Lord's Supper, but even so the point is that they often were present together, expressing to and for one another the glorious unity of purpose that characterized the early church.

So too, the movement for freedom we call the Civil Rights Movement. It was a movement characterized by a closeness brought about by shared purpose, and Dr. King was the servant of that purpose. He drew his support from the friends that were around him. His spirit came from the love of those who heard him, and his strength came from the progress that was made. Like the prophets of the Old Testament, he was vilified, threatened and ultimately killed, but he stands as a model of what a godly man can do and be. “But how,” someone may ask, “can you set before us as a model a man who rumored moral flaws, who created conflict, who healed with the sword of division?” My response is to simply remind us that we talk here of a godly man, not a God, but a man touched by God. We are blessed by not knowing what the rumor mongers said about the Old Testament prophets, about the Apostle Paul and indeed about Jesus himself. I rest confident in the belief that if we would truly be God’s people we must catch a glimpse of what went on in Acts 2, and Dr. King serves as a model. Our context is different from his, but is no less incumbent upon us as we honor him on his birthday to see the vision our Lord has placed before us — to listen to what God would tell us to do — to respond in faith and support one another in fellowship and love.
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Guest Editorial

Our God Is Able

Integrity magazine has now moved into its second decade of service to Christ and the church. While most of us on the board of trustees have had varying tenures of service, our distinguished editor-in-chief, Hoy G. Ledbetter, has been inseparably related to this ministry since its inception. Until recent months, Hoy was a vital part of every issue published, from the reception of a manuscript until the paper was ready for the post office. He set the type (an accomplished printer in his own right), made the lay-outs, at times ran the press, and kept his steady hand upon the entire process. All of the involvement which he personally gave to the work of Integrity, along with his devoted wife, Lillian, has been without any formal salary or remuneration by Integrity itself, until last August (1980) when the board made the decision to place him on a very modest salary.

In behalf of the entire Integrity board of trustees and the many readers who share its columns, I take this opportunity to express our appreciation and deep indebtedness. And to the Community Church in Grand Blanc, with which the Ledbetters were affiliated for ten years, allowing them the privilege to remain. But the situation with Integrity has significantly changed since the Ledbetters finalized the decision to stay in Michigan.

Throughout the 1980 year we have had to job out our printing of the paper. While not always completely satisfied with the final form which a given issue might assume, we are working conscientiously with our printer to perfect each release of the magazine. Two reasons necessitated the change from Hoy's very personal involvement to jobbing out the printing process: (1) the releasing of Hoy from such intensive physical wear and the more efficient use of his time in other directions; and (2) the basic need for more personal income which implied Hoy's finding additional employment which could meet this need. But we needed Hoy to remain at the center of this ministry through Integrity, without which we seriously doubted that journal would

But Willingly

When Paul shared with Philemon his wishes for the latter's slave Onesimus, he made a statement which reflects one of the great principles of Christian- life: "I preferred to do nothing without your consent in order that your goodness might not be by compulsion but of your own free will."

Peter recognized the same principle when he said that the work of elders should be done "not by constraint but willingly." And Paul's direction to the Corinthians regarding the collection for the poor saints could well be applied to any area of Christian service: "Each one must do as he has made up his mind, not reluctantly or under compulsion, for God loves a cheerful giver.

This means that every act of the Christian must be based upon his own decision. He cannot function as one who pleases God if he operates under compulsion. The implications of this for Christian teachers are very serious. We not only must cause men to work in a certain way, but we must cause them to want to do so. Proper behavior is not enough; there must also be valid motivation.

It is evident that Paul lived by this teaching, not only in his dealings with Philemon, but also in every situation. Although, as he told the Thessalonians, he might have made certain demands as an apostle, he refrained from doing so, so that men could always respond to the gospel from the heart. This is why he told the Corinthians: "Not that we lord it over your faith . . ."

As we discuss the so-called authority of church leaders today we need to keep in mind that Paul never made others feel the weight of authority. He had good reason, for service rendered under compulsion is hardly a suitable offering to Him who loves a cheerful giver and who is at work in us (Rom. 12, No. 3)
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continue. And it is our firm commitment that Integrity will continue its vital ministry outreach.

