"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE"

BY

P. C. KEY

CRITICISED

by

J. S. BEDINGFIELD

This tract is printed for free distribution. Additional copies may be secured without charge, by simply sending your request for them, stating the number desired, to the folowing address;

L. C. England,
358 North Gretna Ave.,
Whittier, California.

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE"
BY P. C. KEY.

CRITICISED
BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD

I have before me a little tract written by an old school mate of mine, Bro. P. C. Key; the title of which is, "The One Drinking Vessel Issue".

A lot of water has gone under the bridge since I last saw Bro. Key at Gunter, Texas, the winter of 1906-7 while Bro. N. L. Clark was running the school.

When this little tract came before my eyes, it is needless to say a flood of memories filled my mind; and well do I remember that Bro. Key stood among the tops of the students there.

Regardless as to my love for Bro. Key and others in their error, I must now address myself to the task of criticising his effort, with the hope that he and others might see the error of their way before the judgment dawns upon us.

Bro. Key says, Quote, "I hope that the following discussion, with others that have gone on before, will settle the cup question in every reasonable mind", unquote.

Bro. Key, knowing your ability and seeing this failure of yours, I am constrained to say, Amen.

Knowing that you know the difference in literal and figurative expressions; and seeing your effort to literalize the figurative expression, "Drink the cup", and to make a figurative expression of the expression, "And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of it", (Matt. 26:27); you certainly were pushed for something to put up as argument. Bro. Key, you know that

figurative must be given their proper meanings for us to get what the Bible says on the subject. But folks, here is his proposition.

"The use by Christians of a plurality of drinking vessels in distributing the fruit of the vine among the members of a local congregation partaking of the Lord's Supper is acceptable to God".

Then he defines his proposition by saying; "Acceptable to God, means pleasing to God, or in harmony with His doctrine and revealed purpose". He adds, "No other term seems to need defining".

Lets see if his proposition will stand the acid test. Note in his definition of his proposition; he defined the term, "is acceptable to God", as meaning "is pleasing to God". Now we will see if his plurality of cups is "pleasing to God".

First:--"But without faith it is impossible to please Him", Heb. II:6.

Second:--But the use of a plurality of cups in the Lord's Supper is without faith, (not being mentioned therein) Rom. I0:I7.

Third:--Therefore, the use of a plurality of cups in the Lord's Supper does not please Him (God).

Again;

First:--"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin", Rom. I4:23.

Second:--But the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine to the members in the Lord's Supper, is not of faith, (they not being mentioned therein), Rom. I0:I7.

Third:--Therefore the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's Supper, is sin.

First:--Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of Devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron", I Tim. 4:I-2.

Second:--But the use of a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's Supper, in a local congregation, is a departure from the faith, as they are not mentioned in the New Testament scriptures, Rom. 10:17.

Third:--Therefore, those who use a plurality of cups to distribute the fruit of the vine in the Lord's Supper, in a local congregation;;have departed from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of Devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.

If you will, note, the first argument kills his proposition. The second and third shows the awful condition one gets himself into, substituting "cups" for cup as we find it in the New Testament. Everytime it is "cup", singular number, just one. Many more arguments could be added, but it is unnessary at present. Under the heading, "Meaning of vital words", he says, "We are at liberty to use one, or more than one" You will notice he is here hiding under "liberty", which would be alright ""if"" he had that liberty. Again, page 6, under the heading, "Resume",he says, "He is surely wrong who legislates for the church or takes away liberty granted by the Lord" Again you can see ""liberty"" is where he intends to hide after he has attempted to destroy the evidence for the use of one cup.

Now let us examine God's word that governs our ""liberty" and see how well they come out under it.

We know everything God has commnaded we must do. We know everything God has forbidden we must not do. But we ask, what about the things neither commanded nor forbidden? That is the law we now intend to deal with. it seems a lot of our brethren do not realize there is a law that governs us in the exercise of our liberties.

Paul says, concerning this liberty, "I will not be brught under the power of any", I Cor. 6:12. See also I Cor. 10:23. The Revised Version says, "I will

not be enslaved by any" We might ask the question, why? The fact is, this law is based on the fact, we must not make some' one to offend by wounding their weak conscience, I Cor. 8:I-I3; I Cor. I0:29. Again Paul says, "Take heed lest this liberty of yours becomes a stumbling block to them that are weak", I Cor. 8:9. Again, "It is good to neither eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak", I Cor. I0:32. Again, "If we sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ", I Cor. 8:I2. Again, "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God", I Cor. I0:32. This is the law that governs all the things wherein we have "liberty". They are the things neither commanded nor forbidden, and this is where we put them, and say with Paul, "I will not be brought under the power of any", I Cor. 6:I2. Hence to obey this law that governs our "liberties", we leave them off, if they cause anyone to offend, or to stumble, or is made weak, (Romans I4:2I). If they offend Jew, or Gentile, or the church of God (I Cor. I0:32); for we do not want to sin against Christ (I Cor. 8:I2); besides the condemnnation that would stand against us as recorded in Rom. I4; I Cor. 6:I2; I Cor. 8; and I Cor. I0.

This is where we have authority for our unwritten things above. By having this authority; they are of <u>faith</u>, so long as we do not "<u>doubt</u>"; if we "doubt", it is not of <u>faith</u>, and therefore, sin, Rom. I4:23. If they cause someone to stumble, or to offend, or be made weak, and we went ahead and did them anyway; they would not be of "faith" for we would be violating the very laws that govern these "liberties" Hence we could not say, they came by hearing the word of God (Rom. I0:I7), for in violating the other fellows conscience we would be violating the laws that govern all our liberties.

Since it is evident there are good brethren all

OVER THE COUNTRY that are conscientious against the USE of a plurality of cups; it is up to the cups boys to say with Paul, "I will not be brought under the power of any" (I Cor. 6:12) and leave them off; or be condemned by the laws that govern our liberties as shown above. So you see if they are right in putting their "cups" under "liberties"; they are wrong and are condemned if they use them.

Since we all agree cup is alright and are divided on the plurality, one cup is the grounds of unity. Now, that is giving them everything; and yet they are wrong. But one cup is plainly taught as I will show later.

