

"The Church in the World:
Studies in 1 Corinthians" No. 13

"The Lord's Supper"

1 Cor.11:17-34

--CEFC 8/1/21; 5/17/98

It is an act known by many names--

the Eucharist, the Mass, or just Communion,

but in the New Testament, only one name is given--

the Lord's Supper.

And what to call it is only the beginning of the controversy

that has surrounded this practice of Christians

for nearly two thousand years.

I can remember one couple

who were youth leaders of the liberal church of my youth

who refused to participate in the Lord's Supper

because they saw it as a primitive re-enactment of a revolting blood sacrifice.

For some, it is nothing but superstitious mumbo-jumbo and hocus pocus.

In fact, the very term "hocus pocus" used as a magical incantation

is derived from the Latin words "*Hoc est corpus meam*"--

"This is my body"--

which in the medieval Mass was perceived as a kind of magical chant

transforming the bread and wine

into the very body and blood of Christ.

At the time of the Reformation,

it was controversy over the Lord's Supper, as much as anything else,
that kept the Protestants from being united in their opposition

to the church of Rome.

In Martin Luther's view,

the Lord Supper mysteriously presented the real presence of Christ

"in, with, and under" the elements of bread and wine,

while Ulrich Zwingli, the leader of the Swiss Reformation.

thought of the Supper as little more than a memorial meal.

They had a famous meeting in which they were to attempt

to reconcile their differences,

but when Luther arrived, he simply wrote on the blackboard

the words, "This is my body,"

and the German and Swiss churches never came together.

Calvin's Reformed Church tried unsuccessfully to reconcile the two

by asserting that in the Lord's Supper

the believer experiences the real spiritual presence of Christ by faith.

And that controversy continues today—

with views of the Lord's Supper all over the map,

and various views can be found among us in the Free Church.¹

But already in the time of the early church

this meal stirred up controversy.

In the second century, the Roman pagan Celsus

¹ See the exposition of Free Church views in *Evangelical Convictions*, chap. 8.

accused the Christians of cannibalism because of what he heard about it.

The early Christian agape feasts,

an early version of our "fellowship dinners,"

which were associated with the Lord's Supper,

were officially abolished by the Council of Carthage in A.D. 393

because of the abuses that too frequently occurred.

And way back during the New Testament period itself

we find problems associated with the observance

of this ordinance of the church.

For as we read in our passage this morning,

the church in Corinth was making a mess of things

in the mind of the Apostle Paul.

1 Cor. 11:17-- **"In the following directives I have no praise for you,**

for your meetings do more harm than good." he writes.

In other words, what you are doing is so off-based, so offensive,

it would probably be better if your church didn't meet at all.

He goes on--

"In the first place, I hear that when you come together as a church,

there are divisions among you, and to some extent I believe it.

Which was Paul's way of saying that it couldn't possibly be as bad

as the things I hear, could it?!

But no doubt, Paul says, even this is a part of God's testing process--

"... there have to be differences among you
to show which of you have God's approval. "

"When you come together, it is not the Lord's Supper you eat,"
though that is what you think you are doing.

No--"when you are eating,
some of you go ahead with your own private suppers."

As a consequence,
"One remains hungry, another gets drunk."

What's going on here?

The precise details elude us,
partly because of the ambiguity of some of Paul's terms,
but we may attempt a reconstruction based on a few clues that he gives us
and on what we know of the social customs of the day.

First, we have to recognize that the early Christians had no church buildings
to gather in,
but had to meet together in homes--
and only the wealthier members of the congregation
would have homes big enough for a large gathering.

So, for example, Paul, in his letter to the Romans,²
refers to a man named Gaius,
"who" Paul says,

² writing from Corinth?

"is host to me *and to the whole church*" (Rm. 16:23).

Archeological discoveries of the homes of the period tell us
that the dining room of such homes (the *triclinium*)
could only accommodate up to a dozen guests
reclining around a table,
and so the majority of the people
would have had to eat in the *atrium* or "courtyard,"
that could accommodate perhaps 30-50 people.³

In a city as class-conscious as Corinth,
it would have been very natural for the host
to invite those of his own social level
to eat with him in the dining room,
with the others--
many of whom were slaves or freed slaves--
remaining in the courtyard.

