

Fornication and Revival Centres Policy

A biblical evaluation of 1 Corinthians 5:1-8

by Ian Thomason, MTheol

Introduction

For many people whose lives have been touched by the *Revival Centres International* (RCI), one doctrinal position stands above all others as the cause of significant emotional and spiritual hurt, shame, anguish, spiritual repression and offence. That position—conformity to which Lloyd Longfield demanded in 1995—outwardly at least, proved to be the catalyst for the tearing of the RCI in twoⁱ. Under Longfield senior it was largely a policy; under the leadership of his son and heir Simon it has become more of a dogma. However, whether guidance or direction it remains a blight lacking in biblical warrant or support, and is such that it continues to divide and separate Revivalist families. I refer, of course, to the RCI organisational posture addressing the treatment of ‘moral defaulters’: what Simon Longfield has referred to as the “*Morals Doctrine*”.

Before I begin the essay proper, I need to provide an important caveat. The RCI leadership *did not* then, and *does not* now err when it takes corrective action against people who have been exposed as engaging in sexual behaviours that are clearly prohibited in Scripture: immorality, pre-marital sexual relations and/or adulteryⁱⁱ. Such behaviours are *sinful* and they *should not* be indicative of any Christian’s *ongoing* lifestyle. But the RCI leadership *did* and *does* err insofar that it has removed *any* possibility for repentance and for restoration to full and complete fellowship within the corporate community. In stigmatising, rejecting and condemning those who *have* repented of the wrong, the RCI leadership places itself above, over, and outside the safety and security afforded to them by Scripture.

Sin, God, the Christian and the community

Scripture is rife with examples of what happens when sin is tolerated in the life of a believer. Of first importance is to understand that sin causes a fracture in the relationship between a person and God, which I will refer to as the *vertical axis*. This occurs because sin is nothing short of *personalised rebellion against God*: of the created *rejecting* the rights, the privileges and the authority of the Creator to determine how one acts and lives. It is for the ‘clay’ to reject the ‘Potter’ by elevating oneself to a position of *being equal to God*, and therefore, of being capable of deciding for oneself what is right and what is wrong. But we humans lack those absolutely crucial qualities that God alone possesses, and which enables the making of *fully informed choices*. We need only reflect on the quality of *omniscience* (being “all-knowing”) very briefly, to understand this. Consider: you or I could easily make a choice and cause an action, which although stemming from the purest of motives, might have disastrous consequences. Quite simply we *cannot* comprehend the ‘global’ consequences of our individual decisions when put into action. Consequently, it is for us to remain *image-bearers* of God rather than aspiring towards being gods ourselves. Adam and Eve learned this harsh truth to their and to our cost.

But the effects of sin go further than simply the *vertical axis*. Because we *are* each bearers of God’s image, sin impacts upon each us *personally* and *individually*. We experience its effects daily: guilt, physical, psychological and emotional weakness, shame, feelings of spiritual dislocation, feelings of isolation. Each of these is an out-

working of the effects of sin upon the individual. And although we live in an era that largely denies the spiritual side to humanity, each one of us suffers the effects of sin *spiritually*, and we *do* realise it! Perhaps we might think of this aspect as being the *fulcrum*.

But there is, of course, more to sin's consequences than simply the *vertical axis* and the *fulcrum*. There is also the *horizontal axis* to consider—the effect that *your* sin and *my* sin has upon *others*. We humans were created for community. We require interaction with other *image bearers* in order to function at our best, to feel connected, and to be 'whole' physically, emotionally and spiritually. When you or I willingly act in a way that feeds what are *strictly selfish desires*, we run the risk of causing an impact that extends beyond simply you or I. Taken just a little further, when we exist in what is the mutually-supportive, mutually-identifying and mutually-dependant organism called a Christian church; then *your* sin, or *my* sin, strikes the *vertical axis*, the *fulcrum* and the *horizontal axis collectively*. The effects of the sin are not felt by just the part; they are amplified throughout the whole.

So we should *never* downplay or dismiss the effects of wilful sin in the life of a believer. The costs are simply far too great.

