God's Providence

- 1. "What is meant by the word "providence'?"
- A. It comes from the same family of words as "provide".
- B. Webster says, "The foreseeing care and guardianship of God over His creatures...a manifestation of the divine care or direction."
- C. It, then, means God's personal supervision of our lives or events to care for given individuals or situations.
 - 2. "Do people today believe in the providence of God?"
- A. Of course atheists don't and deists don't (people who do not believe that God ever interferes in the realm of nature). A thorough-going evolutionist doesn't either.
- B. But all who in any real sense believe in a personal, loving God are bound to believe in His providence to some extent.
- C. Where so many people fail in their belief in the providence of God is that they conceive of His caring for mankind as a unit and not in taking note of the particular needs and lives of individual persons.
 - 3. "Does God bother to take note of the individual? Since He exhibits a general goodness toward all people, does He really do anything extra for individuals?"
- A. To cite the way that God led in the lives of Joseph, David, or Daniel, it might be urged against using their examples that all of them lived in the age of God's special miracles.
 - B. But here are two undeniable proofs of God's

providential oversight of our individual lives: (1) prayer, and (2) chastening. If God teaches us to pray, and He does (I Thess. 5;17); if He teaches us to pray concerning our personal needs and spiritual desires, and He does (Mark 11:24); and if He promises to answer our prayers, and He does (Matt. 7:7-11), then the fact is established for those who believe the Bible that God does pay attention to us individuals, that He listens to us individually, and that He does things for the individual. Furthermore if God chastens each of His erring children, and He does (Heb. 12:6), then it is again evident that God does not lump the human family altogether into one big unit and treat everybody alike.

- 4. "But doesn't Matt. 5:45 say that God sends rain and sunshine on the just and unjust alike?"
- A. Yes, God does bless even the wicked with customary material blessings, for He is their Creator also, but who says that all God has to give and all He can and will do for people are sunshine and rain? Who says that man has no need but what rain and sunshine will take care of? What about his personal problems and his decisions? What about his mental, psychological, and spiritual needs? Truly there is far more to life than rain and sunshine.
- B. God talks about other blessings besides the universal blessings He sends on all people. He teaches us to pray for additional things (Jas. 1:5; John 15:7; Matt. 6:6). There are some things we will never receive unless we ask for them (Jas. 4:2). Prayer is the key to realizing the fulness of God's blessings. Those who seek God's kingdom and His righteousness before they do anything else will be given blessings that others living in the same world, in the same community, and at the same time will not realize (Matt. 6:33).

GOD'S PROVIDENCE

- 5. "If people believe in the special providence of God, then, it will surely stimulate a greater prayer-life as well as cause them to be more appreciative of the things they have. Isn't this true?"
- A. Exactly. And you will find that where people do not believe in such providence, they do not pray, and if they do it is more or less lip-worship and not heart-worship. This explains why so many people are not personally grateful to God for what they have.
- B. Furthermore this is why when times of great difficulty come that such people are really beset by fears, for they do not know what it means to put their trust in a living God who will take care of them in whatever manner He may see fit to do.
 - 6. "But aren't there times when it does seem that God is not intervening in behalf of a person's specific need?"
- A. Yes, to us human beings there are times when seems we experience and endure some of the same hardships and difficulties as other sons of Adam who are not Christians. Solomon observed something very "There is a vanity which is done earth; that there be just men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked" (Eccl. 8:14). commenting on the sufferings and physical corruption of mankind, Paul observes, "And not only they (the unsaved), but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit (we Christians), even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23). We do not want to forget that all of Adam's offspring will suffer according to the pronouncements found in Gen. 3: 16-19.

