

- 1) Deliverance to Satan. This involves at least three other matters:
 - a) Excommunication from assembly.
 - b) Suffering in flesh (cf. Job).
 - c) Salvation of soul (cf. 1 Cor. 3).
- 2) Discipline for God. The man involved was not sent to hell! His final salvation was the goal. The "day of the Lord Jesus" is exchatological and speaks of the Rapture. It is God's way of handling sin! It must not be condoned. -

4. EXHORTATION PROVIDED. vv. 6-8.

This concerns:

- a. Something to know. v. 6. Explicitly Paul marks that the selfish sinful glorying is not seemly (so Greek). It is a plague spot in the church. The proverb here is patent (cf. Gal. 5:9). Such a sin taints the whole!
- b. Something to do. v. 7. The verb "purge out" is an effective aorist imperative. As aorist it is urgent and to be done completely. The adjective "new" suggests a fresh start in point of time. Since Christ is the Passover, the leaven should have been removed (cf. Ex. 12:8).
- c. Something to keep. v. 8. The present subjunctive elicits the idea of "keep on keeping" the feast. Malice is evil disposition. Wickedness is active exercise of malice. Sincerity is ability to hold something up to the light. Truth is that which is not hidden. Such feast keeping would avoid sexual sins!

Conclusion It is beyond doubt or debate that the Bible holds to authoritarian and absolutes. One of these is in the area of the moral. Sexual laxness is taboo for the believer on Christ. It is one of the types of life-changing events which come to the child of God. If the filth and mire of this world distress you, invite Christ into your life. He will change you! Amen.

BOOK OF FIRST CORINTHIANS

"The Old Morality"

1 Cor. 5:1-8

Introduction

1. The idea or phrase "New Morality" was popularized by Bishop Robinson in his book Honest to God. It was used, however, earlier by Pius XII when he referred to "situational, existential, or contextual" ethics.

2. It is the contention of many that these protagonists for "New Morality" are not actually revising the standards of the Bible, but seeking to get back to the one absolute standard of Christ--love. They insist that the major issue is: good is first and foremost the good of persons. In brief: "personal interests come first, before the natural or scriptural (sic) or theoretical or general or logical or anything else" (Robinson, p. 119).

3. Opposing this "new" approach is the Biblical standard which persists! It is contended that the Word of God is authoritarian. It is absolute. It is the demand of a holy God which is right, just, and beyond reproach. Whereas the moderns have posited a position which has led to moral decay, the Bible calls forth a position which leads to moral perfection and agreement with the infinite character and will of an eternal God.

4. Illustrative of the strong and solid position of the Bible is the section for study now. That moral concerns have slipped is patent. That the Bible holds to an unwavering absolutism is unquestioned! Consider prayerfully the following facts:

1. INFORMATION RECEIVED v. 1.

This information is:

- a. Reported. The verb employed here is entire-impersonal pointing to the common report which has come out of the church. Anytime the church at Corinth is mentioned, this matter comes up! It is generally known.
- b. Defined. The problem is carefully noted. The Greek term used here points to any immoral

sexual relation, such as prostitution, adultery, and the like. For someone to raise an issue and declare that the Bible has only one absolute-- what will he then do with this raising of a moral issue!

- c. Compared. The matter here is branded as unparalleled darkness. Indeed, with a climactic word, it is such a quality that even the Gentiles wouldn't countenance it. The Jews knew the law and realized that it was forbidden under penalty of death (Lev. 18:7,8; Deut. 22:11, 30). Incidentally, the Roman law forbade it too! The rabbis tried to circumvent the matter, even as many try to do today.
- d. Specified. The particular type of immoral act reported is marked: a man was living without formal arrangements with his stepmother. His father was probably dead. It was a continued association as the present tense notes ("to have"). The woman may not have been a believer, since it is the man who is charged.

2. SATISFACTION NOTED v. 2.

This is clear from:

- a. Pride. This is urged by the verb "puffed up." Those who favoured the rascal justified him. Speech, but no power (cf. 4:19).
- b. Sorrow. The event should have opened their eyes to the fallen state of the assembly. The verb "mourn" speaks of tears for a dead man. They should have mourned for their brother now dead toward God in his actions!
- c. Inaction. "That" is purpose. Banishment should have been the man's lot. This sort of treatment honors God and respects His holiness. Anything less is disrespectful to God!

3. RETRIBUTION DECIDED vv. 3-5.

This concerns three specifics:

- a. Time. v. 3. It is evident that the Corinthians had not taken any action (v. 1, 2). Hence, although Paul was not in Corinth, a decision had already been made. It was actually done! The

perfect tense of the verb "have judged" shows that a decision was made in the past and the decision still stands! Nothing has altered his position.

- b. Place. v. 4. It is true that this verse poses many thorny problems relative to the placement of the clauses. However, the main thrust of the expressions does not seem impossible to determine. It is as if Paul met, outside of Corinth, with a tribunal. The culprit was dragged into court, tried, and condemned. But it was not as though Paul made his decision on his own. He could have done this as he had done previously (cf. Acts 13:8ff). Peter had done the same through apostolic authority (Acts 5:1ff). But there were others in this courtroom with Paul. He lists them:

1) Ye being gathered together. It is as if the Corinthians were present also. They had their say about the situation. They were in a position to present arguments too.

2) My spirit. This suggests that Paul was indeed involved. His whole being was given to the matter. He does not try to avoid the conflict (How many do this today and will not stand up for right!).

3) In the Name of the Lord Jesus. The tribunal of which Paul speaks was met to glorify Him. His competency was likewise felt! Nothing of selfish pride involved, but the LORD!

4) With the power of the Lord Jesus. It was not the mere presence of the Lord, but His cooperation and ability to perform.

- c. Kind. v. 5. The type of decision made by the tribunal is clear. What its full significance is has been hotly contested. The major items are the following: