



(For access to all available commentaries and sermons of Charlie's click [HERE](#))

1 Corinthians

Now in giving these instructions I do not praise *you*, since you come together not for the better but for the worse. 1 Corinthians 11:17

In verse 2, Paul began his discourse on the head and head coverings with a word of praise -

"Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions just as I delivered *them* to you."

Now, he is transitioning to a new discourse, a most sensitive and important matter, which concerns the Lord's Supper. In this, he begins with "Now in giving these instructions, I do not praise *you*..." We know then that his coming words are words of instruction on a matter which require correction. He has gotten word concerning it and he isn't pleased with what he has heard.

The word "you" is not in the original. Rather it says, "Now in giving these instructions I do not praise..." The lack of praise isn't directed toward the people so much as it is directed toward the actions of the people. This is then set in contrast to verse 2 where he directly praised the people. Here, the actions of the people are not to be praised. And the reason is noted - "since you come together not for the better but for the worse."

The people are gathering, but the actions of the gathering are more harmful than edifying. He will explain this in the verses to come, but this verse has set the stage for it in a tactful and yet firm manner.

Life application: Paul's writing in 1 Corinthians 11 shows us a sound way of addressing others over delicate issues. He has praised the people but withheld praise from their actions. Additionally, he first began with praise and then moved to the withholding of praise. This sets a much more positive tone than immediately entering into rebuke; something which would only cause his readers to tune out at the beginning. We can and should learn from this style of approach.

For first of all, when you come together as a church, I hear that there are divisions among you, and in part I believe it. 1 Corinthians 11:18

Beginning with the word "for" connects this thought directly to what he just said - "...I do not praise *you*, since you come together not for the better but for the worse. For..." The issue he will mention is one which does not justify praise because their coming together is "not for the better but for the worse."

What seems a tad bit odd is that he says "first of all" but never explicitly states "secondly" or some other word to define a subsequent point. This isn't a problem, but it does imply that the issues he will raise were known to be separate issues. This is merely the first and most important of them. A second, separate, issue is that of the improper exercise of spiritual gifts, particularly that of speaking in tongues, which he will address starting in chapter 12.

For now though, the matter is something that occurs "when you come together as a church." This then isn't referring to a specific building which would be "in a church," but rather as a congregation wherever they happened to meet "as a church." Different locations would have been used instead of a single, regular meeting place. What was probably a common closing statement of the times would be something like, "Next week we'll meet at the house of Flavius Dwyerinius over on State street. The Lord bless you and keep you. See you then."

It was in such gatherings that Paul notes, "I hear that there are divisions among you, and in part I believe it." The word used for "divisions" is schisma. It is the same word he used in 1 Corinthians 1:10 when pleading that such divisions wouldn't exist among those in the church. A schisma, or schism, can be equated to a tear in a piece of cloth. It is something which completely divides. Paul had been informed that such tears in the fabric of their fellowship existed, but he graciously adds in, "and in part I believe it."

By including that, he is using tact. He knows full well that they exist because of the reports, but he is also showing them that evil reports are always to be taken with a grain of salt unless they are confirmed. And this is true even when they come from someone of high integrity. He is therefore allowing in his words the thought that maybe things were actually not as bad as presented.

Life application: The Bible shows us in many instances and in various ways, that we should not listen to those who divide the church on purpose. Murmurings and grumblings must be backed up with evidence and those who present untruths need to be called out for their actions. If necessary, they should be expelled from the church. However, true reports need to be addressed and corrected as well.

For there must also be factions among you, that those who are approved may be recognized among you. 1 Corinthians 11:19

Paul had just said, "when you come together as a church, I hear that there are divisions among you." After that he said, "and in part I believe it." Immediately after that, he begins this verse with "for." The word in Greek is *dei*. It implies "because." It is the logical outcropping of any such type of assembly that "there must also be factions among you." In other words, there will inevitably be sects or divisions within the congregation which will spring up.