The taxonomy (hierarchy) of sin

The RCI acknowledges that, in practical terms, there exists something of a hierarchy when it comes to the Bible's presentation of sin. Certain sins appear to be given more prominence than others in the two Testaments. And this is true. Whilst it remains the case that sin—*any* sin—is an offense to God's holiness, it is equally the case that God has established something of a reverse "merit-list" on the subject. The RCI has clearly placed sexual sin at the pinnacle of the list, given that it remains sexual sin *alone* that will prevent a 'defaulter' from ever again enjoying fellowship. A person might choose to reject the "British Israel" doctrine or even the 'tongues' doctrine for a time, but should such a one repent and then recant of his or her 'error', then he or she would be allowed back into the fold. But with the new "*Morals Doctrine*" repentance becomes irrelevant. There currently remains no provision for restoring the 'defaulter' to fellowship within the Revival Centres. Should an RCI member 'default' morally, then such a person 'defaults' permanently: 'fornication' is seen to function in a practical sense as *the* one 'unforgiveable sin' within the Revival Centres.

I mentioned earlier that Scripture presents something of a hierarchy of sins, and I will suggest now that the reverse 'merit-list' spans the two Testaments. The list is presented, for the first time, in Exodus 20:3-17. Scholars refer to it as the *Decalogue*. Most know it by the more popular title, the 'Ten Commandments'. This list formed the basis of the Israelite's behaviour towards God and others, as it did much later with respect to the Christian's behaviour. Importantly, though, the New Covenant under Jesus Christ fulfilled perfectly the intent or 'spirit' of the Ten Commandments, which served as the basis for the Mosaic law of the Old Covenant. The list, abbreviated somewhat, is:

1. You shall *not* worship any God other than Yahweh.
2. You shall *not* make and worship any image that stands in place of Yahweh.
3. You shall *not* make an oath in the name of Yahweh lightly.
4. You shall *not* forget the Sabbath day of Yahweh.
5. You shall honour your parents.

6. You shall *not* murder.
7. You shall *not* commit adultery.
8. You shall *not* steal.
9. You shall *not* bear false witness against your neighbour.
10. You shall *not* lust for anything that belongs to your neighbour.

The first four of the commandments—the four of *greatest* significance—deal with maintaining a right relationship and attitude towards God. This represents the *vertical axis*. Number five relates to the foundation of the community—the family relationship—and is the only commandment that is *not* a prohibition, one that specifically brings with it a positive and personalised promise. We might consider this to represent the *fulcrum*. The closing five commandments serve to address the maintenance of harmony within the corporate human sphere—the community: the *horizontal axis*. Sexual sin, which is typified and exemplified by the prohibition against adultery, sits at number seven, a little past mid-way in the list!

I mentioned earlier that Jesus Christ perfectly fulfilled the intent of the ‘Ten Commandments’ through his New Covenant sacrifice. The four gospels provide ample demonstrations of him addressing each of these commandments within a New Covenant context, including that hoary old ‘stickler’, number four. Jesus, we should remember, sought out and spent time with the very people whom the RCI would seemingly reject: including the *immoral*. Now he did not do so in order to *justify* their behaviours, he did so to demonstrate that God’s concern, God’s love, and God’s forgiveness extended even to *them*.

Sexual ethics and morality

A simple definition of the term ethics is, “*the enquiry into humanity’s moral nature so as to discover what are our responsibilities and the means by which we may fulfil them*”. Consequently, ethical enquiry is a reflective activity, one that must be informed by one’s belief or values system if it is to be meaningful. Ethics, then, do not take place in a vacuum, whether moral or otherwise. It stands to reason, therefore, that a Christian’s ethics will be informed by his or her Christian beliefs; by standards and norms of morality that are viewed as defining and as definitive. When outworked in a practical sense, one’s ethics will be representative of one’s theology rather than the reverse. This is certainly true of *orthodox* Christianity, and it is equally true of the RCI.

The Old Testament *Decalogue* formed the theological basis from which the Israelite ethical system progressed and developed. The ‘Ten Words’ comprised the *apodictic* law—the non-negotiable and binding rules—from which *casuistic* (or “case”) laws derived. In effect, the *Decalogue* served as the *theology* from which the day-to-day *ethics* of Israel as a community derived. In a New Testament sense Jesus summarised the ‘Ten Words’ into the Christian command, “*you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength; and you shall love your neighbour as yourself*” (Mark 12:30 and 31). In effect, this, the New Testament law, forms the bedrock theological basis from which a Christian’s ethical system—including his or her sexual ethics—derives. Theology drives ethics; ethics drives morality. So if one holds to a faulty theology, whether corporately or individually, one will invariably have a faulty ethical system. Conversely a faulty ethical system will inevitably result in a faulty sense of morals. And it is at precisely this which we note in the RCI.

