

1Corinthians 18-07-01a

Good morning. Welcome to the Sunday morning services at Grace & Truth Bible Church. It's great to see those who are here and those who aren't here in my mind's eye.

We're going to be talking a lot about things that are real and yet not visible this morning, and I trust that those of you who are joining us at a distance are in fact real even though you're not visible. And we're going to continue our study this morning in 1st Corinthians picking up in chapter 10. This is July the 1st, 2018, and our 1st Corinthians study resumes here with the Old Testament example of Israel coming out of Egypt associated with the cloud, with the crossing of the Red Sea, and the application that Paul is making of this, oddly enough, to the distracted, divided, and defecting Corinthians.

Let's take a moment as we begin our time of fellowship in God's Word to go to the Lord in prayer. Father, it always humbles us and impresses us the magnitude of your grace and your faithfulness, your love expressed toward us first, foremost, and ultimately in the Lord Jesus Christ. His coming to live in our midst as one of us, experiencing our frailties and our temptations, all yet without sin, and ultimately becoming the perfect sacrifice on our behalf.

And we are so thankful for the standing that we have before you in Him, and the privileges we enjoy, the opportunities that we have, the bright hope that is before us and motivates us and encourages us as the days go by. We thank you for this passage of Scripture. We ask that you will bless it to each heart, that your Holy Spirit will minister it and transcend the presentation as He does with our prayers, to ensure that your Word reaches each one of us who so desperately need it, to be the voice of your Spirit in guiding us and correcting us and instructing us so that we can live our lives in full harmony with your plan and purpose and ever mindful of the preparation that this life represents as we look forward to the day when we will transcend this earth and this life and be in your presence and have fresh and new opportunities to put into practice the things that we are now learning.

We pray all these things in Jesus' name. Amen. Well, you'll remember last time that we're looking at Paul's letter to the Corinthian church that he founded that began to get flaky around the edges after he left.

The specific type of departure from the teachings that Paul so thoroughly inculcated them with have to do with subjectivity. You remember our working definition for a subjective point of view? We have our eyes on ourselves. We have our eyes on other people.

We have our eyes on circumstances. Now, it is inevitable that we have to turn our eyes to ourself. You could not confess your sins if you didn't look at yourself.

You could not analyze and see if you're in the faith if you didn't look at yourself. We obviously have to consider one another if we are going to express love and good works the way the Bible tells us to. And, of course, we have to parse our circumstances in order to make decisions,

follow our priorities, pursue our goals.

And so it isn't that we cannot think of ourselves or we cannot think of others or we cannot think of circumstances. We'd be so heavenly minded we would be no earthly good. But subjectivity is when our view in those three directions is shaded and defined by personal interest, self-interest, self-gratification.

I look at myself and my goal is to make myself happy. My priority is to establish my own comfort and to make myself feel good. If I'm looking at others, I am doing so in a way that benefits me and judges them or harms them or does despot or is inconsiderate toward others.

I am not loving them as Christ loved me. And when I look at my circumstances, I am trying to navigate them in my own strength for my own purposes with my own goals in mind instead of having all of that influenced by, saturated by, the Word of God and the Spirit of God looking at it the extent that we're able from God's point of view. So subjectivity isn't just looking in those directions.

It is looking in those directions in a faulty way. We were talking as late as this morning about confirmation bias. You ever heard of that? There's a whole big long article on it in your Wikipedia and that's the fastest way to find a reasonable coverage of something like that.

But confirmation bias is basically, don't bother me with the facts my mind's made up. I will filter the facts and interpret the facts to fit my preconception rather than doing my best to be objective and let the facts guide my viewpoint and my opinion. So if I think the current sitting president is a rascal, then anything he does, I'm going to try to fit into my notion that this is just more of his rascality at work.

If I think he is the greatest thing to happen to the country in 15 years, then I will find a way to vindicate and justify and look for the good in that same individual's actions and words and so forth. And what we want to try to do is step back and instead of having our eyes on a person or ourselves and what we're currently implicated in, what we're currently facing, and start with an objective standard that says, well, certain things are right, certain things are wrong, and do our best. We're going to inevitably fail at this to some extent, but to the extent that we're able, prayerfully, cultivating the active ministry of God's Holy Spirit in our thoughts to be objective, to have what we sometimes call a divine viewpoint, God's viewpoint, God's priorities, God's standards of absolute righteousness because God never changes.