An interesting confirmation of this is found in the book of Acts. From Acts 1-12 the Jewish church is highlighted and the focus is heavily on Peter. However, from Acts 13-28, the Gentile church is highlighted and the focus is almost exclusively on

Paul and his ministry. Read the following seven sets of verses from Acts, noting the same term "one accord" in each -

*These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brothers. Acts 1:14

*When the Day of Pentecost had fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. Acts 2:1

*So continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they ate their food with gladness and simplicity of heart, Acts 2:46

*So when they heard that, they raised their voice to God with one accord and said: "Lord, You are God, who made heaven and earth and the sea, and all that is in them, Acts 4:24

*And through the hands of the apostles many signs and wonders were done among the people. And they were all with one accord in Solomon's Porch. Acts 5:12

*And the multitudes with one accord heeded the things spoken by Philip, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. Acts 8:6

*it seemed good to us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men to you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, Acts 15:25

Seven times this term "one accord" is used. The last such occurrence was in 15:25 at the Council in Jerusalem. After that, the term is never used again in the book of Acts. It was a common trait of the early Jewish church; it is a trait which is completely lacking in the developing Gentile church. It can be understood from this that it was expected and recorded early that the Gentile church agreed (and continues to agree) on very little.

Paul's words show us that such factions exist because it is inevitable that they would exist. It is no surprise to God and it is actually a necessary outcropping of the Gentile church. If there were harmony in all the churches and that harmony included actual heresy, then everyone would be participating in heresy. At this

time, the Roman Catholic Church, for example, is riddled with bad doctrine and outright anti-biblical practices. If they were "the church" then everyone would be in the same boat.

If this were the case, then the only expected result would be complete judgment on the church, the entire church - just as there was on the nation of Israel and on the temple when they followed that same path of apostasy. But rather, in Revelation, Jesus is noted as walking among the lampstands (which represent the churches) and when one church falls to a level of apostasy where it is no longer a church, He removes its lampstand, signifying that He no longer considers it a valid entity. (See Revelation 21-2:5).

It is an ingenious system of protecting the church throughout the Church Age. In seeing these factions, the people could then research and see "those who are approved may be recognized among you." A classic example of this is the Protestant Reformation. There was a schism in the church which necessitated seeing who was in fact approved by God (meaning who was adhering to the word), and who wasn't. This cycle is repeated often as churches move away from Scripture and new leaders arise who hold fast to its truths.

Life application: God knew in advance what would occur within the church and He gave us many interesting clues to show us this. He also expects us to pay attention and to cling fast to those who hold to Scripture, not deviating from its precepts. To fail to do so will only lead to not being approved by Him and to being rejected as a body of believers.

Therefore when you come together in one place, it is not to eat the Lord's Supper. 1 Corinthians 11:20

This verse leads to all kinds of theories and speculations about the taking of the Lord's Supper. It also leads to ideas which really miss the point. An example of this is that the term "supper" indicates an evening meal, which is when Christ shared the elements of the commemoration. Therefore, some have claimed that the

evening is the proper time to participate in the memorial. The point of coming together for it, however, isn't one of "time of day" but rather in remembrance of the work of the Lord.

To insist on commemorating the ordinance in the evening adds in a level of legalism which is unnecessary. Paul's point in this discussion, like the previous issue concerning head coverings, is that of propriety of conduct. In verse 18, he noted the divisions which he had been informed of. Then in verse 19 he gave the seemingly unrelated note that "there must also be factions among you, that those who are approved may be recognized among you." This isn't unrelated, but the explanation won't be fully realized until later in the discussion. "Who are approved" are those who are acting properly. If they are "recognized among you" then the opposite would be true, and those who weren't approved would be known for their improper actions.

But for now, Paul begins with "therefore" to show that he is building upon what he said. It is tied to the "factions" he mentioned along with the actions of the people within the factions. Because of these things, he notes that "when you come together in one place, it is not to eat the Lord's Supper." Instead of what they should be demonstrating, a united group who are there to remember the work of the Lord and to commemorate it, there is disharmony. This will be seen in the coming verses.

Life application: The ultimate aim of church meetings isn't to satisfy oneself. Nor should there be divisions over matters in order for some to attempt to be exalted in the eyes of others. Rather, the aim of gatherings is to exalt and glorify the Lord. Anytime a gathering occurs that isn't directed toward that goal, something else will inevitably fill the void and it will lead to disharmony, not unity.

