IT IS WRITTEN

CAVE JUNCTION, OREGON, FEB. 15, 1947.

COMMUNION 4, "CUP" 2.

HAVING TAKEN UP EVERY SCRIPTURE IN WHICH THE COMMUNION IS MENTIONED: AND HAVING FOUND ONE CUP USED IN ITS ESTABLISHMENT AND DURING THE APOSTOLIC TIMES: BUT NOT ONE TIME DID WE FIND A PLURALITY USED BY ANY CHURCH: HENCE, WE SEE IT IS A DIVIDING WEDGE, PRESUMPTEOUS IN ITS ORIGIN, AND THOSE WHO USE IT ARE DRIVING THE WEDGE OF DIVISION.
ALL THAT WE HAVE FOUND SO FAR THAT ITS ADVOCATES CAN OFFER ARE STRAINED TECHNICALITIES; BUT WE WISH TO FOLLOW THIS STRANGE PLAN OF PROOF FURTHER. SO WE SHALL FOLLOW THE LEAD OF J.L. MUSGRAVE IN HIS "CUP QUESTION".

FOLLOWING HIM ON PAGE 1, WE ARE MADE TO WONDER HOW BRO. MUSGRAVE COULD HAVE BELIEVED ALL HE CHARGES US WITH WHILE HE WAS WITH US. HE MUST HAVE BELIEVED IT AS HE SAYS THAT IS OUR POSITION. NO WONDER HE WENT CONTAINERS".
HE SAYS, ON PAGE 1, WE CLAIM, "THE CUP (DRINKING VESSEL) IS AN EMBLEM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND CITE THAYER PAGE 15 AS PROOF".
WE CITE LUKE 22:20; AND 1 COR. 11:25; AS PROOF TO SHOW THAT "THE CUP" BEARS THE SAME RELATIONSHIP TO THE NEW TESTAMENT THAT THE BREAD DOES TO HIS BODY AND THAT THE WINE DOES TO HIS BLOOD; WHATEVER YOU PLEASE TO CALL IT; WHETHER EMBLEM OR OTHERWISE.
FOR JESUS SAID:

THIS _____ IS - - - - -- -MY BODY. MATTH. 26:26; MK. 14:22.
THIS - - - - - - - IS - - - - -MY BLOOD. MATTH 26:28; MK. 14;24.
THIS CUP - - - - --IS - - - - - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT. LK. 22:20; 1 COR. 11:25.

THESE ARE ALL PARALEL STATEMENTS, AND ALL EXPRESS THE SAME RELATIONSHIP! JESUS MEANT THEM ALL; AND NONE OF THEM NEEDS "FIXING".
HOW CAN ANYONE CLAIM TO BELIEVE THE BISLE, AND BELIEVE TWO OF THESE STATEMENTS AND REJECT THE OTHER?
REGARDLESS OF WHAT "SEEMETH RIGHT" (PROV. 14:12), WE MUST ACCEPT THE LORD'S STATEMENTS AS CORRECT. THIS IS OUR PROOF.
WE CITE THAYER PAGE 15 TO SHOW THAT OTHERS REALIZED THAT THESE SCRIPTURES TAUGHT THAT THE SAME RELATIONSHIP WAS EXPRESSED BETWEEN "THE CUP" AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, AS WAS EXPRESSED BETWEEN THE BREAD AND HIS BODY, AND THE WINE AND HIS BLOOD, IN THE COMMUNION SERVICE.
NOT ONE SCRIPTURE DOES BRO. J. L. MUSGRAVE CITE TO SHOW THAT ANY CHURCH, IN THE APOSTOLIC TIMES, USED A PLURALITY OF CUPS IN THE COMMUNION.
NOT ONE SCRIPTURE DOES HE CITE TO SHOW WHERE ANY CHURCH, IN THE APOSTOLIC TIMES, WERE COMMANDED TO USE A PLURALITY OF CUPS.
HERE IS HIS FIRST SO CALLED PROOF.
SINCE EACH DISCIPLE MAY HAVE A NEW TESTAMENT (BOOK) IN THE TEACHING SERVICE; WYY CAN'T EACH HAVE HIS NEW TESTAMENT (CUP, DRINKING VESSEL), IN THE COMMUNION SERVICE.
THE BIG REASON IS THE LORD NEVER AUTHORIZED HIS INDIVIDUAL CUPS.
HE FAILS TO REALIZE THAT THE NEW TESTAMENT EXISTED HUNDREDS OF YEARS IN THE MIND OF GOD BEFORE A NEW TESTAMENT (BOOK), WAS EVER COMPILED.
SEE GEN. 3:15; 12 TO 17 CHAPTERS; JER. 31:31-33.
EVEN AFTER THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH ON PENTECOST, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS ITS LAW; IT WAS YEARS BEFORE A NEW TESTAMENT (BOOK), WAS COMPILED.
THIS "ONE VOLUME OF THOUGHT", "NEW TESTAMENT", THAT EXISTED IN THE MIND OF GOD, AND WAS OPERATIVE IN THE CHURCH AS ITS LAW, YEARS BEFORE A NEW TESTAMENT BOOK WAS COMPILED; IS THE NEW TESTAMENT JESUS HAD IN MIND WHEN HE SAID; "THIS---CUP---IS THE NEW TESTAMENT--. LK. 22:20; 1 COR. 11:25:
AND NOT YOURS NOR MY BOOKS WE CALL OUR NEW TESTAMENTS.
THOSE NEW TESTAMENTS (BOOKS), ARE CALLED NEW TESTAMENTS, ONLY BECAUSE OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THAT ONE VOLUME OF THOUGHT BY WHICH GOD SAVES THE WORLD THROUGH CHRIST.