God's word is like himself. It lives and abides forever. It's guidance.

The communication of standards that it gives us, those are fixed. There's a Hebrew verb associated with that, natsav, forever, oh Lord, your word is fixed in heaven. And the wonderful thing about us as temporal and changeable and fickle and prone to losing our rudder and blowing about with every wind is that we have an anchor in the soul of the Lord Jesus Christ and that's God's word.

That is God's word. That's what we're looking at this morning. So Paul now is going to reinforce a point that he began to make with examples from life with the Word of God.

And it's interesting because he did this in the last chapter as well. Turn back to 1 Corinthians chapter 9. Do you remember he said, do we have no right to take along a believing wife, in verse 5, as do the other apostles, the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas, or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working? Whoever goes to war at his own expense. Who plants a vineyard and does not eat of its fruit? Who tends a flock and does not drink of the milk of the flock? You remember when he is establishing that his failure to claim these things is not failure to be an apostle or failure to have the right to them.

He is foregoing them for the sake of the goals of his ministry and the function of his apostleship and love for the Corinthians, right? So it is not evidence that they are construing as, well, he's not really an apostle or he would look like the other apostles and he would claim the rights that the other apostles claim. This is confirmation bias. Some of these people in Corinth want to think that Paul is not an apostle because then they can disregard his teaching.

You see how that works? Two factions in the church could look at Paul. One would say, well, he's an apostle. I need to pay attention to what he taught us when he was here and what he is now saying in this letter.

Others could say, you know what, he's not authentic. He's not for real. He doesn't have authority.

Look at him. He doesn't claim support like an apostle does. He doesn't have a wife like the other apostles do.

John's married, Peter's married, and so on. And so they choose to believe that he's not given authority by God. Therefore, it's a self-serving dismissal.

But he begins countering this with secular examples, examples from nature. Whoever goes to war at his own expense, who plants a vineyard does not eat its fruit, who tends a flock and does not drink of its milk. Then he moves in verse 8, he says, do I say these things as a man or does not the law say the same thing? If you're not convinced by these reasonable observations, what does God's Word say? What's the old rule about establishing truth, especially in a court case in ancient Israel? How many witnesses do you need? In the mouth of two or three witnesses, a thing is established, right? So he's using the witness of reason and observation of normal life.

His second and more conclusive witness is the Word of God itself. It is written in the Law of Moses, don't muzzle the ox while he's treading out the grain. Is it oxen God is concerned about, or is this not in fact a principle communicated through a material example? And this is important.

If you're not going to get the message if all you do is make sure your ox doesn't have a muzzle on while he's operating the big grinding stone. You know those things work. There's one

circular stone flat, another circular stone that rolls around it in a circle.

There's a stick through the axis of the upper millstone, and you attach it to the harness of an ox, and he just goes around and around. This is what the Philistines had Samson doing after they blinded him, right? And what's going to happen? As the grinding takes place and this grain gets sprinkled on the lower millstone and mashed, some of it's going to fall in the path, and they say, you know, let the ox get some of that while he's doing the work. He gets some of the benefit of the work that he's doing.

He gets this nice cracked grain to eat and sustain him and, you know, give him a little motivation to keep going around. Every time he comes around there's a little bit of fresh grain down there. Do not muzzle the ox.

But that's not really the point. The point is that those who sow should sow in hope, and those who plant and plow should plow in hope. And Paul makes that point here in verse 11, "...if we've sown spiritual things for you, is it a great thing if we reap your material things? If others are partakers of this right over you, are we not even more? Nevertheless, we have not used this right.

We endure all things, lest we hinder the gospel of Christ." Right? So my point here though primarily is, he started with examples from life and moved to scriptural support for his same idea. Now in chapter 10, he actually started in verse 24 of chapter 9, "...do you not know that those who run in a race all run, but only one receives the prize?" He used up above that his own example, "...I become a Jew to the Jew. I become a Gentile to the Gentile.

I become as those under the law to those who are under the law. I become as outside the law to those who are outside, but not outside the law of God. There's a limit to how far I will go to join myself with a group and make sure that there is no hindrance to their understanding." And then he uses the figure of a race in verse 24, "...everyone who competes has a prize.

They do it to obtain a perishable crown, but we for an imperishable. They for a material crown, we for an immaterial future crown, something that is above and beyond. Therefore I run not with uncertainty.

I fight not as one beating the air. I discipline my body, bring it into subjection. When I have preached it to others, I myself should be disqualified." So he uses himself.

He uses the example of the games. He uses the example of himself. Now he is advancing like he did earlier in chapter 9 to a biblical example.

There really in an ideal world maybe wouldn't even be a chapter break here because this is a continuation of the thought. So when you get to chapter 10 and he says, "...for brethren, I do not want you to be unaware." It's connected. It's not really so much more over here as for.

This is the conjunctive particle *de*, which is translated but or now or furthermore. Sometimes

it's adversative. Sometimes it is continuative.

Here it is continuative. He's not saying, but I don't want you to be unaware. He's saying furthermore.

Moreover is not a bad translation here. It catches the idea of continuation. So I would say, furthermore brethren, I do not want you to be unaware.

We're going to do a whole study of Paul's reference to their ignorance, which he does throughout this letter. But he does it here again, that our fathers, and now we're back to a scriptural example. So the first witness is, doesn't this make sense to you from observation of common things in life? This is reasonable.

This is rational. Does not nature itself teach you? Now he's going to appeal to scripture. This is his second witness.

"...fathers from under the cloud passed through the sea, baptized into Moses in the cloud, ate the same spiritual food, drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." We covered this last time, and what is he doing? He's saying in verse 6, and of course in verse 5, he's saying, "...with most of them God was not well pleased, for their bodies were scattered in the wilderness." These things became our examples. We are to look at the Old Testament scriptures and extract the principle.

It's not just the ox that we're concerned about. We are looking at these Old Testament scriptures to find the timeless, the ineffable, intangible principle. It's really interesting in verse 5, you notice that for their bodies is in italics, and because we're going to have a reference to bodies and the Lord's body and so on coming up, I just want you to notice that that really is not there.

They were scattered in the wilderness, and the word scattered there is a word that literally, it's katastronummi, katastronummi, and an easy way to remember this word, it's not real common, but it's kata at the beginning, and then stronummi, which comes from strao, and it's really where we get the word straw, and it means they were strewed, and kata means alongside. So this was used for taking straw and distributing it on the ground to make a bed, or to take straw and disperse it fairly evenly over the wilderness. I was thinking about this because Paul says God was not well pleased with them, and it's not talking about their bodies, they were strewed, they were strewn in the wilderness, fairly evenly distributed like straw on a hay barn floor.

There might be a few clumps here, he's going to talk later about we're not 23,000 slain in a day. I was thinking about this in terms of archeology. They say, well where's the evidence of the Israelites in the wilderness for these 40 years? Well, if they are strewn evenly across this vast area, it's going to be pretty hard to find any one place.

There will be, you could look for a mass grave if you could figure out exactly where they were. There's been six or seven different mountains that have all been identified as potentially Sinai

at the foot. Where were they when God slew 23,000? Where were they at the Meribah? It's hard to know.

But I would think that when great numbers were slain at once, there should be a collection of graves there. They wouldn't have left them for the birds of the air and the beasts of the field, so there would probably be a burial. And it would be interesting if you had a satellite-based metal detector or something because no doubt they probably were buried with a little bit of jewelry or something.

But there ought to be a way to find those areas where there was a judgment pretty much all at once in one place. But over the 40 years, they are strawed. They are kata strewn evenly all over the wilderness.

And what is this a picture of? Really it's good to not talk about their bodies because they fall short of inheriting the promise. They are distributed in all different times, different tests, different challenges. They fell by the wayside.

Some of them died in battles that were lost. Some of them died in various judgments due to faithlessness and disobedience. So lots of different ways they are randomly scattered.

These things became our examples. The word translated example there is tupos. And most of the time, this is always kind of a prickly question, when you transliterate Greek into English, do you preserve the epsilon or do you change it to a Y? And the prevailing trend now is to take the epsilon and make it a Y. So this would be typos.

They were types. Types. These things became our types.

What is the purpose? That we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted. The same word lust is used by Paul in a positive sense once or twice when he talks about his care, his desire that the people to whom he is ministering grow and inherit and claim all of the fullness that they have in Christ. And he says, I desire these things.

And that's why you have the evil word added here. Evil lust. If evil was inherent in the word lust, you wouldn't have to add it.

It would be the same as saying evil immorality. I mean, why would you need to add the word if it's already inherent? So lust after evil things as they also lusted. And do not become idolaters as were some of them.

Now you notice that Paul is bringing this type around, this example around to his subject. What has been his subject in the last couple of three chapters? What is their problem in Corinth? They do not recognize the dangers of going down to the temple and partaking of these communal meals of what that does in terms of confusing people and causing weaker brothers to stumble and going down there and saying it's really okay. And they say, well, I thought your God was different.

Is He just another God? You can go down to the temple and you can worship this God. And Paul says, you're not being sensitive to the brothers around you in gratifying yourself and it becomes an evil desire. You want to socialize.

You want to be one of the gang. You don't want to be coming out from among them and separate. You want to blend.

You want to be well thought of. It's good for your business contacts. It's good for your kids to have acceptance and potential marriages in the upper crust of Corinthian society.

And so there's many, many rationalizations. Well, Paul has used rationalizations to talk about good things. So how do you know which rationalizations are valid and which ones are not? How do you know if you're taking a type or an example from Scripture and misusing it or using it properly? It isn't that you can construct an argument from nature or from observation.

It isn't that you can find an example in Scripture and bend it to your purpose. What defines what is good and what's not good about Scriptural application or rational analogy? What determines it? What did we start the morning talking about? What is the definition of subjectivity? And the flip side of that, what is the definition of objectivity? I have to determine whether these reasonable analogies, these reasonable arguments, and my appeal to Scripture is in the service of God's purpose, God's plan, God's revealed will, the glorification of Christ, love expressed at some cost to oneself, or is this a way to justify that I get what I want? In other words, is there lusting after evil things that I should not be lusting after? If it's an evil thing, it's not a part of God's plan and purpose. It isn't going to serve the two great summary statements, love the Lord your God and love one another.

It will violate in some fashion because I will be promoting myself. I will be elevating myself. I will be committing one or more of the five I wills that got Satan kicked out of heaven and created the whole mess that is the universe.

So many times in debate and in trying to discern what is good and what is bad, what is right and what is wrong, especially in an era where we have such incomplete and twisted reporting of what's going on in the world, you can't necessarily trust that you're getting all of the facts or that they're being fairly represented or that they're being objectively offered. You get a slant. You get aversion.

You get a filtered account. Some things are left out. And even when a reporter or a news agency is trying to be objective, they are just shot through with confirmation bias, especially when more so in the liberal side.

I recently, in some other context, somebody was saying, can you trust the news? And I went out to a survey that was done a few years ago asking people, first of all, are you really liberal, mostly liberal, kind of in the middle, kind of conservative, mostly conservative, or a radical conservative? They said, what is your philosophical bent? And then, how much do you trust?

And then they listed about 25 news agencies. And what was interesting to me is they did this as a colored graph. And on the conservative side, conservatives mistrust most of the media.

There was only about four out of the 20 or 25 agencies that they said, I generally trust this source. And, of course, as you move over in the graph, if I was looking at it, the conservatives were on the right, the liberals were on the left, and they had a color code. And so there was only like four blocks that were colored in, yes, I trust this news source, this is where I go for news, and I think it's pretty accurate.

And the rest of them were, eh, somewhat, or I really don't know, or I don't trust them at all, and I wouldn't give their account the time of day. On the liberal side, most of the news agencies were trusted. There were like 10 or 12, I really trust them.

And, of course, it's all the CNBC and CNN and the ones that are notably liberal in their bent. But most people in the news business are not conservative. This has been established poll after poll.

They try to be objective, they tell themselves they're objective, but they're all liberals, by and large. And so there's confirmation bias. They present the news as they see it, and all the people who are liberals hear the news and say, yeah, that's right.

And so the whole thing is heavily shaded toward a liberal slant on a self-confessed poll. This is who I listen to, and this is what I trust. So we have to be careful about confirmation bias.

The only bias we should confirm should not be our own standard, but God's standard. This is why in our memory verse, 2 Corinthians says, to the extent that things are good, to the extent that things are noble, to the extent that things are lovely, to the extent that things are pure, to the extent that things are of good report, think on these things. Well, how do you know if it's good, noble, lovely, pure, and of good report? How do you know? Not my definition, God's definition.