Let me now summarize our situation with Integrity, and ask that every reader give prayerful consideration. Our cost in printing the paper through the present arrangement approximates $800 an issue, including postage. But in addition to the cost of the printing, the board of trustees, as previously mentioned, last August reached the long overdue decision to provide a modest salary for Hoy Ledbetter’s services. Our two basic expenses, therefore, in continuing this work will approximate $1,700 an issue or an annual budget of $10,200. Since we do not charge a subscription fee for the paper, we must rely upon the readers to support this ministry with their contributions.

Most of our board members are very supportive of the work in a financial way; and to them we are grateful. And we are indebted to a few readers who send very generous support either regularly or in “chunk sums” each year. We thank each of you for your gracious help. But of our total mailing list which now exceeds 4,400 in number, only about 400 are providing any financial support. Perhaps this is our failing in part, not to have kept you more currently abreast of our continuing financial situation; but frankly, we do not enjoy talking about money. We would rather fill our pages with messages to challenge, comfort, and direct the ways of life. Yet the time has come when we must ask you in a very personal way to help sustain this ministry.

Hopefully, many will take this message and appeal as an immediate occasion to send an appreciation check in behalf of all that our editor has done through the pages of Integrity. He has touched so many lives with his Biblically saturated mind and trenchant pen. We want Integrity to continue its outreach. We feel God wills it so. And further, we believe confidently with the apostle Paul that “our God is able to make all grace abound to you, so that in all things at all times, having all that you need, you will abound in every good work.” (II Cor. 9:8, NIV)

I look forward to both the immediate and regular support from you, as readers, to maintain this ministry so vital to a Christian brotherhood.

Joseph F. Jones, President
Integrity Board of Trustees

Jesus: A Quest from History to Faith
TOM LANE
Cincinnati, Ohio

Few figures in history have aroused such continuing, varied, and widespread attention as the figure of Jesus from Nazareth. Philosophers and social reformers have labored to interpret and apply His ethics; artists and novelists, to explore the aesthetic and emotional implications of His person and teachings. To millions of His followers since the first century, the figure of Jesus has been a special object of devotion, in fact that element which sets Christianity apart from other worthy religions and moral philosophies. Many others have tried to explain Jesus away. From this varied attention, many conceptions of Jesus have emerged. His followers have sometimes played up certain things about Him while ignoring others. Jesus' detractors have often substituted for an objective picture of Him a more readily inviting ridicule.

Who was Jesus really? To ferret out the identity and character of the Teacher from Nazareth, we must enter the realm of historical analysis.

In the late nineteenth century, Bible scholars armed with new theories of literary analysis and historical criticism set out to isolate the "historical Jesus" from the "Christ of faith" presented in the New Testament. Today, scholars in this tradition, which has become the most prevalent school of thought on the subject, have concluded that the picture of Jesus presented in the gospels is so contaminated by theological interpretations that it is practically impossible to reconstruct the ministry and message of the real Jesus of history.1 Such a conclusion cannot go unnoticed by the Christian, who finds Jesus the root of his faith, nor by the seeing soul who is investigating the claims of Christianity. Can we truly know anything about the life and character of Jesus? And, if we can, what can we determine about His identity and character?

The Starting Point
To answer these questions, we must first consider the question of the nature and reliability of the documents which form our primary source of information about Jesus. Since the turn of the century, the four gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, have been the focus of skeptical criticism, even by many theologians.

The historic Christian view is that, allowing for the differing styles and purposes of each writer, the four New Testament accounts of the life of Jesus, though written within a few decades of His ministry, present an integrated, consistent, coherent picture of Jesus. This position holds that the gospel accounts were composed by eyewitnesses to Jesus' life, or, in one instance, by a man who had meticulously consulted eyewitness reports (Luke 1:1-4). Current liberal or skeptical literary analysis argues that the four gospels were written by post-apostolic age churchmen who pieced together their texts from various oral or earlier written traditions. These writers pictured Jesus not as He really was, but according to the highly admired image evolved by the developing church. Proponents of this view of the origin of the gospels magnify the differences in the way the various gospel writers depict Jesus into virtual contradictions. Consequently, they charge that very little can really be known about the historical Jesus, for what we have in the gospels is a confused image that says more about the ancient church than about its supposed Founder.

