

the Tempter, went and gazed at the tree, was allured by the beauty of the fruit, coveted it, then took it, and ate it; here we see three things; namely, "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" 1 John ii, 16, 'good for food, pleasant to the eyes, a tree to be desired to make one wise.' These were the three things presented by Satan to the Lord Jesus, in his temptation in the wilderness, and overcome by Him, St Luke iv, 8, 6. Far different was it with Eve, her security would have been, simple repose in the infinite goodness of God. She should have refused to listen, St. James, iv, 7., 1 St. Peter, v, 9., St. Luke, iv, 8. Eve's sin did not end here, sin reproduces sin, 'She gave also unto her husband,' and he too falls. Perhaps, some may think this was only a little sin, but it was the *only way* in which Adam and Eve could go wrong. They were guilty of distrust of God, disobedience and presumption.

*The Sad Discovery.*—They soon found out that the devil was a 'lying spirit' who had deceived and destroyed them, St. John viii, 44, instead of finding themselves wiser and better, as the devil had said, they were miserable and frightened, verse 8. Innocence had gone, and in its place was shame. They were afraid of God, and hid themselves, verse 10. Isaiah, lvii, 21. How foolish to think they could escape from God's presence! Jer. xxiii, 24, Ps. cxxxix, 7, 12. God calls to them, verse 9.—The good shepherd is already seeking the lost sheep, Man was lost; but God had come down to look for him. Instead of freely confessing his sin, Adam, in verse 12, dissembles, (a) by laying the blame on the woman, (b) by blaming God, 'whom Thou gavest' &c., Eve, in verse 13, blamed the serpent, or God who permitted it to assail her. And so it is ever with fallen man, everyone and everything is blamed but *self*. In the case of true conviction, the reverse is the case, "I have sinned," 2 Sam., xii, 13, Ps., li, 4.

Let us learn from this sad story of man's fall these practical lessons. (1) To obey God's word, even when it contradicts our own inclinations; implicit confidence in His truth, and in His love. (2) To be humble and patient, waiting God's time and will, St. John, xiii, 7. (3) To refuse to listen to temptation, never to parley with it, St. James, iv, 7, 1 Pet. v, 9

Watch, as if on that alone

Hung the issue of the day;

Pray, that help may be sent down.

"Watch and Pray."

## Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear either the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

### CLERGY AT THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE BISHOP.

SIR,—In your note of the funeral of our late Bishop, you gave a list of the names of the clergy present. Considering that the funeral occurred on a Saturday afternoon, it was gratifying to find so many of the clergy present from distant parishes. Some could not be present and return to their parishes for Sunday duty. But there were some present whose names were unintentionally omitted from the list; they were those of the clergy who having arrived by N. W. Railway, had only time to reach the Bishop's late residence when the funeral cortage was at the point of leaving. It was doubtless the purpose and errand of these clergyman to unite with their brethren in paying their last tribute of respect to their Bishop, and as they would avoid even the appearance of having been wanting in that dutiful respect to him, or wanting in sympathy with his bereaved family in their sorrow, I beg leave to request the following names be added to the list, viz.—Revs. F. Motherwell, A. E. Belt, R. T. W. Webb, W. J. Mackenzie. Yours truly,

W. J. M.

### THE HURON DIOCESAN CHANT BOOK.

SIR,—The above little book was placed in my hands by a number of my choir a few days ago for an opinion upon its merits; were it not for the fact that it is entitled as it is, this letter should never appear in print, but I feel it my duty as a musician to point out a few of the many errors which mark its pages—errors not of the printer, but arising from a total disregard (or ignorance) of the fundamental rules of musical composition. The compilers hope "that it may be the means of introducing a *more uniform* system of chanting in all the churches," it is to be hoped however that in its present form, its use may be confined to London. In a Diocesan chant book every thing should be plain, for in many of our country churches, the choirs need all the assistance that can be rendered, this book however falls much in this respect. A few examples taken

hap hazard here follow. Page 25, chant 8, begins in four parts, then goes into three. There is frequently no tenor, and where it does appear, it is written in the treble staff, for no earthly reason. There are many examples of this throughout the book. In the Venite and in other psalms the accent is often omitted. Page 27 chant 1 measure 13, consecutive octaves. Page 23 chant 11 measure 6 the same. Page 8 chant 1 measure 5 unharmonic cross relation (relatio non harmonica). Page 22 chant 9 measure 9 the same. Page 8 last two lines, no such keys in civilized music. On the same page last line, there are in one measure two semibreves in the alto and only two minims in the soprano. The dots after the base clef are totally omitted. Sharps and naturals are frequently confounded, and in several places are left out altogether. When it is noticed that nearly all these errors, and many more, occur in chants of which the compilers are the composers, one is reminded that it takes something more than executive ability to edit successfully a chant book, I remain, yours truly.

WM. FRED FOOT,  
Organist St. Georges, Goderich.

### THE BLACK GOWN AND SURPLICED CHOIRS IN ROMAN CHURCHES.

SIR,—In your issue of Dec. 25th, appears a letter from the Rev. A. L. Fortin in which, writing of the Roman church in Montreal, he says:—1st, the black gown is not used by the priest's in the pulpit. 2nd, very few churches have the gallery arrangement. Your editorial of a former issue, in answer to Mr. Fortin, has, I think, put the matter right. But allow me to say that in regard to the Montreal Roman churches, Mr. Fortin is, I think, altogether wrong. I too have been very often present at services in different R. C. churches in Montreal. In the church of Gesu (Blewry street) I have heard, I daresay, forty sermons, and in every case the priest wore a black gown. In the Parish church of Montreal (Place de Avines Lngare) which seats about 7,000 persons, I have often heard Father Martineau, a very graceful and eloquent divine, and he always wore the black gown in preaching.

In regard to "the gallery arrangement?" The lay choir in the "Gesu" is a mixed choir of men and women, and is in the gallery or rear of the church facing the altar. The Parish church (Notre Dame) choir of men and boys is in the same place. St. Patrick's choir is also placed at the back of the church facing the altar and, like the "Gesu" choir, is composed of men and women. These are the three largest churches of the Roman communion in Montreal, and may be taken as fixing the Roman use generally in the Province of Quebec. In short, in Montreal the black gown is always worn by the preacher in Roman churches, and the choir of laymen is never surpliced. Yours.

OLIVER J. BOOTH,  
PARISH OF CHRIST AND ST. THOMAS' CHURCHES,  
ST. CATHARINES, DEC. 26, 1884.

SIR,—I must say I was a little surprised at the statement in your paper of Dec. 4th, "that in R. C. churches a surpliced lay choir in the body of the church is never seen." I remember seeing *one* myself, and was struck with the similarity to our anglican use. About eleven years ago, I went to the Indian Mission St. Anne, on the Restigouche, to witness the *fete*, held there yearly, in honour of their patron saint, St. Anne. There was a large surpliced choir of about fifty Indians, men and boys, in cassocks and short surplices, not the little jacket we sometimes see, but surplices coming to, or below, the knee.

They occupied seats in the sanctuary, ranged side-wise, as we do, and turned eastward at the creed and glorias, as is seen sometimes in our own churches. An English clergyman, who had made a tour of Normandy, visiting the cathedrals and churches, told me that he had seen twelve surpliced choirs there. It is possible, that in both cases they may have been in minor orders, but that amounts to little in argument. I should hardly think the Indian men and boys, whom I saw, were in minor orders; and I question if mere boys are generally admitted into these orders.