- B. This is not to deny that God exercises special providence for His children (as we have seen above), but it is all subject to His own discretion, and we must ever let His will prevail.
 - 7. "Is there a difference between the providential and the miraculous?"
- A. Yes. Both display the power and workings of God, but the miraculous always has two characteristics: (1) the effect is always instantaneous; and (2) the result is always complete. For examples see the miracles recorded in Matt. 8:13, 15, 26, 28-32. When we today pray in the realm of God's providential action, we do not say God has refused to answer our prayer for a sick person when he gets well over a period of days instead of instantaneously, and we may settle for a great improvement without demanding that he be as well as when he was a young person.
- B. Note--if the Christians of the apostolic age could themselves pray and realize as great an effect as the apostles working miracles, then miracles would not prove that the apostles were apostles. It was such miracles, though, that Paul referred to as "signs of an apostle" (II Cor. 12:12).
 - 8. "Why do you believe in God's providence, and how do you know it happens?"
- A. Our faith in God's providence is based on the promises of God's Word (like Prov. 3:6; Psa. 37:4,5; I Pet. 3:12; Rom. 8:28; and many others) and the accounts of divine providence in the Bible (in Joseph's life, in Esther's, in Hezekiah's, in Daniel's, and in many other Biblical cases).
- B. We know it is a fact by having witnessed it many times in our own lives and in the lives of other Christians whom we have known.

GOD'S PROVIDENCE

QUESTIONS

- 1. What do you understand by "God's providence"?
- 2. Name those who do and who don't believe in God's providence.
- 3. Give Biblical proof that God does pay attention to our individual cases.
- 4. Show that Matt. 5:45 does not rule out God's special providence for His children.
- 5. What should our belief in God's special providence do for us?
- 6. What differences are there between the providential and the miraculous?

Returning Thanks for Food

- 1. "Preachers speak with such concern over those who do not return thanks for their meals. Is this a justifiable concern over a matter that may or may not be done?"
- A. People should be taught to be thankful for all their blessings whether material or spiritual. Colossians alone says, "We give THANKS to God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ...since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints, for the hope which is laid up for you in heaven" (Col. 1:3-5); "Giving THANKS unto the Father" (Col. 1:12); "Abounding therein with THANKS-GIVING" (Col. 2:7); "Be ye THANKFUL" (Col. 3:15); "Whatsoever ye do in work or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving THANKS to God and the Father by him" (Col. 3:17); and, "Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with THANKSGIVING" (Col. 4:2). Jas. 1:17 tells us that God is the One from whom all blessings come.
- B. We are indeed ungrateful if we do not want to express appreciation to God for what He continually does for us.
- C. Then with the Bible showing us so definitely that in the matter of eating we should first give thanks to God, it is not left up to our discretion as to whether we should or should not. Yes, preachers are justified for being concerned over those who do not express thanks to God for their food.
 - 2. "Where does the Bible say anything a-about returning thanks for food?"

In a number of passages.

A. We see it three times in Jesus' life. Even when feeding the 5,000 miraculously Jesus gave thanks before distributing the food to the people (John 6:

RETURNING THANKS FOR FOOD

- 11). He did the same when feeding the 4,000 (Matt. 15: 36). And He did likewise with the two men at Emmaus (Luke 24:30).
- B. Even when Paul was surrounded by a shipload of non-Christians (mostly prisoners), he stood forth in the midst of them all and thanked God for the food they were all about to eat (Acts 27:33-35).
- C. I Tim. 4:3 expressly says that our food is to be received "with thanksgiving", and the same expression is used in I Tim. 4:4.

With the triple example of Jesus and the example of Paul fortified with the plain statements in I Tim. 4, it is a matter of God's dictation that we thank Him for what we eat. It is not man's discretion that determines whether he should or not.

- 3. "Would this apply to meals eaten in restaurants, at lunch time where one is working, and to Christian young people eating their meals at school?"
- A. The place does not alter the teaching. One should be thankful for a meal whether eaten at home or elsewhere. A Christian should not be ashamed to thank God wherever he might be at mealtime.
- B. While thanking God for our food eaten in a public setting, we should be careful not to parade our thanks—remember the warning in Matt. 6:5. Make your prayer as private as possible under the conditions. Please don't say in a restaurant, "Will everybody please be quiet for a minute while I return thanks for my food?" And don't eat a meal at a restaurant and refuse to thank God for it simply because you are ashamed to do so.
 - 4. "Isn't there a danger that expressing thanks at mealtime will become a meaningless form by doing it so often?"