You might say unto us, 'then you claim to be weak'. No brother, emphatically no; we believe we have the truth and that one cup is the Bible way. But if you are right and this "cups question" is a liberty; we are weak, regardless as to what we think about it, and you are wrong and condemned for using them and thus violating the laws that govern liberties.

Under the heading of "the meaning of 'the cup", page I; Bro. Key introduces Mr. Thayer but apparently doesn't like him. He says, "We know that Thayer says, 'Poterion' means a drinking vessel, and we know also that he says it means the contents of the vessel.

Bro. Key, I deny that Mr. Thayer said, "Cup meant the contents of the vessel". You gave his literal definition of "cup" right as it appears on page 533. You know also, Bro. Key, he lists Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:17, 20; I Cor. 11:25; I Cor. 11:28, together with some other references as coming under the head of "Properly", A CUP, A DRINKING VESSEL". Is that why you dropped him so soon? Did you not realize defining these passages as literal use of the word "cup" would kill the

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE" BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

DOCTRINE YOU were going to try to put across?

Why, oh why, did you say Thayer said also that "Cup" meant the contents of the vessel? You were tops in Greek when we went to school together at Gunter; have you forgotten? Here is what Thayer did say; "By Metonomy, of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk" Note, the container (cup) was named to suggest the contents. Get it brother, the container here was named "Cup"; and it contained something, for Thayer said, "By Metonomy, of the container for the contained", then, if "cup" was the container, it contained that to which Mr. Thayer refered to as "the contained" The next breath he kills your idea of a liquid taking the name of a vessel without being in the vessel. Get it brother; "The contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk". Did you know the contents of a cup was in the cup?? You perhaps will say, oh but it is the contents that is offered to be drunk. You use that expression often without telling, "the contents" of what. Mr. Thayer says, "The contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk". But that does not mean the contents of ""Cups"", bottles, jugs, or just any old vessel, or a plurality of them. It means what Thayer said, "The contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk". Cup, singular number.

Take this example as to whether the cup is "refered" to or just the contents as Bro. Key claims, as he says, "Cup" refers to the contents alone". Well, here is my example; Bro. Key tells two young girls to go into the kitchen and look on the table and they will see a bottle and a cup; Susan you drink the bottle and Kate you drink the cup.

Don't you know Susan would drink the bottle by drinking what was in the bottle; and Kate would drink the cup by drinking what was in the cup?? If the "bottle" and the "cup" were not directly refered to by the words "bottle" and "cup"; how did either of them know what contents to drink??? No my dear

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BELINGFIELD.

BROTHER, THAT IS ONE TOO RAW TO LET you get away with it. "The cantainer (the cup) is named in a Metonomy of this kind and "the contents (fruit of the vine) is suggested"; and you can't dig under, climb over, nor bore through, it is too plain for a child to misunderstand unless they have some-one to help them to misunderstand.

One page 2, second paragraph, he takes up Luke 22:20; but he tells us Goodspeed says it is an interpolation and also that Wescott and Hort also rejected it. But since it is an exact quotation from Paul, I Cor. II:25, it does no violence, since, and I quote; "And Paul has told us that 'cup' in the statement refers to the contents". This statement is the result of an overwrought imagination caused by a lot of wishful thinking which has resulted in an idol in the poor brother's heart. He would do well to ponder Ezek. I4:I-8, and place the love of the truth above his idols. See 2 Thes. 2:I0-I2. I will pay the brother a ten dollar bill for that statement in any of Paul's writing relative to the communion cup. Brother, do you like money?? Here is your chance to make an easy ten spot and convert a lot of people.

What the brother has really done, he refers to Luke 22:I7 where Luke says, "Take this and divide it among yourselves"; and since the ""it"" refers to the cup he again literalizes a Metonomy and thus perverts the gospel of Christ.

When he sees the expression, "The kettle boils"; how does he know to look for a kettle to see water boiling in it, "if" the word "kettle" has no reference to the literal kettle?? Why does he not go look at a mud hole??? Ah! my brother, the evidence is too strong that your imagination has gotten away with you. When some-one tells you your radiator is boiling; why do you not look at a cup or a bushel basket to see if something in them is not boiling, if the word "radiator" has no reference to a radiator?

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

If you are told to go and look on a table and find a "cup" and a "bottle", and you are told to drink the CUP and bring the bottle to the other party; how do you know which to drink and which to bring to the other party if the words "cup" and "bottle" has no reference to the literal "cup" and litteral "bottle" containing liquid???

Why don't you literalize the Metaphors, "This is my body", "This is my blood", Matt. 26:26, 28; and Mark 14:22, 25, and declare we eat Christ's literal body and drink His literal blood??? It is no more a violation of the laws of language and of God than your literalozing those Metonomies, "Drink the cup", "Drink the cup of the Lord", "Drink this cup", "Divide it among yourselves".

In these Metonomies, "the container is named", yes, "named" to suggest its contents.

How on earth you can under these conditions think a thing can be ""named"" without refering to it is a mystery beyond solution.

I will now make an examination of this expression, "Take this and divide it among yourselves", Luke 22:17.

Now for arguments sake I am going to admit that "cup is the fruit of the vine", and show you beyond a doubt, if that were true, they are wrong anyway. "------take this and divide it among yourselves", Luke 22:17. Note the disciples were commanded to take something designated by the word, "this", and they (the disciples) were commanded to divide it among themselves (the disciples).

The first thought that we get from this passage is that ""it"", was undivided, one volumne of the fruit of the vine; otherwise the command to "divide" would not have been given.

The second thought we get is the "division" was to take place, "among yourselves", the disciples,

(in this case the audience). But says one, they could do that by ""pouring"" some of it into their cups. Remember those other cups are not mentioned; hence the only way you can get them in is by presuming them, and that is bad business.

And besides Matthew giving the same command as this one found in Luke, gives it in different words than Luke did and brings out another thought. Hear him, "Drink ye all of it". While Luke showed unequivocally that the fruit of the vine was "undivided, "one volumne", by saying "divide it", and that the division was to take place among ""yourselves"", in this case, the audience; Matthew showed the ""it"" was to be divided by all drinking of it.

Either way you take it those ""its"" refer to the same thing. Mark shows they obeyed the command recorded by both Matthew and Luke; for he says, "And they all drank of it", Mark 14:23. This ""it"" in Mark is the same ""it"" in both Matthew and Luke; hence shows they all did drink of that one undivided volumne, of the fruit of the vine.

