

catholicity"—hence, the movement of the reformers of the English Church—who for the most part were the bishops and clergy of the national Church. "The tone and temper of the Church of England appears, therefore, to be that of a body earnestly and steadfastly protesting against Romanism, against all the errors, abuses and idolatries of the Church of Rome; but yet acknowledging that, with a fearful amount of error, the churches of the Roman communion are still branches, though corrupt branches, of the universal Church of Christ." Again, "the English Church has been content to give her decision as to the right mode of ordaining, ministering sacraments, and exercising discipline, without expressing an opinion on the degree of defectiveness in such matters, which would cause other communions to cease from being churches of Christ." (Bishop H. Browne on Art. 19.) Let us by all means be national—hence the splendid seasonableness of Mr. French's letter during the General Synod—but above all let us remember "Jerusalem which is above, which is the mother of us all," and as we turn our faces to Jerusalem below—

"Where the dear Lord was crucified,
Who died to save us all!"

Let us make so Jerusalem, the centre of our policy—the city of the Great King—"and his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east: "It shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not day nor night: but it shall come to pass that at evening time it shall be light." Let our policy be towards Jerusalem, because there shall all nations be summoned in that day to worship the Lord and to keep the feast of tabernacles." Meanwhile let our policy be to obey our commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature"—and "I—if I be lifted up—will draw all men unto Me!"

"I do not ask to see the distant scene;
One step enough for me."

L. S. T.

Old Friends.

SIR,—In the history of the Church during the last forty or fifty years, nothing is so striking, and, we may say, so satisfactory as the pains taken with, and the improvement in, the psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs of the sanctuary. We well remember when the Synod appointed a committee—the first of its kind—to compile a book of hymns for the use of the various congregations in the diocese, and though the book is now out of date in the services of the Church, I suppose some copies of it are in existence. When you compare that hymn-book (with the then bishop's and Synod's imprimatur on it) with the hymns sung in our services now, you find a pleasing and remarkable advance in Catholic teaching. In the Synod's hymn-book, for instance, you have the third and fourth verses of the hymn beginning, "We love the place, O God," omitted, because the third verse alluded to the blessings received in the sacrament of baptism, and the fourth to those conferred in the Holy Eucharist. I have before me one of my first copies of Hymns A. & M., with these verses scored out because they were not in the book in the hands of the people. It is sad to think that, in the various editions of the Synod hymn-book, these two verses were never restored by the committees entrusted with the work of reviewing and adding fresh hymns, while they inserted Mrs. Adams' sentimental heresy, "Nearer My God to Thee," forgetting the saying of our blessed Lord Himself, "No man cometh to the Father but by Me." It gives me unspeakable pleasure to find in Hymns A. & M. (complete edition), now so largely used, many sacred songs from the pen of those "Old Friends" of our youth, aye, and of our old age, Tate and Brady. It is for their sake, and from the spiritual comfort which the psalms and hymns of these two composers have imparted to our childhood, our boyhood and our manhood, that we write this brief notice of them. Their version of the psalms was intended to remedy the ruggedness of metre of the old versifiers, Sternhold and Hopkins. Dr. Nicholas Brady was chaplain, and Nahum Tate was poet laureate, to their Majesties William and Mary, and their versions of the psalms was licensed by the king in 1696. There are, of course, many faults found with the translated psalms of these poets—for poets they were—but the only psalm in which the courtier and flatterer appear is the 101st, and even it contains a sermon and lesson for William in respect to his unfaithfulness to his noble wife, e.g.:

"When, Lord, thou shalt with me reside,
Wise discipline my reign shall guide,
With blameless life, myself I'll make
A pattern for my court to take"—101 Ps. 3rd v.

Indeed the whole of this psalm seems translated so as to bring the king to be more faithful and true to the queen than he had been. Some of the translations of these poets are doubtless poor, and have the stamp of carelessness, but as Horace tell us, "By times even Homer slumbers." Dr. Neale's

translations are, upon the whole, exquisite, but some of them, especially when he is desirous of being very literal, are meagre in the extreme. Keble himself is often not Keble, and I do not think Toplady wrote a hymn worth reading save "Rock of Ages"; but take Tate and Brady's translation of the 104th psalm:

"With light thou dost thyself enrobe,
And glory for a garment take;
Heaven's curtains stretch beyond the globe,
Thy canopy of state to make."

There is scarcely anything more sublime and beautiful than this. Or, again, can there be any condition of the soul, reposing in the security and trust of its God, cutting itself loose from everything, so as to be, in the language of St. Paul, "found" in Christ, more beautifully depicted than the 34th Psalm:

"Through all the changing scenes of life,
In trouble and in joy,
The praises of my God shall still
My heart and tongue employ."

Or, if we want to elucidate our Lord's command "that men should, always pray and never faint," how can that constant condition or state of prayer be better described than in Tate and Brady's rendering of the 42nd Psalm:

"As pants the hart for cooling streams,
When heated in the chase,
So longs my soul, O God, for Thee,
And Thy refreshing grace."

Or when we descend, in thought, to touch the misery of the captive, how that unutterable grief is presented to us in the rendering of the 137th Psalm:

"When we our weary limbs to rest
Sat down by proud Euphrates' stream,
We wept, with doleful thoughts oppressed,
And Zion was our mournful theme."

Need I say, in conclusion, that the glorious idyl—immortal as the language and tongue of England—sung wherever the children of England's Church commemorate the coming in the flesh of their Redeemer and their God, is the product of the poetical soul of one of these men, Nahum Tate:

"While shepherds watch their flocks by night,
All seated on the ground,
The angel of the Lord came down
And glory shone around."

