

LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE

Between Ellis Lindsey &
George "Randy" Dickson

**on One Loaf
in
Communion**

(Dickson Quits!)

THE LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE

PROPOSITION #1: The Scriptures teach that when a congregation of the Church of Christ partakes of the Lord's supper, only one communion loaf may be used.

Affirmative: Ellis Lindsey

Negative: George Dickson

PROPOSITION #2: The Scriptures teach that when a congregation of the Church of Christ partakes of the Lord's supper, the communion loaf may be in more than one piece.

Affirmative: George Dickson

Negative: Ellis Lindsey

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
LINDSEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.....	3
DICKSON'S FIRST NEGATIVE.....	5
LINDSEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.....	8
DICKSON'S SECOND NEGATIVE.....	11
LINDSEY'S AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL.....	14
DICKSON'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.....	15
LINDSEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE.....	18

LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE

Between Ellis Lindsey &
George "Randy" Dickson

**on One Loaf
in
Communion**

ELLIS LINDSEY
4600 Cole Avenue
Waco, Texas 76710

1976

INTRODUCTION

For about 10 years now, I have desired to have a debate upon the subject of the one communion loaf, in which I strongly believe. I have even approached a number of leading debaters—including the great disputant, Brother Thomas B. Warren—concerning the possibility of our having a debate upon this important subject; but met with a great reluctance on their part, for one reason or another. The subject is very important, as seen in the fact that in the early days of the Restoration Movement—in fact, until after 1900—nearly every congregation used and demanded one loaf. Brother Alexander Campbell said, "On the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf" (The Christian System, p. 268; refer to pp. 4 & 5 of this debate). Somehow, many of the churches lost sight of the Scriptural necessity of the one loaf, largely because of the individual communion cups, invented in 1894. After all, when many brethren turned to the individual cups, to be consistent they had to turn to plural loaves or pieces. When several trays of individual cups were handled by several presiders, to have brought out one loaf would have thrown a glaring kink into the whole operation. It became customary to have as many pieces of bread circulated through the audience as trays of cups.

In Brother George "Randy" Dickson, I finally found a man willing to debate this question, although he was to quit before the discussion was completed. He had debated Brother Paul Nichols and Brother Ronny Wade on the cups and Sunday School issues; he, of course, defended these things. Later, I first met Brother Dickson at my four-night debate with Brother Paul Ferguson, in the Fayetteville, Arkansas, area, January, 1975. Brother Ferguson and I agreed that one cup and one loaf must be used, although he debated with me the subject of how the loaf is to be broken; he and I also had a written debate on that subject before he died, and I plan to publish it, Lord willing. Brother Dickson—as the "Minister" of the Downtown Church of Christ, Rogers, Arkansas—attended all four nights of my oral debate with Ferguson, and he approached me for a debate after the fourth night. We decided that since the cup question has been discussed so much, and the one loaf so little, we would go ahead with the loaf question. We settled upon a written debate for publication, and thus was set in motion the factors leading to this debate.

But Brother Dickson quit the debate. He knew full well that if he quit, I could still publish the portion of the debate completed. He and I signed the following Agreement before we began:

"3. Each debater agrees to attempt to expedite the debate. Each agrees to attempt to mail each article no later than two weeks after reception of the last article from the other man, or at least to notify him of intention to do so soon. In no case, except for serious illness, may either man delay more than two months in submitting an article. If either man exceeds two months, the other has the right to publish the debate in its incomplete state (but with no further arguments)."

I might add, in behalf of both Brother Dickson and myself, that we both are aware that the word "broken" is missing from many of the Greek manuscripts in I Cor. 11:24; but since we both have used the verse with the word left in, we obviously believe that there is sufficient evidence for the word, either as being an actual part of the original text, or as being necessary to complete an ellipsis, should it be an interpolation.

--Ellis Lindsey

THE LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE

PROPOSITION #1: The Scriptures teach that when a congregation of the Church of Christ partakes of the Lord's supper, only one communion loaf may be used.

Affirmative: Ellis Lindsey

Negative: George R. Dickson

LINDSEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

A good, strong discussion on this subject is of great importance, for the congregations with which I am identified hold the use of one communion loaf as strongly as one communion cup.

The terms of the above proposition may be defined briefly as follows: "The Scriptures" means the written word of God. "Teach" means to convey information by command, statement, example, or necessary inference. "Partake" refers to eating (I Cor. 11:20). "Lord's supper" is the Sunday communion service. "One" means single. "Loaf" means a cake of bread. "Used" means utilized.

Because of the nature of this subject, arguments of a technical nature will have to be discussed. Since the N. T. was written in Greek, it will be important that we define the Greek noun ARTOS, from which the English noun bread is translated. I shall attempt to make these technical arguments clear to every single reader, and to give background information as I go.

ARGUMENT #1: JESUS USED A SINGLE LOAF IN ESTABLISHING THE LORD'S SUPPER; THEN HE COMMANDED, "THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME" (Lk. 22:19), WHICH REQUIRES THAT WE ALSO USE ONE LOAF.

There is nothing in the Scriptures any more completely agreed upon by translations, Bible commentaries, and Greek lexicons (dictionaries) than the fact that the term "bread" means "loaf" when used in the Lord's supper. The King James Version says "bread" in all communion passages, and this is correct in the sense that a loaf is bread; however, it is more correct to render ARTOS by "loaf" when in the singular, as we shall see.

I do not agree in every point with the scholars I am about to quote, yet they are correct about the loaf. A. T. Robertson is recognized as perhaps the greatest specialist in Greek Grammar who ever lived. In Robertson's translation of Luke, he renders Lk. 22:19 thusly: "Then he took a loaf and gave thanks and broke it and gave to them saying:" (A Translation of Luke's Gospel with Grammatical Notes). He also says "loaf" in his Word Pictures in the N. T. Perhaps the greatest commentator on the Greek text of the N. T. was Alfred Plummer of England. Plummer says "a loaf" in Lk. 22:19 (International Critical Commentary, Luke, p. 499). Nearly every modern translation (many of which are good; some of which are poor) says "loaf" in the text or margin or one communion passage or another.

Of course, ARTOS is used in other ways besides of the communion loaf. W.E. Vine gives a very clear summary as follows: "ARTOS . . . signifies (a) a small loaf or cake . . . shewbread (loaves of presentation). Matt. 12:4 . . . (b) the loaf at the Lord's Supper, e. g., Matt. 26:26 ('Jesus took a loaf,' R. V., marg.); the breaking of bread became the name for this institution, Acts 2:42; 20:7; I Cor. 10:16; 11:23; (c) bread of any kind, Matt. 16:11; (d) metaphorically, of

Christ as the Bread of God, and of life. John 6:33, 35; (e) food in general, the necessities for the sustenance of life. Matt. 6:11; 2 Cor. 9:10, etc." (Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, Vol. I, pp. 146, 147).

