

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

—❖—
VOL. X.
—❖—

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1884

P R E F A C E .

THE tenth half-yearly volume of THE CHURCHMAN is now completed; and the course of the magazine within these years, a period long enough for satisfactory enquiry, calls for an editorial expression of thankfulness and hope.

That a periodical of this character was really needed has been sufficiently shown. THE CHURCHMAN (to quote the recent words of one of our fairest critics) "has supplied a want long felt in the Church of England."

Five years ago, in soliciting the co-operation of the clergy in bringing the magazine under the notice of the laity, we stated upon what lines it would be conducted. To the principles which were then set forth, friends being our judges, we have been thoroughly faithful; and no critic of THE CHURCHMAN, so far as we know, has in any wise complained of its tone and temper.

A representative periodical, which at once possesses a clear insight into the real meaning of current events and is competent to express a sound judgment on the most important works in sacred and secular literature, cannot fail to render valuable service in the guidance of opinion, the defence of the truth, and the encouragement of well-directed Christian effort. Such was our conviction in the year 1879; and encouraging testimony to the influence of THE CHURCHMAN has reached us, from many influential quarters, in the present year.

Our critics in newspapers and periodicals, as a rule, we

gratefully acknowledge, have been appreciative and kindly. In particular, as in duty bound, to *The Record*, a journal which during the last two or three years has shown increasing vigour, as well as judgment and ability, we tender our hearty thanks. From some of our most earnest supporters, new friends as well as old—we gladly mention the fact—we are cheered by letters of sympathy and suggestion.

It has often been said about members of the Evangelical School in the Church, that they are apt to neglect literature, and do not sufficiently value the Press; and that in regard to literary undertakings of which they approve they are slow to “take any trouble.” That reproach, however, we trust, is losing its modicum of justice. Certainly, the needs of this time, as regards both Christian Truth and the National Church, are patent and pressing.

THE
CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1884.

ART. I.—THOUGHTS ON LITTLE THINGS CONNECTED
WITH THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

“THE greatness of little things” is a subject that has afforded material for a recently published volume, and this suggestive and well-chosen title calls attention very forcibly to a truth that we are much too ready to overlook. Life is for the most part made up of little things, and the same may be said of the service of God. Great acts of heroism and devotion are, indeed, occasionally called for by special and unusual circumstances, but this does not happen very frequently in the lives of most of us; and, when it does, he will be most likely to respond to the opportunity who has been most careful in the smaller matters of daily life. Indeed, it is obvious that the greatest things must be composed of the aggregate of little things, and he who passes carelessly over such little things as mere trifles will hope in vain to attain to greatness in any department of human conduct. This is especially the case with all matters affecting our religious life and experience. I heard it once well said that “nothing is small when God is put into it;” and so I don’t think I need apologize to the reader if I offer some remarks upon topics that may appear slight and trivial, but which I am persuaded are not without importance, inasmuch as they closely concern that most important function of the creature—the proper worship of God, and deal with its usual concomitants.

It is a false and exaggerated spiritualism that ignores the connection between the outward and the inward, and that teaches that our inner relations with God, and our enjoyment of those relations, are wholly independent of, and incapable of being influenced by, external circumstances. We are, alas! all of us, I apprehend, only too familiar with the phenomena of mental and moral distraction, and are aware how frequently

outward objects bring this about. It has been affirmed, for example—I fear with only too much truth—that the attention of no congregation is proof against the presence of a small bird flying about in the rafters, or the intrusion of a dog into the church aisle. But if our devotion may be interfered with by external circumstances, may it not also be assisted to some extent by these when they are favourable to it? To take a familiar instance, and only one out of many that might be given: a Christian man of musical taste and sensibility will find his attention greatly diverted, and his enjoyment of worship materially interfered with, if the music that fills his ears is out of time and out of tune, or harsh and devoid of expression, whereas the same person may feel his heart powerfully stirred by a well-sung and impressive hymn that seems to carry home to his mind and feeling the full import of the words that are being sung. It argues not superior sanctity, but rather sanctimonious ignorance of human nature, when we shut our eyes to such obvious facts as these. Our wisdom lies in recognising the close connection between the outward and the inward, and in endeavouring to make the one as far as possible minister to the other.