What is Paul telling the Corinthians here is good. Selfless, dedication to the good to God's plan and purpose. Paul gives himself as an example.

He gives runners and boxers and oxen as examples, and then he gives biblical examples. Actually, he gives farmers as examples, and then oxen is his biblical example. And here, the Israelites coming out of Egypt is a biblical example.

Now, these things became our examples for what purpose? To the intent that we should not make the mistake they made. Not desire evil things as they also desired them. Do not become idolaters as were some of them.

As it is written, the people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. He's going to come back to this eat and drink. We're heading toward the section on the Lord's table, as it's commonly known, right, in the next chapter.

Now, nor let us commit sexual immorality as some of them did. Now remember, the temple ethos in Corinth, as in other major Greek cities, is dedicated to acceptable prostitution, acceptable fornication, acceptable activity outside of marriage. It's okay.

And you see analogies to that in our society today where things have just become okay. Most churches, in my observation now, and I haven't seen most churches, but the ones I have seen, are very tolerant of couples who aren't married living together, coming to church, oh we love Jesus and all that, but we're not sticklers on this whole marriage thing. And other parts of life, it is as though spiritual identity and union with Christ does not penetrate daily life.

Well, I'm a Christian when I come to church. I'm a Christian when I go on an excursion or a retreat. We do the holy thing and then we go back and live like everybody else.

And we're just completely indiscernible from the rest of the population. And Paul says, you can't do these things. Look at what happened to God's people when they returned to the practices that they had absorbed in Egypt.

Where do you think the golden calf came from? They had seen the apis bull and all of the other ox, bull, calf worship in Egypt. That didn't come out of somebody's imagination. It was, let's get back to normal here.

Let's do what we know. And this is what we know. This is what we have absorbed from the culture in Egypt.

So they sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. It's a festival. It's a Bacchanalia.

It's a Saturnalia. It's a Idolalia. Any sort of big festive meal and then everybody gets happy and they drink and they rise up to play.

Nor let us commit sexual immorality as some of them did and in one day 23,000 fell. Nor let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted and were destroyed by serpents. You remember the whole serpent episode.

And Paul is expecting the Corinthians to remember these truths. How can he make such quick reference to these and move right on as we are doing? We're not going back and exhausting Exodus with these. How can he do that? He was there for over two and a half years and he taught them what? The scriptures.

The Old Testament scriptures to the Gentiles. They know this story. He doesn't have to say, oh by the way, Moses led Israel out of Egypt and across the sea and into the wilderness and here.

He has taught them these things. This is a reminder. This is, he says, don't forget your examples.

Nor complain. What's amazing to me is you say, well, idolatry. That's beyond the pale.

I would put that right up there with murder and so on. Adultery, immorality, fornication. Sure.

Putting God to the test. You know, flaunting God. Well, if you're God.

You know this atheist that ran around 100 odd years ago. If there's a God, may he strike me dead. And then he would laugh because he didn't get struck dead.

And Dr. Criswell's rejoinder to that is he heard a story some guy told where there was an ant that crawled up on a railroad rail and said, if there's a president of this railroad, may he come and strike me dead. And you know, the guy is hundreds if not thousands of miles away and this ant is raising his little leg and saying, if there's a president of this railroad, may he strike me dead. And the point being, why would he bother? You are so insignificant.

Does he need to come and strike you dead to prove that there's a railroad, which by the way you are standing on and if you stand there long enough, the train is going to strike you dead. I thought that was an apt story. But putting God to the test basically disrespects God.

It doesn't reflect trust. It doesn't reflect confidence. It doesn't reflect patience.

It doubts God in the way that the Corinthians doubt that God appointed Paul as an apostle. And putting God to the test is a promotion of self and a demotion of God. Submit yourselves under the mighty hand of God that he may exalt you in due time.

Oh no, God and I are sort of equals. I think God needs to prove himself. I don't think God has given me sufficient evidence, many atheists say.

He doesn't pass muster at my judgment bar. He doesn't meet my criteria. He doesn't match my expectation.

Think back to the Pharisees when the Lord Jesus came as the Messiah of Israel. Oh sorry, you don't qualify. If you're the son of God, even Satan tried to get him to prove his case.