These scholars had reasons for saying "loaf." What are they? The great Greek-English lexicon by Liddell and Scott has gone through many editions and printings. It defines Greek words as used both in ancient secular writings and in the N. T. In defining ARTOS, Liddell and Scott tell us this: "bread, a loaf . . . in plural, loaves, bread (generally)" (4th Edition Revised, Oxford University Press). In other words, when ARTOS is singular in number, it means "a loaf"; and when it is plural, it means either loaves or bread in general, and not "a loaf." ARTOS is singular in each reference to the Lord's supper.

Someone may ask at this point, "But how do we know whether or not the Greek term for 'bread,' or 'loaf,' is singular or plural?" In Greek there is a very exact method of determining this—declension. Inflection is the changing of the form (spelling) of a word in order to indicate its various qualities; with verbs this process is called conjugation, and with nouns and certain other parts of speech it is called declension. Alfred Marshall, D. Litt., puts it this way: "Nouns, participles, adjectives, pronouns, the definite article, and some numerals are declined to express—(a) Number, (b) Case and/or (c) Gender" (New Testament Greek Primer, p. 8). Let me list for you now the declensions of ARTOS and all its forms used in the N. T. (all are masculine, although this does not refer to sex): ARTOS, Nominative, Singular. ARTOI, Nominative, Plural. ARTOIS, Dative, Plural. ARTON, Accusative, Singular. ARTOU, Genitive, Singular. ARTOUS, Accusative, Plural. ARTŌ, Dative, Singular. ARTŌN, Genitive, Plural. I have underlined the three spellings used in the Lord's supper; notice that all three are singular in number! By declension, then, we know that Jesus took one loaf, which He gave to the disciples, telling them to continue doing what He had just done.

ARGUMENT #2: IN I COR. 10:17 WE HAVE THE SPECIFIC STATEMENT THAT "ONE LOAF" WAS USED IN THE CHURCHES OF PAUL'S DAY.

The great New International Version (1973) translates I Cor. 10:16b, 17 as follows: "And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf." Here we have not only the same Greek noun ARTOS (singular), but also the very important Numeral "one" attached to it as an adjective. "One" here is translated from the Greek Cardinal Numeral HEIS (pronounced hace or hice), which is used "emphatically . . . one and the same loaf 1 Cor 10:17" (Arndt and Gingrich's great lexicon, pp. 229, 230). This same Greek Numeral is used in the same verse of the "one body"; there was one loaf just as surely as one body! Allow me now to quote some scholars and brethren:

The Gospel Advocate Co., operated by some of the brethren who use plural loaves and cups, republished in 1949 James Macknight's work Apostolical Epistles, which consists of his translation and commentary on the epistles. Macknight (1721-1800) was a denominational scholar who had the truth on many points, and who was therefore quoted by Alexander Campbell, among others. On I Cor. 10:17 Macknight wrote: "The Greek word ARTOS, especially when joined with words of number, always signifies a loaf, and is so translated in our Bibles" (p. 176). Brother Alexander Campbell, who needs no introduction as a

great Restoration figure of the 1800's, wrote this: "On the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf" (The Christian System, 1835, p. 268). On the same page, Campbell quoted I Cor. 10:17 with Macknight's statement which I have given already. Still on that page, he quoted the scholar George Campbell (one of the scholars who helped prepare Alexander Campbell's Living Oracles translation) as follows: "Dr. Campbell says, 'that in the plural number it ought always to be rendered loaves; but when there is a numeral before it, it indispensably must be rendered loaf or loaves. Thus we say one loaf, seven loaves; not one bread, seven breads.'"

Brother J.W. McGarvey was one of the greatest scholars the church has produced. For many years he was a professor in the old College of the Bible. He wrote a number of good books, including two different commentaries on Acts. Brother McGarvey wrote thusly of ARTOS used with Numerals: "And sometimes, though rarely, when the singular number is used, it is further limited by the numeral one, and then we are compelled, in English, to render it loaf, because we cannot say one bread, or even a bread As a single loaf was, and is most commonly, used at the Lord's Supper, it is better to say the loaf than the bread, though the latter is permissible" ("Biblical Criticism," Christian Standard, April 8, 1911, page 7). We also learn from this that in 1911 most congregations still used one loaf. My last quotation about the one loaf comes from the great Companion Bible, a very scholarly work published by the Oxford University Press around the turn of the century. The work contains the King James Version with extensive notes on Greek words; on I Cor. 10:17 it says this: "Gr. artos. Always transl. 'loaf' when the number is specified. See Matt. 14. 17. Mark 8, 14, &c." And in I Cor. 10:17 the number IS SPECIFIED, that number being one, which therefore requires the rendering "one loaf."

ARGUMENT #3: WHEN THE WHOLE CONGREGATION PARTAKES OF ONE LOAF, THIS PROVES THAT THERE IS ONE BODY, OR CHURCH (I COR. 10: 17); THEREFORE, THE USE OF ONE LOAF IS NECESSARY.

As shown in the beginning of Argument #2, the New International Version renders verse 17 thusly: "Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf." Since the loaf represents the literal body of the one and only Christ, and since the church also represents Christ's literal body, then the use of one single communion loaf proves that there is one church (spiritual body). The single loaf is a constant reminder of our one Saviour. But two communion loaves proclaim the falsehood that there were two Redeemers and that there are two churches!

DICKSON'S FIRST NEGATIVE

I agree with the affirmative—we want a good, strong discussion. If I understand (and I think I do) the purpose of a negative respondent is to examine the proofs of the affirmative. This I shall try to do to the very best of my ability.

OBJECTION TO DEFINITION OF TERMS

I wonder why the most important word in the affirmative proposition was not even defined, much less argued? That word is ONLY! I am very concerned as to the reason for this omission, so I come to my first question.

Question Number One—What would be your reply to one who was affirming that "man is saved by faith only." and used Romans 3:28 to attempt to prove his contention?

I also object to the affirmative's definition of "loaf". I do not believe this to be scripturally accurate.