My life and work as a Mission-preacher is constantly bringing me into contact with great varieties of usage in the conduct of our *regular* Church services (and it is of these that I now write), some of which seem to me useful and worthy of general acceptance, while others appear more or less objectionable. Besides variations in custom, I am also frequently constrained to take note of variations of manner; and herein sometimes one is gratified by excellence, and sometimes pained by slipshod carelessness and inefficiency. It is seldom that I join in the worship of a congregation where I do not see something that might be improved; while, on the other hand, it is a very frequent experience to have my attention called to a realized improvement that had not before suggested itself to me. The difficulty in writing such a paper as this is not to find material, for this observation abundantly supplies, but rather so to arrange the material as that my remarks may not appear desultory, and therefore tedious.

It will be needful to make some sort of rough classification of the many subjects which my friendly criticisms or suggestions must touch upon; and, to begin with, I will make some remarks about the *musical element* in our services. And here first let me say, that it seems to me, from a somewhat extensive observation, that the solemn nature of the functions exercised by the choir, and the importance of endeavouring to infuse into its members a spiritual and devotional tone, are insufficiently realized for the most part by the clergy. Surely

if the choir is in its tone and the general condition of its members unspiritual, the service, so far as it is concerned, must be cold and perfunctory, and this must exercise an evil and a chilling influence on the whole congregation. Now I should be slow to suggest any test for membership in the choir, such as participation in Holy Communion, or a distinct profession of certain definite spiritual experiences, because this might induce hypocrisy in some, and check the beginnings of a new life in others, who, in joining the choir, might be taking a first step towards better things. On the other hand, however, it must be obvious that habitual contact with holy things in an unholy spirit must have a very injurious and hardening effect—an effect that one too often discerns in clerks and sextons, and other church officials, and sometimes, unhappily, in clergymen themselves, when these lack true spirituality.

Surely then definite efforts should be made to deepen the spiritual life of our choristers, if they have any; or to infuse it into them by God's grace, if they have it not. It would surely be well if one of the clergy of the church made it a rule to be present at the choir practices, and to open and close them with a few words of earnest prayer; taking care, throughout the whole time, to suppress with kindly firmness all irreverence and levity.

Such a custom, while fostering a devotional spirit, would have this additional advantage. The presence of a clergyman would render it much easier and much safer to employ the services of women in our Church service, and I am quite sure that our music must suffer grievously where they are not employed. Where is there to be found a competent conductor who would think of giving a concert without the assistance of women's voices? and if their presence is so necessary on the platform, how can they be dispensed with in the church? If we are exceedingly, not to say morbidly, sensitive on the subject of feminine modesty, things may frequently be so arranged that women may belong to the choir without having to occupy at all a conspicuous place in the church. The side-chapels so common now in our churches seem expressly made for this purpose; but if such an arrangement be impossible, better, surely, that they should occupy a conspicuous position than that their help should be lost altogether.

I remember being much struck with the custom of one church that I visited, where the men were in surplices, and the women were all dressed in comely black cloaks; the contrast between the black and the white producing a not unpleasant effect to the eye. The Romans are "wise in their generation," in this as in so many other respects. You can hardly go into one of their chapels without being struck with

the beauty and the culture of the female voices that take so prominent a part in their services, although they are concealed from sight.

If the hour for practice were so chosen as to follow immediately the close of the usual week-night's service, there would be this further advantage from the presence of the clergy at the practice, that any members of the congregation that pleased could be invited to remain and take part in, or at any rate become acquainted with, the church music about to be rehearsed. This might conduce to congregational singing, and might also render it much more easy to introduce new chants and tunes, and even simple services.

But, to return from this digression upon a subject that I regard as an important one—I was saying that the presence of a clergyman, and, if possible, of the incumbent himself, at the practice would be the best safeguard against any improper levity or unseemliness amongst the young people attending, and would thus render the employment of women in the choir as unobjectionable as it is expedient. But, need I add, more should be aimed at than mere propriety. If the spirit of devotion and of worship be wholly excluded from our rehearsals, we can scarcely wonder if it also disappear from our services; but if our choirs learn to regard even the practising of church music as a sacred function, their hearts as well as their voices may thus be trained for the Church services.

Something, too, might be done to help the choir, by infusing more of reality and earnestness into the prayers in the vestry before and after church. I must say, that if these are not often performed in a cold perfunctory manner, at any rate they often have the appearance of being so performed. Is the use of a stereotyped form on such occasions—at any rate its invariable use—wise and expedient, especially when the form contains a sort of jingle of words of very indefinite significance. I frankly confess that I am heartily sick of the too familiar "Grant that what we have sung with our lips we may believe in our hearts, and that what we believe in our hearts we may show forth in our lives," etc. This, from much repetition, is apt to become a barren "rigmarole," and is usually followed by a precipitate flinging off of surplices and scrambling for hats, which does not argue that the rattle of familiar sounds has produced at all a solemnizing effect. Surely it were wiser to improve the occasion by taking up some special point that the sermon has dealt with, and by offering a few simple and practical petitions connected with this. Perhaps, too, if all music and intoning were excluded from such exercises, the very contrast between them and the public worship of God in church might tend to increase their reality.