- A. Yes, there could be a danger if one is only mouthing words and not letting words express the gratitude he has in his heart.
- B. The same could be urged against saying, "Thank you," to people each time they do something for us. When someone gives you a ride, don't you thank him each time when leaving the car? When someone hands you a song book at church, don't you thank him each time?
- C. Anything done sincerely will avoid any danger toward formality. When we bow our heads before we eat, we should always be thankful not only for the food but that we are well and able to be at the table, and that our bodies are capable of receiving nourishment from the food.

Let us, then, thank our heavenly Father at every meal!

QUESTIONS

- 1. Who is the source of all our blessings?
- 2. What short New Testament book was cited as containing several references to being thankful?
- 3. Name 3 times we see Jesus thanking God before eating.
- 4. When do we see Paul returning thanks for a meal?
- 5. What New Testament book speaks about our receiving food 'with thanksgiving'?
- 6. Would the above teaching and examples still apply to a meal eaten away from home?
- 7. What warning from Matt. 6 do we need to heed when returning thanks for a meal eaten in a public place?
- 8. Why is the argument that such will become too common and therefore meaningless if we return thanks for our food every meal not valid?

Man's Role

- 1. "To you what most represents the superiority of man to all else that God has created?"
- A. Of course, we cannot overlook the fact that man alone is said to have been created in God's image (Gen. 1:26,27). Even yet we may not fully comprehend all that is meant by that expression, but it certainly relates man to God in a way that nothing else of His creation is.
- B. Then there's Jesus' statement, "How much then is a man better than a sheep?" (Matt. 12:12), and His affirmation, "Ye are of more value than many sparrows" (Matt. 10:31). The fact that man is greater than the animal world is seen many times and in many ways in the Bible: (1) man has the right to kill and eat animals (Gen. 9:2,3); (2) if an animal killed a human being, the animal was to be killed (Exo. 21:28); (3) animals were used as sacrifices for the sins of man (Lev. 5:5,6).
- C. Also the way God created human beings with a greater mind, more ingenuity, more creativity, and some of his special physical characteristics that enable man to do more than animals can do: (1) man being a biped, he can stand on his lower limbs, freeing his upper limbs for useful purposes; (2) he has hands on his upper limbs which are more useful than another pair of feet would be; (3) his having thumbs opposite his sets of fingers gives him many superior advantages; etc.).
- D. Then there's the fact that God has placed man over His creation (Heb. 2:6-8). As God was about to create man in the beginning, He assigned him this role (Gen. 1:26), and He spoke to man about it (Gen. 1:28).
 - 2. "How does this latter thought work out in man's fulfilling this role of being

over God's creation?"

In many ways.

- A. Man can cut down trees and make lumber, furniture, posts, paper, and many other items made from wood as he decides to do, or he can burn it for fuel if he wishes to do so.
- B. Man can plow the land and raise field crops and gardens.
- C. He can build ponds and dams and trap run-off water to use during the dry season for irrigation purposes or for fishing and boating or for generating electrical power.
- D. To protect himself against the elements of adverse weather, man can build a house that will keep him dry on rainy days, warm on cold days, cool in hot weather, and safe from marauding animals and where he can protect his possessions from rain, wind, snow, and other human beings.
- If he doesn't want his food to spoil, he builds a refrigerator. If he wants to go faster than walking or riding a horse, he builds a car. If he wants to fly and get there even faster, he builds an airplane. If he wants to enjoy vegetation and flowers during the winter time, he raises house-plants. people living in the north want oranges and banamas and pineapples, they pay people living farther south to raise them and other people to transport them to them. If man wants to read the newspaper after the sun has gone down, he turns on a light. If his eyes begin to fail, he makes glasses. If his hearing begins to fail, he gets a hearing-aid. If his legs give out, he gets a cane or crutches or a wheel chair. If he has lost too many teeth to time, he extracts the remaining ones and gets a man-made set. If some internal problem threatens his life, he has somebody operate on him. And we could go on and on to show that God has not only given man the intelligence necessary to occupy

MAN'S ROLE

his special role but that man is constantly exercising that right.