The most honest up-to-date scholarship discounts this debunking view of the origin of the gospels, and its pessimism about the accuracy of the information available to us about Jesus. Objective literary analysis has pushed back the probable dates of writing of the gospel records into the very lifetimes of the apostles themselves. This fits suitably with the testimony of recognized post-apostolic Christian writers who cited first century authorship for...
the gospels. And if the gospels were written so soon after Jesus’ ministry, there was little time for that process of embellishment of the Jesus-figure in its own image is a case of putting the cart before the horse; as conservative Christian apologists have noted, it takes a real Jesus like that portrayed in the gospels to adequately account for a church like that of the first century. The gospels, we conclude, depict Jesus substantially as He was.

What is it that different gospel accounts present Jesus somewhat differently? Each writer addressed himself to a different audience and stressed those facets of the phenomenon of Jesus that spoke to the particular needs and interests of that audience. Mark, who traveled with Paul and Barnabas through Gentile lands, thus presents Jesus as the perfect servant of God, a universally understood concept. The early post-apostolic writer, Papias, tells us that Matthew first wrote his gospel in Hebrew. Matthew, scholars infer, wrote to an audience of Jewish background. Matthew presents Jesus as the Messiah Judaism awaited; he is in Matthew’s account that Jesus never personified as something special. Luke’s gospel, on the other hand, tells us that Luke depicted Jesus as the Savior of the whole world. Theophilus — obviously a Greek. For the discomforting fact is, all the gospels record Jesus’ unabashed pretensions to be something more than a mere man.

Consider a few examples. Early in His ministry, Matthew tells us (7:28, 29), Jesus began to speak about spiritual realities in a manner the listening crowds found curiously authoritative. However, Jesus claimed to be one with God the Father, and in the Father’s authority issued His call, “Come unto me” (Matthew 11:27-30). It is in Matthew’s account that Jesus most persistently identifies Himself by the significant Jewish Messianic title, “Son of Man.” It is in Matthew 16:13-17 that we read of Jesus’ approval of Peter’s evaluation of Him: “You are the Christ, the Son of God.” Mark 2:5-7 and Luke 7:48, 49 record instances in which Jesus, in a perfectly natural fashion, presumed to exercise God’s own prerogative to forgive sins, to summon the little children to Himself. He preached with vigor, and was hardened by an outdoor life and the rigors of long walking journeys as an itinerant teacher, but occasionally had to retire to a friend’s home to rest. He possessed a full range of human emotions, and knew when to exercise each. He could utter stinging invective against the hypocritical Pharisees, and with holy indignation drive the money changers out of the temple. Yet He dealt sensitively with the woman caught in adultery. He exulted at the success reports brought to Him by the seventy evangelists He had sent out two by two. He wept at the tomb of His friend Lazarus. He was, as we like to say in my generation, a real person.

Where the Problem Comes

Were it not for certain unconventional things Jesus claimed about Himself, few persons would have trouble accepting the gospels’ portrayal of Jesus. For the disconcerting fact is, all the gospels record Jesus’ unabashed pretensions to be something more than a mere man.
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that Jesus was in fact an appearance of God among men?

There are three such lines of evidence:

1. Again we can point to the believa-
   bility of the character of Jesus as He
   appears in the gospels. We have
   already constructed a sort of character
   sketch of Him. Note how naturally and
   easily this same Jesus could speak of
   Himself in terms of deity, how naturally
   He spoke when He presumed to forgive
   sins, without leaving an impression of
   inconsistency, pretension, or fraud.

2. The reactions of the disciples to
   Jesus, as reported in the New
   Testament, are just what we would expect of
   ordinary men encountering a Man in
   whom God was present in a most
   extraordinary, unique way. A few years ago the movie
   Oh, God! depicted the encounter between God,
   wanting to pass a message to the world,
   and an everyday man, a young grocer
   credited with doing God-like things. It's
   true, though, most of these cases of
   supposed miracles are not reported in
   sufficient detail for us to determine for
   certain that there were no hidden
   natural causes involved. We might
   conjecture that the disciples simply
   misperceived things Jesus did, and
   magnified them into miraculous
   proportions. A recent Monty Python film,
   Life of Brian, traces the misadven-
   tures and misinterpretations by which a
   group of superstitious ancients elevated
   an ordinary, nay, rather bumbling
   person, into a Messiah-figure (despite
   his vigorous protests, of course).

