MCCAY-WATERS DEBATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proposition: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural."……3

Mr. Waters, First Affirmative 3

Mr. McCay, First Negative 9

Mr. Waters, Second Affirmative 17

Mr. McCay, Second Negative 25

Mr. Waters, Third Affirmative 33

Mr. McCay, Third Negative 41

Mr. Waters, Fourth Affirmative 49

Mr. McCay, Fourth Negative 57

Proposition: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by G. Earl McCay is scriptural."……65

Mr. McCay, First Affirmative 65

Mr. Waters, First Negative 73

Mr. McCay, Second Affirmative 81

Mr. Waters, Second Negative 89

Mr. McCay, Third Affirmative 99

Mr. Waters, Third Negative 107

Mr. McCay, Fourth Affirmative 115

Mr. Waters, Fourth Negative 123

Proposition: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural."

Mr. Waters, First Affirmative

Brother Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends. I believe that by being honest, fair, candid, unprejudiced, and unbiased, that we will be able perhaps to resolve our differences. It is indeed lamentable that the disciples of Christ have been struck blows by divisions such as the one which is at issue. Our efforts are hindered. We cannot do the good that we would do. We are not able to convert many souls to Christ. And it is of the utmost importance that we, without bias and without prejudice, discuss such differences as this. And I plead with you tonight that you hear every word which is spoken by either of us, every scripture which is read, and every argument which is introduced that way, weighing them all in the balance of truth, that you may arrive at a sound, sane, and scriptural conclusion concerning the issue in hand.

It is not to be thought that Brother McCay and I are disagreed on everything because we disagreed on this, because I am sure that we agree on far more things than we disagree on. And that as pertains to most of the principal issues which face the Brotherhood today, he and I have agreed wholehearted on those.

But the issue which faces us in this discussion has been of such a nature as to bring between us a barrier which makes it thus far impossible for us to work together in the interests of the cause of Jesus Christ. It is "*to the law and to the testimony*" (Isaiah 8:20), to those scriptures which were spoken of in II Timothy 3:16, to that "truth which makes (us) free" (John 8:32), which "sanctified" us (John 17:17), that I make my appeal tonight. For I realize that if my practice and the practice of those brethren whom I endorse in the observance of the communion service be not found in the word of God, that the things which we teach are as a mere bubble which should be bursted. That we ourselves, by the handling of our teaching of these things are like the raging waves of the sea, full of water and unsafe. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that we be able to go to the word of God and find therein a "thus saith the Lord" for what we teach and what we practice.

I'll now give my attention to the affirmative on this proposition: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural." My manner, of course, as found in the way, the method of handling the Eucharist is exceptional and not usual. I realize it. By these words, I refer to the loaf which is used in the communion and "in the communion", of course, is the center of the proposition. "Those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Watery' refers, of course, to those congregations whose practice with reference to the handling of the bread I endorse. By "is scriptural" I mean that this manner of handling the bread comports with the Holy Scriptures, that this manner of handling the bread comports with the teaching of the word of God. That is what I mean by "is

scriptural".

But now then the question arises of what is the manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations which I endorse? What is it that we do to that bread and how do we use it? By the bread, I refer to the loaf. Now, I am sure that Brother McCay and I agree that that should be one loaf and further that that loaf should be unleavened, that each server of the Church of Christ at the communion should use one unleavened loaf of bread.

Now, what is the manner of those congregations endorsed by me? Well, when we come together to observe the communion service, we take a loaf of unleavened bread and we, with reference to that bread, break it and eat it. Every individual member of the body of Christ, every member of the congregation of the assembly breaks that bread and eats that bread. That, indeed, is the manner of handling the bread in those congregations which I endorse. When we come together to observe the communion, we all break bread and we all eat bread. That is the practice which my respondent tonight is obligated to deny.

And I notice that we have here on the board as request written, I presume, by Brother McCay or someone else at his request: "Please write here book, chapter, and verses that teach the manner of handling the bread in the communion by your brethren, or that teach that the manner of handling the bread in the communion by your brethren is scriptural." I shall write some of those verses on the board immediately.

Now, remember that there are specifically two things which we do with reference to the bread. To be specific at this time, when we come together to observe the communion: First, we break bread; second, we eat bread or the loaf.

Now, what scriptures will teach that we break bread and that we eat bread in the communion service? What scriptures will teach that we all eat bread and that we all break bread in the communion — in the observance of the communion, in the handling of bread? I call your attention first to I Corinthians, the 10th chapter and the 16th and 17th verses. The apostle said: "*The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*" "*The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*" I have now, in the first reference which I have read from the word of God with reference to the bread, read the first act which I placed on the board with reference to it. We break bread. Paul, what do we do? "*The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*" I have in so many words an apostolic statement which asserts the practice denied by my respondent tonight. And so he finds himself in the unenviable position of denying an apostolic statement. Paul said "*The bread which we break.*"

Well, what else do we do? We eat bread. And Paul said (I Corinthians 10:17): "*For we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers.*" And if you partake of anything, what do you do? You eat. "*For we are all partakers of that one bread."* Paul said "*We break*" and he said "*we partake*" or we eat. I have read you those two essential acts in apostolic statement I Corinthians 10, verses 16 and 17, and I will rest my case tonight

upon that one apostolic statement in the assurance, in the confidence, and in the conviction that regardless of how many people may oppose, of how many men may object, that this practice stands and it will stand. We break. Paul said "*The bread which we break.*" He said "*For we all are partakers of that bread.*"

The question arises: Who breaks bread? Who is it that breaks bread in the communion service? Is the breaking of bread in the communion service an, an overly special act performed only by the ones serving at the table? Or is the breaking of bread an act performed by every communicant? Let us turn back to the second chapter of Acts and the 42nd verse: "*And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread.*" Who continued in the breaking of bread? They did. (Acts 2 and 42) Not just one of them, but they. In Acts the 20th chapter and the 7th verse, the apostle said, "*On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.*" Who came together to break bread? Luke says that the "disciples" came together. How many of them? The disciples. Who? The disciples. Plural. And in I Corinthians 10 and 16 again we read: "*The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*" In Matthew 26 and 26, we read where Jesus broke. Now we will turn and read: "*And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.*" Now, we notice here that they broke, the disciples broke, or that we break and Jesus broke. Jesus was the first one to break bread , the bread of the communion. He was the *first* one to ever do it. Jesus was the first one to break bread, but he was followed by others, and according to the word of God "*they brok*e", "*the disciples broke*", and Paul said "*we break*". It is not a matter of my denying that Jesus broke, because I have been taught to believe that with all of my religion, with all of my practice, with all of my heart. It is a matter of someone else denying that "*we break*", that "*the disciples break*", and that "*they broke*". No matter how many deny that Jesus broke, I admit that he broke. I believe that he broke. It is a matter of someone denying that "*we break*", that "*the disciples break*", and that "*they broke*".

I would call your attention now to I Corinthians 10:16 and 17 with reference to bread eating. The breaking of bread is an individual. . . is an individual act, not an act performed by one man in the congregation, but it is an individual act performed by every communicant. Paul said, "*For we.*" All right, let's see what the. . . or who the "*we*" is. Paul said, "*For we being many.*" Notice that. "*For we being many.*" How are you going to get your "*many*" from just one in a congregation? "*We being many.*" "*Many.*" Oh, but somebody says you might have a hundred congregations... a hundred, one in each congregation breaking bread, that would mean many. All right, let's see what many it is. "*We being many.*" What many? "*... are one bread and one body.*" What many? The many who are of one body, one body. Let's read a little more about that later.

We turn to Romans, the 12th chapter and the 4th and 5th verses: "*For as we have many members in one body.*" There's the same many connected with the body; those who make up the body. We have to have many members in one body and all members have the same office. "*For we being many are one body.*"

There's the. . . there are the ones who break bread. The many who constitute one body. But I'll read further in I Corinthians the 12th chapter, the same epistle in which this verse is contained, beginning with verse 13, or verse 12: "*For as the body is one, and hath many members*". How, the body has many members, but what do those members do? Why Paul said: "*We being many*". What do we do? "*We break.*" "*We break*." What many? Why, the many who are of one body. (I Corinthians 10:17) All right, what about the "*we*"? "*We being many are one body.*" In I Corinthians 12:20 it says, quote: "*Now are they many members, yet but one body*". So what are the members going to do? Why, the members who are of one body break... Paul said "*we*" — the many — the one body — "*We break.*" What else do we do? The very same "*we*" who breaks, the very same "*we*" who are many, the very same "*we*" who constitute one body. What else do "*we*" do? "*For we are all partakers.*" The same "*we*" who breaks is the "*we*" who partakes. And that's the many who constitute one body. (I Corinthians 10:16 & 17).

I will not deny one single verse with reference to the communion. I believe every one of them with all of my heart. We practice them. We preach them. We believe them. Now, let me read the proposition again: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural. What? "The manner of handling the bread." What is the manner of handling the bread? We all break bread. We all eat bread. That's the manner of handling it. Well, what does the Bible say about it? Paul said: "*We break*" and "*we partake*. " (I Corinthians 10:16 & 17) Well, what do we believe about the eating? We believe that the eating is an individual act performed by every communicant. Jesus said: "*Take, eat.*" Paul said: "*For we are all partakers.*" What do we believe about the breaking? We believe that the breaking of the bread is an act performed by every communicant and Paul said: "*For we break*" — "*the bread which we break.*" Luke said: "*They continued the breaking of bread.*" Luke said: "*The disciples came together to break the bread.*"

When I serve at the table, what do I do? I break bread; I eat bread. And I want my respondent to hear this: Which one of them is it to which he objects? Does he object to my eating bread? If so, then he objects to my doing what I'm told to do. Does he object to my eating bread? I assume that he doesn't, but if he does, I'll be glad to hear from him. Does he object to my breaking bread? If he does, he is in a very peculiar position, because he believes that one serving at the table is supposed to break bread. When I serve at the table, what do I do? I break bread. If you don't believe it, you watch me sometime. I take the bread and I break it. Does he object to my breaking bread? Well, I'm sure he will say I believe one who serves at the table is supposed to break the bread. What do I do? I break bread. That's just what I do, I break the bread. Now, if it isn't that he objects to that breaking, he'll have to pull out something with reference to it to which he objects. Well, he says: "I object to the manner in which you break." What does he mean? Well, you don't break a big enough piece off? Is that what you mean? This is going to be interesting. Will he deny that that manner of

breaking which I practice does not fulfill the meaning of both the English and Greek word for "*break*"? When I serve at the table, what do I do? I break bread and it fulfills the Book, the definition of the English and the Greek word. I break bread fulfills the definition of both words. Does Brother McCay believe that we are supposed to break bread if we serve at the table? I do. Does he believe that we are supposed to eat? I do.

Now then, I want to know what act do I do when I serve at the table… what act do I do that I'm not supposed to do? What act do I do that I'm not supposed to do? And get this, and what am I supposed to do that I don't do? Now, I want that both ways. Now, when I serve at the table, what do I do that I'm not supposed to do? I break bread; I eat bread. What do I do that I'm not supposed to do? And I will put it another way now: What am I supposed to do that I don't do? Is there anything that I'm supposed to do besides break and eat? I do both. Do I do anything I am not supposed to do? If so, you've got to eliminate the eating or you've got to eliminate the breaking. If I do something I'm not supposed to do, I'll have to eliminate the break or the eat. Which one can you eliminate?

And if I'm not doing all that I am supposed to do, you got to add something besides break and eat. What are you going to add? You've got to subtract one or you've got to add some. What are you going to add? What are you going to subtract? To break and eat. When I serve at the table, I break bread; I eat bread. What can you add to that? What could you subtract from it, the breaking or the eating?

Now, I want you to think about this. I believe that Brother McCay and I, if we would just take the word of God, if we'll take what is… what is necessary to fulfill the scriptures, if we'll accept what can be a common ground of unity upon which we can unite without sacrificing one single word of scripture, we will be able to agree in this discussion. We need Jesus. We need to be able to work together and that's why I'm appealing to you. I want you to use your mind. I want you to use your intellect, because we are thinking beings. God made us that way. He gave us intellectual faculties and He intends for us to use our minds. And I want you to use yours.

When we come together in observance of the communion, when I serve at the table, what do I do that I'm not supposed to do? What single, solitary act do I do that I am not supposed to do? I break bread; I eat bread. Which one would you eliminate? What single, solitary act is there that I don't do that I am supposed to do? I'd like to find out what it is, what it is you would add; what it is you would object to. Why, we ought to be able to agree on this. There is not a thing difficult about it. Not a thing hard to understand about it, not of either act I perform when serving at the table. I break bread; I eat bread. I've done nothing that I am not supposed to do and there is nothing that I am supposed to do that I haven't done.

Now, when I am there, I give that to the other disciples. What do they do? Well, they break and they eat. Now I want to ask this question: We'll pass on

now from me... What are they who are supposed to serve at the table to do? What have they done that they're not supposed to do? Each one breaks and eats. What has he done that he's not supposed to do?

And is there anything that he is supposed to do that he hasn't done? I want to know what I at the table have done that I'm not supposed to do, or what I am supposed to do that I haven't done, and I want to know now, with reference to those other disciples present, what they've done that they're not supposed to do or what they are supposed to do that they haven't done. We are going to get to the issues. We are going to wear this thing down. We want to... we want to get right down to a certain specific act. There is either something that the assembled disciples are not doing that *they are* supposed to do or they are doing *something* that they are not supposed to do. Or the one who serves at the table is not doing something that he is supposed to do or he is doing something he is not supposed to do. Now, we want to know which. This is certainly going to be interesting.

The proposition reads "The Manner of Handling the Bread."

Mr. McCay, First Negative

Fellow orators, ladies and gentlemen. I am glad to have the opportunity this evening to stand before you in defense of truth as I can read it in the Word of God. Brother Waters has a nice personality. He has very much earnestness and is a pretty good hand at arguing. But I want to call your attention to this fact, that personality is not truth, earnestness is not truth, arguing is not truth. The only thing that is truth is what we can read here in the Word of God. I have never entered into a debate with any other reason than to present truth, all the truth, and nothing but the truth to the audience. I am not exactly satisfied with the way Brother Waters used his proposition. Everything is fine excepting the manner. He has not yet told you the manner that they break the bread. I never have worshiped with him, but my son did and I asked him tonight just how they break the bread and I want Waters to tell you how — not just use the word "manner' — not just claim that they break it, but tell you exactly how they break it. That's the only issue between us: The question whether he breaks it like the Bible teaches it or whether he breaks it differently from what the Bible teaches.

Now, I wish to call attention to Isaiah 1:18 "*Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord.*"

The Lord has placed the result of His reasoning in the Word and He asks you and He asks me to come and reason with Him; that is, reason in accordance to the teaching of this Word and if I do that, I am bound to arrive at a correct conclusion.

Now, before we enter into the discussion, I wish to read a little. We didn't sign any agreement as to how to conduct this debate and can conduct it just as we wish to. Waters will conduct it as he wishes to and McCay will conduct it as he wishes to. Both of us shall lend the Spirit of Christ. I like that idea that the moderator mentioned, that we should show the Spirit of Christ. If anyone has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His. But remember, when Christ saw people that were in the wrong, He criticized them more severely than I am going to criticize doctors during this debate. And so I can show the Spirit of Christ and still criticize, still do as Titus 1:13 says: "*…rebuke them sharply…*" And he is talking of false teachers. He is commanding the true, loyal preacher of the Gospel, if he finds a false teacher, to rebuke that false teacher sharply. Now, I wish to read:

"Dear Brother Phillips:

> "I find in the April issue of The Truth a reprint of a fine article of Brother King's taken from the March issue of the O. P. A. [Old Paths Advocate]. I believe it will do a lot of good to call especial attention to some of the things in that article. Would you please to print an open letter from me to Brother King in regard to some of the things he wrote? The letter follows:"

"Dear Brother King:

"I have just read in the April issue of The Truth a reprint of an article by you in the March issue of the 0. P. A. It is certainly worth being read and studied more than once. I wish to refer especially to your question:

"Preach what? Preach the Word; preach the Gospel; yes, preach the Gospel. Why? For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation. We preachers should ever remember that since our preaching should ever be to the end that people may have salvation and this salvation is produced as a result of preaching the Gospel, not our opinions, not our imaginations. I have listened to a few sermons the last few years by some of our younger preachers, in which things not in the Gospel, not in the Word, but purely and wholly their imaginations which they read between the lines, composed at least seventy-five per cent of the words of those sermons. This may be entertaining and interesting to some people, but I do believe it is a dangerous trend. Brother, you can read in the Gospel, in the Word, but you need to preach in the pulpit."

"I say Amen to that last sentence. If you cannot read it in the Word, it is dangerous to preach it. I am encouraged to hear such words from you. All division in the church today is because some have preached things they cannot read in the Word or have failed to preach things that are in the Word. In the last thirty-one years, principles have been preached by you and others and according to a letter from you to me, those principles have been defended in whole degree for the last fifteen years, which principles I have not been able to find in the Gospel, in the Word. I refer to the teaching that the one who waits at the communion table should, after thanks are given, break off a small piece of bread and pass the remainder of the bread to the other members in one piece. It has been preached that Christ broke off a small piece of the bread, ate it, and then passed it in one piece to the other members. . oh... to the disciples. After reading the Book for fifty years, I am not able to find that principle in the Gospel, in the Word. If you can find it there, I would for you to send to Brother Phillips and ask him to print in The Truth the chapters and verses in the Gospel, the Word, where those teachings may be found. If you cannot find such verses, then it follows that you have been preaching your opinions or imaginations of your heart, which things you condemn in your article. As in the first part of the article you teach that people should be honest, I will be honest with you and not ask you to take the time and energy to find that Christ, after giving thanks, broke off a small piece and ate it and then passed the remainder in one piece to the disciples, and will send same to Brother Phillips to be

printed so we all may know them. I will send you Post Office money order for $5.00 for each verse. If you cannot find them, will you quit teaching such doctrine and come back to the teachings of the Gospel and help us to strive to save people?"

"Trusting that you will consider this carefully, I am."

"Sincerely,

"G. Earl McCay, Springfield, Oregon"

Now, I will call attention to some of the things that Brother King says. This isn't Brother McCay's idea; its Brother King's idea and I said Amen to it. If an individual cannot read in the Gospel, in the Word, that Jesus took... oh, that cannot teach... 'er read what he is teaching, then he is teaching his imagination, he is teaching his opinions, he is teaching that which he reads between the lines and not in the Word of God. And I am certain that King, nor Waters, nor any other man can find a single verse in Gospel, the Word, that teaches that Jesus Christ, when He offered thanks for the bread broke off a little piece and ate it and then passed the remainder in a whole piece to the apos... to the disciples or to the apostles. Now, if he can produce that one verse that says so, I have the $5.00 in my pocket tonight, but the verse must say that; he mustn't read between the lines; he mustn't pass his own opinion upon it; he mustn't preach imagination. But if he will find the verse that says that Jesus did it in that manner, the $5.00 is his when he produces the verse.

As he said in his speech, we want to come to the Word. And we are going to come to grips on it in this debate. We are going to come to the Word and I am going to show you that he, in his tract, which I have in my brief case, teaches at least twenty ideas, twenty conclusions that he cannot find a single verse in the Scriptures that will bear him out. Now, you can come to Howard's place any time during this debate between 9:00 and 12:00 — I'll not search the Scriptures in the afternoon — I'm an old man — I haven't traveled as far as Brother Waters has to get here, but I am an old man and I have to rest in the afternoon. If you will come there, I will take his tract on the Communion and show you that there are twenty... twenty ideas, twenty conclusions to which he comes in that tract that are the result of his imagination and he doesn't quote a single verse to prove the conclusion, not a single one.

Now, in the October issue of the O. P. A., Brother Waters furnished the readers of that paper with a little article about G. Earl McCay of Springfield, Oregon. Now I am honored sometimes, you know, to get my name in the paper, but I do want people to tell the truth when they are putting it there. And I... uh... when Howard wrote me about it I said: "Howard, I want to see the article myself. Then, if it isn't true, I will write Waters about it." After I had read the article, I wrote Brother Waters a letter and I said to him, with other things: "There were some things you wrote in that article that Webster would call a lie. I don't know that you would call it a lie, but Webster would call it a lie." But I

did thank him for one thing that he put in. I thanked him for putting the last thing that says: "*Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?*" (Psalms 2:l). Because that put a question in my mind. I am a great man if I have…if I have a question, to study until I learn the answer to the question. David asked the question; Waters called my attention to it; and I found the answer to it. And if, when you get home — now, I won't take time to read that Psalm — if you will read the second Psalm when you get home, you'll find the argument that David was making there, that those people raged and imagined vain things because they were objecting to the Son of God. David was referring to the time when he is going to be tried and the reason that some people are imagining vain things today is because they do not respect the Word of God as they should respect it.

Now, I want to call attention to a few things about this imagining and these vain things. Why do people imagine vain things? I turn now to Matthew 15:9. There the Saviour said: "*…in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the precepts of men.*" Now, there are two different kinds of worship. There is true worship which will prepare you for heaven. There is vain worship which will not prepare you for heaven and the vain worship is the result of the precepts of men being taught to the people as a doctrine. Now, I will ask you this question: Where is the true doctrine? It's found here in the Word of God. Any doctrine that you cannot read in the Word of God is based upon the precepts of men and any worship that is based upon any doctrine that you cannot read in the Word of God is a vain worship and it will send the people who perform it to the wrong place, because it being vain, it will not prepare them for heaven or take them there.

Now, let us turn again. I Corinthians 4:5, 6. The Apostle Paul says there: "*Brethren, I have in a figure transferred these things to… of… of me and Apollos that in us you should learn not to go beyond what is written.*" What is written, is written here in the Word, and if Waters, or any other preacher, preaches something that he cannot read here in the Word, he has disobeyed the admonition of the Holy Spirit and gone beyond what is written. Turn now with me to Romans 10:17. "*So faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God.*" So, if you cannot read within the Word of God, it is not a faith. If any principle or any practice… if what he teaches or practices cannot be read in the Word of God, it is not a faith. Romans 14:23 says: "*… whatsoever is not of faith is sin,*" Turn with me to Hebrews 12:1,2: "*Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, ever looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith…*" Jesus is the author and finisher of faith. In other words, faith begins and ends in the teachings of Jesus Christ, Now, I have asked him to put some Scripture upon the board. He put that one in and I am mighty glad that he did, because I am going to show you — if the Lord will keep… let me have health for four nights — I am going to show you that according to Webster, he did not tell you the truth when he put it there and argued it, because he kept back

something that he should have told that is taught in the Word of God. Oh, he quoted it correctly all right, but he kept back a principle that is taught in the Word of God that should be applied to it, which I will, if the Lord wills, apply before we get through.

Now, turn again, and we will find that in the third chapter of the Colossian letter and the seventeenth verse, there is a command laid down for the people to follow. Now, this is for a congregation to follow. Sometimes people get an idea that just because something is said, it's for an individual. It may be for a congregation, or it may be for an individual. Now, let us notice as to what it says: "*And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.*" Webster says "*in the name of"* means "by the authority of". So whatsoever you do in word — that's in what you teach — or deed — that's in what you practice, you must do it by the authority of Jesus Christ. There are two means that Christ authorizes anything: One is by precept; the other is by example. Now, if Brother Waters cannot find where Jesus Christ taught that after they had blessed the loaf, they would break off a little piece — now, get it, brethren —not just break it, but break off a little piece and eat it, then Christ has not authorized him to teach it and Christ has not authorized him to practice it unless he can also read that that's the way that Christ did it. If he can read that Christ just broke off a little piece and gave it, instead of breaking it, probably, in the way that I will argue when I get in the affirmative, and I'll not only argue it, but I'll prove it by the Word of God and the meaning of the word "*break*". If he cannot do it, then he has disobeyed that command that says: "*Whatsoever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord.*"

Now, then, what is the result of disobedience? Turn with me to Hebrews 2:1, 2: "*Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that we have heard, lest at any time we let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation?*" Under the Old Testament Scriptures, every disobedience was punished. Now, then, if they practice something that Christ has not authorized them to practice, if they preach something that Christ has not authorized them to teach, they are disobeying Colossians 3:17. And now then, the apostle has asked them the question: How can we escape if we neglect salvation? What is it to neglect salvation? It is to fail to do what we are told to do in God's Word and insist only on what the Word of God teaches or it is transgression and disobedience. But now what is it that we wish to escape? Well, there is only one thing that you and I wish to escape and that's Hell. And the apostle is asking how can we escape Hell if we disobey, under the New Testament Scripture, and if you brethren, or any brethren practice in the handling of bread something that they cannot read in the Word of God, they are disobeying Colossians 3:17 and they will... if the Word of God is true... unless they repent and come back and work with us by teaching the Word of God, accept it exactly as it is revealed there, they will go to that place that I intend to escape. And I wish that they could escape it, but they can't do it if they disobey or break a statement of the

Word of God.

Now, I wish to turn you to II Peter 2:1. There Peter said that "*there were false prophets among the people, as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.*" Now, get this, friends, this was among members of the Church of Christ —"*…there shall be false teachers among you…*" He was writing to members of the Church of Christ and Peter said, "*…there shall be…*", so don't be surprised if I find one of those preachers in … during this debate, as are meeting Brother Waters in this discussion. "*False teachers … who privily shall bring in damnable heresies…*" Now I would wonder, if I didn't reason some more about it, as to why Peter called them "*damnable heresies*". I'll tell you why. Every heresy preached by people and believed by people will damn the individual who preaches it and damn the people who believe it. That's the reason that the Apostle Peter called them "*damnable heresies*", because they will damn the fellow that preaches it and they will damn the people that believe it. I am only recounting what the Apostle Peter says about it.

Now, let us notice another thing. What is an heresy? Well, it comes from the Greek word that is defined "choice", and what is that? I have no choice in what I should preach. No preacher has any choice as to what he should preach. God says: Preach the Word. Now, get it, friends. If Waters or McCay preaches something that he cannot read in the Word, he is preaching that which is of his own choosing and because it is of his choice — the word "*heresy*" means" "choice", or the Greek word from which we get the word "*heresy*" means "choice". It is an heresy that he is preaching. And so it is up to Waters and when I get in the affirmative, it will be up to McCay to read what I am teaching. It is up to Waters to read where the Saviour — that He offered thanks for that loaf, broke off a little piece and ate it, and then passed the rest to the disciples in a whole piece. If he cannot read it in God's Word, he is preaching an heresy when he does preach that principle to his people or to any other people as we are here in the audience tonight.

Now, let us turn again. I Timothy 4:1: "*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron.*" Now, the Spirit says this; it isn't McCay saying it. The Spirit speaks expressly that "*some shall depart from the faith*". Now, they cannot depart from the faith, unless they have been in the faith. Oh, yes, these people are Church of Christ people, too, that the Spirit says will depart from the faith "*giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy*". Oh, that's terrible for the individual to say that people will speak lies. It's the Holy Spirit saying it. I can have the spirit of Christ and still claim that there will be people in the Church of Christ, that there will be preachers in the Church of Christ who will give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils and who will speak lies in their preaching. Now then, friends, we are going to get down to brass tacks and I am going to state here that if the Lord

wills, now James said "*if the Lord wills*", I'll live and show you that Waters, even tonight in his preaching, has done what Webster calls "lying".

Thirty-seven years ago, I was preparing a sermon on the subject of Hell; what, where, and why is it? When I came to the why part of it, I read Revelations 21:8 which says that "*all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone*". I asked myself the question: Why did the Holy Spirit say "*all liars*"; why didn't he just say "liars"? Well, that put a question in mind and I went to my Webster's dictionary. I had then the 1906 Edition and Webster said in that — I want you to get it, friends. That's the reason I am going to say and prove that he has done exactly what the Holy Spirit said they would do, that they will speak lies in hypocrisy. Webster says: "If a person keeps back the truth when people have a moral right to know the truth, he lies." I want you to get it now. Webster said in the 1906 Edition: "If a man keeps back the truth when people have a moral right to know the truth, he lies." And I am sure that in his tract, and he should have presented the truth tonight, because he used a verse right next to it, that he kept back a truth that you people have a moral right to know. And Webster says that any man, McCay, Waters, or anybody else, who keeps back the truth that the people have a right to know — McCay, Waters, or anybody else — is lying to that people.

Now then, we'll come and we'll notice some of the things that he has talked here upon the board. We are going to take this one first: I Corinthians 10:16, 17: "*The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?*" Now, I know he teaches, because I have his little tract in my brief case, just liked he talked tonight, that the "*we*" means each individual of the congregation. We, then — we individual people — but now then there is a verse before that that he left out that is just as true as that verse is, a truth that you people have a right to know, but he kept it back. Whether he did it intentionally or not, I don't know. There are two ways that people can lie. They can lie intentionally or they can lie ignorantly. If they don't know what the truth is and keep it back, they are lying ignorantly. If they do know what the truth is and keep it back, they are lying intentionally. That would be speaking lies in hypocrisy, pretending that they are teaching all the truth upon the proposition, but keeping back some of it, because a pretender is a hypocrite. So if anybody pretends that he preached all the truth upon a certain proposition, but keeps back a part of it..... Thank you!

Mr. Waters, Second Affirmative

Brother Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends. The method established was III for the second affirmative of this discussion.

Dear Brother McCay spent almost all of his thirty minutes just sort of preaching a sermon that didn't have anything to do with the bread. Did you know that practically every verse of scripture that he quoted and practically everything that he said about all that he quoted, that I believe it just exactly like he quoted it and like he said it? Why, he was just preaching us a sort of a general sermon about a whole lot of different scriptures and the last thirty seconds he got to I Corinthians 10:16 & 17, and just barely started on it. And I Corinthians 10:16 & 17 was the principal proof text which I used in my first affirmative. And he got to it the last thirty seconds of his speech, just barely mentioned it. Do you call that debating? Do you call that debating?

Now, why didn't he spend his thirty minutes in talking about the bread breaking? Isaiah 1 and 18: "*Come now, and let us reason together.*" Dr. Waters is wrong on the bread breaking. Is that the conclusion? Titus 1:13: "*Rebuke them sharply.*" Dr. Waters is wrong on the bread breaking. Does that prove it? What conclusion shall we reach? Matthew 15 and 9: "*But in vain they do worship me.*" Now, that's a begging of the proposition. He has to prove that our worship is vain before he can quote Matthew 15:9 and apply it. But he applies it to us before he even proves it. That's a begging of the proposition and it is not good debating. He'll prove that our worship is vain. He hasn't proved it yet. Prove the worship is vain, then quote Matthew 15 and 9. Don't quote Matthew 15 and 9 without proving our worship is vain. I believe Matthew 15:9. I believe it. You see? Romans 10:17: "*Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.*" I believe that. Prove that your practice on the bread breaking comes from the word of God before you quote Matthew 10... or Romans 10:17. That's a begging of the proposition. Romans 14:23: "*Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*" Prove that my practice is not of faith before you conclude it's a sin. You see? You're getting the cart before the horse! You quote the scriptures and try... and just assume. You see? And then he says that Brother Waters imagines vain imaginations. And then he quoted verse after verse after verse and just assumed something and then by building... after building them such a strong name, quoted these verses and tried to knock it over. You see? That isn't good debating.

Hebrews 2:3: "*How shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation?*" Well, that's all right. But what's that got to do with the bread breaking? Prove that the way the dear brother breaks bread is that way of salvation before you quote Hebrews 2:1 and 2 and try to apply it to it. You're getting the cart before the horse!

What we want right now, we all want. I suppose everybody in this audience knows every one of those scriptures... what we want to know about now is how to break bread. That's what we want to know. We know about those

scriptures. We want to know to break bread. That's the thing that I came a thousand miles, almost, to debate, the bread breaking.

Hebrews 12:1: "*... compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us.*" What's that have to do with the bread breaking? You see? It neither proves, nor disproves one single, solitary principle, fact, or act with reference to bread breaking. No, it don't.

Colossians 3:17: "*And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.*" Now, brethren, you. believe and I believe in Colossians 3 and 17, but what does that have to do about the bread breaking? You still have to go to the scriptures pertaining to the breaking of the bread and grapple with those scriptures and find out what we're to teach. Don't just make an assumption and then quote Colossians 3:17 and try to make it a part of your assumption.

II Peter 2:1: "*... there shall be false teachers among the people and there shall be false prophets among you.*" Why, certainly, I believe that. Do you believe it? Do you believe it? Doesn't everybody believe it? But you've got to prove that now and apply that to me, that Brother Waters is a false teacher. But you've got to prove that I'm a false teacher before you quote the verse. You're getting the cart before the horse! You see? You've first got to take the scriptures and prove that I am a false teacher, then quote your false teacher verse.

I Timothy 4 and 1: "*... some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils*" and so forth. What's that got to do with the bread breaking? You've got to prove the thing, that the way we break bread is a doctrine of the devil, first. Don't quote your scripture and assume that it is a doctrine of the devil and then not prove it before your speech is over. You see?

Now, I expected better than that from Brother McCay. I really did. I expected better than that.

All right, what else did he do? Why, he read... he read a brief article written by Brother Omar King in the March, 1951, of the 0. P. A., which article didn't say a thing in the world about the breaking of bread. So what's it got to do with the proposition? What has Omar King got to do with us... this... our discussion here? And the article he read from Brother Omar King didn't have a thing to do with the bread breaking. Is that the way to spend thirty minutes of time? What did Brother Omar King say? Why, he says you are to read in the Gospel what you should preach. I believe that. Do you believe it? You see? That isn't proving a thing in the world with reference to the breaking of the bread, not a thing.

And he mentions my tract, says twenty quotations in it that you can't find in the Bible and that the Bible won't support. Just makes an assumption.

And he mentions my tract, says twenty quotations in it that you can't find

in the Bible and that the Bible won't support. Just makes an assumption.

Well, he does just that in almost all of his speech. How, he is supposed to be in the negative of this proposition and the negative is supposed to reply to the affirmative. That is the obligation of the negative. The negative is supposed to reply to the affirmative speech. Do you know what he did? Instead of replying to my speech, he followed an outline of a plan he already had mapped up before he knew what I was going to say. He spent thirty minutes following an outline of a speech which he had already prepared, not knowing what I was going to say, but regardless of what I did say, he followed his outline anyway. Why, that's not replying to me. He is supposed to reply to what I have said, the arguments that I have used, the scriptures I referred to, in his turn. That is what he is supposed to do when he is in the negative. Don't you think for one minute when I get in the negative that that's not what I'm going to do, too.

All right. He says if you practice something that you cannot read in the word of God, you go to that place... that place that we are trying to escape from. If you practice something that you cannot read in the word of God, you go to that place. All right. I'm going right back now to the question that I posed a while ago and he didn't reply to them. He didn't touch top, side, nor bottom of them. Didn't have a thing to say about them. What do I practice that I can't read in the word of God? What do I practice? Now, people, I want you to notice. When I... when we come together to observe the communion, if I serve at the table, what do I do? I break bread and Brother McCay knows it. I break bread and that act of breaking fulfills the definition of "*break*" from its Greek roots. I break bread. All right, he says if you practice something you cannot read in the word of God, you will go to that place. Well, can I read where I'm supposed to break bread? He believes that I can't. He believes that. He believes that the man who serves at the table is supposed to break bread. All right. Then I eat. Does he believe that the man who serves at the table is supposed to eat? Does he believe he is supposed to eat? Oh, he says, yes, he is supposed to eat, but not in vain. He hasn't said yet; I don't know what he will say. I'm interested in that. That's what I want to know.

Nod your head! You had thirty minutes. I wish you had told us.

Now, what do I do when I serve at the table? Listen! I break bread. Am I supposed to break bread? Can I read it? I eat bread. Am I supposed to eat bread? Can I read it? Or am I transgressing the opinions of some because I do? Do they break bread? Do they eat bread?

Now then again, what have I done that I am not supposed to do? What am I supposed to do that I haven't done? When 1 break that bread and eat... each of them... what have they done that they're not supposed to do? And what are they supposed to do that they haven't done? I'm going to get down to close quarters and grapple with this thing. I want to know, you see, what it is to which you object in my practice of breaking bread. You haven't brought it out yet and yet you are supposed to be in the negative of this proposition. And I further want to know... I've posed those questions time and again, and asked: What do I do that

I am not supposed to do? And what am I supposed to do that I don't do? Silence! Infinite silence! I asked the question: What are the assembled disciples to do that they don't do in the congregations I endorse? What do they do that they're not supposed to do? Silence! Perfectly infinite silence on the part of my respondent. Maybe he'll tell us in his next thirty minutes, but I won't have a chance to deny it or to reply to it. He could have, I suppose, in his first thirty minutes. He just couldn't find time to do it. I want to know. What is the proposition? "The manner of handling the bread in the communion of those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural." What is the manner of handling the bread? Well, the one serving at the table takes bread, breaks bread, and eats bread. That's right. He takes bread, and breaks bread, and eats bread. What does he do that he is not supposed to do? What is he supposed to do that he hasn't done?

I beg Brother McCay to tell us. He passes that bread to the assembled disciples and what do they do? They take bread, they break bread, they eat bread. What have they done that they are not supposed to do? And what are they supposed to do that they haven't done? Now, that's the manner of the breaking of bread... the manner of handling the bread in the congregations which I endorse.

Well, let's see if I have proved the proposition. What is it that each of these disciples do? Each disciple breaks bread. Acts 2:42 says: "*And they*" (plural), "*they continued stedfastly... in the breaking of bread…*" (Acts 2:42). What did Brother McCay have to say about Acts 2:42? Not one word! But he is supposed to be in the negative of this proposition. He is supposed to reply to what I say. What did he say about Acts 2:42? Just didn't have time. Acts 20:7: "*And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread.*".

Acts 20:7: "*And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread...*" How many of them came together to break bread? Luke said "*disciples*", didn't he? That's what I said about it; that's what I believe about it. Now, what does that prove? That proves that the disciples are the ones who broke it. It was an act performed by each individual disciple. That's what is says. That proves it. What did he have to say about Acts 20 and 7 from my first text? Not one word, but he is in the negative in this proposition. Why don't he get to it?

Now, I want this understood that I don't want to be too hard on Brother McCay. That's right. Brother McCay is a lot older than I am and I respect age, but we are in a discussion. I want you to understand, I have to... I have to dig a little, because I am debating him, you see? It's not that I don't respect him, but if he doesn't come up to what he is supposed to do in this debate, I am bound, you see, to expose him. I'm bound to do it regardless of how much I am going to hate to do it. I have to do it.

What did he have to say about Acts 20:7 from my first text "*... when the disciples came together to break bread*"? Not a word! What did he come up here

for anyway? What did he have to say about it? Or, on I Corinthians 10:16 & 17, to which he got just before his time expired... just before his time expires. And he said, now then, that there is one thing there that Brother Waters didn't get to and he quoted Webster as saying that if people keep back truth which people have a moral right to know, they are liars. And he said all of the truth in I Corinthians 10 and 16 that Brother Waters kept back from the people and they have a moral right to know it. Brother McCay, in this discussion, I venture that there will be thousands of truths that are taught in the word of God, that I won't mention. Thousands of them! I won't have time to mention every truth. Won't have time to. I am dealing with the breaking of the bread. I don't have time to mention everything the Bible teaches. I won't have time to mention everything. But he says there is one thing in I Corinthians 10 that I didn't get to. He says Paul said: "*The cup of blessing which we bless*"; he didn't get to that. Well, maybe I didn't. But I'm not a bit afraid of it. It has reference to the cup. I'm talking about the bread. But he says, "You didn't mention that." But I'm not a bit afraid of it. I believe I Corinthians 10:16: "*The cup of blessing which we bless.*" I believe that. I believe it with all my heart. I believe that with all my heart. I believe that we bless the cup of blessing when assembled in the church for communion. Or, if we don't, we ought to.

Now then, he said that the Bible teaches by precept and by example. And he said if you can't read a command for it, if you can't read an example for it, it's wrong. The Bible doesn't teach it. If you can't read a command for it; if you can't read an example for it. All right, I am affirming that our method of handling the bread in the communion is scriptural. In other words, that particularly the manner in which we break bread is scriptural. What is the manner? Each of us breaks bread. All right, what does the Bible say? Here is an example, Acts 2:42: "*And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread.*" "*They*" did.

Then he talked about conclusions. You have to reach a conclusion with reference to Acts 2 and 42. That is that the breaking of bread mentioned in Acts 2:42 was an act performed by everyone that was there. And then he'll have to ask another question, too, and that is, what act of breaking bread is performed by everyone at communion? What act of breaking bread is performed by everyone at communion? There is only one act of breaking of bread that I know of, that I can even conceive of, that can be performed by every communicant. That is that breaking of the bread which precedes the eating. I don't know of any other breaking of bread which can be performed by every communicant, by every one that was there, by everyone of the disciples and by everyone that ate. All right, there's my example; there's the apostolic example.

But he said, "Now, you've got to have an apostolic precept or example for everything you say, teach, and preach." Well, Brother McCay, I just want to present this for your consideration. Do you believe that Jesus took unleavened bread? You nodded your head a while ago when I said he did in my first speech. You nodded your head. The scriptures say that he "*took bread*". Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19; I Corinthians 11:24. Not a one of them said he took

unleavened bread. It says be took the bread. Brother McCay says he took unleavened bread. I want him to find a clear cut Bible command that commands us to take unleavened bread. Just put that in so many words. You say we have to read it in so many words. I want him to find a clear cut Bible command which says that Jesus took unleavened bread and that says the disciples when they came together the first of the week, took unleavened bread. Now, I believe they did. I believe that is an inescapable conclusion, all right. Yes, but it is a conclusion you have to reach, not what is specifically commanded. Not just said, you see, in so many words, in a command, or in so many words in an example.

*All right, here comes the next. Brother McCay, I firmly believe that undoubtedly we are supposed to observe the communion every first day of the week. But you know Acts 20:7 just says "*on the first day of the *week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.*" That was a specific occasion. I want you to read where the Bible just commands specifically communion every first day of the week. Where do you read that reference to the communion? Read where the... where the scripture says that the disciples came together, by way of example, that they came together every first day of the week to break bread. Now, that is a conclusion you have to reach. It is taught, yes. It is not taught by clear cut word by word command or example and Brother McCay knows it. However, I have read where the disciples came together to break bread. Now, here is the thing that I want you... I want you to understand: Brother McCay does not believe what Acts 20:7 says. It says the disciples came together to break bread. He doesn't believe what it says, but he believes that they came together every first day when it doesn't specifically say that. He believes what is not specifically said and denies what is specifically said. There are other illustrations of that process of reasoning those things.

The proposition reads, "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural." Now, when we, a group of disciples, come together to observe the communion, what are we supposed to do? We are supposed to take one loaf of unleavened bread. Can you read that in just so many words? One loaf of unleavened bread? We are supposed to take one loaf of unleavened bread. All right, as a group of disciples, what are we to do with that loaf of unleavened bread? We are to break bread. Paul said: "*For we*". What "*we*"? "*We being many*" He is going to have to do a lot of subtracting to get rid of that "*many*". "*We being many*". What "*many*"? "*Now are they many members, yet but one body.*" (I Corinthians 12:20). And "*for we being many are one body.*" "*That we are made therein members of one body.*" What does he mean? The bread which we break. Who breaks? We. What "*we*"? "*We being many are one body.*"

All right, well, what do we practice? In the communion we break. Now that's what we do when we come together to observe the communion. We break. We are many; we are members of one body and we break the bread. And Paul said: "*For we are all partakers*" of the bread when it breaks. We partake. That's our practice. Can I read it in the Bible? Can you read it in the Bible? There it is. Oh, he says, "Can you read in the Bible where it says now to break off a little

piece." That reminds me of a cups addict at one time and he came to me and, you know, and he says, "Why, Brother Waters," he says, "You read in there where each one has got to take a little swallow." You see, I believe in using one cup He says, "If they all take big swallows, why that one cup won't go around." He says, "You read where it says to take a little swallow." Does the Bible tell you how big a swallow to take? Does it? Does the Bible say a thing about it? He says, "Does it tell you how big a piece to break off?" Does it tell you how big a swallow to take? Supposing the first two... the first one drunk half of it and the next one drunk half of It. You see? They're drinking. The Bible says "*drink*". Well, they say, "The Bible didn't tell us how big a swallow to take." In fact, I know some brethren that did that just for meanness because they were against those that use one cup and they went down and worshipped and when the cup came to them, they just drank it all up. And they said, "Well, the Bible didn't tell us how big a swallow to take." He knows that we reach the conclusion that if we are all to drink of one cup, that it is not a matter of feeding the physical body, and since we are all to partake of one cup, why we have to reach the conclusion that the swallows can't be too big for very many of us. Yes, that's the argument the cups fellows made.

How big a piece? Use the intellect the Lord gave you. You know you can't break... each one take too much or the cup won't go around and each one can't break too much off or the loaf won't go around.

I have found my proposition in the scriptures. What is our practice? We all break bread. (I Corinthians 10:16 & 17) "*The bread which we break.*" We all eat bread. He says: "*For we are all partakers.*" And we all eat. So, we break and we eat. (I Corinthians 10:16 & 17). The breaking of the bread in the communion is an act performed by every communicant (Acts 2:42; Acts 20:7). "*They.*" "*The disciples.*" "*They.*" So, the breaking of bread is an act performed by every communicant and that's the kind of an act that we perform. Again, I want to ask this question. When we come together to observe the communion service, if I serve at the table, I break bread. .. I break bread, I eat bread. What have I done that I am not supposed to do? What am I supposed to do that I haven't done? I break that bread and the assembled disciples, each of them take bread, each of them break bread, and each of them eat bread. What are they supposed to do that they haven't done? And what have they done that they are not supposed to do? Is there one single scripture that I or they have not fulfilled? Not a one. Is there one single scriptural mandatory or imperative act which I or they have not fulfilled? Not a one. We have done all that we are commanded to do, or that we are obligated to do, and we have done no more than that which the word of God teaches us to do and that which we can read in the word of God. I submit that to you as a practice upon which we can all unite without sacrificing truth and if our conscience is educated by the truth, without sacrificing conscience. There is the common ground of unity. There is not one.... [end of belt]

Mr. McCay, Second Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, ladies and gentlemen.

Well, Brother Waters hasn't yet told us what the manner of breaking the bread is. Of course, I referred to it, but he hasn't told you. He hasn't told you just how they break that bread. That's the proposition. It isn't whether they break that bread or not, or whether I break bread or not. It's how they break it and he hasn't told you.

Now, he wanted me to prove that he was in the wrong. He is in the affirmative. It is up to him to prove that he is in the right and until he produces the scriptures that teach what he is affirming, I don't have to prove a thing. It is up to him to produce those scriptures and he, so far, has not produced a single scripture that teaches that they should break off a piece and eat it and pass the whole to the rest of the congregation.

Now, I want to notice this "*we break*". Oh, before I get started, he also said I am supposed to follow his arguments. Let him produce the scripture and tell us how he applies that scripture and I will follow him. I have three speeches yet. He has two. And before I get through with my three speeches, I am going to answer every scripture that he has presented and that is all I am under obligation to do.

Now, we come to the bread which "*we break*". I already stated to you that in his tract — and he applied it here — that that "*we*" means every individual, but he did not tell us, how each individual does the breaking. He hasn't told that yet. Now, he did not tell us the verse before. Now, those two verses go together in regard to the argument that he has made. He can say, "Well, we'll not discuss the cup question." But the two verses do go together in order to get the right principle. "*The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ.*" Now, the same "*we*" that break the bread, they are the same "*we*" who bless the cup and if the "*we*" in breaking the bread do it individually, then the "*we*" who bless the cup have to do it individually, too, and in the same manner, because we are discussing manner in regard to the breaking of bread. And they must not only break the bread in the same manner, but they must bless the cup in the same manner.

Now, let's see how it would be then. Here is a brother. He has the cup. He blesses the cup. He takes a sip from it and he is wondering how big a sip to take. I am not worrying about that. I am going to reason with the Lord about it. They must not take such a big sip that it is all gone before the others have a chance to take a sip. If they do, they'll be cheating the other dear people out of a chance to worship their God in the communion of the cup. I don't care how big a sip it is. If it is a big cup, they can take a pretty good sized sip. If it is a little cup, they have got to take a little sip. I am reasoning with the Lord; the Lord tells you to do it. And if you take too much of it and do not leave enough for the other individuals, you are breaking the opportunity of those brethren of

worshipping the cup.

All right, now. The man who waits at the table, he takes the cup, and he pronounces a blessing upon it. He takes a sip, or a big sip, or a medium-sized sip — I don't care — but he must take a sip of it, and then he passes it down to the brother here. That brother, he audibly pronounces a blessing upon it, the same as the fellow who waits at the table, and he takes a sip, and he passes it to his wife, who is a sister in the church, and she audibly pronounces a blessing upon that cup, and she takes a sip, and somebody jumps up and says, "Hold on there, sister. You did wrong when you audibly pronounced a blessing upon the cup, because my book says that, excepting when you are singing, you must not speak in the congregation. You must be silent." Now, they've got a problem here. They either have got to keep the "*we*" from doing it in the blessing of the cup, or they've got to let the women take part in that by audibly blessing it. He hasn't told us yet how they broke it, but if they all do it the same, I know that the individual who waits at the table audibly blesses the cup and if they are going to do it in the same manner, they've got to let the sister do it. And I believe that Brother Waters and I agree upon the proposition that there are some things that the sisters do not have a right to do in the worship and that might be one of them, but it's up to him to tell us how all those "*we*" can all bless the same cup in the same manner when the one who waits at the table blesses it audibly. But now, he never told that in the tract. But if he doesn't tell us in this debate, that is a truth that you people have a moral right to know and if he will not teach it to his people wherever he goes, if you young preachers do not preach it, you are keeping back truths that the people have a right to know. And Webster says you are lying.

Now, I want to notice another truth that is taught by the Holy Spirit that they never yet have impressed upon their brethren. I want you young preachers to get this now. That the Holy Spirit itself lays down as to how a multitude of people may do something, or it may be attributed to them as doing it, though they do not all do it. Turn with me to Acts 2 and 36 and there the Apostle Peter says: "*Let all the house of Israel be assured that this same Jesus, whom ye crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ.*" "*This same Jesus, whom ye crucified.*" Now then, how many people were there in the "*ye*"? There were thousands of them. There were more than three thousand, because three thousand of them obeyed the gospel. Get it, friends, because that principle applies to this manner of breaking the... of to who breaks the bread and who blesses the cup. The "*ye*" crucified the Son of God. Did each one of those thousands of people take hold of that hammer and help to drive the nails into the palms of the Son of God? Did each one of those thousands of Jews take hold of that cross and lift it up and station... and make it stationary, so that the Son of God hung for six hours upon it? Now then, if they did, then they can make the application to the bread which "*we*" break, means that each individual does the act in the same manner. But now then, the Holy Spirit is laying the principle down. It's a principle that I'll venture the opinion that Waters never did preach to his audience, but it is a true principle of God's Word that every audience has

a right to know when it comes to the question as to whether individuals do an act or not. I am certain that those thousands of people did not all hold the hammer when the hammer was driving the nails into the palms of the Son of God. Why? Because I am reasoning upon the proposition and it would have been an impossibility for them to do it. Thousands of people cannot take hold of one hammer and drive the nails into the palms of the Son of God and yet the Holy Spirit says those thousands of people did it. Now, what is the principle laid down by the Holy Spirit? The principle is this, that an agent may act for a multitude and if the multitude agree to the action or endorse the action, it may be said that the multitude did the action. That's the principle taught there by the Holy Spirit. Now, let's take the principle over to that bread which "*we*" break. Now, there is a major congregation of fifty members; a man stands there in the front; he is serving at the table and he takes and pronounces a blessing upon the leaf and he also breaks the loaf. Now, we're not discussing... I'm not... as to how he breaks it. Waters is discussing as to how he breaks it. It's up to him to tell us how they break it. It's up to him to furnish the scriptures that tell us exactly how they broke it, not the fact that they broke it. I agree that they break it, but the manner of breaking is the question that's under issue here. And now then here, this man stands there and he pronounces the blessing. He breaks the loaf and every individual in that audience who agrees to the act that he did can be said to have done the act, applying the principle that the Holy Spirit laid down when it says "*ye*" fellows, thousands of you crucified the Son of God. I believe you are intelligent enough to see the principle and so then, it is possible for "*we*" to break the bread, if "*we*" sit in the audience and endorse what the one individual does who stands before the audience and does the act actually and the others do it. So, it's the same with the cup, now. Here the sister don't have to open up her mouth. She doesn't have to pronounce a blessing. Why? Because the man is waiting at the table. He takes the cup and blesses it and every individual member endorses what he does and it can be said that they did it. And so then it's very easy, if we will just reason with the Lord on the proposition, reason in regard to the things that are taught you in God's Word to arrive at a fair conclusion.

Oh, he wanted me to prove that they had unleavened bread. Now, he made a little slip there. He thought, you know, that McCay couldn't prove it... that McCay couldn't prove by the New Testament that the example was unleavened bread. Why, the Greek says he took the Passover loaf. Now, what was a Passover loaf? Was it unleavened or was it leavened? Unless the Son of God broke a law of Moses, it was an unleavened loaf. It was a Passover loaf. There's my proof that he had unleavened bread when he instituted the Lord's Supper and it is just as plain as the English language can make it. A Passover loaf was unleavened and the Book says that he took a Passover loaf.

Now, he says, "Brother McCay doesn't believe Acts 2:42." I don't believe that he has quoted Acts 2:42 and told us how they broke the bread when "*they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, and the breaking of bread*". We are not discussing whether they broke it or not. We're

discussing as to how they did it. But now, those people in Acts 2 and 42... why, all of them could come together, they all could break the bread and even just one of them, though, actually did the breaking according to the principle laid down that the Holy Spirit said "*Ye crucified the Son of God.*"

Now, I am going to call Brother Waters' attention to another fact and you people, too. Now, here it says that "*they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers.*" The term "*breaking of bread*" included more than breaking of bread. It simply referred to the communion and there the apostle used a part for the whole. The whole communion was bread and cup, but it only said bread. Do you believe that they didn't take the cup, too? In other words, they can give a part for the whole and that is what they did there. And Waters will agree to that. He'll agree that it meant that they communed, but breaking of bread wasn't all of it. It just said that.

Now, the bread which "*we*" break; yes, and that's all right; the bread which we break. And Acts 20 and 7: "*The disciples came together upon the first day of the week for to break bread.*" He says the disciples did it, a multitude of disciples. I'll admit that. There again the apostle used... or Luke used the expression, a part for a whole. Did they come together just to break bread? They came together for the worship and Luke used the expression "*break bread*" to include all of the worship, and that breaking of bread was done by all of them the same as the fellowship was by all of them, the same as the singing was by all of them, the same as the teaching was by all of them, excepting the women folks. They had nothing to do with it according to the way I read the Book. But remember, all of them can do something and it can be attributed to every communicant if only one actually performed the act itself and if others agreed to the performing of that action.

All right now, let us go back... oh, I notice another thing. He seems to not like the idea that McCay talked about things that he had already prepared before he got here. Why, that was easy. I had his tract. I've read it over carefully and I knew that unless he had changed, he would teach it exactly like he did there, or he would be contradicting his own teaching. So, certainly I worked these things out before I came here and I am prepared to meet him upon every point that he wants to bring forth tomorrow night. That will be his last time for a... for an affirmative.

Now, I want to turn to I John 1:5 and 7. He don't like for me to preach. He doesn't like for me to quote scripture. He doesn't like for me to apply scripture. But he wants me to get into the affirmative and prove that he is in the wrong. It's his business to prove that he is in the right and not my business to prove that he is in the wrong. Now, then, I want to quote this scripture, because it applies to all teachings and all worship. We turn now to I John 1:5 and 7. Now, that's something that he'll undoubtedly quote himself, if he is debating with some sectarian or somebody that is in the wrong. I have an idea that he'll put up a pretty good debate when he gets on the right side. Possibly..... [end of

belt]

All right. Here we go. "*God is light and in him is no darkness at all. If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.*" Now, God is all light. In him is no darkness, But now then if we walk in the light as God is in the light, or if we walk entirely in the light of God's Word, then we have fellowship one with another. He made quite a little appeal here that we ought to get together on these things. We ought to be united. I'll admit we ought to be, Brother Waters, we ought to be united and I'll tell you how we can be. Whenever you walk entirely In the light of God's Word, you and I will be working together. We will have Christian fellowship, but when you do that, you have got to show me the manner that the scriptures teach you to break bread. Not that it teaches you to break it, but the manner of the breaking of it. We break the bread, too, but we don't break off a little piece and eat it and pass the whole loaf down to the audience.

Now, there are two words I want to place here upon the board. Now, here is another truth that Brother Waters does not preach to his people in the tract. I doubt if there's a preacher ever been here that preaches this truth to the people of this community. I doubt it. I notice there are four here and one is sitting in the audience tonight who has preached here. Now, the truth is that "klao" means "to break". It doesn't say how to break, but it means to break. Now, in the breaking of the five loaves, Jesus took the five loaves and broke them and gave them to the disciples to distribute to the five hundred people, the five hundred people ate and they took up twelve baskets of fragments. Now, let me tell you something. Now, I'm not in the affirmative, but only one person broke as far as the record goes there. Only Christ broke. Broke the five loaves; they were passed to the five thousand; they all ate; and twelve baskets of fragments were taken up, or pieces were taken up. Now, reason with the Lord. There's the record. Reasoning with the Lord, I am driven to the conclusion that Christ broke those loaves into fragments, into pieces, if you please, because there is no record that anyone else did any breaking at all, and I am told to reason with the Lord. The Lord gives us the record as to who did it, as to what was done, and reasoning with the Lord, I know that there were fragments into which it was broken, because there were fragments gathered.

Now, coming again to the communion proposition. The same Greek word "klao" was used when it was discussing the Saviour's breaking the Passover loaf. Now, reason with the Lord now. The same word was used there. I have a right to conclude that the Saviour broke the loaf in the same manner that he broke the five loaves. Used the same word. Now, if he did break it in the same manner, because it was designated by the same word, then we were told that he broke it into pieces and passed those pieces to the disciples and they ate of it.

Now, I want to tell you another thing. He may not mention it, though he is in the affirmative and should prove all the way of the doing of this. He will probably not tell you that there is no record of any one breaking when the

communion was instituted excepting the Son of God. Not a single word said that anyone when the Supper was instituted did any breaking excepting Christ. The disciples did not break as far as the record goes. If he says they did, it is up to him to prove that when it was instituted, that they, too, broke along with the Son of God.

Now, there is another word in the Bible: "Ekklao." "Ek" means "off of" or "from". "Off of or from" All right, now. We are told by the example of this brethren that the Saviour broke off the bread, didn't just necessarily break it in two, but broke off a piece of the bread. Now, if the Saviour had broken off a piece of that loaf, the Holy Spirit would have told the individual who was recording that to use the word "ekklao", because "ekklao" means "broken off" or "off from".

Now, we have a nice example of that in the 11th Chapter of the Roman letter. We turn over there and the Apostle Paul says that the... some of the natural branches were broken off from the olive tree. Broken off; the Greek word "ekklao" is used there, the same Greek word that should have been used when Christ broke the loaf if he broke off a piece of the loaf. But he didn't use that word, so I have a right to conclude that he did not just break off a little piece. We are not discussing whether he ate it or not, because that doesn't really come into this proposition. I would have been glad if it had have been in, but I wrote the proposition and I'm to blame for that myself. Now then, they broke off a branch, they "ekklao"-ed a branch and so then we get the idea that whenever anything is broken off, the Greek word "ekklao" should have been used in order to express the exact act as it was performed.

Now, we begin with what I worked out of the scriptures before I came up here, you know, I've already quoted it about this... from John. "*If we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.*" I'd like to have fellowship with Brother Waters. I'd like to have fellowship with all these brethren that believe like he does, but how can I do it? I cannot do it just by agreeing that they are right unless they are walking entirely in the light of God's Word. I cannot cooperate with an individual and call that Christian fellowship. God's Word lays down the medium of Christian fellowship and that medium is that we must walk entirely in the light of God's Word. And I am going to prove when I get in the affirmative that my congregations that I endorse do walk entirely in the light of God's Word upon this proposition. Now if Brother Waters will preach only what he can read there, as Brother King said. Now, he didn't like for me to read from Brother King. "Why," he says, "That's not debating." But it is presenting truth, and as I told you in the beginning, I am conducting this debate the way I want to because we never signed any agreement as to how the debate... we didn't sign to agree according to Hegler's Rules of Logic. My idea is to get as much truth before the people, because "*you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.*" I'm not worried whether Waters thinks I'm conducting the debate in the right way. I am conducting it to get the truth before the people.

Now, if we walk in the light, entirely in the light means that we must not... now, I want to talk about it, because I want to prove this thing. He is in the affirmative... we must not practice that which we cannot read in God's Word. If we do practice it, then we are not walking entirely in the light of God's Word. Now, I know he'll get up tomorrow night... tonight because his time's up, and say, "We do break." How do they break? We break by that agent that stands there before us and does the act and we, sitting back, concur it what that agent did, exactly as those people concurred in what the few people did in crucifying the Son of God. And the Holy Spirit said, "You fellows did it." Thousands of Jews did it and we know that they didn't actually perform the act, but they concurred in what the agent did. I want you to get that in your mind, because that's the truth that the Holy Spirit taught and it is necessary to know it in order to know how that we should commune.

Now then, we come over again and let's notice. I Corinthians, you will recall, made a note of that. Matthew 26:26: "*Jesus took bread, and brake.*" And broke it, we would say. He "brake" is what the Book says. Of course, he did. But he doesn't take... Brother Waters doesn't tell us how he broke it. I want him to tell us how he broke it. I want him to read in the Book where Jesus broke off a little piece, as they do practice, and how that Jesus ate that little piece and passed along the rest of it to the people. Now, in his tract... he hasn't in this debate... I'll just... I'll just precede him a little bit. In his tract, he mentions this idea of breaking the bones. Why, he says here that if they break this bread in two, they are going to break the bones. Well, now, I'm not so certain about that. If they have a big congregation and the sister who prepares the loaf, doesn't prepare a pretty good sized one, and if they take a pretty good sized piece of it, each one of them, I'll tell you what they can do. It may look like a miracle, but they can eat all of it and not break a bone of the body of the Son of God. It's the most ridiculous argument that ever I heard put up, the argument that we must not break this bread, because we mustn't break a bone. They eat most of the bread. They break off twenty or thirty or forty pieces of it and still don't break a bone. I'd just like for Brother Waters to tell us how they can do that when he says, "Oh, we mustn't break it in two or we will be breaking a bone." Oh, I know it says, "*Not a bone of him was broken.*" But you cannot eat half of it, twenty-five people cannot break pieces off as if though the bones were all over on that side, just down in that little corner that we left. It's a ridiculous argument that they put up when they claim that the reason we must not break it, is because it says, "*Not a bone of him was broken.*" Oh, it says it all right and I believe it. Fact of the matter is, I believe everything it says.

Now, we'll turn over to John. II John, verses 9 and 10: "*Whosoever goeth beyond and abideth not in the teachings of Christ, hath not God.*" Now, I have asked Brother Waters to read where Christ taught that they should do like they do do in the manner, not in the fact that they break it, but in the manner of the breaking, and unless he can read it, he has gone beyond the teachings of Christ. I'll venture that in other debates with other people, he just dresses that down. He has quite a personality and he has a good way of arguing. He just puts it up

there and brings his fist down once in a while, but now that's not arguing... that's not truth, that's just arguing. Will you tell us, Brother Waters, tomorrow night just where the teachings of Christ say that he broke off a little piece, or that you have a right to break off a little piece and eat it and keep the rest of it in one piece. If a man comes... or if he goes onward and does not continue in the teachings of Christ, he don't have God. And now I venture the opinion that he has a worship that is vain if he don't have God in that worship. And I want to tell you, you young preachers something, that if you don't have God down here by sticking right to what that Book says in your teaching and practice, God will not have you up yonder. You'd better have Him here, or He'll not have you in the great hereafter.

But now, what to do with a preacher that comes along that way. If any man comes, now, and brings not this teaching. Oh, yes, but Brother Waters will say, "I did bring the teaching. It says that Christ broke." But this teaching, how much of this teaching? They must bring every bit of this teaching and they must not bring something that is not in the teaching. They must neither take from nor add to. "*If he brings not this teaching, receive him not into your house.*" That's a pretty serious admonition. I'm not certain whether it means that we mustn't let them sleep in our room or in our house or not, because he may have been writing that to a sister whose house was the congregation. But I do know that it does mean this: "*Neither bid him God speed.*" You mustn't give him ten dollars to help him to promulgate something that he cannot read in this good Word. "*Neither bid him God speed. For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.*" I'll admit that if Waters will read this, I'll believe It. If he'll read how that they just break off a little piece, I'll believe it. I accept everything that that Book says and I preach only what it says, because my father, who was a preacher before me, when I told him forty-nine years ago that I am going to be a preacher, he gave me just one sentence of advice and I have always taken it and I have given it to every young preacher. He said, "Earl, never preach anything that you'll have to take back." And I never had. I've never preached a religious principle that I could not read in the Book. I've never asked my brethren to practice a thing that I cannot read in the Book. And now then, if Brother Waters will leave out or does leave out this principle here, if he leaves out that principle and will not tell his people that following that principle one person may actually do the breaking and the other sitting in the audience.... [end of belt]

Mr. Waters, Third Affirmative

Brethren Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends.

I count myself happy to stand before you tonight again in affirmation of the proposition which I believe with all of my heart to be the truth. This proposition reads as follows: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural."

I do not say that by manner I simply mean the way. By handling, I mean using or utilizing. And by the bread in the communion, I refer to the loaf of the Lord's Supper. Brother McCay and I agree that that is an unleavened loaf and further that when we set the Lord's Table, we should have one loaf. By those congregations endorsed by S. Irvin Waters, I refer to those congregations of the Church of Christ whose manner of handling the bread I endorse. And by is scriptural, I mean that this manner of handling the bread in those congregations comports with scriptural teaching, with scriptural commands, scriptural examples, scriptural statements, and any true inferences which we may draw from the implication of the Word of God.

I suppose that this definition may seem to be ridiculous, but ridiculous or not, I again give my attention now to the truth of this proposition that the manner of handling the bread in those congregations which I endorse Is scriptural, that the way which we use or utilize the loaf of the Lord's Supper is scriptural and that it does comport with the teaching of the word of God. When we come together in assembly to observe the Lord's Supper, we have one loaf of unleavened bread. If I happen to be the one selected by that congregation to serve at the table, I take one loaf of unleavened bread. I am sure that Brother McCay will not object to that practice. We give thanks for one loaf of unleavened bread. I am sure that he will not object to that practice. And then following the giving of thanks, I eat bread. Following the giving of thanks, I break bread. I break that loaf and I eat of that loaf. I asked Brother McCay and those preachers last evening to which of these actions does he object? Does he object to my breaking the loaf or to my eating the loaf? Have I done one single, solitary thing that the Bible does not authorize me to do? That the Bible does not require me to do? Is there anything in the word of... that the word of God teaches that I am supposed to do that I haven't done with reference to the bread that I must do? And have I done anything with reference to that bread which the word of God does not teach me to do? I asked him those questions and what did he have in answer or in reply to then? I specifically ask, "Brother McCay, do you object to my breaking bread, or do you object to my eating it?"

McCay (interjection):

I object to your manner, of breaking it.

Waters:

Thank you. Brother McCay says that he objects to my manner of breaking it. All right, if he objects to my manner of breaking, he must take the word of

God then and show that my manner of breaking does not comport with the scriptures. And he must do more than that in order to offset it successfully and refute and rebut that particular manner, prove by the word of God that the bread is to be broken in some other way. But if he fails to find in the word of God that the bread is to be broken in some other way, he has not successfully rebutted and refuted the manner of breaking. In order to try and refute that, he must show by the word of God that we must do it some other way, not that we may do it, but that we must do it in order to offset the manner of breaking in which I do this.

Now, I want Brother McCay to get up here and point out what it is about the manner of breaking which I follow that's wrong. Now get that: What do I do that's wrong? Now, I take the bread and I break the bread. The breaking which I do... and he admits that it is breaking because he just now used the expression "manner of breaking"... so you do admit I break bread. Thank you. And I want you to get that because I'll be talking about that from now on to the close of the debate. He admits that I do break bread. I'm going to put that on the board. Brother McCay admits that I break bread. I want you to remember that, Brother McCay admits that I break bread.

All right, then in addition to breaking bread, I eat of that bread. Now, you don't object to my eating the bread; do you?

McCay (interjection):

Never saw you eat it; don't object at all.

Waters:

Thank you. All right, Brother McCay has no objection to my eating. Or do you object to my manner of eating?

McCay:

Oh, no,

Waters:

Thank you. All right, he neither objects to my eating or to my manner of eating. He objects, however, to my manner of breaking. Now, Brother McCay, you said, "Well, what is.. what manner of breaking do you follow?" If somebody wants to know, well, you know the manner in which I break the bread? I break it with my fingers as he breaks it. Now then, he objects to my manner of breaking. Now, I break the bread with my fingers. That's the way I break the bread. That's the manner in which I break the bread. I break it with my fingers. He says, "I object to your manner of breaking." Well, somebody says, "Why, you have to break it with your fingers." Well, could you tap the bread, for instance, and strike it a hard blow with an object and break it? There might conceivably be several different ways you could break that bread. Don't you see? You could strike it a blow and you might break it. It's unleavened. But now then he says, "I object to your manner of breaking." I break it with my fingers. I break it with my fingers. Well, in other words, you could say it this way: "I object to the way

in which you break it with your fingers. I object to the way and the manner in which you break it with your fingers." All right, get up and show us how to break it with our fingers. He objects to the way I break it with my fingers. You see? Not that I do break it with my fingers, surely, but to the way that I break it with my fingers. Now, there I didn't... I didn't break a thing off of that, you see. I just dropped it and it broke.