It seems to me most important, also, that special devotional meetings should be arranged for the boys, and, if possible, for the men of the choir, either on the Sunday afternoon or on some week night, so that genuine piety and true religious fellowship may be promoted amongst them, and that the less decided may come under a strong spiritual influence.

I will not encumber this article with any controversy upon the subject of the superiority or inferiority of a choral service. I will only remark, in passing, that I believe strong feelings on either side are chiefly attributable to peculiarities of temperament, or to education, or (not least) to prejudice. If God can be worshipped either by the reading or by the singing of a psalm, His acceptance of a service will not depend upon whether it is or is not choral.

As a matter of fact, choral services are now so common, and are so little regarded as the peculiar characteristic of any party in the Church, that a few remarks upon the subject of how they may be rendered most conducive to true devotion cannot be out of place.

Common-sense might lead us, if we would only have recourse to it, to avoid certain forms of procedure which are unhappily as common as they are grotesque. Whatever may be said on behalf of the monotone, for example, in an address to God, Who discerns the heart, and is not affected by the inflections of the voice, what can be said for its use in an address to man, who cannot read the heart, and is specially open to impressions produced by inflections of the voice? What, then, can be the wisdom of shouting out "Dearly beloved brethren," and so forth, on a monotone? Must not such a procedure contribute to the air of unreality which only too readily attaches to such familiar but important exhortations? It would seem as reasonable to chant the Lessons, or to intone the Sermon; and indeed this is frequently the sequel! For when men lose the power of taking up and laying down the monotone at will, they frequently fall into a miserable sing-song habit, which persists in asserting itself alike in the pulpit and at the lectern. I need not say that the victims of such a habit would be hissed from the stage or the platform; it is unfortunate that they cannot be shown equally unmistakably how grievous is the infliction which their much-enduring flock has to put up with, from this silly habit.

Then, again, how frequent a thing it is to hear that most penitential utterance, the Confession, shouted out on G natural, or even on A, as if it were an object with us to exclude all indication of sorrowful feeling for the acknowledgment of our sin. Surely if music has any place here, it should be made to interpret our feelings and not to outrage them. A low note

(such as E natural), a subdued tone and not very rapid utterance might impress the mind with a sense of the solemnity of this act of self-abasement, and by its very contrast with other parts of the service contribute to its sincerity and reality, whereas the most inappropriate accompaniments that are so common must necessarily tend to interfere with the feelings that are so much to be desired.

Differences of opinion may exist as to the expediency of intoning on the part of the officiating clergyman, but surely it stands to reason that this should only be attempted when the clergyman himself possesses, at any rate, a tolerably good voice and ear. It is my misfortune sometimes to have to listen to clergymen whose attempt at monotone might better be described as an ingenious modification of the chromatic scale with an ever-descending tendency, expressly devised, you might think, to inflict the maximum of torture on a musical ear. When this performance is accompanied by an altogether strained and unnatural delivery, the only idea of which seems to be, to throw as heavy an accentuation as possible upon the last syllable of every clause, while the rest of the sentence is rushed over with a celerity that does not always seem compatible with reverence, you have a combination of circumstances which, if it does not produce dissipation of thought, not to say distraction, might seem to be expressly designed to do so. Nor is the ungainly effect diminished when at the end of a long prayer "intoned" in this fashion the choir and organ, as if in resentment at clerical aberrations, return with their *Amen* to the original key, rising, perhaps, three semitones and a half at a leap.

If a man cannot sing, then, let him read, and no congregation will be any the worse for a little variety in this matter. The plain truth is, we are all of us always in danger of suffering spiritually from the effects of stereotyped modes of procedure, and we should be specially thankful where God in His providence breaks in upon our routine. A musical clergyman may be an acquisition to a congregation if he exercise his gift for the glory of God; but he who does not possess this gift may also benefit the congregation even by the variety which he introduces into its manner of worship; if only he will not try to sing when he can't, and if he will endeavour to read, as a witty friend of mine once remarked, on the only right key-note, which is "*Be (B) natural.*" Alas that this should seem too high a note for many of us parsons to reach!