For in eating, each one takes his own supper ahead of *others*; and one is hungry and another is drunk. 1 Corinthians 11:21

In the previous verse, it was noted that when they came together, it wasn't in the manner of the Lord's Supper (literally - "it is not to eat the Lord's Supper.") Paul now explains why this is so. In evaluating it, all we need to do is think of a modern "potluck supper."

"For in eating, each one takes his own supper ahead of *others*." Instead of bringing along the food and leaving it for all to share in (which is what the known customs of the time reveal) the people would get right into the food they brought, thus there wasn't a fellowship in the meal, but rather a sense of greediness in it. People were just diving in to make sure they got a full belly, regardless of what others received.

Because of this, the result was that "one is hungry and another is drunk." The contrasts are obvious. One person who may have been poor and couldn't bring much was left with an empty stomach; the other who got right into the meal overindulged and got "drunk." As hunger implies deprivation and as drunkenness implies over-indulgence, the two are noted to highlight the situation. Because there was a lack of fellowship and sharing, it thus could not be the Lord's Supper of which they partook. Rather, it was a feast of self-interest, not humble remembrance.

A final point on this verse is that the word "drunk" is the Greek word *methuó*. It means exactly as translated, "drunk." In an honest evaluation of the passage, it can be taken in no other way. Although highly unpalatable to many, the obvious conclusion to be made is that the gatherings of the early church included alcohol. Whether this was acceptable or not will be realized in verse 22. The conclusion is obvious from the text itself.

Life application: It is proper to objectively evaluate issues found in the Bible without inserting presuppositions about the matter at hand. In other words, we are to "let the chips fall where they may." Only then can we be considered to properly handle and rightly divide the word of God.

What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God and shame those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I do not praise *you*. 1 Corinthians 11:22

This verse, coupled with the previous verse, is intended as one very strong rebuke of this particular practice of the Corinthians. They were meeting at their observance in a way which disregarded the holy nature of the meal. In his astonishment at their conduct towards one another, he says "What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in?" In other words, "If you want to engage in a feast, isn't that a better place to do it? Why would you bring food to this gathering and then sit and gobble it up in front of those you are supposed to be fellowshipping with?"

This then leads to the next obvious thought, "Or do you despise the church of God and shame those who have nothing?" The intent of the gathering was first and foremost to remember the work of the Lord. Secondly, if there was to be a meal, it was intended that those with much should bring something along for those who had little or nothing. These poorer brethren probably didn't even have their own homes, making the contrast all the more poignant. But instead of sharing, people would sit down and eat and drink what they had brought. If this was the attitude, then they should just stay home and eat and drink.

Based on this, his obvious questioning comes forth - "What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I do not praise *you*." Their actions could not be condoned. Christ came to serve others and left the example for us to follow. This concept of serving and sharing was lost during their feasts and left Paul with no choice but to write his words of correction concerning the matter.

As a side issue which is necessary for proper doctrine on an important topic, it should be noted in this verse that Paul never rebukes the gatherers for the notion that "another is drunk" which he stated in the previous verse. In other words, the fact that they had consumed alcohol isn't even addressed. Instead, he tells them to simply eat and drink at home if they were to handle the other issue (that of over-indulging at the expense of others) in an inappropriate manner. If one were

to find fault in this verse for drinking alcohol (as many scholars attempt to do) then they must also find fault for them eating food as well, which would be ludicrous.

The subject of drinking has divided many churches. However, if it is looked at from an objective viewpoint, there can be only one obvious conclusion as to whether it is acceptable or not. Unfortunately, personal passions about subjects such as this inevitably lead to false interpretations of Scripture.

Life application: Whatever you do, do it to the glory of God and without harming others in the process.

For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you: that the Lord Jesus on the *same* night in which He was betrayed took bread;

1 Corinthians 11:23

Because of the error of the gatherers at the observance of the Lord's Supper, Paul now takes time to spell out the solemnity which the occasion deserves. And so he begins with, "For I received from the Lord." This means with all certainty that Paul was told directly from the risen Christ about the events of the night before His crucifixion. This very well may have occurred while he was in Arabia (see Galatians 1:17) during a time of personal instruction because of his calling and commission as "the Apostle to the Gentiles." The fact that the "I" is emphatic and singular shows that this was not passed to him by another, but by Christ Himself.

