was *still soliciting* them.

**faithful]** He has *entered into a covenant* with  
you by *calling you:* if He suffered temptation  
beyond your power to overcome you,  
He would be violating that covenant. Compare 1 Thess. v. 24, “ *Faithful is He that  
calleth you, who also will do it.*”

**will  
..... make also the way to escape]**  
Then God *makes* the temptation too:  
arranges it in His Providence, and in His  
mercy will ever set open a door for escape.

**the (way to) escape,** i.e. *which belongs  
to the particular temptation*.

**in order  
that you may be able to bear (it)**: observe,  
not, ‘will *remove* the temptation?’ but, ‘will  
make an escape *simultaneously with the  
temptation*, to encourage you to *bear up  
against it*’

14.] *Conclusion from the  
above warning examples* : IDOLATRY IS BY  
ALL MEANS TO BE SHUNNED; not tampered  
with, but fled from.

**flee from**  
presses very strongly the entire avoidance.  
‘This verse of itself’ would by inference forbid the Corinthians having any share in  
the idol feasts; but he proceeds to ground  
such prohibition on further special considerations.

15—22.] By the analogy of the *Christian  
participation in the Lord’s supper, aud  
the Jewish participation in the feasts after  
sacrifices*, joined to the fact that the *heathens  
sacrifice to devils*, he shews that the  
partaker in the idol feast is a PARTAKER  
WITH DEVILS; which none can be, and yet  
be a Christian.

15.] An appeal to  
their own sense of what is congruous and  
possible,—as introducing what is to follow.

**as to wise men** expresses an assumption on the Apostle’s part, that they  
*are* wise men. ye is emphatic—be YE  
**the judges of what I am saying.**

16.] The analogy of the *Lord’s Supper,*  
which, in both its parts, is a *participation*in Christ. The stress throughout to ver. 20  
is on **participation** and **partakers**. The  
**cup of blessing** is explained immediately  
by **which we bless,—over which we speak**a **blessing**, and is the Christian form of  
the Jewish cup in the Passover, over which  
thanks were offered after the feast,—in  
blessing of which cup, our Lord instituted  
this part of the ordinance: see note on the  
history in Matt. xxvii The explanation,  
the exp which brings a blessing, is wrong,  
as being against this analogy.

**which  
we bless]** i.e. consecrate with a prayer of  
thanksgiving. Observe, the first person  
plural is the *same throughout* : the blessing  
of the cup, and the breaking of the bread,  
the acts of consecration, were not the acts  
of the minister, as by any authority peculiar  
to himself, but only as the representative  
of the whole Christian congregation  
The figment of sacerdotal consecration  
of the elements by transmitted  
power, is as alien from the apostolic writings  
as it is from the spirit of the Gospel.

**the participation** (i.e. that whereby the  
act of participation takes place) **of the Blood.**  
**of Christ?**—The strong literal sense must  
here be held fast, as constituting the very  
kernel of the Apostle’s argument. The  
wine *is the Blood,* the bread *is the Body*,  
of Christ. (*In what sense* the Blood and  
the Body, does not belong to the present  
argument.) *We* receive unto us, make by  
assimilation parts of ourselves, that wine,  
that bread: we *become* therefore, by participation   
of that Bread, *one Bread*, i.e  
ONE BODY: hence the close and literal participation  
in and with Christ. If we are  
to understand this word **is** to mean, *represents or symbolizes*, the argument is  
made void. On the other hand it is painful to allude to, though necessary to reprobate  
the caricature of this real union with