Hence we would by this have a scriptural prevedent for a congregation to use ""one volumne"" of the fruit of the vine in the communion. Yea, and a command. Not only that, but from Matthew, a command, if you please, to all drink of it.

How do the cups boys perform in this matter? Well, as I have always seen it, the division took place at the table (a thing he almost denies to exist) by a part of the congregation; while in this example, Jesus, the one serving, gave it to the disciples (in this case the audience) with the command "Take this and divide it among yourselves". Matthew shows this "dividing" was a "drinking", and Mark shows they did it by "drinking". This is a far cry Bro. Key, from the way you brethren do it. Now, really do you blame us for objecting to this gross departure from the positive commandment of God and Christ???

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

Don't blame me because Luke backfired on you my brother, you introduced this scripture yourself; and it is there my brother.

But hear him again, near the bottom of page two; "Surely one should accept the Lord's statement that cup here means the content instead of substituting the purely human opinion that it means the vessel". Now, where on earth did the Lord really say that??? Bro. Key said that, and he lacks a lot of being the Lord in my way of thinking. Bro. Key, that is awfully cheap stuff for a man of your ability to be pedaling. A man of your caliber should be above literalizing a purely figurative statement.

Any one regardless as to whether he knows What the figure of speech is, should be able to compare, "Drink the cup", with "The pot boils", and the "radiator boils", and see the falacy of your claim that the "word cup refered to the content alone". How could anyone tell whether the liquid was in a pot or a radiator, if those words refer to neither???

Bro. Key now takes up Matthew 26:26-29 and Mark 14:22-25; but since they are as he says identical, he only takes Matthew as an explanation of both. Here is his argument; "------Christ took bread and said, "this is my body". In like manner He, (verse 27, 28), took the cup and said, 'this is my blood'. As the antecedent of this in the first statement is bread, so the antecedent of the second statement is cup. As bread is His body, so cup is His blood---".

First; I deny that the bread, just as bread is, was His body. There had to be certain qualities added to that bread for it to qualify to signify His body; and what are they? To the law and to the testimony. Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and break it, and gave it to the disciples, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body". After it was blessed

and broken, then and not till then did Jesus declare it "ismy body", Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22. My body "given", Luke 22:19. "My body broken for you", I Cor. 11:23, 24. Hence the blessing and the breaking were necessary qualities before the bread was His body.

Hence the bread that Jezus "took", "blessed" and "broke"; the identical bread He gave to them saying, "Take", "eat"; that was the bread ""this"" refers to. Not to just bread alone. If bread without those qualities, "blessing", and "breaking", is His body; then anytime you see bread you see Christ's body. We know this is not rrue.

Again, he is mistaken as to what ""this"" in verse 28 (Matt. 26), refers to.

Matt. 26:27 reads; "And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it". Now the question is, what does the word, "this", in verse 26 refer to when He said, "This is my blood----"?

I emphatically deny it was "cup". Regardless as to whether "cup" is literal or just means the fruit of the vine; this does not refer to the word cup without certain qualities were added. If it were His blood without those qualities added, anywhere you saw grape juice, you would see the blood of the Lord; and we know better.

My contantion is it refers to the preceding clause, the command, if you please, "Drink ye all of it". Since ""it"" here refers to "cup" just mentioned to place the noun, cup, for which the pronoun stands in its place. And we can also place the subject before the verb in the natural English style, no words added, and not change the thought a particle. So here it is; "Ye all drink of the cup". Now placing this sentence after the word "this" in parenthesis will show beyond a doubt that ir is the antecedent of the word "this", in verse 26.

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

Here it is: "This (ye all drink of the cup) is my blood of the New Testament-----".

Our practice agrees with my construction of this sectence. The thing we drink of the cup is what we claim to be the blood of the Lord.

The thing you boys drink of your cups is the identical thing you say is the blood of the Lord. Your practice proves it; as you drink the thing you call His blood of your cup. Your practice admits my idea, but to save your doctrine you have to deny it. Shame, shame.

Lets try Mark and see how we come with him. "And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, this is my blood-----", Mark 14:23-24. What is the antecedent of "this" in verse 24? My answer is the preceding statement, "And they all drank of it". Place the noun cup in this sentence in the place of the pronoun "it" which stands for "cup", and we have, "And they all drank of the cup". Now place this sentence in parenthesis after the word, "this", in verse 24 and see if it is correct. "And He said unto them, this (they all drank of the cup) is my blood------".

This construction agrees exactly with our practice; this we all drink of the cup is what we claim is His blood.

Your practice makes my construction true. The thing you boys drink of your cups is what you say is His blood. You can't dodge it to save your life; you actually drink of your cups the thing you claim represents His blood. And that is the way the sentence reads to place the antecedent after the word "this" in verse 24.

His big brag, "There is not one gramatical or logical reason for saying that either writer refers to the vessel", has backfired; and it is not through backfiring.

"THE ONE DRINKINGVESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

The idea, "Jesus took the cup"; to say there was not a literal cup that He actually took, is to make every literal expression a figurative one. For example: John took a knife. No he didn't; not if you interpret like cups boys, "He took the cup". Bill took a ball. No he didn't, not if you interpret it as the cups boys interpret "He took the cup" Language becomes a joke that you can twist about to suit any fad you might create in your imagination.

I now pass to his ""Ek"" (of) on page 3. Quote; "We know Thayer says Ek means 'Out of' and we know he says it means 'A part of! If we again will just let the Bible interpret itself in these passages instead of substituting a human opinion, the question will be definitely settled".

That is true Bro. Key, if you would only do that. But you literalize figurative expressions, and make the broad assertion that none of the writers refered to the cup but to the content alone; you are not letting the Bible interpret itself. But don't forget, dear brother, if you were told to go to a table and on it you would see a bottle, a jug, and a cup; and you were told to drink the cup, if the word "cup", did not refer to the "cup", you would not be able to tell to save your life which vessel to drink the liquid from. Just keep that in mind every time you make that wild assertion, that none of the writers refered to the cup (drinking vessel).

