malignant ulcer, or other disease.” Estius’s  
objection to this, that in 2 Cor. ii. and vii.  
we find no trace of such bodily chastisement  
is not to the point, —because we  
have no proof that this delivering to Satan  
*was ever inflicted*,—nor does the Apostle  
*command it,* but only describes it as his  
own determination, held as it were *in terrorem*  
over the offender. See note on  
ver. 13.—Observe, destruction of his **flesh**,  
the offending element, not of his body.  
St. Paul could not say this, seeing that  
the body is to partake of the salvation  
of the spirit ;—but not the *flesh*,  
see ch. xv. 50.   
  
  
**5.**] The aim of  
the destruction of the flesh,—which he  
said, as Chrysostom remarks, “to put  
bounds to the devil, and not to allow him  
to advance further.” Thus the proposed  
punishment, severe as it might seem,  
would be in reality a merciful one, tending  
to the eternal happiness of the offender.  
A greater contrast to this can hardly be  
conceived, than the terrible forms of excommunication subsequently devised, and  
even now in use in the Romish church,  
under the fiction of delegated apostolic  
power. The delivering to Satan *for the  
destruction of the spirit*, can belong only  
to those who *do the work of Satan*.

**6.]** ‘How inconsistent with your  
harbouring such an one, appear your high  
flown conceits of yourselves!’   
  
  
**Your  
glorying**: literally, **your matter of glorying. Are you not aware that a little  
leaven imparts a character to the whole  
lump?** That this is the meaning, and  
not, ‘that a little leaven *will*, if not purged  
out, leaven the whole lump,’ is manifest  
from the point in hand, viz. the inconsistency  
sistency of their *boasting*: which would  
not appear by their *danger of corruption*  
*hereafter*, but by their *character* being  
*actually lost*. One of them was a fornicator  
of a fearfully depraved kind, tolerated  
and harbored : by this fact, the *character  
of the whole was tainted*.

**7.] The**  
old leaven is not the *man*, but the *crime*,  
attaching to their character as a church,  
which was a remnant of their unconverted  
state, their “*old man*.” This they are to  
purge out from among them. The command  
alludes to the careful ‘purging out’  
from the houses of every thing leavened  
before the commencement of the feast of  
unleavened bread.—**That ye may be a new  
lump** (opposed to the “*old man*” of old  
and dissolute days), **as ye are** (normally,  
and by your Christian profession) **unleavened** (i.e. dead to sin and free from  
it). This indicating the state by profession  
the *normal state,* as a fact, and  
the *grounding of exhortations on it*, is  
common enough with our Apostle,—see  
Rom. vi. 3, 4: ch. iii. 16, and other places,  
and involves no tautology here, any more  
than elsewhere.—An unfortunate interpretation  
has been given to these words,  
—as ye are *now celebrating the feast of  
unleavened bread*;’ and has met with  
some recent defenders. See in my Greek  
Test. the reasons which have led me to  
decide against this view. I can only say  
here, that the reference is one *wholly alien  
from the habit and spirit of our Apostle*.  
The ordinances of the old law are to him *not*  
*points on whose actual observance to ground  
spiritual lessons*, but things passed in,  
their literal acceptance, and become *spiritual  
verities* in Christ. He thus regards  
the Corinthian church as (normally) *the  
unleavened lump* at the Passover; he beseeches  
them to put away the old leaven  
from among them, to correspond with this