Characters

THOSE BOOKS, BY CERTAIN CHARACTERS PRINTED IN THEM, BRINGS TO OUR MINDS THAT "ONE VOLUME OF THOUGHT", THE NEW TESTAMENT IN(RATIFIED BY)THE LORD'S BLOOD.
AND THIS IS THE NEW TESTAMENT JESUS HAD IN MIND WHEN HR SAID, OF THE CUP; "THIS - - - - -CUP - - -IS - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT-".LK.22:20:1 COR.11 25.
BRO.J.L.M. MAY EMBIBE, DRINK IN, ALL HIS NEW TESTAMENT (BOOK) CONTAINS; YET, ALL REMAINS IN THAT BOOK THAT EVER WAS IN IT.
BUT, IF HE EMBIBES, DRINKS, ALL THE WINE THAT IS IN HIS CUP; NOTHING REMAINS.
HONSETLY, DO YOU SEE ANY PARALEL HERE?
IF ONE THOUSAND OF US ALL EM BIBE, DRINK IN, ALL THAT IS CONTAINED IN OUR INDIVIDUAL NEW TESTAMENTS (BOOKS); WE WILL HAVE EMBIBED, DRANK IN, ONE VOLUME OF THOUGHT, ONE NEW TESTAMENT, ONE SPIRIT.
BUT IF ONE THOUSAND OF US DRINKS THECWINE THAT IS IN OUR INDIVIDUAL CUPS RESPECTIVELY; WE WILL HAVE DRANK ONE THOUSAND VOLUMES OF WINE.
COULD YOU EVEN IMMAGINE A PARALEL HERE?
ALL REMAINS IN OUR NEW TESTAMENTS (BOOKS), THAT EVER WAS IN THEM--NOTHING REMAINS IN OUR CUPS. STILL NO PARALEL.
THIS ARGUEMENT OF THESE BRETHREN, HOWEVER HAS ITS PARALEL IN THE OLD SECTERIAN ARGUEMENTS: "MANY WORDS(IN GOD'S WORD), YET ONE WORD: HENCE, MANY CHURCHES YET ONE CHURCH.
"MANY BOOKS (IN THE BOOK, THE BIBLE), YET ONE BOOK: HENCE, MANY CHURCHES YET ONE CHURCH".
YES, THIS OLD IDEA OF TRYING TO GET A PLURALITYOUT OF ONE, WHERE GOD MENTIONS AND GIVES ONE; IS NOT NEW.

