinketh damnation to himself,not discerning the Lord's body."

EVERY TIME in these passages the EATING and DRINKING are held up as the principle thought of the communion service;and eat being the principle thought of that part of the communion service that signifies the Lord's body:"this do"could not refer to or stand for anything else but(you) "take,eat;this is my body"--.Because it would be the PRINCIPLE THOUGHT and besides the last thing mentioned.Thus fulfilling the rule in both particulars.

After all is said their whole theory is based on the addition of "a little bite and ate it"to their definition of the Greek verb "klao".When they define the Greek verb"klao" to break off and put their addition to it and make it read:"he broke off a little bite and ate it"--.They do as bad as the devil did in the garden of Eden when he added "not" and caused the fall of man.Why will men commit this awful crime when they can see the fruits of adding to God's word every day,is a problem to me. I am still calling on those brethren to give one single Greek Lexicon that defines the Greek Verb "Klao" or any of its forms "to break off a little bite and eat it". Or if they can't do that,show one translation that translates the Greek verb "Klao"or its form"Eklase" used in the institution of the communion service;"to break off a little bite and eat it".

Of all the translators that have had to do with our bible none have translated,"Eklase" Matt.26:26"to break off a little bite and eat it". Of all the Greek Schollars that have put out lexicons, defining Greek words;they can't show one that has defined the Greek verb "Eklase"(brake) Matt.26:26 "to break off a little bite and eat it".

Since that is a fact,how can you gamble off your future on these additions to God's Holy word,when we know the devil by just such a trick caused all the sorrows and heart aches we now feel.

Brother Phillips on page 3 "The Voice" has this heading;"He also drank". Suppose he did,does that prove he drank IMMEDIATELY after he had given thanks,before he gave it to them?His job is to prove Jesus BOTH ATE and DRANK BEFORE he gave the bread and wine to the disciples to partake.Just merely to show "He drank" doesn't show that their doctrine which makes the servant at the table partake before he gives it to the disciples TRUE.Mk.14:23,"And he took the cup,and when he had given thanks he gave it to them;and they all drank of it". Note:"--He gave it to them,WHEN he had given thanks--"."WHEN he had given thanks" is a TIME clause,telling WHEN"he gave it (Cup) to them",it was"WHEN HE HAD GIVEN THANKS", Then he didn't sup first, as it would have read,WHEN HE HAD SUPPED;therefore, nothing came BETWEEN 'giving of thanks' and 'giving it (the cup) to them'.Hence he did as Mk. said;"AND WHEN HE HAD GIVEN THANKS,HE GAVE IT TO THEM:" and they all drank of it.

So that arguement alone is enough to kill Doug's book.

No.1	No.2	No3.	No.4	NO.5	No.6	No,7
He took the cup Matt. 26:27 Mk.14:23	And gave thanks Matt. 26:27 Mk.14:23	And gave it to them Matt. 26:27 Mk.14:23	Saying, drink ye all of it Matt. 26:27	And they all drank of it. Mk.14:23	He said this is my blood Matt. 26:28 Mk.14:24	Iwill not drink henceforth Matt.26:29 --- No more Mk.14:25.
		Doug says Jesus drank here.			Disciples drank here	Jesus drank here

You will note in the above diagram I have all the items relative to the cup,also beheath each item is a list of scriptures on each particular item.No.1,"He took the cup" Is in Matt.26:27;Mk.14:23. No2"And he gave thanks".Matt.26:27,Mk.14:23.No.3"And gave it to them"(disciples)Matt. 26:27,Mk.14:23.No.4Saying,drink ye all of it".Matt.26:27.No5"and they all drank of it",Mk.14:23.No.6 "This is myblood--"Matt.26:28,Mk.14:24. No.7"I will not drink from henceforth"."No more".Matt.26:29,Mk.14:25. You will note under No.4 is the command"DRINK YE ALL OF IT"while,under No.5 is the statement,"THEY ALL DRANK OF IT". Therefore, on the line of division,between the command,DRINK YE ALL OF IT",and the statement "THEY ALL DRANK OF IT"unquestionable isthe place where the disciples DRANK:and this would be at the star on the line of division between the command TO DRINK and the statement THAT THEY DID DRINK.

