

other translations of the Psalms, especially those of Sir William Mure of Rowallan, and Mr. Zachary Boyd, were compared with that of Mr. Rouse; and at last, after the assiduous labors of five years, the present authorized version of the Psalms was read to the General Assembly, approved, and deliberately adopted: "On the 15th day of May, 1650, which day the General Assembly being met at Edinburgh, the new Psalm Book was read, and ordained to be sung; all others discharged."

The General Assembly introduced many alterations and improvements in the new psalmody, which they were the more free to do, since all hope of the proposed uniformity between English and Scottish worship had passed away. Had the General Assembly bestowed the same care and pains on the music of the new version as on the words, no lasting injury would have been inflicted on Scottish psalmody. After a time the change might have proved beneficial, but it would appear that the Church paid no attention to the tunes whatever. This was not their mission—they remembered the Psalms were to be *said*, but they forgot they were also to be *sung*. Previous to this version of 1650, the editions of the metre Psalms were all accompanied with the music. The early reformers did not think it beneath them to study and authorize the tunes as well as the words. Both were printed together in the same book; both were put into the hands of the people; and by this excellent method, words and tunes became familiar to the worshippers, and congregational singing was promoted to a wonderful degree, to the joy of the people and the glory of God. This was all changed in 1650. The Church "discharged" the old Psalter, with its various metres and corresponding music, and replaced it with a new version. The words were there, but the notes which gave life to the words were gone. From that hour congregational singing in Scotland began to decline, and very soon ceased to exist.

After the revolution settlement in 1688, with a time of quiet to the Church and country came a time of declension and decay. Music seems to have been utterly neglected. John Knox's Psalter was forgotten, and the psalmody of the Church was reduced to twelve or thirteen tunes which were considered orthodox. These alone were permitted to be sung, or rather drawled out in the slovenly style of singing which then prevailed.

Any one referring to Dr. Mainzer's Gaelic Psalms, will find "Dundee," "French," "Stilt," "Elgin," and "Martyrs," noted as they are still sung; but every note of the melody has attached to it from five to nine ornamental tones (the recognized number was eight), so that the tunes cannot be recognized. The singing of each verse takes three to four minutes.

This ornamentation, or "quavering," as it is called, seems to have arisen from the impossibility of sustaining the tones when sung in the slow drawing style which prevailed. The people consequently ornamented them by grace notes, and slurring runs from tone to tone, till the old syllabic time of the Psalter could not be recognized.

Such was the style of psalmody which prevailed in many parts of Scotland about two hundred years ago. In England the case was different. After the Psalters of Reformation times, other Psalters appeared, as we have already seen, such as Playford's, Este's, and Ravenscroft's. These contained much beautiful sacred music, which began to find its way across the border. This produced no small stir in Scotland. Some Scotch gentlemen in England, seeing that congregations could be taught to sing—that is, to read music without the aid of instruments—determined to promote a like reformation in Scotland, as soon as proper teachers could be had. When General Wolfe's regiment was lying at Aberdeen in 1753, one of the soldiers, named Thomas Channon, was found capable and willing to teach; the result was that the list of tunes used was increased from twelve to about forty, of which a grand public performance took place in Aberdeen, on the 2nd of January, 1755.

These psalmody reformers gave great offence by the introduction of the pitch-pipe to give the key. In April, 1754, a correspondent of the "Scots Magazine" complains "that a new-fashioned profanation of the Sabbath was introduced by singing the Psalms at church with a herd-boy's whistle, an instrument of music which gives great offence to many serious Christians, which led to the innovation of singing music in parts by trained choristers, set apart by themselves in a loft or corner of the church, begun by a profane heretic above a thousand years ago." This matter

became so serious that the Aberdeen kirk-session took it up, and gave the following deliverance:

"The session being fully met and convened, and taking into consideration the specimen of music that was given in this church on the 2nd January instant, after divine service, do unanimously give it as their opinion that the tunes of said specimen should not be introduced into public worship; and they appoint their precentors to sing only, in all time coming, the *twelve* church tunes commonly sung in churches in Scotland, and printed in parts; and recommend the precentors to sing the same in *proper* time, for this innovation is bad, and has occasioned such disturbances, distractions, alienations, divisions and heart-burnings, that the 1745 was but a jest to it.—*Aberdeen, Jan. 20th, 1755.*"

The deliverance of the session was appealed to the Synod, who, by a wise and temperate decision, overruled the session's finding; further, the Synod recommended town councils and burgh authorities to use their influence by getting the people taught music, so as to be able to sing in a becoming manner.

In the same year the town council of Edinburgh took the matter up, and resolved and enacted: "That a master well skilled in the practice and theory of church music shall be immediately employed to teach in the city:" to which office Mr. Robert Bremner was appointed. He published a treatise on the rudiments of music, and a collection of the best church tunes, in four parts, containing also "particular instructions for song, and a plan for teaching a *crowd*."

He seems to have been very successful, for we are informed that men of seventy and boys of seven years old were at school together and equally keen of instruction. The same spirit spread to Glasgow, where, in 1761, John Girvin's Tune-Book was published and inscribed to the town council and to the Glasgow society for improving church music.

Yet after all little real good was accomplished, and very little done for the revival of musical education in Scotland.