NO AMOUNT OF QUIBBLING CAN ESCAPE THE IDEA THAT THE LORD SAID;
"THIS-------IS - - - - -MY BODY- -".(SPEAKING OF THE BREAD).
"THIS - - --IS - - - -MY BLOOD--".(SPEAKING OF THE WINE).
THIS CUP- - -IS - - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT--".
SO WE SEE GOD HAS ONE VOLUME OF THOUGHT, ONE NEW TESTAMENT, ONE SPIRIT; BY AND THROUGH WHICH WE CONTACT THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.
THEN HOW APPROPERIATE HIS WORDS;
THIS CUP - - - - - - - -IS - - - - - - - THE NEW TESTAMENT-- 1
" THIS - - - - - - - - -IS - - - - - - - -MY BLOOD--".
"THIS - - - - - - - - -IS - - - - - --MY BODY--".

ON PAGE TWO HE SHOWS IF ONE WORD REFERS TOO, OR MEANS THE SAME AS ANOTHER WORD; YOU MAY SUBSTITUTE ONE FOR THE OTHER AND DO NO VIOLENCE TO THE TEXT. THIS IS CORRECT, AND AS AN EXAMPLE WE REFER YOU TO MATTH.26: 27; JESUS SAYS, "--DRINK YE ALL OF IT". THE WORD "IT" REFERS TO THE WORD, "CUP"; HENCE, YOU MAY SAY, "DRINK YE ALL OF THE CUP".
THE WORD, "THIS", IN VERSE 28 DOES NOT REFER TO THE WORD "CUP AS BROTHER J.L.M. CONTENDS AS THAT WOUL MAKE IT CONTRADICT JESUS IN LUKE 22:20 AND 1 COR. "11:25; WHERE JESUS SAID IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS:
"THIS CUP P P P P P P P P IS - - - - - - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT - -" IN&RATIFIED)BY HIS BLOOD. HENC, COULD NOT BE THE BLOOD. BUT "THIS, REFERS TO THE PRECEEDING CLAUSE - "THIS" (JESUS SAID) "DRINK YE ALL OF IT"(THE CUP) "IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT--".
AS A PARALEL SENTENCE I REFER YOU TO EPH.6:1; "CHILDREN, OBEY YOUR PARENTS IN THE LORD; FOR THIS IS RIGHT". WHAT DOES "THIS" REFER TOO? GET IT.
FOR THIS (CHILDREN OBEY YOUR PARENTS IN THE LORD); IS RIGHT.
HERE IS ANOTHER PARALEL.
ECCL.12:13; "LET US HEAR THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER: FEAR GOD, AND KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS: FOR THIS IS THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN".
WHAT DOES THISC REFER TOO? GET IT.
""----FOR THIS (FEAR GOD, AND KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS:) IS THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN.
HENCE, WE SEE THAT WHAT THEY "DRANK YE ALL OF IT"(THE CUP) IS THE BLOOD OF THE LORD--AND NOT THE CUP: FOR JESUS SAID, AND DIDN'T STUTTER, WHEN HE SAID; "THIS CUP - --IS - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT IN(RATIFIEDBY)MY BLOOD.
LUKE 22:20; 1 COR 11:25.

WE DO NOT NEED TECHNICAL LOGIC OR GRAMMAR TO PROVE OUR POSITION FOR IT IS PLAINLY STATED IN GOD'S WORD.BUT WHEN THE FORCES OF ERROR GO THERE TO TRY TO OVERTHROW GOD'S STATEMENTS,IT IS OUR BUSINESS TO EXPOSE THEM.

BUT BRO.J.L.M. MAKES THE MISTAKE OF THINKING IF ONE PRONOUN REFERS TO A WORD,EVERY PRONOUN THAT FOLLOWS REFERS TO THATC SAME WORD.THIS IS WHAT HIS EXAMPLES LEADS TOO ANYWAY.SEE HIS EXAMPLES ON MATTH.26:27- 28;ON PAGES TWO AND THREE OF HIS BOOK.

HE BEGINS BY SAYING; "HE TOOK THE CUP"(THE DRINKING VESSEL".

DOES ANYONE DOUBT THAT THERE WAS NOT A CUP,SOMETHING TAKABLE,WHICH HE LITERALLY TOOK?OR DO YOU THINK HE LITERALLY TOOK THE FRUIT OF THE VINE AS HE INDICATES,WHEN HE SAYS;" HE TOOK THE CUP")THE FRUIT OF THE VINE)? WHEN HE GAVE IT";DID HE GIVE THE LITERAL FRUIT OF THE VINE ,ONLY;OR DID HE GIVE THE CUP THAT CONTAINED IT?.BROTHER,YOU CAN NO MORE TAKE THE UNTAKABLE ONLY;NO MORE THAN I CAN DRINK THE UNDRINKABLE LITERALLY.

