

## CHAPTER XI

### THE CHURCH AS A SOCIETY (A)

THAT the Lord Jesus Christ came to found a Society or Church upon earth through which the blessings of His Gospel should be diffused over the whole world is an admitted proposition. That this Society was to be filled with His Spirit and guided by His laws is equally indisputable. He intended that His Church should be an attraction to all mankind. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye love one another." To make Christ's Church an attraction was the aim of the Apostles. St. Paul, with frequent exhortations that the strong bear the infirmities of the weak, and that Christians avoid quarrels and litigations, being filled with charity as the highest of all graces ; St. John, inculcating mutual love as the commandment given from the beginning ; St. Peter by urging on his friends to beware of all illegal deeds ; and St. James by his definition of pure religion and undefiled, were all endeavouring to build up the Church as an attraction to the world, as a haven to the tempest-tossed, and a helper to the needy.

If, then, we are asked to define this Society or

Church, we must say that it is an organised Society under rule and order; its true members are the redeemed who have accepted eternal life in Christ; its outward marks are the two sacraments; its indispensable officials the ministers of the Word; its characteristic such mutual brotherly love in obedience to the precept and divine example of the Saviour as to draw all men in. As the wanderer on barren moor in the dark welcomes the light that streams from some cheerful home, so must they that are without learn to regard the household of God. The spirit within is everything; if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of His.

### I. *Membership and Discipline*

The Church of Christ, like every other Society, had from the first its formula of admission and the power of exclusion. This is known as the power of discipline, or the power of the keys. But its power of exclusion is of no weight unless its power of attraction be great. To be shut out is no penalty unless one longs to enter. The Church has sometimes reversed this, and upon the terrors of exclusion has tried to found the attractiveness of admission. The closing picture in the Apocalypse might have taught a higher lesson. The presence of the Lamb, and the fellowship of the sainted are within the Golden Gates and beside the River of Life; without are sorcerers and all doers of evil, and the Spirit and the Bride say Come.

Let us look for a little at the conditions of member-

ship and the sacramental privileges of members. To believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, as God's Son, the Word come in the flesh, crucified, raised, glorified,—that was the condition of membership; and the kingdom was so much an object of desire that the eager nations crowded in, the violent took it by force.

The Church of Christ has always admitted members through Baptism, and has regarded the Lord's Supper as the Household Table at which members of the family assemble.

Regarding BAPTISM. The imagery of St. Paul's Epistles suggests that immersion was the form of Baptism, wherein believers were "buried with Christ." It is usually supposed that this was the ordinary mode down to the third century, and that the only controversy was whether a sick person should be immersed. Yet the *Didaché* (say A.D. 100) directs that warm water might be used in the case of invalids, and if water is scarce—too scanty a supply for immersion—it is to be poured three times upon the head. This is regarded as valid by the author, whose general rule, however, is three immersions in "living (*i.e.* running) water."

The evidence of Archæology is against the ordinary use of immersion in the early ages of Christianity. It seems to show that the primitive form of baptism was water poured on the head of a person standing in water; that not till the ninth century was this changed into immersion, and that chiefly in the Eastern Church; that from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth immersion was the rule even in the Western Church; that from

the sixteenth century till our time effusion or sprinkling has been the rule in the West, except in the "Baptist" Church.<sup>1</sup>

**THE LORD'S SUPPER.** At some risk of repetition (see pp. 93 ff., 129), we may here say regarding the Lord's Supper that it was from a very early date in the life of the Church connected with the Agapé or Love Feast. The Agapé in some respects resembled Roman, and in some respects Jewish, social feasts, but it was in its essence different from both. The Roman were convivial feasts with no charitable purpose; the Jewish was an exclusive festival with no room for guests. The Christian Agapé was, as we have seen, at once a means of brotherly communion and a provision for the poor. But the question occurs as to the relation of that friendly and charitable festival to the Sacrament of the Supper. The Sacrament was instituted at the close of a Jewish meal—the Passover—and it appears that for some time the Sacrament was observed at the close of the Agapé.<sup>2</sup> There seems to be ground for believing that the term Lord's Supper (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*) was sometimes used<sup>3</sup> so as to include both the Sacrament

<sup>1</sup> See *Baptism and Christian Archaeology*, by Clement F. Rogers, Oxford, 1903, and Professor Warfield in *Princeton Review*, July 1904. See argument for immersion as the rule till the fourth century, except for sick people, in article by Dr. Bigg, *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1904. The argu-

ment chiefly rests on rather obscure patristic references which may be explained by copious effusion.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom reverses the order, but he is not accepted as accurate. (See Keating as in next note.)