3. The miracles Jesus performed are
   a testimony to God's active presence
   with Him. It is appropriate that Jesus,
   whom the gospel writers allege to have
   been a manifestation of deity, is
   moved by the heavy stone seal at the
   entrance to the tomb? Some have
   suggested that the Jewish authorities
   moved the body to a different tomb for
   some reason, or that the disciples had
   gone to the wrong tomb when they
   reported Jesus' tomb empty, or that the
   disciples only had a hallucination of a
   risen Christ. These explanations
   founder on the question of why the body
   of Jesus, which would have been in their
   possession or still in the tomb, was not
   produced by the Jewish authorities to
   refute the preaching of the disciples
   that their Master had risen from the
doors. The most adequate explanation
   for the empty tomb, the post-resurrec-
tion appearances of Jesus to the
disciples, and other attendant details of
   the alleged resurrection event, is the
   explanation offered by the apostle
   Peter: "They killed him by hanging
   him on a tree, but God raised him from
   the dead on the third day and caused him to be seen" (Acts 10:39, 40; New
   International Version).

A careful investigation of the gospel
records gives us a definitive picture of the
historical figure of Jesus. Such a study
also turns up some strong
evidences that in the phenomenon of
Jesus, God was living and moving
among men in a unique and
consummate way. The historical facts
of the life and character of Jesus thus
lead us to faith in His teachings and in
Himself. Through the gospel accounts
we hear the voice of the Father speaking
over the transfigured form of Jesus,
"This is my beloved Son; hear Him." And,
in believing, we listen.

1. An excellent update of liberal views of the gospels and the
   Jesus they portray is Kenneth L. Woodward, Rachel Mark, and
   Jerry Buckley, "Who Was Jesus?," New York: Seabury Press,
   1979, p. 74. For a full discussion of the gospels and a
   presentation of modern liberal views, see the excellent
   work by R. W. Scott, "The Gospels of the Word," in the
   New American Commentary Series, Nashville: Thomas

2. C. E. Lewis, "How Christianity Goes to the Movies," The
   Macmillan Company, 1971, p. 90. For more detail,
   see Jerry Buckley, "Jesus: The Man Behind the Mystic Baffles,
   Baker Book House, 1979, pp. 50ff.
How Much Can Worshippers Eat?

HOY LEDBETTER

Some of you may think that a discussion of whether or not the early church ate the Lord’s supper in connection with a larger meal is a terrible waste of space. But to the conservative who clings to the concept of a specific pattern for worship it is a question of great magnitude. The implications are quite serious to him because if the early church actually did eat the Lord’s supper in conjunction with a larger meal, then the usual practice today of limiting the supper to a mere pinch of bread and a sip of grape juice hardly constitutes compliance with the pattern. Since such compliance is viewed as one of the marks of the faithful and the dividing line between the sheep and the goats, some of our friends were understandably upset by one of my editorials in the last issue and would like for me to cite the evidence.

Our understanding of how the early church ate the Lord’s supper rests on three passages—Acts 2:42, 46; Acts 20:7, 11; I Corinthians 11:20ff. In which the expression “break bread” is interpreted as equivalent to “eat the Lord’s supper.” This interpretation also assumes that “eating the Lord’s supper” is not substantially different from the way we assimilate that pinch of bread and sip of grape juice in our meetings today.

In evaluating that assumption we should bear in mind that the act of breaking bread was of significance in ordinary meals long before the term became attached to the Lord’s supper. In the course of ordinary and/or special meals within Judaism the head of the household would give thanks, then break the bread and hand pieces to those who sat at table with him. Thus, “The breaking of bread is simply a customary and necessary part of the preparation for eating together. It initiates the sharing of the main course in every meal!” (Johannes Behm, TDNT, III, 728). In view of this we should expect that “to break bread” would in the New Testament indicate “a common meal in terms of the opening action” and would in Acts 2:42, 46 most likely denote “the ordinary table fellowship of members of the first community each day in their homes.” In other words, if “the breaking of bread” did become a stock expression for eating the Lord’s supper (in the sense of limited symbolic elements), then that exceptional technical sense was imposed on the phrase by the worshipping community.