Sexual sin

“Shun fornication! Every sin that a person commits is outside the body; but the fornicator sins against the body itself. Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own? For you were bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body.”

And so thunders the apostle Paul to the wayward Corinthian church (1 Corinthians 6:18-20, NRSV). The above verse was appealed to with force by Lloyd Longfield during the “Great Debate of ‘95”, as supporting *the* moral issue, and then as an indicator of just how *seriously* God views sexual sin. And let us *not* be mistaken, God views the issue *very* seriously! But what Longfield senior failed to do was adequately explicate the *context* of chapter 5 verses 18 through 20, notably in light of the *specific circumstance* which prompted Paul to pen these words. And it is the *specifics* of the situation which this essay will seek to briefly address.

We will seek to consider the issue of *fornication*; specifically, with how such is defended within the context of an oft-quoted Revival Centres ‘proof-text’. But first, we need to briefly review what is intended by the term ‘fornication’ itself.

The English word ‘fornication’ translates the Greek πορν (porn-) word group, which includes: πόρνευω (*porneuō*), πόρνη (*pornē*), πόρνος (*pornos*), and πορνεία (*porneia*). In classical Greek, the basic meaning of the lexical stem was, “to sell”; metaphorically, “to prostitute oneself”. However, in the received Greek translation of the Old Testamentⁱⁱⁱ, the translation that was most widely used within the early Christian church, πορν stood for the Hebrew זנה (*znh*), which meant “*illicit sexual intercourse*”. In this respect it differed from μοιχεύω (*moicheuō*) / נָפַח (*n’p*), which specifically referred to the act of adultery between a married person and someone other than his or her spouse.

In the Jewish rabbinical tradition that developed after the close of the Old Testament and prior to the establishment of the New, *porneia* included not only prostitution and *any* kind of extra-marital sexual intercourse, but also incest and all other forms of unnatural sexual activity. According to the *Wisdom of Solomon* 14:26-31, a person who surrenders to *porneia* gives evidence of having broken covenant with God. Further, *Jubilees* 33:13 and 18 declared that a person guilty of fornication had committed an *unforgivable* sin! To Judaism, sexual purity was an absolute: it protected the covenant community from transgressing the Seventh Commandment, a transgression which would immediately incur the wrath of God. A secondary but no less important benefit was that adherence ensured that family lineages remained ‘pure’ and legally recognised. The former concern was religious, the latter social. The former concern was ‘vertical’; the latter was ‘horizontal’.

Moving into the New Testament we discover that the *porn-* word group appears 55 times, the two largest groupings being in Paul’s writings (21 times, 15 of which occur in the two Corinthian letters) and in John’s Revelation (19 times). Clearly then the issue of *porneia* arose with the matrix of a Christian confrontation with the Greek world, and later still, within the context of the final judgment. Given that with respect to biblical interpretation “context is king”, it is necessary to review the *individual situations* that underpinned the various biblical usages in *full* if one is to develop a proper understanding of what Scripture teaches on the matter. For the purpose of this essay; however, 1 Corinthians 5:1-8 will serve as the indicative test passage for the Revival Centres morals policy, given that it is this passage which has most often

been appealed to in support of the RCI position on the *permanent* expulsion of ‘moral defaulters’.

To briefly set the stage, it seems somewhat telling that there are only *five* references in the gospels to *porneia*—Matthew 5:32; 15:19; and 19:9; Mark 7:21; and John 8:41. With respect to Matthew, the first is in the Beatitudes and relates to Jesus’ teaching on the grounds for divorce, a specific context. The second has Jesus identifying the true source of defilement, which is the sinful heart of man, a more generalised issue. The third has Jesus reinforcing his previous teaching on divorce, again a specific context. Turning to Mark we discover his to be a parallel account of the events recorded in Matthew 15:19. Finally, John’s account has Jesus confounding the Jews over the nature of their religious lineage, a specific context. In short as *porneia* was not a pervasive *cultural* issue to Jews, it did not require much in the way of expansion or comment in Jesus’ teaching. Sexual immorality, quite simply, was *not* a major issue for Judaism.