"That which I also delivered to you" indicates that he had already instructed the Corinthians on this matter when he was present with them. The letter he received told him that his words were not acted upon, and so the letter includes this instruction to be maintained as proper doctrine. If followed, error wouldn't creep in again as it had. Unfortunately, even though we have the letter included in the Bible, error still creeps into this most solemn ceremony. However, correction is available by merely opening the Bible and reading it. How sad it is that this simple procedure is so enormously neglected or mishandled!

"That the Lord Jesus" is given to show believers that the ordinance was instituted by the Lord Himself. Further, it is exclusively of the Lord. He didn't ask one of the disciples to conduct the affair for Him. Rather, the entire ordinance is of Him.

"On the *same* night in which He was betrayed" is an account which is recorded in various ways in the four gospels. However, the description which most closely follows Paul's words here is that of Luke. With only a few minor variations, they match exactly. The only real differences are that Luke says "given for you" while Paul leaves out "given." Also Luke omits, "This do, as often as you drink *it* " after the giving of the cup. Despite this, they are implied in his words "in the same manner" during the giving of the bread.

Finally, it says He "took bread." This was at the time of the Passover. In the law, the Passover requirements say this -

"In the first *month*, on the fourteenth day of the month at evening, you shall eat unleavened bread, until the twenty-first day of the month at evening. ¹⁹ For seven days no leaven shall be found in your houses, since whoever eats what is leavened, that same person shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether *he is* a stranger or a native of the land. ²⁰ You shall eat nothing leavened; in all your dwellings you shall eat unleavened bread." Exodus 12:18-20

The bread which was consumed at the Passover was unleavened; it had no yeast. In the Bible, yeast pictures sin. Just as leaven makes bread rise, so sin puffs up an individual. The bread itself was a picture of the sinless Bread of Life, Christ. Because of this, it is proper to present unleavened bread at the observance of the Lord's Supper. This is not a legalistic addition to the rite, but rather it is what is proper and honoring to Christ. To use a common loaf of bread is to abuse the very picture which is being made in the ceremony.

Life application: Traditions are often one of the worst cancers in a church body. When a tradition is introduced and is elevated to the level of Scripture, then only a degradation of the sanctity of Scripture can occur. However, if a tradition finds

its roots in Scripture, it is proper and honoring of God - who gave Scripture, that we follow through with the tradition. How much more important then is proper adherence to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper! It is a tradition which is actually mandated by the Lord Himself.

How sweet and pleasant it is to come, O Lord, to Your table

To share in communion with You in the bread and cup

Yes, I will participate as often as I am able

And to have a time of reflection before we sup

I will think on You, my Lord, who died on that tree

I will think on the cross, where my sin was washed away

I will ponder the relation between You and me

And I will call to remembrance Your work; the price You did pay

Glory to You Lord, how You care for the sons of men

We will continue to fellowship at this table until You come again

...and when He had given thanks, He broke *it* and said, "Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me."

1 Corinthians 11:24

Paul continues with words of instruction concerning the Lord's Supper which he received from the Lord. On the night of His betrayal, He took bread and then gave thanks over it. A common form of thanks at such a time as this would have been -

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who brings forth bread from the earth."

This then is a picture of the coming resurrection of Christ. Though the Bread of Life would be laid in the tomb, He would come forth from the earth in victory. The term "had given thanks" is the Greek word *eucharistesas*, from which we derive the term Eucharist. Thus this is often called such. After the Eucharist, "He broke it." Bengel comments on this,

"The very mention of the breaking involves distribution and refutes the Corinthian plan - every man his own."

In other words, he is showing that the breaking of the bread implies parceling it out to all attendees. This is set in contrast to the improper attitude mentioned in 1 Corinthians 11:21 which said, "For in eating, each one takes his own supper ahead of *others*; and one is hungry and another is drunk."

Next, after breaking the bread, the Lord instructed them to "Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you." If nothing else (and there is more, but not as biblically explicit), these words show that the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is not only wrong, it isn't even well thought out. This teaching says that the elements given by the priests of the Roman Catholic Church literally become the body and blood of the Lord Jesus. In essence, one is literally eating His flesh each time that they take of the Communion. This is also similar to the doctrine of the Lutheran Church which teaches consubstantiation. It is similar to, but not quite the same as, the Roman Catholic teaching.

