

I should also like to object very strongly to the habit of singing the hymn "for those at sea," whenever it is asked for. It is exceedingly selfish for an individual in a congregation to expect any important part of the *public* service to be turned into an intercession for him alone. It is of course desirable for people requiring assistance in danger, etc., to ask for the prayers of the faithful, but this can be done without monopolising one of the hymns. When a vessel is lost, or has not been heard of for some time, or during specially dangerous seasons, the hymn is appropriate; but I do not for an instance suppose, that it was intended to be used in cases of individuals who were perhaps in no more danger than those who were singing it. For my own part I should be very willing to change places with some of the people who, with full purses, ample time, and the prospect of an enjoyable visit to England, etc., are "in peril on the sea." Sung in the indiscriminate way in which it is, it becomes pointless and wearisome; pointless, because the congregation are usually ignorant of the name of the person, and wearisome, on account of its repetition. If we once begin using it, we must go on with it, or some person will be offended.

If my readers are not weary of the subject, I should also like to say a few words on the subject of secular music in church. People say, "why should the devil get all the best music?" This remark is made, for instance, when we hear the Salvation Army singing a hymn to the tune of "The Little old Log Cabin," or a congregation joining vigorously in words arranged to the air "Drink to me only with thine eyes." The points to be considered are:

1st. Does the devil get all the music which is not sung in church? There are some things in the world intended to minister to God's glory, and some things which may, without taking away from God's glory, minister to man's enjoyment. There is, for example, music intended as a direct offering to God, and also music intended for man's enjoyment. But even the latter may indirectly minister to God's honour: "*Whatsoever* ye do, do all to the glory of God." Therefore secular music, although not suitable for Divine Service, is not necessarily the property of Satan.

2nd. Is such music the *best*? It has a certain charm about it, a certain amount of pathos in it, and is well known, but all this does not constitute "good" music. Is "Drink to me only," or, "Tenting on the Old Camp Ground," *better* than, "O Come all ye Faithful?"

3rd. Such music is composed for secular songs, and for purely personal enjoyment, and to set it to hymns, and to sing it in church, is to make an offering to God of what is "second hand."

4th. The associations connected with secular music should prevent it being used in Church. It cannot be edifying to sing hymns which recall scenes of worldly amusement, and drive out all thoughts of the words we are singing.

5th. A hymn is sung as an act of worship, not for enjoyment. There is, no doubt, great pleasure in singing some

hymns, but that is merely an incidental feeling, although a very useful one. Worship and praise are the primary ideas.

6th. The music is as much a part of this act of worship as the words are. If we sang Tennyson's "In Memoriam" to the tune of "Glory to Thee, my God this night" no one would consider it a suitable offering to God, because the tune was a hymn tune. No one would try to justify such an act by saying, "why should the devil have all the best poetry?"

7th. If our stock of hymn tunes was small, there might be some ground for using secular airs, but with the thousands of good tunes which have been accumulating for centuries there is no excuse for picking up second-hand negro melodies. As long as men like Mendelsson, Gounod, Dykes, &c., give us hymn tunes, we have no right to descend to such trash as is sung in Church in these days, and which is defended on the ground that people sing it "so heartily. People will sing "The Church's One Foundation," or "Holy, Holy, Holy," as heartily as they will sing "Marching thro' Georgia," or a hymn tune adapted from the last song in "Lucia de Lammermoor," (and sung to "Jerusalem my happy Home"), and with more profit to themselves.

KINGSLEY'S "WATER BABIES."

BY PROFESSOR CLARK.

The "Water Babies" is evidently intended to be more than a "Fairy Tale for a Land Baby." It is also an allegory of the spiritual life of man; and a brief exposition of its meaning may be something of a help to those who undertake the reading of it. It may be here remarked that the outline of the meaning here given had the approval of the author. The reader should have his copy of the "Water Babies" at hand in perusing these notes, as the space at our command will not allow of lengthy extracts.

In the "Water Babies" we have two different accounts of the beginning of the spiritual life, as we might say, two different types of conversion, namely the crisis of the conviction of sin and the forsaking of moral and spiritual evil, as the first; and, as the second, the change from worldliness to a perception of our place in the Divine family as children of God and brethren in His house.

The first of these types is represented in the life of Tom, the chimney-sweep, and in his being turned into a Water Baby. Tom was very dirty without knowing it, but the admonition of the Irish woman and the sight of Ellie in her beautiful, clean, white bed, and other painful experiences begat in him a sense of his dirtiness, and he cried out: "I must be clean," and threw himself into the flowing river, and was turned into a Water baby. The meaning of this is very clear. The earnest struggle after real goodness usually begins in the sense of evil.