NEGATIVE REPLY TO AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE

I will accept the argumentation of the affirmative that where the King James Version says "bread" it could (or even should) be "loaf." But does this prove his contention? I think not. I believe this to be just an assumption. Note the following list of things his position assumes:

1. When Jesus commanded them to "do this", the one loaf only was still in one piece. The text cited would indicate otherwise, for it states, "...and (He) brake it." This looks like more than one "piece of bread, only" to me.
2. "This do which requires that we use one loaf" (We are now using the affirmative's definition) Proof please. Let us focus our thinking by asking the affirmative another question.

Question Number Two—What is the antecedent of "this" in Luke 22:19? No one could possibly arrive at the conclusion of the affirmative as stated in his argument number one from reading the scripture cited—he must depend on letting him assume conclusions, yet unproven. He further assumes:

3. That the one "unbroken loaf, only" remained in one piece. This is just an assertion. The scripture plainly states our Lord "broke it." As much as I may respect the sincerity of the affirmative, I cannot accept his assertion for proof.

NEGATIVE REPLY TO AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO

I am surprised the affirmative would use this verse (1 Corinthians 10:17) in his affirmative, because this verse completely defeats his position.

Note what he does: he "proves" that one loaf (not loaves) was used in the churches (not church or congregation) of Paul's day. This proves too much for his contention. Please consider this carefully and mark it well—I believe that if these brethren who contend the communion loaf must be in one piece only, would understand this one passage, they would not only cease their contention on this proposition, but also on the one container. Please follow me through each step...

1. Paul wrote Corinth from Ephesus (1 Corinthians 16:8)
2. But he said, "...the bread which we break" (1 Corinthians 10:16)
3. And, "...we are all partakers of that one bread" (loaf) (1 Corinthians 10:17)
4. So, Christians at Ephesus, and at Corinth partook of that one bread (loaf).

Question Number Three—Did they ese the same piece of bread at Corinth and Ephesus?

Question Number Four—What is the antecedent of "we" in 1 Corinthians 10:17?

REPLY TO HIS USE OF "SCHOLARS AND BRETHERN"

First, lets consider the quotation from Bro. Campbell. Our friend finds in this much, much more than was stated. But I am not surprised at this after all that he reads into Luke. It is not at all unexpected that he would deal with Bro. Campbell this way. Bro. Campbell was not contending for one unbroken loaf as evidenced from the following:

"The one loaf must be broken before the saints feed upon it, which has obtained for this institution the name of 'breaking the loaf'" (The Christian System 1890 Edition page 327). On page 329 Bro. Campbell further states: "We have said that the loaf must be broken before the saints partake of it. Jesus took a loaf from the paschal table and broke it before he gave it to his disciples. They received a broken loaf, emblematic of his body once whole, but by his own consent broken for his disciples."

Not one of the quotations used from Bro. McGarvey et. al. states the affirmative position, i. e. that we can only use one unbroken piece of bread on the communion table. This is an old debating trick—quote some respected, venerable old saint and imply they agree with you because you quote them. None of these men ever taught the affirmative's position.

NEGATIVE REPLY TO AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE

This argument as stated is absolutely right! But, not as he defines his terms nor as he argues after stating the argument. I believe there is a representation of that one body and one redeemer, when all believers partake of the one loaf.

One of the tools of our predecessors was to insist that the definition of a term could be put in place of the term and it would make sense. This is used in refuting the argument that baptism means to sprinkle or pour. By definition sprinkle means to "scatter about in drops" and pour means to "let out in a stream." Now, lets read Mark 16:16 substituting the definition. "...he that believeth and is 'scattered about in drops or is let out in a stream' shall be saved." This is nonsense. But placing the scriptural definition in the same passage it reads, "...he that believeth and is immersed shall be saved."

Now, we want to substitute the affirmative's definition for "loaf". "Because there is one (cake of bread) we, (believers at Ephesus and Corinth and all existing congregations) who are many, are one body, for we (all Christians) partake of the one (cake of bread)." I believe this reduces the affirmative position to an absurdity. Paul was not talking about one "piece of bread." He was talking about one loaf (species). I mean by this, we all partake of the same kind of bread and hence are all partakers of one loaf.

REPLY TO AFFIRMATIVE'S LAST SENTENCE

"But two communion loaves proclaim the falsehood that there were two Redeemers and that there are two churches."

In my opinion, this is probably the most absurd statement in the first affirmative, made so by his own practice and definition.

If I understand his practice, the one officiating at the table breaks a piece off of the one "piece of bread"...STOP...now, according to the affirmative we have two bodies, two redeemers represented, one in his right hand and one in his left hand. But, does the affirmative want to argue the size makes the difference? i. e. the one in his left hand is most of the loaf, while the other is a smaller portion? Then there could be as many loaves as we want, just as long as one was larger! Pshaw! But let's go on with this little charade a little further... he (the officiator) now has two bodies (one large and one small) two redeemers (one large and one small) but he eats the little body-redeemer, now there is just one. He then hands it to the next man, and he now "divides the body" and has two bodies-redeemers, one in his right hand and one in his left.

But he eats one of the bodies-redeemers and now there is but one! He then hands it to the next and the next and the next. Back in the audience there is one poor old brother that doesn't understand the fine points of this, and he breaks it exactly in two pieces of the same size—equal parts—what is he going to do? Which one should he eat? Well all the other brethren have eaten the right hand body-redeemer so he eats the right hand one, now there is one again. Now that all this representation of two bodies and two redeemers is finished in the first congregation where they all go through the charade of two bodies, two redeemers and then they rush the remainder over to the next congregation and the next so that "we can all partake of that one piece of bread." WHO COULD BELIEVE IT?

Question Number Five—(Remembering your definition of terms) Can you conscientiously say... "Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf"?

CONCLUSION

If we understand that there is just one sense in which all believers can and do partake of that one loaf—and that Paul was referring to species i. e. the unleavened bread of the passover (1 Corinthians 10:17) we could be united. We plead with all who have espoused this position to leave it and recognize that we do partake of the one loaf when we all partake of the unleavened bread. Then all believers are and can be partakers of that one loaf. To say the one loaf is "a piece of bread" doesn't even make good nonsense.

LINDSEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Dickson and Brethren:

We are making real progress. Brother Dickson has become quite confused early in the debate. He already has gotten himself into deep trouble, as we shall show after we answer his Question #1, which reads, "What would be your reply to one who was affirming that 'man is saved by faith only,' and used Romans 3:28 to attempt to prove his contention?" That's easy. I would tell him that this faith is the "faith which worketh by love" (Gal. 5:6) and that "faith without works is dead" (James 2:20). Brother Dickson makes a big play on the word "only" in my proposition. But he said to me in a letter of Feb. 25, 1975, "I personally believe I am the one cup, one loaf man, and that you brethren have many cups (at least two per congregation) and many loaves, although I believe you do not realize it." Brother Dickson, would it be fair to say that you claim to believe in ONLY one loaf? I thought you knew the meaning of the term "only"—it simply means "sole."