- 3. "But if God wants to show His displeasure with the wickedness of mankind by sending drouth conditions, a plague of grasshoppers, etc., wouldn't we be fighting against God to irrigate and offset the drouth and spray to get rid of the grasshoppers? How then can God bring hardships on sinful man?"
- A. No doubt God does send such problems at times because of the wickedness of man. He still exercises some moral oversight of man so that He can call for hard times when He knows this will help bring man to his senses.
- B. But God is not limited in His choice of means whereby to humble man. Irrigation may handle the drouth situation, but farmers in irrigated sections realize that a big hail storm can put an end to their crops. God will have plenty of ways left to deal with sinning man when we have done all we can to overcome the hardships of nature.
 - 4. "In Heb. 2:7, where it says of man, 'Thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet,' the next verse goes on to say, 'But now we see not yet all things put under him.' What does that mean?"
- A. When God put all things under the foot of man in Gen. 1, that was before man fell into sin. Indeed at that time everything in nature was submissive to the way of man. There was no opposition to man from nature: Adam and Eve lived in perfect happiness and triumph.

- B. But while man is still over nature, nature at times rises up against man--ever since Gen. 3 when God pronounced those sentences against the human race for going the way of sin. God pronounced certain curses on man that remain to the present day (see Gen. 3:16-19).
- C. That Heb. 2:8 statement ("But now we see not yet all things put under him") is immediately followed by these words: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man" (v. 9). Jesus came to make an atonement for man's sins and to begin his redemption, and when He comes again it will be to complete that redemption -- we yet wait for the "redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23). When divine redemption is complete, and we find ourselves in God's glorious New Jerusalem described in Rev. 21:1--22:2, all the curses that have kept us from being completely the victor over the forces of nature will be past, for the very next verse says, "There shall be no more curse" (Rev. 22:3), "for God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make things new" (Rev. 21:4.5).

In conclusion it is truly great that God has placed us over His creation and at the same time given us the opportunity to be His children (I John 3:1). God has thus honored man, and man is at his best when he realizes that his is the middle position: over the things of the earth materially and under God Himself spiritually. To live in harmony with this realization is life at its best—to know that he can utilize the natural resources available to him while recognizing that he himself is to submit to the mind and hand of God that are over him.

MAN'S ROLE

QUESTIONS

- 1. In what ways is man superior to the rest of God's creation?
- 2. What role did God assign man in His universe?
- 3. Show some of the ways man exercises that role.
- 4. What keeps man from now having perfect control in God's universe
- 5. Who is still greater than man?

Same Bible Text Today

- 1. "Our English Bible is a translation. Does that mean we cannot rely on it? Some people say we cannot depend on it because it has been translated so many times that what we have in our Bible today is far different from what the original was. Help!"
- A. Yes, our English Bible is a translation, but if English-speaking people are to know the Word of God, it must be translated out of the original languages (mainly Hebrew for the Old Testament and Greek for the New) into English.
- B. But don't be worried by those who say the Bible has been translated so many times that it is vastly different today from the original. Our English Bible has been translated directly from the Hebrew and the Greek. The way some critics of the Bible talk you would think the Bible was translated out of Hebrew and Greek into Spanish, and from Spanish into French, and from French into Swedish, and from Swedish into English. If that were the case, yes our English translation would be so many steps away from the original that we could not depend on it. But since our English Bible has been translated directly from the original languages, we can be just as confident of it as two diplomats from foreign countries are of their translators' words between them.
 - 2. "Do we have the original copies of the New Testament books today? If so, who has them?"
- A. As far as we know, they are no longer in existence. The poverty of the apostles likely necessitated their writing most of their communications on papyrus writing material rather that the expensive parchment and the even more expensive vellum of their day.
 - B. Papyrus, the forerunner of paper, was brittle,

SAME BIBLE TEXT TODAY

and as these original copies were handled often as various congregations made personal copies of them, likely an ultimate death befell the originals.

- 3. "What are the oldest known copies of the original Greek New Testament now in existence?"
- A. The Sinaitic copy was made around 325 and is now owned by England.

B. The Vatican copy is in the Vatican Library at Rome. It too was made around 325.

It is thought that these two very valuable copies could have been among the 50 copies of the Bible that the Emperor Constantine had the famous Eusebius and his staff copy in the early part of his reign. They are on the most expensive vellum and would indicate such a royal history.

