

## ***Why Is It Called The “Church of Christ”?***

Do you wonder why it is so important that the church be designated properly? Let us give these very simple and very vital reasons:

1. The church belongs to Christ by right of purchase. “To feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood” Acts 20:28. No other person or thing, therefore, should have any part in the title of the church.
2. The church is the body of Christ. “And he is the head of the body, the church.” (Col. 1:18) The body of Christ is the church of Christ, so it is altogether logical and right that the church be called “the church of Christ.”
3. The church is the bride of Christ. “For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is great: but I speak in regard of Christ and the church.” (Eph. 5:31 -32)
4. The church operates under the sole authority of Christ. “All power in heaven and earth has been given unto me: go ye therefore...” Matt. 28:18-20. Since it operates by no earthly authority, by what right should it be called after any earthly being or thing?
5. Christ is the Savior of the Church. “Christ also is head of the church, being himself the savior of the body.” Eph. 5:23. So we are obligated to no other person or thing. Why should we desire to glorify any other than the Savior?

- by **H. L. Collett**

---

## ***They Could Not Blush***

The fat is in the sun — and, we may add, “in the fire” for all who question the various stages of undress seen in the stores and on the streets these days. The more angular and misshapen the woman, or the more knobby-kneed the man, the less propriety and modesty is shown. *And no one blushes!*

Jeremiah prophesied against Jerusalem saying, “Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush . . .” (Jer. 6:15a).

*They could not blush.* It is a terrible thing when a people can no longer blush. It means there is no sense of shame — the conscience is seared. They have so lowered their standards that “abominations” appear acceptable. Self-respect has been destroyed, and there is no personal pride to urge them to better, higher, more noble attainments. Their moral “slip shows” and they “couldn’t care less.”

Further, they frequently compound their degradation by a blasé smugness, as though their calloused hearts were marks of high honor. He who blushes (should one remain) is a “square,” or maybe a “cube.”

Once my wife and I visited a woman whose attire was almost non-existent. We were so embarrassed for her that we sought to excuse ourselves; but apparently she thought her clothing (?) perfectly adequate. She sat, chatting gaily, until her three-year-old, wearing training panties, walked into the room. Then she rushed the child away with a “spat” saying, “You know better than to come in here undressed like that!” I suppose psychology has some explanation for it.

Paul commends “shamefastness”—a word meaning “bound, or controlled by a sense of shame—modesty.” As a bedfast person is “bound” to the bed by physical disability, so a shamefast person has a built in sense of right or propriety that “binds” and forbids appearing in public carelessly or improperly clothed (1 Tim. 2:8-10).

When a friend of mine commented on the gross immodesty that prevailed in a western resort city, he was told, “After awhile you’ll get used to it.” My friend replied that he hoped not.

“Getting used to” something that degrades character and lowers moral standards is no inducement to one who can still blush and is proud of it

- by **Robert F. Turner**

---

## **Did The Church Come Together For A Common Meal in Acts 20?**

A question has been asked about 'eating' in Acts 20:6-11:

*"And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together. And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep: and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him said, Trouble not yourselves; for his life is in him. When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed."*

We have emphasized two instances of "breaking bread" in the text. This expression is an idiom that can have reference to either a common meal (as in Acts 2:46) or the Lord's Supper (as in Acts 2:42, 1 Cor. 10:16; 1 Cor. 11:23-26).

We believe the first reference in Acts 20 is in regards to the Lord's Supper. We reach this conclusion because:

- The context implies that Paul waited in the city of Troas for seven days in order to be present at this assembly. Why wait if this were a common meal that could have been eaten on any day of the week?
- The disciples had specifically come together for the purpose of this 'breaking of bread'. But Paul had previously condemned the concept of a church coming together for the eating of common meals (1 Cor. 11:20-22,34). Paul would not have violated his own teaching in this matter, and therefore this must have been referring to the Lord's Supper.

But, what about the second occurrence of "breaking bread" in Acts 20 (verse 11)? Here we conclude that the meaning is of a common meal, because:

- The assembly had already been broken up because of the death and miraculous revival of Eutychus.
- The timing of this 'eating' was at sometime after midnight (vs. 7) and thus, by either Roman or Hebrew timekeeping, would have been on Monday, not Sunday.
- The meeting of the church, now dismissed, had likely occurred in a private home where common food stuffs would have been available for those who normally lived there and their guests.
- Paul did this without violating the previously mentioned prohibition on the church 'coming together' to eat common meals (1Cor. 11:20-22,34).
- And, Paul is the only one mentioned who consumed the food (vs. 11). This was in anticipation of his leaving the city within a matter of hours to continue his journey. It would be impossible to prove that any other person ate a single morsel of food, and therefore impossible to use this text to demonstrate that the whole church was involved in eating a common meal as an official or sponsored activity of the collective body.

**- by Greg Gwin**