And not only were the guests divided by location,
but probably also by cuisine.

It was common practice for hosts at this time
to serve different guests different food based on their social status.

Pliny the Younger, a Roman writer of the second century,
describes his experience of dining as a guest of a man

³ Based on the number of the people Paul mentions by name, the number in the church could have been at least fifty.

who boasted of the "elegant economy" of his hospitality:

*The best dishes were set in front of himself and a select few,
and cheap scraps of food before the rest of the company.
He had even put the wine into tiny little flasks, divided into three categories,
not with the idea of giving his guests the opportunity of choosing,
but to make it impossible for them to refuse what they were given.
One lot was intended for himself and for us, another for his lesser friends
(all his friends were graded),
and the third for his and our freedmen. (Letters 2.6)*

It would be the rough equivalent of flying first class

as opposed to business class or coach.

Some understand Paul to be saying

that apparently the rich were eating their own meals as a part of the Lord's Supper

before the others of the congregation--the slaves and the freedmen--

were able to arrive.

Others, and I think this slightly more likely,

believe that the rich were simply eating their own meals

with no regard for the others in the congregation,

forgetting that they had come together as a church to share in the Lord's Supper.

This separation had resulted in extremes--

some, "the have-nots," received nothing to eat and went away hungry;

while others gorged themselves with food and drink,

having more than enough and so became drunk.

With this sorry state of affairs, Paul was indignant--

speaking to those wealthy members of the congregation he says,

If that is the way you are going to act,

"Don't you have [your own] homes to eat and drink in?

Or do you despise the church of God

by humiliating those who have nothing?"

What shall I say to you?

Shall I praise you? Certainly not in this matter!"

This kind of behavior was an insult to the church--

it signaled that the church of God meant nothing to them.

They saw this gathering like they saw any other--

as just another social function

in which their old social standards,

their old class distinctions

their old ways of dividing people into the valuable and the invaluable,

the useful and the expendable,

still held sway.

It makes me think of churches of the Jim Crow South

in which white and black believers were seated in areas that were kept separate

and were certainly not equal.

Something was deeply wrong with what was happening in Corinth.

Their celebration of the Lord's Supper was making a travesty

of what that celebration was supposed to mean.

So what does Paul do?

He seeks to correct the Corinthians by reminding them

what this meal, this Lord's Supper, is all about.

v. 23--"For I received from the Lord what I also passed on to you:

The Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, took bread,
and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said,

"This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me."

In the same way, after supper he took the cup, saying,

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood;

do this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me."

For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup,

you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes."

There are two aspects of this presentation that are especially important--

First, the Lord's Supper is a remembrance of Christ's death.

Jesus said, "Do this in remembrance of me."

"For," Paul adds, "whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup,
you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes."

Think about what was Jesus doing

when he gathered with his disciples

in that upper room on that night he was betrayed--

He was celebrating the Jewish Passover.

In that family celebration, the head of the house--a role which Jesus played--
would guide his household through a meal
with various blessings and readings
that renewed the memory of that single, defining moment
in the history of the people of Israel--
that night when the angel of death was to take the life of the first born
in every household in Egypt.

But that angel spared the houses of Israel
because they had sacrificed a lamb and put its blood on their doorposts.
When the angel saw the blood he "passed over" those houses,
because in those houses, a death had already taken place.

On that night, the Lord showed his power over life and death,
and on that next day the Israelites were set free
from their many long years of bondage.
They were liberated from slavery and began their exodus from Egypt
and their movement toward the land of God's promise.

In Exod. 12:14 Moses declared: "**This is a day you are to commemorate;
for the generations to come you shall celebrate it
as a festival to the LORD --a lasting ordinance.**"

And so every year, in every Jewish home, those events would be re-lived.
They would come alive in their minds,
and every new generation of Jews would understand themselves
as the ones whom God had rescued./

On that last night with his disciples,

Jesus took that Passover meal and gave it a new significance.

It now pointed to himself.

As he broke the bread, he gave it to them and said,

"This is my body, which is for you."

The picture is one of Jesus giving up himself for his people--

as that Passover lamb--

whose death substituted for the death of the firstborn of Israel.

And the cup was to point to Jesus' own blood,

poured out as a sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins.

This Christian meal is meant, in Paul's words,

to "**proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.**"

The meaning of the meal, then, is a proclamation of the gospel—

Its meaning is the same as

the fundamental message of Paul's preaching:

Christ crucified (2;1,2).

But of course, the Christ who died, was also raised and is coming again.

The Lord's Supper, then, is visible preaching, pointing us to **the cross**

and ultimately to the resurrection and return of Christ

and helping us to call to mind all that that means.

Pastor Steve Brown makes the comment:

"The world drinks to forget;

The Christian drinks to remember."⁴

But what exactly did Jesus mean when he gave them the bread
and said, "This is my body"?

The historical setting makes any literal rendering of "is"
in Jesus' statement incoherent.

No one reclining with Christ at the table would have thought he was saying
that the bread was somehow a literal extension of his flesh.

It was a picture--
a picture to help us keep in mind forever just what he was doing for us.

How many men, when going off to war, have given their wives or girlfriends
pictures of themselves as a remembrance until they returned.⁵

I was engaged when I went off to England for a year--
and I know Susan kept a picture of me prominently displayed
by her bedside.

"This is my fiancé Bill," she might say.

But it wasn't really me, of course,
though it did help to keep me present in her mind and heart.

So Jesus Christ has left such a memento of himself for his bride until he returns--
the bread and the cup.

⁴Cited in Colson, *The Body*, p. 127.

⁵ I owe this illustration to a sermon from Roy Clements at Eden Baptist Church in Cambridge, England.

But Christians through the ages have felt that there is more to it than that--

for Susan never ate that photograph of me.

Why do we eat the photograph, the memento of himself,

that Jesus has left behind for us?

What is the significance of our eating and drinking?

And why did the early Christians choose Sunday and not Friday

on which to celebrate this meal,

for it was on a Friday that he died?

The reason must be that there is more to this meal

than simply remembering Jesus death.

When we eat of the bread and drink of the cup we are also sharing in his life,

his resurrection life.

As we come to this table in faith,

by the work of the Spirit of God,

we celebrate our union with our Risen Lord.

It is a union vividly captured in the act of eating--

In John 6:53 Jesus puts it in such a graphic way that it is almost offensive--

"I tell you the truth, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man

and drink his blood, you have no life in you."

Jesus used organic imagery to describe our vital relationship with him--

"I am the vine, you are the branches"--

his very life flows through us.

Christians have affirmed that there is something special
about the Lord's Supper,
some would call it spiritual or even mystical.

In eating and drinking, though our faith in the gospel,
we identify with and actually have fellowship with Christ.

It doesn't just symbolize Christ's work for me;
through the Lord's Table, I actually experience Christ's work in me.

It doesn't just commemorate Christ's saving work;
in this meal I really do participate in it.

In this meal, God has given us a physical means,
not unlike preaching and prayer,
to nourish our faith
and to help us experience the spiritual reality of the gospel—
the gospel of the death of Christ for us
and his new life in us./

And related to that,

Paul emphasizes a second aspect of this meal here--

That is, **the Lord's Supper is a declaration of a New Covenant--**

a new relationship with God that Jesus' life, death and resurrection

now makes possible for us.

As we come to him in faith

we are joined to him--

such that what is true of him becomes true of us.

He takes our sin, and we receive his righteousness;

in union with Jesus the Son of God,

we become sons of God.

And this vertical dimension in our relationship with God

has a horizontal dimension in our relationships with one another.

For all who now have God as their Father

have each other as brothers and sisters.

If we are joined to Christ,

and what is true of him becomes true of us,

then we become the body of Christ in the world.

This New Covenant means a new community--

And when Jesus says, "**This cup is the new covenant in my blood,**"

he is pointing to that new covenant community, **the church.**

So do you see what Paul has done?

He has done the same thing in dealing with this problem in the church

as he has with several other problems that he dealt with earlier in the letter.

To deal with the practical problems arising in the life of the church,

Paul takes them back to the gospel-

-

the good news of Jesus' death and resurrection.

In their abuse of one another in the way some were humiliating others

with regard to food and drink,

Paul says they were denying the very meaning of the meal
they thought they were celebrating.

They were not living according to the gospel.