ARGUMENTS AND REPLIES

ARGUMENT #1 CONTINUED. In my first article, I proved in Argument #1 that Jesus used a single loaf in establishing the Lord's supper, and that He commanded us to use one. I gave conclusive evidence that the Greek noun ARTOS means "loaf" in the Lord's supper. This forced Brother Dickson to admit, "I will accept the argumentation of the affirmative that where the King James Version says 'bread' it could (or even should) be 'loaf'" (paragraph #5).

However, he later indicated, "We all partake of the same kind of bread and hence are all partakers of the one loaf." Doesn't Brother Dickson know that the word "loaf" is never used in this sense of species? He is trying to tell us that "loaf" is used as a collective noun (a noun in the singular number, but which indicates a whole collection of objects). Let me prove that "loaf" (ARTOS) is not used collectively, and that only the term "bread" is so used: Liddell and Scott's great Greek-English lexicon defines ARTOS as "a cake or loaf of wheat-bread . . . then collectively in sing. bread" (1888 Harper and Brothers Edition). According to this authority, the word "loaf" is not used collectively; also notice that when ARTOS is used collectively, it is translated "bread." Dickson's admission that ARTOS means "loaf" in the Lord's supper forces him into a decision between two positions, either of which is deadly to him: (1) He can agree with the above authority that the term "loaf" is not used collectively, and thus give up his whole argument; or (2) He can differ with this authority, and thus be caught up into an unscholarly position against the definition and usage of ARTOS. I am glad that the choice is his and not mine.

From the above evidence we know that when Jesus took the loaf, He did not take bread in general, but took a single loaf. Brother Dickson tries to get into the subject of how the loaf is to be broken; so I will ask him this: Isn't it your practice to break the bread BEFORE the giving of thanks and to divide the cup before thanks? If so, what are you doing quoting the Scripture which shows that Jesus broke the loaf AFTER thanks? Your Question #2 reads, "What is the antecedent of 'this' in Luke 22:19?" Answer: The clause "this do" refers to the breaking of (partaking of, I Cor. 10:16, 17; Acts 20:7) the one loaf as Jesus did.

ARGUMENT #2 CONTINUED. I showed from I Cor. 10:16b, 17 that one loaf was used in all the congregations of Paul's day. I quoted the New International Version, which renders the passage thusly: "And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body. for we all partake of the one loaf." Here, Brother Dickson has to resort to the old, worn-out argument which claims that since Paul wrote the book of I Corinthians from Ephesus, he was speaking of the loaf at Corinth plus the loaf at Ephesus as one loaf. However, let me construct a parallel: There is no doubt whatever that the Passover lamb represented the body of Christ (compare John 19:30-37 with Exodus 12:1-11, 46). It is equally true that the Israelites were told to have "a lamb for an house" (Exodus 12:3). Although EACH HOUSE was to have its own lamb, the Lord spoke of ALL the lambs in all the houses as follows: "Your LAMB shall be without blemish" (vs. 5). The Lord had in mind here the single lamb in each house. Somebody of that day could have come along and said, "Lord, we know that you said 'lamb,' but we also know that each house has one lamb; however, we desire to have more than one lamb per house, and we are going to have them, since you referred to the lambs by the singular term 'lamb.'" This would have been just as reasonable as Brother Dickson's argument. Somebody back then could have said also, "Lord, we know that you have commanded 'a lamb for an house,' but it seems to us that if we can tear off pieces (plural) of the lamb in eating it, we could also have more than one lamb to begin with; therefore, we are going to have two lambs per house." The fact that the lamb was consumed by its being eaten did not do away with the regulation to have one lamb, any more than the fact that the loaf is consumed in eating does away with the regulation to have one loaf.

There is something else unscriptural about Dickson's argument. If his argument is true, then this means that the church universal worships as a united body; and this would get him into deep trouble in trying to meet those brethren who operate the Herald of Truth and orphan homes. The only manner in which the churches in the N. T. worshipped was simply that each independent congregation of the universal church worshipped by carrying out the acts of worship. Thus, we know that Paul in I Cor. 10:16, 17 had in mind the one loaf where he worshipped and the one loaf where the Corinthians and others worshipped. His Question #3 reads, "Did they use the same piece of bread at Corinth and Ephesus?" Answer: No! His Question #4: "What is the antecedent of 'we' in I Corinthians 10:17?" Answer: I take it he means who is meant by "we." I explained that above.

I am quite shocked at the manner in which Dickson deals with Alexander Campbell, who, although being wrong in saying that the loaf must be broken in two, still believed strongly in one loaf. I showed that Campbell said, "On the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf" (Christian System, p. 268). His description of one loaf "ON THE LORD'S TABLE" can only mean that he demanded one loaf in each congregation having a Lord's table.

ARGUMENT #3 CONTINUED. Here I proved that when the whole congregation partakes of one loaf, this proves that there is one body, or church (I Cor. 10:17); and that, therefore, the use of one loaf is necessary. I showed that this passage says, "Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf" (NIV). I then demonstrated from this that since the loaf represents the literal body of the one and only Christ, and since the church also represents Christ's only literal body, then the use of one single communion loaf proves that there is one church (spiritual body). I pointed out that the single loaf is a constant reminder of our one Saviour.

Dickson claims that the one officiating at one of our services breaks off his piece and that, therefore, there are two pieces, which would represent two redeemers. No, Brother Dickson, the breaking off of a piece of a loaf does not make two loaves, any more than the breaking off of a piece of meat from the Passover lamb made two lambs. Brother Dickson, why can't you reply to the argument, rather than just saying "Pshaw!"? You simply are copying the word "Pshaw!" from some of the debates which have been published. So far as I am concerned, you are getting hot here because you feel the pressure in my arguments. You say, "Back in the audience there is one poor old brother that doesn't understand the fine points of this, and he breaks it exactly in two pieces of the same size—equal parts—what is he going to do?" Brother Dickson, it would take some "poor old brother that doesn't understand" the Scriptures to do this; and it is interesting that you have to go to such a person as this to get across your point. What if that same "poor old brother who doesn't understand" decides to eat the whole loaf and to pass a plate of scrambled eggs to the remainder of the audience? Would this be Scriptural simply because your "poor old brother" did it? If not, what does your "poor old brother" argument prove? Your statements such as "But he eats one of the bodies-redeemers and now there is but one" are sacrilegious and totally out of order.