Then he takes up I Cor. II:26; "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup----" He asserts of this quotation, "That the two statements are identical in Greek and English, and further states; "We know that to eat of this bread does not mean to eat out of it but a portion of it". But let me remind you before we pass on he again crosses Thayer and reason.

This I will show a little later. Then he makes the wild assertion and claim, "We are sure also that of this cup does not mean out of but means a portion of it". Then he makes another wild assertion; "Since the Lord thus tells us that of here means a portion of, we are further assured that cup must refer to the content and the meaning of both words is settled".

Let me ask, dear brother, where did the Lord tell us that of did not mean out of??? That's another of his wild assertions. That's the only kind of proof he has. I will pay him Ten Dollars for the statement that the Lord, "tells is that of means a portion of".

Back to the idea that "eat of this bread" and "drink of this cup", are identical parallels. I cannot agree with him in this assertion. The word "eat" and the word "drink", are different acts but could be paralleled if other obstacles were not in the way. The word "of" comes from the same Greek word, "Ek". While "ek" has several meanings, yet they parallel without their use in the different sentences require a different definition. The word "this" in both cases is a demonstrative adjective. The word "bread" means an article of food; it is never used in the sense that it is the ""container"" or of an object.

The word "cup" is a drinking vessel in both the English and the Greek. The idea of "drinking vessel" is inherent in the word, "cup". Hence we see that to eat of (ek) this bread, and to drink of (ek) this cup, are two very different acts. In the first you actually consume, by eating, a portion of the bread; while in the other, you actually consume, by drinking, a portion of the contents of the cup. You do drink a portion of its contents; but you actually drink out of the cup.

Since the Lord addressed us in language made up of words, and since words have established meanings according to their uses in the various sentences; the only way we can settle the meanings is to appeal to the authorities on language. Bro. Key has brought

up Thayer twice and each time ran away from him so he could literalize the figurative expression and thus by his wild assertions seem to prove his position. For example of the different meanings of a word in different sentences, take the following: "I broke my watch","I broke my land", "I broke my horses","I went broke". Try if you please to give the same deffinition in these different sentences to the word, "broke", and see how far you get. Thus you can see what a flagrant violation of the meanings of words the brother has indulged in. I will now call attention to the next argument he makes in the next paragraph, same page, and show the fallacy of both it and the above argument at the same time as they both involve the same misuse of language.

He takes up Matt. 26:27; "------drink ye all of it (the cup)" and Matt. 26:29; "------drink of this fruit of the vine---". Because, "drink of this fruit of the vine" means to drink a portion of the fruit of the vine, he concludes, to "drink ye all of it (the cup) means drink a portion of it. This is exactly the same violation as the above, as I shall show.

Everyone knows the expression, "of the fruit of the vine", include all the product of the vine. In other words, it is a supply out of which one drinks. If you drink the product of the vine in a cold drink stand, in a saloon, at a party, in the communion; in either case you have "drank" of the fruit of the vine. Because that expression, "the fruit of the vine", includes all the product of the vine.

On the other hand, ""it"" refers to cup with the modifications expressed in the sentence, the amount of the fruit of the vine taken that was in that cup for that particular occasion was only small amount of, "the fruit of the vine" that is produced. Hence, to drink of (ek) the cup, is to drink of a thing, a vessel, named cup. While we drink of (ek) the fruit of the vine, is to drink as a supply, a portion of

the fruit of the vine set apart for that particular occasion. Just as it is done in every church of Christ each first day of the week. They each take a portion for that occasion while each of them do not obey the entire command of the Lord to "drink of it (the cup)"; they substitute ""cups"". Am I right in this, or is Bro. Key right in his position??

Let us examine the words used and see. May the truth prevail.

Now, as to what was refered to when the word, "cup", was used in connection with the communion, I have shown you if the word cup did not refer to the cup; you could never tell whether you were to drink the contents of a bottle, barrel, jug, or cup, if you were told to go into a room where all were, and was told to drink the cup. How could you my dear brother, if the word "cup", did not refer to the cup? If you were a cups man, how could you determine what was cup, bottle, barrel, or jug???

The authorities back me up in this matter.

On page 533 Mr. Thayer says, in defining the Greek word, "Poterion"; "A cup, a drinking vessel". In giving the literal uses he says; "a. properly". Among the examples of this "proper" use he gives, Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:17, 20; I Cor. 11:25; I Cor. 11:28; I Cor. 10:16.

Mr. Harper agrees that "Poterion" means----"A vessel for drinking".

Mr. Young and Mr. Berry both agree that "Poterion" is a cup.

This is from four Greek scholars which says I am right in my contention, that cup in the above scriptures is a cup a drinking vessel.

On page 510 in discussing the verb, "Pino", to drink, under "Pino ek" "with a genative of the tessel out of which one drinks". Among other examples he

gives Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; I Cor. 11:28. Note if you please, in those scriptures he, Mr. Thayer, gives them as examples of the "vessel out of which one drinks". Now can you see why Bro. Key always runs away from Thayer?? But watch him tremble, tremble.

Now we go to the real "ek" which Bro. Key perverted.

Mr. Thayer on page 189 under I. I. we come to where the "ek" is after "Pinein" "of the thing out of which one drinks". And as examples he gives Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; I Cor. 11:28.

Note, "The thing out of which one drinks". A cup is a "thing"; it is a "thing" out of which one drinks. But you will notice a Parenthetical clause just after the statement, "of the thing out of which one drinks", which says (differently in 2. 9. below) now with this warning we had better see 2. 9. below.

And here it is; on page 191.

"Of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, received, eaten, drunk etc". Where the "ek" is after "Pinein" he gives the following examples together with others, Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25. Where does he, Thayer put Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, "Drink of the fruit of the vine"? Get it brother, under ""the supply"".

And bless your soul, to cap it all off, I Cor. 11:28 where the "ek" is after "Esthein" (the Greek word for eat), where he said "eat this bread" is also here under "supply". While I Cor. 11:28 where the "ek" is after "pinein", (to drink), where he says, "Drink this cup"; he puts it on page 189 under, "the thing out of which one drinks"; and on page 510, where the "ek" is after the word "pinein" (to drink) he puts it under the "Vessel" out of which one drinks.

Hence Bro. Key's parallel on "eat of this bread" and "drink of this cup", I Cor. 11:28, fails to flicker. For Mr. Thayer puts "eat of this bread", under "supply"

while he puts "drink of this cup" under, "the thing out of which one drinks", page 189; "the vessel out of which one drinks", page 510; the word "cup", as literal on page 533.

So away goes Bro. Keys fog bank on I Cor. 11:28.

As we have seen above, Thayer puts "drink of the fruit of the vine", Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25, on page 191, under "supply"; and on page 510 he puts them under "supply"; while he puts Matt. 26:27, "drink ye all of it"; Mark 14:23, "and they all drank of it", and I Cor. 11:28, "drink this cup---", on page 189 under the heading of the ""thing"" out of which one drinks---"; and on page 510, "with a Genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks; and on page 533 puts the word "cup", in all of these as a literal vessel.

So away goes Bro. Key's smoke screen trying to make Matt. 26:27; "drink ye all of it", and Matt. 26:29, "--drink of this fruit of the vine" both being a parallel meaning drink a ""portion"of""!

Every argument these boys make violate the laws of God and of language. And to show the seriousness of mixing these expressions, Thayer on page 191 after telling "of the supply" he gives the warning, "differently in I. I. above. And you remember that under I. I. he warned us that it was "differently" under 2. 9. below". These warnings were not made for nothing; yet Bro. Key, a Greek scholar, paid those warnings no heed and tried to parallel the exact scriptures Thayer was so cautious putting them under different heads each time that it was different under the other listing.

I could give more; but why should I? I have shown you by the scriptures, by reason, by the laws of language as, and by the scholarship that I am right and he is wrong.

I have shown you in those Metonomies, "drink the

CUP", "drink the cup of the Lord", "drink this cup", that on page 533 Mr. Thayer in giving the uses of the literal word cup, he said, "By Metonomy, of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup, which is offered to be drunk". Any one can see the container (in this case, cup) is literally there containging what is contained, for he plainly says in the next breath, "the contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk". Can a thing be ""the contents of a cup"" without being in a cup??? Nay verily.

Also on page 510 I showed where "drink the cup" (I Cor. 10:21; 11:27) the meaning was, "that is, what is in the cup". Can a thing be in a cup without being in a cup as Bro. Key tries make us believe??

Mr. Williams on page 220 says of this kind of a Metonomy; The container is named to suggest its contents. Mr. Webster of this kind of a Metonomy says, the container is put for its contents. Mr. Welch says of this kind of a Mentonomy, it puts the container for its contents; and as one of the examples he gives "Drink the cup", one of the things Bro. Key has been trying to literalize. Lockwood and Emerson says of this kind of a Metonomy, "The container for the thing contained" and gives as an example, "Meaining the water in the kettle boils". Who could dodge such statements as those with a straight face??

Mr. Tanner says, in giving his example of this kind of Metonomy, "The kettle boils (that is, the water in the kettle boils)". How can Bro. Key get the water out of that kettle with that statement?? And don't forget their final effort is to divorce the ""cup"" entirely from such expressions as "Drink the cup".

Again we call your attention to the following example. Bro. Key and I are in a cavalcade of automobiles of ten persons each being in his own car. I say to Bro. Key, 'our radiators are boiling. If the radiator is not ""refered"" to in that

expression; how does Bro. Key know I mean the water in two dadiators are boiling and not a bottle, pot, jug, or the Pacific ocean??/ Neither if he were in a room where we had a bottle, jug, and cup on the table, if we told him to drink the cup; he could not tell which vessel was meant if the word, ""cup"" did not refer to a cup.

On page 4, under heading of table and cup, I Cor. 10:16; Luke 22:30; he tries to draw another parallel. He is great on parallels that don't parallel.

He assumes all admit when the "table of the Lord" is mentioned that the word, table, has no reference to the literal table.

I will have to disagree with him here. Webster defines table; "DefinitionI I, Origin: A thin slab of any kind or flat piece of solid material, with a relatively smooth surface; a plate; slab; tablet; board; panel; lamina". Robert Hunter and Charles Morris, Encyclopedic Dictionary says; Definition I, "A flat surface of some extent; a flat smooth piece, a slab".

So we see a flat surface of some extent is a table. Oh, yes, I know all about a four-legged piece of furniture, but "a flat surface of some extent", is also a table.

In view of this, anywhere you set the emblems it is tabled. The table is set. You have a literal "flat surface of some extent", with the bread and a cup containing the fruit of the vine on it.

I defy Bro. Key to set what he calls the table, that I cannot according to the definition, show a literal table. Did anyone ever see those boys set what they call the table without a table? Nay, verily. Then why will intelligent men haggle around as though it was a common occurance?? Since he cannot set a table without a table; his parallel goes like the rest.

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

The most rediculous part of it is, he argues that if everyone must put their lips to the cup, then everyone must put their lips to the table to eat the table of the Lord. Did anyone ever see Bro. Key or any of the rest of these boys partake of the fruit of the vine that they did not put their lips to the literal cup they drank of?? Nay verily. Then did they put their lips to the table in doing the eating, to be consistent with putting their lips to a cup, to eat the table of the Lord??? Nay verily.

A cup is a drinking vessel, it is made to put your lips to to drink. A table is a flat surface of some extent, to place the items of food on. No one can show one single case where people put their lips to a table to eat of it. That is not the use of a table, but with a cup it is different. It is a drinking vessel. To drink, you swollow a liquid. Since a cup is a drinking vessel, you would swollow the liquid from a cup. How else could you do it without your mouth came in contact with the cup?? Go anywhere these boys have the communion and you will see them putting their lips to cups to drink, but you do not see them put their lips to the table. Why they know they would render themselves just as rediculous as his argument is. Yes the Lord said, "The table of the Lord", and all the inovators and demons of Hell can't do away with it. No one can set a table without "A flat surface of some extent", and then he has a table.

To try to parallel a table and a cup, is something they themselves do not even try to practice, yet they expect people to swollow that class of stuff.

Then he goes to Jacob's well (Jno. 4:I2) and tries to parallel it with a cup.

What would you think if you visited Bryan, Texas and went over to Bro. Key's house and find he had a pumping device erected over his cup and attempting to lift his well and use it as a drinking vessel??

and see him pouring his food out on the table and putting his lips to his table to eat to be consistent with putting his lips to his cup when he drank; what would you think?? You would say he is crazy.