With this in mind let’s look at the first of the texts, Acts 2:42, 46: “They devoted themselves . . . to the breaking of bread . . . And day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes, they partook of food with glad and generous hearts.” Two expressions require definition: “breaking bread” and “food.” Do they refer to different acts of eating, and, if so, did the two take place within the same “service”? Does one or the other of these terms refer to the Agape (or love-feast) which is mentioned elsewhere in the Bible and in early Christian literature? Does “breaking bread” denote the Lord’s supper as we eat it today, and does it necessarily have the same meaning in both verses? If the word “food” is this text refers, as Ernst Haenchen says, to “substantial repasts,” what obligation does that fact lay upon the church today?

It is not easy to answer these questions, and, as we might expect, there is a lack of consensus among commentators, but the strong body of opinion which prevails is well summarized by Barclay Newman and Eugene Burnside, who is generally agreed that these fellowship meals [TEV’s rendering of “the breaking of bread”] were common meals . . . followed by the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. . . . In view of the fact that the agape (the fellowship meal) did involve the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, it would be entirely appropriate to have a marginal note to explain the precise nature of these meals, which were so characteristic of the believing community” (A Translator’s Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles). Eugene Burnside reaches the same conclusion, perhaps to all three, if we are to gather from ver. 46 that they took the principal meal of the day in each other’s house, observing the Lord’s Supper each time they did so.” Burnside holds that this breaking of bread was “a daily occurrence.” In his commentary on the English text he states that their observance of the Lord’s Supper “appears to have formed part of an ordinary meal.”

Finally I ask you to listen to F.F. Bruce, who has written three commentaries on Acts. In his volume on the Greek text he asks, “Is the reference here [in Acts 2:43] to the Eucharist, to an Agape, or to an ordinary meal? Perhaps to all three, if we are to gather from ver. 46 that they took the principal meal of the day in each other’s house, observing the Lord’s Supper each time they did so.” Bruce holds that this breaking of bread was “a daily occurrence.” In his commentary on the English text he states that their observance of the Lord’s Supper appears to have formed part of an ordinary meal. You may wish to pause at this point and reflect on what the pattern for eating the Lord’s supper would be if it were based solely on the second chapter of Acts. You might even want to ponder the thought that a point of view which is supported by scholars of such stature as those cited above would at the very least not be considered
unreasonable. But there are two other Scriptures which we must take into account.

The second passage which is supposed to provide us with a pattern for eating the Lord’s supper is Acts 20:7: “On the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul talked with them . . .” This text should be placed alongside the statement in verse 11 that “when Paul had gone up and broken bread and eaten, he conversed with them a long while . . .” If “break bread” means “eat the Lord’s supper,” as is commonly assumed, then notice what happens when we read the text that way: “when Paul had eaten the Lord’s supper and eaten . . .”

But are two kinds of eating referred to in this scripture? A “yes” answer seems inescapable. The two aorist participles in verse 11 appear to denote two distinct acts of eating. Regarding the one rendered “eaten” (Greek geusamenos) F.F. Bruce says, “This refers to their taking food in addition to the eucharistic breaking of the bread” (New Bible Commentary). A fuller statement, which will be appreciated by those who read Greek, appears in a footnote in his New International Commentary: “In v. 11 klasas ton arton (where the article points back to klasai arton in v. 7) refers to the eucharistic breaking of the bread, while geusamenos refers to the fellowship meal.”

Regarding geusamenos (lit. “having eaten”) R.B. Rackham says that “we may not unreasonably infer that by its use here he alludes to the Agape, which would in that case have followed the Eucharist.” J.R. Lamy’s comment is in the same direction: “i.e., partaken of the more substantial meal of the ‘Agape.’” W. F. Burnham agrees: “After the Eucharist he partook of some food.”

R.C.H. Lenski asserts that the brethren in Troas met “not merely to dine together but to dine in the Agape which was followed by the Lord’s Supper in the usual manner of the time.” This is supported by Henry Alford: “The breaking of bread in the Holy Communion was at this time inseparable from the agape or love-feasts. . . . The agape was a veritable meal.” William Barclay also thinks of a real meal, adding, “During it or at the end of it the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was observed.” And, finally, F.J. Foakes-Jackson comments, “We may suppose that the breaking of bread was eucharistic, and that it was here followed by a regular meal preliminary to the departure of the apostle.”

