(DISPUTANTS: ELLIS LINDSEY, WACO, TEXAS
PAUL FERGUSON, FAYETTEVILLE, ARKANSAS)

LINDSEY-FERGUSON

DEBATE

ELLIS LINDSEY
4600 Cole Avenue
Waco, Texas 76710

1976

LINDSEY-FERGUSON

DEBATE

SUBJECT: THE BREAD-BREAKING QUESTION, OR HOW THE COMMUNION LOAF IS TO BE BROKEN

THE LINDSEY-FERGUSON DEBATE

PROPOSITION #1: The Scriptures teach that at an assembly of the Church of Christ for the communion, the servant at the table, after giving thanks for the loaf of bread, must break off his piece and eat; then it is given to the assembly for them to break off and eat.

Affirmative: Ellis Lindsey
Negative: Paul Ferguson

PROPOSITION #2: The Scriptures teach that at an assembly of the Church of Christ for the communion, the servant at the table, after giving thanks for the loaf of bread, must break it into two or more pieces; then it is given to the assembly for them to take and eat.

Affirmative: Paul Ferguson
Negative: Ellis Lindsey

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 2
LINDSEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE 3
FERGUSON'S FIRST NEGATIVE 6
LINDSEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE 9
FERGUSON'S SECOND NEGATIVE 12
FERGUSON'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE 15
LINDSEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE 18
FERGUSON'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE 21
LINDSEY'S SECOND NEGATIVE 24

APPENDIX: THE AUTHENTICITY AND ANTECEDENT OF "WHICH IS BROKEN" IN I COR. 11:24 28

THE LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE IS NOW AVAILABLE. REFER TO THE BACK COVER FOR DETAILS & PRICE.

INTRODUCTION

Surprise may be the first reaction of many of our readers when I say that more preachers and brethren have asked for information upon this subject than upon any other subject about which I have been approached, unless it would be the wine question. Indeed, our subject here of bread breaking is a major one, as the following facts force us to conclude:

1. Most of the early Restoration figures believed that the one communion loaf must be broken in two (but not into more than two pieces) by the presider at communion. Alexander Campbell advanced this view in The Christian System, 1839, pp. 270-273. He was no more correct here than when he became the first President of the American Christian Missionary Society in 1849.

2. The Christian Church still requires such ceremonial breaking, although that group allows many pieces instead of only two.

3. Almost all Churches of Christ which use individual communion cups, plural loaves, and Sunday School break their crackers into many pieces before distribution and even before prayer. However, they do this as a matter of "convenience," and not as a matter of law. Their most lauded preacher-scholar since 1900 was the late Robertson L. Whiteside, who was a President of Abilene Christian College, Queries Editor of the Gospel Advocate, and author of a widely-used commentary on Romans and such books as Doctrinal Discourses and Reflections. He wrote this:

> Hence, when Jesus took bread and broke it, it means that he ate some of it—did this, no doubt, as an example to show the disciples how to proceed. And remember the body of Christ was not broken into two or more pieces. When the person who ministers at the table imagines he is following a precedent by tearing the bread into two or more pieces, he misses the significance of the term "breaking bread," goes through as meaningless performance as could well be. That is merely a ritual established by ignorance. [Reflections, p. 397]

4. Among a number of churches which use one cup and no classes, as well as among some other "conservative" groups, there are those who bind the fragmenting of the loaf. I am among those who use one cup; our churches do not allow such fragmenting by the presider, and those few which do bind this are separate from us, having no fellowship with us (Brother Paul Ferguson being among that number).

My first debate upon this subject was in April, 1971, at Broken Bow, Oklahoma, with Brother Lloyd Treat. Brother Paul Ferguson and others from Fayetteville, Arkansas, were there for part of the debate, at which time Brother Ferguson told me, "I'd like to take you on sometime." Finally, he and I conducted a four-night debate in Fayetteville during January of 1975. Then we conducted the present written debate for publication, completing it in mid-1975, a few months before he passed away with a heart ailment. Quite a lot of new ground was plowed during this debate, and I pray for it a fruitful harvest among the studious reapers.

—Ellis Lindsey, August 14, 1976.

THE LINDSEY-FERGUSON DEBATE

PROPOSITION #1: The Scriptures teach that at an assembly of the Church of Christ for the communion, the servant at the table, after giving thanks for the loaf of bread, must break off his piece and eat; then it is given to the assembly for them to break off and eat.

Affirmative: Ellis Lindsey
Negative: Paul Ferguson

LINDSEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Dear Brother Ferguson and Brethren:

I am very happy to engage in this needed debate with Brother Ferguson. I wanted to affirm the following proposition, but Brother Ferguson would not agree to it: "The Scriptures teach that when the church observes the Lord's supper, the communion loaf must be broken only by each member in partaking." The terms of the proposition under discussion are well defined by the proposition I suggested.

FERGUSON'S QUESTIONS & LINDSEY'S ANSWERS

Brother Ferguson has submitted five questions, which I now answer.

"1. Did Jesus set a perfect example for the servant at the table, when he instituted the Lord's supper?" Answer: Certainly! However, Brother Ferguson does not follow the example which he says Jesus set; for he says that Jesus did not partake when He presided at the first supper, but Ferguson does partake when he presides. In our oral debate I asked him, "Do you do what Jesus did?" He did not reply. Perhaps he will tell us now. I shall press this point throughout the debate!

"2. Is the King James Version and others, correct in the translation of the account of the Lord's supper?" Answer: The King James Version is correct; most of the others are correct, although a few are very wrong in several areas, as shown in my answer to question #3.

"3. Does any translation of the new testament, in the institution of the Lord's supper, state that Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke off a piece and ate it, and gave to his disciples, and told them to break off their piece to eat?" Answer: No. However, the Living N. T. (by Kenneth Taylor) translates I Cor. 10:16 thusly: "And when we break off pieces of the bread from the loaf to eat there together, this shows that we are sharing together in the benefits of His body." Taylor does say of Mk. 14:22 that Jesus took a loaf "and broke it in pieces," which is incorrect. But Ferguson is forced to differ with Taylor's "translation" of I Cor. 10:16. This alone proves that one cannot prove his point merely by quoting translations made by individuals, not groups. There are about 75 translations of the N. T. in English. I know of only four which say that the loaf was broken into pieces by Jesus; they are the ones by Taylor (quoted above), Goodspeed, J. B. Phillips, and C. B. Williams. No major

translation made by groups of scholars makes the above mistake. It is also interesting to notice that the same four translations which say "in pieces" also say that the fruit of the vine is "wine"; and, of course, this is incorrect, as Ferguson must agree.

When Henry Alford, that great scholar and author of Alford's Greek Testament (with technical commentary), introduced his translation, the Authorized Version Revised, in 1869, he stated in the Preface that he had to finish the work by himself without the aid of the other four scholars with whom he had begun it. He wrote these very revealing words:

> "It is impossible, to say nothing more, that one man's work can ever fulfil the requisites for an accepted Version of the Scriptures. If there was one lesson which the 'Five Clergymen' learnt from their sessions, it was that no new rendering is safe until it has gone through many brains, and been thoroughly sifted by differing perceptions and tastes" (Preface, p. vi).

These words are so much more true today, when many of the "translators" of private versions do not even claim to give literally what the Greek N. T. gives. Many of them seem to attach more importance to the traditions of men and to denominational bias than to the strict linguistic meaning of passages. A classic example of this is the blunder of J. B. Phillips on Rom. 16:16, where he CHANGES the "holy kiss" to a "hearty handshake"! Phillips himself admitted,

> "We know that the early Christians greeted one another with 'an holy kiss.' Yet to introduce such an expression into a modern English translation immediately reveals the gulf between the early Christians and ourselves, the very thing which I as a translator am trying to bridge" (Translator's Foreword, pp. ix, x).

Thus, some of these "translations" are injecting their own opinions into the N. T., and even changing the N. T. to suit their own senses of what is parallel to early teaching. (Of course, when translations are correct in a given place, we may quote them.)

"4. Can you give one standard Greek lexicon, that defines the Greek verb 'KLAO' or any of its forms, to break off a piece and eat it?" Answer: John Parkhurst's great Greek-English lexicon of 1825 states, "Bishop Pearce, in his note on Acts xx. 7, observes, that 'in the Jewish way of speaking, to break bread is the same as to make a meal" (p. 385). Thus, the statement that Jesus "brake" the loaf means that He ate of it.