Well, attempting to pull the act is no more crazy than trying to parallel them.

What is not practicable is not a parallel. I know all see that. A cup is a drinking vessel, a well is a source from which we take water as a supply. You do not drink of a well as you do a cup, their uses are different. It is as crazy to try to parallel them as it is to try to reverse their uses. Hence his conclusion on all those parallels are false.

On page 5, under the heading of "vessels in the original supper", he quotes from Mr. Hastings stating that the Jews at that time always had four cups of wine. You will notice, the Bible does not give any authority for wine in the Passover. Hence Mr. Hastings statement is purely historical. I do not doubt the Jews had wine as an inavation in the Passover just as some brethren now have "cups", an inovation in the Lord's supper. But that is not "Bible authority" any more than the other historical accounts he condemns in his next paragraph. Personally, I think very little of history, wholly, to prove a Bible doctrine, that is, so-called Bible doctrine.

As to the cup in the original supper I would like to know how else it could have been said that the Lord took a cup than as it is stated, "And He took the (a) cup", and since there is nothing in that statement that shows the cup contained anything, nor nothing previously stated, it is a mystery how any one gets tangled on it. "And He gave thanks"; still nothing said about the fruit of the vine, "And gave it to them". Both of them literally handled it, so it must have been a cup just as inspiration said it was. "Saying, drink ye all of it". A plain

unequivocal command to drink of the cup. But in this statement we know the cup contains something. And in verse 28 He tells what, "Ye all drink of the cup", signified. So get it, "This (Ye all drink of the cup) is my blood------".

He tries to make the prepositional phrase, "of it", in Matt. 26:27 the object of drink. Did you ever in your long life diagram a sentence and put a prepositional phrase as the object of an active transitive verb, as drink?? No, dear brother, you did not. The object of drink is the statement that tells what we drink, and what is it?? "This is my blood of the New Testament----------". It is the thing you drink, it is the thing I drink, it is the thing everyone ""drinks"" in the communion service.

Hence, ""of it"", is an adverbial phrase telling the ""place"" to drink, of the cup. Verse 29, tells what the element that was in the cup which they had all drank that signified the blood of the Lord, "This fruit of the vine". It is too plain for quibble.

Mark 14:23-25 backs this statement up in every detail. It shows Jesus did literally take something, and held it while giving thanks, then, gave it to the disciples. Yes, they could literally handle it, and the divine writers all agree it was "a cup". In Mark 14 the word this in verse 24 refers to the previous statement in verse 23; "And they all drank ot it". Place this statement after the word "this" and see if I am right. "And He said unto them this (they all drank of the cup) is my blood----". The prepositional phrase "of it" is adverbial and modifies the verb, "drink", telling where they drank, of the cup.

Verse 25 tells exactly what they drank, what I drink, what Bro. Key drinks, and what everyone else drinks in the Lord's Supper; hence, is the object of drink. And the verse 25 tells what the element was that signified the Lord's blood, "the fruit of the vine". And so away goes all his cobwebs blinding the

eyes of so many people.

It is unnecessary to go over Luke and I Cor. II:25 at this time.

Since every point in his "resume" on page 6 has been exposed, it is not necessary to go over his so-called points in it again. So I will pass on to his next point, "A supper", on page 6.

He says, "Having shown that no drinking vessel is refered to in the Lord's supper----". Yes, dear brother, you showed there was no drinking vessel refered to in the Lord's supper, just as the sectarians show that baptism in Acts 2:38 is not refered to in connection with the remission of sins. They deny one direct command and positive statement of the Lord; you also deny one commandment and statement of the Lord. The Lord positively said, "Drink ye all of it", and you know and I know the "it" here means and refers to the cup He had previously taken and handled and gave to the disciples, which they "took".

And you know a prepositional phrase is not the object of an active transtive verb; hence, you know it is an adverbial phrase modifing "drink", telling where to drink. And Mark plainly and positively states, "And they all drink of it". Since in those Metonomies, "Drink the cup", "Drink the cup of the Lord", "Drink this cup", "And as oft as ye drink it", and "Take this and divide it among yourselves"; the container (cup), <u>is named</u> to suggest its contents (the fruit of the vine); yet you will stand up before the world and say even though the cup is ""named"", it is not refered to. That's the substanee of your unanswerable (?) arguments. Anyone can make those wild assertions you boys and the sectarians make to put over your doctrine, on your cups and their baptism.

Suppose the supper is an institution, does that invalidate the command the Lord gave when He said,

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

"Drink ye all of it"? "It", refering to cup, of course would be ""Drink ye all of the cup"". By circumstantial evidence you are trying to invalidate a command of God. Did you not know to prove circumstantially, was to presume??? Better look up on manners of attempted proofs, my dear brother, before it is too late.

Under the heading of, "An ordinance", page 7, he again tries to show the cup is not ""refered"to"" and he mentions the upper stories etc. to prove it as usual. I have already shown that those "upper" stories" etc., comes under the law governing our liberties and must be left off if they offend Jew, Gentile, or the church of God (I Cor. 10:12), they must be left off. So, if his cups comes under that law, he must leave them off or be condemned for disobeying the commands that govern it. See I Cor. 10:12; I Cor. 8:9; I Cor. 8:12; I Cor. 6:12; Rom. 14:21-23.

Then he asserts that the drinking vessel is no part of the ordinance, "it is like the plate for the bread, is useful in the distribution and do not interfere in the distribution and do not interfere with anything ordained or set apart, a plurality is acceptable".

See there friends, even so if the Lord did ordain to "drink ye all of it", (note, one cup, as it is singular number); he has the nerve to assert the use of a plurality does not interfere. By the same way I can prove Hell will be a Heaven.

Under the heading, "A Supper" on page 7, he asserts, "The institution is a supper, and since any drinking vessel is merely an attendant, and no part of the supper, the institution as a supper remains the same whether one vessel or more than one is used. So far as the supper is concerned then, a plurality is acceptable".

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE", BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

Brother, the Jewish sacrifices had to be offered in the place where the Lord had recorded His name. The fruit of the vine, a part of the supper, had to be drank where the Lord commanded "Drink ye all of it" (the cup), the one He had taken and literally given to the disciples.

Brother Key, what on earth has come over you, anyway?

