offender, if a Jewish convert, might defend  
his conduct by the Rabbinical maxim that  
in the case of a proselyte, the forbidden  
degrees were annulled, *a new birth* having  
been undergone by him. This latter however is rendered improbable by the fact  
that the Apostle says nothing of the  
*woman*, which he would have done, had she  
been a Christian :—and that Jewish maxim  
was taxed with the condition, that a proselyte  
might marry any of his or her former  
relatives, only provided they came over to  
the Jewish religion. The father was living,  
and is described in 2 Cor. vii. 12, as “he  
that suffered wrong;” and from the Apostle  
saying there that he did not write on *his  
account*, he was probably a Christian.

**2. ye are puffed up]** Not, which would be  
absurd,—at the occurrence of this crime,  
nor as Chrysostom and some others fancy,  
because the offender was a party teacher:  
but, as before, with a notion of their own  
wisdom and spiritual perfection: the being  
puffed up is only a fault which co-existed  
*with* this disgrace, not one founded upon  
it.

**and did not rather mourn** (viz.  
when the crime became first known to  
you), that (your mourning would be because  
of the existence of the evil, i.e. with *a  
view to its removal*) **he who did this deed  
might be removed from among you** (viz.  
by your casting him out from your society.

**3—5.]** justifies the expression  
just used, by declaring the judgment  
which the Apostle, although absent, had  
already passed on the offender.

**3.] I verily, I for my part..  
hath so done...]** The **so** may point to  
*some peculiarly offensive method* in which  
he had brought about the marriage, which  
was known to the Corinthians, but unknown  
to us. Or we may understand it,  
‘*under such circumstances*,’ ‘being such  
as he is, a member of Christ’s body.’ But  
this, being before patent, would hardly be  
thus emphatically denoted. Perhaps after  
all, it refers merely to the peculiar heinousness  
of the kind of offence: compare “*such  
fornication*,” in ver. 1.

**4.]** ‘This sentence  
stands thus: In the name of our  
Lord Jesus belongs to the clause to **deliver  
such an one**, **&c.**, that which intervenes  
being parenthetical **(when ye have been  
assembled together and my spirit with the  
power of our Lord Jesus)**.

**my spirit,**  
i.e. ‘**I** myself, in spirit, endowed by our  
Lord Jesus with apostolic power:’ and  
then the words **with the power of** our  
**Lord Jesus Christ** belong to **my spirit**, and  
are not to be taken as indicating a mere   
element in the assembly. *What does the  
sentence here prescribed import*? Not  
mere excommunication, though it is doubtless  
included. It was a delegation to the  
Corinthian church of a *special power,  
reserved to the Apostles themselves, of inflicting  
corporeal death or disease* as a  
punishment for sin. Of this we have notable  
examples in the case of Ananias and  
Sapphira, and Elymas, and another hinted  
at 1 Tim. i. 20. The congregation itself  
could *expel from among themselves*,—but  
it could not *give over to Satan for the*  
*destruction of his flesh*, without the  
authorized concurrence of the Apostle’s  
*spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus  
Christ*. What the *destruction of his flesh*  
was to be, does not appear: certainly  
more than the mere destruction of his  
pride and lust by repentance, as some suppose:  
rather, as Chrysostom suggests,  
“that Satan might afflict him with a