

This is a very important section of the Bible. It's not easy, but it's very important and I would call this section 'Dining with Diety vs Dining with Demons'. Let me ask you a question or two. According to our study up to this point, is there such a thing as an idol? Say an idol God that people worship. Are idols real? Idol God? They exist - no, they do not exist. Paul says they do not exist, in 1 Cor. 8: 4 (read) so the idol, of course, is non-existent.

All right, let me ask you this question - are demons real? Do they exist? How many of you think demons - that they're real? How many of you think they are not real? Surely, they are real. Is there any relationship between idol worship and the activity of demons? You think there is. How many of you think there is a relationship between the worship of idols and demon activity, raise your hand. That's what Paul is talking about tonight. It is so very, very relevant. So VERY, VERY relevant! I hope that we can understand it but it's in the context of the Lords Supper.

He is pointing out to the Corinthians that it is impossible for him to commune with the blood and body of Jes. and at the same time, commune with demons. Or to sit at the table of the Lord or to sit at the table of demons. This is one of those sections of Scrip. that generally people just rush over rapidly and you don't hear much preaching on it, because it is not easy and yet, we KNOW in reading it, that Paul is getting at the very heart of the Lords Supper. In

10: 14

1 Cor. 10: 14 (read) 'wherefore means therefore'. Shun it, avoid it at all costs. In

V. 15 (read) I am speaking to you as sensible people. You be the judge - make up your minds, about what I'm saying. Now look at

V. 16 (read) the third cup of the Passover was the Cup of Blessing and Jes. instituted the Lords Supper in the midst of the Passover and I've often thought He must have done it at the time of the third cup. 'The cup of blessing (or of Thanksgiving) which we bless (or for which

we give thanks) is it not the communion (now the word 'communion' there is the word 'kornea', participation, sharing). Is it not the sharing in or the participation in the blood of Christ? The break which we break, is it not the communion (there's your word again - is it not participation or sharing in) the body of Christ?

There have been three historic positions on the Lords Supper. All three of which, I believe, are false. I. There is the Catholic position - how many of you were reared Catholics, raise your hands. Well, Tony, I'm sure whether you heard the big word or not, that if you went to Mass, you were taught that in the miracle of the Mass, that the juice becomes the blood and the bread becomes the very flesh of Jes. This is called 'trans-substiation' which means a change of the elements - of the very elements - into the literal blood and body of Christ. It's good for us to know this, because you see, this is the reason that the Mass is so important in the Roman church.

This is the reason the Pope, all over the world, is celebrating Mass. Because the Romans church believed in trans-substiation. Well, I do not believe in this and I think we ought to always shy away from magic. There is a thin line between super-naturalism and the miraculous and the magic. When we get into magic, we're in trouble in Xtnity. I would urge you never to be a part of that which is magical, if you understand it. Then, there is the view of what we call

II. CON-SUBSTANTIATION and this is the Luthern view. You see, this con - it means with the substance and this is a strange view that Christ is in the elements. That He is - His very presence is in the ~~ax~~ wafer, in the juice. I've never quite understood where Luther got that. I think that he was trying to get away from Catholicism but that is his view. His con-substiation. But there's a third view and this has been, basically, Baptist and the free church and just to keep the 'tions', I've called it

III. IMAGINATION. By that, I mean that there's been a view that in the Lords Supper we simply imagine, in our mind, or you could call it 'Memorization' - we imagine in our minds

what happened and that's all the Lords Supper is. I do not believe that and I do not believe it because Paul is saying (V. 16) the Lords Supper is the participation in the blood of Christ and it's also participation in the body of Christ. Now we could say 'well, we take the Lords Supper, we testify to the cleansing in the blood and being a part of the body' but that is not what Paul's saying. Paul is indicating something that is present and something that is real in the life of the believer and he's actually referring to sanctification rather than justification.

I don't think that I will ever unravel this verse - or any one else - but I BELIEVE that IN the sharing of the Lords Supper, that the Lord manifests His power and His sanctifying Grace to His people. That there is a sharing in the merits of His blood and there is a sharing in His body - His living body. And I believe it's more than imagination. I don't think it's trans-substantiation. I don't believe it's con-substantiation and I don't know what I would call it. Paul calls it 'a sharing IN the blood of Christ and in the body of Christ.

Now, my conviction is further strengthened when he compares this sharing in Christ with demon worship. He says 'when we share IN Christ (in the Lords supper - in His blood) it would be impossible for us at the same time to participate in the worship of demons. Which says to me that the Lords Supper is far more serious than just our imagination and far more serious than our memorization. So I just want you to think of this. Now he goes on to say in

V. 17 (read) in the Apostolic church I think they actually took from one common loaf and one cup and I think it's appropriate that we do that today. To indicate our oneness. Not only does the Lords Supper indicate that we're united with Jes., but it indicates that we are united to every child of God in the world. There's only one loaf and there's only one cup. That's what he's saying in V. 17.