Under heading, "A memorial", pages 7 & 8, he again tries to slip in his cups.

He argues as the supper is a memorial and the bread is in memory of His body, and the fruit of the vine is in memory of His blood, and the cup is in memory of nothing; hence no part of the memorial.

Bro. Key, did you ever stop to think there are other things that enter into this to make it a memorial?? It must be on the First Day of the week, it must be Christians that prepare and eat the supper, the bread must be taken as per the example for the fruit of the vine to signify His blood, it must be with a self examination, and the drink element must be as Paul stated, "The cup of blessing", (Note, not cups of blessing); as Jesus exemplified when He took, yes brother, He literally ""took""" the (A cup),-----and commanded ""Drink ye all of it"".

Oh yes, you can dote and strive about words (In this case perverting the word cup) and thereby cause envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings; but God's holy word still stands with that command, "Drink ye all of it". And cup still means cup with all those loud claims you make against it. Brother, it will be there in the judgment. See I Tim. 6:3-6.

But brother, when you say the fruit of the vine remains a memorial just the same whether it is one or a plurality of vessels; you as well say it remains a memorial the same if sectarians, horse thieves, or

anyone else prepares it with thanksgiving other than Christians. Don't lose sight of the fact, they were commanded to all drink of the cup. That command is as binding as for it to be on the First Day of the week etc.

When you assert the expression, "This cup is the New Testament------", does not mean that the cup symbolizes the New Testament; I can by the same logic assume the fruit of the vine does not symbolize His blood, nor the bread His body. Talk about parallel passages; look at them.

"This (bread) is my body----".
"This(fruit of the vine) is my blood----".
"This cup is the New Testament----".

If He meant one, He meant the other two. If one is a joke, they are all jokes. If one can be dodged, they can all be dodged.

He says, "It seems clear we do not need anything (No drinking vessel) to represent the New Testament-"

"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" Prov. 14:12. The Lord thought differently from Bro. Key for He said, "This cup is the New Testament----". It is a shame Bro. Key was not there to tell the Lord what ""seemeth"" to be right.

His whole theory is built on literalizing those Metonomies. "Drink the cup" is a Metonomy. In this kind of a Metonomy the container (cup) is ""named"" to suggest its contents (The fruit of the vine") The idea of those brethren standing up before an intelligent people that a thing can be ""named"" and in no way refered to, and expect them to believe it instead of God's holy word and all authorities, is a fulfillment of God's word relative to the last days. 2 Tim. 3:13; 2 Tim. 4:1-4; I Tim. 4:1-2.

Page 8, last paragraph. He attacks the idea that the cup sanctifies the fruit of the vine. Many

parallel the cup and Altar, gift and the fruit of the vine. If you take the word "sanctify", to mean set apart, how else do you set apart a volumne of the fruit of the vine for the supper?? But Bro. Key says, the table would come nearer being in the place of the altar, setting the fruit of the vine apart. And yet ha has said you did not even need a literal table. Be consistent, brother.

Page 9, his conclusion is just a rehash of what is already exposed.

Page 9, "Revealed purpose of the supper".

Under this heading he says; "The supper is designated to commemorate the body and blood of Christ and to show His death".

To this I can say Amen, ""if"" the brother will stick to it. He cites Luke 22:I9; I Cor. II:24-26; Matt. 26:26-28.

But this fact does not prove that a plurality of cups in the communion is pleasing to God; but the scriptures cited on the contrary shows in the scriptural precedent, "cup" in the singular number was used. This alone kills his plurality of cups. Besides Jesu commanded the disciples to "Drink ye all of it"; and since "it" refers to the cup Jesus literally took, the command is, "Drink ye all of the cup". A direct command, if you please. His plurality contradicts that command. In I Cor. II:24-26, the 25th. verse is included and it reads, "After the same manner also He took the cup----". Note if you please, the cup here was one He ""took""; yes sir boss, and hear Him further, "when He had supped, saying this cup is the New Testament in my blood". What cup was that which He called, "this cup"? The answer would have to be the only one mentioned, the one He ""took"", yes sir, brother, the one He ""took""; and that was the one that represented the New Testament, and not the fruit of the vine in the cup.

Hear Him further, "This do ye". What was this

OVER THE COUNTRY that are conscientious against the USE of a plurality of cups; it is up to the cups boys to say with Paul, "I will not be brought under the power of any" (I Cor. 6:I2) and leave them off; or be condemned by the laws that govern our liberties as shown above. So you see if they are right in putting their "cups" under "liberties"; they are wrong and are condemned if they use them.

Since we all agree cup is alright and are divided on the plurality, one cup is the grounds of unity. Now, that is giving them everything; and yet they are wrong. But one cup is plainly taught as I will show later.

You might say unto us, 'then you claim to be weak'. No brother, emphatically no; we believe we have the truth and that one cup is the Bible way. But if you are right and this "cups question" is a liberty; we are weak, regardless as to what we think about it, and you are wrong and condemned for using them and thus violating the laws that govern liberties.

Under the heading of "the meaning of 'the cup", page I; Bro. Key introduces Mr. Thayer but apparently doesn't like him. He says, "We know that Thayer says, 'Poterion' means a drinking vessel, and we know also that he says it means the contents of the vessel.

Bro. Key, I deny that Mr. Thayer said, "Cup meant the contents of the vessel". You gave his literal definition of "cup" right as it appears on page 533. You know also, Bro. Key, he lists Matt. 26:27; Mark I4:23; Luke 22:I7, 20; I Cor. II:25; I Cor. II:28, together with some other references as coming under the head of "Properly", A CUP, A DRINKING VESSEL". Is that why you dropped him so soon? Did you not realize defining these passages as literal use of the word "cup" would kill the

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE" BY P. C. KEY:
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

THING WHICH was refered to as "This do ye"? There is one thing sure, He was not talking about the drinking, for "this do ye" was something they were to do, "As oft as ye drink it in memory of me", (last part of verse 25, I Cor. II). Then what was that "This do ye" they were to do "As oft as ye drink it in memory of me"?

The only thing it could be was the ""taking"" of that cup containing the fruit of the vine and preparing it by thanksgiving as the Saviour did when He set the example. Again the scripture cuts his throat down to the cup (singular number, meaning one) Jesus literally ""took"", the one He literally ""gave"" to the disciples. Isn't that plain?