Well, if you're the son of God, turn these stones into bread. If you're the son of God, cast yourself down from this pinnacle. If you want to be the king of the world, I can do that for you.

Here's all of the nations. All you've got to do is acknowledge me instead of acknowledging your father as your authority. I'll give you all this stuff and you don't have to go to the cross.

It's the crown without the cross. And Satan had the power to grant it. He is, temporarily at least, the God of this world.

So verse 11, all these things happened to them as types. Once again, you have it in verse 6, you have it in verse 11. These things happened to them as examples.

These things happened to them as examples. Their experience provided examples. Is it valid to look in your own experience for examples? It is if you know the principles for which these

examples are valid.

You can't work from an example and establish a principle. Remember your textbooks in school? They say, here is the associative property of some mathematical function, addition. Here is the distributive property of multiplication.

Then they'll give you examples. They don't say, see this example? Well, that makes this thing true. What if I have another example that disproves it? You can't work from examples alone back to a principle.

But you can recognize a principle in an example. So what am I saying? You've got to know your biblical truth first, then you can look at your life and say, God rewards patience. You can't just say, well, I waited and waited and waited, and then something good came along.

That was God. Without knowing from Scripture that you have need of patience so that after you've suffered a while you inherit the promises. You cannot only have the example.

This is a great source of false theology is people arguing from things that don't reflect scriptural principles. So what is the point of all of this? What is the takeaway? What is the application? What do we do now? They were written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages have come. Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age, Jesus said in Matthew 28, 20.

Remember that? The quote-unquote Great Commission, 28, 19, and 20. And lo, I am with you always, always, even to the end of the age. And that phrase that Jesus uses is the telos of the ionos.

Telos. We've talked about that before. Telomere.

I was thinking when you have teleport, telephone, television, we think tele means to televise a thing, to telegraph a thing means to move it across. But telos in Greek means the end. You're getting to the end.

The only point of having a television is you're at the receiving end of a broadcast. Telephone, you're at the receiving end of a phone call. Or you're at one end of it.

There's two ends. And something is going from one end to the other end. Telos.

Well, this is upon whom the ends of the age have come. Jesus says, I am with you always to His disciples, even to the end of the age. Well, the end of the age has come, and this is the preposition e-i-s.

There's a perfectly good word in Greek for upon, and this ain't it. This is eis. Into, unto, or with a view toward.

With a view toward whom, unto whom, into whom, the ends of the ages have come. All of the

Old Testament, all of the life of Christ, the work of Christ, the completion of His mission was with a view toward us. The ends of the ages were with a view toward this age.

The fulfillment, the creation of the body of Christ, the manifestation of what humanity can do, enabled and empowered and imbued with God's Spirit. Baptized with God's Spirit. Filled with God's Spirit.

Enabled, gifted, sealed, indwelt. All of that. This is the telos, the end of the age.

And it's the last age before the revelation of Jesus Christ and the Millennial Kingdom and the Kingdom of the Father. So that's the end, the telos of the ages, plural. There have been a number of ages, but this is the last one.

This is the culminating one. And we're in it. It has come unto us.

So what? I asked that question a minute ago. Now what? We've reviewed most of chapter 9 and this first part of chapter 10, so what? Verse 12, therefore let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall. Don't be a victim of confirmation bias.

Don't be a victim of subjectivity. Don't let your own desires carry you away. Examine yourself.

Compare yourself. Are you an Israelite? Seeing somebody throw a party and saying, that's a good thing to join. Paul is telling the Corinthians, just because somebody's throwing a party at the temple and you can think of a number of benefits to going, doesn't mean you should go.

You're at the end of the ages. God has purposed a better thing for you than self-indulgence, self-interest, self-advancement, self-promotion, getting ahead by what you think is a good idea. There's something better.

Therefore, if you think you're okay, cuidado, be careful, take heed, watch out, is a good translation. Watch out. Take heed here is from blepo.

Remember blepo is the word that means to look, to see. The best literal translation here is look out. If you think you stand, let him who thinks he stands look out lest he fall.

And who thinks, this is dokeo. This is judgment. Dokimazo is to think of a thing in terms of passing judgment on it.

With most of them, God was not well-pleased. He was not you dokeo. He didn't have a good judgment of their status.