"5. Does the servant perform any acts when he waits on the table, that no one else in the assembly does?" Answer: No. But the manner differs. For example, by using "Amen" the prayer of the presider is also offered by each member (I Cor. 14:16), although only the presider prays aloud. The statement in I Cor. 10:16 about "the bread which we break" means every member breaks bread himself.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT. One of the most important aspects to our debate is whether or not Jesus ate of His own supper. We know that Jesus ate and drank of the first Lord's supper; for He said,

"Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mk. 14:25). When He said that He would drink "no more" until later in the kingdom, or church, He meant that He had just drunk. The phrase "no more" is translated from the Greek adverb OUKETI (ook-et'-ee), which means "never again" (Arndt and Gingrich's lexicon, pp. 596, 597). Even Goodspeed's translation says "never...again"! Nearly all translations and lexicons agree. Webster says that "again" means "once more; a second time; anew." Jesus did drink of the fruit of the vine, since He said He would not do it again, or a second time, until He would drink it spiritually with Christians in the Church. Jesus ate of the communion loaf; for Lk. 22:15, 16 tells us this: "And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." The only way to understand this passage is to say that Jesus ate of the communion loaf, which represents "Christ our passover" (I Cor. 5:7); but that He would eat no more (never again) until He ate it in the Kingdom, or church, soon to be built. We cannot possibly apply this passage to the Old Testament Passover; for this would force us to say that Christ eats the O. T. Passover in the church today!

Having proved in the last paragraph that Jesus ate of the communion loaf, let us now employ what is called in Logic a Disjunctive Syllogism:

1. Either Jesus did eat of the communion bread (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He ate of it), or Jesus did not eat (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He merely broke the loaf into pieces).

2. But Jesus did eat of the communion bread (as proved above).

3. Therefore, the statement "he brake it" means that He ate of it.

Or again, we may use the same first premiss and the conclusion to construct this Syllogism:

1. Either Jesus did eat of the communion bread (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He ate of it), or Jesus did not eat (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He merely broke the loaf into pieces).
2. But the statement "he brake it" means that He ate of it (conclusion, Syllogism #1).
3. Therefore, the statement "he brake it" does not mean that He merely broke the loaf into pieces.

Therefore, the presider at the Lord's table today can only break the bread in eating; and this is the only way in which He can follow the example of Jesus. Thus, MY PROPOSITION STANDS PROVED.

FERGUSON'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Dear Brother Lindsey:

I am very happy to answer your first aff. speech. But I am somewhat surprised you failed to define your proposition, you stating that the proposition you wanted me to sign well defines the proposition that we are discussing. This I do not believe sets forth a diff. Do you not believe we must have either a command, or approved example, or statement, or a necessary inference?? No wonder, you have none of these, to prove that the servant after taking bread, giving thanks, breaks off his piece and eats it. This is what you must prove by the Scriptures.

Just to keep the record straight, the propositions that we are now discussing are the ones I sent you first, you didn't want to sign them, and you sent me your propositions, tho stating mine was good, which I would not sign, as you have stated, the propositions sets forth both of our practices, I said if we are not willing to affirm our practice, then why have a proposition, then you signed them.

Now to his answer to my questions, No. 1. Answer: "Certainly!" Then you have admitted that Jesus set a perfect example for the servant at the table when he instituted the Lord's supper. This you do not practice, when you affirm that the servant at the table, after giving thanks, must break off his piece and eat it, then gives the rest to the assembly, for them to break off to eat. No where did Jesus set an example like that.

Notice Matt. 26:26; Mk. 14:23; Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:23-24. All state that after that Jesus had given thanks for the bread, he brake it, and gave to the disciples, for them to take, eat: Read your Bible, brother.

Brother Lindsey, I listen at the recording in our oral debate, in which you said that I said that Jesus did not eat. I did not hear one time that I said that, but I did say it didn't matter to me whether he ate or drank, he did not first, just to prove Jesus ate and drank, is not for you, you must prove he ate and drank first, and that you cannot do.

In Mk. 14:23, And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. Note—He gave it to them WHEN HE HAD GIVEN THANKS—is a TIME clause, telling WHEN "he gave it (cup) to them." It was "WHEN HE HAD GIVEN THANKS," then if Jesus drank, he did not first. In answer to question number two, he says, King James Version is correct; most of the others are correct, although a few are very wrong in several areas. He admitts those translations are correct. NONE, no not one, that translates the account of the Lord's supper, where Jesus after giving thanks for the bread, breaks off his piece and eats it.

Brother Lindsey, instead of you proving your proposition, as you say, you have given up your proposition, by your admission.

Brother Lindsey answers question number three, No translation translates that says Jesus, after giving thanks for the bread, breaks off his piece and eats it, and Brother Lindsey says there are about 75 translations of the N. T. in English. Friends, doesn't it seem strange that if Brother Lindsey's position is correct, some of the translators would have translated some as such? No not one, not even the "paraphrase" new testament, by "Kenneth Taylor" helps Lindsey, as he in Mk. 14:22 states that Jesus broke the loaf in pieces, in which Lindsey says is incorrect. But don't you know that if it had stated that Jesus, after giving thanks for the bread, broke off a piece and ate it, he would hung on to it for dear life, we would not hear the end of it.

Lindsey says he knows of only four translations that translates, broken in pieces. And at the same time, of none that says, broke off and ate. You also state "(Of course, when translations are correct in a given place, we may quote them)." Then what you are saying is that though some translations may be wrong in some places, but may be good in other places, so we may quote the good. Note—Jesus took bread, gave thanks, and break it. Webster defines the word "break", "1. in general, to separate into parts or fragments," so that would be in pieces, and that is in harmony with the translations that state, he broke it in pieces, so then we can use these translations, though other parts may be wrong.

His answer to question 4, "Does any standard Greek lexicon define the Greek verb 'KLAO' TO BREAK OFF AND EAT?" He cites Parkhurst's lexicon, his notes on Acts 20:7, to break is the same as to make a meal. Note—to make a meal, then he does not define it as to break off and eat, does IT? Acts 20:7, "the disciples came together to break bread," which includes keeping of the entire communion.

Your comment, "The statement that Jesus 'brake' the loaf means that He ate of it." I know that you have been telling us all along that Break means to eat, but without proof. Note—as you say, Jesus ate what he brake, then in Matt. 15:36; Mk. 8:6 if Jesus had eaten all that he broke (klao) he would have eaten all that 4,000 people ate, besides seven baskets full of fragments. So this shows that Jesus didn't eat what He broke, and remember that this same Greek word is used in Matt. 26:26; Mk. 14:23, etc. Now to question 5, His answer: "No. But the manner differs." Well, if the manner differs, then they don't do the same thing, which you admit that a woman can't preside at the table, and you know as well as I do that those in the assembly do not take an unblessed loaf, or one unblessed cup, do they? Your argument won't stand.

Now to his first affirmative argument. Lindsey says, "One of the most important aspects to our debate is whether or not Jesus ate of His own supper. We know that Jesus ate and drank of the first Lord's supper."

Answer: The most important aspect of this debate is that you prove by the Scriptures that the servant at the table, after giving thanks for the bread, must break off his piece and eat it. You say that Jesus ate and drank of the supper, if you do prove He did, where does that help you? What you need is what you don't have, to help you you must prove that Jesus drank first. And this you cannot do, Mk. 14:23.

And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: Therefore no room for him drinking just after he gave thanks, the next thing he did, was he gave it to them.

You state that Jesus said he would drink no more. Certainly Jesus had drunk some where, but remember if he drank in the supper, he did not drink first.

Brother Lindsey, you say Jesus also ate of the communion loaf; for Luke says, Lk. 22:15-16, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:" And this passover you say is the Lord's supper.

How in the world can you stretch your imagination to say that it is the Lord's supper is beyond my comprehension. If you will notice in verse seven of the same chapter, the passover was to be killed, the only thing that was killed was the lamb, which Peter and John prepared for Jesusand His disciples to EAT, so if it is as you say, you have got a lamb in the Lord's supper, and you can't keep it out, by your interpretation.