THE TRUTH IS WE TAKE THE UNTAKABLE(THE WINE),BY TAKING THE TAKABLE(CUP) THAT CONTAINS IT.AND WE DRINK THE UNDRINKABLE(CUP),BY DRINKING THE DRINKABLE (WINE) IT CONTAINS. THERE IS NOTHING FOR EITHER OF US TO GAIN RENDER OURSELVES SILLY BY TRYING TO SHOW THE OTHER FELLOW SILLY.

HERE IS AN EXAMPLE:ON PAGE 6,THE 3 RD.SYLOGISM BRO.J.L.M. GETS THIS CONCLUSION;"THEREFORE THE FRUIT OF THE VINE IS THE ONLY THING THAT IS THE CUP". USING THIS AS A MAJOR PREMISE.

BUT,JESUS TOOK THE CUP" MATTH 26:27.

THEREFORE,THE ONLY THING JESUS TOOK WAS THE FRUIT OF THE VINE.

WE ALL KNOW HE REALLY DID AS JESUS SAID HE TOOK THE CUP(THE VESSEL THAT CONTAINED THE WINE).

HE SAYS THE LORD DEFINED THE CUP AND QUOTES HIM AS SAYING;"THIS(CUP) IS MY BLOOD".MATTH.26:28.

NO HE DIDN'T BROTHER.I WILL PAY $25.00 FOR THIS STATEMENT AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE BIBLE.IF THE LORD WAS DEFINING TERMS;WHAT DID HE REALLY SAY THE CUP WAS ?

THIS CUP ----IS ---THE NEW TESTAMENT --".LUKE 22:20;1 COR 11:25.

WHY DID YOU NOT QUOTE IT THAT WAY BROTHER?

INSTEAD YOU "FIXED" MATTH.26:28 TO FIT YOUR DOCTRINE.THEN LATER YOU TRY TO "FIX" LUKE 22:20 AND 1 COR 11:25 TO FIT YOUR "FIXING" OF MATTH. 26:28.

WHY NOT BELIEVE IT AS IT CAME FROM THE LIPS OF JESUS?? $$??

THIS--------IS ---MY BODY MATTH 26:26.

THIS -------IS -----MY BLOOD-. MATTH 26:27.

THIS CUP- - -IS - - -THE NEW TESTAMENT - - -.LK.22:20;1 COR.11:25.

YOU DON'T HAVE TO GUESS WHAT THE CUP IS;JESUS SAID THAT IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS:"THIS CUP - -IS -C- THE NEW TESTAMENT.

HE SEEMS TO TRY TO CONSOLE HIMSELF WITH WEBSTERS DEFINITION 3.A."THE CONSECRATED WINE OF COMMUNION".LOUIS,WHEN IS WINE THE CONSECRATED WINE OF COMMUNION?LETS LET PAUL TELL US.1 COR 10:16 SHOWS FIRST-"THE CUP OF BLESSING".SECOND,"WHICH WE BLESS".THIRD,THE RESULT--"--THE COMMUNION OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST".

BUT WHAT IS THIS "BLESSING"OF WHICH WE MUST HAVE A CUP OF ?SEE IS.65:8 "---THE NEW WINE IN THE CLUSTER". DID THE BEGINNING SHOW THIS?YES,SEE MATTH.26:27;MK:14:23--" HE TOOK THE (A) CUP". DID IT CONTAIN ANY - THING?YES,SEE MATTH 26:29;MK.14:25;"OF THE FRUIT OF THE VINE"

WAS IT BLESSED?SURE,SEE MATTH 26:27;MARK 14:23."GAVE THANKS".

SURE WINE WITH THOSE REQUSITES IS "THE CONSECRATED WINE OF COMMUNION". THE DEFINITION IS ALL RIGHT.YOU KNOW WHAT A CUP OF WINE,CUP OF WATER ETC IS.WEBSTER,INTER-NAT. 2 ND. EDITION SAYS ALSO DEF.2-B."THE DRINK CONTAIN- IN A CUP" HENCE,PAULS "CUP OF BLESSING" 1 COR 10:16.