<sup>3</sup> So Dr. Keating, *The Agapé and the Eucharist*, p. 172, a very learned and dispassionate book.

and the friendly festival, but St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. xi. 20 shows that in the Apostle's mind there was a clear distinction. Thus he goes on (vv. 33, 34) to urge that they should not come as to an ordinary feast at all, because the place for a hearty feast is at home. Those words seem to discountenance the attempt to make provision for the poor and for strangers in a church feast connected at all with the Sacrament. They are deep-searching words, and the experience of the Church in later generations proved how wise they were. Attempts have been made to show that they are not incompatible with a hospitable meal for strangers, but the attempts do not succeed. They are indeed quite compatible with hospitality at home and gifts in kind laid before the President of a meeting in the church for distribution among the poor before sunset. This is quite another matter from eating them in the church, in imitation of the Jews, who took their feast in some building near by the Synagogue.

The Church was long in separating the Holy Sacrament from some other feast of communion (see *Didaché*), and her apologists, notably Tertullian, pointed to her brotherly hospitality as a proof of the high-toned goodness of her members. But after some centuries, during which many abuses crept in, as in Corinth at the first, the Lord's Supper was liberated from the feast. The liberation would have come much sooner had not Christians wished to escape the terrors of the Roman law by keeping a feast resembling what was known and (more or less) permitted in connection with Roman

non-political clubs. It was something for them to plead that their meetings resembled, though of higher purpose far, such well-known gatherings as those of heathen Rome, which dated from the days of the Republic. But when the Church was set free in the fourth century the Agapé soon disappeared.

Many questions, however, arise regarding the Lord's Supper itself. At an early date there was difference, rather than dispute, as to the sense in which our Lord's words *This is My Body* are to be interpreted. By and by disputes came. The utterance of those words in the celebration intimated a change upon the simple elements (see before, p. 129; Note on the Eucharist); but did that mean simply that the Bread and Wine thereafter represented His Body and Blood, or did they indicate His spiritual presence—unseen—beneath the symbols; or did it mean more, even that in some mysterious way they were no longer Bread and Wine, but became the very Christ; and further still, did it mean that, once consecrated, the elements became the very Body and Blood of Christ, so as to be fitly adored by the faithful? Into these remote and mysterious questions we have no need to penetrate.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Those who wish to see how good and able men discuss them in our day will find much food for reflection in *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice* (a Report of a Conference of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents at Oxford, A.D. 1900, Professor Sanday, Convener) and

in *The Doctrine of Holy Communion and its Expression in Ritual*, being Report of a Conference of Members of the Church of England at Fulham, A.D. 1900, Dr. Wace (now Dean of Canterbury) in the chair. The discussions are supremely interesting.

It is enough for us here to remember that since the foundation of Christ's Church the Sacrament of the Supper has been the visible bond of union between the members of the Church and the once crucified Lord, and also between those members one with another. The Church in every land rejoices to have this Sacrament as a means of testifying before God and angels and men to her love of Christ and faith in Him, and believes that in "doing this," as in obedience to all His commands, there is experienced by the humble heart a real and great blessing. It is easy to raise controversy by any statement, but in all the diversities of faith it is agreed that the Spirit of God makes the Sacrament a means of grace and of growth in godliness. There is no proof that the Christian who presided at the Communion in the early Church was a bishop, still less that he was a priest. All Christians are priests in the usage of the New Testament, and they who preside are "the ministerial organs of the Church's priesthood,"<sup>1</sup> delegates of the great priestly body to which they belong, offering up in the congregation, as all Christians offer in their own life, spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. It is a weary task to weigh arguments or inquiries as to the Lord's Supper being a sacrifice offered to God by man; sad work to consider what is the relation of the Crucified Body of Jesus Christ to the Glorified Body of the triumphant Redeemer, and which Body is offered in the Mass. It is a simple and blessed thing to sit at the Communion Table and

<sup>1</sup> Canon Moberly.

“do this in remembrance” of the Lord, and to expect that He will send His Spirit to us, so that we shall be by faith “made partakers of His Body and Blood to our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.” The great meaning of the Sacrament is best seen—as surely we might well expect—in close adherence to the unadorned simplicity of its First Institution. The communion with one another, which was so marked a feature, seems to disappear when the elements are distributed rather than “partaken of.” It is most like the First Communion when there is the Common Table, the Common Meal, and the Bread and the Cup passed from one to another by the thankful believers.<sup>1</sup>

The Church penalty was *Expulsion*. In respect of this the Christian Church imitated the Synagogue. In our Lord’s own words we find (St. Matthew xviii. 17),<sup>2</sup> that He contemplated the imposition of the penalty of exclusion, and expressly conferred upon His Church the power to bind or loose, of which admission and exclusion are the exercise (see Matt. v. 22; Gal. ii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 3). Instances of the extreme form of exclusion we find in the well-known case of the incestuous person in the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. v. 4 and 5), and in 1 Timothy, where St. Paul says he has given over Hymenæus and Alex-

<sup>1</sup> This is disappearing from the ritual of many congregations in the Presbyterian Church. Communion in the pews, even pews without a white covering cloth, is not uncommon.

<sup>2</sup> “If he shall neglect to hear thee, tell it unto the church: and if he shall neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.”

ander to Satan "that they may learn not to blaspheme." A milder form of exclusion by the Christian Society we find in 2 Thess. iii. 14, where the Christians are told to keep no company with the offender until such time as he is ashamed of his misconduct. In thus exercising the power of discipline, the disciples of Christ were using those keys of the Kingdom of Heaven which were given to the Twelve, and to Peter, as their leader and chief. For three hundred years after miracles ceased the Christian Church had no power but that of persuasion, no penalty but that of more or less rigorous exclusion. It never so grew in love, so waxed mighty in Divine power; never could its advocates and apologists so challenge comparison for its members with all men. In course of time the penalties were arranged in a graduated scale, and became more complicated, even more so than the minute Levitical system. An ordinary congregation was a motley gathering when so many penitents were grouped in various places according to their sin and penance. For two centuries penance lasted only for weeks, but its term grew longer, to ten, fifteen years, or for life. Culprits had to observe the penitential stations at church. Mourners stopped outside the door, penitential "hearers" apparently did the same, "kneelers" stood just within the door arrayed in sackcloth, the *standers* were along with the ordinary congregation, but had to leave before the Eucharist. Some were excluded from partaking of the Lord's Supper and from joining in offering the oblations and in the prayers of the faithful, although they were

allowed to stay in church until the catechumens left. Some were outcasts from all the service, and were even debarred from entering the building when the congregation worshipped. Not only were they ordered to have no intercourse with believers, but believers who had intercourse with them were excommunicated.<sup>1</sup> Those penalties were regarded as terminable, "poenae medicinales"; but there was another which was lifelong as well as (in extreme cases) efficacious for both worlds. The Councils were not always at one in construing the sentence, some shrinking back from what others spoke trippingly on the tongue. In the eighth century it was said in awful words, "We confound them with eternal malediction and condemn with perpetual anathema. . . . May they be numbered with the Devil and his angels."<sup>2</sup> This is

The awful doom which canons tell  
Shuts Paradise and opens Hell.

Things went from bad to worse until public penance was abolished; gradually and from the fifth century private penance came in and grew apace. The private

<sup>1</sup> See Smith's *Dictionary*, article "Excommunication. Council of Toledo," c. 15 (A.D. 400). Comp. the Acts of Scottish Assembly, 1569: Persons excommunicated were to stand bareheaded at the church door till prayers and singing be ended, and sit at the public place of repentance bareheaded all the time of sermon, and again depart before the Lord's Prayer. (Pardovan, 437). In 1643-1648:

If a minister haunt the company of excommunicated persons he shall be suspended for the first fault and deprived for the second, unless he have licence from his Presbytery, or else the excommunicated person be *in extremis* (Pardovan, 434).