Anything commanded to be done in commemorating the body and blood of Christ was necessary to make the commemorating valid. I have shown you in this they were commanded to "Drink ye all of it (cup)" and it was the one Jesus literally took and literally gave to the disciples.

I have shown you we should recognize the direct statement of the Lord that "This cup is the New Testament------" And that the words "This cup" could mean no other than the one He ""took"".

Oh, yes, "As oft as ye drink it". It refers to "cup". As oft as ye drink the cup, is a Metonomy. The container (cup) is "named" to suggest its contents (the fruit of the vine). Yes, "cup" was named, hence refered to, and was a literal cup for it was a "container", the one He ""took"".

Now to the ""showing"" of His death.

Christ died to save sinners. They are saved through obedience to the Gospel. He gave Himself for the church, Eph. 5:25. He purchased it through His blood, Acts 20:28. The blood is effective in Christ. Eph. I:7; Col. I:14. We get into Christ through obedience to the gospel, by baptism, Romans

6:3-6; Gal. 3:27. That Gospel, New Testament, is ""in"" (ratified by), or as Paul puts it in Hebrews 9:16-20, dedicated by ""His blood"", Matt. 26:27-29; Mark 14:23-25; Luke 22:20; I Cor. 11:25.

Since we see we reached the blood of the Lord through the New Testament, and that New Testament is ""in"", dedicated by Jesus blood, we would not be surprised to see this demonstrated in the ""showing"" of His death. So, since we reached the literal blood of Jesus through the literal New Testament; so also we reach the symbolic blood (fruit of the vine), through the symbolic New Testament, (the cup).

I wish to add further; that, "that New Testament" which went in force at Pentecost; was in force years before a book called the New Testament was compiled. Testaments have in them words that bring to our minds that one New Testament the Lord meant when He said "This cup is the New Testament".

As to the New Testament needing nothing to represent it as it is always here, and since He said it always refered to something not present; I will say; our flag is symbolic of the United States. Is the United States not present? Allother flags represent their respective countries. Does that mean they have ceased to exist? Hence, we see in a ""show "", as the supper, when contiguity is to be shown as the relation of blood to New Testament; it is not out of the way to represent it with a symbol that fits the occasion.

His "relation of purpose to vessels", pages 9 and 10, is already answered. His "relation of vessels to unity", pages 10 and 11, misses the point. There is but one way we can all speak the same thing and be one in faith and practice, and that is on the Word of God, Jno. 17:20-21; I Cor. 1:10; Rom. 15:18; Rom. 16:17-18; Phil. 1:11; Phil. 1:27; Phil. 4:9; Phil. 3:23-26; Phil. 4:19; Col. 2:3-10; Col. 2:20-23; Col. 3:17; 2 Thes. 3:6; 2 Tim. 3:13-17; 2 Tim. 4:1-4;

"THE ONE DRINKING VESSEL ISSUE" BY P. C. KEY;
CRITICISED BY J. S. BEDINGFIELD.

2 John 9 and others.

And since the Lord used one cup in instituting it and commanded them to all drink of it, and since Paul shows we must "This do ye as oft as you drink it", the Bible grounds are not hard to find. All he has to do is to look at the division his "cups" are causing, to see their result on unity. Some of us are determined to follow the Lord.

His general summary has already been answered many times. Just remember his foolishness on putting his lips to the table because lips are put to the cup. He, himself, puts his lips to the cup when he drinks the fruit of the vine, and he does not show his consistency by doing as he himself stated; put his lips to the table to eat the table of the Lord.

A plurality of New Testaments (books), I give as example for individual use; I refer to two books of Timothy, one of Titus, one of Philemon, one of Luke, one of Acts. Each of them were written to individuals. Will he please! oh please! give that many for his plurality of cups?????

His up-stairs, down-stairs, etc., and his idea of "cups" as a liberty are all answered under the law governing our liberties. Read it.

I have not intended to be harsh with my old school-mate or anyone else, but faithfulness to the Lord and His holy word forces us to be plain.

May God have mercy on the church of God in its divided state, that we may all posess that Christian character to quit the things any and all of us are guilty of and be united on His holy word, is my prayer.

Your brother in Christ,

J. S. Bedingfield.

Box 767, Bryte, California

GENERAL INDEX: PAGE.

What Is Pleasing To God---------- 2.
Liberty---------- 3 & 25.
Meaning Of The Word, "Cup"---------- 5.
One Cup Is Grounds For Unity---------- 5.
Is Luke 22:20 An Interpolation?---------- 7 & 28.
Literalizing The Metaphors---------- 8.
How Divide It Among Yourselves?---------- 8.
When Is Bread HIS Body?---------- 10 & 11.
Did The Lord Say "Cup" Means Contents?---- 10 & 13.
The Word, "This", In Matt. 26:27---------- 11.
Making Fihurative Expressions Figurative------ 13.
The Greek Word, "Ek"---------- 13 & 17.
Is "Eat Of This Bread", And "Drink Of This Cup", Parallels?---------- 14 & 17.
Different Meanings Of A Word---------- 15.
Meaning Of The Expression, "Of The Fruit Of The Vine"---------- 15.
What Does The Word "Cup", Refer To?------- 16 & 25.
Metonomy---------- 18 & 25.
What Does The Word, "Table", Refer To?-------- 20.
Cannot Parallel "Table" And "Cup" ---------- 21.
Jacob's Well---------- 21.
Christ And The Disciples Both Literally Handled The Cup---------- 22.
Active Transitive Verb In Matt. 26:27--------- 23.
Adverbial Phrase---------- 24.
The Vessel A Part Of The Supper---------- 25.
Cup Is Part Of The Memorial---------- 26.
Cup, Symbol Of New Testament---------- 27.
Literalizing Metonomies---------- 7,27 & 29.
Cup Sanctifies Fruit Of The Vine---------- 27.
Revealed Purpose Of The Supper---------- 28.
Cup, Is Used In Singular Number---------- 28.
The Showing Of Christ's Death---------- 29.
How To Reach The Blood Of Christ--------- 29 & 30.
New Testament Represented By A Symbol--------- 30
How We Can All Speak The Same Things---------- 30.