McCay (interjection):

I didn't have a chance to drink.

Waters:

Well, at least that's a demonstration of my argument; you see? I broke the glass and I didn't do it with my fingers. The glass is broken and I didn't do it with my fingers. You see? I break the bread, however, with my fingers, but he objects to the way in which I break it with my fingers. Now, I really wonder if you object to the way in which I've been breaking it with my fingers. I just wonder. Or do you object to the size of the piece... the pieces?

McCay:

I'll tell you when I get up.

Waters:

I hope you do. You didn't last night. Now, I want to get down... I want to get down to close... to close battle here. I do! I want to come to close grips. I want to find out what it is about that breaking that he objects to. I want to know what it is. I rather think that be doesn't actually object to the way I break that bread with my fingers, but that he objects to the fact that I eat among the sisters. Brother McCay, if I broke the bread and you know how I do it, you are pretty sure, you're reasonably sure that you know how I break it or you wouldn't object to it. But if I broke the bread just exactly like I break it, but put both pieces back down on the plate and passed the communion, would you object to that? Would you object to that? Now, I want to know and I'm trying to find out, you see? If I broke it just like I do, but I didn't retain or keep any of it, put it all back on the plate, and passed it. Would you object to the way I broke it?

Now, I want to know if he objects to the way I broke it or what I did with it after I broke it. You see? I want to know. Does he object to the way I broke it or what I did with it after I broke it? And if I take that bread and I break it. Well, where are you going to break it? I wonder if he is going to take the position that you have got to break it at a certain place. Does it have to be broken down the middle? I want to know. May one of the portions be bigger than the other? And if so, how much bigger? And if one portion may be smaller than the other, how much smaller? Now, the way I break the bread, of course, at least the way I have done it thus far, one of the portions are larger than the other. And come to think of it, I suppose it would be impossible for you to break it exactly down the middle, so one portion would be bigger than the other.

Now then, does he object to my eating one of those pieces after I've broken it? If I didn't eat one of them and just put them both back on the plate and passed it, would he object to that? If he wouldn't, he doesn't object to the way I broke it, he objects to the fact that I ate one of them after I broke it. All right, but now then, if I eat one of those pieces after I break the bread, have I done anything but what the Bible tells me to do? The Bible tells me to eat. Jesus said: "*Take, eat.*" So then when I eat. I'm a disciple and I eat. Now, I wonder does he object to my eating or to my breaking? Yes, this is going to get interesting. All right.

Let's see if we can prove now by the word of God our practice. What do we do? We break bread; we eat bread. Now, I have already showed you what I do when I break bread. Now, I pass that bread to the assembled disciples. What do they do? Each breaks bread; each eats bread. What have they done that they're not supposed to do and what are they supposed to do that they haven't done? What did I do that I wasn't supposed to do and what am I supposed to do that I didn't do? Again I ask and I want answers. We break bread; we eat bread. I Corinthians 10:16 and 17, we read: "*The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.*" Now, then, what do we do? We break; we partake of that bread. What "*we*"? Why, "*we, being many*". Paul said (I Corinthians 12:20): "*Now are they many members, yet but one body.*" Also, the 12th Chapter of Romans, verses 4 to 5 and I Corinthians, 12th Chapter and 12th verse: "*Many members, yet but one body*". We. What do we do? We break; we partake or we eat. What "*we*" is it? The "*we*" that are of one body. All who breaks and who eats is of one body. They are the ones who break; they are the ones who partake, or eat.

All right, let's turn over here to "*break*". Acts 2:42: "*And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and in fellowship and in the breaking of bread.*" They continued the breaking of bread. Acts 20:7: "*Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread.*" I Corinthians 10:16: "*We*". Matthew 26:26 we read that "*Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it.*" Who breaks? They broke; the disciples broke; we break; Jesus brake. So that's what the word of God teaches with reference to the breaking of the bread.

All right. Now, let's hear this again: He said it is not whether he breaks, but it is how he breaks that I object to. Not whether, but how, so he does admit that I break, but he objects to the how. And I want you to remember that. And I break with my fingers, so he must object to the way in which I break it with my fingers. If he doesn't, he objects then to my eating afterwards and I want him to tell us what it is to which he objects.

Well, last night, you know, he said you must not take such a big sip of the cup that there will not be enough left for the others. We want to know more about that, how small a piece, how big a piece, and so forth of the bread. Well, now, how about the drinking of the cup? How big a swallow? A cups advocate

asked me that one time, he said, "How big a swallow should you take ?" "Well," I said, "I don't know. One ought not to be too hoggish about it, because after all, we are all supposed to drink and it is not to feed the physical man." I Corinthians 10:16 and 17: "*The bread which we break.*" Brother McCay last evening said that the one at the table breaks as an agent acting for the group and that man breaks and the others approve of it. They approve of it... or he used some such word. They approve of it; they sanction it; they consent to it. And the one at the table acts as an agent for them and he said that's what Paul meant when he said: "*The break which we break.*" And he said, "*The cup of blessing which we bless.*" He said, "Now, then, that one expresses audible thanks." And he said, "Does every communicant, then, express audible thanks?" Do we all bless and do we all give thanks? Well, I said last evening that I believe we did. I believe we did. Now, we all give thanks; we all bless. But he said, "What about your women? Are they going to speak out load and express audible thanks?" No, don't think so. Well, he says that the multitude or the group is supposed to consent to it or approve of the action done by their agent. How do they consent to it? Would the women consent by voice? How do they consent to it? Would they consent mentally? Would they consent with their voice? How would they do it? If they could consent mentally, I wonder if they couldn't give thanks without speaking actually with the words. Could the audience, for the sake of argument, permit one to give thanks audibly and they express thanks simultaneously in their hearts?

I read in I Samuel, the first Chapter and the 13th Verse: "*Now Hannah, she spake in her heart.*" "*She spake in her heart; only her lips moved, but her voice was not heard.*" There's where a woman talked in her heart. Her lips moved even, but her voice was not heard. I just wanted to know if it could be done.

All right. Now, last evening Brother McCay went to the Greek. Now, I am not going to criticize Brother McCay for going to the Greek. Never did like to hear people criticize others just because they might happen to go to the Greek. But when a man goes to the Greek, I like for him to know enough about it to not blunder when he does it.

Now, Brother McCay goes to the Greek and he says now there are two words here: "klao and ekklao". That "klao" is used with reference to the communion and that "ekklao" means "to break off or to break off from or to break off out of." All right, that's fine. "klao" means "to break"; "ekklao" means "to break off or to break out of". But there is one "klao" that you didn't put down, a word in combined form which you ought to have mentioned last night, but you didn't. And that is "kataklao". "Kataklao." Now, Brother McCay ought to have mentioned that one last night, but he didn't. Didn't mention that. Now, I want you to get this. "Klao" is the general term, "Klao" is the general term and within the meaning of the general term, these, which are specific terms, exist. Now then, "break" is a general term. How break? Well, you might take and you might just break into a great number of pieces, you see? Or you might take and you might break a piece off. In either case, you "klao". That's

the general term. But now, there are specific terms. "Ekklao" and "kataklao". With reference to the communion, neither "ekklao" nor "kataklao", we eat. Which one of those do we use? The thing, however, is that both of these exist within "klao". Now, "klao" can't mean both at the same time. Of course, not. But now, this "kataklao" is used several times in front of the following passages where Jesus fed the multitude with the leaves and fishes; for instance, Mark 6:41; Luke 9:16. Broke into a great number of pieces. That's kataklao". "Kataklao". Now, he didn't get to that. He talked about "ekklao" and "klao", but he didn't talk about "kataklao". You see?

Now, if he wants to go to the Greek in order to know the Bible, to learn all of these parallels. Not that it necessarily pertains to what he said, but a person that willfully withholds evidence, what? Liars. I didn't say that; that's what he said.

All right. What's in this word? In Acts 2 and 42: "*And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine*", and in what? "*In the breaking of bread.*" Now, I contend that they all broke bread, that the breaking of bread is an act performed by every communicant. Brother McCay denies that they all broke bread and he said in a sense that they all acted through an agent who broke it for them. Now, I want you to notice the shape and the fate that he's got himself in with reference to Acts 2 and 42. "*They continued stedfastly in the breaking of bread.*" He says they didn't all actually break bread, but they acted through an agent. "*Continuing*" is "action". I'll prove that it is action. They didn't all actually do it; they acted through an agent. But he turns around and says that the breaking of bread in Acts 2:42 means the communion. Oh, what a fix he's got the "*they*" in. Whatever they did, they did through an agent and he said the breaking of bread there refers to the communion, the entire communion. He says then that they observed the communion through an agent. They observed the communion by proxy. They had an agent to observe the communion in their behalf or for them. I'm not going to let him have his cake and eat it, too. I refuse to let him take the position that they all actually and literally observed the communion, the thing implied, but that they didn't actually all do the thing that was mentioned. He's not going to fix that "*they*" up and make it with an agent part of the time and all of them some of the time. He can't do that.

Now, the rule of Biblical interpretation... now the rule of language interpretation... which goes like this... the meaning of a word cannot be diverse and multifarious at the same time and place. A word may mean more than one thing indifferent usages. It may not mean but one thing in one usage. So that the word for "*they*" cannot mean "by an agent" and also "all of them". Now what they did, they all did, he says, by an agent. Matthew said that they all observed the communion. Did they... did they break bread? Did they do the thing that was implied in "observe the communion"? Why, certainly they all did. But listen, the part that is mentioned here has to be true in order for the whole and implied to be true. The part mentioned is the breaking of bread. "*They continued the breaking of bread*." I contend that they did the thing that was mentioned and they did the thing that was implied. All right, but if they acted through an agent

in Acts 2:42: "*They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine*", so they obeyed the teaching of the apostles through an agent. "*They continued stedfastly in the fellowship."* How did they do that, continue this fellowship just through an agent or did they all actually do it? Now, I won't let you have that "*they*" acting through an agent and then not acting through an agent in the same verse. We want you to tell us something about that.

All right. Well, last night he again went to the Greek in an argument. He said, "You've got to just read it in so many words, whatever you teach and practice. You've just got to read it in so many words. I want him to read their manner of breaking in so many words by apostolic precept and apostolic example." Well, I said, "You can't just read it in so many words where Jesus took a loaf of unleavened bread." I believe that he did and Brother McCay believes he did. He just can't read that in so many words. Doesn't say it. He can't read in so many words an apostolic command that says, "Come together every first day of the week to observe the Lord's Supper." He has to conclude that from the general teaching of the scriptures. All right, he says, "Not so. The Greek says he took a Passover loaf... or biscuit is one of the terms." The Greek doesn't say it. Now, I challenge that. The word for Passover in the Greek is another word, is p-a-s-c-h-a. It is not in Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, I Corinthians 11:23. Pascha is not in either one of them. The word Pass-over is not there in the Greek. Brother McCay says it's there. It isn't there. Do you have a Greek New Testament? Look at it. I've got one in Greek. The word is not there.

Now, when a man says something that isn't so, what is that? It isn't so and I want you to understand that and if there is anybody here that doubts my word about what the Greek New Testament says, say it! Now, I believe he was honestly mistaken. That's what I believe about it and he ought to get up like a man and just admit it and say, "I was mistaken." The word "pascha" for Passover is not there. I believe he was honestly mistaken. That's what I believe about it. It is not there, It does not say it.

In Matthew 26:26, the Greek says "artos"; that's the "loaf". In Mark 14:22, it is just p1ain artos". Luke 22:19 "artos". I Corinthians 11:23 "artos". No "pascha artos" yet. It is not there. Neither place. Now I note that he went to II John 9 and 10 where it says, "*He that abideth not in this doctrine... receive him not... neither bid him God speed.*" Again, a begging of the question of the proposition. He must... he should stay with the proposition and prove what the doctrine of the Lord is, I John 1:7: "*But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.*" Not a thing there about the breaking of the bread. He says, "It is not my business to prove that Brother Waters is in the wrong." That's what the negative does when he's in debate. He is supposed to prove that the affirmative is wrong. That's what he is in the negative for. He says, "I have never taught anything I have had to take back. I've never taught anything I've had to take back." Did you ever worship where they had class? Two or individual? Answer! Did you ever worship where they had classes? Tell

us! Did you ever change on anything? In all of your life, have you ever changed on anything? Have you ever taught anything that you now concede to be wrong And I thank you.

Mr. McCay, Third Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, ladies and gentlemen.

I am going to take up some of the last things he said lest we might forget and lest you might forget.

He said that I said that I never taught anything I couldn't read. He misquoted me just a little. I said I never have taught a religious principle that I could not read in the Book. I stick right by it. I have never taught a religious principle that I could not read in the Book.

He also stated that I said that the Greek said that it was unleavened bread. Now, I doubt that I said that. I know that I did say that I could read where it said the Passover loaf and I can. And I can read it in God's Word. I looked it up today. The book is at home yet, but I can tell him where to find it and I can read it in the Bible where it said it was a Passover loaf and Brother Waters knows that the Passover loaf was unleavened, because the law said it had to be. Now, I told you that we should reason together with God. The Book says it was a Passover loaf. That's God's reasoning. I reason with God and if the Book says it was a Passover loaf, I know that being a Passover loaf, it had to be unleavened. He misrepresented me in that statement.

Now, let's turn again. Acts 2:42. All broke bread. Let's just quote the whole thing: "*They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers.*" I would like for Brother Waters to ask... or tell me... I will ask him to tell me in his next speech, was that referring just to the breaking of bread there or was it not referring to the communion, both the breaking of bread and the cup... drinking of the cup? In other words, taking the part for the whole. He was not... it was not discussing the manner. Now, we wish to notice that. Was the manner of his breaking this loaf... here he broke it with his fingers and he broke maybe just a little piece off and he wanted to know how it would be if he left that little piece on the platter and passed it on around and they all might break off a little piece. I've heard that before, because he brought up something like that in a debate with Brother Beddingfield upon the proposition. He still has not shown one scripture. That told you that McCay had to prove that he was wrong in doing the way he did it. He's in the affirmative. Tomorrow night, McCay will prove his proposition and he'll prove it by the word of God. He has not shown one scripture yet that tells the way that he and his brethren break the loaf. I never have been there. Howard worshipped with them a little while. He told me how they broke it. They did not break it in the manner that I am going to show by the word of God that the Saviour broke it. I object to their manner for this reason: When they break off a little piece, they eat it then, and they leave the rest of the loaf whole or in one piece. I want to illustrate something about that... no, I'd better tell something else, because I might forget.

He don't like the way I did it last night, because I stuck to what I had

already prepared beforehand. Now, he mentioned "*Hannah spoke in her heart.*" He misrepresented the argument that I made last night. I'll have to make it again. If people break the loaf in the same manner which he does teach and they practice, I said they should also bless the cup in the same manner, because they broke, and that if they bless the cup in the same manner and if the person who waits at the table or waits upon the table blesses it audibly, if they bless it in the same manner, that woman cannot bless it in her heart. She's got to bless it audibly. But he did not notice as to how I proved that a person can do something as an agent and it may be attributed to a multitude of people noticing it... or doing it. Turn with me to Acts 2 and 36 and there the apostle preaching says, "*Let all the house of Israel be assured that this Jesus, whom ye crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ.*" "*...this Jesus, which ye crucified.*" He said, "McCay said that." The Son of... The Holy Spirit said that. The Holy Spirit said that those people, it was attributed to them, that they crucified the Son of God, when he knows that three thousand people did not take hold of that hammer and nail the hands of the Son of God to the cross. And he'll not deny that I was not right... he will not deny that I was right in the argument that I made. If he does he certainly has not the intelligence that I believe he has. The Holy Spirit said that "*ye*" did it, "*ye three thousand people*" did it. I asked him last night, "Did those three thousand people take hold of that hammer and drive the nails into the palms of the Son of God?" I want him to tell me in his next speech if he really believes they did it. If they did not, then the Holy Spirit, not McCay, lays down the principle that an agent may do something and if the people approve what that agent done, the people can be said to have done it. I am sure that I am right, because I am taking what the Holy Spirit said and not what McCay said.

Now, he stated that McCay must prove that the manner of breaking is wrong. He knows better than that. He is intelligent enough to know that he is in the affirmative and it is his purpose or his place to prove that his manner of breaking is right. I could stand here and have a right to, according to the rules of debate, and not produce one evidence that he's in the wrong. Now, if he cannot produce the evidence that what and the way he does it is right the very fact that he cannot produce the evidence proves that he is in the wrong. It is his duty to make the proof here. I have here upon the board the word "manner". I have here a question mark. I want him to produce just one scripture that teaches the manner that he breaks the bread. I am not objecting to him using his fingers, but I want him to give the scripture that shows that they just broke off a little piece and left all the rest of it in one part. I might possibly make that better demonstrated to you here. I brought a couple of loaves tonight (let me just open them up) in order to show you some things that can be demonstrated according to the teachings of God's Word. And while Howard opens them up, I'll notice this "ekklao" proposition. Now, I am sure of this that the word "k-l-a-o" is used when he broke the five loaves. I am sure that "klao" is used in the communion. I said that "ekklao" was not used in the communion. Now, he did not deny it tonight. If he does not think that I was right, let him say so. "Ekklao" was not used in the communion and "ekklao" means "broken from" and that is evidence that a little piece was not broken of or from. And now if he wishes to deny it,

let him get up. I am not a Greek scholar. I admit I'm not. But I do know that "klao" is used in the breaking of the five loaves and I know it was used in the breaking of the one loaf in the communion.

Now, let's see about this communion proposition, quoting from the scripture, we have here a couple of loaves. I'll break one of them in the manner that my brethren break it. I'll break the other one probably in the manner that his brethren break it. If I don't, why he ought then to correct me.

Now, I wish to return to I Corinthians 11:23: "*For I have received of the Lord that which also I have delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night In which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: This is my body, which is broken for you.*" Doesn't say, "broken by you" but "*is broken for you*". And the Saviour is the only one who did that breaking as far as the record goes. Now, he may have... maybe we can imagine that somebody else did some breaking there in the instituting of the Lord's Supper, but the record only shows that Jesus did the breaking and he says, "*This is my body which is broken for you.*" <u>For you</u>, my disciples. Now then, let's read a little further: "*For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.*" Now I want you to get that last part especially, that in this eating of the bread, it is necessary ..... [scratched place on the belt] I want to ask this question. I'd like for him to answer it in his next speech. Do we discern a whole body, an unbroken body, or do we discern a broken body when we discern the body in the communion? Now then, let us notice again. In the communion we must discern the Lord's body either broken or unbroken. On the cross, two things were done that have to do with our salvation. Now, those two things upon the cross which have to do with our salvation was the breaking of the body and the shedding of blood and they... both of them are necessary.

Let's turn again now. I Corinthians 15:1: "*Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which ye are also saved if ye keep in memory the things which I have preached unto you. For I delivered unto you how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.*" Now then, without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin. The blood had to be spilled up on the cross for the remission of sins, but also Christ died for our sins and in his death, his body was broken. Now, I am not going to try to tell how it was broken, whether it was broken in two or whether it was broken by the wracking of pain as he hung there for six hours of time. I don't care how it was broken, but the Saviour said when he held there that loaf before them, "*This is my body which was broken for you*", but he did not say it until after he had broken the bread.

Now then, I want to break this. We break it similarly to the way that we break it in our communion. It is broken into at least one large part, or

reasonably small part. And now I'll break this. I have an idea it's clean, Mel baked it and I am sure that I won't get any germs, and I'll eat it. And now then, I'll show these two things up here. As you look at the two now and you just look at them and I say now, in which one of those do you discern the broken body of the Son of God, the body that was broken upon the cross? Just looking at the two… Would you say as you look at that, that that brings to your mind or that you discern by looking at that the broken body of the Son of God? Or when you look at this, would you say, "I discern there the broken body of the Son of God"? Reason for us now and I quoted the first thing last night… the very first quotation: "*Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord.*" Reason says that you will not think as you look at that. . just looking at it… you wouldn't even think of the broken body of the Son of God. But as you look at this, you are bound to think of it and in that you discern the broken body. It is necessary that it be broken. It was broken by the Son of God and was not broken, as far as the record goes, by any of the twelve apostles.

Last night, Brother Waters tried to throw dust into your intellectual eyes by saying I claimed you should present all the truth and then saying that there are thousands of truths in the Word that I wouldn't have time to present. Now, he misrepresented me there and as I see it here, he was just trying to throw dust in your eyes. I said that upon any particular subject that a person was preaching, it was necessary for him to present all the truth upon that subject and not keep it back and if he did so, Webster said he lied. He said in his speech tonight that McCay said he lied. McCay did not say he lied. I quoted Webster and Webster says if a person keeps back truth when people have a moral right to know the truth, he lies. And Brother Waters said there's thousands of truths in the Bible and would McCay expect him to present those thousands of truths when he is preaching upon a subject… that's throwing dust. He was just creating a smoke screen there. He knew that I did not mean that and that I did not say that and he also knows that when he is preaching upon a subject, whether the subject is communion or baptism or any other subject, he is under obligation to teach those people everything that has a right to do with the question of their salvation. That's where the moral right comes in. If it is just a question that hasn't anything to do with their salvation, the moral right doesn't come in, but if they have a moral right to know it, it is necessary for him to preach every point. Supposing I was preaching on baptism and am I to present every truth upon the subject of Sabbath, when preaching on baptism? And yet that's the inference… the connotation that he had by presenting that thought, that I intended, you know, that he must get up and present every truth in the Bible or Webster would say he lied. Yes sir, he is throwing dust into your intellectual eyes and he is not being fair when he does it. I said a person should present every truth on a subject.

Now, we come again. He asks: "Call that debating?" Call what was doing debating? I am under no obligation to follow him until he presents a scripture, which he has not done, until he presents a scripture that shows that his position is scriptural, I am not under any obligation to follow him in this debate. I told

you at the beginning that I was in this debate for the purpose of getting as much truth before the people. I am not wondering about whether I had to follow him or not.

I expect... I am pretty sure... that I was debating before he graduated from short pants and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if I know more about it than he does. But I want to read a little from the Rules of Discussion given to us by the one man which we usually go to when we are talking about as to how a discussion should be carried on. I turn now to Rule I: "The terms in which the question in debate is expressed and the precise point of issue should be clearly defined that there can be no misunderstanding respecting them. If this is not done, the dispute is liable to be in a great degree carried on to all meanings." Now, that's the first rule of debate laid down by Ned Rules of Logic.

Now, not one time in three speeches has Brother Waters clearly d fined his proposition. Not one time has he told exactly how they break and eat and then leave the rest of the loaf. Not once! He told how they break with their fingers and he told as to how they eat it. I didn't object to that, But not one time has he clearly defined exactly how they do it.

But now then, here it is again. I want him to give just one scripture that tells the manner... that is in the Bible that tells the manner in which they break it. One scripture that tells, as I read last night, that Jesus took the bread, blessed it, broke off a little piece and ate it and then passed the remainder to the disciples in one piece. I just want one scripture. Whenever he presents that scripture, I will shake hands with him and we will quit the debate. But until he does, he is the one to do the proving and it is up to him to produce the evidence. He has tried to tell you tonight that it is up to McCay to do the proving. Tomorrow night it will be up to McCay to do the proving, because tomorrow night I will be in the affirmative.

Now, we want to start in where I left off last night. Revelation 22:18 and 19: "*For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book, and if any mail shall take away from the words of the prophecy of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the Holy City, and from the things which are written in this book.*"

Now, if any person adds to the word of God or takes anything away from the word of God... I charge that Brother Waters is not only taking away, but adding to the word of God. He has added to by saying that it is right after giving thanks to just break off a little piece and to eat it and pass the remainder in a whole piece to the brethren. I challenge him to show one passage of scripture that teaches it and when he teaches it, he has added to the word of God. But he has done more than that. This may come in a little better tomorrow night. He has taken away from the word of God, because I am going to show you tomorrow night... I am going to show you by reasoning with God's Word as God tells us to do that the Saviour did break it and did not just break off a little piece and eat

it. He took that part away from the word of God and he does every time he preaches to his brethren upon this proposition.

Now, let's turn again. II Peter 3:16: "*As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures unto their own destruction.*" Now, the word "*wrest*", or the Greek word from which we get the word "*wrest*" is "to destroy, to pervert". Now, if he cannot find, in the manner of this now, where the Saviour took bread and blessed it, broke off a little piece, and ate it, and then passed the rest of it to the disciples, he is perverting what the scriptures say upon the proposition. He is wresting the scriptures, as Peter said some of them would, to his own destruction.

I turn now to a positive teaching in regard to this communion proposition. It should come up in my... in my proof, or in my affirmative, but I am going to notice it because Waters teaches it and he teaches it in his little tract that I have there in my... in my brief case and not only does Waters teach it, but the other preachers that have been here have taught it, too. And I want to notice now Psalms 41 and 9: "*Yes, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.*" Nothing is said here about the one who possessed his bread eating with his friends. Now, somebody ate with an individual who had bread. He possessed it and it was called by him "*his bread*" because he did possess it. Now, there isn't anything said that the person who possessed the bread ate any of it at all, but there was an individual who ate of the bread which he possessed. And this individual who ate of the bread that the other fellow possessed, he lifted up his heel against the other fellow.

And now, let us turn over to the New Testament scriptures and see just what application can be made of it. And I say, brethren, that Waters, through what is taught here... remember now, I said in the beginning of this debate I want to get as much truth before the people as I can. I'm not worrying about how I conduct the debate, because I didn't sign up any agreement as to how to conduct it. But now I turn to Mark 14:17 to 21: "*And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you which eateth with me shall betray me.*" Now then, there was some individual going to eat with Jesus. They were both of them going to eat. Brother Waters will admit that the one of them that was mentioned in Psalms 41 and 9 could have referred to Judas, probably did, and the other one could have referred to Christ, probably did. Now, let's go a little further: "*One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? And another said, Is it I? And he answer and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish. The Son of Man indeed goeth, as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had never been born.*"

Now, I want to call your attention to this fact and I want him to disprove it if he thinks he can, because he is in the... he is in the affirmative here and should produce the proof. Now, there is not one place in the teachings of the

scripture where it teaches that Christ and Judas both ate excepting in this verse that I have just read in the Book of Mark. And Brother Waters knows and I know that that was the Passover Feast. In the Passover Feast, Jesus possessed bread and possessing that bread, he allowed... he ate of it he allowed Judas to eat of it, all the rest of the apostles ate of it, and he said the individual who is going to betray me... now he was quoting there, referring back to Psalms 41 and 9... that individual is dipping with me in the dish. In other words, he is eating with me. There is a fulfillment of Psalms 41 and the 9th verse and there is not another place in the New Testament where he can find the fulfillment of it. Not another verse or another place excepting here in Mark. I know what he might say, but I am going to say this: If you take the five loaves, Jesus didn't eat of it as far as the record goes and Judas didn't eat of it as far as the record goes. None of the disciples ate of it as far as the record goes. The record says that the five thousand people did eat of it and Jesus, he broke those five loaves, he passed them to the disciples, and the disciples passed them to the multitude, and they all ate. But now then, that was a place where Jesus possessed the bread. It was his bread, because he did possess it. And the place where the four loaves were, or the four thousand were fed, you know, he possessed it there. And I am sure of this, now, that it was not his bread just because it might have been something that represented his body. If it had have been, he would have said, "Eat of my body" and not "Eat of my bread." I am presenting that for this reason. Some of you people may have read his tract and I know that you have heard King preach, you have heard Mason preach. I've talked with Mason, but not with King, because I have never met King. And both of them presented that thought, that it was the bread or the body of Christ that Judas and Jesus Christ ate. Not one verse can we find in the scriptures where this is so taught or is a fact. Verse 22: "*And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.*" He brake it; he told them to eat it. And as far as the record goes, he did not take a single bite of it. He did not eat it. They did not both eat together at that time.

Now, turn with me to I Corinthians 11:23: "*For I have received of the Lord that which I have already turned over unto you.*" We'll turn back now and ask about this breaking with the fingers proposition. He says, "Brother McCay, do you object to me breaking with my fingers ?" No, I don't object to you breaking with your fingers, but I do object to you breaking and claiming it is scriptural, a little piece out of that loaf, eating that piece, and passing the whole loaf or the rest of the loaf in a whole piece to the people. The reason I object to it is, it is not scriptural. You cannot find it in the Bible. Now remember that Waters is in the affirmative tonight. He has said that McCay ought to prove these things. There is not one single reason why he could say that excepting that he wants to throw the responsibility upon my shoulders, when the responsibility is entirely upon his.

Mr. Waters, Fourth Affirmative

Thank you for your indulgence while I put these chalks up on the board.

Now, Brother McCay said that I have never taught a religious principle I had to take back. Last evening, however, according to my recollection, he said that he had never taught anything that he had to take back. Now, I asked him if he had ever changed his mind on anything. If he, in all of his life, had ever taught anything which he believes now to be wrong. He didn't tell us. But he says he has never taught a religious principle which he had to take back. Now, I asked him if he had ever in his lifetime of worship taught to use individual cups or whether he used two or more cups. Did he reply? Did he answer? No. Now then, if he did and obeyed the principle which he preaches, he didn't teach the right principle. And if in doing that, he disobeyed the principle he taught, did he disobey all that is said in Romans, the 2nd chapter and the 21st verse: "*Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?*" He disobeyed Paul who said in Romans, the 2nd chapter and the first two verses concerning those who judge others, he said that "*Knowest thou not that thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for", he says, "wherein thou judgest, thou doest the same things.*" Now then, we want Brother McCay to tell us if in what he acted, he so did in compliance with all of the principle he taught, or was he teaching the principle and not obeying? Jesus, in Matthew 23, said concerning those who sit in Moses' seat: "*Whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not.*" I'd like for him to tell us about that.

He again says the Bible does say that he took a Passover loaf. The Bible does not say it. The Authorized Version does not say it. The Revised Version does not say it. And the Greek does not say it. I have a Greek New Testament here. The word Passover is "pascha" and I want you to look at Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, and I Corinthians 11:23 where he took bread or took a loaf and you will not find the word "pascha" there. I didn't say that Jesus didn't take a Passover loaf. I just said the record didn't say he did. I wouldn't say that he didn't, but you can't read it in so many words.

He doesn't want Waters to reach conclusions, but he can reach all the conclusions he wants to, but says, "When I do that, I am just reasoning with God's Word." He'll reach conclusions which he cannot read in so many words, but when I do it... but when McCay does it, it's all right.

Acts 2:42. He asks a question, "Was that referring to the communion? Was the breaking of bread, a part, put for the whole?" Yes. The figure of speech is a synecdoche in which a part is put for the whole. They committed this practice in "*the breaking of bread.*" The breaking of bread is a part of the whole communion and one wherein apart of the communion which "*they*" did... which they did... was mentioned as to "klao" that they did. But was the part mentioned true? Brother McCay won't even accept the part of the communion that is mentioned. He will not admit that they all continued in the breaking of bread

mentioned except in the sense that they acted through an agent. But if "*they*" in Acts 2 and 42 acted through an agent in doing the thing that was mentioned, they acted through an agent in doing the thing that was implied. They observed the communion and therefore, the "*they*" who observed the communion through an agent. I told you I could not let him have his cake and eat it, too. And I will not let him the "*they*" to mean that they all observed the communion and at the same time have the "*they*" to mean that they acted through an agent. Now, I wanted him to tell us about that. Silent as the breeze!

But then he says, "I object to his manner of breaking, because he does not break it like Jesus did." He says, "I object to his breaking a little piece off, eating it, and passing the remainder whole." Thank you. All right, let us... let us go to the breaking. Brother McCay says, "I object to the manner that your brethren break it." Not that I break it with my fingers. All right. We'll break it like that now. Is that broken? Now, I want to know. How big does that piece have to be? How big does it have to be? How many molecules got to be in it? Will you tell us about that? Is that broken? He says. .. he admits that I break bread. He says, "You break the bread." All right, what happened there? I broke it with my fingers. Is it broken? Now what does he object to about that? Is he going to say that's not big enough? I'd like for him to go to the Hebrews, to the Greek, to the Bible, or to Webster, or to anyone he wants to and show me that that's not broken. Just go anywhere you want to. That fulfills the meaning of the word "klao". But what does he do? He says that's "klao". He says that's not "klao". Is that the difference? Is it "klao"-ed if it's that big and it's not "klao"-ed if it is that big? Oh, my. You talk about proving something. Think about that. That's "klao"; that's not "klao".

All right, Brother McCay, we are going to get down to this same thing. You admit, now, that you break a piece off that big, that that's fulfilling the "klao". Don't you; if you break it that way? That's...

McCay:

I will prove my part of it tomorrow night when I get in the affirmative.

Waters:

You have already introduced these loaves.

McCay:

You have a perfect right to.

Waters:

If you don't want to talk about it, you don't have to answer.

Listen, he admits now that if we break it like this, that fulfills the scriptures. Now then, Brother McCay, for the sake of unity, we would like to get together if we can. I'll do anything that I can conscientiously do for the sake of unity that I believe is in harmony with the Bible. Now then, Brother McCay, if I were the one breaking and I broke it and I had one piece this big and the other

one that big, would you think it was all right if I did it? If I did it and the piece I broke was that big, would that loaf be broken? Would that fulfill the "klao" of the scriptures? If it would and Brother McCay will say that's all right, I'll tell you what I would do. If he will come and worship with us and work with us, I'll Just do my best to remember how big that was and when I go to the table, I'll do my best to break it just as closely as I can according to my recollection, that bread.. that big. Now, I wonder if I do that, if he will say that the bread is broken and I've fulfilled the "klao". Now, after I do that, the Bible tells me to eat, so I'm going to eat that piece. I've established that. And then I'll pass the loaf to the remaining disciples. Now, would Brother McCay accept that? I broke it just like he did. I broke it in pieces, the same sized pieces, but I ate one of them. Now, I'm going to find out if he objects to the way I break it, or does he object to my eating. We're going to get this thing ironed out. For the sake of unity, if I break when I'm at the table as close to my recollection as possible, I'll break it in pieces corresponding to that, that big a one and that small a one, and then I'll eat the smaller one and pass the remainder to the assembled disciples, will he unite with us on that? If he won't, he doesn't object to the way I broke it. He objects to my eating. I want you people to remember that, because I am not going to let you forget it. What does he object to, the way I break it or my eating? I told you a while ago I suspect that he doesn't actually object to the way I break it. No, he's not going to get down to that fine a point and say that that bread's "klao"-ed, that this isn't, but that that is. No, what does he object to? Evidently, he objects to my eating. Now I have set my practice before you. What is it that he objects to on scriptural principles? What have I done? I have broken. He admits that I have broken and I will break... I will do the best I can to break off a piece that big if he will fellowship with us. All right. Now then, I break bread. He admits I broke it. The Bible tells me to eat. I'm authorized to eat. Now then, suppose I eat. And I eat the smaller piece. Have I done anything the Bible didn't tell me to do or didn't authorize me to do? What have I done that the Bible didn't tell me to do? And what have I done that the Bible told me not to do? Now, you break it and see. You can see that. You admit that I broke the bread and I broke it with my fingers. Now then, when I eat a small piece, did I do wrong? Am I not supposed to eat? Am I not a disciple? And am I not authorized to eat? Paul said we are all partakers. I've certainly got to partake of it; I've got to eat, too. If I eat that piece, have I done wrong? What scripture have I violated? Where have I stepped one iota beyond the teaching of the word of God? What act have I done that is unscriptural and not authorized in the scriptures? You people can see that. He doesn't object to the way I break. He objects to my eating the smaller piece. That's what he objects to. He does not object to the way I break it. He objects to my eating the small piece. Brother McCay, this is going to get interesting.