Jesus gave his own life for you--
and some of you in Corinth were not even sharing your food
with others in the church.

And in dying for us,
Jesus was creating a new covenant people--the body of Christ,
a people united in him in which there is neither Jew nor Greek,
slave nor free, male nor female.

But they were maintaining the same old social lines of class distinction
in their gathering.

You could say that when they were coming together,
they weren't "coming together" at all.

They were divided into social cliques--
with the rich and the poor splintered off
into their own sequestered sections of the meeting place--
some enjoying abundance, the others having nothing.

It was shameful behavior--
a denial of all that the Lord's Supper was meant to display.

I appreciate the perception of Dietrich Bonhoeffer in this matter of community--

He wrote, "Not what a man is in himself as a Christian,
his spirituality and piety, constitutes the basis of our community.

What determines our brotherhood is what that man is by reason of Christ.

Our community with one another consists solely
in what Christ has done for both of us."⁶

“Our community with one another consists solely
in what Christ has done for both of us”—

Our family bond is deeper than any difference in our economic status
or our educational level,
or our race or ethnicity or political party affiliation,
or, dare I say it, whether we agree with some covid mask policy.

“Our community with one another consists solely
in what Christ has done for both of us.”

That's why our unity as a church ought to be evident
especially in our sharing in the Lord's Supper.
For it is precisely there that we focus on what Christ has done for all of us.

Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper
involves more than just one's own individual state before God;
it also includes the corporate life of the church.

v. 27--"So then, whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord
in an unworthy manner
will be guilty of sinning against the body and blood of the Lord.
Everyone ought to examine themselves

⁶Cited in Peterson, *Long Obedience*, p. 175.

before they eat of the bread and drink from the cup."

What does it mean to share in this meal in an "unworthy manner"?

First, let me tell you two things that it doesn't mean.

It doesn't mean that we have to prove ourselves to be *morally worthy people*
to share in the Lord's Supper.

For the truth is,

no one is worthy.

For how good do you think you would have to be

to be good enough for Jesus Christ the Son of God die for you?

The silliness of it is evident even in asking the question--

for why would Christ need to die for you, if you were good enough.

Paul writes in 1Tim. 1:15--

"Here is a trustworthy saying that deserves full acceptance:

Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners --of whom I am the worst."

So much for being worthy.

Didn't Jesus commend the faith of the Roman centurion

who confessed that he was unworthy

for Jesus to come under his roof?

And didn't Jesus tell a story about someone who thought he was worthy--

it was the story of a self-righteous Pharisee,

who boldly stood to pray

and thanked God he wasn't like all those other people--
robbers, evil doers, adulterers and even like the sinful tax gatherers.

Then Jesus spoke of a despised tax collector who would not even look up to heaven
but beat his breast and said, "**God, have mercy on me, a sinner.**"

Now which of those two did Jesus say went home justified?

And which of those two would Jesus welcome to his table?

The one who knew he was unworthy.

No, sharing in the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner couldn't mean
that you have to prove yourself to be a worthy person.
Quite the opposite—this supper is for sinners.

But does that mean that everyone should share in this meal
regardless of their moral or spiritual state?

That's the mistake that some people make,
and I see it expressed in some of the current arguments in the press
about whether anyone should be denied communion in the Catholic Church.

If one's moral state or behavior has no bearing on participating in this meal
then what is Paul so upset about here?

Earlier in the letter, Paul urged the Corinthians to exclude from their midst altogether
a man involved in a sexual relationship with his stepmother.

And he is adamant that one who is joined to the body of Christ
ought not to be joined bodily to a prostitute.

And he says, you can't join in both the table of idols in the pagan temple

and in the Lord's table in the church.

The point is that you don't come to this table because you are worthy;
you come because you recognize that you aren't,
and you come humbly recognizing your need of God's mercy—
saying, like that tax-collector, "God, have mercy on me a sinner."

In confessing your sin,
you are agreeing with God about what is good and right,
and you are admitting that you have been in the wrong
and you want his help to do what is right.