Your Question #5 reads: "(Remembering your definition of terms) Can you conscientiously say . . . 'Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf'?" Answer: I not only can say it—I do

say it, emphatically. Brother Dickson, let me ask you two questions: (1) How many loaves are meant in Mark 8:14, which reads, "Neither had they in the ship with them more than one loaf"? (2) In what way, if any, does the universal church worship—(a) only through means of local congregations? or (b) through some function of the universal church itself?

My proposition remains proved and untouched. As I said, I pointed out in my last article that the single loaf is a constant reminder of our one Saviour. How could two loaves be passed to a congregation and they see in those TWO loaves the ONE Redeemer? Two loaves can no more picture the one body of Christ than two Passover lambs in the same house could have pictured His body. IF two loaves can picture the one body of Christ, then two Passover lambs in one house could picture it; and two denominational bodies (churches) could picture His body. Brother Dickson, you had better get busy!

DICKSON'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Lindsey, Brethren and Readers:

As you read the second affirmative, if you notice a decided change in tone, don't judge Bro. Lindsey too harshly—you don't know what you would do if you had obligated yourself to affirm the proposition he is affirming—you might do worse.

NEGATIVE REPLY TO AFFIRMATIVE'S FIRST PARAGRAPH

The affirmative missed the whole point and didn't even touch top, side or bottom of my question concerning faith only. The point is the faith only advocate used Romans 3:28 but the only isn't there any more than it is in the scriptures Bro. Lindsey uses to try to substantiate his position that "we must use one cake of bread, only."

Answer to Affirmative question number one: Yes, I believe in ONLY one loaf for all Christians. You'd better try again. Why didn't you define the word ONLY? I know the definition. I wanted to know why you didn't define it in your first affirmative.

REPLY TO "ARGUMENTS AND REPLIES"

Answer to Affirmative question number two: No, I don't know the word loaf is never used in the sense of species, and neither do you. Your authority does not prove this either. The affirmative just asserts this. He is long on assertion, but short on proof. Let me illustrate. Paul comprehended at least two loaves when he said the loaf which we break—yes a collective noun. This is an old argument, but not worn out! You are arguing with Paul when you say loaf is not a collective noun. You are also arguing with yourself, for you admitted in your first affirmative "Argument number two--In 1 Cor. 10:17 we have the specific statement that 'one loaf' was used in the churches of Paul's day." The loaf has to refer to species i. e. the kind of bread used by all Christians. I would rather argue with your "authorities" than to have to argue with the Apostle Paul and myself! I'm glad its your choice, not mine.

Answer to Affirmative's question number three: "Isn't it your practice to break the bread before the giving of thanks..." he asks: We don't have a practice either way, but—**WE NEVER BREAK THE LOAF BEFORE WE GIVE THANKS!!!**

Answer to Affirmative question number four: "If so, what are you doing quoting the scripture which shown that Jesus broke bread after thanks?" Answer: simply because one loaf which we all partake of, may be, and of necessity is, in many pieces.

You answer my question number four that the antecedent of "this do" refers to partaking of one loaf only. So we eat bread but don't drink the cup "in remembrance" according to Bro. Lindsey's answer—"Pshaw"! try again. You know we both eat and drink and do this or this do in remembrance of him. You know the antecedent of "this do" is to partake of both elements of the supper.

Before we leave this—Bro. Lindsey, you don't know what you're talking about in your comment about "pshaw". I have over fifty probably closer to one hundred debates published by our brethren and I don't recall of even once where any debaters used "pshaw". You must have been trying to prejudice the reader by that comment. But you know as much about this matter (why I used "pshaw") as you know about the "one loaf which we break". I did reply to your argument even if you really didn't realize it. I feel sure the readers of this debate will realize it, and your empty assertion to the contrary notwithstanding will not obscure this.

BROTHER LINDSEY CAPITULATES

God said "one lamb for an house" (Exodus 12:3) so all the affirmative said about more than one lamb is nonsense. God did not say "one loaf for a congregation" but rather did say the loaf which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ. We have to go to Bro. Lindsey to learn it was one cake of bread only per congregation. If God had wanted one loaf per congregation, only, He could have as easily said one loaf per congregation as one lamb per house. Obviously He didn't say this and didn't make any significance as to how many pieces the one loaf is in. Bro. Lindsey quotes very readily when the regulation was one lamb for an house, but couldn't find where God said one cake of bread only per congregation. The fact remains, Paul said we (all Christians) are all partakers of that one bread (loaf) 1 Corinthians 10:17. Since God could say one lamb per house—He could have also said one loaf per congregation, only, if He wanted to enforce this. Hence, by your absence of scriptural proof, you tacitly admit there is no such teaching in God's word. I would never have denied a proposition that said "Bro. Lindsey teaches..." but did deny the scriptures teach. In just giving your opinion of this matter you must admit the scriptures do not teach any such thing or you would have cited the book, chapter and verse.

Next, I do not argue that every congregation used one piece of bread—that was the consequence of the affirmative position. I never argued the church all broke off one cake of bread, only—that was your position as adduced from your definitions and argumentation. The affirmative resorts to an appeal to prejudice by bringing into the debate the church universal, Herald of Truth etc.—Bro. Lindsey, its you that's in trouble here. If your contention is right i.e. the loaf means one cake of bread, only—you cannot answer the church universal argument.

The affirmative gets into deeper trouble when he answered my question, that the "we" of 1 Corinthians 10:16,17 is the Ephesians and Corinthians. He is in trouble because he has an unscriptural position on the bread (loaf) being a "cake of bread—only" remember it was Paul which said "...the loaf which we break..."

Next the affirmative is "shocked". I'm sorry for his condition, but he then admits that Bro. Campbell does not agree with him. He would have you believe he does. Bro. Campbell does not say or teach that on the communion table there must be "one cake of bread, only."

REPLY TO AFFIRMATIVE'S REPLY TO NEGATIVE'S REPLY

TO AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE

I agree the breaking off a piece does not make two loaves—but it would if Bro. Lindsey's materialistic interpretation of this is correct. The one loaf (species) i. e. the unleavened bread which we (all) break is a representation of the one Lord and the one body. If you had two loaves i. e. two different kinds of bread, you would then have a misrepresentation.

Answer to Affirmative's question number five: I did reply to your argument, I did not just say "pshaw".

