

file of the clergy know of social science? Perhaps I am speaking to those who are familiar with that study, and have no right to impute to you that ignorance on the subject which I must plead guilty to. But I feel confident that your educational training for the sacred ministry, like my own, consisted of nine parts of Theology to one of Sociology, (99 to 1 would be a better comparison): *i.e.*, that your attention was absorbed by the first commandment while the second was ignored, so far as its elaboration was concerned. When we have completed our Theological training we may know more or less of the Atonement, of Sacraments, of Apostolic Succession, and Liturgies but we know decidedly less of how to apply the teaching of the Incarnation to social problems of the day, or of how human equality is the practical outcome of Holy Baptism, and human brotherhood the practical outcome of participation in the Holy Communion. And if the clergy do not know this, how shall the laity know it? If the teachers of man's duty content themselves with teaching one-half only of that duty, how shall they who are taught, know this whole duty? Must they go to other teachers, and must they turn away from the church? In the rebound from Theology to Social Science, in the swing of the pendulum from the extremity of teaching the 1st commandment and ignoring the 2nd, we have reached in certain countries and in certain minds the other extreme of anarchism, and an antagonistic attitude to Theology. In our strenuous efforts to persuade men to believe, have we not failed to emphasize sufficiently the method by which, as He Himself has told us, Christ will separate the sheep from the goats? The test of the final judgment as described in the "In-as-much" passage, (Matt. 25, 31-56) is how we fulfilled the 2nd commandment—our duty towards our neighbor. The marks of distinction between sheep and goats are not regular church attendance, not correct beliefs re Baptism or Holy Communion, or Valid Orders or the conditions of life hereafter, but simply and solely the performance or non-performance of social duties to our fellow-beings. I am well aware that there are many other passages in which our future salvation is made to depend upon our belief, but acceptance of these will not invalidate the other. I suppose the reconciliation between them consists in this, that right belief is essential to right action; by our actions we shall be judged, but he who can honestly say at the close of his life, "I have kept the faith," will be the one who has fulfilled his social duties the best. While it is written by St. John, that a man cannot keep the 1st great commandment if he keep not the 2nd equally great commandment—"He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen."

But we shall best arrive at our duty as individuals by obtaining a clear grasp of the meaning and the message of the church. For what purpose was the church instituted? For what purpose has it existed for so many centuries and exists to-day as fair and beautiful as ever, nay fairer and more beautiful to our eyes whom the years have taught to see more and more of her beauty? Why has it been permitted to weather the storms and survive the shocks which

destroyed and undid mighty empires and human systems? Let us understand what it is here on earth for, and then we, who are "very members incorporate" in it "the mystical body" of the Son, shall understand what we are here on earth for. What Sadler calls "the church idea" is very widely taught in our day. It forms a very large element in the revised teaching of the Oxford or Tractarian movement and the mass of literature which was the outcome of that inspired revival has done its work thoroughly; so that he must know very little of the Christianity of the first two centuries, who, without an ulterior motive, could deny that Christianity was from its first conception, and by the intention of Christ, identified with membership in a visible society of brotherhood. What we need to learn now, is what is the work, the object of this society, this body of Christ, this Church? To save souls, will of course be a general reply. Yes but this work of saving souls is not to be carried on on individualistic lines so much as on socialistic lines. To unite men in the common brotherhood, owning the common fatherhood, that is the aim of the Church Catholic. The individualistic message of the church has been too long deemed the only message of the church. Men have thought it sufficient to be able to say, I am saved, I am a communicant; to be able to speak of their own personal thoughts of Him. This is very forcibly brought home to us when we study the hymnology of the church. Said Prof. Ely, addressing the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, eight years ago, "While many of them (our hymns) are undoubtedly grand, yet taken as a whole they contain in their exclusive individualism an unanswerable indictment of the life of the church. I would emphasize this point, because the hymns of the church must of necessity reveal the true inward life of the church, just as the life of a nation is revealed by its songs. It is difficult to find a hymn in our hymnal which is not individualistic, while many of them reveal an unhealthy introspection and positive selfishness." What the Prof. said of his American hymnal I claim to be true also of our hymns A. & M., Hymnal Companion, and Church Hymns. The church proclaims and affords to its members individual salvation, but it proclaims and affords to the world social salvation, and should inculcate strongly in the minds of its members the duty of seeking the salvation of society, and the coming to pass of that kingdom for which we have so idly and indifferently petitioned for so many years. "The true moral idea of Catholic membership," Canon Gore tells, in a lecture entitled "The ethics

**Rubber Balls,
Base Balls,
— Cricket Bats, etc.,**

A. E. MAYCOCK,

520 Main Street,

WINNIPEG.