DEF.2 IN DEFINING BOTTLE.SAYS;"THE CONTENTS OF A BOTTLE".

DEF.2 DEFINING JUG,SAYS;"THE CONTENTS OF A JUG"

ACCORDING TO THESE CONTAINER BOYS ALL THIS WINE WOULD BE CUP,REGARDLESS OF WHAT IT WAS IN.BUT SMART MEN DIFFER.

PREACHERS HAVE CAUSED PEOPLE TOLERR BY TEACHING BECAUSE THOSE PEOPLE IN MATTH 3:5 WENT OUT OF JERUSELAM AND JUDEA AT THE TIME OF THEIR BAPTISM AND STILL WERE DESIGNATED AS "JERUSELAM AND JUDEA";THEREFORE,A LIQUID CAN BE OUT OF A VESSEL AND STILL BE CALLED BY THE NAME OF THAT VESSELWITHOUT ANY RELATIONSHIP WHATEVER.
FRIENDS,THIS IS NOT TRUE,LOOK AT IT JUST AS YOU SEE IT IN EVERY DAY LANGUAGE;FOR THAT IS THE WAY THE LORD HAS ADDRESSED YOU.
THOSE PEOPLE WERE CALLED "JERUSELAM" AND "JUDEA" BECAUSE THEY RETAINED THEIR CITEZANSHIP IN THOSE RESPECTIVE PLACES,AND NOT MERELY BECAUSE THEY OCUPIED A CERTAIN SPACE WITHIN A CERTAIN AREA.WHILE WITH A CUP AND A LIQUID THE ONLY RELATIONSHIP THAT EXISTS IS THE FACT,THAT THE LIQUID OCUPIES SPACE WITHIN THE CUP.
PEOPLE CAN BE TEMMPERARILY OUT OF A PLACE AND STILL RETAIN THEIR CITEZANSHIP IN THE PLACE AND BE CALLED BY THAT NAME:WHILE WITH A LIQUID WHEN IT IS OUT OF A GIVEN VESSEL,IT IS OUT;AND THAT IS ALL THE RELATIONSHIP THAT EVER EXISTS BETWEEN A VESSEL AND A LIQUID;EXCEPT WHEN THE LIQUID HAD ITS ORIGIN IN THAT PLACE.HENCE,WEBSTERS DEFINITION.DEF.2,B.
CUP;THE DRINK CONTAINED IN A CUP.
BOTTLE;THE CONTENTS OF A BOTTLE.
JUG; THE CONTENTS OF A JUG.ETC.
SOME PREACHERS TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING.

ON PAGE 5 HE GETS ALL MIXED UP ABOUT A CUP OF WINE,WATER ETC.
HE IS ARGUEING THE QUESTION,IF THE WORD CUP WAS USED LITERALLY,AND DECLARES ALL THE LAW IS ON THE CONTENTS AND NOT THE CUP.
WELL,IF IT IS LITERAL JUST AS IT IS STATED IN THE BIBLE;YOU HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE(A) CUP" AND NOT FOR CUPS;THEY ARE NOT MENTIONED AND YOU GET THEM BY PRESUMPTION.--SO THEN WHAT?
IF IT IS USED FIGURATIVELY,BY METONYMY; THE VESSEL IS NAMEDTO SUGGEST ITS CONTENTS;AND "THE(A) CUP" IS ALL THAT IS NAMED;HENCE,ALLTHE CONTENTS SUGGESTED.STILL,YOU GET THE PLURALITY BY PRESUMPTION.THE PRECEDENT IS ONE,EITHER WAY,WHETHER LITERAL OR BY METONYMY;THE OTHERS ARE PRESUMED.