Turning to Paul we note the situation has shifted markedly. Given that his missionary efforts lay with the non-Jewish Greco-Roman culture, where sexual immorality was perceived in a completely different light, it is not surprising to discover that greater teaching and explanation proved necessary.

Luke used *porneia* thrice in his Acts (15:20 and 29; 21:25), each a reference to the Jerusalem Council’s requirement that the gentile Christians abstain from sexual immorality, alongside their abstinence from things dedicated to idols, meat sourced from strangled animals, and the consuming of blood. In short, that the gentile Christians abstained from those practices *most abhorrent* to their Jewish-Christian brethren. The underlying issue, then, is in the maintenance of *social* and *religious harmony* between Christians stemming from two rather different and divergent cultures, in other words a very specific context.

From the perspective of his writings it seems that Paul’s most personally distressing church was the one at Corinth. It was comprised mostly of ‘converted’ pagans, but of a largely superficial sort who had failed to appropriately divorce themselves from their previous sinful social and religious habits. Consequently, this was a thoroughly schismatic fellowship, one that squabbled over everything from the nature of authority through to appropriate forms of worship and participation. In some respects then, the church of Corinth is rather like a good many Christian churches today. Notably, however, it is also particularly similar to the Revivalist denominations. We note, for example, the similarity of the emphasis towards the ‘incidentals’ rather than the ‘fundamentals’, and the tendency towards misplaced pride/arrogance and schism.

Paul commenced his rebuke to the Corinthians by stating, “*It is actually reported that sexual immorality exists among you, the kind of immorality that is not permitted even among the Gentiles, so that someone is cohabiting with his father’s wife!*” 1 Corinthians 5:1 introduces the section of Paul’s letter that decisively challenges the Corinthian church’s behaviour with respect to immorality, lawsuits and prostitution (chapters five and six). These chapters provide us with an insight into the sorts of Greco-Roman behaviours that were considered to be thoroughly *normal* in a pagan sense—excepting for the charge of incest—but which brought considerable moral shame to the wider Christian community, harmed Paul’s ongoing missionary efforts, and caused the apostle considerable personal and pastoral anguish.

In contemporary Greek culture it was more-or-less the norm that men would be sexually promiscuous, both before and during marriage. A woman was not afforded

the same social leniency, however. Legal heirs were required in order to continue a family's citizenship and good-standing within the community. Consequently, a woman's virginity (prior to marriage) and her sexual constancy (after marriage) was intentionally and zealously guarded. Her 'defaulting' in this respect could lead to her speedy death, or to an immediate divorce and banishment given that a woman's citizenship, and therefore, her rights to legal and social protection, depended upon her relationship to a male citizen whether father, husband or son. The famous quote attributed to Apollodorus sums up the matter succinctly: "*We have courtesans for pleasure, handmaidens for the day-to-day care of the body, wives to bear legitimate children and to be a trusted guardian of things in the house*"^{iv}. Both Jewish and Christian writers agreed that the Greco-Roman world was characterised by moral corruption in a general sense. Sexual sins were prevalent, and nearly all of the catalogues of sins that we see in the New Testament have a range of synonyms for 'licentiousness'^v. Interestingly, the numerous words in the Greek language that describes 'sexual relations', suggests a decided pre-occupation with this aspect of life. Homosexuality was rife, and was legally permissible between males of teenage years through to the early twenties. Prostitution, notably in a religious context, was ubiquitous with the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth being world renowned. In fact, Corinthian immorality was so well known throughout the ancient world as to become something of a byword: to 'Corinthianise' meant to play the harlot!

This was the social fabric and setting in which the church of Corinth was established, and such were the sorts of sins that continued to beset her well into the second century!^{vi}

But what of us who live in a post-Grecian, 21st century western world? Apparently, not too much has changed.