C. The Alexandrian copy and the Ephraem copy were

both made around the year 400.

These 4 are the earliest known copies of the Greek New Testament in existence.

- 4. "If the earliest of these were copied around 325, how do we know that somebody didn't write the New Testament about then?"
- A. It is easy to trace the New Testament from 325 right back to the days of the apostles through ancient versions and numerous quotations from it. For instance the Peshito Syriac version was translated about 150 as was the Old Latin version. And the two Egyptian versions (the Bahiric and the Sahidic) for the two sections of Egypt (Lower Egypt and Upper Egypt) were translated around 175.
- B. Thus within but a few years after the apostles and their inspired associates wrote the New Testament books, a translation was made of them for the Syrian

Christians in the east, a translation was made for the Latin-speaking Christians in the west, and two translations were made for the Egyptian Christians of Africa.

- C. These translations prove that the New Testament did not come into existence around the days of Constantine. These very early versions help us know that the New Testament traces to the days of the apostles. Before any book is translated into another language or languages, it must attain such prominence in its original language that the demand for it in other languages is created. That took much longer in the early centuries after Christ than it does today. This fact argues for the New Testament's being in existence quite sometime before our earliest known versions, especially since it was translated for people in widely separated areas.
 - 5. "Is it true that the literature of the early Christian writers abounds in quotations from the New Testament, showing that the New Testament was surely in existence from the apostles onward, and that it was the same as our New Testament today?"

Yes, that is true. Following are some samples and some observations.

- A. Clement of Rome wrote to the Corinthian church about 96 A.D. concerning its long-standing problem of division. He wrote, "Take up the Epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul (referring to I Corinthians--D.G.H.). What did he write to you in the beginning of the gospel? Truly, under the inspiration of the Spirit he wrote to you concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because even then parties had been formed among them."
 - B. Polycarp was born around 55 A.D. and was bap-

SAME BIBLE TEXT TODAY

tized in 70 A.D. Thus he grew up right during the apostolic age. He was appointed an elder in Smyrna by apostles. He wrote a letter to the Philippian church. Notice how many Biblical statements are found in his letter to it: "Wherefore girding up your loins serve the Lord in fear and truth, as those who have forsaken the vain, empty talk and error of the multitude, and believed in Him who raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead and gave Him glory and a throne at His right hand. To Him all things in heaven and on earth are subject. Him every spirit serves. He comes as the judge of the living and the dead." These lines are just a sample of the several chapters in his letter to the Philippians.

C. Ignatius was born around 60 A.D. and was martyred just 10 years after the death of the apostle John. On his fateful trip to Rome from Antioch he wrote letters in which are references to Matt., Mark, Luke, John, 9 of Paul's epistles, I Pet., and I John-15 New Testament books (more than half of the New Testament books).

If space permitted, we could give you an abundance of such quotations from their sermons and other writings and from those of other men also. It has been stated that if the New Testament as a book were lost, almost the entirety of it could be reproduced from writers of the early centuries of Christianity such as Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and others. Irenaeus's writings alone contain quotations from almost every book of the New Testament. And there are 1,800 quotations from the New Testament in the writings of Tertullian alone.

The impact of all this is seen from the following statement by McGarvey: "The force and value of the evidence from quotations can be more properly appreciated if we compare the evidence from the same source for some of the most noted classical writings of antiquity. The writings of Herodotus, the most famous of

Greek historians, are quoted by only one author in the first century after they were written, by only one in the second, by one in the third, and by only two in the fourth. Thucydides, second among Greek historians, is not quoted at all during the first two centuries after he wrote. Livy, the early Roman historian, is quoted by only one writer in the first hundred years, and the first to quote Tacitus is Tertullian, who wrote about 100 years later. If then our task had been to trace back to their authors the works of these celebrated writers, works the genuineness of which is never called in question, the case which we could make for them would be weakness itself compared with that which we have made for the writings of the New Testament."

Thus there is no question but what the Greek manuscripts from which our English Bible has been translated can be traced right back to the age and authorship of the apostles.