Answer to Affirmative's question number six: He would be wrong to pass scrambled eggs! Although as mixed up as you are on this matter it would not surprise me too much if some of your brethren should pass the eggs sometime. The "poor old brother" should know better than to break the bread into equal parts, according to Bro. Lindsey. So it would be a tragedy if he did so, on a par with passing scrambled eggs. Its all right to have one large piece, but not good to have two equal pieces, I guess, if his reply means anything. Now, what if that "poor old brother" was next to the last one of the congregation to partake, and he finds only enough bread left for two portions? "Scrambled eggs" if he breaks them into equal parts—"Pshaw"—No, I am not saying Pshaw to your argument, I replied to it and the result of looking at your practice elicited from me then and now, "pshaw".

Answer to Affirmative's question number seven: No.

Answer to Affirmative's question number eight: The "poor old brother" proves how ridiculous and inconsistent your position is.

He then accused me of sacrilege—no not me—"thou art the man." Its your idolatrous concept of the "one unbroken loaf, only" that is the cause of any sacrilege if such there be.

He then answers my question—"in the light of his position could he quote 'the loaf which we break'" and he says—"emphatically!" Question: How could you?

Answer to Affirmative's question number nine: One. But note: 1 Corinthians 10:17 doesn't say "Neither had they in the congregation with them more than one loaf."

Answer to Affirmative's question number ten: The church universal doesn't function any way other than the sense that "we" all partake of that one loaf (unleavened bread) and drink of that one cup (fruit of the vine).

CONCLUSION

I have never contended and I believe Bro. Lindsey knows this, for two loaves. I am the one loaf man. He is the one cake of bread, only, per congregation man. The reason I think he knows this is that you can see from our correspondence that I refused to affirm two loaves. I believe the one loaf represents the one body. the one cup represents the shed blood.

Answer to Affirmative question eleven: Answered above.

Bro. Lindsey, its too late for you to "get busy"—you failed to sustain your position that there MUST BE ONE CAKE OF BREAD ONLY PER CONGREGATION.

LINDSEY'S AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL (500 WORDS)

Brethren:

Brother Dickson has made one of the most fatal blunders I have seen. I asked him this question: "In what way, if any, does the universal church worship—(a) only through means of local congregations? or (b) through some function of the universal church itself?" He replied, "The church universal doesn't function any way other than the sense that 'we' all partake of that one loaf (unleavened bread) and drink of that one cup (fruit of the vine)." You can see that in this, his only negative argument, he has been forced to say that the universal church functions. This completely contradicts his own Brother Roy E. Cogdill, who writes, "The New Testament scriptures are completely silent as to any universal function of the church" (Walking by Faith, 1957, p. 86). Cogdill is correct! Another one of Dickson's famous brethren is Fanning Yater Tant, who accurately stated this: "II. All New Testament church action is congregational—never super-congregational or inter-congregational. III. The two great apostasies (Catholicism and Digression) developed out of efforts to promote 'church universal' action" (Harper-Tant Debate, 1955; Part II, p. 17).

Dickson's argument that when I Cor. 10:16 speaks of "the loaf (singular) which we (plural) break" this has reference to the universal church partaking of the same loaf falls; for the same verse speaks of the "cup of blessing (singular) which we (plural) bless, and he admits that the universal church does not bless the cup. He limited the action of the universal church to ONE thing—partaking of the communion. He has the universal church performing only ONE act of worship; however, he does not have it offering prayer for the communion, nor does he have it singing, teaching, or contributing! Yet he bases his whole negative argument on this one weak point.

I showed an exact parallel in my 2nd Aff. (Argument #2)—how that the statement, "Your (plural) LAMB (singular) shall be without blemish" (Exodus 12:5), was addressed to all Israel. Yet the same chapter required ONE "lamb for an house" (vs. 3). The singular term LAMB did not mean that all Israel partook of just one lamb, but that the members of each house partook of one lamb. Likewise, when I Cor. 10:16,17 speaks of "the loaf (singular) which we (plural) break." this simply refers to the action of each congregation. (The plural pronoun "we" was required because it takes a plurality of members to constitute each local congregation.) Would God have required that this Passover lamb which represented Christ to come be eaten locally and not universally later require that the loaf which represents Christ is to be eaten universally rather than locally??? Furthermore, the word "loaf," which Dickson admits should be used in all communion passages, cannot mean bread in general (universally), but means "A portion of bread baked in one mass" (Oxford Eng. Dict., Vol. VI, p. 370). I shall take up matters like "Pshaw" in my First Negative.

THE LINDSEY-DICKSON DEBATE

PROPOSITION #2: The Scriptures teach that when a congregation of the Church of Christ partakes of the Lord's supper, the communion loaf may be in more than one piece.

Affirmative: George Dickson

Negative: Ellis Lindsey

DICKSON'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Before I define my proposition I feel I must get Bro. Lindsey to clear up some matters in his rejoinder.

I said (first neg. last pp.) "... there is just one sense in which all believers can and do partake of that one loaf—and that Paul was referring to species i. e. the unleavened bread of the passover (1 Cor. 10:17)..."

You said I said (rejoinder pp. two) "...this has reference to the universal church partaking of the same loaf falls:" Now, Ellis, I never said any such thing!

I said "Next I do not argue that every congregation used one piece of bread—that was the consequence of the affirmative position." (Second negative, page 12.)

Ellis, if you have not understood before, it is your position that makes it imperative that there be just one loaf only for all Christians to partake of, for they must all partake of that one loaf. It's your problem, and now you have another—Why did you do this, didn't you know any better or are you deliberately trying to deceive our readers and make them think I have argued there must be one piece of bread only? Don't ignore this, as I am not going to forget it and I want to know why you did this dastardly trick.

ROY COGDILL'S STATEMENT

I am not surprised by my opponents' use of the quotations as I have learned to expect this from them. He led you to believe this was Bro. Cogdill's entire statement by his use of a period after the statement quoted. —Here is what Bro. Cogdill said: "The New Testament scriptures are completely silent as to any universal function of the church and as to any universal organization through which such a function of the church and as to any universal organization through which such a function might be performed." Not a period after "church" as used by Lindsey. This type of thing is deceitful and dishonest. Now let's notice two other statements from "Walking by Faith".

Bro. Cogdill states that God is in control of discipline in the church universal hence a function of the universal church, but not an organization through which the church universal may function.

Bro. Cogdill also taught that the congregations of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia co-operated (acted concurrently) in meeting the universal church functions but not an organization through which they function. The functioning of the church universal is concurrent, not collective. When we (all Christians) break the bread (loaf) we do it concurrently not collectively. That will take care of his use of Bro. Yater, also.

Ellis, why did you put a period in Bro. Cogdill's statement? For shame!

Perhaps a mantle of charity should be placed about Bro. Lindsey on the above after we see what he does to HIMSELF.