No one should come to this table without that humble spirit of a repentant sinner. /

And more specifically, eating and drinking in an unworthy manner,
and being **guilty of sinning against the body and blood of the Lord**
in the context of our passage
must relate to what Paul says in v. 29--

**"For anyone who eats and drinks without recognizing the body of the Lord
eats and drinks judgment on himself."**

"recognizing the body of the Lord"--

he's not talking about distinguishing the elements of the Eucharist
as the real flesh and real blood of Christ.

That's totally foreign to the context.

Most likely, the term "**body**" deliberately recalls Paul's interpretation of the bread

back in 10:17--

"Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body,

for we all partake of the one loaf."

That one loaf pictures the one body of the church.

And that image of the body

is going to be used extensively in chap. 12 in this same way

to picture the life of the church as the body of Christ.

Paul is telling the Corinthians that when they come together as a church,

they must recognize that the Lord's Supper is not just any meal--

it is *the* meal--

the meal at which, at a common table, through the one loaf and the common cup,

they are proclaiming that through the death of Christ

they together are one body, the body of Christ.

They aren't just any group gathered together--

they must recognize the special character of this one body,

and they must act in a way consistent with that recognition.

Not to do so is to eat and drink in an unworthy manner.

To treat other Christians as second-class citizens in the redeemed community

is an insult to the Lord himself,

who loves them as much as you,

and who died for them just as he died for you.

As Paul had said back in 8:12--

"When you sin against your [brothers or sisters] in this way ...,

you sin against Christ."

When we come to this table should examine ourselves especially with regard to
how we are treating the members of that body.

I think of the words of Jesus in Matt. 5:23--

**"Therefore, if you are offering your gift at the altar
and there remember that your brother has something against you,
leave your gift there in front of the altar.**

First go and be reconciled to your brother; then come and offer your gift."

Or the words of Paul in Eph. 4:1--

**"As a prisoner for the Lord, then, I urge you to live a life
worthy of the calling you have received.**

**Be completely humble and gentle;
be patient, bearing with one another in love.**

Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace.

**There is one body and one Spirit--
just as you were called to one hope when you were called--
one Lord, one faith, one baptism;
one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all."**

How we need to hear these words,

for never in my thirty-five years as a pastor

have I felt the divisions in our culture—and even among Christians—

to be so fractious and contentious.

Lord, help us!

The issue here is not recognizing the physical body of Christ in the bread,

but recognizing the spiritual body of Christ in the church,
the gathering of believers.

Christ is now embodied in his people,
and it is around the Lord's Table that that reality is to be most evident.

This, of course, is a direct affront to our American individualism.

To be a Christian is to be an integral part of a new family.

The Christian life is meant to be an inherently corporate existence.

And the failure to recognize that fact,

and the failure to live in accordance with that fact,

can have disastrous consequences--

v.30--"**That is why many among you are weak and sick,**

and a number of you have fallen asleep."

Here Paul acting as a prophetic physician,

diagnosing the source of some serious health problems

among the Corinthian believers.

Obviously, not all sickness is a result of the direct judgment of God

upon a particular sin--

but some certainly is,

and apparently, it was the case here.

Why should God take this so seriously?

Why should he respond with such punishment to ecclesiastical abuse?

First, God punishes to protect the honor of his name--

to abuse each other in the church reflects on

the reputation of God in the world.

He is not seen as the wonderful, living God that he is.

Second, God punishes to protect the meaning of the gospel--

to abuse each other in the church reflects on

how the gospel is understood in the world.

It is not seen as the wonderful good news that it is.

God will judge his people when they go astray.

It is not that God is an ogre, out to zap us whenever we do wrong--

this is not that kind of judgment--

Paul says as much--

v. 32--"**When we are judged by the Lord, we are being disciplined**

so that we will not be condemned with the world."

This is for our ultimate good,

but still it is a kind of discipline we would do better not to need.

Just think of an analogy of our physical bodies.

When we abuse our own physical bodies--

through lack of exercise, long nights with little sleep,

constant stress and anxiety,

or immoderate amounts of caffeine, or nicotine, or alcohol.

What happens?

Well, some people can live like that for 90 years.

But that's rare--

often there are consequences--

many become weak or sick and a number fall asleep,
to use Paul's language.

So what about when we abuse our spiritual body--the body of Christ, the church?