The remarks that I have ventured to make with respect to certain forms of intoning as practised by some clergymen, suggest a few words of counsel with respect to similar faults on the part of some choirs. It may seem to be stooping to very small matters when I insist upon the importance of what

is technically called "singing true;" but first I am dealing with little things, and next I can witness from my own painful experiences to the distressing and distracting effects of a neglect of this fundamental condition of all good music. Is it a light matter to a worshipper, or one who wishes to be so, that sometimes he has to give up attempting to sing, in sheer despair, because he doesn't know whether to adhere to the key of the organ or to follow the eccentricities of the choir, who are perseveringly pursuing their course at least a quarter of a tone below? Is it a light matter that when he thus has to cease joining audibly in the service of God, his ear is assailed by such discordant combinations as are rarely excelled in cacophony even by German brass bands at a watering-place? To one who is gifted or afflicted, as the case may be, with a sensitive ear, this means so much nervous torture; and surely this may seriously interfere with the concentration of one's thoughts upon devotional exercises. Do organists and choir-masters as a rule pay sufficient attention to this point? We do not demand of them elaborate musical performances; we would prefer to have things as simple as possible; but we think we have a right to ask for two things—musical truth and intelligent expression. We should be fortunate, however, if we always obtained as much as this.

With regard to the latter of these two requisites (for I cannot otherwise describe them), much no doubt has been done, but a good deal remains to be done. The editors of "Hymns Ancient and Modern" deserve general thanks for the happy idea which they have so well carried out of introducing notes of expression (*ps.* and *fs.* in fact) into their book, and I hope that before long every hymn-book in common use will contain these reminders of the nature of the sentiment that has to be expressed. But the loudness or softness of our singing is not the only thing that has to be thought of if music is to be expressive. Two other points at least require a consideration that they do not always receive. One is *time*, and the other is *accentuation*.

With regard to time, it may be said, speaking generally, that our grandfathers used to drawl, and we gallop! This is only explicable on the ground of æsthetic reaction; but surely it is clear on the very surface of things, that the adoption of a uniformly high rate of speed must be fatal to all true interpretation of sentiment. What organist out of Bedlam would think of playing Mozart's well-known and exquisitely plaintive *Agnus Dei* at the same rate of time as he introduces with such thrilling effect into the last jubilant movement of Beethoven's "Hallelujah Chorus;" and yet this is the sort of treatment that our rich supply of psalmody has to be content with. I do not remember at this moment more than one

church amongst the hundreds I have visited where it was possible to induce singers and people to sing "When I survey the wondrous cross" slowly and softly. I have nearly given the case up now as hopeless. I scarcely expect ever to hear people singing this, the most tenderly pathetic hymn that Watts ever wrote, otherwise than they would sing "Great the joy when Christians meet," to "Durham." It would certainly be helpful if future editions of our hymn-books contained references to the metronome as well as marks of expression; but until this can be brought about, a little care and attention on the part of the parish-presbyter might surely produce a great improvement. He will, in all probability, be a man of considerable education and refinement, and it is too much to expect that the same should invariably be true of the organist. And be it remembered that musical capacity is not so much required to decide a point of this kind as general intelligence and good taste, and aptness in detecting and appreciating a sentiment.

The same fault often mars the singing of our Canticles. It surely must grate upon our feelings and shock our sensibilities, when we hear the "Tris-hagion" in the *Te Deum* sung exactly at the same rate of speed as the other verses of the hymn. Surely the thrice-repeated cry of adoring admiration must lose much of its solemnity, and even of its import, under such treatment. And not less incongruous is the effect when the same iron law of speed is ruthlessly applied alike to the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis*, the *Cantate* and the *Misereatur*.

A smaller matter than even this I cannot allow myself to pass by—the subject of accentuation. Here, certainly, great strides have been taken of late years, and a vast improvement may be noticed when we compare recent Psalters with those of twenty years ago; yet, even in the best it would appear that there is much still to be desired.

