

moral sense of man. Society, as another has observed, would disclaim the offence contemplated in 1 Cor. v.; but society would never deal with it as the Church is there called to deal with it. Society, for instance, would never put covetousness or extortion in company with it; but the saint is instructed to do so. The moral sense of man would there make distinctions, when the pure element of the house of God resents all alike as unworthy of it.

“This is ‘fine gold,’ dear brother—gold refined again and again. Even the morals of the Church are to be of another quality from those of men. What sanctions are brought in in 1 Cor. v., vi., as to the common matters of life! If the saint be to abstain from fornication, it is because his body is *a temple*—‘the temple of the Holy Ghost;’ if he be to refuse the judgment of others in the affairs of this life, in their more ordinary ways of right and wrong, of debit and credit, it is because he himself is destined to be a judge in the seat of the world to come, even from a throne of glory. Is not this ‘fine gold’? Does not such sanction make morals *divine*? What, in the world’s morality, is like this? And I ask further, is not the need of this divine or peculiar agency, to the effecting of any moral results, intimated in Luke xi. 21–27? If it be not the *Stronger Man* possessing himself of the house, is anything done for God? If it be merely the unclean spirit going out, the end of the history of the house is, that it becomes more fitted for deeper evil. The emptied state, even ac-