Since the beginning of the present century many tune-books have from time to time appeared, such as Stevens', Mitchison's, Brown's Robinson's, and a host of others, giving rein to that style of florid and repeating tunes which are now in our day being discarded, and are giving place to the simple, solid, syllabic tune. The "Scottish Psalmody" appeared about twenty-five years ago. It has been repeatedly enlarged, and has been extensively used throughout Canada, as well as in Scotland.

It contains a large number of good tunes and metrical chants with fewer florid tunes than some of its predecessors contributed.

Others have from time to time been added; just a few months ago a very fine new Hymn Tune Book was published in Scotland for the United Presbyterian Church, edited by Henry Smart, which has been adopted by some of our churches.

Still our young but extensive Canada Presbyterian Church requires a Psalm and Hymn Tune Book of her own; a book comprising a careful selection of what is excellent in present editions, while avoiding everything that is inferior in music or poetry; printed in both notations; providing a sufficient variety of long, common, short, and peculiar metres, chants and doxologies, with the sublime Te Deum and a selection of the very best congregational anthems. Possessing such a book, such a "good gift" as it would doubtless be; having it universally adopted; its claims pressed unhesitatingly on the attention and sympathy of the entire Church, we should soon be enabled to raise our Church Psalmody to the standard of excellence so devoutly to be desired.

By avoiding carelessly constructed tunes, such as were lately so popular in Scotland, sometimes called the "John Campbell" type; by getting every one connected with our Church to take an active interest in the work; by attention to musical instruction in all its vocal branches with special attention to voice training and the art of reading. By these and all such means as these, we may make our Psalmody what it should be.

By the command of God himself the great fountain and source of music, and "every other good and perfect gift;" by the example of Christ, who with His disciples "Sang an hymn;" by the example of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles of old; by the early Christian Church, the voice of martyrs, saints, and reformers; by our open Bible, our civil and religious liberty; by the example of nature, vocal with His praise;

by its power over sin and satan; by the eternity of God's praises; let us yield a willing obedience to Him who will have all men worship Him, and by improving our talents and opportunities here, prepare our Church militant for joining in the praises of the Church triumphant, "Who cease not day or night to ascribe blessing and honor, and glory, and power, to Him who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—X.

Relics according to the Church of Rome, are "the dead bodies or bones of saints, and whatever belonged to them in their mortal life." Let us keep this definition before us while we review what His Grace says regarding relics.

Of course, he denies that Roman Catholics worship or pray to them. On pages 34-5, he says that they only hold them in reverence. Protestants, he maintains, have their relics too. In support of this, he refers to the relics of kings, queens, etc., which are kept in the Tower of London, and to the clothes, kitchen utensils, etc., once belonging to the "Father of his country," which are kept with great care at Washington. Protestants do not honour, adore them, as, for instance, by bowing the head or the knee, neither do they believe that miracles can be wrought by them. Just fancy a Yankee falling on his knees before Washington's hat or frying-pan, or kissing said hat or frying-pan in the hope of being thereby cured of some disease. "Adoration" is a term which Romanists themselves often used to describe the honour which they pay to relics of the saints. In many instances, they believe that these relics can work miracles.

In answer to the question (page 35), "Do we read in the Bible anything about relics?" he says "Yes, we read that miracles were wrought by their touch." He then gives several instances thereof. He says, "The cloak of the prophet Elias in the hands of Eliseus divided the waters of the Jordan (4 Kings ii. 13), and the bones of the same prophet raised from the dead a man that was thrown into the Saint's sepulchre" (4 Kings xiii. 21). I ask attention specially to the latter part of the sentence just quoted. The words at the beginning, "the same prophet," refer to the prophet who occupies the chief place in the first part. He of whose bones we read in the one, is the same as he of whose cloak we read in the other. I challenge any person to prove that my interpretation of the Archbishop's language is not the proper one. Well then, he speaks here of *the bones of the prophet Elijah!* Why, this is as good as the statement in the "Leader" some years ago, that the ceremonies at the burial of the late Mr. Joseph, the optician, were the same as those performed by Joshua at the grave of Moses! We are most plainly told that Elijah went to heaven without "tasting death." How then, could his bones be in the grave? A showman once exhibited a skull as that of Oliver Cromwell. A spectator said that it was too small to be his, as he was an old man when he died. "I know that," said the showman with the utmost gravity, "but this is his skull when he was a boy." Your Grace, were these bones of Elijah his when he was a younger man than he was when he was translated? Had the prophet the power of shedding his body as the snake has of shedding his skin or the lobster his shell? You are like one playing at "checkers" who is so situated that he cannot move any way without putting himself where he can be taken. If your implied statement that Elijah died, be according to "the unanimous consent of the Fathers," then we have here an instance in which they are directly opposed to Scripture. If it be not according to that consent, you have disregarded your ordination oath. Or, to put the matter in another form. If, by "the same prophet" you mean Elijah, it is not creditable to you as a divine; if you mean Elisha—whom you ought to mean—it is not creditable to you as a scholar. Take your choice. But let us go on. The Archbishop next says, "The handkerchief and apron that touched the body of the great St. Paul the Apostle, cured the sick and drove away evil spirits." (Acts xix. 12) "Handkerchief" and "apron" should be in the plural. These handkerchiefs and aprons were not relics of the Apostle, according to the definition of relics as given by the Archbishop's Church in the sentence above quoted, for Paul was still alive. "The hem of the garment of Christ cured the poor