"(The plural pronoun 'we' was required because it takes a plurality of members to constitute each local congregation.)" (Rejoinder, last pp.) Here Lindsey said the "we" is just one local congregation and even underscores local—but hear him again:

On page 10 of his second affirmative he clearly states the "we" had reference to both Ephesus and Corinth. Now, Ellis, you can't have it both ways. I asked you that question because I knew it was devastating to your position, and you answered it correctly, but now you say it only means one local congregation. It cannot be two or more congregations that are indicated by the "we", and then, only one local congregation. You can't have it both ways, I won't let you. Maybe he just doesn't realize what he did with Cogdill.

Lamb Argument Falls:

About his lamb argument I just want to call the readers attention again to the fact there is nowhere in the scriptures the statement, "one cake of bread per congregation". God did say "one lamb for an house" but we have to ask Bro. Lindsey about one cake of bread only since God didn't tell us. Sorry, Bro. Lindsey, you are not an authority in this matter. God could say one lamb for an house, He could also say one loaf for a congregation, but He didn't. God did say: The loaf which we (all Christians) break. All Christians break one loaf.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The Scriptures	- the 66 books of the Bible
Teach	- imparts the information
That when the Church of Christ Partakes	- a local unit of the Lord's church
of the Lord's Supper	- communes, eats, drinks, blesses, etc.
the Communion Loaf	- the unleavened bread and fruit of the vine
	- the unleavened bread which we (all Christians) break
may be in more than one piece	- it is permissible—there is nothing prohibiting it in the scriptures
	- portion

If this definition does not satisfy the negative, I will be glad to define any term further.

ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE

The reference to the loaf (1 Corinthians 10:16) demands an understanding there is more than one piece of bread only, under consideration

If the loaf in 1 Cor. 10:16 must be two or more—(admitted by Lindsey then denied) who is to say the loaf in Matt. 26, Mark 14, Luke 22 must be one only?

Lindsey has admitted "the loaf" of 1 Cor. 10:16 is more than one piece of bread only when he said the "we" of 1 Cor. 10:16 was at least Ephesus and Corinth—hence two—unless they ran the same one undivided loaf around to each congregation. If the loaf could be two or more pieces in 1 Cor. 10:16 why can't the loaf be in more than one piece in Luke 22:19? "And he took some bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them..." (New International Version, 1973 ed.) The opposition just assumes there was one undivided piece of bread only.

ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO

1 Cor. 10:17—"For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread."

1—Many members—all one bread and body

2—Many pieces—all one loaf

If the above is not true why not? We have many members yet but one body (1 Cor. 12:20) we also have many pieces (more than one in each congregation) and all these pieces are just one loaf. Ellis, if you can see through a fence you can see that.

ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE

The "loaf which we (all Christians) break" must be in more than one piece because of what the scriptures plainly state—

Matthew 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."

Mark 14:22 "and as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed and gave to them, and said, Take eat: this is my body."

Luke 22:19 "and he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to them saying, this is my body which is given for you:"

1 Cor. 11:24 "...took bread; And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat: this is my body which is broken for you:"

Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul all specifically state that Jesus broke the loaf. Now, to break means to divide into pieces—hence again my proposition stands—Lindsey's falls on the basis of the clear statement of the Bible. The loaf when eaten was in pieces.

ARGUMENT NUMBER FOUR

The loaf must be broken to picture the physical body of Christ which was broken on the cross.

John 19:33-37. "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: But one of the soldiers pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe. For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another scripture said, They shall look on him whom they pierced."

His body was broken (he said it was to be, quoted before) Therefore the loaf must be in more than one piece when it is consumed by the disciples. Not a bone was broken but the body consists of more than bone and the record states plainly his body was broken. To deny this, places one in the position of not believing the Bible.

ARGUMENT NUMBER FIVE

The negative's position (the loaf must stay in one piece only) is not only not taught in the scriptures, but is impracticable.

Note the following ridiculous situations our brethren are in who insist on one undivided piece only.

1. If when the one piece of bread only per congregation is passed to a "poor old brother" he in breaking off a piece, happens to leave more than one piece on the plate, zap—this would certainly mess up these brethren. What is he to do? He might eat two of the pieces leaving only one. But that would have him eating two bodies—"scrambled eggs!"

2. If when the "poor old brother" broke off his one piece only some crumbs were left besides the one big piece—"scrambled eggs" again.

3. If the "poor old brother" takes the extra piece and puts it into his pocket—he has a part of the body of Christ in his pocket. Who could believe it?

We plead with you brethren to give up your untaught and ridiculous position for the unity of the faith. The Bible does not teach the loaf must be in one piece only per congregation. The truth is that no matter how many pieces the bread is in it is still one loaf. The unleavened bread of the passover, taken anew as part of the remembrance, is though many loaves i.e. pieces, just one loaf.

Therefore, my proposition is proven: "The scriptures teach that when a congregation of the Church of Christ partakes of the Lord's Supper, the communion loaf may be in more than one piece.

LINDSEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brethren:

Brother Dickson has falsely accused me of misrepresenting him, when he himself is the guilty party. Even his own brethren will not approve his attitude and language. However, while he is "wallowing in the mire" (II Pet. 2:22), I shall continue with a firm, reasonable defense of the truth.

As an example of Dickson's method, he has used the term "Pshaw," which is "an exclamation of impatience, disgust, contempt, etc." (Webster). He even denied that "Pshaw" was used in other debates. If he will turn to page 57 of the FAMOUS Nichol-Bradly Debate, he will see that Brother C. R. Nichol used it before he outgrew such things.

Another example: In his answer to my Question #3, Dickson claimed, "WE NEVER BREAK THE LOAF BEFORE WE GIVE THANKS!!!" (his 2nd Neg.). Yet, Brother Herbert E. Winkler, one of Dickson's famous brethren from Nashville, said, in criticism of their churches, "And those who serve at the table MOST invariably brake the bread before the giving of thanks" (letter to me, Oct. 8, 1962).

He is dead wrong on "this do"; for although this clause is used of the loaf only in Lk. 22:19, it is used of the cup also in I Cor. 11:25. What is his point, anyway?

