Broken Bow, Okla.
13 N. Bock, 74728

Dear Bro. Hunt,

I will write you a few lines tonight and send you a little article in reply to one in the O.P.A., beginning on page 3, by Johnny Elmore, edited by Ellis Lindsey. Title: One Communion Loaf In One Piece Demanded.

The first thing noticed; there are those that break the loaf into two pieces in or near the middle. They state that J. Ervin Waters, in 1947, traced this division over this practice as follows: In the 1930s, the division on the breaking of the bread struck the church. Then gives Bro. Bob Musgrave as the chief exponent of this theory, then Charles F. Reese, then John Beddingfield. The thing I want to notice here is that their chief man in those days states that this division started in the 1930s and used this on Barney Owens, here at Broken Bow. And he said it started with Christ and the apostles, the practice like they do. But here their own man states it started in the 1930s. Next, we notice under arguments for loaves and pieces of loaves refuted. Now on page 8, No. 6 no one denies that Jesus broke bread, and states that each disciple present was to do exactly what Jesus did. Let's see how this comes out. Jesus took a loaf. Each disciple must take a loaf to do exactly what Jesus did. Jesus blessed bread. Then each disciple must bless bread to do exactly what Jesus did. Jesus broke bread. Each disciple must break bread to do exactly what Jesus did. Jesus gave the broken bread to the disciples. Each disciple must give the broken bread to the disciples to do exactly what Jesus did and said, "Take eat...," to do exactly what Jesus did. How can anyone say that each disciple must do EXACTLY what Jesus did? Then under No. 6 of this article he states it is not specifically mentioned in Matt. 26:26 that Christ ate of the bread, then stated under D. of this same paragraph, if the disciples ate the bread, it was in response to the command, "Take eat" and "This do in remembrance of me", Mark 14:23 and Luke 22:19. Then he said he must have done what he

commanded the disciples to do; therefore Jesus ate the Bread. But notice he said that it was not specifically mentioned that Jesus ate the bread. Question: which time does he want us to believe him? Then said that Jesus left us an example that we should follow His steps, 1 Peter 2:21. One time he tells us that it is not mentioned that Jesus ate the bread. Then he has the nerve to come right out and say that he did eat the bread after saying that it is not mentioned. If I read my Bible right, Romans 10:17 faith comes by hearing the Word of God, not listening to Johnny. Then in No. 8 he states Christ's body was never literally broken. I would like to know how a Roman spear can enter a man's side and make a hole big enough to thrust a man's hand into and not be broken, much less the nails in his hands, the thorns on his head, to say nothing of his feet. He states that if the breaking of the bread is to portray Christ's broken body, then it should not be separated into two or more pieces, for he said Christ's body was not broken into several pieces. This I would like to see demonstrated since it cannot be broken into more than one piece, and still be Christ's body. How does he break it into 50 pieces and still call it the Lord's Body? For if there are fifty members in the church and they all break it, then there are fifty pieces, yet he said it could not be broken. Then in I Corinthians 11:24 says that Jesus broke it and also says under O. it would be impossible to partake of an unbroken body for it must be broken to be eaten. The very thing we contend for is the very thing he said, yet he will not do what he said and come over to the truth as he has said. Then in I Corinthians 11:24 he said that this is in the futuristic present tense. And could not refer to the loaf, then states Jesus broke the loaf. What does he try to say? One time he says could not refer to the loaf, and then in the next statement said Jesus broke the loaf, then added to that, ate, then said his body was in the process of being broken, not the loaf. But there is one thing he forgot. That this scripture was some 26 years after Christ had died and was delivered to Paul. So if he was correct here about the future and present tense, it would have to refer to the loaf and not the actual body. For Christ’s body was broken some 26 years before so this kills the theory of it being his literal body there at that time, as he stated future and present tense. Therefore, if Paul did what he said he did and what Christ did, he broke the loaf and gave to the disciples as Jesus did, for he said he loved Christ.

I Corinthians 11:1. Now we shall back up to section B. of his statement. He said that Christ's body was never literally broken, since the spear went into his side and was not this body that was broken. Now down to No. 9 of his statement. Here he uses Bro. J.S. Beddingfield as he stated, the bread does not become the body of Christ until after it is broken by the man at the table for Christ did not say that it was his body until after it was broken. Mark 14:22. This is correct as you will see if you will read it. His reply is this is invalid because all do break before partaking. I will ask, where do they break? At the table or away from the table? Christ broke at the table, Mark 14:22, and commanded this do. Luke 22:19 in His memory till he came again when he knew it would be impossible for his real blood and body to be used anymore and why do we hold the communion so sacred if what he said only referred to his real body and blood. It has to refer to what we do today in His memory, as well as to what has happened in the past. And this can't be done unless the example is followed, and we must have a loaf, and cup of the fruit of the vine, today on the table as this is set forth in I Corinthians 11:23-27 by Paul and a number of other places in the New Testament. What I can't see is how he can take just one thing, break bread, out of all Jesus did and bind this on the church, each member of the church. And not bind the rest on them also, the taking, blessing, breaking and giving to the disciples. Now they say we sin when we break the bread and give to the disciples and have divided the church over this. Well, what I want them to tell me is that if we sin when we break the bread and give to the church, what does he do when he breaks the bread and gives to the church? For that is exactly what they say they do for them say they follow Jesus, and that is what Jesus did. Read Matthew 26:20, Mark 14:22, and Luke 22:19, and see if this is not what Jesus did. So why the fuss and division? The only one of them that does not eat of a broken loaf if the one that is at the table. And if we sin when we eat of the broken loaf, then they also sin when they eat of the broken loaf. And the one at the table, he sins, for no one can commune by himself. It takes two or more to have a communion. Now he uses Bro. Beddingfield, Bro. Musgrave, Bro. Reece, and R.C. Clements and tries to pick them to pieces after they are dead. Shame on the man! They can't defend themselves and it is not good to take what the dead have said and make light of it.

So the only thing that they have left to holler about is the one at the table. What he does with the bread, and nowhere can he read that Jesus ate first, or ate at all of the broken bread that He said was His body or drank of the cup that He said was His blood. Now Ellis Lindsey used Luke 22:18 in our discussion here at Broken Bow and said this is where Jesus ate, and that this was the communion. If this is true, then we know 22:19-20 is the communion for that is what Jesus said was His blood of the New Testament. So if verses 17-18 is the communion, then why fuss over the loaf, and cup, for this makes one writer say that they had two loaves and cups. And if two, why not all we want? No, they can't read where Jesus ate of the broken loaf, as they have already stated, so they want him to eat first and call that the breaking that he did, but Jesus knew more about what he wanted done and set the pattern, and we better follow it if we expect to live thereafter.

Sincerely yours,
Lloyd Treat