All right. But as to Acts 2 and 36, he says that "*that same Jesus whom ye have crucified.*" Well, he said they did it through agents. They approved of it; they consented to it. I never have objected to that principle. But did you know that that's a figure of speech, too, that same old figure of speech, synecdoche, instead of a part being put for the whole, it is whole put for the part. It's our old

friend, the synecdoche, just reversed. It is the whole put for the part. That's a figurative use. That's figurative language when it is thus used. That's in partiality, not in full. But listen, the rule of Biblical interpretation is this, that language must always be taken in its literal signification unless the literal meaning is repulsive to reason or destroys the sense. You don't interpret the language literally if you can.....figuratively if you can interpret it literally. If you can interpret literally and the literal is in harmony with the rest of the teaching of the Bible, makes sense, is not repulsive to reason, it's literal. Now, that's the rule of interpretation you have to follow in interpreting the Bible, or you will miss the mark. Is there anything that would make it impossible for us to interpret it literally in Acts 2 and 42? "*They continued stedfastly in the breaking of bread*". Is there anything that forbids out interpreting that literally, that they all, literally all, continued in the breaking of bread? Is there anything that forbids our interpreting.....[end of belt]

Suppose we take I Corinthians 10 and 16: "*The bread which we break*" and we will not interpret that figuratively according to synecdoche and put the whole for the part, "*we*" for "one", whole for the part, but suppose we interpret literally and make them all... the bread which we break... all of us break. All right is that repulsive to reason? Does that destroy the sense, the bread which we break. Can we all break the bread in communion? Can we all break the bread in the communion? We do, so you can do it; we do it. Now then, when we all break bread, have we violated the scriptures? Now, think about it. If you can interpret the language of the scriptures literally, the rule of Biblical interpretation forces you to interpret it literally unless your literal interpretation destroys the sense, or is repulsive to reason, or violates the Bible. All right. When it's interpreted literally, does it make sense? Well, we all break. Is it repulsive to reason? We break, not repulsive to reason. Well, does it violate the Bible? No, you know what it violates? It violates Brother McCay's opinion. It violates Brother McCay's theory that the breaking of bread is an act performed only by one man. His opinion. Now, that's his theory; that's his opinion. But when we interpret I Corinthians 10 and 16 literally, that does not violate the Bible; it violates Brother McCay's opinion and theory and policies. So he will refuse to accept a literal interpretation of the scriptures, not because it violates the scriptures. It doesn't violate the scriptures for us all to break and eat. But because it violates his theories, so he will throw away the literal interpretation and affix a figurative interpretation to it, something he is not compelled to by reason, sense, or the scriptures.

Now, if you pursue that way of interpreting the Bible, you can prove almost anything. Now, I want you to remember that. I'm following what the Bible says and I am following the interpretation of the scriptures in a way that does not conflict with the Bible for we... we accept the literal interpretation of the language. It violates Brother McCay's theory; it doesn't violate the Bible. My practice does not violate the Bible. It says the bread which we break and it says we all partake. Now, the question is: Can we all break? We can. Can we all partake? We can. Do we all break? We do. Do we all partake? We do. Well,

that's what it says, that's what we can do; that's what we do. Does it violate the Bible? It doesn't, does it? That's what it says. Are there any other scriptures it violates? No. What's wrong about it? It conflicts with Brother McCay's theory. That's all. Just conflicts with his theories.

All right. Let's notice. He went to I Corinthians 11:24 where Jesus took bread, you know, and brake it, gave it to them, and said: Take, eat; this do in remembrance of me, and he said, "*For this is my body which is broken for you.*" Now, he says, notice that it says "*broken for you*", not "*by*" you, but broken "*for*" you, indicating or implying, if I understood him, that the word "*broken*" referred back to "*break*". Is that what you... you'd nod your head if that's it, that the word "*broken*" referred back to "*break*". Is that right? It's all right, just nod your head. Does the word "*broken*" there refer back to the bread Jesus took? Is that what it refers to? Would you nod your head if it does?

McCay:

I won't. I'll answer that.

Waters:

I'll be glad if you just nod your head. Does the word "*broken*" refer back to the bread Jesus took, or does the word "*broken*" refer to the body of Jesus? "*This is my body which is broken for you.*" Now, what is the antecedent of "*which*"? "*bread*" or "*body*"?

McCay:

Body.

Waters:

Body is the antecedent of which. This bread... this is my body. This is my body which is broken for you. He tries to break the bread... what about the bread... what is it you call breaking? Didn't I break bread? I guess I broke bread; it's broken, isn't it? How in the world are you ever going to get that unbroken after I've broken it? It's broken; isn't it? He admits that I broke it. It's broken into four parts there. I broke; didn't I? The bread is broken, isn't it? Even if he is not there, then it still fulfills the Bible, but broken refers to body. Now, I want you to notice this. Why select one out of three parallels upon which to build a theory? This bread must be broken to be the body broken for you. I Corinthians 11:24. Must not the bread be given to be the body given for you? Luke 22: 19. Jesus gave it to them and said: "*This is my body which is given for you.*" Now, when was the body given, then, or when Jesus died on the cross? Oh, he says, it isn't so that this is my body which was broken for you until after he had broken the loaf. It didn't say this is my body which is given for you until after he had given the loaf, either. Luke 22:19. I want to know if the bread is the body given for you when you express thanks for it or if the bread is not the body given for you until the one serving at the table gives it to the rest. Does the "*given*" refer to the body of Christ or does it refer to the bread.

All right. Can the fruit of the vine be shed to be the blood shed for you?

(Luke 22:20) "*This is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you.*" What is it? Why, this is my... the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you. I want to know. Does that "*shed*" refer to the fruit of the vine or the blood? The blood that Jesus shed on the cross, is that what it refers to? Or does it refer to the fruit of the vine? What do you do to the fruit of the vine that represents the shedding of the blood?

Now, those are three parallels. Do you take the fruit of the vine in the communion and shed it for it to be shed blood? What do you do to that fruit of the vine to represent the shedding of the blood? When was the blood shed? Was it shed on the cross? He said, "*This is my blood which is shed for you.*" What is shed? The fruit of the vine or the blood? What do you do to the fruit of the vine to represent the shedding of the blood? Not one thing do you do. You don't pour from one container to another in that communion to represent shedding. You don't squeeze it from grapes into the cup to represent shedding. You don't perform, why, with reference to that fruit of the vine that in any way is emblematic of the act of shedding of blood. But there's your parallel. "*This is my blood which is shed for you.*" Nobody that I've ever heard of has constructed a theory on that and said they've got to do something to grape juice to make it represent the shedding of blood. You see? Take grapes, for instance, and squeeze them, the fruit of the vine into the cup and say that's the shedding of the blood, that represents the shedding of the blood. But they are perfect parallels. "*This is my body which was broken for you.*" Then say you've got to break bread to represent the breaking of the body of Christ. But you don't shed the fruit of the vine to represent the shedding of the blood and I've never had any one of them say that you've got to give the bread before it's his given body. Why select one of these and build a theory on it to the exclusion of the other two when they are exact grammatical and scriptural parallels? What's wrong? You want to know what's wrong? Because it suits Brother McCay to build his theory on this. These other two, he just accepts them like I do. I am pretty sure he thinks they mean just what I think they do, but he takes one of these and builds a special theory on it. I want to know what's the matter. What do you do to the fruit of the vine to represent the shedding? What do you do to the bread to represent the giving? But if the bread has to be broken to be Christ's broken body... he's admitted that I break bread when I serve at the table... if it's broken, how are you going to get it unbroken?

And then again away he goes. All right. But he says now Paul says, "*Not discerning the Lord's body*". (I Corinthians 11:26 & 27) "*Eateth and drinketh. . whosoever eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation, not discerning the Lord's body.*" He says, now you discern the... how are you going to discern the Lord's body if you eat this and pass this? How are you going to discern the Lord's broken body? How are you going to do that? When it's broken, eat it. Did I break? He admits the breaking. But I want to ask another question: When he drinks that fruit of the vine, how do you discern the Lord's shed blood? Did you shed that fruit of the vine? There it is in one Bible. What have you done that represents shedding? Can you discern the shed blood in

it? If you can discern his shed blood, I can discern his broken body.

Now, I want you to get this. If he says you have to break the bread in order to show forth his death... broken in bits, you know. Paul says, "*As oft as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you do shew his death.*" How do you show the Lord's death? Paul says you do it by eating the bread and drinking the cup. He didn't say you show the death in the breaking of the bread. He says, "*As oft as ye eat this bread.... you do shew his death.*" How do you show his death? Paul says, "*As oft as ye eat this bread.*" He didn't say, "As oft as ye break. He says, "*As oft as ye eat.*" How do you show his death? "*As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup;*" You show the death by eating and drinking. How about that?

Well, he says, now here...when he broke those loaves two ways, you know... he said... he said, "which?" All right. The act of breaking which I did is an act everybody can do. I break it. This brother here can break it and eat it. This one here can break and eat. Everybody can break and eat. That's something we can all do and the breaking of bread in the scriptures is something they all did. They did. The disciples did. Paul said, "*We break.*" But this breaking which he performed, he broke, he passed all that. How can everybody do that? He is the only one that can do that particular thing. The way I did it, we can all do it, and Paul said, "*The bread which we break.*" He said the disciples came together to break and Luke says, "*They continued stedfastly in the breaking of bread.*" The breaking I do is a breaking we can all do and the breaking of bread in the scriptures was a breaking they could all do. That's reasoning with the scriptures. But he doesn't want me... doesn't want Brother Waters to reason with the scriptures. My proposition as stated is proved. That the manner of handling the bread in the congregations endorsed by J. Irvin Waters is scriptural. We break bread. We eat bread. We must break bread. We must eat bread. We do no more than the Bible teaches us to do and we do no less than we are authorized to do. What less have we done than we are authorized to do? Did Jesus eat? "*Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread.*" (Psalms 41:9) Now combine that with Jesus' quotation John 13:18 where he says, "*He that eateth bread with me bath lifted up his heel against me.*" "*Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread.*" (Psalms 41:9) "*with me*" (John 13:18) "*hath lifted up his heel against me.*" Now, if the bread was eaten with the Lord, the Lord ate, too. What bread was it? Psalms 41:9 says, "*my bread.*" Matthew: "*my church*" (Matthew 16:18) "*my kingdom*" (Luke 22:29 & 30) Does it mean the Jewish Kingdom? "*my table*" Does it have reference to the Jewish table? Then why is it that "*my bread*" doesn't have reference to the Passover Jewish bread used in the Passover Feast. But it doesn't suit his theory for "*my bread*" to refer to the bread in the communion. That's all. The trouble with Brother McCay is that he will not accept what the Bible says. He tries to find more ways to circumvent whole Bible language. That means my bread. My bread. That's what we refer to as the communion. In other words, Jesus said, "*This is my body.*" "*This is my body.*" Why won't Brother McCay believe that? Why won't he accept that?

Mr. McCay, Fourth Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, ladies, and gentlemen.

That was quite an interesting talk that Brother Waters made, but he drew a conclusion that I am sure is wrong. He says: "My proposition is proved."

I asked him to just present... I did ask him to just present one scripture, one text, that said that the way they handle the bread in the communion is right. He never even tried to prove it. Oh, he made a good talk, all right, but not one time did he offer a single text and I told him at the beginning of this debate that for every scripture that he would find that taught that Jesus took bread, broke a piece of it, and ate it, and then passed the rest whole to the people, I'd give him $5.00 and it still stands. He didn't even try to. He knows that such a verse is not in the Bible. I purposely went to the bank before I came here and deposited some money that would be left there if in case he produced a single text that taught it and it is there now and I will send him a check, but he has already forgotten, he has already gone beyond, now. He has not produced one text that says or teaches that Christ took the bread, offered thanks for it, broke off a little piece like they do, and then passed the whole to the congregation. His proposition is not proved, because he would not put down one scripture that told the manner of breaking the bread that he practices. Not one scripture. I put it there. He had two speeches… the time of two speeches to put it there and find it and he did not do so.

Maybe I'd better go back a little, because you will remember the thing that he said last and that's what I'll take up last while it is still fresh on your minds.

Now, he stated that "*my bread*" as mentioned there by the Psalmist David must have meant the communion bread, the very last case... or thing that I wrote here in my notes, that the bread mentioned in Psalms 41 and 9 must mean the communion bread. He did not present one scripture that said so. Not a single scripture did he present. Now, if it had have said back in Psalms 41:9 that "*he will eat of my body*", then he may have had a case, but it did not say that "*he will eat of my body*". I told you before that possessive case showed that if Jesus possessed bread, it could be called "*his bread*", And I challenged Waters then to produce a single scripture...I read from Mark… where it said that Jesus ate bread in the communion, and he cannot show it. Not one scripture in the Bible states that Jesus ate bread when he instituted the Lord's Supper. And my proposition is still good, now. You just produce one Scripture that teaches the way you do it, that he did it the way you do it, and I have the $5.00 in my pocket and I have money in the bank that I put there purposely just a few days before I came up here and I'll send you a check for $5.00 for every scripture that says that Jesus took the bread, offered thanks, broke off a little piece of it, and ate it, and passed the rest in a whole piece to the... to the brethren, or to the disciples. If he cannot do it, he has not proven his proposition, because that's the proposition that they do handle it in the same manner that they teach that

Christ handled it.

How can everyone break the way McCay breaks? Well, I have told you that and I didn't... it was not McCay's opinion. He has accused me of using my own opinion, but he did not tell just how it was my opinion. The way we can break the way McCay says they break is given to us by the Spirit. Not by McCay. Now, in Acts 2:36, he has ridiculed the idea of me claiming that some people could do the act of breaking or any other act and it be attributed to a multitude when only one or a few people did it. When he did that, he was ridiculing the Spirit of God. And that is probably the reason his lack of respect for the Spirit of God probably is the reason that David asked the question: "*Why do the heathen rage and people imagine vain things?*" He imagines these things, because he does not respect the... the Acts 2:38... 2:36... which lays down the principle that a person may do an action and if people approve that action, the action may be attributed to the people who do approve of the action done by one individual.

Can we all break the bread literally? Can we all bless the cup literally? Now, if we can all break the bread literally and if we all do break it literally, then we should all bless the cup literally. I've gone over this before and I don't see why that Waters isn't intelligent enough to get it? I'm not the person to be blamed for his lack of intelligence in grasping a fact, but here: They literally broke the bread. They've also literally blessed the cup and Waters does not believe that they should literally bless the cup. Oh, he mentioned Hannah... Hannah praying for that son, you know, and she prayed, her lips moved, but she didn't make any noise. Ah, but that's not the way it is in this blessing the cup. The individual who waits at the table audibly blesses the cup and if they all bless the cup in the same manner, some of them do not sit there, back there like Hannah did when she was praying for her son and just move their lips or just have it in their hearts. If one person acts literally in blessing the cup and we all must break literally in the same manner, we must also bless literally in the same manner and we cannot get away from the conclusion that every single member of the congregation has to audibly bless the cup before they can drink of it. And I am certain that Waters would object to the sisters doing it, because I believe that he agrees with me that there are certain things that the sisters cannot do in the Lord's Day worship. And if he does, he is going to keep his sisters from doing what, according to his own interpretation of the statement, where it says that they all... that we break the bread, according to his interpretation of it, he is going to be inconsistent and not let the sisters and the brothers all bless the cup.

He says, "It violates McCay's opinion. It violates McCay's opinion." McCay's belief is that Jesus did not take bread, that he did not bless it, he did not break off a little piece of it, and eat that little piece and place the rest of it in a whole piece before the disciples. Why do I believe it? Because there is no evidence that he did, so I believe that he didn't do it, or I reject the idea that he did. The accepted rule was made by the Spirit. We've noted that.

Does the word "*broken*" refer back to "*bread*"? Well, now, let's see about that. The word "*broken*". In the first place, we have the bread that Christ brake; the word "broke" isn't used there; we use it; that's the way we would express it. We have the bread that Christ broke. He held that bread there in his hands. Alter he had broken it, he says, "*This…*" What? "*This* (bread, now) *is my body which is broken for you.*" "*It is broken*" may have been spoken as a present tense referring to the time that it was going to be broken upon the cross. Now, I said it may refer to that. But as far as the breaking of the bread was concerned, it was done right then and there. And Christ broke it and with that bread that was broken before him, he says, "*This is my body which is broken for you.*" I don't care when the body was broken. I don't care where it was broken. But I do know that the bread was broken right there and the Saviour said as a result of that, that "*This is my body which is broken for you.*" Christ did do something to the bread. Why, certainly he did something to the bread, but there is one thing he didn't do to the bread as far as the record goes. Now, I'm just saying "as far as the record goes." I have no imagination when it comes to teaching religion. As far as the record goes, Christ broke the bread, but did not eat it. And yet we are told, "*This do in memory of me.*" Now then, just what does that word "*this*" include? To what does it refer? Why, it refers to everything that was done when the Saviour instituted the communion. First, the Saviour took bread. Next, he blessed the bread or gave thanks for it, as we would express it. And then, he broke it. Then, he gave it to the disciples and told them to eat of it. Now then, "*this*" means do all of this which I have done. So, we should take bread. We should bless that bread. We should break that bread. And every single disciple should eat of that bread. And that's just exactly the way the congregations do that G. Earl McCay endorses. But that's not the way that they do in regard to this proposition.

Now, let's turn again. "McCay builds his theory on the breaking. Now, let's see, "McCay builds his theory." Now, just whose theory is it that Christ broke bread? Is it McCay's theory, or is it Mark's theory, or is it Matthew's theory, or is it Luke's theory? Matthew, Mark, and Luke said he did it and yet Waters has the effrontery to stand here and say, "That's McCay's theory." McCay accepts the record as laid down there. McCay has no theory to build. McCay just simply accepts what the Word says upon this proposition.

How can everyone break the way McCay breaks? The Spirit tells how. Acts 2:36.

Now, let's go back to the forepart of his argument. He asked me if I ever changed. Asked me if I ever changed. That hasn't a thing to do with whether I ever preached or taught a religious principle that I could not read. There have been some things that I did not understand and practiced them possibly because I didn't understand them, but that hasn't a thing to do with it. He tried to impress upon your minds that because maybe sometime I have changed in my practice, that is proof that McCay has taught religious principles that he cannot read in the Book. There is no evidence there in the proposition as he put it up to you that that would mean that I ever taught a religious principle that I could not

read In the Book. Why, yes, I even went to a Methodist Sunday School when I was a young fellow back home, but I never did teach that it was right to have a Sunday School. Can't you see the difference? There's lots of things that I have done that may not have been right when I was young and didn't understand them. Yes, I even sang in the choir of the Christian Church at Brookside when I taught school there, but I never did teach in regard to a choir. I never did teach that the Christian Church was right. They offered me a salary... oh, more than forty years ago... and said, "McCay, we'll give you a salary if you will preach for us." So you can see the difference. There was a time when I did... [end of belt]

That was before I began preaching, but not one time did I ever sanction, in my teaching, a choir, instrumental music. And so when I got a little older, I began to preach. And as I began to preach because father said, "Never teach anything that you will have to take back," I was careful in what I preached, but I didn't know it all yet... I didn't know it all then and I do not know it all yet. But whenever I did something that I could not read in the Book... now, I never taught it... but when I did it, I quit doing it. Now, I believe that this audience is intelligent enough to see the difference, yet he implied by asking me that question that if ever I had done something that was not right, that was proof that I had taught something that was not right. He implied that. And I want to tell him right now that the God of Heaven knows that it was a wrong implication! It was a wrong thing for him to say or to tell you that just because I may have practiced something one time, that was proof that I lied when I said I never have taught a religious principle that I could not read in the Book. I never have. And I want to tell you this: There is not a person sitting in this audience and there are people here that have heard me for as long as twenty years preach. There are people in this city that heard me preach forty-three years ago in this valley and you cannot find a single individual that will tell you that McCay ever preached a religious principle that he could not read in the Book. I have done things, I'll admit, and I am not certain but what maybe Waters will. Waters, was there a time that you worshipped the same as I do in regard to the breaking of bread? Now, you can answer if you wish to and you don't need to answer if you don't want to. If you answer "yes", then your own argument is against you. And if you... if you refuse to answer, that's all right with me, but I do know that some of his brethren have done it. King did it. And now then, because his Brother King one time worshipped just exactly like I do and has quit worshipping that way, is that evidence that King was preaching wrong at the time that he was worshipping like I am worshipping at the present time? That's his argument. And I told him in a letter that I wish you would have King here to help you out, because I'd like to talk to both of you upon some of these propositions. He knows that I wrote that in about my last letter.

He still does not say that Christ broke it in a way... in the way that he breaks it by a scripture. Now, I want to impress that upon your minds. Waters has not shown by one single scripture that Christ broke the bread as he breaks it.

Now, I want to go back to Colossians 3 and 17. Some of you here tonight

were not here last night. I quoted from Colossians 3:17 where it says: "*Whatsoever you do, do all by the authority of Jesus Christ,*" Now, did Jesus Christ authorize them to do what they do do in the handling of the bread? He does not authorize it unless they can show that he taught them to do it that way or set the example. He's been in the affirmative these two nights. It's up to him to show that Jesus Christ did it exactly like they do or he has broken that commandment of Colossians 3:17. I may have said 27 a while ago, but that was wrong.

Now then, let's have a resume of some of the things I presented last night. In the first place, I quoted from... not the first place... but I did quote from I Corinthians 4 and 6 where the Apostle Paul told those brethren not to go beyond what is written. Waters has gone beyond what is written, because he has taught something that he has absolutely failed to find in the Word of God.

And I also quoted from Romans 10 and 17: "*Whatsoever is not of faith is sin*"... no, "*that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God.*" He has not shown one faith where the word of God says that they should practice like they do practice in the handling of the bread. And I turned to Romans 14 and 23 where it says, "*Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*" If he cannot show by the scriptures, which he has not done, the way that they practice, it is a sin for them to do it.

And then I turned again to Hebrews 12:1 and 2 where it says, "*Therefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, ever looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.*" In other words, Jesus is the author and finisher of faith and therefore, if Jesus did not teach them to do the way that they do do, it is not of faith, because faith begins and ends in the teachings of Jesus Christ.

I went from that then over to the statement of the Apostle John, in his second letter, and there is only one chapter of it, and the ninth and tenth verses. I quoted where that "*whosoever goeth onward and abides not in the teachings of Christ...*" Now, unless Waters can show that the manner of his practicing in the breaking of bread is in the teachings of Christ, when he goes ahead and does that, he has gone beyond the teachings of Christ and John says he does not have God with him.

Now, maybe because my time may be up... I've forgotten just to take a look at the clock... I want to notice another scripture especially in regard to, as to what should be done with this individual that may teach something that isn't in the Word, "*goeth onward and abideth not in the teachings of Christ*". He doesn't have God. Now then, he says to the brethren, "*If a man come and bring not this teaching, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.*" Waters has not brought the teaching and shown a single place in the scriptures... I put the question here... I wanted the scripture put down showing the manner in the scripture of his acting at the present time. He has not shown it and John says for the brethren not to receive him into their house, neither bid him God speed.

Now then, we are going to turn over to the statement of the apostle where he says that there will be people who would depart from the faith. "*The Spirit speaketh expressly that some will depart from the faith.*" They must have been in the faith to start with, because they departed from the faith, teaching lies in hypocrisy, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils... I got the two backwards there... but they are all in there. Do they do it? They ask for some things that they could not read in the Bible. They have left out things that are there. We noticed first last evening that he left out the fact... he noticed it tonight, but he disagrees with it... we noticed the fact that "klao" was used in the breaking of the five loaves. "Klao" was used in the breaking of one loaf. We reason with the Lord upon the proposition and we come to the conclusion that if the same word was used when five loaves were broken as was used when one loaf was broken, the natural conclusion would be that the breaking was similar and we were certain that he broke into fragments for the simple reason that they gathered up twelve baskets of fragments after the five thousand people had eaten. And, as I stated last evening, there is no record that anyone did any breaking of the five loaves excepting the Son of God. And so he must have broken it in that way. And we also called your attention to the fact that the word "klao"... or "ekklao" means to "break off". Oh, but there is another thing. Oh, yes, he almost had me lie and I had just about forgotten it, but I am afraid now that I had better tell it now for fear that my time will be up. He denies that the word Passover loaf" was in God's Word. I looked it up this afternoon and it is in God's Word. And I have the little book over at my son's at the present time. Now, I don't know whether he knows it or not. He may be ignorant in regard to the matter, but I can find the expression that he took a Passover loaf and I can find it in God's Word as translated into the English language. And yet he stood here and almost called me a liar by saying that it was not there when I claimed that it was there. It is there and I have the book over at Howard's place now. He was over and got it today. It says he took a Passover loaf, not just a loaf, but he took a Passover loaf, Then did McCay lie when he quoted the scripture upon the proposition, when he said it was a Passover loaf? No, McCay didn't lie, because McCay read it in the Book. I knew it was there and I asked Howard to go over and get the book today. I have the book down home, but I don't carry my reference books around with me. And it does say that he took a Passover loaf. And I hope that Brother Waters will have a conscience that's not seared as with hot iron. You know the Apostle Paul said that some of these false teachers would have their conscience seared with a hot iron. And that he will ask the God of Heaven to forgive him for the accusation that he brought against me when he claimed that I said something that was not true. And if he still denies it, I will bring the book tomorrow night and I will read it to you. I hope that God will forgive him, but I know that God won't forgive him unless he repents and asks forgiveness for charging me with something that I did not do and that I can prove that as far as the expression is concerned, it is in the word of God.

Now, let's see again. We turn over to the statement of the Apostle Peter. He says, "*As there were false teachers among you, so there shall be false...*" "*As there were false prophets among them, there shall be false teachers among you.*"

Yes, among Church of Christ people, "*who privily shall bring in damnable heresies.*" I told you last evening that an heresy was something that a person chooses to speak that is not given him the privilege of speaking when God says to preach the Word. He has taught things that he cannot find in the Word. The Book says. "*Preach the Word.*" Not a part of the Word, not nine-tenths of it, but the Word. And when he preaches that the manner of partaking of the loaf or the handling of the loaf is in God's Word and taught this way as they do it, he is presenting that which is an heresy. I've asked him, last night and tonight, to produce just one verse that teaches that Christ broke it that way. If he cannot, he is not preaching the Word when he preaches it; he has presented a damnable heresy. I called attention to the fact that "*a damnable heresy*" is an heresy that will damn a person. Now, McCay is not calling it a damnable heresy. The Apostle Peter did. And we also told you that Peter said that they would even deny the Lord that bought them. I want to tell you brethren it's a serious thing to practice something that you cannot read in the word of God, because if you do, you are doing that for which you have no authority and when you do that for which you have no authority, you deny the individual who has the right to authorize you to do anything. And Jesus Christ was called Lord because he had all authority. He had the only right to tell you what to preach and what to do. If you practice something that you can't read in the book…and Waters has not even tried to read it. I've asked him time and again to just give me one reference that will teach the manner of handling the bread as they practice it, and when he preaches it, he has denied the authority of Jesus Christ. He has denied the Lord that bought him and he will bring upon himself great destruction when, in the Day of Judgment, the Son of God will be compelled to say, "*Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels.*"

Now, let's see about the Devil and his angels. I have used that once before and so I have a right to use it again. Who are the Devil's angels? Angels are messengers. Anyone who preaches a false doctrine is a messenger of the Devil. But just the true people, now, that conform to the doctrine, we presented that last night. God produces the true doctrine. The Devil, through his angels, produces the false doctrine that is not taught in the word of God. And every messenger... I don't care whether it is McCay or whether it is Waters, ... who teaches that which he cannot find in the word of God is teaching the doctrine of the Devil and becomes an angel of him and he will have a place reserved for him down in the place where the Devil and his angels live. (Is my time up?)

I thank you.

Proposition: "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by G. Earl McCay is scriptural."

Mr. McCay, First Affirmative

Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, and friends.

What is commonly called a lie being passed, was passed last evening. I have said that I could read in the Book where it said Jesus took a Passover loaf. Brother Waters said I couldn't read it. So either McCay lied or Brother Waters lied. If McCay cannot read it, McCay lied. If McCay can read it, Waters lied. There are no "ifs" nor "ands" about it. Now, I'm turning over and I am going to read: "*During the meal, Jesus took a Passover loaf, blessed it, and broke it.*" Who lied?

Now, I wish, as I have lots of time for my affirmative, two nights, I first will just analyze my proposition, clearly define it. Now, I won't wait until the last of the debate, as Brother Waters did, and he didn't himself clearly define it, but he let me define it, and he agreed that I was telling it correctly. "The manner of handling the bread in the communion by those congregations endorsed by G. Earl McCay is scriptural." To be scriptural, I must be able to find that the scriptures teach it. If I can find that the scriptures teach it, it is scriptural. The manner of handling the bread by those congregations whom I endorse is: The individual who waits at the table takes the loaf, blesses it, and breaks it into two or more pieces, and the broken loaf is passed to the congregation. I am sure that that covers entirely the proposition and I have clearly defined it and I am certain that you people will understand as to just what I have to prove. I have the weight of the work tonight. It's up to me to prove. I'll not tell Brother Waters, as he told me, that Brother Waters must prove anything. It's not up to Brother Waters to prove anything tonight. It's up to McCay to prove what his proposition is. The man in the affirmative is the person who has to produce the evidence and to produce the proof. I thought probably that Brother Waters knew that, because he is an experienced debater. Maybe he just forgot it.

Now, I made a couple of slips last evening. Oh, not in what I said, but in what I did. And I tonight take my notes… I write a big, bold, free hand. And I had my notes resting over there and I noticed Brother Waters walked over about this close to me and I thought, you know, he was going to look at me, but I looked up and he wasn't looking at me. He was looking toward my notes. Now, I don't know whether he was reading them or not. I just reached over and turned my notes over. I'll not make another slip like it. I made one slip. I am getting old and I am not as cautious as I used to be in regard to those things.

There was also another slip that I made. I was a little tired. I'll admit that I was and when he commented on… let me see; where is it? John 13 and 18, I never heard it. I may have been writing, but that didn't bother me, because I happen to have his tract, so this morning I took his tract and I read some things

he said about John 13 and 18 and I will present them tonight at the opening of my speech before I present any other arguments.

But before I present any other arguments, I want to read something to you. Now, I'm not vouching for the truthfulness of what I am going to read. Now, get that. I do not know whether it is true or not. If I knew it personally, I'd say, "Yes, it's true. "But I do not know it personally and I am going to read it for you to take for just what it is worth. And I read:

> "To break the bread into two parts in or near the middle is as sinful to most of these brethren..." (referring to those that break like Brother Waters) "as to have a big dance and everyone get drunk. Each of the members must break off a piece of bread and eat it. By doing this, they soon have the bread to half its original size, which is equivalent to breaking it in two in the middle, but it is no sin when done this way. They assume breaking it in two in or near the middle would be breaking his bones; however, they can consume the entire loaf..."

I mentioned it almost like this the other night in an argument, "without breaking or eating a single bone. All in knowing how, I suppose."

Now, here is something that has been distributed here in this community. I say I do not vouch for the truthfulness of it, because I do not know, but if Brother Beddingfield was here, he could vouch for it, because he attended the debate and he was there when H. C. Harper and Omar L. King decided upon a strategy in order to meet what we call the "cups brethren". Now I read:

> "H. C. Harper, the reported originator of the cup question, encouraged his followers to make the breaking of bread a test of fellowship, also. Something like ten years ago in southern Oklahoma, he said:
>
> > 'No one can successfully meet the cups brethren and take the position that the bread can be divided into two parts. If the bread can be divided into two parts, the cup can be divided into two parts.'"

That is a direct quotation of H. C. Harper. Now, I'm not vouching for the truthfulness of it.

Waters:

How do you suppose it would be...

McCay:

Just stop a minute.

McCay:

Just stop a minute.

Now, I don't know whether that's true or not, but Brother Beddingfield told me that he was there at the debate and that when Harper and King decided on doing that, he asked them not to do it. He told them that they would divide the Church of Christ. He argued the question with them. Take it for what it is worth. If he were here, he could give… could speak for himself upon that proposition. [This occurred in 1928 per Sister Dorothy Sage and Sis. Lurana McKlusky, who were present at that meeting, as stated in an audiotaped interview by J. D. Logan, August 19, 1979 — Ellis Forsman].

Now, let's turn over to Waters' argument on John 13 and 18. I admit I didn't hear it last night. I am not as alert as I was thirty years ago, but I took it from his tract. And what I quote, I quote it exactly as his tract states it. John 13:18: "*I speak not of you all. I know whom I have chosen, but that the scripture may be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.*" This is Waters' comment: "According to Jesus, he and Judas both ate my bread…" Now, get this: "the bread of the communion."

I made the statement at the beginning of this debate that I would give to anyone in this discussion $5.00 if they would find one single verse that said that Jesus took bread, broke off a little piece, and ate it in the communion and that offer still stands. I wish you would watch him closely. He's a good twister; he's a good squirmer. He knows how to get around things, but I want you to watch him closely, to see if he produces a single text that says so. Now, that's one conclusion to which he came where be used his imagination and where he asserted his opinion. It does not say that they ate the bread of the communion as I read it to you. Now we quote from the Bible: "*He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his hand against me.*" Now, does that say one word about the bread of the communion? It does not say what bread, although Brother Waters concluded in his comment on the other that it was the communion bread. Judas was present at the institution of the communion for Jesus said: "*The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.*" (Luke 22:21) That is correct. "*…with me*" (John 13:18). So Christ must have partaken… now, get this… here is his conclusion… because Judas was there at the table with Christ, his conclusion is: Therefore, Jesus must have partaken with Judas, because he said, "*He that eateth bread with me,*" and this bread was "*my bread*". I will admit it was "*my bread*", but it did not tell whether Jesus ate the bread at all as far as communion, but there was a place on the table where both Jesus and Judas did eat bread and I am sure it was on the Passover table. But they were at the same table when Jesus instituted the communion service. Now notice verse 19: "*Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he,*" Does Waters know that the "*it*" which is come to pass, refers only to the communion? Now, in his tract, he puts that argument up that the "*it*" that is going to take place sometime in the future was the communion. It does not say one thing about whether the "*it*" referred to the communion or not. There were several things that were in the future yet. It could refer to the Passover. Both of them were to come to pass in the future from the time that Christ was speaking.