And they fell and they were strewed in the wilderness. So if you're going to dokeo yourself, watch out. Otherwise, you may fall.

And fall is from pipto. And parapipto to fall alongside. We have a lot of combinations of this word.

But this is fall how? Trip? Sprain your ankle? Wound your knee? What does it mean to stand and to fall? What is the realm of standing and falling? It's in the realm of judgment. It's in the realm of what God thinks. With most of these in the wilderness, God was not well-pleased.

If you think you are going to stand, remember Psalm 1? Walk not in the counsel of the ungodly. Don't stand in the way of sinners. And sit in the seat of the scornful.

Delight is in the law of the Lord. In that law he meditates day and night like a tree planted by the river's water. Fruit in his season doesn't wither.

The ungodly are not so. And they will not stand in the congregation of the righteous. Do you think you stand in the congregation of the righteous? Look out.

Just when you think you got it all wired together, that's the best time to check. Take heed lest ye fall. Now it says, no temptation has overtaken you except such as is common to man.

Overtaken you is from lambano. Lambano. And lambano means to fall.

Lambano means to fall. This is a perfect active indicative, and lambano is used hundreds of times, and it means to take. So the subject is temptation, testing.

The verb is take, to grasp, to lay hold of a thing. And you is the object. No test has taken hold of you.

No test has taken hold of you. This is what it literally means. Then it says, except, and except in Greek is I may, if not.

EI is the word if, and may is the negative. And we had that negative in the previous verse when it says, lest he fall. Lest is may.

Lest is may. Lest is may. Look out to not fall is what it basically says.

Let the man take out, look out to may not fall. It's a subjunctive. Not to possibly fall.

Subjunctive mood is the mood of potential. Maybe yes, maybe no. But the last two words of the previous verse are may pese, may pipto.

Look out that you may not fall. No perasmos. This is testing.

This is challenge. No testing has grasped you, has taken you, but. And you have if not, literally, except.

If not, and then there's a single word for such as is common to man. It's one word in Greek. And the word is anthropinos.

Anthropinos. And it's an adjective. And it's singular, and it's masculine.

No test has grasped you, if not, manly. If not, of man. That's all it says.

Such as is common is an attempt to try to interpret what this means. No test has grasped you, if not, anthropinos. Anthropos, anthropology.

If not, anthropological, you could say. If not, the kind that is usual or usually associated with man. But God is faithful.

God is pistos. Pistia is the word for faith. Pistos is the adjective.

He will not allow you. This is an interesting word in Greek. He will not permit.

It's a a a o. It's got no consonants. It's an e and a and a long o. A a o. It's reminds me of that horse, is it, in Winnie the Pooh, when his name Eeyore. What is Eeyore? Is he a horse? He's a donkey.

Donkey, yeah. Donkey. Eeyore.

Well, this is e a o. And it means God will not permit. Will not allow. Will not suffer.

Remember it says He will not suffer the righteous to be moved? He will not permit it. He will not allow it. He will prevent it.

He will not allow you to be perazode, huper, beyond, above. This is hyperventilate. You're breathing above and beyond what you should.

To do anything in a hyper way is above, too much, too high, or higher and above. Hyper, what you are able. And this is dunamis.

Dunamis is dynamite. Dynamite, whenever you think of dunamis, whenever you think of ability, this is ability in the potential. It's a stick of dynamite.

It hasn't blown up yet, but it's got the power. A stick of dynamite doesn't necessarily look like it has power unless you're familiar with dynamite and you know what it can do and you've seen what it can do. But dunamis is typically power in the potential.

Now, you use dynamite and you can move dirt, you can destroy things, but it is the inherent power. It is the ability. God will not permit you to be challenged, to be tested, to be brought into conflict above your power, your ability by extension to cope.

But that's where the comma is, beyond what you are able. But with the perasmos, he will make, poiao, to make or to do, he will create, he will construct the single word here, way of escape is a single word, it's ekbason. And this is ekbasis.

You know what a basis is, right? Well, this is the ekbasis. This is the out of basis. It's an egress.

It's an exit. It is leaving this life, a way to leave so that you may be able, dunamis again, to bear

it. And this is the other word.

Instead of hyper, the temptation is not going to be above you. God will make a way to leave so that you may be able to bear up under it. It's not going to be so high that you can't bear up under it.