It seems to me that no man is competent to point a Psalter who has not made elocution a matter of careful study, and I apprehend that this condition has not been fulfilled by many of our most accomplished organists. Were it otherwise, should we be taught to sing as follows, "The sea is His, *and* He made it"? Here, of course, the general rule is that a personal pronoun should not be accentuated, but equally clearly it should be accentuated when it is emphatic. The thought we want impressed upon our minds is the almighty power of God, and the opportunity of being forcibly reminded of this is lost when we fail to sing, "The sea is His, and HE-E made it." Or again, "And kneel BEFORE the Lord our Maker." Do we wish to emphasize the idea that we are to kneel before (instead

of behind), or to call attention to the Person of Jehovah? If the latter, why not sing, "And kneel before the LORD our Ma-aker"? and why not similarly, in the next verse, sing "the SHE-EP of His hands," instead of "AND the sheep," etc. Why should we be instructed in the *Jubilate* to "SPEAK good" of God's name? Would any sane man read the verse so? Why should we not sing it as we should read it, "speak GOO-OOD of His name"? Why in the *Magnificat* should we have to sing, "He hath filled the hungry WITH good things," when we should certainly say, "He hath filled the hungry with GOO-OOD things"? Why should we sing in the *Nunc Dimittis*, "the glory OF Thy people Israel," when "of" is the last word that any rational person would think of emphasizing, and when it is just as easy to sing, "the glory of Thy PEOPLE Is-ra-el"? Why in the *Te Deum* should we lay a stress upon the word "this" in the prayer, "Vouchsafe, O LORD, to keep us THIS day without sin," that, if it suggests anything at all, might seem to imply that all other days were to be exempt from this blessing? Why not sing, "to keep us this DA-AY withou-out sin"? This, surely, is what we should say. These faults are common to most of the best Psalters, and seem to arise from a want of proper appreciation of the modes of expressing sentiment which the study of elocution teaches us to discern, as naturally belonging to our language.

But if such obvious flaws as this disfigure even our best manuals, what shall we say about the worst? Surely the time is come when we should no longer, as reasonable men, be constrained to stultify ourselves every time we sing the *Gloria*, by exclaiming "world without end, A-amen"; nor should we be forced to adopt the scarcely less objectionable alternative of singing "world WITHOUT end," since all the best Psalters seem agreed that the passage should be sung, as we would read it, "world without E-END, A-amen." This may serve as an example of other enormities which are still unfortunately only too frequently to be met with, such as (in the *Te Deum*) "The Father, o-OF an infinite Majesty." The insignificant word "of" being unduly emphasized in order to render it possible to take Majesty at a mouthful, as if it were a word of one syllable. Where obviously, "reason would" that we should sing, "Of an infinite Ma-jes-ty;" or again, in the next verse, "A-AND only Son," instead of the natural "and o-ONLY Son;" or in the very next verse, "THE-E-E Comforter," instead of "The Co-OM-fo-orter."

But I must desist, or I shall weary my reader's patience. Let me ask him, however, to bear with me while I call attention to another evil closely connected with this which often tends to rob our chanting of all intelligence, and to render con-

gregational singing impossible. I refer to the neglect or the abuse of punctuation. There was a time when the former of these two faults was common, and the stream rushed on without any regard for such things as commas or colons; now an opposite and perhaps more insufferable evil is far more common, arising from a servile adherence to the somewhat archaic punctuation of the Prayer Book, emphasized by the introduction of a staccato style, with the result that the choir seems to be broken-winded or to be aiming at such effects as are produced by an insufficient supply of air to an organ played at full power! Imagine the effect of this system in such a verse as the following: "If his wrath be kindled!—yea!—but a little!—blessed are all they," etc.; or again, "Lead me!—O Lord!—in Thy righteousness!—because of," etc. It is clear that in each case only one pause is required, and that even that need not be in the least emphasized, as any rational man may see by reading the passage in a natural way. It would be wise, when this is not already done in the Psalters employed, to run through the books used in the choir, and erase with a pen-knife all superfluous stops; for you cannot expect that ordinary members of choirs will be able to guide their conduct with regard to them by a reference to the sense.

These little mistakes that I have been indicating may seem the merest of trifles, but it is obvious that they are distracting just in proportion to the intelligence and sensitiveness of the worshipper; and further, they tend to create confusion and to militate against that unity of congregational expression which is a thing so much to be desired.