ON PAGE 6,HE INDULGES IN SOME SYLOGISMS.HIS FIRST THREE HAS FOR THEIR MAJOR PREMISEES THE FALSE STATEMENT,"TIE CUP IS THE BLOOD".JESUS IS ACCUSED OF MAKING THIS STATEMENT;BUT BROTHER,J.L.M. MADE THAT STATEMENT AND NOT THE LORD.THE LORD SAID,"THIS CUP--IS--THE NEW TESTAMENT--". HENCE, HIS CONCLUSIONS ARE WRONG.
HIS FOURTH FROM THE TOP HE STARTS WITH LK.22:17 "DIVIDE IT AMONG YOURSELVES".SEPARATE INTO PARTS AMONG YOURSELVES.
BUT NOTICE THE DIVISION WAS TO TAKE PLACE AFTER JESUS GAVE "IT"TO THEM.
HENCE "IT" WAS ONE VOLUME.MATTH.26:27 (SAME IT,ONE VOLUME;SAME GIVING) "--DRINK YE ALL OF IT"(ONE VOLUME).DID THEY OBEY THE LORD?YES,INDEED:SEE MARK14:23(SAME ONE VOLUME,SAME IT;SAME GIVING)."--AND THEY ALL DRANK OF IT".(ONE VOLUM)HENCE,IF "IT" REFERS TO THE WINE THEY ARE WRONG ANYWAY.
HIS SECOND PREMISE IN THIS SYLOGISM IS WRONG,BEING BASED ON THE FALSE STATEMENT,"THE CUP OF THE LORD IS A METONYMY".
"THE CUP OF THE LORD";WHETHER YOU SAY IT IS THE LITERAL WINE OR THE LITERAL CUP IS-- NOT-- A FOGURE OF SPEECH.A METONYMY IS A FIGURE OF SPEECH.THE NAME,WINE;AND THE NAME,CUP;EACH CAN BE USED FIGURATIVELY BY METONYMY:BUT TO SAY A LITERAL THING IS A FIGURE OF SPEECH IS WRONG.
THE STATEMENT IS AMBIGIOUS AND THE BRETHREN WHO MADE THE SYLOGISM NEVER USED IT IN THAT SENSE.

THE SECOND FROM THE BOTTOM IS WRONG,HAVING FOR ONE OF ITS PREMISES THE STATEMENT,"THE CUP IS THE BLOOD".THIS STATEMENT IS NOT A BIBLE STATEMENT;BUT MAN MADE.WHAT JESUS DID SAY WAS;"-THIS CUP--IS--THE NEW TESTAMENT--"LK.22:20;1 COR,11:25.
LAST ON PAGE SIX IS WRONG,FOR HE GETS THE WORD "CUP" IN HIS CONCLUSION WHEN IT IS NOT IN EITHER OF HIS PREMISES.HOW DO YOU GET THAT WORD "CUP" IN YOUR CONCLUSION WHRN IT IS NOT IN EITHER OF YOUR PREMISES?

YOU HAVE NO SCRIPTURE STATING THEY USED CUPS;NEITHER A COMMAND TO USE THEM;AND YOU RESORT TO LOGIC TO PROVE THEM AND VIOLATE THE FONDEMENTAL LAWS GOVERNING IT.
AT THE TOP OF PAGE SEVEN HE PARALELS "PLATE",SOMETHING NOT MENTIONED; WITH "CUP",SOMETHING MENTIONED.
BROTHER ,CANT YOU BEAT THAT?YOU HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE CUP" AND NO MENTION WHATEVER OF THE PLATE.
AGAIN HE ACUSES JESUS OF SAYING,"THE CUP IS THE BLOOD".NOPE!BROTHER,I AM NOT GOING TO LET YOU PALM THAT OFF ON THE LORD.J.L.M.SAID THAT.
JESUS SAID "THIS CUP---IS ----THE NEW TESTAMENT--".LK.22:20;1 COR11;25.

HE ASKS THE QUESTION,"WAS THE VESSEL SHED"?I ASK HIM IN RETURN,WAS THE WINE SHED FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS;ORC WAS JESUS7 BLOOD SHED FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS?