DICKSON FORCED TO SAY THAT THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH FUNCTIONS

Dickson replied to my Question #10 by saying, "The church universal doesn't function any way other than the sense that 'we' all partake of that one loaf (unleavened bread) and drink of that one cup (fruit of the vine)" (his 2nd Neg., near the end). Here he has the universal church itself acting in partaking of the communion. When I quoted his Brother Cogdill in contradiction, Dickson claimed that I placed a period in his statement and that I did not quote all that he said. However, (1) I did not place the period within quotation marks; (2) the part I didn't quote was on the different subject of "organization"; (3) Dickson himself did not quote the very next sentence, which completely destroys his own position; and (4) in the portion of Cogdill's statement which he added, Dickson totally garbled and distorted the meaning by twice repeating 14 words! I am going to cite Roy Cogdill's statement now. The first part which I have underlined is what I quoted before; the part not underlined is that given by Dickson; and the second underlined portion is the statement which Dickson refused to quote, but which is death to his position:

"The New Testament scriptures are completely silent as to any universal function of the church and as to any universal organization through which such a function might be performed. If God had intended for the church universal to perform any function upon the earth is it not self evident that He would have been wise enough to give it a medium or organization through which to perform that function? The necessary conclusion then is that since God has given the church only a local organization—the congregation—He intended for its function or work to be executed through the local church as a medium" (Walking by Faith, 1957, p. 86).

Cogdill correctly argues that the church universal DOES NOT FUNCTION; whereas, Dickson argues that it DOES FUNCTION in communing. When I said that Dickson's argument on I Cor. 10:16 "has reference to the universal church partaking of the same loaf," I was referring to his answer to my Question #10 (as shown above), and NOT to the statement in his 1st Neg. which he says I referred to. He even goes so far as to claim that I accused him of teaching that "every congregation used one piece of bread," and then calls this a "dastardly trick." What language! Brother Dickson, I totally defy you to show where I accused you of such a thing! You continue to mention some "poor old brother who doesn't understand." I have figured out who that "poor old brother" is. Poor old brother Dickson! I have never seen a man so confused about a subject, about what his opponent has said, and even about what he himself has said!

Next, Dickson misrepresents Cogdill twice more. Although Cogdill said, "God is in complete control of discipline administered to the church universal" (Ibid., p. 87), he made it clear that this discipline was the ACT OF GOD (not of the church universal, as Dickson claims), and gave as an example Rev. 2 & 3. Nor did Cogdill say that when churches Scripturally cooperate, this is universal church action!

I said that in I Cor. 10:16, 17, "The plural pronoun 'we' was required because it takes a plurality of members to constitute each local congregation" (Aff. Reb.); but he twisted this around and claimed I said, "The 'we' is just one local congregation" (his 1st Aff.). The "we" had reference to both Ephesus and Corinth—but to "EACH" separately. This is the only position possible, unless one wants to take the unscriptural position that here the universal church is acting. (More on this below.)

DICKSON'S AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENTS REFUTED

His Argument #1. I simply refer the reader back to my 2nd Aff. (Argument #2), Aff. Rebuttal, and this 1st Neg. for material which has already answered his argument on I Cor. 10:16, 17. As shown, the passage cannot refer to the universal church.

His Argument #2. I Cor. 10:17 cannot include "many pieces" of bread: (1) The passage does not say "many pieces." (2) Although there are "many members," the loaf does not represent them, but represents the ONE body of Christ. (3) Brother Dickson has admitted that "loaf" is the correct translation in this passage. But he totally failed to reply to my Affirmative Rebuttal, in which I proved that the term "loaf" means "A portion of bread baked in one mass" (Oxford Eng. Dict., Vol. VI, p. 370). Webster's New World Dict. defines "loaf" as meaning "a portion of bread baked in one piece" (2nd Ed.,

p. 829). The very fact that the term "loaf" is used in I Cor. 10:16,17 proves that the requirement for each congregation was "A PORTION OF BREAD BAKED IN ONE MASS," or "IN ONE PIECE." Can't you reply, Dickson? Has a cat got your tongue? All Dickson can say about my powerful lamb argument is that God did not say "one loaf for a congregation." But I have proved that I Cor. 10:16,17 has a congregational, not a universal, application! (Refer back to my Affirmative Rebuttal and to my 2nd Aff., Argument #2, for strong parallels between the Passover lamb and the loaf in this passage.) Question #12: What is the meaning of the statement, "We have an altar" (Heb. 13:10)?

His Argument #3. Here Dickson contradicts his own brethren again. He contends that when the Scriptures say that Jesus "brake" the loaf, this means He divided it into pieces, and that we MUST do likewise. However, Brother Robertson L. Whiteside—late Queries Editor of the Gospel Advocate, President of Abilene Christian College, and famous author—correctly stated 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" (Reflections, p. 396). More questions: #13. Upon what authority do you say that when Jesus "brake" the loaf, this means He broke it into pieces? #14. If you believe that Jesus partook of that first Lord's supper (as I do), what Biblical words describe His partaking? #15. Do all Christians personally break bread? (I Cor. 11:24 is noticed under Argument #4 below.)

His Argument #4. His argument reads, "The loaf must be broken to picture the physical body of Christ which was broken on the cross." He then proceeded to quote John 19:33-37, which specifically says, "A bone of him shall not be broken" (vs. 36), but says, rather, that He was "pierced" (vs. 37)! Jesus' body was not literally broken, because the piercing of flesh is never called the breaking of a body! Yet Dickson says that the bread which represents Jesus' unbroken body must be literally broken for the saints! When I Cor. 11:24 says, "This is my body, which is broken for you," notice that (1) this refers to the body, not to the bread; that (2) the expression "is broken" means "is given" (Lk. 22:19, the parallel passage); and that (3) His body WAS NOT literally broken (Jn. 19:36), but was figuratively broken, as in Ps. 38:8, "I am feeble and sore broken," and as in Ps. 69:20, "Reproach hath broken my heart" (said of Christ). The breaking of bread is the eating of the Lord's supper in Acts 2:42; 20:7; I Cor. 10:16,17. **DICKSON'S OWN BROTHERHOOD, INCLUDING WHITESIDE, DOES NOT DEMAND THAT THE LOAF BE TORN INTO PIECES.**

His Argument #5. Here he argues that if some "poor old brother" (like Brother Dickson, I guess) in the audience just happens to break the loaf into pieces, this would justify our using more than one loaf. What if that same "poor old brother" brought along his guitar and began strumming and picking up a storm during the singing? Would this justify our putting in instrumental music because of some freak and accidental happening??? In fact, it is a fallacy to try to prove anything upon the grounds of accidental occurrence; this is recognized even in the court room. Poor old Brother Dickson!

(The End.)



At this point, Brother Dickson QUIT, although he had two more articles promised, one of which was to have been the last of the debate!

"Is not the cup of thanksgiving for which we give thanks a participation in the blood of Christ? And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf."
(From THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION of 1973;
I Cor. 10:16, 17.)