Space will only permit me very briefly to touch upon one or two other points connected with the musical element in worship, and the mention that has just been made of the desirableness of congregational music suggests the first. I notice, with some regret, a disposition on the part of the choir, in not a few churches where the music is good, to encroach upon the unquestionable rights of the congregation, in taking the singing of the Canticles out of their hands altogether. This may, perhaps, be due to another fact, that the choir is by popular prejudices or preferences so frequently deprived of the right which the rubric after the Third Collect certainly gives it; and therefore it has, so to speak, to compensate if not to revenge itself by deliberately appropriating what belongs to the people. It seems to me that there is much to be said for an anthem, especially if it can be sung correctly, and above all devotionally, and not as a mere performance; and no one who has witnessed the effect produced by one of Mr. Sankey's hymn-sermons can doubt that a well-chosen solo, such as "If with all your hearts," earnestly and devotionally sung, may be

a useful adjunct to a service. The choir has its part and office, as choir, apart from that which it exercises as leader of the psalmody of the congregation; but if this be denied it, that is surely no reason why reprisals should be made by the purloining of those portions of the service which certainly belong to the people. It seems to me nothing less than a grievous thing when a whole congregation has to stand dumb listening to an elaborate *Te Deum* or *Cantate*, when they should all be making "a joyful noise" with heart and voice. Surely "services" so-called are out of place altogether in a parish church, unless they are familiar to the people; then, indeed, they may become more effective than an ordinary chant.

No musical person will speak very highly of the well-known "Jackson's *Te Deum*;" yet I venture to say, no man who has heard two thousand people sing it with might and main at a thanksgiving service at the end of a Mission, will have any heart left in him for mere æsthetic criticism. The thing rises to a region where criticism must be mute.

My last word shall be to the organist. Dear Mr. Organist, I would dare to say, you have more musical skill in your little finger, I can well believe, than I have in my whole person, and yet may it be possible for you to obtain a hint or two, even from a wandering "Missioner." Let me be bold, then, to ask a few questions. Is it, since our services are usually pronounced to be too long already—is it necessary for you to add ten minutes to their duration? Could you not begin your voluntary two or three minutes before the time of service, so as to bring your sweet strains to a close just as we rise from our knees, while the clock is on the stroke, instead of playing on for five minutes thereafter, while we all sit listening to you? Can you not so train your choir that they shall not need to hear their hymn tunes and chants played through, but be content with a single chord, and then begin to sing? Please to remember, my worthy friend, that each verse you play over takes up as much time in playing as would be occupied in singing it, probably about one minute; and if we sing four hymns, that means four minutes wasted—I beg your pardon—*occupied* instrumentally in the course of a service already, by admission, too long, to say nothing of the six chants that you also add to your labours by playing over. We would fain *spare* you the extra toil.

Furthermore, could you not be a little more liberal of trumpet-stop, or other violent measures, when "those boys" insist on getting flat; or else would it not be better to be silent for a time and let them sink to their own level, and then pick them up when they are safely landed a semitone below? Once more, will you so far respect our sensibility as to select only plaintive and tender music for the *Kyrie* after the Commandments?

Surely it cannot be desirable to sing these solemn words jauntily and with a flourish! And last, if your patience be not exhausted, *please* must the organ always dismiss us with a roar? This may be the right thing sometimes, but surely it would be well not to arrange what you are going to play beforehand, but to wait and be guided in some measure by the subject of the sermon.

I had an organist once, who seemed to think it his special work to supplement my teaching when he played; for no sooner had my voice done preaching, than he—himself a clergyman as well as a first-class musician, and more than all, a true Christian—took up his parable upon that organ, and wove the spell of tender music around thoughts that were still fresh in his hearers' minds. Peace to his dear memory—he has gone to join the chorus above. I can only say, as I look back lovingly on those calm efforts of sanctified melody and consecrated skill—*Utinam sic omnes!*

By the kind permission of the Editor, I shall proceed to consider other "little things" in a future paper.

W. HAY M. H. AITKEN.



ART. II.—THE QUESTION OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF A DISESTABLISHED CHURCH FROM THE CONTROL OF THE CIVIL POWER.

THE above question, which I have not seen touched upon in any of the various articles or reviews which have succeeded each other in rapid succession on the subject of the Ecclesiastical Courts, has had some light thrown upon it by the evidence given before the Royal Commission. The subject itself is undoubtedly one of very great importance. It has not in my opinion received the attention which it deserves. Statements are frequently made which show that those who make them have not considered the subject in all its bearings. Men of strong self-will chafe under the restrictions to which they are subjected in a National Church, and oftentimes speak as though they imagined that all State control of any kind whatsoever would be removed simultaneously with the disestablishment of the Church. Utterances of such a kind must be familiar to the readers of this review, and by being oft-repeated have almost passed into supposed truisms. The liberty of disestablishment is sometimes sighed for by those who little know what that supposed liberty would entail.

I do not intend to refer to any aspect of disestablishment,