ON PAGE SEVEN UNDER THE HEADING,"MUST BE IN A CUP TO BE CALLED CUP",HE SAYS;THESE GOOD BRETHREN CONTEND A THING MUST BE IN A CUP (A DRINKINGC VESSEL)-AND NOT IN A BOTTLE OR POT)BEFORE IT CAN BE CALLED A CUP.LET US SEE ABOUT THIS".
THEN HE QUOTES "THE CUP OF SNARES"-PS.11:6.
CUP OF WHICH THE LORD IS A PORTION,PS.16:5."CUP OF JOY",PS.23:5.
" CUP OF SALVATION",PS.116:13. "CUP OF TREMBLING",IS.57:17.
"CUP OF CONSOLATION",JER.16:7. "THE CUP OF FURY OUT OF WHICH ALL NATIONS OF THE EARTH MUST DRINK",JER.25:15-28.
"THE CUP OF ASTONISHMENT AND DESOLATION",EZEK.23:31-33.
"JERUSELAM A CUP OF TREMBLING",ZECH 12:2.
"CUP OF SUFFERING AND DEATH", MATTH.26:39.
"CUP OF INDIGNATION",REV.14:10."CUP OF WRATH",REV.16:19.
"CUP OF ABOMINATIONS",REV.17:4.
BROTHER WERE ANY OF THESE THINGS MENTIONED IN A PITCHER,POT OR BOILER? REMEMBER HE WAS TO PROVE IT COULD BE.
DOES HE MEAN BY THE ABOVE ARGUEMENT BECAUSE "CUP" WAS USED FIGURATIVLY THAT THERE IS NO LITERAL CUP IN THE COMMUNION?IF SO,THEN WHY DO THEY RAISE SUCH A HOWL FOR SO MANY? WAS THE DRINK IN THESE PASSAGES LITERAL WWINE?IF NOT THEN WOULD IT NOT BE JUST A S GOOD ARGUEMENT FOR DOING AWAY WITH THE WINE IN THE COMMUNION.
READ MATTH.20:21-23;HERE YOU SEE "CUP" AND "BAPTIZED",USED IN THE SAME SENSE AS IT IS USED IN MOST OF THE PASSAGES HE HAS QUOTED.
IF THEY MEAN NO LITERAL CUP IN THE COMMUNION;THEN WOULDENT IT ALSO MEAN NO LITERAL WATER IN BAPTISM?IF NOT,WHY NOT?
A LIQUID DOESN'T HAVE TO BE IN A CUP TO BE CALLED A CUP;EH?
BY THE SAME LOGIC WOULDN'T PEOPLE BE CHRISTIANS WITHOUT BEING IN CHRIST? THEN A BODY OF PEOPLE COULD BE CALLED "THE BODY OF CHRIST"WITHOUT BEING IN THE BODY OF CHRIST?YOU SAID TOO MUCH DID YOU NOT?

O,WHAT A SWEET MORSEL;WINE CAN BE CUP WITHOUT BEING IN A CUP AND YOU CAN DRINK IT OF THE "CONTAINER"OF YOUR CHOICE.THEN,BY THIS BRAND OF HUMAN WISDOM;PEOPLE CAN BE CHRISTIANS WITHOUT BEING IN CHRIST AND YOU CAN JOIN THE CHURCH OF YOUR CHOICE. YUM,YUM,YUM.
ANY ONE KNOWS IN ALL THESE PASSAGES GIVEN BY BROTHER J.L.M. THEX WORD "CUP IS USED FIGURATIVELY,BUT THE "DRINKING" WAS JUST AS FIGURATIVE: WHILE IN THE COMMUNION THE DRINKING IS LITERAL WITH A LITERAL ELEMENT TO DRINK;AND IT TAKES A LITERAL VESSEL TO HANDLE IT WITH;BUT WE HAVE ONE,"THE(A) CUP"BY SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT.
HENCE ALL OF THOSE SCRIPTURES GIVEN BY HIM ABOVE,AS FAR AS THE COMMUNION IS CONCERNED;IS IRELEVANT AND HAVE NO BEARING ON THE SUBJECT .

BROTHER,NEVER LET THIS SLIP YOUR MIND:WHAT SCRIPTURE DO THEY USE TO SHOW A PLURALITY OF CUPS WERE USED BY ANY APOSTOLIC CHURCH?
OR,WHERE HAS GOD COMMANDED US TO SPEAK THIS WORD,"CUPS",IN HIS NAME? NONE.THEN IT MUST BE A PRESUMPTION.DEUT.13:20.

BROTHER,YOU CAN'T TAKE AN INDIVIDUAL CUP FOR EACH PEARSON IN EVERY NATION NEAR AS EASILY AS I COULD ONE.SO WHERE IS YOUR ARGUEMENT? REMEMBER IT NOT THAT HE DOESN'T WANT ANY CUP AT ALL.NO,NO;HE WANTS LOTS OF CUPS :I ONLY WANT "THE (A) CUP" FOR WHICH I HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT.