If you will notice that in speaking of the passover, as eating, eat the passover, no mention of drinking. But at the Lord's table is eating and drinking, Luke 22:30, also to, the new institution, was never referred to as the Lord's passover; But is called communion, breaking bread, Lord's supper. Certainly, Christ is our passover lamb, which was slain for us, 1 Cor. 5:7; Christ died for our sins, 1 Cor. 15:3; He gave himself for the church, Eph. 5:25; He gave himself for our sins, Gal. 1:4.

The old testament passover was fulfilled, Jesus said He would not any more (He ate in the passover) until it be fulfilled in the kingdom, not meaning the old passover, but the Lord's supper.

In eating of the bread and drinking of the cup in memory of Christ, we show forth his death.

Now, to your logic, in syllogism. But you remember your propositions calls for the Scriptures teach, that the servant, after giving thanks for the bread, must break off his piece and eat it, which you don't have Scripture for, you would not have used space on Logic.

Your proposition stands unproved.

LINDSEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Dear Brother Ferguson:

You seem to forget that it was my idea to have this debate. You totally failed to answer my question, "Do you do what Jesus did?" Either way you answer, you are trapped in a hopeless dilemma: Since you partake when you preside, and since you claim that Jesus did not partake when He presided, (1) if you answer the question "Yes," then this forces you to admit that Jesus partook (since you do); but (2) if you answer "No," then you thereby admit that you do not follow the perfect example which you say Jesus set.

I. FIRST AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT CONTINUED. Before I repeat the two Disjunctive Syllogisms, I want to answer your objection, "You must prove that Jesus drank first." In trying to prove that He did not drink first, you quote Mk. 14:23 as saying that it was "when he had given thanks" that He gave the cup to them; and from this you reason that there was "no room for him drinking just after he gave thanks" and before He gave it to them. But not one of your four translations which says He broke the loaf into pieces has "when" in this passage. Why? The whole statement "when he had given thanks" is translated from the Greek Aorist Participle EUCHARISTĒSAS, which means simply "having offered thanks" (New English Bible), with no reference to a particular point in time. The same Greek form is used in Matt. 26:27 and Lk. 22:17 (parallel accounts), where even the King James Version does not have the adverb "when."

But let me prove that Jesus ate FIRST. Jesus ate of the loaf when He took it. In Matt. 26:26, He told the disciples, "Take, eat." "Take" is from the Greek verb LAMBANO, which here means "to take with the hand, lay hold of" (Thayer's lexicon, p. 370). The disciples ate at the point of their taking the loaf. Likewise, the same verse says that Jesus "took bread"; and the same Greek word is used, since "took" is simply the past tense of "take." Jesus ate at the time He took the loaf and offered thanks; for there is no statement that He ever took it again. But He took it FIRST, or before He told the others to take it and eat. This conclusion further strengthens my Syllogisms, which I repeat here, since they went totally unanswered:

1. Either Jesus did eat of the communion bread (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He ate of it), or Jesus did not eat (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He merely broke the loaf into pieces).
2. But Jesus did eat of the communion bread (as proved).
3. Therefore, the statement "he broke it" means that He ate of it.

ALSO:

1. Either Jesus did eat of the communion bread (in which case the statement "he brake it" means He ate of it), or Jesus did not eat (in which

case the statement "he brake it" means He merely broke the loaf into pieces).

2. But the statement "he brake it" means that He ate of it (conclusion, Syllogism #1).

3. Therefore, the statement "he brake it" does not mean that He merely broke the loaf into pieces.

NOTE: "Inference" means "the deriving of a conclusion in logic" (Webster).

Brother Ferguson, come on out into the open and tell us that you do not believe that Jesus ate and drank of His own Lord's supper. In our oral debate, you listed the things which Jesus did, and you did not mention His eating! I quoted Mk. 14:25 as follows: "I will drink no more (Greek OUKETI, meaning NEVER AGAIN) until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." This forced you to admit, "Certainly Jesus had drunk somewhere." Since the "fruit of the vine" which He drank represented His "blood of the new testament" (vs. 24), then it was in the Lord's supper that He drank it.

I showed from Lk. 22:15,16 that Jesus did "eat this passover," but that He said, "I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." The phrase "not any more" is also from OUKETI, and means NEVER AGAIN, which proves two things: (1) Jesus did eat of that new passover; and (2) He was to eat it again when the kingdom or church was established. This cannot refer to the O. T. Passover lamb; if it did, then this would force the conclusion that Christ later ate the lamb in the kingdom. (However, it was "as they were eating" the O. T. Passover that Jesus took the loaf—Matt. 26:26.) As further proof that Luke does not refer to the O. T. Passover, notice that (1) the gospels give us the order of events used by Jesus—He first took the communion loaf and then the cup; (2) but verse 17, which immediately follows verse 16 cited above, mentions the cup of the Lord; (3) therefore, if the passover which Jesus said He would eat again in the church (vs. 16) were the O. T. Passover, then Luke does not even mention the communion loaf which came before the cup, but in its place talked about a Passover lamb!

DEFINING KLAO ("break"). You say that Jesus told the disciples to eat but not to break; yet you and all your congregation breaks as well as eats. Your dilemma is this: Either (1) admit that BREAK means to EAT, and thus give up your position; or (2) say that EAT does not mean to BREAK, and thus condemn your own congregation for BREAKING as well as EATING when the loaf is passed to each member. In our congregations we all take the loaf and "separate into parts or fragments" as a necessary part of the eating, just as Webster says. But you go a step beyond Webster: You claim that the presider must break off his piece to

eat AND also break the loaf in two to "qualify" it to represent Christ's body. But according to Webster, the loaf is broken when the presider breaks off his piece to eat; thus YOU differ with Webster. In fact, you admit that the phrase "break bread" in Acts 20:7 means to eat! And you failed to notice my point, "The statement in I Cor. 10:16 about 'the bread which we break' means that every member breaks bread himself."

It is significant that you have to go to the miracles of the loaves and fishes to try to prop up your definition. You tell us that KLAO, the Greek word for "break" in the Lord's supper, is used in Matt. 15:36 and Mk. 8:6 (I might also add Matt. 14:19). But you only tell us one-fourth the truth. There are three other words or phrases used with reference to these two miracles: (1) KATAKLAO, which is KLAO with KATA ("down") ADDED, and which means "to break in pieces . . . Mk. 6:41; Lk. 9:16" (Thayer's lexicon, p. 331). (2) EKLASA EIS, another spelling of KLAO plus EIS ("into"), all of which is "a pregnant const., equiv. to 'to break and distribute among' . . . Mk. 8:19" (Thayer, p. 348). (3) DIADIDŌMI, which means "to distribute, divide among several . . . Jn. 6:11" (Thayer, p. 136). Both miracles are referred to in Mk. 8:19, 20 with the added construction of No. "(2)" above. The four gospels have to be harmonized, since one or more writers might not have covered all that happened. When we add all the accounts together we have more than eating under consideration, but only because different words were used besides those used in the Lord's supper. Even if the word KLAO had been used alone of these miracles of the loaves, the whole meaning of the word wherein a miracle is involved would differ from the normal meaning. Not one of the additional constructions above is used in the Lord's supper; and this proves my point, since those constructions would have been used in the Supper also if Jesus had meant to say that the loaf had to be fragmented by the presider who then distributed the fragments.

II. SECOND AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT: THE FOUR UNDIVIDED BODIES OF CHRIST.

(1) The Passover Lamb, which represented Christ to come, was to be UNDIVIDED: "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof" (Exodus 12:46). (2) The literal body of Christ, to fulfill the preceding passage, was UNBROKEN on the cross: "That the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken" (John 19:36). He was broken only figuratively: "Reproach hath broken my heart" (Ps. 69:20). (3) The "church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22, 23) must be UNDIVIDED or UNBROKEN. (4) The loaf, of which Jesus said, "This is my body" (Matt. 26:26) must also be UNDIVIDED. There is ONE UNDIVIDED CHRIST, and the three things which represented Him must be not only ONE, but also UNDIVIDED. If it is scriptural to divide the loaf, then it is scriptural to divide the other three bodies. Breaking did not, and could not, qualify any of the three representatives above to represent Christ's body.