But using his imagination and reading between the lines, he concludes that Christ had in mind the communion, so his conclusion is therefore Christ and Judas both ate the communion. It was called "*my bread.*" (Psalms 41:9) He did use his imagination. He did use his opinion, because it does not say that in the communion, Christ ever ate the bread, and he cannot find a single verse that says so. Now, if Psalms 41 and 9 had had in mind the communion so his conclusion is... Now, if Psalms 41 and 9 had said: "Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, with whom I did eat... or, who did eat of my body", then Waters would have some ground for his conclusion that Christ and Judas both ate of the communion. But it did not say that he ate of Christ's body. It said he ate of "*my bread*". Judas both [? - indiscernible] ate of the communion, but it does not say "*my body*" and Waters has no Bible ground for his conclusion.

Now, in Matthew 26 and 21: "*And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me.*" Was that the communion? Every Bible scholar knows it was not the communion. "*He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish.*" That dish was on the paschal Passover table and the Passover feast and Judas and Jesus both dipped together in that dish and both of them ate. Now, this could be the time… I am not taking a positive position, but I am saying that it could be the time that Christ referred to in regard to his... to what was going to take place that he was telling them about before it did take place. This proves conclusively that Christ and Judas were both eating there. That which they were eating was in Christ's possession, and was his. My hat means a hat in my possession. Christ's bread was bread that he possessed. Waters has to use his imagination to conclude..... [end of belt]

My dinner would be a dinner that I possessed. Now, I believe those are illustrations enough to show you that when Christ... or when the Psalmist David said "*my bread*" it did not designate as to what bread it was, it was bread that did belong to Jesus Christ.

Now, I wish to go back to Jeremiah 23 and 28: "*The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.*" Now, if Waters wishes to have a dream, that's all right. He has a perfect right to have a dream, but when he has a dream or when he uses his imagination or when he wishes to express an opinion, whether it is in his book or not, he should say to the audience, "This isn't God's Word. This is my dream. This is my imagination." He should tell it as a dream, said the Prophet Jeremiah 23 and 28. He says, "*He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.*" And whenever he reads in God's Word where it says that Jesus took bread, blessed it, broke off a little piece, and ate it, he'll be speaking God's Word faithfully if he is sure it is in His Word. If he cannot read it here in His Word, he is not speaking God's Word faithfully. He is disobeying the command of the

Bible as given in Jeremiah 23 and 28.

Isaiah 8 and 20: "*To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*" When Waters says that the eating done by Christ and Judas was the communion, does he speak according to God's Word? If he can read it in God's Word in so many words, he is speaking exactly as God's Word says. Or has he put on his invisible, but highly magnifying glasses, that permit him to read between the lines? We cannot see the glasses; they are invisible to us, but they must be highly magnifying, or he wouldn't be able to read between the lines. You know I read the first night of this discussion how Brother King said that too many of their preachers now... not our preachers... preachers that believe as Waters does, are reading between the lines, and seventy-five per cent of the things that they are saying cannot be read in the Book. And some of the older ones are doing that, too. And I want you to watch him carefully tonight. He is shrewd. He is a good twister. I want you to watch him carefully and make sure that he reads where it says in God's Word that Jesus ate bread in the communion. Whenever he does, 1 will admit it. But I will not admit it until he does, because I am preaching the Word as it is here and I am speaking according to that Word, because I want light to be in me and let that light guide me through this life until it will bring me to the gates of the Eternal City, until I can enjoy the eternal light, the light that comes from the Glory of God. If he reads between the lines, it is because there is no light in him. If he is walking in the light as God is in the light... If not, it would be impossible for anyone to have Christian fellowship with him. I want to talk to him about that just a little bit, because he has made an appeal to you people and he, of course, included me in that appeal, that we ought all to get together, we ought to all work together. If Brother Waters will walk entirely in the light of God's Word, he and I can work together. But he and I can have no fellowship unless he walks entirely in the light of God's Word, because John says (1 John 1:5): "*God is light and in him is no darkness at all.*" In other words, God is all light. And in the 7th verse it says: "*If we walk in the light, as he is in the light*" — that is, as God is in the light — "*we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.*" Whenever Waters will walk entirely in the light of God's Word, whenever he will never preach a principle that he cannot read here, he will find that McCay will be willing to have fellowship with him, work with him, preach with him, and encourage him. But until he does, the God of Heaven says, "McCay, you can't have Christian fellowship with him, because you both must walk entirely in the light of God's Word in order to have this fellowship."

Let's turn again. "*Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve. And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth as it is written of him, but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed!*" Now, we've already read a part of that out of Brother Waters' tract. The man

that was dipping in the dish with him, sitting there was the fellow that was going to betray him, the one who was doing exactly like David in Psalms 41 and 9 said he would do, lift up his heel against him. "*It had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said. And as they were eating...*" They just were eating in the Passover... had just finished eating the Passover Feast... "*Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.*" Now, let's see just exactly what he did. He took bread, he blessed it, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. Now, Jesus did the blessing. Jesus did the breaking. He said to his disciples, You disciples do the eating. Not one word there about Jesus doing one bit of eating, but all the disciples did eat. Jesus blessed. Jesus broke and the disciples ate.

Now, I could rest my case on that one quotation, but I am not going to. Waters told you last night that he had proved his proposition, yet he would not put a single verse here upon the board. He would not put a single reference upon the board giving me a chance to refer to that reference and he said he had proved his proposition. Without no reference at all, he proved his proposition according to his imagination. I have given you one reference, read it exactly as it is in God's Word.

But I read again: Mark 14:17 to **22:** "*And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I? And he answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish.*" Now, this was the Passover Feast. In the communion feast, they did not have a dish into which they could dip. It was the Passover Feast where the two of them were eating. "*The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him; but Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had never been born. And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.*" The command to take and eat was the same exactly in Matthew and Mark.

Now, let us come over to Luke, the 22nd chapter, 14 to 21: "*And when the hour was come, he sat down and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.*" Now, it was the Passover that he was going to eat with him. Not the communion that he was going to eat with them. They ate the communion afterwards, but not one word said about him eating the communion with them. "*For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves, for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come.*" Now, there are two places where Luke mentions the cup. We will read a little further. "*And he took bread, and gave thanks. and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me.*" Paul, referring to the same thing, said that Jesus

told him... that Jesus had said that this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. This which he commanded them to do referred to what? It did not just refer to the breaking of the bread. It referred to everything that they did at the time that the communion was instituted. It referred to the taking of the loaf. It referred to the blessing of the loaf. It referred to the breaking of the loaf. It referred also to the eating of the loaf. "*This do in remembrance of me.*" All this that I have just been doing now, you people take and you do the same in remembrance of me. In other words, there was a command for the disciples to do similarly to what Jesus had done at the time that he instituted what we commonly call the Lord's Supper or the communion.

Now, the quotation as to being "*broken for you*" is I Corinthians 11:23, 24: "*For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread. And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me.*"

There are four quotations, now, that I have read. Not one of those quotations mentions the assertion... not the fact, because it is not a fact... that Jesus ate in the instituting of the communion. It's only an assertion of Brother Waters and the other preachers who believe and preach like he does on the communion proposition. These scriptures give us the example of Christ. His example is our authority. We discussed how authority could be given. Authority can be given in two ways: One is by precept; the other is by example. And everything that we do, we are commanded to do by the authority of Jesus Christ. Now, if we have to do it by his authority, we must find either an example for it or we must find a precept for it in the fact that he tells us exactly what to do. First, he set the example, and after he had set the example, he gave us the precept and said, You do this which I have just done. The example is there and also the precept is there.

Is following the exact example of Christ scriptural? My proposition is that the manner of handling the bread in the communion by those brethren whom I endorse is scriptural. Now, I am asking that question again for you to get. Of course, the people who read the book, they would not have to read it over the second time. But the question is: Is following the exact example of Christ scriptural? If it is, then we have proven that our proposition is scriptural. (I guess my time is practically up, so I'll just quit.)

Mr. Waters, First Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends.

I am going to take up the first thing to which Brother McCay brought our attention tonight. And I have to say that he has done this, I am sure, to his own sorrow. I did my best last evening, Brother McCay, to spare you this embarrassment. I told you then and I told the audience then that I thought when you said what you did about the Greek saying he took a Passover loaf, that you didn't know what it said. I gave you the benefit of the doubt. I gave you a chance to take it back as just perhaps a slip of the lip. But you refused to take it back. You have stubbornly and in a self-ruling way pursued your course, constantly with my warning you that it was not there. He persisted in saying that it was there. Be it remembered that in his statement, and we played the record today to make sure, he said the Greek says he took a Passover loaf. In other words, that that is in the Greek, a word which pointedly can be interpreted Passover. I deny it. It is not there. And furthermore, I still will say I give you the benefit of the doubt, if he admits that he has not read the Greek and just doesn't know what he is talking about. But if he has read the Greek, he knows better. If he hasn't read it, be ought not to say what he did with such forcefulness.

Now, he said either McCay or Waters is lying. Well, you are the one that used the term and I am going to admit it, that one of us has lied about it. That's right.

All right, now then let's see what he did. He went to a translation, Weymouth's translation. Why, Brother McCay, I knew all the time what this translation said about it. Why, certainly I did. You said the Greek said. I wasn't interested in what Weymouth said. When Weymouth put the word in that the Greek doesn't have, I don't respect that over the Bible. What do you think about it? This is a one man translation and it must be remembered in regard to almost all translators, once in a while they interpolate words that are not in the original. They just simply interpolate. That's even so in the King James version. I can show you words there that are interpolation and paddings. That is, the interpolator supplied the words. They weren't there in the original. The word Passover is not in the original. He went to a one-man translation where Weymouth just simply interpolated. Why such men ought to be the first to admit that the word Passover wasn't in the Greek. I have not denied that Jesus did take the same kind of a loaf that was eaten in the Passover. I admitted it; didn't I? I said the Bible Just didn't say it. That's what I said about it. We have to reach that conclusion, but the Bible does not specifically say it. And he came back and told you the Greek said it. Why, Weymouth is not the Greek. And this isn't Greek. Brother McCay said the Greek said it. And if he doubts it or if anybody here doubts it, we will, for the record, deny it and let you hear it. He said the Greek said it. All right, let's see about that. Brother McCay, here is a Greek New Testament. There are four references -- I Corinthians 11:23, Luke 22:19,

Mark 14:22, and Matthew 26:26 — which mention Jesus taking bread. Find the word Passover, the Greek pascha, in either one of these. You told me you had a Strong's concordance by letter. Find the Greek word pascha, which is the only word in the Greek which is ever translated Passover. You can look it up, no doubt, in your Strong's. If you haven't, you had better look it up. Now, you find the Greek word pascha right in that Greek New Testament in one of those four references. I challenge you to do it. If you can't do it, who lied? If you can do it, Waters lied. I want to face the fact for I know what I am talking about. I knew all the time. Now, right here is Young's Analytical Concordance. It gives every place in the New Testament where the Greek word pascha is used. Every place. That's the only word translated Passover. It gives every reference. Brother McCay perhaps has already consulted Young's. If he has, he knows better. If he hasn't, he ought not to be so dogmatic about it. Now then, he can read and right here it is. I want you to look at it. Consider the angles from the testimony before you go so deep. Look at it. Not one single, solitary place with reference to the bread that was eaten is it called Passover. Here's the Greek Lexicon right here. Under the Greek word pascha, on page 493, he gives every reference... it shows so by the presence of the asterisk at the end of the quotation... that he gives every reference in the New Testament where the word is used. Right here is the Greek Lexicon where that word is used every time. It is not there in reference with... of the communion. Now, here it is. Would you consult that? Would you look at the evidence and the testimony? And I don't have Strong's. Do you have it with you?

McCay:

I do. It's Young's. I didn't tell you I had...

Waters:

Oh, I beg your pardon. My mistake. I thought If he had Strong's... I thought you said Strong's. You have Young's. Fine. Then you know. Well, if you had Strong's, it would tell you the same thing. It shows the same things that Young's does. Now, I want you to look at those. I want you to get back up here in your next speech and say it's there. If he does, I going to be duty bound to have to call time and have some of his own friends come up here while I show them the equipment [?]. I'm going to have to. It's isn't there. I don't like to expose a man among friends. I don't like to have to do this. I'll probably say he was just embarrassed. I'll probably say he was just troubled. If he had just been a man, a gentleman and got up last night and said, "Now, I just made a slip of the tongue. It isn't there. The Greek word pascha is not used there." You said the Greek said and that's where I hunted it. I am not interested in what Brother Knott [?] says. I'm interested in what the Bible says, what the language of the Bible has in it. And there is no word in the original... in the Greek... that's your own expression... that is used for Passover with reference to the communion loaf. Just isn't there.

Now, then, who... [blank on belt] and understand what I said, speak and say, "Waters, you lied about this thing." Who will do it? If you will do it, I'll

show you. I'll come over there, word by word, and show you. But now, here's the sad part about it. If I were to stack up a mountain of evidence that high to prove it isn't there, there is no doubt but what some of you have got enough confidence in Brother McCay to say, "Oh, he must be right." That's the sad thing about it.

Young, you step aside; Taylor, you step aside; Strong, you step aside; Greek New Testament, you step aside; and let Brother McCay pass by.

Look at them; will you? You haven't looked at them yet. If you'd only looked at them, you'd have known you were wrong. And if you haven't, you had better look at them before you speak again.

All right. Now then, let's go to something else. He reads from a little tract written by J. L. Musgrave. J. L. Musgrave, by the way, is a cups advocate. He believes in the use of cups. Well, now, Brother McCay says, "I don't vouch for the truthfulness of it." He introduces evidence and he says, "I won't say it's the truth." Isn't that an ignorant thing to do something about? Why. I wouldn't be obligated to even touch it, as far as that is concerned. He introduces evidence and says, "I won't say it's the truth. I wouldn't vouch for it. Yet, I'm going to read it; maybe somebody might happen to believe it," If it's not the truth, now, somebody believed him, no doubt, that's here tonight. But he says, "I wouldn't say for sure it's the truth." How many people believed him? Now, is that the kind of evidence to put out? Evidence that the man who puts it out says, "I wouldn't say for sure it's the truth." What's it put out for? To convince, to prove, or to disprove. Takes truth to do that. But he says, "I wouldn't say it's the truth."

Well, I want to show you what Musgrave has done. Oh, he quoted from Musgrave where Musgrave said Harper, you know, is the one that began this thing. Harper… you know what Musgrave said? "H. C. Harper, the reported originator of the cup convention." Why, the same man said that… that reported Harper is the man who originated the cup convention, too, the convention supporting cups. Do you believe that? If you don't believe what Musgrave said about Harper originating the cups convention, do you believe what he said about our originating the bread breaking convention which I oppose? You see? Will you accept his evidence? Will you accept his testimony? Will you accept his witness? We will not! If he will, then he will have to admit his evidence that Harper originated the cups convention, too. Now, that's the kind of evidence he puts out. He says, "I wouldn't say it's the truth. I wouldn't say it's the truth. When I get positive about something, you can just be pretty sure I know what I am talking about. I've looked it up, studied it, looked it in the face for a long time, and know what I am saying.

All right. Now then, to John 13 and 18. Notice! "*Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread…*" (Psalms 41:9) What bread? "*My bread.*" Now, John 13 and 18 quoting it says, "*He that eateth bread with me.*" (John 13 and 18) What bread is under consideration? My bread. David speaking prophetically using the personal pronoun, first person, "*my*" there,

putting himself in the place of Christ as he did frequently through the Psalms. "*He that eateth my bread with me,*" (John 13 and 18), "*hath lifted up his heel against me.*" What bread is under consideration? "*My bread.*" Now, what's wrong with Brother McCay? He won't have a thing but what he can read in the Bible. He won't believe a thing when he can read it, but he'll believe what he can't read. He'll believe something he can't read, but he won't believe what you can read.

Now then, what does he do? He goes to Matthew 26 and begins to talk about their observing the communion. And you know what he does? He says, "Now, I won't say for sure, but this could have referred to that bread in the Passover." You see? "I won't say for sure," he says, "but it could have, it might have," he said. In other words, tacitly admitting, "I don't know what bread was under consideration. It may have referred to the bread of the Passover." But he don't say for sure. You see? Yet, he just reverses, you see, indicating that it was probably that way, but it might not have been that way. Now, that's the kind of evidence that Brother McCay introduced. You see? But why is it that Brother McCay won't have my bread to be the bread of Christ? Why is it? Oh, he said, "My bread... if I. . . if I lift my hat, that would be the hat in my possession. My bread," he said, "means bread that was in the possession of Christ. Doesn't necessarily have any reference to the communion bread." The bread of the Passover eaten by Jesus and the disciples was not any more, in the sense of possession, the bread of Christ, than it was the bread of the others present. You see? It was no more the bread of Christ in the sense of possession that he talks about, than it was the bread of the others. But now then, when Jesus says, "*My bread*" he evidently refers to bread which in a peculiar sense was his. What bread was the bread of Jesus in a peculiar sense? The bread of the communion. He said, "*This bread, this is my body which is given for you. This is my body.*" "*My church*" doesn't mean the church in the wilderness, but the Church of Christ. If "*my church*" (Matthew 16:18) doesn't mean the church in the wilderness" (Acts 7), if "*my kingdom*" (Luke 22, verses 29 and 30) doesn't mean the Kingdom of Israel, then why is it that "*my bread*" doesn't mean the bread of the communion? Why is that?

Why? Brother McCay isn't going to believe that. Well, you know why? It doesn't fit Brother McCay's theory.

Now, he has admitted by way of implication he doesn't know for sure what bread was under consideration. No, he didn't say positively that it was the Passover bread, said it might have been, but he didn't say for sure. All right. If he doesn't know for sure what bread was under consideration, it may have been the bread of the communion. May it not have? You don't know for sure whether it was the Passover bread or not. It may have referred to the communion. It's just according to your point of reasoning. You don't know for sure what it was. It may have referred to the communion, but why is it that you refuse for it to be the bread of the communion? It doesn't suit your theory. You see? Because if it had… if it pertained to the bread of the communion, it proves that Christ ate the bread with the disciples. And that doesn't suit his theory. Oh, he said, "It

would have had to say 'which did eat of my body' if it referred to the communion bread. " Who told you it would have had to say that? Why, the bread in the communion, even though it's emblematic of the body, is still bread and is still referred to as bread. The Lord still refers to it as bread. The writers still refer to it as bread. Who told you it would have had to say "which did eat of my body"? That must have been the result of those highly magnifying glasses which permit you to see between the lines. I don't want to jest this thing.

All right. He refers to Jeremiah 23:28: "*The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream.*" Nothing about the communion. Still getting off the subject.

Isaiah 8:20. Nothing about the communion.

I John 1:5 to 7. Nothing about the communion.

And did you know he talked twenty minutes before he started affirming his proposition, He's been telling us for two nights, "When I get in the affirmative, I'll prove something." And he talked for twenty minutes before he actually began to deal with his proposition. Dealt with it for ten minutes out of his thirty. I dealt with mine, all of my speech the first night, the first affirmative. I wasn't off the subject; I was on the subject. I was in my proposition. He's been telling us he would do that, when he got in the affirmative. He was in the affirmative and talked twenty minutes before he started to affirm his proposition.

All right. Now then, here is Brother McCay's… one of his main errors in studying the Bible. One of the fundamental rules of biblical interpretation is this: That every scripture must be interpreted analogically; that is, every scripture pertaining to a subject must be interpreted with the light of every other scripture pertaining to that same subject. Now, what does he do? He quotes Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:17, Luke 22: 19-23, I Corinthians 11:23 where Jesus took bread, and Jesus broke, and stops right there. And he reads that Jesus brake, Jesus brake, Jesus brake, Jesus brake, but those are not the only scriptures which mention the breaking of the bread. You see? In order for us to understand the breaking of the bread, we must compare these scriptures with every other scripture pertaining to the breaking of the bread.

All right. Let us compare these scriptures, now, with every other scripture pertaining to the breaking of the bread. Is that all right? Well, we have over here Acts 2:42: "*They continued… in breaking of bread.*" What does he say about that? Oh, they must have acted through an agent. If that be the case, he admits the breaking of bread there is one part of the communion which is mentioned implies the rest of it. He wants only one to do the breaking, but he wants all of them to do the thing that the breaking of the bread implies. He cannot have his cake and eat it, too, with reference to the bread. He cannot make the "*they*" operate through an agent in the breaking of bread and all of the "*they*" commune, do the thing that is implied. He can't do that, because the fundamental rule of language interpretation is that the meaning of a word cannot be diverse at the same time and in the same place. Can't do it. He can't reason figuratively and literally both in that same place, synecdoche on the one hand

and literal on the other. It can't be. That violates a fundamental rule of language interpretation. You may have been preaching before I got out of knee pants, Brother McCay, but you certainly need to learn something about the rules of language interpretation.

Well, I want you to notice an interesting thing: Paul said "*The bread which we break.*" Not just one verse, but in all the scriptures we get "*The bread which we break.*" What "*we*"? "*We being many.*" What "*many*"? "*Of one body.*" The "*many*" that are of "*one body*". "*Now are they many members, yet but one body.*" (I Corinthians 12:20; I Corinthians 12:2; Romans 12:verses 4 and 5) Now, we being members of one body, we break. What else do we do? Paul said, "*For we are all partakers.*" Oh, he says that the multitude may act through an agent. I told you the other night that I agreed with the principle; that it will work for some things that a multitude may act through an agent. Yes, I concede that. I've never denied that. In fact, I even told you that the verse of scripture "*whom ye have crucified*" was a synecdoche. Now, I even told you what figure of speech it was, the whole put for the part, but he says I still denied the principle. I do say that the principle doesn't apply to the breaking of the bread. Oh, he says, yes it does. All right, what have we got? He says, "We partake", so then one, an agent, may partake for the rest. They may act through the agent and partake. The Catholics preach that it should be one for the rest. They partake through their agent. They teach it that way, that they all partake through their agent, the priest, and let him drink all of it. You see? That's right. Well, what have you got? Well, he is going to try to limit his rule, so we act through an agent who breaks, but all the "*we*" partakes. But if the "*we*" can act through an agent in the breaking, the "*we*" can act through an agent in the partaking.

In Acts 20:7: "*... the disciples came together*". How many of them? "*... the disciples*", plural, "*came together to break bread*". All right. What do we learn about these verses? We learn that these verses, in conjunction with those which say that "*Jesus brake*", only prove that the breaking of the bread in the communion is an act performed by every communicant.

Now, he says, "What about the manner of the breaking? You didn't prove your manner." Let's reason with the Word of God. That's what you said. You said, "Reason with the Word of God. "All right. According to the Word of God, the breaking of the bread in the communion is an act performed by every communicant, but there is only one act of breaking which can be performed by every communicant. Let's reason with the Word of God. Let's use our intellects. There is only one act of breaking which can be done, performed by every communicant, that is the act of breaking which precedes the eating. I'm going to see if Brother McCay will stay with his Bible interpreting's.

All right. Let's notice. In Acts the 20th chapter and the 11th verse, we have a Bible principle. He says he likes these Bible principles. Let's see what it is. Acts 20 and 11: "*Paul went down and fell upon him, and embracing him said, Trouble not yourselves; for his life is in him. When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten...*" What is the Bible principle? That

eating naturally and logically follows the breaking, the breaking of bread, that they go together. What's that? When he "*had broken bread and eaten.*" The eating logically, naturally follows the breaking. There's your Bible principle. I am going to see if he stays with the Bible principle. He said the Holy Spirit says these principles.

All right. Let's notice again, now. In Acts 27 and 35: "*And when he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all and when he had broken it, he began to eat.*" There's your principle said by the Holy Spirit. What is the principle? That the breaking naturally and logically follows... or precedes the eating; that the eating naturally and logically follows the breaking. There's your Bible principle. He says the Holy Spirit says these things. Brother McCay, you're fixed now. There's your Bible principle. The Bible principle is that it is natural and it is logical for the eating to follow the breaking, and for furthermore, the eating to follow the breaking done by both parties, that is by the same party. The same party is supposed to do the breaking — "broke and ate." There you are. See if you will stay with this Holy Spirit Bible principle, now. See if you like it?

I'll ask a few questions here from Brother McCay. I want to narrow the issue down. First, if when I serve at the table, I would break the bread into pieces comparable to the size of those into which you broke it last night in demonstrating your practice, then eat the smaller piece, and pass the remainder to the rest of the disciples present, would you accept it? Broke it just like you do, but I eat the smaller piece, pass the remainder to the disciples present, would you accept it? If you would not, then is it not a fact that you are really objecting to the fact that I eat one of the pieces, and not to the manner of my breaking the bread?

Two, if when I serve at the table, I will break the bread into pieces comparable to the size of those into which you broke it last night in demonstrating what you conceive to be my practice, and then passed both pieces to the remainder of the disciples without eating first — I broke it just like you did when you demonstrated my practice, but I just went ahead and passed both of them to the assembled disciples — if I did that, would you accept that? Just want to know if you would accept it.

Third, if when I serve at the table, I will break the bread into piece comparable to the size of those into which you broke it last night in demonstrating your practice, then retained the smaller piece in my hand, and without eating first, passed the remainder to the other disciples — not eating the piece I retained until others had first partaken — would you accept it?

Four, what act do you perform the way I told you the first time to represent the shedding of the blood which is shed for you (Luke 22:20)?

Five, what act do you perform with reference to the bread to represent the giving of the body which is given for you (Luke 22:19)?

Six, in respect to "*this is my body which is broken for you*" (I Corinthians

11:24) — does the "*broken for you*" point forward to the death of Christ upon the cross, an as yet unaccomplished fact, or as to the past breaking of the loaf, previously an accomplished act?

Seven, in your second negative speech where the recording will show that you said the Greek says he took a Passover loaf, you said nothing about some interpolation made by one man translator. I want this put down as a one-man translation in which he interpolated a word not in the original. Will you please cite the Greek text which so reads and give us the Greek word in the verse which was translated "Passover"?

Eight, that where is the precept or example authorizing the man sitting at the table in the congregations you endorse to break the bread twice? He hasn't told you about all that manner yet of how his congregations observe the communion. I want you to go ahead and tell us all about it and why that bread comes back to that man and he breaks again. Talk about me affirming the proposition. I want him to tell us about that man breaking bread twice, and find the scripture for that.

Nine, will you please read the verse or verses which say that Christ broke the loaf into two large pieces and then without partaking, passed both to the assembled disciples?

Ten, did every one of the "*they*" in Acts 2:42 do the things mention in that verse, or did "*they*" act through an agent in doing them?

Ten… or eleven, in the communion, when does the loaf become the body of Christ? I am especially interested in the answer to that.

Twelve, in the communion, when does the fruit of the vine become the blood of Christ?

Now, we want him to get up here and read the verses which prove his practice that the man serving at the table has authority to break the bread into pieces and pass all those pieces, without eating and partaking, in violation of a Holy Spirit principle said in the Word of God, and when the bread comes back to him, break again and then eat.

Mr. McCay, Second Affirmative

Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, ladies, and gentlemen.

I should not have said the "Greek". I should have said the "Word". I just admit that I made a mistake there. The Word does say it; the Greek does not. I read it from the Word.

Now, before I take up my notes that were formerly prepared, I want to notice the remarks that he has made and notice them very carefully

He held his hand up. If I would pile evidence that high, implying that the evidence showed McCay was wrong, some of you people would take McCay's word for it. Not a one of you would, because I have always told you in my preaching and in every argument that if you did not believe that I was preaching exactly what I could read in the Bible, tell me of it and make me turn and read it. My brethren do not take my word for anything. I've got to read it. And that's been my principle for forty-nine years, or forty-eight years and a little over of preaching.

McCay will not believe what he can read. That is absolutely false. McCay will believe anything that Waters can read, but I will not believe that Jesus Christ took a loaf, broke a piece off of it, and ate it, unless I can read it, or unless Waters will read it to me. And just as soon as he reads it to me, I will believe it. Or just as soon as he shows me in the Bible where I can read it for myself, but it must say that. That is what I started out with; it must say that Jesus ate it,

Now, I want to make a little remark here. I may make an argument on it later on. That even if Jesus broke as Waters illustrated last night, if he did not eat it and if Waters cannot show that he ate it, then the condition would be exactly the same as the condition where we pass it around. There would be two pieces on the plate. So you see it is up to him to prove that Jesus ate it or he is passing two pieces around the same as I might pass two pieces around. If he proves that Jesus ate it, then that is a different proposition.

"McCay will say, 'It might be the Passover.'" The reason I did not say positively that it was the Passover is because it does not say it was the Passover. And the reason that I will not admit that it was the communion bread is because it does not say it was the communion bread. Of course, if Waters will read that it was the communion bread, right then McCay will accept it.

"The bread was no more the possession of Christ than the possession of the disciples." The truth will not bear him out in that. Jesus sent and had that prepared and it was possessed by him as soon as it came into his presence and was brought to him. Jesus did possess it. The disciples had no possession at all of that bread.

Does Waters know it was the bread of the communion? You see, he says, "McCay admits that he doesn't know it was the bread of the Passover, because it

doesn't say so. "Does Waters know it was the bread of the communion? I want him to tell you that when he gets ready for his next speech. If he does know it and if he will show it in the Book, then McCay will know it, because we both will read it. And when we both read it, Waters will know it and McCay will know it. But I want Waters to read it and I am asking him does he know it was? He said it is. I said I didn't know it was the other, because I can't read in the Book that it was the other. Reason would tell me that if it was not the bread of the communion, it would probably be the bread of the Passover.

"*This is my body*" was said of the bread that Christ had. "*This is my body*" was said of the bread that Christ had, but it did not say that that was the bread that Christ was going to eat of and that Christ and Judas both would eat of that same body. It does not say that. That's the point at issue and if Waters cannot show that Christ ate of that bread, he has got to admit that there were two pieces — if it was in a plate. I don't know it was. Now, Waters may come at me on that, because I say I don't know it was on a plate. I don't, because the Book don't say so. But if it were on a plate and Jesus did not eat, they passed at least two pieces around for the disciples to partake of.

I talked twenty minutes "before he started his proposition". Let me tell you what he did, and you will know it; he talked three hours before he defined his proposition. But he says, "That's terrible. Brother McCay talked twenty minutes before he starts in on his proposition." I've still got him beat a good many minutes. He talked three hours, made three nice speeches before ever he described his proposition.

"Must take all scripture about breaking bread." I'll admit that. I'm willing to take all the scripture about breaking bread, but I want Waters to just give me one scripture that says that Jesus took bread, and broke it, and ate it. If he does, I'll take it along with these other scriptures that I have been reading. I'm willing to take it all, because it takes all of the scriptures to prove a proposition upon any subject with which the scriptures deal.

Now, let's turn again. Does the principle of Acts 2:36 apply to the blessing of the cup? Now, he says here the principle of Acts 2:36, which we have discussed before, does not apply to the breaking of the bread. I am asking him does it apply to the blessing of the cup? And if he says yes, why shouldn't it apply to the other then? Because of this fact now, if it does not apply to the blessing of the cup, he has got to find in his congregation where the leader blesses the cup — audibly now — you can't bless, it with just your lips closed, or your lips moving, like Hannah did when she was begging God for a male child — it is necessary for him to bless that cup audibly. Now, if he blesses that cup audibly and we all bless that cup audibly, then every single member of the congregation must bless that cup audibly before they take a sip of it and as I said the other evening, the women would have to bless the cup audibly, just the same as the men bless it audibly and you having your women speaking in the congregation. I don't believe Waters believes they have a right to. I am opposed to it excepting in the singing. I want you to tell whether that applies… Acts

2:36 applies to the blessing of the cup or not.

Acts 20:11. "Eating follows the breaking." I'll admit it that it did there, but he implies now that the principle is that whenever it says "*break*" it implies "*eat*". Now, I deny that he proved that by that quotation. If "*breaking*" meant "*eating*", why did it say that he eat? Why didn't it just say that he broke it and we'd all know that he eat, because in the breaking it implied the eating? The very fact that it said that Paul ate is evidence that in order to find out whether the eating was done, it was necessary to say that it was done. And so then in order to find out that Christ ate the bread after he broke it, it must say that he did, the same as it said that Paul ate alter he had broken the bread. If it wasn't necessary to say that he ate, why would it have been put there?

And then he turns over to the time when the Apostle Paul, after the shipwreck. They had been on board I think it was fourteen days — I won't turn to read it — they had been fasting and he took bread and blessed it and brake it and eat, or ate. Why didn't they leave out "the ate" part if breaking meant, or implied that they should eat? It does not imply that they should eat and that's the reason that it says that Paul ate when he after… that's the reason it said that Paul ate during, or after the time of the fourteen days fast. And because it says it, it should be up to Brother Waters, as he understands, you know, the interpretation of language and everything like that, it should be up to Brother Waters to show that Christ ate by not only mentioning that he broke, as it mentioned that Paul broke, but in mentioning that he ate, the same as it mentioned that Paul ate after he had broken. I'd like for him to take his own medicine and tell us about that.

"Did Christ break the loaf into two large pieces?" Well, now, you see, I don't know, so I'm not going to say for the simple reason that I don't know. There are a lot of things that I don't know and I will tell you just what those things are. Anything that the Book doesn't say on religion McCay doesn't know. And more than that, McCay doesn't believe it, because faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God. I might think that he did it, the same as Waters thinks that he ate it, but a "think so" is not scriptural. And no one should base his hope of Heaven upon Waters' "thinks so" or McCay's. But McCay is not going to say what he thinks about it. McCay is going to admit that he don't know just how large those pieces were into which the Saviour broke the loaf, but I do know that the Book says, now I know this; I'm not just thinking about it; I'm not just imagining it. I do know that the Book says that the Saviour broke the loaf after he had given thanks for it.

Now, let us examine the meaning of the work "*break*" as given by Webster. One of my grandchildren said to me the other night, he says, "Grandpa, who was Webster ?" I don't know whether he thought it was somebody in the Bible, or what he was. Who was Webster? Well, I said, "Webster is the individual that gives us the authoritative meaning of English words." Well, he understood that then.

Now, let's turn to Webster and see a little bit about the meaning of these

words. “Break. In general to separate into parts (plural), fragments, or cause to fall apart by any force.” It doesn’t have to be a great force or a little force, but it must be some force. “Break. To come apart into two or more pieces.” It can be two pieces, or it can be more pieces. That’s the meaning of the work “break”, The Saviour could have broken it into just two pieces. He couldn’t have broken it into one piece, because it wouldn’t have been broken. He could have broken it into two pieces and met the meaning of the word “*break*”. He could have broken it into more than two pieces and still met the meaning of the word “*break*”.

Now, let’s turn again. “Broken. Violently separated into parts or pieces, in fragments.” Now, I made an argument the other night that there were twelve fragments of... twelve baskets of fragments taken up. The Saviour had broken the five loaves. It is evident that he broke them into many fragments, into many pieces, because there is no evidence that anyone did any breaking in the five loaves excepting the Saviour. But he had to break them into fragments or they could not possibly gathered up twelve baskets of fragments. But now then it doesn’t say that he broke it into that many, but it does say that they had that many. It does say that Jesus broke. It does not say that another single individual broke of the five loaves, so naturally, reasoning with the Lord — Waters kind of — doesn’t exactly like the way I said that once before — reasoning with the Lord, I know that he had to break it into fragments in order to have fragments. And it does not say that any one did any breaking excepting the Son of God.