BUT HE SURELY HITS THE HIGH SPOT ON PAGES 11 AND 12.ON THESE PAGES HE PROVES TO HIS OWN SATISFACTION THAT DEVILS HAD A PLURALITY OF CUPS TO DRINK FROM.

HE SUMS UP THE WHOLE THING BY SAYING;"IF THE CUP OF DEVILS CAN BE IN A PLURALITY OF VESSELS,IN HOW MANY VESSELS CAN THE CUP OF THE LORD BE"? NOW,THERE YOU HAVE HIS PRECEDENT,THE CUP OF DEVILS.HE DID FINELY OUT WITH IT,

HE CAN'T SEE WHY,AS HE PUTS IT;"IF THE CUP OF DEVILS CAN BE IN A PLURALITY OF VESSELS,IN HOW MANY CAN THE CUP OF THE LORD BE"? THIS WAS NO SLIP OF THE PEN WITHOUT IT SLIPPED MORE THAN ONCE SEE SECOND PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM PAGE 13,"THE CUP QUESTION"BY J.L.MUSGRAVE AND YOU WILL SEE HE MADE THE SAME STATEMENT.

WE HAVE A SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR "THE (A) CUP" WHEN DEALING WITH THE COMMUNION;BUT HE SEEMS TO THINK HE CAN DO AS DEVILS DO.

HE DOESN'T SEEM TO REALIZE THAT THE DEVIL "ABODE NOT IN THE TRUTH"ST. JNO.8:44. HENCE, HIS CUP WOULD BE A LIE ORCELSE HE WOULD BE ABIDING PARTIALLY IN THE TRUTH.

IF I SHOULD CALL A LOT OF CUPS A CUP I CERTAINLY WOULD BE LIEING.

O,BUT SAYS ONE THE APOSTLE PAUL IN 1 COR.10:21 WAS THE ONE THAT CALLED IT THE "CUP OF DEVILS",AND YOU WOULD BE CALLING HIM A LISR.

YES, AND THAT SAME APOSTLE SAID (CONCERNING THE GODS OF DEVILS),"THERE ARE GODS MANY"--BUT HE FURTHER SHOWS THERE IS REALLY ONLY ONE GOD.

SO WE SEE THE LORD OFTEN MENTIONS THEIR PRACTICE AS THEY THEMSELVES PRACTICE IT.

SEE ALSO MANY PLACES IN THE BIBLE WHERE THE BIBLE SPEAKS OF HEATHERN G GODS AS THEY REALLY EXISTED.WHILE IN OTHER PLACES HE SHOWS THERE IS BUT ONE TRUE LIVING GOD.

LET ME BEG OF YOU FRIEND,WHEN ANYONE TELLS YOU THAT ANY ITEM IN HIS WORSHIP IS PATTERNED AFTER DEVILS WORSHIP;YOU LEAVE THAT SEVERELY ALONE.

THERE IS AS MUCH DIFFERENCE IN THE PRACTICE OF GOD'S PEOPLE AND THE PRACTICE OF DEVILS AS THERE IS BETWEEN HEAVEN AND HELL;RIGHTEOUSNESS AND UNRIGHTEOUSNESS.

HOW CAN ANY MAN DISTRACT FROM THE SANCTY OF THE COMMUNION SERVICE,BY S SAYING HE COULD FOLLOW THE PRACTICE OF DEVILS IN THE VERY LEAST DETAIL, IN THE WORSHIP OF OUR LORD AND MASTER.

NO,BRO,BEDINGFIELD DIDN'T DO THIS;HE DID IT HIMSELF.

I AM ONLY POINTING IT OUT TO YOU.

DESTITUTE OF PROOF A MANS PRACTICE MUST BE INDEED,TO RESORT TO SUCH PROOF AS THIS:AND YET,SOME WILL FOLLOW.

THERE IS NO ESCAPE;FOLLOW J.L.MUSGRAVE AND THE PRECEDENT OF DEVILS AND USE A PLURALITY OF CUPS IN THE COMMUNION:OR FOLLOW THE SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT SET BY THE LORD AND FOLLOWED BY THE APOSTLES AND USE "THE(A)CUP".

MAY THE LORD HELP USALL TO GET AS FARX AWAY FROM THE PRACTICE OF DEVILS AS PO SIBLE IS MY PRAYER.

YOURS IN CHRIST

J.S.BEDINGFIELD.