FERGUSON'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Dear Brother Lindsey:

No, I did not forget this written debate is your idea, and you are getting one aren't you? You utterly failed to define your proposition in your first affirmative, also neither in this one. Yet you affirm that the Scriptures teach; do you not believe that we must have a command, approved example, or statement, or necessary inference??

Your question, "Do you do what Jesus did?" Answer: When I serve at the table I follow the example Jesus left. Matt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22; Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:23-24, which says Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat. As presiding at the table I do what Jesus did, it matters not if Jesus ate or not at the supper, I get my part under the command Take, for I am also a disciple, even though I serve at the table. So I am not trapped in a hopeless dilemma, as you think.

As to my statement that you must prove that Jesus drank first, you haven't disproved, not yet. Note—You say my four translations which state broken pieces has not when in this passage, Mk. 14:23. I think I will let you keep the paraphrase (Living New Testament) which is not a translation. J. B. Phillips states, Mk. 14:23, "Then he took a cup, and after thanking God, he gave it to them," then you can see that teaches the same thing as other translations, which state, when he had given thanks. And there are many that state such.

Next you state that you would prove that Jesus ate FIRST, you said that Jesus ate of the loaf when he took it. This is purely assumption, and you have been saying along that break means to eat, which one do you want us to believe? You said in Matt. 26:26 He told the disciples, "Take, eat." Yes, that's right, Jesus took bread, blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat: This is my body. You next try to limit the word "take" as just to take hold of, or to take with the hand (Thayer's lexicon, p. 370). Yes, Thayer further states in the first def., or thing in order to use it.

So the word "take" does not always mean just to grasp, it is a general term, depends on how it is used. When Jesus took bread, this cannot mean the same as when he told the disciples to take eat, what ever was necessary to get their part was included in the word "take", not stating how each must get his part. Example, God took a rib from Adam, Gen. 2:21; "Take" also of the tree of life, Gen. 3:22; "Take" to them a lamb, Exod. 12:3; so you can see what was being done, when they performed the word "take".

You state, "The disciples ate at the point of their taking the loaf. Answer: You are wrong again, they were commanded to take, eat; taking is one thing, and eating is something else. You say same Greek word

used when Jesus took bread; perhaps you are right, but it cannot be used the same way as when he said take, eat; as you well know the same word can be used different, it depends on the context, in where it is used.

You state again, "Jesus ate at the time He took the loaf and offered thanks." You just stated before, that Jesus ate of the loaf when He took it. Which one of these you want us to believe? Then you say break means to eat. All these are assertions, without proof.

You say that Jesus took the loaf FIRST. Yes, you are so right, and what did He do to it? Matt. 26:26, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat: This is my body.

So we can see that Jesus gave the disciples a broken loaf and told them to "take", eat. You state the conclusion of your arguments strengthens your Syllogisms. Answer: If assertions make your logic strong, then I must say you are a master. What you need more than the syllogisms is Scriptural proof that the servant at the table, after giving thanks for the bread, must break off his piece and eat it. Brother, this you must prove by the Scriptures, which you can't, you are in the affirmative.

If any translation would have stated in the instruction of the supper, that Jesus took bread, and gave thanks, and broke off his piece and ate it, you would have given it long ago, you didn't in four nights, neither in this written debate. You claim there are 75 translations into English, but not one translates as such, which you have admitted.

Since you have no Scripture to prove your proposition, you are filling up your space on syllogisms. You seem to want me to say something about it. Answer: You must have (1) a major premise, (2) a minor premise, and (3) a conclusion. Example, (1) All sinners deserve punishment, (2) AB is a sinner, (3) Therefore, AB deserves punishment. Note—Major and Minor Premises must be facts, not assertions.

In your first, (2) minor, Jesus did eat of the communion bread; that you have not proved, so your conclusion is false. Your second, (2) Minor, "He brake it means He ate of it"; which is also not true. Therefore, your conclusion is not true.

Next, you want Jesus to eat so bad, you go to Luk. 22:15, which is the passover supper. Certainly, Jesus ate in the passover, which He said he would do; Luk. 22:8, verse 7 & 8 Peter and John killed the passover which was the lamb, and prepared for Christ and disciples to eat.

If this is the Lord's supper (which it is not), to help your doctrine, you would have to prove that Jesus ate first. That you cannot do.

You state that I said Jesus told the disciples to eat but not to break. Why do you keep misrepresenting me? What I did say, Jesus said to take, eat; so what ever was necessary to get their part was included in the word "take". You say that I claim that the presider must break off his piece to eat AND also break the loaf in two to "qualify" to represent Christ's body. Answer: Are you so confused that you want to swap sides

with me? You are affirming that the servant, after giving thanks for the bread, must break off his piece to eat, not me, I never said that, this belongs to you. You also state, must break the loaf in two to "qualify". No, I did not say that it must be broken in just two pieces, I said two or more pieces, so let us keep the record straight.

You say according to Webster, the loaf is broken when the presider breaks off his piece to eat. Yes, but you break like the Baptist baptize, for the wrong purpose. Baptist baptize to get in the baptist church, the real purpose is for the remission of sins, Acts 2:38, and you break to get your part to eat, the real purpose is to qualify.

You said that I admit the phrase "break bread" means to eat, Acts 20: 7. Answer: Why do you want to partly quote me? It means not only to break, or eat, but also to drink of the cup. This you agree.

Your statement, 1 Cor. 10:16, "'the bread which we break' means that every member breaks bread himself." Answer: But to fit your practice, it should read the bread we bless, as you say the bread is qualified at thanks.

Then you never break bread, but body, if it becomes his body at thanks. The cup of blessing which we bless, why don't you contend that all to give thanks out loud, Jesus did, the servant at the table does, in following Christ's example. The cup we bless, and bread we break, are qualifying acts, is in harmony with Jesus' example, Matt. 26:26, and others. So by your interpretation, the phrase, We break, they break, Acts 20:7; 2:42. The same they went every where preaching the word, Acts 8:1-4, then you have women preachers.

You say I have to go to the miracles of the loaves and fishes to prop up my definition, Matt. 15:36; Mk. 8:6. You seem to think that if a miracle is involved, that would change the definition, but you notice, not in this case. Jesus took seven literal loaves and literally brake them. The miracle is not in this part, but the miracle was in the increase of the food, though other words were used in connection with it, does not change the definition of the Greek word (klao) and this word was also used, where it says Jesus brake the bread.

You mention "four undivided bodies of Christ," then you state that the passover Lamb was undivided. They were to eat the flesh of the Lamb, Exod. 12:8. Please tell me how they could eat the flesh of the Lamb without dividing it?? You say, neither shall you break a bone thereof, Exod. 12:46. Yes, that is right, we can read that. The Scriptures do not say the lamb was undivided, you said that.

You say Christ's body was not literally broken on the cross, but figuratively. Notice a parallel passage, Luke 22:19, "This is my body which is given for you." Do you mean to tell me that Jesus did not literally sacrifice his body when He died on the cross?? The church does not represent Jesus' literal body, It is His Body, Eph. 1:23.

Your proposition stands unproved.

THE LINDSEY-FERGUSON DEBATE

PROPOSITION #2: The Scriptures teach that at an assembly of the Church of Christ for the communion, the servant at the table, after giving thanks for the loaf of bread, must break it into two or more pieces; then it is given to the assembly for them to take and eat.

Affirmative: Paul Ferguson
Negative: Ellis Lindsey

FERGUSON'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Dear Brother Lindsey:

I am happy to engage in this debate with Brother Lindsey. I will define my proposition: The Scriptures teach, either by a command, or approved example, or statement, or necessary inference. I don't think the rest of the proposition needs defining, for the Scriptures is the key issue.

LINDSEY'S QUESTIONS & FERGUSON'S ANSWERS

Brother Lindsey has submitted five questions, which I now answer.

"1. Do you do what Jesus did? Or, to put it another way, do you do any more than He when He presided? Don't dodge again, but tell us!"

Answer: When I serve at the table, to prepare the elements, following Christ's example, I do no more, or no less.

"2. Brother Ferguson, you are trying to deceive the readers. Why don't you just be man enough to tell us that you do not believe that Jesus partook of that first Lord's supper? Tell us, Sir. Just say 'Yes' or 'No,' that He did or He didn't partake."

Answer: Your first part is not a question but a statement. If any one is trying to deceive the readers, I am willing to let the reader decide that, how about you? Whether I believe Jesus ate or not has nothing to do in me proving my proposition.