There's a lot of verticality in this statement. So, what kind of temptations is he talking about? He's just given the examples to the Corinthians here that pertain to their circumstance. What are the challenges? What is dividing the congregation? What is causing the faithful and everybody else to differ and to have schisms and divisions? The issue of going to the temple.

The issue of what to do about foods in that context. The issue of consideration for one another. The issue of marriage and interaction between men and women.

What should widows do? What should the unmarried do? What should those who are engaged do? What should those who are married do? And some of them are with fellow believers and others are unequally yoked. What should you do? Under what conditions? In all of these things, Paul says, these things are not unique to you. Some people say, well, I'm special.

I am tested like few, if any, others have been. Nobody knows the trouble I've seen. The Bible says, take heed.

If you think that you get a pass or you've got a special dispensation or you've got some unusually bizarre form of testing or challenge, no test has grasped you, Paul says. No test except what others have faced. It's in the human race, anthropinos.

We tend to think because I'm special, the rules don't apply. I'm an outlier. I'm beyond the average, so it doesn't apply to me.

Paul says, no, you are in the common realm of test and you're not tested above what you're able to bear. God will make an exit. But it's interesting, he says, God will make an exit so that you can bear the test.

He doesn't say an exit so that you can leave the test. So what is this exit? What is the way of escape? If there's a way of escape, but you bear it anyway, does that remind you of anything? Did Paul say, I have the option of leading about a wife. I have the option of receiving support.

I have the option of leaving my oppressed state where I don't have a wife and I'm not supported and I have to make tents and I'm having to undergo a lot of this suffering. He has a way of escape, but he doesn't use it. He says, that's my boast, is that even though I could do these things, I don't.

It's an interesting point here and don't miss it as we go to the break. Paul says, in your test, God will provide a way of escape, but the way of escape allows you to bear up under the test. He doesn't say that you may be able to escape it.

He makes an exit so that you can escape. He says, God will give you, what does that escape represent? I could do this, but I'm not. I'm going to bear up under.

I could leave, but if I do leave, what am I doing? Why would God bring a test? He didn't bring it unless I could bear it. If it's a test I can bear, do I need to escape? Is God forcing me to stay in that test? God will provide a way of escape with every test. He will not allow you to be tested beyond what you are able, but with the test will provide a way of escape so that you can bear it.

The way of escape is sort of a, oh I see, I could opt out of this. It always reminds me, remember when you were in school, I don't know if they still do this, but when I was in school, they would have ten questions at the end of the chapter and then there would be a bonus question in a lot of the textbooks for extra credit. See if you can crack this really hard one.

Well, you could opt out and say, well, I don't want to try that. That's a lot of work. But if you were competitive, and I went to school with a couple of people, we would kind of egg each other on to try to set the curve on a test or something.

And so we'd always try the extra credit problem. It takes time. If it's a timed test and you're going to work on the extra credit question, which usually takes more time than anything else, you've got to already pretty much know your stuff and leave yourself enough time to do it.

Well, there's a way of escape. You don't have to do that extra credit question. But if you do it, there's opportunity there.

God will never allow you to be challenged beyond what you're able to bear. So any challenge you have, you can handle. So why does he provide a way of escape? So that you can bear up under.

Now it's your choice to stick and to stay and to persevere. And that's your boast. That's your sacrifice to God.

That's what you put on the altar to the Lord. Yes, I could leave, but I know you brought this for a reason and you have a purpose for it. And even though there is an exit, I'm going to stay.

I'm going to stick. You've provided a way out, but I don't need it. I'm trusting you.

I know you've given me this and I can handle it. Isn't that interesting? It isn't. Well, anytime the test gets too hard, God will just let us pull the eject.

It always reminds me, they taught us in school back in the days of the jets that were current when I was a midshipman. There's a thing called the face curtain and you reach up over your head and you pull this thing down and that triggers the ejection seat and out you go. And some midshipmen decided that the test was too great of trying to get through four years of that.

And we would talk about that. They've pulled the face curtain and out they go. Well, God provides that, but you stay with the plane.

You keep flying the thing. God says, it's not going to crash. You're going to be okay.

Things may look disastrous. And you've got an eject lever you can pull, but you don't need to. Interesting.

Well, that brings us to verse 14 and we're going to get to the therefore and we'll pick up at that point when we come back from the break.