Again, the article "gowns and galleries in R. C. churches," quotes the English practice as a proof that "in placing her choirs in surplices in the nave or chancel she departs from the usual custom of Rome." This seems to me a very loose mode of expression, and one which must convey a very false idea. It would be as wise and true to say that the English church departed from her own very wide spread custom, for, though not an old man, I can well remember when the west gallery choir was the prevailing anglican use; so much so that a service by a surpliced choir was generally called a "Cathedral service," and the few Parish Churches adopting it, were in my younger days called "Puseyite". Is there not a broader view to be taken than that of the writer of "gowns and galleries"? Do we not find surpliced choirs in *both*

churches, growing (lately) in our own, and decreasing in the Roman church? Are they not in *both* cases, the remains of pre-reformation custom? was this not one of very many customs untouched by the reformation, unless indeed the plunder of revenues in many places necessitated their abolition for want of the funds to carry them on? It is more true of the anglican than of the Roman church "that a surpliced lay choir in the body of the church is a recognition \* \* \* of the priesthood of the laity", &c.? Why is it *always* necessary to *make* a difference between the anglican and Roman churches? Are there not real and vital differences enough without straining to *make* them? Though a thorough anglican churchman myself, I can rejoice at the *similarities*, and they are not a few, between us and our neighbours; and this very question of surpliced choirs is one, as I have shown, and I was very much struck with it, "as I said before". The eye testimony of one who has seen.

O. SAPIENTIA.

### CONCERNING THE SECOND ADVENT.

SIR.—I trust that I may not be considered heterodox, when I assert, that I believe when Christ comes at what is called the Second Advent, He shall not at the same time come to judgment. Plain Scripture teaching assures me of the contrary. We are assured that when Christ shall come a second time, the world will be in a state of Spiritual deadness, Luke xviii., 8.; 2nd Thes. ii., 3. But when He shall come to judgment, mankind will be in a different state. We are certified that a time of great peace is yet to dawn upon the world. Is. lxx., 25. How are we to harmonize these Scriptures? Our only method is to search the Scripture, and not be too ready, as so many are, to spiritualize what will bear a literal interpretation. I find then, in 1st Thes. iv., 19, 17, that two resurrections are implied. The first is the resurrection of the just. I find in 1st Cor. xv., 23, 24, the same doctrine set forth: "Christ the first fruits *afterward* they that are Christ's, at His coming. Then cometh the end." The particles *epeita* and *aiti*, respectively translated *afterward* and *then*, are really synonymous. So we have here three distinct events recorded, viz., Christ's resurrection, the resurrection of the just, at His second coming, and at a still future time the judgment.

In Rev. xx., the whole mystery is fully explained. There we read that there is a *first* resurrection revealed in accordance with the words of St. Paul, already quoted; but "the rest of the dead," (*i. e.*, the wicked dead), lived not, but shall be brought to judgment at a yet future period. Commentators are accustomed to treat this first resurrection spoken of, as a prosperous and happy period which the Church is to enjoy; but how are we to make this exegesis accord with the plain words of Scripture, which declare that there shall be in the last days a great falling away?

I find the following to be Scriptural teaching. In Rom. xi. we read that when the Jews rejected Christianity, they were rejected of God, until the fulness of the Gentiles should come. After this fulness of the Gentiles the Second Advent shall come, when Christ will raise the righteous dead, and bring them with the saints still living on earth to a place of glory with Himself—it may be to heaven or paradise, Scripture does not plainly declare which. (1 Thes. iv.) Then, after this great event, the Jews shall be received back as life from the dead, and to them shall be given all authority in that future Church on earth. The latter part of Ezekiel's prophecy speaks very plainly as to this latter fact.

Many are accustomed to speak of us Gentile believers as "the Israel of God." Scripture never once even implies that we should be so fearfully arrogant as to thrust ourselves into the place of the chosen people of God. To the Jews were committed the oracles of God. A Gentile hand never wrote a word of the original Scriptures, whether of the old or new Testament. Jews founded the Christian Church, and any Church that has not a succession of bishops from the Church founded by the Apostles, who were all Jews, is not a Church in the light of Scripture teaching. We must remember that we are only Gentiles—adopted sons; but Israel is the chosen nation, and God will yet do away with our Gentile dispensation, and re-establish the Jews in favor more abundant than ever they experienced in their most prosperous days. This period of Jewish prosperity is called the millennium.

I have many things to say on this subject; but with your permission will do so in future issues of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN. Yours truly,

SHEMNI.

Glassware should be washed in cold water, as it gives a brighter and cleaner look than when washed in warm.