"3. If you admit, by chance, that Jesus partook of that first Lord's supper, what Biblical words are used to describe His partaking?"

Answer: If I did admit by chance (which I haven't whether He did or not) I am sure you would want to know, as you have tried so hard to prove that Jesus ate in the Lord's supper, that you said the passover supper was the Lord's supper, Luk. 22:15, then you run into more trouble because you have to prove that he ate first, and that you can't do.

"4. Is there any translation or lexicon which agrees with you that to 'take' means to 'break'? If so, name them."

Answer: No, I don't know of a translation or lexicon that means exclusive to "break", but the command to "take," eat; take is a general term, not stating exactly how one must get their part to eat, but what

ever is necessary to get a part to eat is included in the word "take."

"5. IF no Scripture says that all Christians break bread for themselves, how can it be Scriptural for all your members to break bread as well as to eat it?"

Answer: When Jesus instituted the supper He did all the breaking that was mentioned; the disciples were to take, eat; the phrase "break bread" when the servant at the table breaks the loaf to qualify, the assembly accept it, last part of your question, see No. 4.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENTS. Jesus set the perfect example, for others to follow. So what did He do? Matt. 26:26—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. Also Mk. 14:22; Luk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:23-24.

Notice—I have given every Scripture in the account of the institution of the Lord's supper in detail. This proved my proposition by "Example."

The word break is a generic term, not stating just how many pieces the loaf was broken into, but it must be broken in at least two, could be more. Webster defines the word break, 1. In general, to separate into parts or fragments by concussion or stress; separate violently.

When Jesus broke the loaf, He broke it into pieces, and he gave the disciples a "broken loaf" so they was commanded to take, eat; of the loaf that Jesus had broken. Notice, Goodspeed's translation, Matt. 26: 26, As they were eating Jesus took a loaf and blessed it, and he broke it in pieces and gave it to his disciples. Also Williams' translation, and Phillips says that Jesus "break the loaf in pieces." Brother Lindsey says if a translation is correct in a given point, we may quote them, though it may be wrong in some other places, so in this point as breaking in pieces, is in harmony with other translations, which state brake, or broke the bread, so I can therefore use them. In 1 Cor. 11:2 we are to keep the ordinances as he had delivered to them, then it is commanded to do as Jesus set the example, Paul said He was a follower of Christ. So my proposition is proved also by command. Brother Lindsey says there are seventy-five translations translated into English language, and only four state broken in pieces, which I have showed that the word break means to separate into parts, or pieces, so they all teach the same thing.

But to be in harmony with Lindsey's practice, it should read, Jesus after giving thanks for the loaf, breaks off a piece and eats it, unfortunately for him, not one out of seventy-five does. Looks like to me is he is correct in his practice, some would have translated it as such the thing about it it, he is not correct in his practice.

We want to notice the word "take". Matt. 26:26, after Jesus brake the loaf, He gave it to his disciples, and commanded them to take, eat; "take" is a generic term, not stating how one must get his part ot eat, but what ever was necessary to get a part to eat was included in the word take, so if it is necessary to break a piece from the broken loaf, and most of the time it is, but not always, if there are pieces that is already broken the size I want to eat, I can also eat it. Remember Jesus never said that the disciples "must" break his piece to eat.

Let us notice other examples of take or took past tense. God "took" a rib from Adam to make eve (Gen. 2:21). Several things are involved, as to open up the flesh, etc. Also "take" of the tree of life (Gen. 3:22); if we have picked any fruit from trees, we know that many things are involved.

"Take" to them a lamb (Exod. 12:3). You may have to drive it off the range, run it in a pen, and etc. So we cannot restrict the definition just to grasp or take hold of. Sometimes it does mean to just grasp, if I take medicine, or if I take sick, so it depends on the context in which it is used. This gives you farther definition to your question number 4.

In the institution of the Lord's supper, Jesus was the one that prepared both elements to qualify the bread to signify His body, and of the fruit of the vine His blood. Luk. 22:19, Jesus after He gave thanks and broke the loaf and gave it to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: This do in remembrance of me.

Matt. and Mk. said nothing about doing anything in remembrance of Christ, Luk. said nothing about drinking in Christ's remembrance. But Paul explained it, 1 Cor. 11:24-25, concerning the cup, He said, "this do ye, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me."

Notice—this do ye precedes the eating and drinking, and means to do what Jesus did, what did Jesus do? 1. took bread, 2. gave thanks, 3. brake it, 4. gave it. This can only be carried out by the servant at the table. The servant, 1. takes bread, 2. gives thanks, 3. breaks it, 4. gives it. This is done by the servant as a congregational act.

If you tried to apply as individual act, you would be in trouble, it would force you to individual loaves and individual cups. We only have authority for one loaf and one cup on the Lord's table.

Brother Lindsey says, Jesus break and ate of the loaf, and told the disciples to do as He had done. He told them to eat and drink in memory of Jesus, then who did Jesus eat and drink in memory of? His self?

If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God, 1 Pet. 4:11. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, II Tim. 3:16-17.

So my proposition stands proved by the Scriptures. The servant at the table, after giving thanks for the bread, breaks it into two or more pieces, then it is given to the assembly to "take, eat," Matt. 26:26; Mk . 14:22; Luk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:23-24.

LINDSEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Dear Brethren:

When I defined the terms of my proposition by rewording that proposition, Brother Ferguson claimed that I had not even defined them. Yet, the only term of his own proposition he defined was the word "teach"! I call upon him to define the terms, especially "take."

FERGUSON'S ARGUMENTS REFUTED

I. BROTHER FERGUSON AND HIS BROTHERHOOD CONVICTED OF NOT FOLLOWING THE VERY EXAMPLE WHICH THEY CLAIM JESUS SET. Ferguson teaches that Jesus set a perfect example by not partaking of the Lord's supper when He presided; yet when he and his brethren preside, they all partake! In my first two articles, I gave overwhelming proof that Jesus did partake of His own Lord's supper. The only new objection from Ferguson on that point is that he wants to know if Jesus did partake, "then who did Jesus eat and drink in memory of? His self?" Everybody knows that the O. T. Passover lamb was also eaten in memory of Christ; and Ferguson himself said in his 2nd Neg., "Certainly, Jesus ate in the passover." If Jesus could partake of a passover lamb which was in His memory, He could, and did, partake of the Lord's supper in His memory.

In our oral debate, I asked Ferguson, "If Jesus did not eat the Lord's Supper, how can the presider at the table follow Christ's example and yet eat?" He wrote the following reply: "The presider is also a disciple." But a "disciple" is defined as a "follower"; and if the presider does not follow the example of Jesus, he is not a disciple. He tried to base his whole First Affirmative upon what he claims is the perfect example of Jesus. Now he convicts himself for not following the example he says Jesus set. If he cannot follow the binding example which he claims Jesus set in not partaking when He presided, then one of two things is true: Either (1) the example itself is not perfect as set; or (2) the one who claims to follow the perfect example, and yet who does not follow it, is CONDEMNED.

But this is not all. In my second question, I asked him if he believes that Jesus partook of that first Lord's supper. His reply, if you can call it that, was, "Whether I believe Jesus ate or not has nothing to do in me proving my proposition." he gave no answer. My third question was one of vast importance, which inquired, "If you admit, by chance, that Jesus partook of that first Lord's supper, what Biblical words are used to describe His partaking?" He replied: "Answer: If I did admit by chance (which I haven't whether He did or not) I am sure you would want to know." This is a flat admission that he has failed to answer my questions. He has broken his word; for our agreement for this debate states that the debater in the negative submits questions, and that "these questions are to be quoted word-for-word by the affirmative debater, who then gives his ANSWERS." Let me explain to the readers why Brother Ferguson

goes into a state of paralysis so deep that he will break his word in order to keep from replying to those questions: You see, if he ever admitted that Jesus did partake, then he would be faced with the problem of what Biblical word was used to describe His partaking; and the only word which can describe His partaking is the word "brake." And if "brake" means "partake," then this destroys his idea that "brake" means to tear into pieces without partaking. Ferguson cannot afford to come out in the open and answer those questions!