QUESTIONS

- 1. Is our English Bible a translation of a translation of a translation, etc., or has it been translated directly from the languages in which it was written?
- 2. Why are the original copies of the apostles' writings not known to exist today?
- 3. What are the 4 most ancient Greek copies of the New Testament in our possession, and at what approximate dates were they made?
- 4. Give the names and approximate dates for the earliest translations known.
- 5. Name some of the early Christian writers who quoted freely from the New Testament.

Breaking of Bread

- 1."Aren't there some who say that
 'breaking of bread' in Acts does not mean
 the Lord's supper but a regular meal?
- A. Yes, and there are also some who say it means "preaching".
- B. Those who deny that "breaking of bread" refers to the Lord's supper possibly do so because they are not giving the Lord's supper as prominent a place in their religion as is taught in the New Testament.
- C. We should be Biblically prepared to meet their arguments.
 - 2. "On what do they base their contention that 'breaking of bread' is eating a common meal?"

They base it on something the two men of Emmaus said. After the resurrection Jesus was walking north-west out of Jerusalem toward evening. He fell in with two men walking out to their hometown Emmaus. They urged Him to spend the night with them instead of traveling on, not realizing it was Jesus. During the beginning of their evening meal, "their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight" (Luke 24:31). They immediately went back to Jerusalem and told the apostles "how he was known of them in breaking of bread" (Luke 24:35). This event was not the Lord's supper but their evening meal.

3. "How can we determine when it means the Lord's supper and when it means a regular meal?"

There will be something within the text itself that will indicate to which it refers. By so doing it is easy to show that both Acts 2:42 and Acts 20:7 def-

initely refer to the Lord's supper.

- A. Acts 2:42. In this passage Luke is narrating the spiritual faithfulness of the first converts to Christianity. He says they continued steadfastly in four things: the apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers. Does Luke mean to say in this passage, "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and prayer, and you really ought to see those fellows eat?" Of course not, but that is what he is saying if "breaking of bread" in this passage means common eating. This passage is also useful to show that the expression does not mean preaching, for the preaching is involved in the "apostles' doctrine" in this passage.
- B. Acts 20:7. This passage says the disciples had come together on the first day of the week "to break bread", and that Paul being present preached to them. Now why do saints come together on the Lord's day? To eat common food? Of course not. They come together for spiritual reasons. Surely this "breaking of bread" is not common eating but the Lord's supper.
 - 4. "What about 'breaking of bread' in Acts 2:46? If this means the Lord's supper, then we should observe the Lord's supper every day."

Having established that Acts 20:7 does mean the Lord's supper, it is easy to show by contrast that Acts 2:46 does not.

- A. In Acts 20:7 they CAME TOGETHER to break bread while in Acts 2:46 they WENT HOME TO THEIR HOUSES FROM THE ASSEMBLY to break bread.
- B. Acts 20:7 as corroborated by early church history shows a WEEKLY OBSERVANCE of the Lord's supper, something quite different from the "breaking of bread" in Acts 2:46 which they did EVERY DAY.

 C. When you read, "Breaking bread from house to
- house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness

BREAKING OF BREAD

of heart," in Acts 2:46, the "did eat their meat with gladness, and singleness, of heart" is in apposition with "breaking bread from house to house", referring to the same matter.

These last verses of Acts 2 show the daily life of the new converts: every day they came together in the temple and then broke up to go home, happy in Christ, praising God, having favor with their fellowmen, and seeing their numbers increase daily.

5. "What about 'had broken bread' in Acts 20:11?"

The question is, was this the Lord's supper or a meal? They came together to break bread (the Lord's supper). It would seem that after they had done that, Paul preached to them, Luke mentioning that he preached "until midnight". After restoring Eutychus to life, he came back up to the hall, ate, and waited until daybreak, when he took his leave of them. It had to be regular eating—it was not even done on the first day of the week, for it was after "midnight".

OUESTIONS

- 1. On what do some base their contention that "breaking of bread" is a common meal?
- 2. How can we tell when that expression means a meal and when it means the Lord's supper?
- 3. Why does "breaking of break" mean the Lord's supper in Acts 2:42?
 4. Why does it mean the Lord's supper in Acts 20:7?
- 5. Why does it mean eating food in Acts 2:46?
- 6. Why does it mean eating food in Acts 20:11?