<sup>2</sup> Anglican Pontifical of eighth century, Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities* — "Excommunication."

confessional came with it; the power of the priest and the bishop also waxed mightily, and in the Eastern part of the Church preliminary absolution was given at once, though restoration to communion did not come till the end of the time of penance. This arose from the fact that in addition to exclusion from privileges, or suspension of them, the offender was in some cases called upon to pay continuously certain penalties. Out of this grew the elaborate system of Penance and Indulgences, which became so great an evil as to be the proximate occasion, and very largely the cause, of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. The infliction of penalties was accompanied by the growth of a system of Indulgences, applying both to this world and the next. To Tetzels shameless sale of those Indulgences was largely due Luther's brave rebellion.

In the exercise of this discipline a man was always judged, in the Christian Church, at least by his peers, and usually by his peers and superiors combined. The laity were judged by the clergy, the clergy by the bishop and clergy, the bishop by his metropolitan, the metropolitan by bishops and the patriarch, and an offending patriarch by the Pope and Council. This was the Church system. In the New Testament it would appear that every member of the Church was, in the ordinary case, judged by his fellow-members. Thus St. Paul does not excommunicate the incestuous man. He calls upon the Corinthian Church to exclude him.

In later times the Church was fearless in asserting

against the highest dignitaries her power of exclusion. That power was owned. The Emperor Philip was excluded from the Church till he did penance. Athanasius excommunicated the Prefect of Libya, and Basil refused the communion to that excommunicated man. Ambrose drove the Emperors Maximus and Theodosius from the doors of his church. Chrysostom shut the Church against Eudoxia, and Synesius against Andronicus, the Prefect<sup>1</sup> Yet for long it was not admitted, or even claimed, that the spiritual sentence and censure went beyond spiritual things. For six or seven centuries after Constantine no one believed that a whole community could be put under interdict for the fault of any one member, be he Bishop or be he Prince. Augustine said (*Ep.* 75) that a family could not be excommunicated for the fault of its head, and a nation could not for the fault of its sovereign. At God's table the King is no King, but a simple member. Yes, and from that it followed that not the King but the member was put under ban or excommunication. Till Gregory VII.<sup>2</sup> (Hildebrand) extended and deepened the sway of Papal power those things were admitted. (A few doubtful exceptions do not count.) Gregory went further far. In his hands the penalty of excommunication inflicted on a kingdom was terrible. Great Kings, and even Emperors, crouched before the Pope, who wielded this awful weapon of terror. A potentate might for himself have made head against the pontiff, but his soldiers and all his subjects who had intercourse with the excom-

<sup>1</sup> Du Pin, 279.

<sup>2</sup> See Du Pin, 289.

municated sovereign were themselves excommunicated, and, in terror for their own spiritual privileges, they refused to support their temporal head against the head of the Church. The Pope absolved every soldier and subject from allegiance to the degraded King. And thus the victory was won. That the Emperor Henry should wait those three days at the door of Hildebrand, in thinnest garb, in winter cold, at Canossa, seems the result of the successful tyranny of a stronger power than his own; and it was all that, but it was also an assertion by the Pope of the great truth that the Christian Church is a spiritual society entitled to assert its own conditions of membership against every offender. It was a complicated thing to pronounce clearly upon in that particular case, but throughout the whole career of Hildebrand the Pope was supported by the conscience of Christendom. He was asserting spiritual truth against "wickedness in high places." It was the same backing of public conscience that had enabled Hildebrand to prevail over the clergy of Milan, indurated in long indulgence, but compelled in his iron grasp to abandon and forswear their ways. That human pride largely tinctured the proceedings of Hildebrand it is needless to say, as it were idle to deny; but, notwithstanding, the conflicts in which that great Pope won the victory would have had disastrous issue had he been vanquished. The discipline of the Church was oppressive in his hands, but if it had been overturned by a reckless Emperor, or undermined by unfaithful clergy in Milan or elsewhere, the Church of Christ would have

been throwing its heaven-given keys into the depths of the sea.<sup>1</sup> The evil lay in this, that to gain a spiritual end Hildebrand used most material means; that to humble pride he himself grew prouder. The day came when he fell by the same weapon he had wielded, but his pride remained. "I have loved justice and hated iniquity (he said), therefore I die in exile."<sup>2</sup>

The power of discipline is essential to a living Church. She must have the right of her freedom to define the conditions of membership, always in accordance with the directions of Holy Writ. In interpreting these directions she may err. As a matter of fact she has often erred, but this discipline is, notwithstanding, her inalienable prerogative, and when days of purer vision come, she always puts her right in exercise. Before the Church was mixed up with the Imperial edicts of more-than-half-heathen Rome, her community was the fairest form that human society had ever taken. Lecky says that the Christian community, for two hundred years after its establishment in Europe, exhibited a moral purity which, if it has ever been seen, has never for any very long period been surpassed.<sup>3</sup>

During that early time the Christian Society used its power of excommunication sparingly, and only upon the gravest occasions. Membership of the Christian Church was highly valued, and excommunication from it shut out a man not only from participation in religious

<sup>1</sup> See Du Pin, p. 279.

<sup>2</sup> May 25, 1085.

<sup>3</sup> Lecky, *Civilisation in Europe*,

vol. ii. p. 12. See also Marshall's *Penitential Discipline*, pp. 154 ff. for pains taken by the Church.

rites, but thereby, in a considerable degree, from the intercourse of Christian society. This was all, but it was enough. When the Church thus rested the power of her censures upon her own spiritual commission, and made her circle a happy, holy brotherhood, the censures were fruitful for good. But when they were held to involve direct civil effects, they became tyrannical. Even those under Hildebrand were not in reality of such doubtful value as Church censures have often been when they involved the serious temporal consequences which are fittingly enough visited upon the criminal by the State. By the establishment of St. Louis, the estate or person of the excommunicated man might be attached by a magistrate. Both Pepin and Charlemagne intimated, though somewhat vaguely, that the State would give effect to Church censures. Hallam says that by the common law of England an excommunicated person is incapable of being a witness or of bringing an action, and that he may be detained in prison until he obtains absolution. By the law of Scotland, at and after the Reformation, men were not allowed the privileges of citizens of this kingdom unless they conformed to the Church and participated in her rites. In Scandinavia even the recently relaxed laws make confirmation in the State Church indispensable for all royal appointments, for governors, judges, and all military officers of high rank. Alliances with the civil power, such as those legal provisions indicate, cannot be productive of good to the Spiritual Society which Christ founded. The consequence of them is that the Church cannot,

from very compunction, exercise her discipline where it is really needed, and depends in practice upon ordinary public opinion, and not upon her own official acts, for the purity of the life of her members.

## II. *Remedial Aspect of Church Discipline*

“That they might be taught not to blaspheme” was the hope and the purpose of St. Paul in his terrible censure; to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, the warm-hearted Apostle soon said. Ye ought now to “forgive him and comfort him, lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow.”<sup>2</sup> The Synod of Nicea has many Canons dealing with such as had lapsed or had fallen, and it seeks to show such tenderness as befits the healing mission of Christ’s Church. “Those who lapsed,” says Canon XI., “during the tyranny of Licinius, are to be treated with tenderness, though undeserving of it.” It seems hard enough tenderness,—twelve years of exclusion from the Holy Table,—but it has to be remembered that during all that time they were amongst the ordinary congregation as hearers of the Word. The first step upwards from being mere hearers was that they were permitted to join in the prayers, and then the next was that they were permitted to add their gifts to the oblation laid upon the Holy Table. Doubtless they felt their degradation in not mixing with the accepted

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. v. 5.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 7.

faithful, and in having to go away before the Lord's Supper was celebrated ; but still in their long penance they were sustained by hope. If during its term death came upon them, every dying man received absolution and the Holy Sacrament, as the *viaticum* upon his dark journey.

Everything shows how tolerant the Church was at first. The doctrinal and practical errors which the Apostles reprov'd, but which though reprov'd did not lead to the expulsion of those who held them, are remarkable. Denial of Christ seems to have been then the only ground of anathema. Even 1 Tim. i. 18, 19, seems to point at Atheism arising from immorality. The grounds and the amount of penance in the following centuries are subjects of dispute. Idolatry (afterwards called Apostasy), Adultery, and Murder are called the great or mortal sins. For them penance was lifelong, but the Sacrament was given at last. "Lapsing" was less than deliberate Apostasy, but caused serious questions. Thus after a persecution, when peace came, many thousands of weak-minded Christians that had crouched before the storm, arose and knocked at the sacred portals, seeking to be readmitted. But when the Bishops abated the requirements of long probation, those thus taken in proved a great weakness to the Church. "The time of toleration which followed on the death of Valerian had a more mournful effect on morals and Christian zeal than the time which preceded the era of Decius."<sup>1</sup> One cannot wonder that Novatian counted apostasy a mortal sin. The con-

<sup>1</sup> Chastol, *Le Christianisme dans les six premiers Siècles*, vol. i. p. 74.

troversies which arose through this difficulty consequent on persecution, rent the Church to its very foundations. It would have been well if the Church had been as tolerant of those who had once erred through doctrinal heresy, and had come back penitent, as of those who had failed in the time of persecution. When Cyprian's fiery zeal accounted lapse in doctrine a fatal sin, nullifying the value of the sacraments, and required that those who had been brought up in heresy should be re-baptized and put upon a level with those who had been born and bred in heathenism—and thus made a Donatist heretic as much an outcast as any immoral man or obstinate idolater—he was introducing a new element, pregnant of discord, into the heart of the Church.<sup>1</sup> One would have supposed that the mere fact of a heretic coming back to the Church from which he had stood aloof, and seeking to be admitted to Christian privileges under her shelter, would have been accounted penance enough, and have secured for him restoration and a welcome. He had not been an apostate like those who denied Christ in time of persecution. He had not led an immoral life, and to count him an alien because the whole Church to which he belonged had been excommunicated was to disregard the struggles through which such a man must have gone before he could so humble himself as to seek privileges from the Church against which at one time he stood out. If the father in the

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian at one time let his human heart or his wiser statesmanship re-admit to the Church after a few months those who

had fallen into idolatry. It is seen in the sequel how his stricter views were overruled. See p. 225.

parable had put his returning prodigal son under penance or under quarantine, we may be very sure that the youth would not have been so melted as by the fulness of forgiving love.

The Church of Christ in all times has had a twofold function and duty, but has always been prone to look to only one part. She has to maintain the standard of righteousness, but she has also to represent the healing power of Christ, and to set herself to be attractive, as Jesus Christ was to publicans and sinners. Many times she has made her discipline vindictive, believing that righteousness so demanded, and in so doing has forgotten that God, who is just, is also the justifier of him that believes. On the other hand there have been times when the reverse was true. Some churches have still no discipline. It is surely possible to recognise the existence of an ideal in the Redeemer's life, who came to call sinners to repentance, but not to penance, and to join to His injunction of a better life the ready assurance that the sins of the old life were forgiven. When one reads in the old history of the Church of Scotland the violent and persistent infliction of penances, which must have done ten times more to exasperate than to reclaim the offender, one cannot but feel that the Church in those days had forgotten, through excess of mistaken conscientiousness, the great truth, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." To realise her commission as a remedial institution is an infinitely more difficult task than any to which she sets herself. Does the Church realise

that at present? I scarcely think so. At present she takes the easy rôle of treating what is not "respectable" as the Pharisee treated the publicans and sinners, and thus shuts her doors on the harlot and the drunkard; and the still easier rôle of taking no steps to exercise discipline upon those whose sins are not a public scandal according to secular opinion; so that she has misers, and oppressors, and rudely insubordinate men within the innermost shrine of her sanctuary. Hence the Church ceases to be an attraction. There are violent dispositions and mean vices harboured within her pale which cause many tender and sensitive natures to shrink from her. If the Church, as interpreting God's law, were to show that she frowns on hard masters, on grinding rich men, on misers, on inconsiderate people, on dishonest (though it may be legal) money-making, if she denounced the rich who are not pitiful and the poor who are not courteous, she would soon establish Christ's visible kingdom on the earth.

And what of her care of the fallen? "Ye that are spiritual *restore* such a one," not merely tolerate him, but put him in his old place and surround him with an atmosphere of helpful love. Of what great Church, what members of a great Church, can this be said? More than once or twice I have known penitent offenders who did not seek readmission to the Church connection of their former days because they were afraid of the callous toleration or the cynical banter they had to expect.