V. 18 (read) he says 'think of the practice of Israel in the flesh'. What he's saying there is 'the Levites, the Israelites, under the Old Cov., they were not just eating meat and food

at the altar; but they were actually worshipping the God represented by the altar. Now he's saying all of this to come to his definitive statement there in V. 21, and 22.

V. 19 (read) 'I'm not saying that the idols are real. He's already made that point in Chap. 8, but here's what he IS saying, in

V. 20 (read) Gentiles (or pagans). Well you know I thought there was just one devil but according to V. 20, there must be several. He says 'they sacrificed to devils and not to God, and I would not that ye should have fellowship with the devils'. Is there more than one devil? I thought there was only one devil! What is the answer here? Well, Meda, you have the answer? Is that what your Bible says? How many of your Bibles says 'devils' in V. 20? How many of your Bibles says 'demons'? How many of you are reading in the KJV? It says devils. How many of you are reading the non-KJV? Does it all say 'demons'? NIV says demons. Somebody have a translation?

The New KJ says demons. Alright. Does anybody have an NASV? What does it say? It is really demons he is talking ~~about~~ about. There's only ONE devil but how many demons are there? We don't know. There's plenty of them! He's making an amazing statement here in V. 20. He says, in V. 19, 'idols are non-existent' (he recognized that) but in V. 20 he says 'but I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice (and he's talking about sacrificing in their Temples) they sacrifice to demons and not to God; and I would/<sup>NOT</sup>that ye should have fellowship with demons'. Have any of you ever experienced anything like this?

Bro. Doug Van Devender, on the Mission Field, have you seen something that would shed light on this mysterious verse for us? Stand up and share it with us, Doug. Hm-m. Course Emanue (?) he's one of the greatest prayer men I've ever heard in my life. You all remember him - that prayer he prayed - I never will forget that. Anybody else - have you seen the work of demon power; have you experienced that. Oh, Mrs. Curtis, you've seen it? You want to say anything about it? You've seen it at Sparks? Where do we generally see it? Any of you been

involved in the occult? Jessie, you've been involved in the occult? Well, any real harm in the things you did - outwardly, did it look that harmful? What did you do? Could you share with us just briefly? Weijie Board? Well, is that that bad - these things, just on the surface? Do they look that bad? No. Well, what's the problem and what is Paul saying?

He says when you're involved in that, you're opening yourselves to demons. This is an interesting thing here. How about music? You think music might be a doorway for demons? Bro. Paul Gean, you remember when we were in Bangkok and went to the power pole and saw the people bowed down? Remember in Bangkok when we went to the Buddhist Temple? Especially the lady and Dr. Hill said 'she's probably seeking a child'? You know, I've never forgotten that experience. While they were worshipping the idol of Buddha and other things, you know I felt the power of demons.

I just felt strange indeed. I was glad when we went out of there. You remember? I think that's the closest thing to me - the nearest thing - that I remember. Paul is saying there are no idols but he says 'in the very act of offering the sacrifices to idols in the Temple, demons are behind this and the powers of darkness'. Then he goes on to say in

V. 21 (read) now we'll come back to this in just a few moments.

V. 22 (read) that is a reference back to Deut. - lets turn to us. That is a reference back to Deut. 32: 21 - at least I believe that's what it's referring back to. The Lord is speaking - Deut. 32: 21 (read) He's talking about idol worship, of the Jews. Now look at V. 22 in 1 Cor. 10 again (re-read). Apparently the Corinthians were saying 'now we can go into these idol temples and it's not gonna bother us. We know there's no such thing as an idol and we're free to do this and we don't want any restriction.

Paul is saying 'this doesn't you? It bothered God. Are you stronger stronger than God? That's his argument. Now, what would this be, if we applied this? There in V. 21 - 'ye

cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons'. The cup of the Lord is the communion of His blood and of His body and he says you cannot commune with His blood and body and at the same time, commune with the demons. What would be an example of that, in modern life? All right, that certainly would be a general explanation of it - Mrs. Partain says we cannot live in sin and partake of the Lords Supper. Now we COULD partake of the elements - right? We COULD eat some bread and we could drink some juice, but we could not REALLY commune with the blood and body of Christ, if we're living in sin.

But let's be more specific - let's just give a case of somebody. Suppose we're gonna take the Lords Supper on Sunday morning - all right. Iris says that if on Saturday night, they got drunk - that they could not come to the Lords Supper on Sunday and commune with the blood and body of Christ. Do you agree? But now that's something that's very obvious and kinda external and fleshly. What would be another example that might be even greater temptation to us? I ~~XXXX~~ don't think anybody here would drink alcohol on Sat. night, or would you? I hope not.

But how about something else on Sat. night? That might be. What defiles us? Well, Kenny mentions immorality. Could a person be immoral, say on Saturday night - we're just taking Sat. night, but of course, it could be any other night - and partake of the Lords Supper? Commune with the blood and body of Christ on Sunday? All right, you say unforgiveness. Yes. How COULD we, with unforgiveness in our heart, commune with the blood and body of Christ? I don't see how we could. This reason - that I really - the last time we served the Lords Supper I thought we needed to do it and I always like to announce it before hand.