As further proof that "brake," or "break," means to partake, notice Acts 2:46 " . . . breaking bread from house to house, DID EAT their meat." The writer defined "breaking bread" as eating. I Cor. 10:16,17 speaks of "the bread which we break . . . for we are all PARTAKERS." Now notice Mk. 14:22: "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." A parallel account is found in Lk. 22:19: "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." Mark recorded Jesus as saying, "Take, eat"; whereas, Luke recorded the same meaning by saying, "This do," which means to eat, or brake, the loaf as Jesus had done. "This do" proves that the disciples broke the loaf like Jesus; and that Jesus ate, since they ate in doing what He did.

The above arguments prove that Jesus drank before the disciples, or "first." Ferguson ignored my argument which stated, "Jesus ate at the time He took the loaf and offered thanks; for there is no statement that He ever took it again."

Ferguson still tries to construct a parallel between the breaking of the communion loaf and the breaking of the loaves and the fishes. But he claims that the communion loaf is not "sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (I Tim. 4:5), like common food; that prayer is not enough to cause the loaf to represent the body; and that a further act—fragmenting—must be performed to qualify the loaf to represent the body of Christ. Yet he admits that prayer alone, without another "qualifying act," causes the fruit of the vine to represent the blood. Let me ask, if the miracle of the loaves and the fishes is parallel to the communion loaf, then were the loaves and fish sanctified by prayer before being broken? The miracle was in the manner of breaking; for Jesus "break the five loaves among (Grk. EIS, "into") five thousand" (Mk. 8:19). There were three added constructions in the Greek to describe that breaking; none was used in the accounts of the Lord's supper. In Ferguson's 2nd Neg., he said that if the bread is qualified to represent the body at thanks, "then you never break bread, but body, if it becomes his body at thanks." If this "reasoning" is true, then the congregation only eats "body," and not "bread," since they eat after prayer! It is often argued by Ferguson that it was not until after Christ had broken the loaf that He said, "This is my body" (Mk. 14:22). However, notice from the same verse that it was not until AFTER Christ had GIVEN the loaf to them and SAID, "Take, eat" that He said, "This is my body." Does this mean that the giving and the

saying were acts which qualified the loaf to represent Christ's body???
If not, then neither was the breaking. Ferguson denies that prayer causes the loaf to represent the very body of Christ!

II. BROTHER FERGUSON'S WHOLE CONGREGATION AND BROTHERHOOD CONVICTED OF BREAKING BREAD AS WELL AS EATING IT, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME DENYING THAT THE SCRIPTURES SAY THAT ALL CHRISTIANS BREAK BREAD. Ferguson claims that every Scripture which mentions the breaking of the communion loaf refers to the presider breaking the loaf into pieces, and not to the communing audience. My 5th question reads, "IF no Scripture says that all Christians break bread for themselves, how can it be Scriptural for all your members to break bread as well as to eat it?" In our oral debate, he replied, "The command take." But no authority agrees with him. This is why I asked my 4th question: "Is there any translation or lexicon which agrees with you that to 'take' means to 'break'? If so, name them." He replied, "No...." I pointed out that "take" (Grk. LAMBANO) here means "to take with the hand, lay hold of" (Thayer's lexicon, p. 370). However, let us assume for argument's sake that "take" means "break." This would destroy Ferguson's position: (1) If it is true, then Jesus broke bread twice in the same service, for He "took" it and afterward "brake" it. (2) IF THE COMMUNING AUDIENCE BREAK BREAD UNDER THE COMMAND "TAKE" AND EAT UNDER THE COMMAND "EAT," THEN SINCE NONE OF HIS MEMBERS WHO THUS BREAK DO ANY FRAGMENTING OF THE LOAF EXCEPT TO BREAK OFF A PIECE TO EAT, WHEN JESUS BROKE HE DID NO BREAKING EXCEPT TO BREAK OFF A PIECE TO EAT! THIS IS A POWERFUL TRUTH WHICH CANNOT BE MET.

Then Ferguson tries to give us two examples in which he says "take" means "break": (1) "'take' of the tree of life." But does this mean, "Break the tree of life into pieces???" (2) "'Take' to them a lamb, Exod. 12:3." But does this mean, "Break them a lamb," when verse 46 plainly forbids such breaking??? He then gives us the example, "take medicine," which can only mean that the medicine was consumed; and according to this, his own example, he would have Jesus eating the Lord's supper, since He "took bread," and first.

III BROTHER FERGUSON CONVICTED OF MISUSING THREE MODERN TRANSLATIONS. He now has narrowed himself down to three translations by individuals which say that Jesus broke the loaf into pieces (although Phillips says this only in Matt. 26:26). The same "translations" say "wine" instead of "fruit of the vine." Of the three, only Phillips has the word "broken" in I Cor. 11:24 (nearly all translations leave it out). Goodspeed says Jesus "took some bread" (I Cor. 11:23). Brother Ferguson, do you agree with Goodspeed when he renders I Cor. 11:25 thusly: "He took the cup, too, after supper, in the same way"?

But he is against all of them on his saying that "take" means "break." He has not replied to my first article on translations. What did he say about Henry Alford's statement???

CONCLUSION: I will reserve comment for now on his "reply," except to say this: (1) The Passover lamb was not divided, but was partaken of simply in the process of eating, a bone of it not being broken (Ex. 12:46). The loaf cannot be broken except in eating, as it, like the lamb, represents the Lord's body. (2) The church can be divided if the loaf can be, for the church also represents the body of Christ. Ferguson denies that the church represents the body, and claims that the church IS LITERALLY THE BODY OF CHRIST, WHICH IS AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD, HAVING BEEN RESURRECTED!!! (3) When I showed that the body of Christ was not broken literally, but figuratively (Ps. 69:20), Ferguson wants to know if the statement that His body was "given" for us (Lk. 22:19) means it was literally sacrificed. Certainly! And this proves that when the parallel passage in I Cor. 11:24 says that His body was "broken" for us, this proves that "broken" means "sacfificed"; and this is certainly not a literal breaking, therefore. More later. Ferguson's proposition has fallen.

FERGUSON'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Dear Brother Lindsey:

No, Brother Lindsey, I do not believe by rewording the proposition you sent me, defines itself, not the one we are discussing. You have utterly failed to define your proposition!! Now he wants me to farther define my proposition, especially "take." This I will be glad to do, not only take, but the rest of it, as I have already defined the word "teach". The Scriptures, I mean the Old and New Testament. An assembly, I mean just that, Christians coming together. The communion, I mean the Lord's supper, 1 Cor. 11:20; break bread, Acts 20:7; Acts 2:42. The servant, I mean the man that presides at the table, which performs acts that no one in the assembly does, in following the example that Jesus left for the servant at the table, which was a perfect example, which we both agree. He takes one unblessed loaf, blesses, gives thanks, out loud, no one in the assembly does that, then breaks the loaf, into two or more pieces, or breaks it in pieces, as a qualifying act, following Christ's example, Luk. 22:19, after Jesus took bread, gave thanks, and brake it, He said it was His body.

Jesus never said the bread was His body before he brake it, but after he brake it.

But to fit Brother Lindsey's practice, it would have to read that Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke off his piece and ate it.

Brother Lindsey says there are seventy five translations into English. And don't you know not one out of all these translations not even one, states that Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke off his piece and ate it. If brother Lindsey's practice is right, surely some would have translated as such. I have to depend on translations out of Hebrew and Greek language. So the Scriptures are made known to us by translations. No wonder Brother Lindsey is hurting so bad, he has no Scriptures to help him.

Now to the word "take". He wants me to especially to define "take". Perhaps he failed to read my comment on it, in my first affirmative, on page 17. As Brother Lindsey tries to restrict the word to just grasp, which is one definition, but not all as I have shown. He has misquoted me as saying that take means to break. It depends on how it is used. The word "take" is a generic term, not stating how one must get his part to eat, what ever was necessary to get a part to eat was included in the word take, so if it is necessary to brake a piece from the broken loaf, and most of the time it is, but not always, if there are pieces that is already the size I want to eat, I can also eat it.

Remember, Jesus never said that the disciples "must" break his piece to eat. Brother Lindsey, you say each one MUST break off his piece to eat. You refer to 1 Cor. 10:17 all partakers of one bread. Yes, we are all partakers, but it didn't say that we were all breakers.