In refutation of this, Benson wisely notes the following -

"As the clause, which is broken, cannot be taken literally, because it would imply that Christ's body was broken, or put to death on the cross, at the time he said this, contrary to truth; so the clause, this is my body, cannot be taken literally: for the two clauses making but one proposition, if the clause, this is my body, which is the subject of the proposition, be interpreted literally, the predicate, which is broken for you, must be so likewise. Consequently the proposition will import,

that the bread in our Lord's hands was converted into a thing which at that time had no existence."

Said differently, if the bread is literally His body, then how could he hold it in His hands and say "This is My body?" Likewise, in breaking it, His own body would have then been broken at that time. Neither was the case. Rather, He was showing that the elements are symbolic representations of His body and blood, not the actual elements.

In closing this portion of the instruction, Paul finishes with, "do this in remembrance of Me." The word "do" is *poieie*. It means "be doing" or "continue doing." It is to be a common, continual practice when the church comes together. There is nothing wrong, and everything right, with continuing in this practice at every gathering. After all, it is in remembrance of the Lord Jesus which is the very purpose of gathering together in the first place.

Life application: The Lord's Supper is a symbolic remembrance of the work of the Lord. Be sure to participate in it as often as your church holds it. And if they don't hold it often, then show them the words of the Lord. What is frequently treated as an inconvenient side issue is actually the heart of where our faith and practice should lie.

In the same manner *He* also *took* the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink *it*, in remembrance of Me." 1 Corinthians 11:25

"In the same manner" is referring to the Lord's previous handling of the bread - its blessing, being broken, and being passed to the disciples. It is in this same manner that "*He* also *took* the cup after supper." The words "after supper" are used only by Luke in the gospels. It is an addition which is intended to mark a distinction between an ordinary meal and that of the Lord's Supper. And although it doesn't mention that He blessed the cup, He would have done so, just as He did with the bread. In the blessing, He would have spoken these words -

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, Creator of the fruit of the vine."

This again makes a picture. Christ calls Himself the "true Vine" in John 15:1. He then said to the disciples that they were the branches which bear fruit. The Creator of the fruit of the Vine then is a picture of the work of the Lord and of His work through those who belong to Him. As Paul notes in Ephesians 2:10, "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them."

The cup after the Lord's proclamation would have been shared with the disciples, and the proclamation is, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink *it*, in remembrance of Me." It is obvious, just as it was with the bread, that it is only a sign and a symbol of the work of Christ, not literally His blood. Therefore, both the bread and the wine are symbolic of the body and blood of the Lord, and also of the covenant which is ratified in Him.

The term "My blood" is being set in contradistinction to the blood offered in the Old Covenant of which the law was comprised. In Hebrew 9:11, 12 it says -

"But Christ came *as* High Priest of the good things to come, with the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation. Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption."

What the Law of Moses could never make perfect is realized in the shed blood of Jesus. Thus, the law is set aside by the work of Christ, completely and entirely. As Hebrews says again,

"In that He says, 'A new *covenant*,' He has made the first obsolete." Hebrews 8:13

The second supersedes the first, thus annulling it entirely. It is this marvelous work which we remember when we partake of the Lord's Supper. And the Lord says that this is to be done "as often as you drink *it*, in remembrance of Me." Anytime the church gathers, it is right and appropriate to partake of the Lord's table in remembrance of His great work which has obtained eternal redemption for His people.

Life application: When you come to the Lord's Table, it should be with the remembrance that it is His death which is being proclaimed. It was the highest price imaginable to restore us to God, so remember to partake of the elements with profound gratitude and respect.

For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes. 1 Corinthians 11:26

Christ's words of instruction to Paul have been completed and so he now states the word "for" to show that his words of explanation lie ahead. What Christ proclaimed has a purpose. As He said, "Do this in remembrance of me." Paul's "for" then is given to reiterate and fully explain this. Every time the Lord's Supper is held it is a memorial. And so "as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death."