When the one who presided at the table has offered thanks, he separates.... [end of belt]... he divides that into parts or pieces, in fragments. Then when the bread was broken — that is what Webster said “break” means. And the Saviour gave an example when he broke the bread. Now if the Saviour broke it into pieces or into fragments and the man that waits at the table breaks it into pieces or into fragments, he has done exactly what the Saviour... what the Book says the Saviour did. There’s our example for it. When we do exactly what the Book says the Saviour did, we have an exact example and that’s our authority and when we take that authority, we certainly are doing that which is scriptural as revealed to us in God’s Word. Now if “*broken*” means “violently separated into parts or pieces, in fragments”, then when the bread was broken to represent the broken body of Christ, it was separated into parts or pieces, fragments. The bread was broken into pieces. I don’t know how many pieces, but it was broken there in the hands of the Son of God and he says this broken body now... this broken bread, rather, represents the broken body of Christ. I don’t care how many pieces it was broken into. If he only broke it into two pieces, that’s all right with me, but if he broke it into two pieces, that gives me the authority to break it into two pieces. Now, Brother Waters, I don’t know whether I got this down on my notes or not. I thought I did. But I do know that he asked the question as to just how big those pieces were. Why, I don’t know. I don’t know how big the loaf was. Neither do I know how big the pieces are going to be broken into when one of our brethren over at Eugene waits on the table.

And then you did bring up another thought. Oh, it seems to bother him about this individual breaking twice. That isn’t necessary. I am sure that every

time that that loaf has been broken in our congregation at Eugene that there are always fragments of that bread upon the plate. Very seldom do I have to break it, because it has been broken for me, as applying Acts 2 and [?]. If I have to break it again, that is, I'm not waiting on the table, I never do over there, but if I had to, I would only break what was necessary in order for me to eat. And the man who breaks first, usually, probably, it could go clear around to all of the congregation and come back and there still be a fragment. It doesn't have to be a big bite, you know. Some of us fellows with big mouths take big bites. If it is a fragment, that answers the scripture. And if a fragment that is a quarter of an inch each way comes back to the person who is waiting on the table, he can eat that fragment. He does not have to break twice. Waters implied — now, he didn't say it word for word — he implied that the fellow who breaks and waits on the table would have to break twice and he wants to know where McCay can show authority for him breaking twice. I say that it does not necessarily imply that he has to break twice, but if he did, the second breaking would only be what was necessary for him to do to eat as every single disciple is commanded to eat.

Now, let's turn again. The first thing you know I'll be losing my glasses. I'll be up against it if I do. Oh, I've got them over here. I've got two pair with me anyway. I always take two pair along. If I break one, I'll need the others. I'm glad you mentioned that because this is… are the kind I want.

I Timothy 4:16: "*Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.*" Now, you know, Brother King had a good idea. I read it to you the first night of the debate. I wish all young preachers would take his advice. I wish Brother Waters would take his advice, too, and never preach anything excepting what he can read in the Book, because King said that in our preaching, we should want to save people, not just down an opponent or another debater, to save people. Now, let's see as to what is necessary in order that we may — now, get this — "*for in doing that thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.*" Now, if we can see in the doctrine that we can read here in the Book, we will save ourselves and the people who hear us. But now supposing that I preach a doctrine that I cannot find in the Book. I have no promise that I will save myself or that I will save any of the people who hear me. Neither does Brother Waters. If he preaches a single principle that he cannot read here in the Book, he is not continuing in the teachings of God's Word as the Apostle Paul commanded Timothy to do so, "*continue thou in the doctrine. Take heed unto thyself*", were the things that the Apostle Paul told him to do, "*for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.*" He said, "*Continue in them.*" Now, that is in the plural, not just continue in one principle of the Gospel or the doctrine, but in all the different things that are taught in God's Word. And I wish — yes, I wish that in order that Brother Waters and I can work together and have Christian fellowship, that he would just show me in that doctrine where it says that Jesus Christ broke off a piece of the loaf... I don't care whether it was a little piece or a big piece… but broke off a piece of the loaf and ate it. And after he does, I'll go out, too, into this broad land of ours and

I'll be preaching that Jesus Christ broke the bread and that he ate and that we might conclude that he passed the rest of it in a whole piece. I said, "might conclude," now. Don't misunderstand me. But unless he can show that Christ ate it, I know that there is no possible way of concluding that Christ passed the loaf in one piece to the people and I don't think Waters will deny that. I believe that is reasoning with the Lord and I believe that it's reasoning with Waters. I believe it is reasoning with you. If he broke a piece off and didn't eat it, there had to be two pieces left, the one that he broke off from the other and the one from which he broke it. But as I told you the other evening, the word that means "*broke off*" was not used there in regard to the breaking of the bread in the communion. Oh, yes, he put something else up here. That's all right. But still he did not deny that "klao" was used in the breaking of the bread, both of the five loaves and of the communion bread. It is the word. I looked it up before I came. I looked it up in Young's and that is the word that is used there. But this is the word used when it says that the natural branches were broken off. When it means "*broken off*", "ekklao" is used and not just "klao". So if the Saviour just broke off a piece of the loaf, that is the word "ekklao" that would have been used there by the reporters. He didn't use it, so I have a right to conclude that Jesus did not break off a little piece from the main body of the loaf, and I know I have a right to conclude that he didn't eat it, because no one has ever been able to find it. I expect that Brother Lee is the only preacher here in the audience that has got me beat a little bit, but I doubt if he ever found it. And I doubt if I live to be a hundred years old, I'll ever be able to find a single scripture that says that when Jesus broke the bread, he ate it. And until I do, friends, I am not going to preach it. I am not going to preach a religious principle that I cannot read in the Book. Oh, he asked me last night, you know, about did you ever make a mistake? Did you ever worship like us? I asked him did ever he worship like we worship, and he didn't answer. I don't know why he didn't. I'm willing to admit that I have made mistakes in worship in the past, but I do deny that ever I preached a religious principle that I could not read in that little Book there. I told you last night that I had sung in choir. I told you last night that I had attended Sunday School, but I never… I never repented them, never preached them. The fact of the matter is the first year I began preaching at lower Montana, the brethren there wanted to organize a Sunday School. They wanted to organize it, because… a doctor there wanted to organize it, because he had been in the Christian Church in Kansas City and his brother was the man who baptized me when I was only twelve years of age. His brother was there in the audience. When they suggested that they were going to organize a Sunday School, McCay was the man that got up — a twenty-one year old preacher of the gospel — and opposed it and opposed it so strenuously that I threw that doctor into epileptic fits. And Brother W. J. Owen, the man who baptized me, said, "Oh, Brother McCay, you can never do any good opposing anything." I said, "Didn't Luther oppose something when he came out against the Roman Catholic Church. "No, Brother Waters. McCay never has preached a principle that he cannot read there in that Book. I have worshipped in ways that was not there. I've been caught in places. I have been caught where they had

individual cups, because I didn't know they had them there, and the wife was with me. What did we do? We drank from one cup and ignored the others and we knew that the Lord would accept our communion, because we drank from just one cup and we blessed that one cup In our mind now, he may take that up — we blessed it in our minds, because we would not drink from individual cups. They don't catch me that way unless it is by mistake. I never do go to a place where they have individual. I never do worship where they have individual cups for fear that there might... oh, yes, you know, I could even [?] it to the Lord without making a disturbance in the congregation when I blessed that cup... but I don't get caught there any more, whenever I know that that's the kind of congregation it is. But I never did preach it. I never did accept it. I still want Brother Waters to tell us before this debate is through whether he ever worshipped like we do. I know King said he did and I have been told that Brother Lee said he did. I know that Mason told me that he did and that he departed from the faith; gave heed unto seducing spiritual doctrines of devils, and he — that is, Mason — printed a lie about me. Why, the wife knows it; my boy knows it and that's exactly what the Spirit said they would do, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and the lie was printed in former Harold King's paper.

II Tiniothy 3:16: "*All scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.*" Now then, the Holy Scriptures furnish us with the example that we follow when we have the communion. And now I want to ask the question, "Is it a good work?" If exactly like the Holy Scriptures furnish it if it is a good work, it would have to be scriptural, because things that are nonscriptural are not good works. And good for a reproof, for correction, instruction in righteousness. Now then, let us see about that righteousness proposition. "*All unrighteousness is sin.*" This is found in I John 5 and 17. "*All unrighteousness is sin.*" Now, where do we find that unrighteousness? Turn with me to Romans 1:16 and 17: "*I am not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith.*" I'll have to take that up in my next speech. I thank you.

Mr. Waters, Second Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends.

As I stand before you for the last negative of this session, I would like to say that I think more of Brother McCay now than I did a few minutes ago, because in the first part of his last speech he just got up and frankly said that "I made a mistake." He said, "I should have said the Word and not the Greek. "In other words, he just admitted that it just isn't in the Greek — that's what he said in the first place and the thing that I continued to battle. It just isn't there. He said "I made a mistake. I shouldn't have said it. "Now, I'm glad you said that, because I knew you were wrong all the time, Brother McCay, and I appreciate your saying that.

However, he said, "I should have said the Word. "But remember this: Paul said, "*Which words we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth.*" (I Corinthians 2:13). Now, what were the words which Paul spoke as the Holy Spirit spoke? They were the words in the Greek, as given in the Greek New Testament. Those were the words that were taught by the Holy Spirit, the actual words, the inspired words. He says the Greek doesn't say it. In other words, the language as inspired by the Spirit, actual language inspired by the Spirit don't say it. And if they don't say it, the Word doesn't say it. Weymouth said it. The Word didn't. The Word cannot say it if it is not there in original; otherwise, we could all just interpolate and just put in anything we wanted to. He says, "The Word says it." I have got just as much right to interpolate as Weymouth. McCay has just as much right to interpolate as Weymouth does. It is not in the Greek, therefore it is not in the Word. I appreciate his admitting frankly it is not in the Greek. That settles it.

He said, "My brethren will not take my word for anything." Now, then, I want to apologize for having left the impression a while ago that there may be someone here who agreed with Brother McCay who wouldn't accept evidence if I could stack up a mountain of it. I don't mean to imply such a thing as that. That would imply that this audience isn't sincere about it. And I don't want to do that, and so I want to apologize for having said something that might cast any reflection over this audience, because charity — real Christian charity demands that I take for granted that the other fellow is just as sincere and honest as I am, as I believe myself to be. The rule of Christian charity demands that.

All right. Let us notice. Last evening, he said, now... the evening before, he said, "I'll give $5.00 for every scripture introduced which will prove your manner of breaking. I'll give $5.00 for every scripture." All right. What is my manner of breaking? I break with my fingers. Do I have you wrong?

Another voice:

The moderator isn't here.

Waters:

That's all right. I thank you. Stop... stop the... I don't want to misrepresent him, now.

Now, let us quote him. He said, "I'll give $5.00 now for any scripture that Brother Waters will produce now that will prove that Jesus broke and ate. "All right, let's notice. Matthew.

Another voice:

It's stopped again, Brother Waters.

……. [Small scratchy, untranscribable portion on the belt.]

Waters:

He doesn't want me to produce scriptures that will just prove it. Say, we are right back where we started this thing. He wants Waters to produce scriptures that will just in so many words say it. Now, but what does he do? Why, he... he will say that they all acted through an agent in the breaking, yet he cannot produce a scripture that in so many words says that they broke through an agent. You see? He just... he tries to prove that. He tries to reason with the Word of God, you see, to prove it, but if I reason... "Oh no, I won't give $5.00 for that. I won't give $5.00 for the scripture that would prove it if you have to do it with reason." But it's all right for him to reason with reference to his method of breaking. It's all right for him to just reason. He cannot produce a scripture that says that they broke bread through an agent. (Acts 2:42) I just accept what it says. He won't have what it says; he says it means something else, but he can't produce a scripture that says it means something else. He can't do it. He won't have a scripture that says the disciples came together to break bread. That's what it says. He won't have a scripture that... when I produce it, as what it says. He won't have what it says, but he'll have what it doesn't say. It doesn't say the disciples acted through an agent and he'll have what it doesn't say. It does say that the disciples broke and he won't have that. What is the matter with the man? He won't have what it says, but he will consent to what it doesn't say. "Brother Waters, we've got to have it word by word and word for word from you." Well, I gave it word by word right here on the breaking. He won't have it, says it means something else.

All right, let's notice. Now, he said he would give me $5.00 if 1 can just read it, not just prove it, but read it that he broke and ate. I'm just an old poor fellow and I need the money. Now then, let's see. In Matthew 26 and 26: "*Jesus... brake.*" All right, I've proved that he broke. He broke it. All right. "*Jesus... brake.*" Did he eat? Psalms 41:9: "*Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread...*" "*...with me...*" (John 13:18) "*... hath lifted up his heel against me.*" Matthew 26:26 says that he broke. This says that he ate. I want my $5.00! I've read you this. I want my$5.00!

Another voice:

Here... here it is, Brother.

Mr. Waters:

You… you have had.

Mr. McCay:

Read a verse, now, just read a verse that says that he ate and don't put three or four together.

Mr. Waters:

Why, listen to that…

Mr. McCay:

Read a verse that says…

Mr. Waters:

He's not going to let me think that two, or three, or four.

Mr. McCay:

I've got my $5.00 right here in my pocket and you can have it when you read a verse that says that…

Mr. Waters:

Do you know what the Bible says about the teaching of the truth? "*Line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, there a little.*" That's what the Bible says about the truth and he won't let me get it here a little and there a little.

Mr. McCay:

You give me a verse and you'll get the $5.00.

Mr. Waters:

Won't let me do it. See? He said, "I'll never preach a Bible principle that I'll have to take back. "What's his principle on that? His principle is that you've got to have it all in one verse or he won't have it. That's his principle. His principle is that you've got to have one verse that says that he both ate and broke… or broke and ate… got to have it all in one verse or he won't take it. You see? He certainly wants to keep that $5.00; doesn't he?

Mr. McCay:

Oh, no! It's right here and whenever you give me the verse… I've got it right handy.

Mr. Waters:

You won't let me have two or three verses?

Mr. McCay:

Well, maybe I'll make a little… Just shut her off.

[Recorder turned off.]

Mr. Waters:

Humph. I can get by without the $5.00. I wanted to prove this.

Now, then, listen. He "*brake*". (Matthew 26 and 26) He "*brake*". But I want you to notice, now, Psalms 41:9: "*Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I have trusted, which did eat of my bread…*"; "*my bread*"; a bread which in a peculiar sense belonged to Jesus. What bread? Why, the bread which was "*my bread*". When he said "*my church*", that was a church that in a peculiar sense was his, belonged to him, wasn't the church of the members. When he said "*my kingdom*" (Luke 22:30), that was in a peculiar sense his kingdom, not the Kingdom of Israel. When he said "*that ye may eat and drink at my table*", that was a table that in a peculiar sense was his. But when "*my bread*" is used, my respondent doesn't want it to be the bread of Christ in a peculiar sense. Jesus said of the bread of the communion, "*This is my body which is broken for you.*" There his bread… his, in a peculiar sense. Here is it: "*which did eat of my bread*" (Psalms 41:9); "*with me*" (John 13:18) "*hath lifted up his heel against me.*" Not a prophecy concerning the fact that Judas was getting meals with the Lord, eating meals with him and then betray him, but a prophecy concerning the fact that Judas, as a partaker of something that was special, with special significance attached to it, even as the communion. He was present before he left to attack him. You can turn to Luke 22. He was right there, partook of it. And now then, a man that will even do that, turned against the Lord and betrayed him, that is what the prophecy had reference to and Jesus shows that that was "*my bread*" which was eaten "*with me*". Eaten with him. He ate, too. Now, there's the breaking; there's the eating. Bad enough for a man to preach a doctrine he can't read it the Bible; it's worse for him not to pay his honest debts.

All right. This is interesting; isn't it?

What did he have to say about my questions? Why. I didn't necessarily mean for him to answer them all in this speech. No, I gave him these. These are my questions that remain for tonight and tomorrow night, you know. I would have liked for him to answer about half of them and do the other half at least tomorrow night. Now then, he's got to answer them all tomorrow night. Oh, no, he doesn't have to. He told us the first night, "I'm not going to abide by any kind of rules." You can see that is his way, too; he's proved that all the way through, all the way through. He don't have to abide by rules. But the negative has the right, the ethical, accepted right to question the affirmative in order to elicit his position in detail. He didn't answer my questions. Oh, the last few minutes of his first speech, he did like he usually does, he got up and just rambled around, I Timothy 4:16 and Romans 10:17 and scriptures that didn't have anything to do with the breaking of the bread. Why did he do that instead of answering these questions on the breaking of the bread? He's certainly getting off the subject, isn't he? Why didn't he deal with the breaking of the bread? Why didn't he answer these questions? He certainly had time to answer these questions that are on the issue. But I'll guarantee you this, if he will just answer these questions, forthrightly and straightly, and handle them, he'll be in a predicament. But he doesn't have to answer them. But I'll tell you one thing,

people will want to know why he didn't. He don't have to. I can't force him to, but I can make him wish he had, though. I can't make him do it, but before this debate is over, I can talk about it so much, he will wish he had answered them. That's right. Why doesn't he answer these questions? Can he answer them? He can, surely. If he can't... if he won't, why won't he? If he can and he won't, why don't he? Now, we want him to answer them tomorrow night. Why, I'm just eager for him to answer them, just eager for him to. I want him to answer them.

All right. I want you to notice this. He says, "If Jesus broke as Waters said he did... or as Waters said all the others broke it... if Jesus broke like that... didn't break off, you know, just a little bitty piece, you see? One larger piece and one smaller... If Jesus broke like that and didn't eat, passed those on, he said the principle is the same, same as that for which he contends. When he admitted that, he has admitted that we break the bread and observe the principle that he'll accept in the breaking. He said if Jesus had broken it like we do and passed it on, the principle would have been just the same. In other words, he does not object to the way I break the bread when I serve at the table. He doesn't even object to the size of the pieces. But if Jesus had eaten, the principle would have been just the same, there still would have been fragments. He doesn't object, then, to the way I do it; he doesn't object to the size of the pieces; he objects to my eating, you know. Now, you folks have been thinking that Brother McCay objected to the way I broke the bread. He doesn't. He does not object to the way; he objects to my eating one of the pieces, one of the smaller pieces. That's what he objects to. Now, I want him to produce the scripture that forbids me to eat one of these pieces. Talk about a man reading between the lines with magnifying glasses Where is the scripture that tells me I can't eat that smaller piece? I'm supposed to eat. Oh, he says, "The one who serves at the table doesn't necessarily have to break bread twice. Doesn't necessarily have to do that. When it comes back to him, he can just take one of those little fragments there that somebody else happened to break off and he can eat that. "Say, what if that man serving at the table broke into two fragments, one larger and one smaller,……. [end of belt]

Now, I want you to get this. If the one serving at the table breaks the bread, one large one and one small one — why, he even broke it into four fragments last night, one smaller piece and one larger, then the smaller piece into three fragments — but the one at the table, now, breaks it into two fragments, one large one and one small one; he passes both of them. Incidentally, all the people In the audience eat off the larger piece, and the smaller one, the man who is serving at the table originally broke it off to begin with, it is still on the plate when it gets back to him, and he picks it up and eats it. How would that be? It's all right. Oh, he breaks just like I do when I serve at the table and that's all right. He can pass both of them to the audience and that's all right. They can all break off of the larger piece and that's all right and when it gets back to him, he can break... he can eat that smaller one which he originally broke off to begin with and that's all right, but what is wrong with my practice? It's wrong if the man eats in the first place, but it is all right if he eats

in the last place. So now, what does Brother McCay object to? He doesn't object to the way we break. He objects to the man serving at the table eating that smaller fragment first. It would be all right if he passed it around and nobody else took it and he took it last. But I want to know this: What if he just retained that smaller fragment to begin with and didn't eat first, just held it in his hand until a few others had eaten, would that be all right? Would that be all right? No wonder he won't answer these questions. He doesn't want to either uphold them or belittle them. No wonder he won't answer the questions. I want Brother McCay to answer these questions. This is the issue. This is the object of the debate. We've gotten down to close grips, you see? Getting right down to talk about the issue. That's what I want to do. I am just eager *for* him to get down to the issue and just stay with it, deal with it.

All right, now. He says, "Jesus broke as Waters said and didn't eat." Then the principle is the same. All right, when he admitted that, away goes his "klao" argument. Away goes his argument if Jesus had broken like I break and the principle would be the same. Away goes this, this argument that he has offered. What was the difference in the way he broke demonstrating for me and the way he broke demonstrating for his practice last night? All the difference was in the demonstration. The fragment in the case of the demonstration for me was just smaller, the small fragment was smaller than in the case of the demonstration for him. That's all the difference. Is he going to argue that the… that that fragment has to weigh so many grams and has to contain so many molecules? I'll tell you right now, he is seeing things with those glasses.

I said that "klao" is a general term. Within the meaning of that general term is contained both of the meanings of the specific terms. The general contains the specific meanings. Now, in the case of the breaking of the loaves for the multitude, "klao" is used in the sense of a specific terms which is used several of the times showing that it was in the sense of that specific meaning that time. That general term was kept with them in mind to the specific meaning "kataklao" in those… in the case of the loaves that were fed to the multitude. You see, all those loaves had to be broken. There had to be some way to distribute it out to the company that was set and that is how "kataklao" is used which has reference to breaking into many pieces. You see? Many fragments. And not only that, but one time when "klao" was used, it is used with [?] which Taylor says is a kind of construction and means "to break and distribute among." You see you break them into a lot of pieces and distribute them among them. Sure, you still use the same for the "kataklao", the specific meaning. Brother McCay surely knows those things. He's the one that brought up the Greek.

He said I talked three hours before I defined my proposition. I defined it in the beginning of my first speech, defined my proposition and the manner in which we break and handle the loaf. I defined it, too, just what I do when I serve at the table. Told him what I do. Defined it within the first several minutes of my first speech.

What did he say about Acts 20:11 and Acts 27:35? I said the Holy Spirit principle (He's pretty strong on those Holy Spirit principles), the Holy Spirit principle in Acts 20:11 is that he broke bread and ate, that the eating naturally follows on the part of the person who did the breaking. (Acts 20:11) Acts 27:35: He broke bread and ate. The eating naturally followed the breaking, the eating by the same person who broke. There's his principle, but he won't have that with reference to the eating. Oh, he said, "That shows that breaking doesn't mean to eat." "Following" doesn't say that break means to eat. Break is one verb and eat is another verb. But even you admit over here that the figure of speech synecdoche, that the word breaking is, implies also the eating, in the figure of speech. But break and eat don't mean the same thing. No. But the principle is that eating naturally follows the breaking. No, he wants his principle in reference to the agent acting for the multitude, but he won't have his principle with reference to the eating following the breaking. Jesus broke bread so that he could eat and Jesus ate. He affirmed that principle. He observed it. And notice over here: We break. We partake. There's your principle. States it. The same "*we*" who break, Paul says "*We partake.*" It's fitted right into that principle. For what purpose did he break except to eat bread? Why do you people break the bread... the one serving at the table... in an ultra-special way that's performed by nobody else? Why do you do that? Why does Brother McCay contend for that, that that one serving at the table has to break it In a special way that nobody else breaks it, in which nobody else breaks it? Why does he contend for that? Well, he says, "Because Jesus said '*This is my body which is broken for you.*'" (I Corinthians 11:24).

What did he have to say about the parallels here? He argues that the bread has to be broken to be Christ's broken body. I asked the question, "If the bread must be broken to be '*my body which is broken for you*' (I Corinthians 11:24), must not the bread be given to be '*my body which is given for you*"? (Luke 22:19) He said that he gave it before he said, "*This is my body which is given for you*." And the fruit of the vine, must it be shed to be the "*blood shed for you*" (Luke 22:20)? Does the "*shed*" have reference to the fruit of the vine or to the blood that was shed on the cross? He argues singly that the "*broken*" refers back to the "*break*", yet it refers to the "*body*". You know what he said about it last night? About "*which was broken for you*"? He said, "It may have been that the present tense was used with which to refer to the future act." If that be the case, that the present tense was used — It may have been — the present tense used to refer to the future act of the death of Christ on the cross, if it points that way, it can't point back. You see?

Now then, the cases are all three parallels. "*Shed for you*", the blood was not actually shed yet. He was about to die, but he hadn't died yet. His body was not yet broken in this. It was about to be. But he used the present "*is shed*", *"is given*", "*is broken*". And there is another figure of speech, the figure of speech, Brother McCay, in case you haven't looked it up, is a prolectus in which as future event is spoken of as being present or past. A future event spoken of as being present or past. Why don't somebody come along and say, "We've got to

shed the fruit of the vine before it's his shed blood. Get some grapes and shed the juice into the cup to represent the shedding of blood." Why don't somebody come along and do something like that? Never heard about it. Maybe somebody will do that someday. Brother McCay built up a theory on "*is broken*", but he will not build a theory on the two scriptural Holy Spirit principle parallels. He won't do it. He culls out one of the parallels to build his theory on. He will not build a theory correspondingly and comparably on these two. What is the matter with the man, that will build a theory on one of the parallels and not on the others? You don't shed the fruit of the vine for it to be his shed blood. His blood was shed on the cross. We don't do one thing to that fruit of the vine to represent shedding and we don't do a thing to that loaf to represent the "*body broken for you*", that is, to represent the breaking. Not a thing.

And I asked him a question — I've got it right here — when does the bread — I mean the communion — become the body of Christ? Now, I want to know. Is it the body of Christ when you give thanks for it? — Or isn't it the body of Christ until after you break it? I want to know when does it become the body? I want to get down to the issue. You see? He didn't answer that question. Why? Why? Why? You wonder why, I wonder why, they all wonder why he didn't answer. I'm going to wonder why tomorrow night. People are going to wonder why if he doesn't. I can't make him answer it, but I can make him wish he had. I want to know why? Why? I want to know when that bread becomes the body of Christ?

Well, he said, "Webster on break means to cause to fall apart with force." Well, I don't guess he and I disagree on the meaning of break, as far as the word "*break*" is concerned. But in what sense is the word "*break*" used with reference to the communion? It is used — listen — in the sense of a breaking of bread which can be performed by every communicant. Here it is. Here it is. In the sense of a breaking of bread which can be performed by every communicant. Now, what act of breaking is or can be performed by every communicant? What is the act of breaking that is and can be performed by every communicant, logically, reasonably, scripturally. That is the act of breaking set forth in the scriptures. I'm staying with these scriptures. Don't you think I'm not. I'm staying with them. When this debate is over, I'll still be with them. I've read the act of breaking for which I contend it is an act performed by every communicant. But the act for which Brother McCay contends is an act performed only and solely by the one serving at the table.

All right. What else? Well, let's see. He said, "Did you ever worship like we worship?" When I was baptized, I became a member of a congregation which had already for a long time been worshipping as I worship. Oh, he says. "Brother King and Brother Lee and Brother Mason admit that they used to do it the way I do it." Well, but he said last night that the fact that Brother King said it, didn't prove he was wrong. That's what he said last night. So what did it prove? Brother McCay says, "I've changed. I used to do things I don't do now." King says, "I used to do things I don't do now." That don't prove anything does it? Don't you see? What was he talking for? Just to take up time, I guess. Just to

take up time.

All right. Now why hasn't he told me — I've asked him for three nights — when I serve at the table and I break the bread (and he knows how) and I eat, what have I done I'm not supposed to do? What am I supposed to do I haven't done? If he says, "Oh, you've got to break the bread." Well, I broke it. So if he says, "It doesn't become the body of Christ until alter you break it." I broke it; it's the body of Christ. When I pass it to the audience and each breaks and eats, what have they done they're not supposed to do? And what *are* they supposed to do that they haven't done? The breaking of bread contended for by my respondent tonight is a: breaking that is foreign to the Word of God. It is a breaking performed by only one man, whereas the breaking mentioned in the Word of God is a breaking performed by us, by all of us, "*we*", a breaking performed by the disciples, by "*they*". A breaking performed by Jesus, yes, first by him and a breaking performed by each and every disciple afterwards. For Jesus gave it to him and said, "*This do.*" "What I have done, you do, in remembrance of me." But the breaking……. [end of belt]

Mr. McCay, Third Affirmative

All set? Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, ladies, and gentlemen.

You know last night I didn't know just what might happen to me tonight, because you know Brother Waters says, "If you don't answer those questions, I'm going to make you wish that you did." I wasn't sure but what Brother Waters was going to call down upon me some great calamity to hit my bald pate. But I went home and rested. I need rest. But this morning I got up and I just wondered how great those questions were and I'll read my answers. I won't read all the questions, because they were read last night. I'll read some of the questions, because I am very particular that you get the question while I'm giving the answer tonight. So I call your attention to the answers.

1. I've answered with the numbers, so that in the report of the debate they will appear therein numbered as the questions were asked. If you ate all of the broken parts except one, I would object.
2. If you just broke off a little piece and passed it in one large piece, I doubt if it would be acceptable to the Lord.
3. I would not care whether you kept a piece in your hand or not. When I broke the loaf, there were several pieces.
4. I handle the fruit of the vine exactly as Christ handled it. As to how it becomes the blood, I'll leave that to Divinity.
5. I handle the bread as Christ handled it and leave the rest to Divinity.
6. "*Broken for you*" refers to an act not yet accomplished, but was not spoken until the actual bread was broken. "*All power is given unto my hands*" was spoken concerning something yet… future to that time, but was accomplished when Christ was crowned, probably on the first Pentecost after the Resurrection.
7. That question has already been settled, but now I wish to just notice it a little bit. I stated that the Passover loaf was in the Greek. I was wrong. I admitted that I told a falsehood, but others told me that the second time I mentioned it, I said it was in the Bible and I am not taking that back. I'm still staying to that. But Brother Waters picked up Weymouth's translation that I had here and he doubted whether that was the Word of God, because he said the Word of God was in Greek, which I admit originally. But… now here is the question: Is it right for Brother Waters to use Weymouth's translation as if it were the Word of God in his little tract if it's not the Word of God, and he thinks it is, he is deceiving the people who read his tract. He takes Weymouth's translation just the same as I do. He quotes it just the same as I do. You'll read it in his tract. So if you read that tract, keep this in mind, Brother Waters does not

believe that it's the Word of God as he expressed it the other night. But how about the King James translation? How about the Revised Version? How about any translation? If we, in order to have the Word of God, just go to the Greek, no preacher can preach the Word as he is commanded to unless he knows the Greek. And there would be a good many preachers in the world that would not preach it. I still say that if I said in the second time that I repeated it that it was in the Bible, in the Word of God, I stick to it. But I did apologize for making the statement and I can be forgiven. When a fellow apologizes, you know, he repents of it. But I want to say something here to our Brother Brother Waters, I want you to get this. I want you other young preachers to get it, too. You know what Webster says about keeping back the truth that people have a moral right to know the truth, he said that person lies. Now if Waters ever preaches upon the communion question and keeps back any principle of truth upon that question, whether it is in Acts 2:36 or any other place, Webster said he lied. He may have a lot of lies against him up there unless he begins preaching the truth exactly as it reads in God's Word and does not keep back a part of the truth as I know that he does in his tract. I'm certain of that.

8. All right. Let's come down to No. 8, I never have seen the bread broken as my brethren break it that would make it necessary for the one waiting at the table to break it twice.

9. "Will you please read the verse or verses which say that Christ broke the loaf into two large pieces and then without partaking, passed both to the assembled disciples?" Brother Waters is too intelligent and old debater… he is experienced... to put such a question as that to anyone who is not affirming what he states. Brother Waters knows that it is just as unfair as a fellow can be to ask a person to affirm a negative. Now, he knows that and yet he is asking me to affirm the negative. Let's read it again. "Will you please read the verse or verses which say that Christ broke the loaf into two large pieces and then without partaking, passed both to the assembled disciples ?" I never have taught that Christ broke the loaf into two large pieces. I never have. Now then let's see. "… and then without partaking…" I did not say that Christ did not partake. I did say that I could not read it in the Bible. He is affirming that Christ ate. I am denying it and it is not up to me to read a single verse that says that Christ did not partake and Waters knows it. He knows that he was just as unfair as a debater could be when he framed that question. I think he probably ought to apologize to the Lord for being so unfair, for being so dishonest as he was when he framed that question for me to answer.

10. "Did every one of the '*they*' in Acts 2:42 do the things mentioned in that verse, or did '*they*' act through an agent in doing them?" Now

that… I want you to notice carefully. This is the answer. There were some things in Acts 2:42 that they could not do through an agent. If "*fellowship*" included contribution, that was not done through an agent, because of the command in I Corinthians 16:2, which command reads, "*Let every one of you upon the first day of the week lay by in store as the Lord hath prospered him.*" "*Every one of you*" had to do it, because the Bible commanded "*every one*" to do it. Now, he may play on that for the simple reason… he brought it up… he should have had sense enough not to, because I have been arguing that the idea of "*we all break*" can be done by an agent and I have shown it from Acts 2:36. Now, let's go a little further. Neither could singing, which is not mentioned in Acts 2:42, be done through an agent, because of Ephesians 5 and 19: "*Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody. in your hearts to the Lord.*" Now, they were to do this in the plurality, "*speaking to yourselves.*" "*Yourselves*" is a plurality, both yourselves have to do the singing, so it could not be done by an agent. Now, there is another thought. No soloist — agent — can sing for the congregation.

11. "In the communion, when does the loaf become the body of Christ?" When Divinity causes it to be. It was called by Christ "*the body*" when he had broken it.

12. "In the communion, when does the fruit of the vine become the blood of Christ?" When Divinity causes it to be. Christ referred to it as "*the blood*" when he instituted the communion. I have nothing to do with what only Divinity can do. And I have a little remark here if you care to have the sister write it down. I have a little remark here that came to my mind after I had read those questions over. You remember the little statement from… "The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse."? Waters laboured and brought forth such insignificant questions as he gave to me.

Now, let's come to our part of the discussion without the questions.

"*The cup which we bless… the bread which we break.*" Waters contention has been that his brethren's way of handling the bread is the only one that meets the requirements of "*we*". He objects to my brethren applying the principle of Acts 2:36 to the breaking of the bread, but he thinks it is all right for his brethren to apply the same principle to the blessing of the cup. Can he be sincere, fair, and honest while doing that way? Now, there's a question that I want you people, in your minds, to get. He objects to my brethren applying the principle of Acts 1:36 to the breaking of the bread, when every single one of his brethren do apply the principle when it comes to the blessing of the cup. Now, if it is necessary… I've gone over this so much, but it *seems* as though Waters can't get it in his head. I want to make it so plain that even the children can get it, that when the Holy Spirit made the principle that one individual could do

something and that action could be attributed to a multitude, that principle was made by the Holy Spirit and that principle may be applied anywhere that the applying of the principle does not conflict with a direct command of the God of Heaven. Now, again I want to repeat it. I don't like to repeat, but I want you to get it. If it is necessary for each one of those brethren to break that bread in the same manner, it is just as necessary for each one of them... the brethren to bless that cup in the same manner. And in order to be consistent, it is necessary for Brother Waters every place he goes from now on to take and tell his brethren, "When the leader at the table blesses the cup and does it audibly, which they do do, it is necessary for every one of you brethren when that cup is passed to you, to bless that cup audibly, no matter whether you be a man or a woman," He will not be fair to the God of Heaven unless he does do it according to the way he has been arguing that that principle cannot be applied to the statement "*we break bread*". If it cannot be applied to that statement according to Brother Waters, it cannot consistently be applied to the statement "*we bless the cup*". And he knows it. The ten year old children here know it. You brethren know it. You in the audience know it. Why isn't he fair? Why will he not tell his brethren, "If we all have to break the bread in the same manner, we all must bless the cup in the same manner."? I'll venture the opinion, though. I can't vouch for it, because I can't vouch for what H. C. Harper said, because I never heard it. I believe it. I'll venture the opinion that Waters never yet has preached a straight sermon upon that question as to whether it should apply to both the cup and to the loaf and make it apply as it should if he wants the issue to be reasonable.

