(2) *That of practice*, where open *immorality* is held  
and *practised*. 1 Cor. v.  
 If the angel should be remiss after this warning,  
Jesus would come to him. No threat against himself,  
individually, is *expressed;* but the removal of the lamp,  
as at Ephesus, seems to be implied. The Lord’s coming  
may be *either joyous or grievous* to His own people,  
according as He *finds their work to be*.  
 Here is “evil unjudged” in a church; yet the Saviour  
only warns. The *sound portion of the believers did not  
leave communion*. They are not taught by our Lord  
to do so; even if, after divine warning, the angel should  
leave the evil untouched.  
 But a sterner menace is directed against the criminals.  
Jesus held not the sword in vain.  
 *How awful a threatening to be uttered against a  
portion of his servants!* “I will war against them  
with the sword of my mouth.”

“He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith  
unto the Churches.”

The Holy Ghost again throws wide the lessons of the  
epistle to every one of spiritually-opened ear. Where  
the majority fall away from their true standing, individuals may yet retain their integrity, and receive approval from the Lord Jesus. The address to the angel is over; every member of the Church is now appealed to.

17. “To him that overcometh will I give of the hidden manna;  
and I will give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name  
written which none knoweth, save he that receiveth it.”

What is the *meaning* of the promise? Here interpretations file off in two directions: some regarding it as  
spiritual; others as literal. Our maxim is, to apply  
the principle of *literality first*. Is it absurd to take it  
thus? Some may say, they think it is. How shall we  
decide it *then?* By scripture instances. *That cannot  
be absurd, which has already been in fact fulfilled*.