Post-Christian Western society is in some respects defined by a very relaxed approach to the issues of personal morality and the social ethics that attach to the same. Virginity, and with it personal sexual purity, no longer seems to be prized in the way that it historically has been. Consequently, sexual promiscuity is widely regarded as being a *non sequitur* of modern life and culture. Clearly, then, we modern Western Christians have more in the way of social and cultural linkage with the gentile Christians that Paul ministered to during the first century, than we do with the contemporary Jewish Christians ministered to by the likes of James. Again, context is fundamental to establishing meaning.

1 Corinthians 5:1-8

It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality among you, and of a kind that is not found even among pagans; for a man is living with his father's wife. ² And you are arrogant! Should you not rather have mourned, so that he who has done this would have been removed from among you?

³ For though absent in body, I am present in spirit; and as if present I have already pronounced judgment ⁴ in the name of the Lord Jesus on the man who has done such a thing. When you are assembled, and my spirit is present with the power of our Lord Jesus, ⁵ you are to hand this man over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.

⁶ Your boasting is not a good thing. Do you not know that a little yeast leavens the whole batch of dough? ⁷ Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new batch, as you really are unleavened. For our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed. ⁸

Therefore, let us celebrate the festival, not with the old yeast, the yeast of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. (NRSV)

Our current passage presents as a topical and extended discussion on a rather *specific* instance for the application of moral discipline within the church. It involves the case of a younger man within the Christian community at Corinth co-habiting in a 'marriage-like' relationship with the wife of his father. Importantly, there exists considerable *contextual specificity*, which needs to be identified *before* one attempts to make 'sweeping' judgments as to what is or isn't the timeless 'biblical' teaching on the subject of 'fornication' and/or adultery. To begin with the text identifies the following: (1) to begin with the use of the passive voice Greek term for 'reported' signals the *continuation* of the oral report that was brought by Chloe's people in 1:11. Clearly then, this *specific* event was of considerable and pointed interest to Paul, and was partly the reason for his writing to the Corinthian church as he did. (2) Paul's concern shifts from "about you" in 1:10 to "among you" in 5:1. The subtle shift in emphasis bespeaks the nature of Paul's concerns. (3) The 'incestuous' relationship is earmarked as being a particularly abhorrent and outrageous sub-class of *porneia*, one that was *not* tolerated *even* by the gentiles^{vii}. (4) Next, the present tense of the infinitive ἔχειν (*echein*), "is having", denotes an *ongoing* and *continuous* activity; contrasted against a one-time or perhaps a past-time event^{viii}. (5) The NRSV translates πεφυσιωμένοι as, "you are so arrogant", although the continuous effects of the perfective tense of this passive participle leans *more* towards the concept of the church (leaders) *remaining complacent* about the issue. In other words, to the leaders of the church at Corinth what the young man was doing was 'no big deal'. In this respect our current passage hearkens back to the earlier passages in the letter that address the idea of improper 'boasting', with the decided sense of "not again!" (6) The perfect indicative active κέκρικα (*kekrika*), "I pronounce judgment", implies that Paul had *already* reached a settled and public verdict on the man. A *previous* apostolic judgment had been given, but one that had been *ignored* by the Corinthian leaders!

In effect, then, we have a situation where a member of the Corinthian church was *openly* living in a promiscuous sexual relationship with his step-mother, and such constituted an offense to *both* Greek and Jewish customs and sensibilities. The situation had *previously* been reported to Paul, and his public, apostolic direction had been for the leaders of the church to *expel* the member from the believing community: the man's actions tainted the community from *within*, and harmed Paul's evangelistic efforts *without*. The church leaders, however, chose to ignore Paul; they had become complacent/arrogant because they believed that their 'new status' as Christians rendered null and void the requirement to adhere to *any* and *all* previous legal, moral and social conventions! This failure on their part to grasp the *ethical* requirements inherent in their status as Christians is a continuing theme within 1 Corinthians.