Now look here. I'll go a little heavier on that. Peter says, "*Let all the house of Israel know that this same Jesus, whom he crucified, has been made both Lord and Christ.*" Now then, according to the principle laid down by the Holy Spirit, not McCay's..... [end of belt]... as he had been referring to it as McCay's theory, but the Holy Spirit laid down this principle that all those Jews killed Jesus. I don't know how many hundred thousand Jews were there, but I do know this, that it was a physical impossibility for all those Jews to actually kill the Son of God, a physical inability... or impossibility for a hundred thousand people to each one of them in a day's time to take ahold of that hammer and help to drive the nails in the palms of the Son of God. And Brother Waters knows that that principle is laid down there by the Holy Spirit that one person may commit an act and the committing of that act may be attributed to a multitude of people. And as it can be so taught and it is taught by the Holy Spirit, so then one agent or one person waiting at the table may take that loaf, may offer thanks for it, may break it for a whole congregation and yet if that congregation endorses what that individual does, it's exactly the same principle here. All those Jews endorsed what the few people did and all my brethren endorse what the one individual who waits at the table does when he breaks the loaf. The principle is exactly the same and the brethren also endorse the same principle when the person who is at the table blesses the cup and they endorse that blessing, so that each one of them does not have to actually do the blessing, the same as it was laid down here by the Holy Spirit. In other words, my

brethren do exactly like the Holy Spirit gives them the privilege of doing. And is it scriptural for them to do what the Holy Spirit gives them the privilege of doing? I think that you people would answer, "Yes, that would be scriptural for them to do what the Holy Spirit gives them the privilege of doing.

I have in my notes in regard to Weymouth, but I have already mentioned that in the answer of the other.

Brother Waters, "The bread was no more the possession of Christ than the possession of the disciples." Now, I am not so sure about that. The person who possesses anything rules it, bosses it. Jesus Christ ruled in the Passover and in the other. Jesus Christ actually possessed the bread in the Passover. He possessed everything that was there. The disciples had nothing to do with bossing it, of ruling it, and they did not show in any way that they even thought that they possessed it.

"Must take all the scriptures concerning the breaking of bread." Well, now, that's all right. Does one of those scriptures say that Christ broke bread? I am willing to take it all, but I want you to just read tonight now — the debate is going to go tonight — I just want you to read where it says that Christ ate the bread after he had broken it. If you can, I'll take that scripture, because lam one of those individuals who takes all the scripture upon any proposition that I am discussing or that I am listening to for any other individual to discuss.

Acts 20 and 11: "*When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long time, even till break of day, so he departed.*" Now then he told us last night that "eating naturally followed breaking." It does not, and that language will prove that it does not. If eating naturally followed breaking, then eating would not have been mentioned, because naturally following breaking, they would have known he had eaten, because he broke it. He is not quite as bold as some of them. Some of them say that whenever it says "*break*", it means "*to eat*", but he knows better than that. That's just a little bit too easy to meet, but he is also wrong when he takes the position that eating always naturally follows the breaking of it, absolutely wrong, and he cannot show it by the Bible. It's true that he broke the bread. It's true that he ate, because it says that he ate… Paul did, now… I'm not discussing the Saviour… Paul did, but if Paul would naturally eat it following the word "*break*", there would have been no reason for the recorder to say he broke it and ate it.

Let's turn again. Waters, "Did Christ break the loaf into two large pieces?" Now he asked me that last night besides in the question. The Word does not say into how many pieces or as to what size. And I hope if ever you report this debate, that you won't be like A. J. Mason was. Mason was here at one time and I was sent for to talk with him, but in making his report to the paper, he said, "We were sent for to talk with McCay", which was just exactly opposite from what it was. And in the presence of Brother Dow and I think both of my boys and maybe their wives and Brother and Sister Rodney, he asked me this question, similar to the present one that Brother Waters asked. He said,

"Brother McCay, did Jesus break the loaf down the center into two parts ?" I said, "Brother Mason, I don't know because the Book don't know." That's one thing about me. I never will say that I know he broke it until the Book says how he broke it. What did he do? I am just asking Brother Waters never to do it. He wrote to Brother King's paper and he said that Brother McCay tried to make his brethren believe that it was broken right down the middle as near as possible by the Saviour. Brother McCay never tried it. Brother Dow knows that I didn't try it. My boys know that I didn't try it. I just simply answered, "I don't know how he broke it, because the Book doesn't say." But I do say I know he did break it, because the Book says that he broke it. So when he asks me, "Did he break it into two large pieces down the center," why, I would be foolish to say, "Yes," and I'd be foolish to say, "No". Why? Because I don't know whether he did or not. That was just a catch question that he asked me to see if he couldn't get me out on a limb and maybe make me fool with the idea a little bit. I am answering him just the same as I did Mason. No one knows as to whether he broke it into two big pieces or not. No one knows as to whether he broke it down the center or not. We never teach that he broke it into two pieces. We never teach that he broke it down the center. But anyone who reads the Bible knows that he broke it and that's all they do know about it. And anyone knows who has ever followed the services of my brethren that they break it, just the same as the Saviour broke it, because we don't know how he did and so we don't know how he did it, but we brake it, the same as he broke it. We pass it to the disciples and tell them to eat it, the same as he told them to eat it, and that's exactly like the Bible teaches.

I notice that he's got something up here that's just fine and that was in regard to "*This do…*" Oh, yes, hold on a bit. Jesus commanded his disciples to "*This do.*" Now, what did the "*this*" mean there? What did the "*this*" mean? It meant to do the same as he had done. Now, what had he done? He had broken a loaf. He told them to eat it. He gave thanks for it. I should have put that in, too. He gave thanks, broke a loaf, and told the disciples to eat it. That's what he told the disciples to do. That's what my brethren do do. They take up a loaf; they offer thanks for it; they break it; and they eat it. And that's just fine up there. That's what he told them to do and that's what I teach my brethren to do. That's what my brethren do do, exactly like the Saviour taught it there.

Now, he tried to criticize me for telling about King changing. I had a reason for that. He asked me the question, "Have you ever worshipped any other way besides the way you do now? Have you ever worshipped where they had classes? Have you ever worshipped where they had cups? Have you ever done this and that?" And I admitted I had. Before I began preaching, I sang in the Christian Church choir back in Brooks, Iowa. But… now this was what he was trying to prove or imply… he wanted to make me out a liar in this statement and I have said that I never had preached a principle that I could not read in the Book and because I said that, why, he says, "Have you ever done anything that was wrong?" I never preached individual cups. I never preached classes. I never preached any of these things, though I did do them while I was quite young. I

grew up and I quit them as I learned more, but that's not preaching it. He wanted to make out that I… when I said that I had never preached a religious principle that I could not read in the Book. Just as unfair as Brother Beddingfield told me he was. He wrote me and told me what kind of a debater he was.

One evening I was about to make a point on Romans 1:16 and 17, but my time was called just at that time, so I will make it now. We hear that John says "*All unrighteousness is sin.*" Now, let's get that. "*All unrighteousness is sin.*" In Romans 1:16 and 17 it says, "*I am not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith unto faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith.*" Now then, in the gospel the righteousness of God is revealed. Outside of the gospel is no righteousness of God. All unrighteousness is sin. Then if something is done that you cannot read in the gospel, like Brother King says, you know, says some of them do preach it, preach things they can't read in the gospel and can't read in the Word… if they preach something that they cannot read in the gospel, cannot read in the Word, they are preaching something that is unrighteousness and John says, "*All unrighteousness is sin.*" Oh yea, it's a terrible sin for anybody, a young preacher or an old preacher, to preach a religious principle that he cannot read in the gospel, because in the gospel is the righteousness of God revealed, "*As it is written…*" or "*…from faith to faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith.*"

I want to turn again. Romans 10:1-4: "*Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.*" The trouble with the Jews were… was that they were ignorant of God's righteousness. The trouble with them was that they didn't want to submit to the righteousness of God, and so not being willing to submit to God's righteousness, they were going about to establish their own righteousness. Now look here. Any person who preaches and claims it's right what he cannot read in the Bible is not doing the righteousness of God. He's like the Jew who is not saved because he had not submitted himself to the righteousness of God and he is going about to establish his own righteousness. And I've asked Brother Waters, night after night during this discussion, to just tell me one verse that says that Jesus ate the bread at the time of the communion. He hasn't given me one. He can't give me one! And the reason he cannot give me one is because there isn't one in the Book. Oh, he'll reason all right. Brother Beddingfield says he's great to, and likes to argue, but he says he's just as much to cover up the truth as any man he has ever met. And he is. He is covering it up. And he will try to show you tonight in this last part of the debate, he'll try to show you by taking different references and seeing if he gets the right connection between those references. I don't blame him for trying to beat me, but I do blame him for trying to deceive

the people and helping them to take the way down to eternal destruction by not telling them the things that he can read in the Word of God. I am not worried about whether he beats McCay or not, but I am worried about whether he will get up here and teach something that he cannot read in God's Word and mislead the people into the way that will lead them to the hot place, instead of coming here and preaching only what he can read in the Book and give them at least a chance of eternal happiness over yonder. McCay should just not be so interested as to how it affects McCay, but he should be interested as to how it affects the souls of men and women who listen to the way that he garbles…… [end of belt]

Mr. Waters, Third Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends.

I am so happy to be before you tonight in denial of a proposition which my respondent is supposed to be affirming and which he did not even read in his affirmative speech tonight Now, I want you to get that. You know he told you last evening, he said, "Now, Brother Waters talked for three hours and never did define, his proposition. I only had two hours in my affirmative altogether. He said three, but I wouldn't doubt he was confused and listen. He said I talked three hours, and that's wrong, without affirming my proposition, and that's wrong, because I defined it the first three minutes of my first speech. And I doubt that the record will show that in all of my four affirmative speeches, I failed to read or refer to my proposition every speech.

Tonight there may be people here who were not here last night and Brother McCay did not even read his affirmative... he did not even read his proposition, didn't redefine it for the benefit of those who were not here last night. Didn't even read or refer to it. And I would like to just ask a question of those who are here tonight who were not here last night From his speech tonight, would you know what he is affirming? Do you? Now from his past thirty minute speech, do you know what Brother McCay believes and do you know what he is affirming? He never read his proposition, never referred to it, never talked about it; did he? I'd like to know in what school of political ethics you learn such tactics. I'd like to know. Yet he said, "I was debating, Brother Waters, before you got out of short pants." I wonder if that's the way he debated. Is that the way you debated? Why, he didn't even read his proposition. You folks don't think I'm too hard on him; do you? I can't help this. I'm here to debate him tonight. I'm here to expose his policy. It's not because I don't like Brother McCay. Why, I like the little fellow. Certainly, I do, but when he is fallacious and inconsistent and unreasonable and when he doesn't stick by even one of the rules of discussion and when he has a proposition and doesn't read it even in the affirmative speech... of course, the affirmative denies me... well, I'm naturally going to talk about that. Yes, that's what I am going to do. I'm here to expose his position and I'm here to expose his inconsistencies. Where did you learn such debating, Brother McCay? Where did you learn that? I guess you must have learned that before I was out of short pants.

I'll tell you, some people are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. That's what Paul said. Oh, Brother McCay!

All right. He said, "The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse." Is that right? "The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse. I guess you meant that I was the… the mountain, because I'm big. Who's the mouse? There, you see. You see what he gets into. Hump, hump. "The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse." Says I'm the mountain. If I'm the mountain, he's the mouse. You see? Now, that isn't debating, folks. Course we're going to have a little fun in debating. I'm not going to get insulted. But he was the one that

mentioned that. Now, I want you to get that. I'm not the one that brought that up. He's the one. Now, if it backfires on him, why, I can't help that.

All right. Now let's see. Let's see about these questions. Oh, he said, you know, "I just wondered what Brother Waters would do if I didn't answer these questions." I was just going to make you sorry if you didn't. I was going to make you wish you had. I was going to talk about it for the rest of my life until you wished you had.

All right, let's see about it. First, if when I serve at the table, I would break the bread into pieces comparable to the size of those into which you broke it last night, then eat the smaller piece, and pass the remainder to the rest of the disciples present, would you accept it? If you would not, then is it not a fact that you are really objecting to the fact that I eat one of the pieces, and not to the manner of my breaking the bread? Answer: If you ate all of the broken parts except one, I would object. All right, now remember I told you the other night that I suspected that it was not my breaking to which he objected, but to my eating, and the answer to that question shows that he objects to my eating. That's all he objects to. He objects to my eating. He doesn't want to eat until afterwards. Oh, he says, now, "If you ate all but one, I'd object." In other words, if I broke it into three then and I ate one and passed two, it would be all right, but if I broke it into two and I ate one, it would be wrong. You see? He objects, now, to my eating especially if it is only broken into two pieces. Oh, Brother McCay. You… I want those who endorse you in this discussion to get this, Brother McCay doesn't object to the way Brother Waters breaks the bread. He objects to the fact that when we serve at the table, we eat one of the pieces. That's what he objects to.

All right. I wish Brother Beddingfield was here to hear this.

Two, if when I serve at the table, I will break the bread into pieces comparable to the size of those into which you broke it last night in demonstrating what you conceive to be my practice, and then passed both pieces to the remainder of the disciples without eating first, would you accept it? "If you just broke off a little piece and passed it in one large piece, I doubt if it would be acceptable to the Lord." "If you just broke off a little piece and passed it and the big piece, I doubt…" Now, he didn't say that it wouldn't be; he said, "I doubt if it would be acceptable to the Lord." But now, I want you to get this. If the piece which we broke off was just somewhat bigger, you know., not too much, not too much bigger than the one that he broke off for me in demonstrating my practice… Now, then, how many grams must the piece weigh? How much area must it cover? What must be its volume? If it just gets a little small now, you know, about so big, he says, "I doubt now that that would be acceptable. "But if it is about that big, it would be fine. You see? Talk about a man that strained a theological mouse. You see? What's the matter with a man like that?

Now then, he talks about those glasses, invisible glasses I have on through which things will magnify so I can read between the lines. You think

about a man now that's got the kind of glasses on that he can see a great difference in a piece this big and a piece that big. Now, there's the man. I want you to look at him. Man or a mouse.

All right. Let's see. Three, if when I serve at the table, I will break the bread into pieces comparable to the size of those into which you broke it last night in demonstrating your practice, then retained the smaller piece in my hand, and without eating first, passed the remainder to the other disciples — now, I break the bread, but I retain one piece, and I pass the other to the remaining disciples, not eating the piece I retained until several others had first partaken — would you accept it? Answer: "I would not care whether you kept a piece in your hand or not. When I broke the loaf, there were several pieces." All right. Now, he comes along and says, "I don't care whether you keep it in your hand or not. I don't care." Oh shaw! I'm going to tell you... I'm going to be frank with you. Now, he's tried to tell you, "Brother Waters is a pretty shrewd man. And he might let you believe something that is not there," and all that. I want to be frank with you. If I'm as shrewd as he thinks I am, I don't know right now what it is he objects to. Just for sure, now, from all those answers If I went over them with these glasses on, I still don't see, in the lines or between the lines what it is he objects to. Now, I want him... I want him to tell us. What is it that he objects to? According to that, he don't care if I do save one out. I want to know what it is that he objects to. Folks, do you know? Do you know? What is it? He doesn't object to the way I break it. He doesn't object to my... to my retaining a piece in my hands awhile. Says, "I don't care whether you do it or not." I want to know what it is that he objects to. Is it that I eat first? That if I won't start eating until somebody in the audience starts eating first? Why, it would be all right. I'd just like to find out. I'm here to... I'll do anything within the bounds of my conscience to please the man in order to have unity; if I could just find out. He's got one more speech and I want him to get up here and tell us. If I can do anything within the bounds of my conscience taught by the Word of God, I'll certainly do it. And I want him to get up here and tell us what it is he objects to.

All right. What's next. Four, what act do you perform with reference to the fruit of the vine to represent the shedding of the blood which is shed for you? You know he has told us "*this is my body which is broken for you*", that Christ said that indicating that he had to break the bread in order for it to be his broken body. I've asked him, "What do you do to the fruit of the vine to represent the shedding of the blood?" Jesus said, "*This is my blood which is shed for you,*" Answer: "I handle the fruit of the vine exactly as Christ handled it. As to how it becomes the blood, I'll leave that to Divinity." Well, he doesn't shed the fruit of the vine for it to be his shed blood. He wants to break the bread, though, he says to be the broken body.

Five, what act do you perform with reference to the bread to represent the giving of the body? If bread must be broken to be the body broken for you (I Corinthians 11:24), must not the bread be given to be the body given for you (Luke 22:19)? Answer: "No. 5. I handle the bread as Christ handled it and leave

the rest to Divinity." Didn't answer the question. You see? Just "I handle the bread as Christ handled it." I asked him, "What do you do to the bread to represent the giving?" Why didn't he Just say, "I do nothing to represent the act of giving. " He said, "I handle it as Christ handled it." Didn't answer the question. Evasive.

Six, in respect to "*this is my body which is broken for you*" (I Corinthians 11:24) — does the "*broken for you*" point forward to the death of Christ on the cross, an as yet unaccomplished fact, or to Christ's breaking of the loaf, previously an accomplished fact? Answer: "'*Broken for you*' refers to an act not yet accomplished." "'Broken for you refers to an act not yet accomplished, but was not spoken until the actual bread was broken." Granted. But the "*broken for you*" refers to an act not yet accomplished. I'll read that to these brethren. I've debated them. I've heard them talk. I've heard them argue and they argue on and on that the "*broken for you*" refers to the bread and to the… to the… and it is "*broken for you*" by the one serving at the table. Brother McCay has given that up if he ever had it and he says tonight that "*broken for you*" refers to an as yet unaccomplished fact of the death of Christ on the cross that's well in the future. I wish Beddingfield was here tonight. I certainly do. I wish he could have heard that, because Brother Beddingfield believes that you have got to break that bread to qualify it as the broken body. That's his position. I wish Brother Beddingfield was here tonight. We'd have Beddingfield against McCay and we would have fun.

Seven, in your second negative — and that's about the Greek says, you know, there, and he said, "Well, I still say the Bible says it." I said if the Greek doesn't say it and if it isn't in the Greek, it's not in the Bible. Now, I'd like to know how you're going to get in the Bible what's not in the Greek. The New Testament was written in Greek. If it's not in the Greek, it's not in the Bible. Some man may interpolate… You talk about throwing dust into people's intellectual eyes… that's what you said I was doing the other night… Will you admit that some translators do interpolate? Will you admit that Weymouth ever interpolated? Certainly, I use Weymouth. Certainly, I do. I use other translators, but when they interpolate a word which… of which there is no parallel in the original, I tell people about it. That's right. I was preaching a sermon the other night on I Corinthians, the 14th Chapter, and I mentioned the fact that in the original Greek there was no parallel for the word "*unknown*". "*Unknown tongue*". The "*unknown*" isn't in the Greek. The word is "*tongue*". I tell people about those interpolations. You see?

Now, Brother McCay says if you hold back something that people have a moral right to know, Webster says it's a lie. When you hold back those things you know to be interpolations when people have a moral right to know it, what is it? He's the one that told us. You are the one that told us that Webster said if you hold back something that people have a moral right to know, that it's a lie. Now, if you know it's an interpolation… if it's not in the Greek, it had to be an interpolation… and you withhold that from the people, what is it called by Webster? What's the matter with the man? That's what I'd like to know. He

can't... he can't state a principle and stay with it. Now..... [end of belt]

Eight, "Where is the precept or example authorizing the man serving at the table in the congregations you endorse to break the loaf twice?" He says what? Why, he said, "I've never seen the bread broken as my brethren break it that would make it necessary for the one waiting at the table to break it twice." Did that answer my question? I said, "Where is the scripture authorizing them to do it?" And you brethren who stand with McCay tonight, who have been worshipping as he worships, can look me in the eye and know that it is the general custom whenever that bread comes back to that man serving at the table for him to break off a piece and eat it. That's the general custom and you know it. You may not always do it. When he does it, where is the scripture that authorizes him to break that bread twice? I want him to come up and grapple with the thing instead of evading it. Surely, he knows that many of his brethren do it. What is the scripture that authorizes that man to break bread twice? He didn't answer me. He didn't answer me. You've got one more chance and I want you to answer me. Where is the scripture that authorizes that man to break the bread twh e? He broke once already; now he breaks again. Where is the scripture that authorizes it? If there is none, then he will have to insist that the one serving at the table not do it and that the people be particularly sure to leave one piece there for him to eat without breaking. I want him to come up and grapple with this thing. I want him to get down to the issues. Find out what it is, what it is he objects to. He knows what I object to, just exactly what it is. I object to that man breaking the bread into pieces without eating and passing that loaf in severed sections to the audience, because he performs an act that is ultra-special, super special, that no one else performs and has no right to do. He has no right to do it.

F. H. Stram, in his tract on the breaking of the bread, says that he would as... he said that he would as soon have individual cups as to have the bread broken into as many pieces as there are communicants, indicating now that if the loaf... into how many pieces the loaf is — that would be the conclusion of it — you could have the fruit of the vine divided into that many portions. Why can't you? Isn't it strange that you will pass that loaf out in severed sections, but you don't want to divide the fruit of the vine and pass it out that way, in portions like that? Talk about inconsistency, but there is one thing about it, Stram could see that individual pieces was on a par with individual loaves. It's right there in his tract and no doubt some of you brethren have read it. And I can accept this doctrine of breaking the bread into as many pieces as there are communicants... if I can, I think I would be willing for individual cups also.

All right. Let's see now, No. 9. "Will you please read the verse or verses which say that Christ broke the loaf into two large pieces and then without partaking, passed both to the assembled disciples?" Well, he said, "I never have taught what is in the question. Never did teach that Christ broke the loaf into two large pieces and then without partaking, passed both to the assembled disciples." Well, I just know that they do that. But wait, he said, "Now, Brother Waters is unfair." That's a negative question. He said... listen... I got this... he

said, "I did not say Christ did not partake." What in the world does the man say? He said, "I did not say that Christ did not partake." What's he arguing with me for then? I say he did. Brother McCay, "I don't say he did." I say that he did partake. Brother McCay says, "I don't say he didn't." What does the man say? Now, what does he say? I say he did. McCay says, "I don't say he didn't." So if he doesn't know that he didn't, he may have; don't you see? I'll tell you right now his entire position, as far as he is concerned, stands on "maybe so".

All right, let's see. Did Christ partake? He did. "*Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread...*" (Psalms 41:9) What bread? "*My bread*"; bread that in a peculiar sense belonged to Jesus, just like "*my church*" belonged to him, "*my table*" belonged to him, just like "*my kingdom*" belonged to him. "*My bread*"... "*which did eat of my bread...*" "*with me*" (John 13:18) He said, "*with me*". All right, if he... if "*my bread*" was eaten with him, "*with me*", he ate, too. "*Eateth of my bread*" ... "*with me*" (John 13:18) "*hath lifted up his heel against me.*" Jesus did eat.

All right. Let's turn over here to "Jesus drank." I've proved that he ate. Did he drink? I'll turn over here to Mark 14:25. He gave the cup to them "*and they all drank of it, and he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*" "*But I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine. until the kingdom of God shall come.*"

It's just like the old darky said one time, "You can't have more 'lasses, until you've had some 'lasses." You can't have more until you have had some, and he said, "*I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine.*" I'll drink no more." That shows that he had drunk. The "*more*" implies that he did. Well, somebody says. "I don't deny that he drank. Maybe he drank the day before. Maybe he drank back in the Passover." You cannot take the Old Testament — the Passover is an Old Testament institution — you cannot take the Old Testament and prove by one jot, iota, or scintilla of scriptural evidence that the Passover even.....[belt bad here; cannot decipher].... I say that with the least fear of successful contradiction, because I have begged for that scripture for years. It isn't there.

"*I'll drink no more,*" said Jesus (Mark 14:25). All right. When did he drink? He said in Matthew 26:29, he gave it to them and he said, "*I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.*" All right. He was not going to drink then from that moment on, but he had drunk. "*No more*" shows that he had, but he was not going to drink after he handed it to them, gave it to them, now, and he said, "*I will not drink henceforth.*" From this time on. So he did drink, but he didn't drink last as some people teach, because as he gave it to them, he said he wouldn't drink henceforth from this moment on. So he drank then before he gave it to them, but he did drink. "*No more*" shows that he did. All right. What fruit of the vine was under consideration? Listen. I don't guess. I'm not going to suppose. It's not going to be hypothesis. I'm going to read it to you. He said, "*I*

will not drink henceforth of this… fruit of the vine." Not that back yonder. "*… of this fruit of the vine.*" "*This.*" "*This fruit of the vine.*" Get that, you folks. What fruit of the vine? "*This fruit of the vine.*" What this fruit of the vine? "*This fruit of the vine*" which in a previous verse he says "*is my blood*," for which he had given thanks (verse 27). That's the fruit of the vine of which he would not drink from this moment on until… that of which he said, "*I will drink no more.*" So he had already drunk according to the "*more*", of this fruit of the vine.

It's just like I have been saying ever since this debate started. You won't believe what the Bible says, but you will believe what it doesn't say. When I read to him out of the Bible, he won't believe it, and yet he'll come along and believe what the Bible doesn't say. When I read to him that "*they*" continued in the breaking of bread, that "*the disciples came together*" to break bread, they all broke bread… it's an act performed by every communicant… he won't believe that. When I read in I Corinthians 10:16: "*The bread which we break*", he won't believe that! He won't believe what the Bible says that Christ drank of "*this fruit of the vine*". He won't believe that. He won't believe that he ate bread like this says. He tries to get around everything I can read that states my belief. And he believes what he can't read. Why? Oh, why? I ask you with candor and humility, will you back a man like that?

Now, I want to tell you this. You can think what you want to of Waters. Let Waters sink beneath the wave of living. Eternal truth will never perish. And when you stand before the great white throne, regardless of whether you liked Waters, how he talks, or how he looks, or how he acts, these words are going to judge you, McCay to the contrary and notwithstanding. Forget about Waters. Forget about how he looks and how he talks and whether you like him or you don't like him. You think about these words. They're quick; they're powerful; they are the truth; they'll judge you. Now, you remember that. You let those words sink into your hearts. Let those words pierce you. Let those words develop your very thoughts and your very intents. You forget about me and look at the Christ behind me. Forget about me and look at the Word. Think about the Word. I'm not here for personal victory. I'm here because there is a clash of doctrines. I'm here to put the truth up and let the truth down what you teach and what you practice.

Listen. Let us see what Jesus did. I turn over to Luke 22:19. He took bread and he blessed it and brake it and gave it to his disciples and what? He said, "*This do in remembrance of me.*" Now, Luke 22:19 didn't even say, "Take, eat." (Luke 22:19) He said, "*This do in remembrance of me.*" But "*this do*" meant for them to do what he had done. Brother McCay says the same thing. Therefore, Jesus commanded his disciples to do what he had done. All right, Jesus commanded his disciples to do what he had done, but Jesus had broken bread (Luke 22:19), therefore Jesus commanded his disciples to break bread. He commanded them to break bread; didn't he? "*They broke,*" "*the disciples broke*", and Paul said "*we break*".

All right. Jesus commanded his disciples to eat. In I Corinthians 11:24, he

said, "*Take, eat...*" in that verse and "*this do*". But Jesus commanded his disciples to do what he had done, therefore Jesus had eaten. There's right; there's reason. And there are three indestructible and irrefutable syllogisms based upon major and minor premises with conclusions reached. And remember this, the truth is reasonable. You can reason on it. But if you reason all you want to, if you reason on the truth, it is not contrary to reason. Truth is always consistent with truth.

All right, are my conclusions here contradictory to truth? No. Therefore Jesus had eaten. That is the conclusion of the syllogism. Did he? This said he did. What is the conclusion here? Therefore Jesus commanded his disciples to break bread. Is that contradictory to truth? "*We break*", "*the disciples broke*", and "*they broke*". The conclusions are harmonious and concur with truth. Turn it over, if you can. If what I put forth isn't the truth... I don't want it if it isn't the truth... perish it! Remember that. This is truth. These are conclusions, but the conclusions harmonize with the facts in the case. Take all these chalks down. I want you to study them in the quietude of your homes as the days pass. This is the truth. And I want you to look at it; I want you to read it.

Question: Did every one of the "*they*" in Acts 2:42 do the things mentioned in that verse or did "*they*" act through an agent in doing them? What did he answer? He said that every one of the "*they*" could not have acted through an agent in doing all the things mentioned. Now, get it. Every one of the "*they*" could not have acted through an agent in doing all the things mentioned. Well, if "*they*" acted through an agent part of the time, "*they*" did all the time. You can't split the "*they*" up and make part of it a synecdoche and the rest of the time literal, because the fundamental rule of interpretation is the meaning of the language cannot be diverse at the same place and the same time. It can't be literal and figurative. He wants it literal part of the time and he wants it figurative the rest of the time. You can't have it both ways. He can't have it. We just can't afford to let him have it that way.

In the communion, when does the loaf become the body of Christ? Well, he said, "When Divinity causes it to be..."..... [end of belt]

Mr. McCay, Fourth Affirmative

Brother Moderators, Brother Waters, ladies, and gentlemen.

Brother Waters, I think, made a statement that was not according to scripture. Now, if I misunderstood him, I want him to speak up. I think he said that I could not find any place in the Old Testament where it taught that they had the wine in the Passover, or at the Feast of the Passover. Let me read from the 15th chapter of the book of Numbers: "*And will make an offering by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, or a sacrifice in performing avow, or in a freewill offering, or in your solemn feasts…*" — now, get it, the Passover was a solemn feast, one of the solemn feasts of the Jews and here he is telling them what to do in the solemn feast — "*… to make a sweet savour unto the Lord, of the herd, or of the flock. Then shall he that offereth his offering unto the Lord bring a meat offering of a tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of oil. And the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink offering shalt thou prepare.*" Now, this drink offering was in the solemn feast and the Passover was a solemn feast and I have reason to conclude that the wine was in the solemn feast which was the Passover. Now, let's take up this: "*I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine*", and he said the darky said, "you can't have any more sorghum until you have had some sorghum", or you can't drink any more wine until you have drunk some wine. He had drunk some back yonder in the Passover. But I want you to notice this, "*I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine.*" He had drunken in the Passover, but "*I*", Christ, will not drink any more. Your brethren, you are going to drink some more, because he commanded them to all… to drink all of it… drink ye all of it. Not like the priest that drinks it all, but all of you drink of it. Now, be commanded them to. He had already drunk back in the Passover and he says, "I will drink no more." Now, here is where Waters falls down. He gives us to understand that "*this*", "*this*", now. But Mark says "*the fruit of the vine*". Luke says "*the fruit of the vine.*" Matthew says, "*this fruit of the vine*". Two witnesses just make it general and he says that "*this fruit of the vine*" must have meant that that he was holding right there, now, and that he had just drunk of it and was just ready to pass it over to the disciples. Not one word in the Bible that will bear him out in that. He guesses as to when they had drunk… when Christ had drunk. He guesses that. He had put on those spectacles where Brother King tells him not to do and reads between the lines.

Now, let's take up some of the things that he said and just notice them as we go along. I might want to remark, though, that he is not debating with Stram, nor Beddingfield. He had better pay attention to what I say.

"Brother McCay is in the affirmative and never mentioned his proposition." And he turned and said to you people, "Are there people here who do not know what his proposition is?" If they were here when we began, they do know. My moderators read the proposition for me. I don't have to read the proposition after my moderator has read it and Waters knows. He was just

making a big adoo here. He was just trying to make out that McCay didn't know how to debate, because McCay hadn't mentioned his proposition when my moderator had already read it to all of you. What kind of a man is he who will misrepresent that way when I didn't agree to. And then he said... Waters said he defined his proposition in the first three minutes. I deny that. I just ask him to reproduce it and read it over. Now, he did affirm... or he mentioned part of it, but he had made two speeches before ever he told how they break the bread. I was the one who told how they did it and then he concurred in what I said. I dare him to produce the proof either now or any other time, and give it to these people, where it will show that he fully defined his proposition during the first speech of the debate. I had to call his attention to the fact. I was the one that told the brethren as to how he did it and he never defined it at all. He defined a part of it. I'm not denying that he defined a part of it, but he did not define it completely and I believe that he knows that he didn't. I know that the record will show when it comes out from the transcript.

"Brother McCay did not even affirm his proposition tonight. "I don't have to. I proved my proposition the very first night of my affirmative. I only had to show that Jesus Christ took bread and that he blessed it and that he brake it and that he gave it to the disciples and told them to eat it. Now, there was the authority in God's Word and that's just exactly like we do. We take the bread; we offer thanks; we break it; and it is given to the disciples. I had the authority. I read the three quotations, one from Matthew, Mark, Luke and John upon the proposition. And I had and I had it proven there by the Word of God. Why will he get up here and say that I never have proved my proposition, that I never have stated it even tonight? I did prove it and the people who were here will know it; and more than that, when it comes out in print, you can read it. And you can read it where Waters isn't up here ridiculing the truth that I have presented, but ridiculing me. Now, that's all right. I don't care if he does that, but I don't want him to make too much fun in a serious meeting. I want him to take the Word of God. And I still have that $5.00 whenever he produces that verse that teaches that Christ ate after he had blessed and broken the loaf.

He said, "The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse." I... that was a quotation and I said so. I said, "Now, this is a quotation." And he wanted to know whether Waters was the mountain and brought forth a mouse and looked at me and implied that I might be the mouse. Well, it's too bad that he can't understand anything. I said that Waters laboured and brought forth those simple questions that he gave me. But his looking at me implied that maybe Waters, a great big man, had laboured and brought forth a little bit of a mouse like the little man like I am. Why, he knows that I said that Waters in his labour produced just those questions. Do you call that being honest? Do you call that being in earnest? Do you call that being fair? I don't! He knows that I said that Waters laboured and brought forth those questions. And then he looked down at me another time. He says, "Is he a man or a mouse?" I think when you read the debate, maybe you will decide that I am a man. I'm a little man. I'll admit that, but I haven't a bit of doubt that when people read the debate, they will know as

to who stuck to the truth and who produced it… the evidence.

He says that I object to him leaving only one piece as the members would not see it was broken. I do object to that. I object to him leaving just one piece for the simple reason that those brethren down there won't know whether it was ever broken or not. Christ broke it so those disciples could see it was broken. We break it so that the brethren can see it was broken. It is passed around to the brethren so that they can see it is broken They wouldn't see it if it is not… that is, if it is not observed that way, in the way that Brother Waters breaks it.

He wishes Brother Beddingfield was here to hear. Brother Beddingfield told me how he would ridicule, how he would cover up, and if Brother Beddingfield was here, he would enjoy it, because he knows that I have asked him to produce the evidence upon the proposition and he has not been able to do so.

"Doubt if it would be acceptable to the Lord." Now, he objected to that answer of mine. It does not make one bit of difference whether what he does is acceptable to McCay or not. Now, get it, friends. The question is: Is what he does acceptable to the Lord? And that was the answer that I made and I do doubt whether if he did that way, it would be acceptable to the Lord or not. He wants me to say whether I would have accepted. I'm not his judge. I am the judge as to how I should do these things. And if the Lord wants to accept him when he is not following the Word of God, why that's not my business. As I have told some of my brethren that believe in classes and such things as that. I get along fine with them over at Eugene. I said, "If the Lord will save you when you are doing something that I don't believe is right, that's the Lord's business." If the Lord will save Waters in the way that he is doing, that's the Lord's business. But he doesn't need to ask me, "Well, will it be acceptable to you." God didn't make me his judge. He didn't even make me one of the receptive committee, as to whether I accept it or not. It's a very foolish way for him to ask questions like that.

He says, "He doesn't care whether I keep it in my hand or not. "What business is it of McCay's whether he keeps it in his hand or not. I don't care whether he keeps it in his hand or not. But he can't bother Brother Beddingfield upon that. He asked Brother Beddingfield that same question and Brother Beddingfield thought that maybe he had better hold it in his hand. And what did Brother Beddingfield tell me that he said? Just as quick as it could be, "Why," he says, "if that's what you want, Brother Beddingfield. I'll hold the little piece in my hand until all the rest of them get their little pieces in their hands and then we'll all chew at the same time. "Making ridicule of the services of the God of Heaven. I don't care whether he holds it in his hand or not, but I do want that bread broken so the people know it's broken, so they can see it's broken, and I do know that the Son of God did break it and I know that Webster says that the meaning of the word "*break*" is to put it into fragments or pieces. I read that to you the other evening. It isn't a question of what I am willing to do about it. The question is what the God of Heaven wants to do about it.

Waters ridiculed the fact that only Divinity can turn it into blood. I answered that I don't know when it becomes the blood. I'm not like the priest. The priest says it becomes the blood of Christ just as soon as he prays over it. But I do know that it is up to Divinity and to Divinity only. Waters can't know when it turns into blood. McCay cannot know when it turns into blood, but Divinity does know. And it is my purpose and my right and my duty to take that cup, to offer thanks for it, to bless it, as Paul said, and to distribute it to the brethren. And it is his duty, if he believes in the principle that he has been preaching, it's his duty to tell his brethren that when you have that cup, you must take that cup and bless it. You must pass it to my members and they all must bless it, too. It's not the question of the time, because he knows it is a fact that if the principle will not have to do with the breaking of the bread, the principle will not have to do either with the blessing of the cup. He knows that. He has not met the issue, because he can't meet it. He knows that if each individual has to break the bread individually, each individual will have to bless the cup individually. He never has touched it yet. Never has touched it yet. Probably he will. I venture that in his last speech he will get up and do a lot more ridiculing. But watch him closely. Watch and see if he reasons with the Lord upon the proposition and watch and see if he gives one verse in the New Testament scripture that says that Christ ate at the time that he broke it. If he does, I still have the old $5.00 in my pocket that's burning my pocket and he's going to get it.

Is the King James translation the Word of God? I don't know whether this is King James or not. It may be the Revised Version. Does Waters think this is the Word of God? He says, "If it's exactly like the Greek it is the Word of God." He implies that this is not the Word of God. Well, where is he going to get the Word of God, then? I am commanded to preach the Word. Do I have to go and learn the Greek in order to preach the Word? It's a little bit ridiculous for him to stand here and imply that this book that I hold here in my hand is not the Word of God. Yes, it's ridiculous. And if it is not the Word of God, he had better throw his book away, too. I see he has one there. If it is not the Word of God, why doesn't he take it away and burn it, because he doesn't need anything but the Word of God in order to preach to people and save their souls.

"Does the waiter have to break bread twice?" He does not. But now, suppose that he did. Suppose that there isn't anything left there in the way of a fragment after it came back to him... you know he could have eaten first if he had wanted to. We never object to the man who breaks the loaf eating first. He breaks it into parts now, not just into two big parts in the center like he is implying by his question that I teach that... you know then that he just breaks it and I never have seen it broken yet, but what it was broken into many parts. That's the way it is broken, not because the person tried to break it into many parts, but he did, and he has a perfect right to eat then. It's ridiculous for Waters to stand here and say..... [end of belt..... "Where is your authority for him breaking it twice ?" He doesn't have to break it twice. We don't ask him to break it twice. We don't have to have authority for him to break it twice for the

simple reason that he doesn't need to. But we will suppose that he did have to. Suppose he made a mistake and hadn't eaten when he had a chance and it goes clear around and there is not even a fragment there for him to partake of. Well, now here, God does not blame people for doing what they have to do in order to meet a command, if he absolutely had to break the second time... the absolute having to break is included in the command to eat. Now, you just take it and digest it. I said, "If he had to."

Stram... he quotes from him... I don't know what Stram says, but he implies that Stram puts forth this idea: That he would just as soon have individual cups as to have the loaf broken into many pieces. Now, I don't believe that Stram said it in those words. I don't believe that Stram said it in those words. Now remember, for the simple reason that I know that Stram does believe that it should be broken into more than two pieces, so if it is broken into twelve, I do not believe that Stram said that it would be wrong to break it into twelve, or a good many, and if they did, they might just as well have individual cups. I doubt it, because I know him, and I doubt that Brother Waters can show it in any of his tracts, in just those words, now. I don't want him to twist what I have said.

"I did not affirm Christ did not eat. "Now, look at this. I want you to see how dishonest the man is and I am saying it slowly. He says that because I said that I did not affirm that Christ did not eat, therefore I was admitting that he did eat. I said that I was not in the affirmative upon that proposition. He misquoted me there and misrepresented me. I said it was not my duty to find where…… [recorder apparently stepped]

Is it started?... No, I did not affirm that Christ did not eat. I did not; why? Because I am not in the affirmative. But I did say that it was up to him to prove that he did eat. And you people can see it. He is acting as if he thinks you people do not have any intelligence. Just because I am not in the affirmative on the proposition, he says, "Brother McCay admits that he is wrong in claiming that he did not eat." McCay doesn't admit any such a thing. McCay said besides it's up to him to show it and when he does show it... just one single verse that says that Christ ate after he broke the loaf... I have the $5.00 and he gets it, because I know that he can't find it. He just simply cannot find that verse. It is not there. Oh, he will twist around. He'll give you this verse over here and this verse over here and that verse over there and then he will say, "Therefore Christ ate." But that's not the way I learned my logic. I learned my logic in the college. I didn't learn it that way that just because you state something here and something there, where there is no connection that is stated... now, get that rule of connection stated... that therefore I draw the conclusion that it is so and so. That's the way he does it. I don't care where he learned his logic, but I do know that he has got to find that one verse before he has a right to tell you people that Christ did eat the bread after he had broken it. But I did say I had never read where he ate.

"Cannot have more until you have had some." I've already noticed that.

Christ drank at the Passover some.

"This fruit of the vine." "This fruit of the vine, this that am just holding right here in my hand." Not one word in the Bible says that "*this* fruit of the vine" was being held in the hand of the Son of God. Not one word, and yet he implied it. He tried to make you people believe that Jesus Christ had actually held the fruit… a cup of the fruit of the vine there, he had blessed it, he had taken a sip of it, and then he turned to the disciples, "I'll drink no more of this fruit of the vine that I have here in my hand until I drink it anew within my Father's kingdom." But he assumed that the Son of God did that and there is not one iota of proof in the Bible that that is the way it is. I don't like his assumptions and nobody will get to Heaven on them. He presumes these things and I quote from the Psalmist David upon that proposition, the 19th Psalm. David says: "*Keep back thy servant from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright and free from the great transgression.*" He is presuming these things and never has produced a single verse that says that Christ ate. And he is not going to find a single verse that says that he drank at that time. Not one single verse. He did drink all right. He drank back there at the Passover. They had the wine in the solemn feast. They were commanded to have that wine as given in Numbers 15 and 5.

Waters won't believe Acts 2:36. He has told you time and again that "McCay won't believe the Bible." Waters will not believe Acts 2:36. He stays away from it and Waters is afraid to preach it to his people and apply it where it says "*the bread which we break*." Acts 2:36 does divulge the principle that an agent can act for a multitude of people and Waters won't believe it. He denies it by implication. He doesn't come up and say, "I don't believe Acts 2:36", but he argues against it all the time and the fact that he argues against it is evidence that he does not believe it.

Now, let's us forget about Waters! That's all right. Forget about McCay, too. But remember this that unless you can read in the verse where it says that Christ broke the bread and ate it, you had better take what the Book says about it and not believe that he ate unless the Book says he did. It does say he broke and we break and forget those other things and the ridicule that he has given. Forget everything excepting the Word of God. But let me tell you something, you had better read that over and you had better watch when you read his tract… I hope you've got his tract… I want you to read it, but when you do read it, watch carefully and see how many times he assumes a proposition instead of proving it by the Word of God. I wish he would even give me one. I borrowed the one I have from Brother Waters. I would thank him if he would give me one so I can keep it.

"I'm here to put the truth…". All right, thank you, "I'm here to put the truth." All right, that's just fine. Where is the truth that says that Christ broke the bread and ate it? Now, if he is here to put the truth, I want him to put that just one verse of truth and when he does, I'm paying him $5.00 for just that one little verse and that's better than he will do if I produce a verse in regard to

some of the things that he claims that I teach.

"Study them in your own homes." That's just fine.

He said, "They could not all do it through an agent." Now, he just misrepresents a little bit there. I did not say that in the eating in Acts 2:42 they could not all eat through an agent or do the breaking through an agent. I said that all the things that are taught in Acts 2 and 42 could not be done and I explained… that is, through an agent… I explained that if "*fellowship*" included contribution, they could not give that through an agent, because it says, "*Let every one of you…*" I took that position and I explained it. But I didn't say that I would deny that Acts 2:42… that any of it couldn't be done through an agent. Some of it cannot. But the breaking of the bread can be as we have shown that "*ye*" can do something by agency as laid down there by the Word of God. Now, let's see. He said, "They could not all do it through an agent." Not exactly what he said.

Well, my notes are all over with, so we'll just take up: "Therefore Jesus had eaten." I want you to watch when he leads up to that. I want you to watch and see if that is a logical conclusion from the things up here that Jesus commanded his disciples to do what he had done. No, he commanded his disciples to do what he and they had done. Not just what Christ had done. "*Do this.*" Christ had broken the bread after he had offered thanks. That's all that Christ did, but he passed it to the disciples, the disciples ate it, and then he said, "*Do this.*" Do all that they had done together. Christ offered thanks; Christ had broken; the disciples had eaten. And those three things were included in the "*this*".

Now, let's see if that's the way my brethren do. Yes, that's the way my brethren do. They offer thanks for the loaf; that's a part of what was done in the "*this*". They break the loaf; that's a part of what was done in the "*this*". And the disciples, now, eat the loaf and the disciples are the only ones that the Book says ate at the time that Christ instituted the communion. And every one of you brethren and you friends who have read your Bible know that there is not one word that says that Christ ate at the time that he instituted the communion.

Let's turn back again. "Therefore Jesus commanded his disciples to break bread." I'm not so certain of that. He set the example for his disciples to break bread, but I am not certain that he commanded them to do it. He set the example and he said, "You do all of this", and in that sense, he might have. He did not command those to. He told them to do the things that had been done there. Why, Jesus had broken bread. Jesus commanded his disciples to do that which he had done. Yes, he did that, too, but he did not say that just because he had commanded them to do what they had done, that included the breaking of bread… the eating of bread, because the Saviour never did eat bread. Commanded them to do what the Saviour had done, all right, to offer thanks and to break, but he did not tell them to do that… the Saviour had done the example. And he told them to eat all right, but that has nothing to do with Jesus' eating. Not a thing to do with Jesus' eating. Jesus commanded them to eat. Jesus did the

breaking there. They did not do the breaking there. When they got to worshipping at other places, they broke the bread all right and they didn't have to every one of them individually break it in the same manner or Waters is not teaching the truth when he does not tell the truth to his brethren that they must all of them bless the cup in the manner. Oh, he's teaching a part of it, but if you keep back a part of it, you may be subtracting from the Word of God. And Revelations says if a man takes away from the things which are written in this Book, his part shall be taken away from the book of life. And unless Waters and each one of you, unless these young brethren teach everything about that, now, and teach that it is just as necessary to offer thanks for the cup, every single one of them, as it is for every single one of them to break the loaf, they are taking away from the Word of God and their parts will be taken away from the tree of life. Brethren, you young preachers, preach it like it's here and if it shall cause this congregation to every one offer thanks audibly, if the leader has to, if you have to, if the brothers have to and the sisters have to, still preach it or admit that they don't all of them have to break the bread in the same manner. You can do as you please about it, but you've either got to have all of the brethren offering audibly thanks for the cup, or you've got to admit that they do not all of them have to break the loaf in the same manner.

"Therefore Jesus commanded his disciples to do what he had done." That's just exactly right, but he hadn't eaten. But "*this do*" meant for them to do what he had done. Jesus commanded his disciples to "*this do*". That's right and he knows that. And I guess...

How much more time do I have? Five minutes; all right, sir.

There are certain things that are general in Christianity and one of those things is that people should be united. The Saviour in the 17th Chapter of the Book of John, he prays that all that believe on him through the name of the apostle should be united. Now the Apostle Paul tells us how to be united. Turning over to I Corinthians 1:10, he advises them to be of the same mind, that there be no division among you, to speak the same thing, be of the same mind and of the same judgment. Now, there is a way to do that. I lost my Testament last night. I don't know where it went to. If anybody just picked it up, I hope that it will do them some good. Or I may have lost it myself.

But now here, if people will preach the things that are taught here and only the things that are taught here, they will speak the same thing, and that is the only way that we can have..... [end of belt]

Mr. Waters, Fourth Negative

Brother Moderators, Brother McCay, brethren, friends.

I am happy to stand before for the last speech of this discussion. I want you to listen carefully to everything that is said. I want you when you leave this place to remember everything possible that has been said by either of us, every scripture read, and every argument that has been adduced therefrom. Consider not the man who spoke, but the words spoken. And remember that you shall be judged by the Word of the Lord, by the truth.

Now, Brother McCay, in his first affirmative tonight, plainly said and we got it plainly, he said, "I did not say that Jesus did not eat." He said he didn't say that he didn't eat. That's the word he used, "say". But now, in his last speech, if I understood him and I certainly tried to, he took the position that he didn't eat. Said that he didn't say that he didn't and turned around then and argued that he did. Now, I don't know, just like I've told you before, sometimes I don't know just what the man actually does believe and what he does actually teach. I don't know when a man talks like that what he does believe and what he doesn't believe.

But he mentions Stram. Now, I want to read to you. "When I can accept this doctrine of breaking of bread into as many pieces as communicants, I think I will be ready for individual cups, also." Now, I said this, I said that the conclusion of that would mean if you can't break it into as many pieces a there are communicants present and if he thinks that is parallel with individual cups, the conclusion would be… the logical conclusion, the principle is that you could have as many cups as you can have pieces, that if you could have individual pieces, you could have individual cups. Now, I said the conclusion of that would be that you could have just as many cups as you can have pieces. Now, Stram doesn't want individual pieces, doesn't want the one serving at the table to break it into individual pieces. He says when he comes to that conclusion, he thinks he can accept individual cups. So the conclusion is this, now; the principle is this: You can have as many cups as you can have pieces. Now, Stram may not have thought about the conclusion, but that is the point, that you can have as many cups as you can have pieces, because if you can have individual pieces, you can have individual cups if you can break it into in individual pieces. Well, that's the conclusion and I think the conclusion all right, that if you can have individual pieces when you pass that bread, you can have that many cups. And you brethren who believe that you can pass that bread in a number of pieces to the assembled disciples, consistently ought to go to cups. Consistently. You ought to go that way. That's consistency.

I believe that people break from one loaf, which when they break from it constitutes a harmonious part. I believe that when people drink of one cup, they drink of one volume. If that bread can be severed into piece's and passed in those pieces, with consistency you can pass the fruit of the vine in numerous cups. You think about that, brethren.

Now, then, Stram says, “Jesus brake the bread, “but not one word to indicate how many pieces he broke it into.

In his last speech, he plainly indicated that the bread should be broken into at least three pieces, into at least three pieces. Now, then, he quoted from Webster, last night, I believe, where Webster says “*broken*” means to separate or divide into two or more pieces. Two or more. So according to Webster, if there are only two, it is broken. But he doesn’t want it to be just two. He wants it to be three. Stram says it doesn’t say how many. And listen to this now. It is possible that the bread was not even broken in two. Get that, now. It is possible that the bread was not even broken into, but simply broken as his own body was broken and it wasn’t in two.

McCay:

Are… Are we.

Waters:

He called out a question, folks.

McCay:

Just on one point…

Waters:

Now, he won’t have it. He indicates that I might be misrepresenting Stramwhen I made that statement awhile back. He indicated that I might be misrepresenting Stram. I am sure that I’m not. Stram doesn’t believe you’ve got to break that bread in two pieces, at all. No, sir. He believes that you might just tear it just a part of the way, not even break it in two pieces.

I wouldn’t let you say it, but I went back.

Yes, I wish he was here. He believes that.

Now, I don’t want to violate rules of controversy. He said he didn’t sign up to any. Now here’s the thing. If he does break one of the rules and I mention it, he says, “I’m free to break one of the rules.” But if I happen to violate one, it’s awful bad, you see. “The legs of the lame are not equal.”

McCay:

I am a little lame in one leg.

Waters:

He says, you know, that “I didn’t sign to debate according to rules.” But he wants to impose rules on me, but he doesn’t want to impose any on himself. You see? Personally, I like rules of debate. And I would be glad to debate according to rules. He didn’t seem to want to.

All right. Let’s look at this. That “in the records of the debate, he alleges that Jesus drank in the Passover.” I said there was not one jot, one tittle, one iota or scintilla of evidence in the Old Testament indicating that there was a

drink held during the Passover. And get this, friends. I knew what I was talking about when I said it. I told you last night when I got positive like that, I knew what I was talking about. And now, what does he say? Why, he comes back and reads from Numbers 15 that they had a drink offering in all of their solemn feasts. Says the Passover was a solemn feast; therefore, they had a drink offering in the Passover. He won't let me reason, you see, but it is all right for him. Now, then, I want you to get this. Brother McCay doesn't even know, individually, what a drink offering in the Old Testament is. It is evident he doesn't know. Now, it says "*drink offering*" in the English; it has the word "*drink*" there, but they didn't drink it. They didn't drink it. The Hebrew word translated "*drink offering*" — look in your Young's; it's there — it says a "libation, that which is poured out". That's what the Hebrew word means. What did they do with those drink offerings? You can read several times. I don't have time to go into all of that. If you don't know what they did with it, you can read it. It says they "*poured out*". It is called a drink offering, but it is unto the Lord. They poured it out unto the Lord. They took that and poured it out unto the Lord. Then, Jesus didn't drink in the Passover.
If you could get that drink offering, that libation, into the Passover, he didn't drink it, because the record shows that they poured out the drink offerings.

And I'm going to read you right here — you boys that use the drink offering — I'm going to show you what the Lord said about those people that drink the drink offering. Listen here. In Deuteronomy, the 32nd chapter and the 38th verse, talking about those that wasn't doing his will, here is what he says: "*Which did eat the fat of their sacrifices...*" and no doubt you have heard about those sacrifices of the Old Testament. They weren't allowed to eat the fat of their sacrifices. They weren't allowed to do it. I can show you verse after verse that show that they couldn't eat the fat of the sacrifices. These people did. They weren't supposed to. What else ? "*Which did eat the fat of their sacrifices and drank the wine of their drink offerings*", and the Lord is condemning them for it. They weren't supposed to eat the fat of their sacrifices or drink the wine of the drink offering. And he's got Jesus doing what the Lord God condemned Israel for doing. Those drink offerings, wherever they were, were to be poured out, but not even one of those libations was in that family feast for the observance of the Passover. No, sir. The commandment, as found, is that they shall be poured out unto the Lord and the Lord condemned them for drinking it and for eating the fat of their sacrifices, because they were not to do either one. I'll tell you right now, folks, I could teach you a lot about those things if I had time. When you give out something, I know it. He didn't think that I knew that; did he? Why, I knew all about that drink offering (Numbers 15) before he told about it. What's he think I've been doing these years, without studying those thing? Why, I knew all about that. I knew about that fat; I knew about those drink offerings and I knew what was supposed to be done with it. I knew what God said to Israel when they drank it. Yet he'll tell you Jesus did what God condemned Israel for doing. No sir, they didn't have a drink offering at the Passover. That drink offering right there was to be poured out unto the Lord. That's what they did with those drink offerings in the Old Testament….. [Cannot understand, but

it sounds like "Ah's thirsty"]

Now then, I want... I want to notice something else here. "Where is the truth that says that Christ broke bread and ate ?" You know, last night he did everything in the world to keep me from getting that $5.00, hedging around and trying to impose conditions here and conditions there that nobody could meet and he couldn't be led to do anything else about it. But I want you people to get this. Where is it that says Christ broke and ate? "*Jesus brake*" (Matthew 26:26). "*He that eateth my bread with me*" (Psalms 41:9; John 13:18) Jesus what? He broke. He ate. What? He ate "*my bread*". That's what the record says. Jesus ate; Jesus broke. All right, did he drink? "*I will drink no more*" (Mark 14:25). I will not drink henceforth; that is, from this time on, so if he is not going to drink from this time on from the time he gave it to them, so he had drunk before then. And he had drunk before because there was some fruit. What fruit of the vine? He said, "*I will not drink henceforth of 'this' fruit of the vine.*" What fruit of the vine? "*This fruit of the vine.*" Didn't say "*that*". You know that "*this*" has reference to the thing that is close and "*that*" to the thing that is remote. You know that; don't you?

McCay:

He would have said "these".

Waters:

That's it; yes. I know, but do you know what's the trouble? He doesn't want all the truth; you see? He doesn't want me to give all this. Yes, some of them said "*the*", but you've got to get all the truth together. I told you last night you have to take the scriptures analogically. You have to get all of them together pertaining to one subject. Some say "*the*". Matthew says "*this*"... "*this*"... so then the "*the*" is correct but it's the "*this*"... "*this*"... "*this*"... "*this*"... "*this fruit of the vine*". You have to take all the truth. You can't get the "*this*" out; can you? "*This*" narrows it down. It's "*the*", yes, but what "*the*"? "*This fruit of the vine.*" Not just "*the fruit of the vine*". Why? "*This fruit of the vine*... "*This*" narrows it down and "*this*" is supposed to be and points out that which is close, not that which is remote. If we're talking about fruit of the vine back yonder somewhere, it would be "that" fruit of the vine. You ought to know the rules of grammar on the demonstrative; you know? "*This*" and "*that*"; "*these*" and "*those*". You learned that, didn't you? "*This*" is a thing close to you; "*that*" is out yonder. He is trying to make it that out yonder. Jesus said "*this*". What "*this*"? "*This*" of which he said, "*This is my blood*" in the preceding verse. "*This*"... what does "*this*" have reference to in verse 28? It has reference to the very thing of which he is speaking in verse 29, "*But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine.*" What fruit I am talking about. What's he talking about... let's hear, now... what fruit of the vine is it that he is talking about? He's talking about the fruit of the vine of the communion. That's the fruit of the vine of which he said "*This is my blood.*" Well, what about this which "*is my blood*"... "*this fruit of the vine*"? He says, will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine", so the fruit of the vine of which he is

talking about that he had drunk? Why, "*this which is my blood*"... "*this fruit of the vine.*" He had given thanks for it in verse 27, said it's his blood in verse 28, and he wouldn't drink any more of it henceforth in verse 29, coupled with Mark 14:25.

It's not a matter of Waters' shrewdness; it's a matter of what the Bible says about it. Do you believe the "*this*"? It didn't say "*that*"; it said "*this*", the thing that was close to Jesus, not that which was far from him. What are we going to do about it? Are we willing to accept what the Word of God says?

Now, I've proved it. He hasn't given me the $5.00. I doubt that he will.

McCay:

Just which verse said that?

Waters:

Matthew 26:29; Mark 14:25; Psalms 41:9; John 13:18; Matthew 26:26, Get 'em all together and read 'em.

McCay:

Oh, yes, but that's your conclusion.

Waters:

See? There you are.

McCay:

Not one verse says it.

Waters:

There you are. No, he's not going to turn lose with that $5.00.

All right. Now, we want to get something else. A while ago, you know, when he was talking about the... that man maybe having to break the bread twice? He said, "Why, it's all right for him to do what he has to do," What do we have to do? Break. That's what we've got to do; see? That's what we have to do when we eat. And listen. He says the eating implies the breaking. The eating implies the breaking. That's what he says. But he don't want the breaking to imply the eating.

McCay:

Just a moment, now. I'll not stand for this. I did not say that the eating implied the breaking. Are you calling time?

Another voice:

Call time.

Waters:

[Note: this starts in the middle of a sentence] ... possibly not, but these brethren will play it later and get that.

All right. Now, I am going to sum up rapidly some of the things which Brother McCay has said during this discussion, the admissions he has made, some of the conclusions we must draw.

Now then, first, Brother McCay has admitted that the way I break the loaf harmonizes with the principle of "klao". He has admitted, now, that if I broke the bread as I break it and passed both pieces to the assembled disciples, that he wouldn't particularly have any objections. So now, he doesn't particularly object to the way I break the bread, but he does object to the fact that I eat that smaller piece before I pass the bread to the assembled disciples. I quote from him. He says, "When the man at the table breaks into fragments, he has done exactly what the Book says. "Well, of course, Webster says into two or more fragments, that's what the word "*break*" means. He's done exactly what the Book says the Saviour did. And he further in this discussion made this admission: "I admit that they break." All right, he admits that we break bread.

Second, Brother McCay has admitted he does not know the size of the fragments… the size the fragments should be, so he cannot object to our breaking; otherwise, he would predicate what he objects to on that which he does not know.

Further, if I pass both fragments, he could not possibly object, because he doesn't know how big they are supposed to be or not supposed to be. We are forced to conclude that he objects, then, to my eating.

Fourth, Brother McCay has the "*they*" in Acts 2:42 acting through an agent. And now then the "*they*" have been acting through an agent in the breaking of bread, but admitted that they could not have acted through an agent in doing all that is mentioned in that verse. Now, when they acted through an agent, that was a figure of speech, synecdoche, in which a whole is put for the part, the "*they*" mentioned but only one of them… one of several did it. So we cannot have the "*they*" being figurative part of the time and literal part of the time in the same verse in that way, because that would be a violation of one of the most fundamental rules of interpretation. Brother McCay has admitted that one may bless inaudibly. Hannah (I Samuel 1:13) "*spoke in her heart, but her voice was not heard*" And so away goes all his objections with reference to the fact that we can all bless and yet not all of us bless audibly. And furthermore last evening, he said at one time he and his wife worshipped where they had individual cups and when the cups came around, they blessed it in their hearts inaudibly and then ate. And he said, "Oh now, you may use this against me. Certainly, I will. Why, you did it yourself. You blessed inaudibly, even; didn't even bless audibly any time there and drank and tried to authorize it. And now then, if you authorize you and your wife drinking out of one of those individual cups by blessing that way, then you can worship with individual cups. You can do it that way. And if you can do it, others can do it. If I could worship with the individual cups conscientiously, I'd never open my mouth in objection to them, if I could do it conscientiously.

All right, but now let us get on down the line. That by the way of his

arguments on the "*we bless*" in I Corinthians 10:16, Brother McCay has tried to rebut Psalms 41:9 and John 13:18 with Matthew 26 where they ate bread in the Passover, but admitted he wasn't sure. He wasn't sure that that's the bread which Psalms 41:9 and John 13:18 spoke and so he just bases his argument upon that which he is not sure, but that in absolute defiance of the expression "*my bread*" (Psalms 41:9). Now, the bread spoken of was, of course, "*my bread*", the bread of Jesus. And so he argued and he's not so sure that that's what he meant when he read about the bread in Matthew 26 in the Passover. The Apostle Paul said, "*So fight I, not as one that beateth the air.*" Brother McCay said the Greek said he took a Passover loaf, then when I produced irrefutable evidence to the contrary, he took it back. And I said I appreciated it. First, Brother McCay said, "My father said… " — this was the first night — "Earl, never preach anything that you'll have to take back, and I never have." There at first, he didn't even use the word "principle". "My father said, "Earl, never preach anything you'll have to take back" — anything — "and I never have." Later on down the line, remember, he put "principle" in there. It was "anything" and I played the record and took it down word for word. All right and he has admitted then that he taught things he has took back. Well, that's all right. I admitted in the beginning of this discussion that I have taken positions in my lifetime that I've changed on. He said he has, too. He said Brother King has and others have, so that doesn't prove anything. When a man has never changed on anything, that proves nothing and he's the man that first brought up the matter of changing. I am not the one that first introduced it.

All right. Now he mentioned that I had spoken three hours when I couldn't have. I only had two in my affirmatives. That was a mistake.

Then Brother McCay, when he was in the negative, he said, "It is not my business… not my business to prove anything when I'm in the negative." All right. It's not his business to prove I'm in the wrong when he is in the negative according to him. The negative has no responsibility. And then he said, "Until the affirmative proves, it's not my business to disprove." According to that, if the affirmative is in the wrong, it's not his obligation to show he is in the wrong, but if the affirmative proves it, he'll try to disprove it. I'd hate to try to disprove a thing that was true. You see? If the affirmative proves it, then he's got an obligation. If the affirmative proved it, the negative ought to accept it.

All right. Now then, let's notice. Brother McCay defended his worshipping with individual cups, last night. Tried to take the bars all out when he and his wife did that. Why don't they do that right along?

McCay:

I object.

……. [Another blank space on belt]

Waters:

How much time left?

Another voice:

You've got about eight minutes.

Waters:

Brother McCay wouldn't let me use scriptures to prove Christ broke and ate unless they said it specifically and said in the communion, but he can't read that Christ broke in the communion, just in that... in that way of expressing it. He can't read that Christ broke and without partaking, passed all the pieces to the assembled disciples. He tries to argue that all the pieces were passed. The Bible doesn't say it. Consistency, where art thou?

Brother McCay has violated the following rules of interpretation:

First, the meaning of a word cannot be diverse at the same time and place. But he tried to make "*they*" diverse in being figurative part of the time and literal part of the time in the same place, violating this fundamental rule of interpretation.

Second, a scripture should be interpreted analogically; that is, compared with all the scriptures pertaining to the same subject. He won't let me compare the scriptures.

Third, language is literal unless the literal meaning destroys the sense, is repulsive to reason, or contradicts the Bible. He tries to make "*they*", "*the disciples*", and "*we*" figurative. A synecdoche, when it violates no rule of language, is not repulsive to reason, does not destroy the sense for it to be taken literally. If it can be literal, it has to be literal according to the accepted rule of Biblical interpretation. He rejected that.

Fourth, the most obvious meaning of language is usually the true one. That's a rule of language interpretation. The most obvious meaning is usually the true one. Well, what's the most obvious meaning of "*He that eateth my bread with me*"? What would be the most obvious meaning of "*my bread*"? What's the most obvious one? What's the most obvious meaning of "*the bread which we break*"? Can "*we break*"? Is it sensible that "*we break*"? Is it repulsive to reason that "*we break*"? Does it contradict the Bible for us to break? What's the obvious meaning of it? What is the most obvious meaning of "*the disciples came together*" to break? What's the most obvious meaning of "*they continued*" the breaking of bread? The most obvious meaning is usually the true one. What's the most obvious meaning of "*I will drink no more*"? What's the most obvious meaning of "*I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine*"? What's the most obvious meaning of "*this fruit of the vine*"? What obviously would "*this*" refer to? What fruit of the vine would be referred to? What's obvious about it? The most obvious meaning is usually the true one. He will not accept the most obvious meanings of these. I want you to get that.

Brother McCay said he would give me the $5.00 for every scripture teaching the manner and I have not received the $5.00 yet.

McCay:

I object to that.

……. [Recorder apparently turned off here; then turned on again]

Waters:

All right. I have proved: First, that Christ broke bread. Second, that Christ ate bread. He took bread; he blessed it; he brake it and gave it to the disciples and said, "*This do.*" And they could not have done what he had done and ate if he didn't eat. He said, "*This do in remembrance of me.*" "*This*" refers to that close; "*that*" to the thing remote. Something that he had done. "*This do*". What I have done, you do. Read that over there. Fourth, Christ commanded his disciples to break, Fifth, Christ commanded his disciples to eat. Read these conclusions and read the Word of God. They did eat. They did break. Further, I have proved that we all break.

How much time do I have left?

Another voice:

[?] minutes.

Waters:

According to you?

Waters:

I hope that you will remember what the Word of God has said about these things. That you will stand with what the scriptures teach and have unity. I plead with you to give up hypocrisies, to give up guesses, and to take what the Word of God says. Unite with us. You could do it without sacrificing the truth…… [end of belt]

Waters:

I've proved that we all break bread. I've proved it by the Bible. I have proved that the disciples broke. I have proved that "*they*" broke. I have proved that the breaking of bread is an act performed by every communicant, not by one. I've proved these things. I've given you the Word of God for it.

No man has authority to break bread twice. There is not any authority in the Word of God anywhere for a man to break bread twice. Brother McCay's teaching perverts, twists, violating those… the scriptures. It both adds to and takes from the Word of God. Brother McCay's practice violates the apostolic commands, apostolic examples, statements, and inferences. My teaching and practice is only what the Bible states, commands, exemplifies, implies, and authorizes.

And now, my friends, I pray… I want us to remember that we are all rapid travelers to another shore. That soon the [?] death will be seen coming over the horizon for each of us and we will all stand before God in Judgment. When that time comes, it will not matter how you may have lived as far as scale of living is concerned. It will not matter what kind of an automobile you had or house

you lived in, what kind of clothes you wore. It will matter about how you lived with reference to the teachings of the Word of God. Jesus prayed for unity. The Apostle Paul enjoined unity and we ought to have unity. We need to convert the world to Christ. If we could unite the scattered and diversified forces of the disciples of Christ, the snow... the opposition would melt before us as the snow thaws before the rays of the morning sun. We could go forth in a proclamation of truth. We could go forth in the establishing of churches. We could have power. We could have strength which we do not have, because of our divided condition. Let's unite upon what the Word of God teaches. Let's give us theories; let's give up error; let's give up that for which we do not have evidence in the Word of God. Remember this.