It may be argued, of course, that the expression “to break bread” in this context refers merely to the opening act of the Lord’s supper, and that the words “and eaten” would only indicate the completion of what was started by that initial act. But the apparently broader use of the term in verse 7 makes this highly improbable. It is much more likely that two kinds of eating are mentioned in the passage and that there is no question about the propriety of either one. This would not necessarily mean that other churches followed the same practice, or even that this was always done at Troas, but it does mean that if sound exegesis of the passage does yield a pattern for eating the Lord’s supper, it must be a broader one than is often supposed.

In the third text, I Corinthians 11, we find nothing inconsistent with the interpretations already cited. The abuses of fellowship with which the chapter deals are indicated in verses 20-22: “When you meet together, it is not the Lord’s supper that you eat. For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another is drunk. What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God and humble those who have nothing?

Their error was not in eating a supper, but in eating in such a way that there was no real communion, the kind of eating in which one went ahead with his own (as opposed to the Lord’s) supper. The absurd result that while one became intoxicated, another was left hungry. This could hardly be called a fellowship meal! It took no account of the body, it humiliated the poor, and it was merely eating and drinking which could be done at home.

Paul’s remedy for this blight on the body was not to ban all meals, but to ban those which were not fellowship meals: “When you come together to eat, wait for one another.” And what if one was too hungry to wait? Then, said Paul, “let him eat at home.” Otherwise they would come together to be condemned. They did not need to change the nature, or the quantity, of the food served, but they had to recognize that the church is a body and that communion is not just something to be set on a table.

But this stress on fellowship recedes into the background when we begin to build parties around specific ways of eating the Lord’s supper. Which is why I participate in this discussion. I have no desire to tear down traditions except insofar as those traditions tear down brotherhood. But when an act which lies at the very heart of the church’s unity so often becomes an occasion for its division, we should at least be open to the idea that we just might have been doing something wrong.

Thinking About Dr. King

ROBERT M. RANDOLPH
Wellesley, Massachusetts

This past week we celebrated Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday at Dana Hall. It was a moving experience for those there, and one of the most moving was the service itself. After the service was over I asked people to respond with what they remembered about Dr. King. I included this opportunity in the service because I knew that most of the students present knew very little about him. He had lived and died before most of them were conscious of the world about them.

As the adults present shared their memories the room became alive. One teacher remembered eating with Dr. King at a post-graduation luncheon in New Haven, and how impressed he had been with the man despite the fact that he was not a man of imposing appearance. He had a charisma that captivated those around him. Another woman remembered having Dr. and Mrs. King in her home and the beauty and charm that etched Mrs. King forever in her memory. Others responded, and finally one man brought this portion of the service to a close when he said that he thought Dr. King served for him as a model of what
a religious man or woman should be: motivated on behalf of his fellowman by the divine imperative, "Come and follow me." He was courageous in the face of uncertainty and threat, and selfless in the gift of time and intellect. What more could have been said?

I pondered his comment for a time, believing it true but unsure exactly why I felt as I did. Finally, it occurred to me that I would probably put it in a different way. The marks of the truly Christian man or woman may be the cause of some debate, but I would like to suggest to you three that seem to me to be a Christian, and a fourth that following his death. They had, and the marks of the truly religious person must have, caught the glimpse of a God-given vision. They have a vision to proclaim. They tell their history. And their experience on the face of uncertainty and threat, and of Tarsus and carried the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the far corners of the Greco-Roman world, so I am compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my home town. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Response
Response is the third characteristic of a life truly touched by God. The men and women who heard Peter on Pentecost not only heard the words, not only saw the reality behind the words, but they responded by asking what they had to do to be part of the proclaimed new kingdom. Their response involved baptism, reception of the Spirit’s gift and their proclamation of the vision they had seen and acted upon.

When Dr. King found himself the man on the spot in 1954, he had several choices. He might have refused to respond, and he could have gone on enjoying the fruits of his successful career. He might have played off the pent-up hatred of black people for an oppressive system and allowed his movement to express itself in violence and death. He chose the non-violent model. In his words: "The Negro turned his back on force not only because he knew he could not win his freedom through physical force, but also because he believed that through physical force he could lose his soul."

Closeness
There was in the early church another quality that was as important as the three I have mentioned. The new Christians continued in the apostle’s doctrine and the breaking of bread. They lived what the apostles had taught them, and they were together in fellowship. The term “breaking of bread” may in fact refer to the rite we call the