When we mistreat one another,

when we offend one another,

and then we hold on to that offense and keep bringing it up,

cherishing a grudge,

or when we slight one another, and form little cliques,

not being sensitive to include others,

or we get upset because we feel slighted, and go off in a huff.

When we divide along socio-economic, or racial, or generational lines.

When we abuse the body, simply by not loving one another with the love of Christ--

what can we expect to happen to our spiritual body?

That's how churches get sick and die.

By God's grace, may it not happen here.

Every one ought to examine themselves,

Are you living in line with the gospel in your relationships with others?

For we need the body of Christ--

to try to live as a Christian apart from this body, the church,

is like trying to live as a human being apart from your physical body.

It can't be done.

v.33--"So then, my brothers and sisters, when you gather to eat,
you should all eat together."

Or perhaps that might better be translated, "when you gather to eat,
you should all receive one another."⁷

Receive one another in the love of Christ--
receive one another as brothers and sisters--
members of one family,
parts of one body.
The beautiful body of Christ.

Remember the meaning of the bread and the cup--

For when we gather as the church,
as we remember the cross and appreciate the new covenant,
as we live as God's people in love and holiness,
we declare to a lost world something beautiful,
and in that beauty, there is life.

Prayer—

Everyone should examine themselves—

confess a prideful attitude—better than others, more righteous than others
a resentful or jealous attitude, not rejoicing with those who rejoice

⁷Cf. Fee, Hays. The verb has that meaning, e.g., in 3 Macc. 5:26 and Josephus, Ant. 7:351. Cf. Paul's admonition in Rom. 12:13--"Share with God's people who are in need. Practice hospitality."

a lack of compassion—

not weeping with those who weep.

a judgmental attitude looking down on others as ignorant fools—

we can disagree in love.

Failing to receive one another as fellow sinners for whom Christ died.

May we not eat or drink in an unworthy manner.

I urge you to live a life

worthy of the calling you have received.

Be completely humble and gentle;

be patient, bearing with one another in love.

Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace.

There is one body and one Spirit--

just as you were called to one hope when you were called--

one Lord, one faith, one baptism;

one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all."

Confess our sins and turn from them,

and seek the Lord's power to live in a way pleasing to him.

Communion—

The Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, took bread,
and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said,

"This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me."

In the same way, after supper he took the cup, saying,

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood;

do this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me."

For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup,

you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.

If Christian baptism is the entry point into the visible body of Christ,

the Lord's Supper is the ongoing demonstration of it—

If you been baptized into union with Christ

come and experience that union

by eating and drinking these elements,

trusting that what these elements visibly display are true—

Jesus has given us his body and blood for us—

and by the Spirit he comes to live in us.

I invite the servers to come—

when the singing begins, come to one of the stations—take your time--

take one of the double cups—and return to your seat

and we will eat and drink together.

**"The Church in the World:
Studies in 1 Corinthians" No. 13
Aug. 1, 2021**

"The Lord's Supper"

1 Cor. 11:17-34

Throughout history, controversy has surrounded the church's practice of celebrating the "Lord's Supper." Our passage this morning show how quickly abuse in this practice crept in. Paul seeks to correct the Corinthians by reminding them what this meal is all about.

I. The Lord's Supper is a Remembrance of Christ's Death--

It points us to the Cross.

II. The Lord's Supper is a Declaration of a New Covenant--

It points us to the Church.

How can we participate in a "worthy manner"?

Sermon Response:

"The Lord's Supper"

1 Cor. 11:17-34

- Though there is some dispute on the details of what was happening in Corinth, some who were wealthy were humiliating others in the church who had very little (cf. v.22). How can that happen today? How can we seek to avoid it?
- Read vv. 23-26. Reflect on what we are to "remember" when we share in the Lord's Supper. How ought that remembrance to affect our lives?
- Lord's Supper "in an unworthy manner"? Think of v. 29--"recognizing the body of the Lord." Cf. 8:12. Do you appreciate that those who share in the Lord's Supper with you are Christ's body in the world?
- Read vv. 30,31. Could there be some judgment of God upon our church for some unconfessed sin? Seek the grace of God to reveal this to us, and give us the strength to deal with it.
- Read Matt. 5:23,24. Are there in the body of Christ to whom you need to be reconciled? Perhaps you should write them a note today.