If Jesus drank first,he would have had to drink,just after thanks and before"he gave it to them";which would be~~m~~the star between Nos2&3;but there is not the slightest hint in the record that he did drink there; but there is a statement that immediatly after,or"WHEN he had given thanks he gave it to them;and they all drank of it".Mk.14:23. This positive statement cannot be gotten around,it says too plain;WHEN he had given thanks he gave it to them; and they all drank of it". So if the Lord drank,we will have to look either BEFORE he gave thanks,and this is unthinkable,or after the disciples drank;because Mk.14:23 makes the POSITIVE statement"WHEN he had given thanks,he gave it to them;and they all drank of it". The first hint we have that Jesus might have drank is in Matt.26:29--"I will not drink HENCEFORTH--".If this means he drank we will have to see something about what HENCEFORTH means.

In the "Voice"page 9 brother Phillips says:"I will not drink HENCEFORTH")Matt.26:29)Henceforth is from Ap Arti(after this time)W.B.Godby A.M. one of the greatest Greek schollars the world has produced and author of the Godby translation of the N.T. says;'The Greek word ApArti, translated 'henceforth' means INSTANTANIOUSLY from this very moment. If "HENCEFORTH" means"INSTANTANIOUSLY FROM THIS VERY MOMENT",and we have no right to dispute it,then,Jesus must have DRANK on the line of division between Nos.6&7. Since "henceforth"is INSTANTANIOUSLY,it can't even go behind the statement;"This is my blood--in No.6:There fore it MUST be at the star on the line of division between Nos.6&7,after the disciples drank.

"Voice"page 9 paragraph 3,last of paragraph,Brother Phillips says;"This shows conclusively that Jesus did drink of the 'fruit of the vine'just before he said he would do so 'no more(,'after this'etc. Ifbrother Phillips is right in this statement,"that Jesus had drank just before he said he would do so 'no more',So if that be true HE HAD TO DRINK AT THE STAR ON THE LINE OF DIVISION BETWEEN Nos.6&7,after the disciples drank. So if the statement;"I will not drink henceforth",Matt.26:29; "No more" Mk.14:25,means Jesus drank,he unquestionably drank after the disciples as we have shown.That alone kills his doctrine and practice, that the one serving at the table must break and eat first.

1--Jesus was among the disciples as a servent--Mk.22:27

2--But a servant serves others and eats last.--Lk.17:7-8.

3--Therefore, Jesus served the disciples first and ate last.

Some might say a servant couldn'tgive thanks,--Jesus took no orders and he was master--and divers and sundries objections,just to try to get rid of the arguement.But let it be remembered, that Jesus himself said he was among the disciples as a servant;then,if he didn't serve pray tell what he did as a servant?SINCE HE MUST AT LEAST SERVE TO BE A SERVANT, then we know he did serve.And since he, himselfLk.17:7-8 showed that a servant served others and ate last;there is no other conclusion but that he served the disciples first and ate last.Dear reader let no one beguile you with any kind of sophistry,fordelusion of every kind and hue is rife in the world.Let God's blessed word be the men of your counsel and may the good Lord have mercy on our short comings is the prayer of your brotherin Christ. Submitted in the love of the truth and for the unity of God's people. J.S.Bedingfield, Yuma,Arizona.

After mine and brother Phillips' debate at Belvedere, Calif. Oct.24-27, 1933,Brother Homer L.King made a very unfair report of the debate.I challenged him(by letter)to meet me at the same place,discuss the same subject,and the Church of Christ at Bellflower would pay hall hire,stenographer and publishing expenses.I repeated the challenge publecly,at Temple City,Calif. Feb.12,1939;but Bro.King hid behind his brethren.They didn't think another debate at present advisable.Bro.King has gone on record,refusing to meet me and thereby demonstrate,at our expense,he was correct.This challenge still stands personally to Bro.King and any other they will stand behind.My brethren are behind me.If any one believes Bro.King's report,just try to get him to make the above investigation and see how strong bro.King believes his own report. J.S.B.