So that we have time to examine our hearts and that we not come to it quickly or flippantly. Does one have to be perfect to commune with the blood and body of Christ? No. Paul does not say that. But he IS saying - and making a very dogmatic statement - that we CANNOT eat at the table of demons and also at the table of the Lord. That we CANNOT commune with the blood of Christ and commune with demons. That we simply cannot do this.

Dr. Lee used to say that you can't live skimmed milk during the week and preach cream on Sunday! That's a pretty graphic way to put it. Is the Lords Supper a serious discipline for the church? Do we look at it as a serious discipline or do we look at it as a ritual that we do once a quarter or say, once every two months or do we really look at it in the light that Paul is talking about? How about it? How many people really take the Lords Supper very, very serious? Say, you know you're gonna take it on Sunday, spend special time in prayer, in repentance, in confession and really prepare our hearts?

There's something very serious for us to think about. VERY serious. You can tell the level of the Spirituality and perception of a congregation in the way they receive the Lords Supper. Now, we're not Church of Christ, but there would be nothing wrong with partaking of the Lords Supper every Sunday if we could commune with the blood and body of Jes. It would be a great thing. And we're not Catholic and we're not Lutherans but we're N. T. Xtns and we need to take seriously what Paul is saying. The Lords Supper is MORE than our imagination.

It's more than a ritual. It is a sharing in a way that we can't ever understand, in the merit of Christs blood and of His body - the Church. To me, it's the Holiest moment there is in the life of the fellowship. Paul goes on in the following verses, to deal with any number of things that relate to the culture of that day but which are applicable to us today. I don't have time to expound them, but I'll just read, and comment briefly,

V. 23 (read) 'lawful (or permissable) now he's already said that in Chap. 6. He says 'let no man (V. 24 (read) 'wealth (or welfare). V. 25 (read) what's 'shambles'? Well, would you know that if you didn't - if somebody didn't know Greek and translated it? How many of you would have known what the shambles was - it was a market place? Would you have known that? Well, you see, here's the perfect answer to the person who says that we don't need any modern translation; we don't need anyone studying Greek. Now here's a shining example. 'Shambles'. I wouldn't have known what that meant unless I read it in Greek or read it in the NASV or NIV or something.

What's the New KJV Sam, what does it say? It says 'meat market'. The New KJV will correct these anakronisms(?) or these ancient words. V. 25: whatsoever is sold in the meat market, that eat, etc. V. 26 (read) where is he quoting from there? Ps. 24: 1. V. 27(read) 'bid you' (or invite you) to a feast' and that is, invite you out to a meal. Now he's talking about if an unbeliever invites you to a meal and evidently, where the food has been offered to idols, he says 'if it doesn't bother your conscious, there's no question, just go ahead'.

But look what he says in V. 28 (read) if anyone specifically tells you 'this is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it and for conscience sake (his conscience). He says if you're specifically told this was offered to idols, says 'go not eat'. Then he repeats what he said in V. 26 (however that is not in the original manuscripts, it's up there in V. 26. It would be out of place in V. 28).

V. 29 (read) and V. 30 - evidently Paul had eaten meat offered to idols and evidently he had been criticized and he is able to thank God and he says 'why am I judged? Why am I criticized? Then he lays down a tremendous principle in determining whether a thing is right or wrong. He says in V. 31 (read) now this is a real test of whether something is right or wrong. Another test if V. 32(read).

V. 33 (read) 'profit' (or good). Paul says there are three questions we need to ask of whether something is right or wrong:

1. Can we or do we glorify God in it? Well, really there would be four. If you take V. 30: Can I thank God for it? Can I actually thank God for this? (V. 30).

2. Does this glorify God? (V. 31). Notice he says 'whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, (and that includes everything from a meal to atomic energy - that includes EVERYTHING).

3. Does this cause anybody to stumble? (V. 32).



4. Will this make me a witness whereby I can win souls? (V. 33). Think of gambling which is an issue in our state. Can you thank God for gambling? Does gambling glorify God? Is gambling an offense to anybody? Would gambling help us to win souls? This is a pretty good test to determine whether a thing is right or whether it's wrong. If we can put it to these tests and it will pass.

Can you give thanks to God for things you're doing tonight? Are the things we're doing in our personal life, are they glorifying to God? Notice how Paul is concerned about winning people in V. 33 - 'even as I please all men in all things' is he saying there 'when in Rome, do as the Romans do'? Does Paul teach that? What is he teaching here? 'Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own good but the good of man, that they may be saved'.

What's wrong with this statement 'I'll do anything I want to; it's nobody's business'? You ever heard that? 'I'm a free American; I'll do anything I want to'. 'Go where I want to, say what I want to'. What's wrong with that statement or is it a good statement? Anybody? Can we do anything we want to? Even though it's right to us sometimes, we can't do some things because our witness is at stake.

Let's bow our heads - our time is up and we haven't had time to get into some of these verses.