It is an open proclamation that we believe that Christ died for us. As He is Lord, and as He died, then this is the only possible explanation. Being the Lord implies sinless perfection. As "the wages of sin is death," then His death must have come as a payment for sin, but not His own. In other words, He is our substitutionary atonement. Further, it implies that His righteousness (in that He has not sinned) is imputed to us. What would be the point of Him dying if this were not the case? There would be none.

Therefore, this is our proclamation. We are to participate in the Lord's Supper, acknowledging His work on our behalf "till He comes." Whether Christ's return was expected in a short time after His ascension, or whether it will be ten

thousand years from today, we are to continue making this solemn proclamation until that time.

Of note is the fact that the Lord's Table doesn't explicitly include the resurrection. It doesn't say "you proclaim the Lord's death and resurrection till he comes." The death of Christ implies substitution. If He is coming again, it implies that He has risen and ascended. As this is true, it therefore implies that if His righteousness is imputed to us, and that we will, in fact, rise again. In other words, the Lord's Table is a table of faith.

We are placing our hope and trust in the promises of Scripture that they contain the truth concerning the work of the Lord and the return of the Lord. If Scripture isn't the word of God, then we are truly to be pitied. If it is, then nothing can separate us from the surety of the promises which the Lord's Table implies - Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again, and we will be like Him at that time. We will be given eternal life and all of the promises of the Word of God will be realized in us at that time!

Finally and once again, in this verse we see the nonsensical nature of the Roman Catholic teaching of transubstantiation (the bread and wine literally becoming Christ's flesh). Paul said, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup..." He does not say, nor does he imply, that we are eating the Lord's body or drinking His blood. Instead, just as was seen in the words of Jesus, the bread and wine are symbolic of His work, nothing more.

Life application: Participating in the Table of the Lord implies that the words of Scripture concerning Christ are true, accurate, and complete. If you cannot accept the words of the Bible, then how can you accept the truth which the Lord's Supper promises? The very hope of heaven itself is tied up in the surety of God's word. Have faith that the Bible is absolute truth.

Therefore whoever eats this bread or drinks *this* cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

1 Corinthians 11:27

"Therefore" is given for a mental review of what Paul has already laid out concerning the Lord's Supper -

- 1) The Lord Jesus shows that partaking in the bread is given as a symbolic remembrance of His broken body.
- 2) He shows that partaking in the cup is given as a symbolic remembrance of His shed blood.
- 3) In taking the elements, one is making a proclamation of the Lord's death till He comes.

Thus "therefore" has been given to reflect on this. Understanding this then, "whoever eats this bread or drinks *this* cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Some translations incorrectly say "whoever eats *this* bread **and** drinks this cup." The conjunction is "or" not "and." During the Lord's Supper, partaking of either element demands the same respectful attitude when received.

Also, note that Paul uses the term "bread" not "flesh." The continued use of the word bread, even at the point of consumption by an individual, shows that it was, is, and remains bread. It does not somehow transmute into the actual body of the Lord, even when received. The same is true with the cup. It does not become the Lord's literal blood. Were it so, Paul would have said so in this verse as an indication of it. This is of the highest importance to understand and remember because the Christian is not re-enacting a bloody sacrifice. Instead, he is remembering one, once for all time.

Next, the words "unworthy manner" are appropriate. The word in Greek is *anaxios* which is an adverb; unworthily. Those who don't partake of the Lord's Supper because they have done something wrong which makes them believe they are unworthy have misunderstood what is being conveyed and should be

corrected. All people, even those who seem the epitome of piety and self-control, are inherently unworthy of this honor. Were "worthiness" a consideration in partaking of the Lord's Supper, there would be no Lord's Supper.

Rather, it is those who flippantly receive the elements, or who treat them in an unholy manner, who are being spoken of. The sacredness of the ritual, not the state of the individual, is what is being spoken of here. To come with arrogance, to mock the ritual, or to conduct oneself in an impious manner are reasons for guilt. And the guilt bears a penalty. The term for "guilty" is *enochos*. It essentially means "liable to penalty." They have committed a personal crime deserving of punishment.

Life application: The Lord's Table is a solemn remembrance of the death of Jesus Christ. It should be conducted with a sense of dignity and in a most pious manner. Likewise, it should be received with gratitude, a holy demeanor, and in a way which honors the greatest deed which has ever occurred in human existence.