Paul indicated in verse five that the purpose behind the ejection of the offending man from table fellowship within the Christian community was *salvific* rather than a *punitive*: the aim was spiritual restoration rather than temporal punishment. In deciding as they have done the RCI leadership has failed to understand that ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (*olethron tēs sarkos*), "destruction of the flesh", can refer to the whole 'self' as perceived in terms of a specific event. In other words, the 'destruction' itself can refer to the destruction of the particular aspects or qualities which the term denotes. The famed early Church Father and theologian Origen noted this when he commented that the phrase meant, "...the destruction of the mind or

stance of the flesh^{ix}. The implication is that what is to be destroyed is the self-glorifying or self-satisfaction of the offending man and perhaps also, of the complacent/arrogant Christian community. The peculiar phrase, “*handing the man over to Satan*” implies excluding him from the ‘Body’ life of the Christian community, which should then spell the end of self-congratulation. Being subjected to total isolation from the rest of the believing community would serve to trigger the remorse necessary to invoke repentance within the man, the eventual result being his restoration to complete and unfettered fellowship.

In summary what Paul had in mind was *not* the permanent expulsion of the Revival Centres, with the “defaulter’s” eventual and eternal ‘state’ being left up to God; but the *temporary* removal of the man in the hope that such would lead to the ‘destruction’ of his current self-serving and promiscuous ‘lifestyle’, thereby triggering remorse (both personal and corporate), repentance (again both personal and corporate) and eventual restoration into the believing community. 1 Corinthians 5:1-8, then, *does not* provide a sound biblical basis for the RCI’s doctrinal policy of permanent expulsion for so-called ‘moral defaulters’.

Conclusion

It is possible to multiply the biblical examples *ad infinitum* in order to demonstrate the gross and destructive error of the Revival Centres International on this subject. However, this really should not be necessary. Sufficient numbers of Revival Centres pastors identified the error for what it was, to exodus *en masse* into the newly established Revival Fellowship throughout 1995 and 1996, to adequately prove the point. The very tenor of the New Testament message of *reconciliation* itself speaks *against* the Revival Centres International misunderstanding.

In closing, let us be blunt. There is *not* a single verse or passage in the entire New Testament that teaches that a person must marry in order to “tidy up” an act of sexual immorality. The only passages that teach about marriage in this respect are *preventative* in their specific contexts, not *remedial*. There is *not* a single verse or passage in the entire New Testament that teaches that sexual immorality of *any* sort, whether pre-marital sex, extra-marital sex or homosexuality serves as grounds for the *permanent expulsion* of the offending party or parties from a believing community of Christians—a church—when such behaviour is repented of and concluded with. Although *ongoing* activity of such a sort *remains* grounds for the expulsion of a Christian brother or sister from fellowship, the purpose of the ‘ban’ remains *salvific* and *restorative*, not *punitive* and *permanent*. It always remains the mandate of the church to seek out the lost, and to restore the wayward. And it is no less a figure than Jesus Christ himself who provides the exemplar of such an attitude.

Perhaps the ideal way to recapitulate the issue is to pose a rhetorical and theological moral question? Which serves as the *greater* sin, and therefore the more *deserving* of permanent condemnation: moral and sexual failure *a la* fornication or adultery? Or denying the Lord Jesus Christ before others? According to Second Corinthians the man who *had* lived in sexual sin with his stepmother was restored to fellowship by apostolic injunction after demonstrating his repentance. And with respect to the second issue, Jesus Christ himself *restored* the repentant Peter after the latter denied him publicly during his pre-crucifixion trial before the Great Sanhedrin. In common with *all* New Testament concerns, the heart of the issue rests on Christ’s teaching about, and personal example of, G-R-A-C-E.

ⁱ Whilst the “morals doctrine” served as the *catalyst* for the schism that led to the forming of the Revival Fellowship, it is clear that the actual division resulted from a complex of issues that related to authority, power and the rights of succession within the Revival Centres International.

ⁱⁱ However, emphasis needs to be directed towards the issue of such behaviours being an ‘ongoing’ reality.

ⁱⁱⁱ The so-called *Septuagint* (LXX).

^{iv} Pseudo Demosthenes 59.122.

^v See for example, 1 Corinthians 6:9; Galatians 5:19 and Colossians 3:5.

^{vi} As the letters attributed to Clement of Rome attest.

^{vii} For example, Gaius, *Institutes*, 1:63; Cicero, *Pro Cluentio* 5.27; Catullus, *The Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus* 74 and 88-90.

^{viii} This is a *crucial* point of distinction. Paul’s prohibition and call for church discipline is towards continuing (unrepented of) sexual immorality. Our passage says nothing of past, or repented of, actions.

^{ix} Origen, *1 Corinthian Fragments*, 24:93:12-13.