On page 20 Lindsey says, Ferguson tries to give two examples in which he says "take" means "break". Why do you make a false statement like that? Nothing is farther from the truth, the examples I gave to show that the word "take" means more than to just grasp, like took a rib, take of tree, take a lamb, take medicine, take sick. Then you ask, break a tree, break a lamb??? No and I never said break a tree, nor break a lamb. Why don't you meet these arguments like a man??? Then you defeat yourself in saying take medicine means to consume medicine! Then according to you, the word take don't always mean to just grasp. Lindsey against Lindsey!

Lindsey says, Everybody knows that the O.T. passover lamb was also eaten in memory of Christ. No, I didn't know that!!! Where did you learn that anyway, can you give us Scriptures for that statement??????

Dear readers, please read Exod. 12:14-27. This shows what it is done in memory of.

Brother Lindsey says that I broke my contract, which is a false statement. You will note Question 3. I quoted it word for word, gave my answer, and if you don't like my answer, that makes me break my contract. Then what about YOU, what is your answer to question 4. When I asked, Can you give one standard Greek lexicon that defines the Greek verb "KLAO" or any of its forms, TO BREAK OFF A PIECE AND EAT IT? What did you answer? John Parkhurst, notes on Acts 20:7 as to make a meal, Then he does not say, break off a piece and eat, no body knows that better than you do. Then because you do not like my answer, that makes me break my contract, then you have already broke yours.

You say, Ferguson goes into a state of paralysis. Lindsey is like the old "adage" a drunk man thinks every one else is drunk, and for as some one being paralized, as far as the Scriptures is concerned to prove your doctrine, you have been paralized from the start.

Yes, you don't have any command, example, statement, or any Scripture, that state in the example Jesus set when He instituted the supper, that he took bread, gave thanks, broke off a piece and ate it. No TRANSLATION STATES SUCH, which he has admitted. Yes, paralized, too dead to kick.

Then he decends to the point of misrepresenting, twisting, what I say. Lindsey says, the Church also represents the body of Christ, and this you mean His physical body. You say, Ferguson denies that the Church represents the body. Yes, and I still do. But you state that I claim that the church is literally the body of Christ, which is at the right hand of God, Having been resurrected!! Brother Lindsey, why did you say that? This is simply a false statement. Why don't you apologize to the readers, even if you do not want to to me?

What I did say, It is His body (Eph. 1:23). I will now quote verse 22: And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church. 23, Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. To confirm this to the readers, notice the last part of my negative, you can see what I said.

Lindsey says, that I said Jesus did not eat, and that I say take means to break. Perhaps you want to know why I haven't said I believed Jesus ate or not ate. Because you want to stay away from the real issue and talk around, since you don't have Scripture for your doctrine.

Lindsey says, the only word which can describe His partaking is the word "brake", then according to you, the word brake is the ONLY WORD that describes Jesus's partaking. You said in the last part of your first affirmative, Luk. 22:15-16, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you, you say that is the Lord's supper. So you have gave up this argument according to what you say.

Lindsey says, Acts 2:46, "brake" means to partake," breaking bread from house to house, I think you believe the phrase, "breaking bread from house to house" means the Lord's supper. Did they eat their meat (food) with gladness, etc., has reference to a common meal, and therefore does not define the breaking of bread as eating. Because "breaking bread" implies the whole communion, such as giving thanks for the bread, and breaking the loaf, giving thanks for the cup, and drinking.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENTS

Jesus set the perfect example for the servant at the table, both Lindsey and I agree. Notice, when Jesus instituted the supper, Matt. 26:26, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples and said, Take, eat; This is my body.

Mk. 14:22: Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body.

Luk. 22:19: 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.

1 Cor. 11:23, 24: For I have received of the Lord that which also I 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. This is every place mentioned in detail, where the supper was instituted. Notice—No place states that Jesus took bread, gave thanks, breaks off a piece and ate it??? This is Lindsey's practice, this he affirmed. Brother Lindsey, why don't you deal with these Scriptures? Let me see you try to twist them. Goodspeed's translation says Jesus broke the loaf in pieces. And so does Phillips and Williams' translations.

1 Pet. 4:11, If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. A man saying that "Jesus break off his piece and ate it" cannot speak as the oracles of God. Its not a walk of faith. Rom. 10:17, Faith comes by hearing. Its not Scriptural, therefore not a good work. 11 Tim. 3:17. It is also not "truth," Jno. 16:13; Apostles guided into all truth, but was not guided to say, Jesus broke off his piece and ate it??? Acts 20:27, Paul did not shun to declare all the counsel of God. But He did shun to declare that Jesus broke off his piece and ate it!

1 Cor. 11:23, What did Paul declare? For I have received of the Lord, Of who? The Lord. What did he say? Jesus after he gave thanks, "brake" the bread, or break it in pieces. Paul received his from the Lord. Brother Lindsey, Where did you receive yours?

End of Ferguson's second and last Affirmative.

Dear readers, please read what each writer has said, then compare with the Bible. May the Lord bless each one to know and to do his will is my prayer.

LINDSEY'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Dear Brethren:

I. SOME THINGS FERGUSON IGNORED. In spite of Brother Ferguson's front, he has failed miserably, and even has resorted to accusing me of misrepresenting him. He is so completely whipped and paralyzed that he has dropped all discussion of seven of my main negative points.

In my Question #2, I asked Ferguson, "Why don't you just be man enough to tell us that you do not believe that Jesus partook of that first Lord's supper?" In his last article, he admitted that he has allowed the debate to conclude without his answer. He said, "Perhaps you want to know why I haven't said I believe Jesus ate or not ate," and then claimed that my question was not on the subject. But my whole first affirmative

argument was based upon the fact that Jesus partook when He presided, and Ferguson's first Question and first argument were concerning the perfect example which he claims Jesus set when He presided! Let's face it—he denies that Jesus partook; yet he partakes every time he presides, while at the same time claiming, "I do what Jesus did" (his 1st Neg., paragraph 2). Brother Ferguson, you know good and well that you do not do what you claim Jesus did! IF YOU DO WHAT JESUS DID, THEN JESUS PARTOOK (SINCE YOU DO). And when Jesus partook, He did so under the meaning of the word "brake," the only word said during the actual supper itself which can mean that He ate (although Lk. 22:15, 16 says He was going to "EAT," for which see my 2nd Aff., following the Syllogisms). Thus, "brake" did not mean to fragment, as shown in my Question #3 and the Syllogisms.

Does he actually think that the intent of our rule that all questions were to be ANSWERED is that you can just say you are not going to answer them and then call that an answer??? You have to resort to claiming that I did not answer one of your questions concerning breaking off a piece of bread. We teach that the word "break" in Matt. 26:26 means to EAT, and that the breaking off of a piece to eat is a necessary but incidental part of the eating. You are the one who demanded that "break off" be in my proposition (which you worded) so that you could make a play on words. I quoted a lexicon (Parkhurst) which says that to break bread is to make a meal; this was in direct answer to your question, and was so strong that you had no real reply.

II. THE TRANSLATIONS EXPLAINED. Let me point out WHY three translations incorrectly say that Jesus broke the communion loaf "into pieces." In 1873, a religious document dating from, perhaps, a hundred or two years after Christ was discovered in Constantinople. This creed—known as the Didache, or The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles—is good in some places, but is bad in others. Among its many bad teachings is its statement that baptism can mean to "pour out water thrice upon the head" (7:3). It also says, "And concerning the broken bread: We thank Thee, our Father..." (9:3). The Greek word here translated "broken" is not KLAO (as is used in the N. T. of the communion), but, rather, KLASMA ("fragmented" or "fragments"). In defining KLASMA, the great Greek lexicon by Moulton and Milligan says, "In Didache ix. 3f KLASMA is used of the broken bread of the Agape and Eucharist" (Vocabulary of the Greek N. T., p. 345). Because KLASMA is used in the Didache of both the communion loaf and of the Agape (love feast), it is very probable that the word refers in both cases only to the breaking performed as a necessary part of the eating. But the three translations which Ferguson has offered have taken these references as meaning that the loaf was fragmented by the presider. The 70 other translations had better scholarship than to change the Scriptures in favor of a Creed they misunderstood!

If "divide" (Lk. 22:17) means "drink" (Matt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23), and "broken" (I Cor. 11:24) means "given" (Lk. 22:19), why can't "brake" (Matt. 26:26) mean ATE, or "EAT" (Lk. 22:15)? Every translation which says Jesus "brake," or "broke," the loaf is correct; for the Jews used this word to mean "EAT." Such Jewish expressions are called Hebraisms, or Semitisms. If "in pieces" is correct, why didn't the other 70 translations say this?

III. "TAKE" DOES NOT MEAN "BREAK." Ferguson falsely says that I believe that "take" always means "to grasp." I said it "HERE" means that (my 1st Neg., #II). He claims that every reference in the N. T. to the breaking of the communion bread means the act of the presider in breaking the loaf into pieces, and never to the breaking which the whole congregation does. When I pointed out that every member of his own congregation BREAKS OFF PIECES of bread AS WELL AS EATS, and that this BREAKING was done without Scriptural authority (if his position is true), he was forced to search around for another N. T. word which could include such breaking off. He latched upon the word "take" in Matt. 26:26, which reads, "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body."

However, in this passage, the Greek word LAMBANO is used twice; the first occurrence ("took") we shall call the "a" occurrence, and the second ("take") the "b" one. Thayer's lexicon lists Matt. 26:26 twice (both occurrences) under the meaning, "to take with the hand" (p. 370). The great lexicon by Arndt and Gingrich agrees, saying, "take in the hand, take hold of, grasp ARTON Mt 26:26a. . . . Absolutely LABETE take (this) Mt 26:26b" (p. 465). According to these authorities, Jesus meant by the word "take" that the disciples were to GRASP the loaf as He had done (the eating and the necessary breaking off came under the command to "eat"). If the idea of breaking off a piece were included in the word "take," then Jesus broke off a piece when He TOOK the loaf (and the cup), and before prayer!

You will notice, also, that Arndt and Gingrich's lexicon tells us that in the second ("b") occurrence ("Take, eat"), the word "take" should be supplied with the direct object "this," making the passage mean, "Take THIS." The lexicon by S. T. Bloomfield (based upon the German works of Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider) defines LAMBANO thusly: "I. to TAKE, I. prop. with the hand, foll. by acc. expr. or impl." (p. 300). Therefore, in the statement "Take, eat," the word "take" is followed by an implied accusative (direct object), making the statement mean, "Take THIS and eat IT," which is exactly the way both Goodspeed and Williams translate the statement; and even Phillips says, "Take and eat THIS." Sorry, Brother Ferguson, but the very three translations you introduced have hanged you! Don't you see that the disciples were to "Take THIS (LOAF)," and that it was the LOAF which was to be taken, not a piece of the loaf??? Therefore, the loaf had not been broken into pieces by Jesus!

IV. TO "BREAK" IN COMMUNION MEANS "TO EAT." When I Cor. 10:16 says, "The cup of blessing which we bless," the meaning is that WE ALL bless it (by means of the "Amen," I Cor. 14:16). Likewise, when the same verse speaks of "the bread which WE break," this means, "FOR WE are all PARTAKERS" (vs. 17), or breakers.

The statement "breaking bread from house to house, DID EAT their meat" (Acts 2:46) refers to common meals, as I said in the oral debate, and as he agrees. The figure of speech Synecdoche (a part put for the whole, or the reverse) was used here, but not in the sense that some presider at the common meals broke the loaf into pieces for all before the meal began, and not in the sense that this kind of breaking was the part which suggested the whole meal. How, then, could the same language, when applied to the Lord's supper (Acts 2:42; 20:7), mean that the part which suggested the whole was the tearing of a communion loaf into pieces by the presider???

V. UNBROKEN REPRESENTATIVES. Refer back to the last paragraph of my 2nd Aff., where I proved that since the literal body of Christ was not literally broken, the three things which represented His literal body—the Passover lamb, the church, and the communion loaf—had to remaid unbroken. Ferguson replied, "The church does not represent Jesus's literal body, It is His body, Eph. 1:23" (from his 2nd Neg., last paragraph). When I showed that if the church does not represent the literal body of Christ, then it IS the literal body of Christ, he accused me of misrepresenting him! Brother Ferguson, don't you know that when Eph. 1:22,23 says the church IS his body, this means REPRESENTS his body, as in "this IS my blood" and in "this is my body"? You still have not escaped my argument. The fact of the Passover lamb's representing Christ is covered in my 2nd Aff., last paragraph, which you now pretend I did not even write!

VI. CONCLUSION. Ferguson then introduces five passages which condemn him. He speaks of the "oracles of God" (I Pet. 4:11); "faith cometh by hearing" (Rom. 10:17); "all good works" (II Tim. 3:17); "all the counsel of God" (Acts 20:27); received of the Lord (I Cor. 11:23). This sounds good coming from a man who in one breath claims that he follows the supposed example of Jesus in not partaking when He presided, and in the next breath says that he partakes although Jesus did not! He has not gone to the Bible, but rather to three translations, to get the idea of breaking into pieces. I have never been more pleased with a debate, and I send it forth now to all honest brethren who wish to study its pages.

(The End.)

(SEE ALSO THE APPENDIX ON THE NEXT PAGE.)

APPENDIX: THE AUTHENTICITY AND ANTECEDENT OF "WHICH IS BROKEN" IN I COR. 11:24

Brother Ferguson and I accept as authentic the verb "is broken" in I Cor. 11:24. Although the American Standard Version omitts the word, it adds in a footnote, "Many ancient authorities read is broken for you." The brilliant Bible translator James Moffatt retained the term in his version and added, "Von Soden brackets KLOMENON /broken/, but if it is a gloss, it is a correct one, unless the Lucan DIDOMENON /given/ be preferred." Godet admits that "there is something extremely bare" if the term is excluded. If Paul did not write the word, then he certainly left an ellipsis, requiring us to supply the term.

Ferguson and I also agreed that the statement "which is broken for you" refers to the body of Christ, not to the bread. Verses 23 and 24 inform us, "...the Lord Jesus ...took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you." The pronoun "which" is here translated from the Greek Demonstrative Pronoun TOUTO (the singular, neuter form of HOUTOS). Such a Greek Pronoun has to agree with its antecedent (the previous noun to which the pronoun refers) in GENDER. TOUTO is neuter gender, and has to refer back to TO SOMA (the body), which is also neuter, and cannot refer to ARTON (bread), which is masculine.

Also, the Greek preposition HUPER, translated "for" in the statement "which is broken for you" means "in behalf of, for the sake of someone or something" (lexicon by Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich, 846). The bread was not broken "for the sake of" the apostles, but the body was. Under the word KLAO (break), Thayer says, "Metaph. TO SOMA, shattered, as it were, by a violent death, 1 Co. xi. 24 RG" (p. 348), and that it was only metaphorically (in a figure) broken in death. —Ellis Lindsey

NEW BOOKLETS BY ELLIS LINDSEY

1. THE LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE (ON ONE LOAF IN COMMUNION). This debate provides some very strong technical and logical data in support of the single communion loaf. George R. Dickson, a debater from among the cups and classes churches, struggled in vain to prove plural loaves. However, he quit the debate before it was completed, although the debate was his idea to begin with. 50¢ Post Paid.

2. THE COMMUNION DRINK ELEMENT: A DEFENSE OF GRAPE JUICE AND REFUTATION OF FERMENTED WINE. The author presents arguments which have never been answered in his five debates on the Wine Question. This is the only booklet which reviews and refutes the latest arguments of the Wine group. Much new material has been presented, together with a brand new introduction. 50¢ Post Paid.

SOME OF THE OLDER WORKS OF ELLIS LINDSEY

1. THE STALEY-LINDSEY DEBATE. This debate, published in 1969, is on the subject of wine in communion, and is with John Staley, the leading advocate of wine in the church today. 50¢ Post Paid.

2. THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELDERS. Published in 1970, this work remains a strong presentation on a most vital subject. 20¢ Post Paid.

3. THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT: A RESEARCH PAPER. A very technical study of the important truth that the communion drinking vessel rep - resents the N. T. At present out of print. 50¢ Post Pd.

4. EVANGELISTIC AUTHORITY: A REASONABLE TREATMENT. Evangelists do have authority where there are no elders. This tract has never been replied to by the few who differ!!! 20¢ Post Paid.