J LOGAN

Broken Bow Okla
13 n Bock 74728

Dear Bro. Hunt.

I will write you A few lines to-night, and send you A little article in reply to one in the o.p.a.. Beginning on page three. by Johnnin 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 the bread struck the church. then Gives Bro. Bob musgrave as the chief exponent. of this theory then charles F. neese then John Bedaingfield. the thing I want to notice here is that their chief man in those days states that this division started in the 1930s used this on Barney Owens. here at B.B. 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 eight. no.6 no one denies that jesus broke bread. and states that each disiple present was to do (exactley) what Jesus did. let us see how this comes out) Jesus took A loaf. each disiple must take A loaf to do exactley what jesus did, Jesus Brokse bread (then each disciple must bless bread, to do exactley what Jesus did) Jesus broke bread (each disiple must break bread exactley what jesus did) jesus gave the broken bread to the disiples. (each disiple must give the broken bread to the disiplest to do exactley what Jesus did) and said take eat. to do what jesus did. how can anyone say that each disiple must do EXACTLEY what jesus did, and then just take one thing he did and apply his theory to it, and leave the rest of what jesus did out of the picture and claim he is doing EXACTLEY 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 states, under, D. of this same paragraph, if the disiples ate the bread it was in response to the command take eat. and this do in rememberence of me, Mk. 14-23- and Lk. 22-19. them he said (he must have done what he commanded the disiples 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, 1pet 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. Rom 10-17 faith comes by hearing the word of god, (not listing to johnny) then in. No.8 he states Christ Body was never literaly broken, I would like to know how A roman spear can enter A mans side and make A hole big enough to thrust A mans hand into and not be broken much less the nails in his hands the thornes on his head to say nothing of his feet, he states that if the breaking of the bread is to potray Christ broken body then it should not be seperated into two or more pieces for he said christ body was not broken into several pieces, this I would like to see dimostrated since it cannot be broken into more than one piece, and still be christ body how does he brake it into 50 pieces and still call it the Lords body. for if there is fifty members in the church and they all brake it, then there is fifty pieces yet he said. it could not be broken. then in 1 cor, 11-24 says that jesus brake it and also says under C. 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 1cor, 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 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 body was broken some 26 years before so this kills the theory of it being his litteral 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 disiples as jesus did for he said he did christ

I cor 11.1.now we shall back up to section B. of his statement.he said that Christ body was never literaly broken, since the spear went into his side and also that it was christ literal body that it pierced.how can A man say that it 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 untill after it is broken by the man at the table for christ dianot say that it was his body untill after it was broken.Mk.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. Iwill ask ,where do they break, at the table or away from the table? christ broke at the table,Mk.14-22 and commanded this do.Lk 22-19 in his memory as he has stated. in no.6 do exactley what jesus did. now I wonder if he does that or is he just talking, now in no,10 of his statement.he uses the terms,broken, given,and shed,and said this refered to christ real body and blood,and not to the bread and the fruit of the vine, if this be the case, then why did christ go to al the trouble explaining to the world as well as to the apostiles about the loaf. the cup and the blood, and told them to do this in his memory till he came again when he knew it would be impossible for his real blood and body to be shed anymore and why do we hold the communion so sacred if what he said only refered to his real body and blood.it has to refer to what we do to-day in his memory,as well as to what has happened in the past. and this cant be done unless the example is followed,and we must have A loaf,and cup of the fruit of the vine,to-day on the table as this is set forth in I cor.11-23-27. by paul and a number of other places in the N.T.,, what I can see now,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 givingto the disiples now they say we sin,when we brake,the bread,and give to the disiples,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 brakes the bread and gives to the church. for thatis exactley what they say they do for they say they follow jesus,and that is what jesus did.read Matt.26-26.Mk.14-22 Lk.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 is 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 his self,it takes two or more to have a communion,now he uses bro. Beddingfield, bro,Musgrave, bro reece, and R.C.Clements,and tryes to pick them to pieces after they are dead.shame,on the man,they cant defend theirselves and it is good to take what the dead have said and make light of it.

so the only thing that have left to hollow about is the one at the table what he does with the bread,and no where 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 Lk.22-18 in our discussion here at B.B. and said this is where jesus ate,and that this wasthe communion if this is true,then we know 22-19-20 is the communiom for thatis what jesus said was his blood of the N.T,/so if. verse 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 cant 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 hereafter,

sincerley yours Lloyd Treat