When we consider how much poorer our psalms and hymns and spiritual songs would be without the contributions of Tate and Brady, I think the Church, and people speaking the language of England, may be proud in thinking of what these two Irishmen—Irish Churchmen—have done in enriching our volume of sacred song.

J. H. M.

Synod Reform.

SIR,—I gave in my letter of last week a brief history of the establishment of the Synod of Toronto in 1858. Two years after that event, there was a desire springing up to unite the Synod with the Church Society, but one party wanted to accomplish this without the necessity of an appeal to the legislature! We cannot positively assign the reason, but it almost seems that this party fought shy of the amended Synod Act of 1858, and would be glad of its repeal; as it stood in the way of a plan then quietly entertained by some. I have no means of knowing Bishop Strachan's view on this embryo plan, if indeed it ever came to his notice, but I feel sure he would have been very greatly rejoiced to see the Synod united with the Church Society, provided the union was based on his two Acts of 1857 and 1858. Very soon—too soon—after the demise of the bishop, it would seem the Synod authorities, having now a free hand, took counsel together to see how they could in the best way, and with the least shock to the feelings of Church people, change and alter and render nugatory the bishop's explanatory and amended Act. They had probably found that it was difficult for congregations in the outlying and poor parishes to get three resident laymen to represent them in Synod; but is it not obvious that as they had full power, they should have been content to send only one—one well conversant with the parish and its affairs—which they could easily have done if the clergy and churchwardens had been equal to their duties? As to the former we know that the bishop had reminded them that it was their duty "to teach our people energy and self-reliance." Had they followed the advice, the bishop's idea of gradually building up a parish by having resident laymen as representatives in the Synod would have been fully answered and faithfully carried out. But the advisers of the Synod had other views. They had no power, perhaps no inclination, and there was no superintendent, no inquisitor or inspector—pardon these uncanonical expressions—to see that the churchwardens did their duty, and were desirous of promoting the welfare of their parish in the way the amended Act and Constitution required. Their thoughts were on their embryo plan, for which there was now a chance. The foundation for this intended

departure from the bishop's thoughtful scheme was to be carried out by the Act to incorporate the Synod of the diocese with the Church Society; the 32 Vic., ch. 51, passed 23 January, 1869. By section 2 the Synod was to consist of the bishop, priests and deacons, and of lay representatives to be elected according to the Constitution of the said Synod as the same exists at the time of the passing of this Act. The Constitution was based, as it had long been, on, and we believe was in strict conformity with, the two Acts of 1857 and 1858, which the bishop so highly approved of, and yet strange and lamentable it is to say, that by this Incorporation Act, passed as we have shown so immediately after the bishop's death, section 6 enacts, "the Synod shall have all powers, rights, privileges and franchises conferred upon the said Synod under the Act passed in the session held in the nineteenth and twentieth years of her Majesty's reign, entitled "an Act to enable members of the Church of England to meet in Synod," being the above Act of 1857, only, entirely putting on one side, annulling and blotting out of existence the all-important Act passed in the following year, to explain and amend the Act of 1857. Is it possible that this was legally done? The first Act of 1857, enabling members of the Church of England in Canada to meet in Synod, is of little or no value unless joined with the second Act of 1858, which explains it. The two Acts must be taken and construed together as one Act. But if this fair, honest and proper construction had been acted on, there would never have been found a place in the Constitution of the Synod of Toronto for canon 17, which reads as follows: "17. In the event of the inability or refusal of the chairman to certify that such lay representatives, or either of them so duly elected, are communicants of at least one year's standing, and had communicated at least three times during the year previous to their election, he shall forthwith after such election require the lay representative (or lay representatives) as to whom he cannot so certify, to procure and furnish to him within ten days after the same shall have been required of him (or them), a certificate or certificates from any minister who is able to certify thereto in the form," &c. This important canon was probably adopted in 1869. It would be interesting to know its exact date; perhaps then some of my remarks might have to be modified. Up to this year, 1896, it is almost certain that the explanatory Act of 1858 had been faithfully adhered to. It provides as above stated, and that there may be no mistake, we repeat that "the representatives should be elected at the annual Easter meeting in each parish, and that all laymen within such parish, or belonging to such congregation, of the full age of 21 years, and who are members of the Church of England, and did not belong to any other religious denomination, should have the right of voting at such election, and that each representative shall receive from the chairman of the meeting (usually the minister) a certificate of his election. And the Constitution of the Synod further provides that the representatives be habitual worshippers with his congregation, also communicants of at least one year's standing, and who shall have communicated at least three times during the year previous to the election." Now who but the minister or layman presiding at the Easter meeting of the parishioners could be acquainted with all these requirements so as to give a true certificate? Not a soul outside the country church! and so the authorities, as we contend, wrongfully got over the difficulty by a circuitous route, they enacted canon 17, which enables "any minister," though he reside a hundred miles away, perhaps, and most likely in Toronto (indeed I believe the 33 country representatives who do not belong to the congregations represented all reside in Toronto, and with Toronto's own representatives, 81, the Church here should be well cared for), to give his certificate to one of his congregation, but only so far as to the nominee being a communicant, and who is as ignorant of the wants and circumstances of the parish supposed to be represented as the child unborn! I feel quite sure that if the bishop could have been present when that canon 17 was promulgated, he would have been greatly surprised and grieved to find his life work on behalf of the country laity, to encourage them to be energetic, persevering and a self-reliant in fostering and supporting their church, their country church—I say he would have been grieved, to find his life work had been so thoughtlessly and ungratefully destroyed, and that, too, in the presence of the good bishop, his friend and amiable successor! Until I am better informed—and I have to confess that I am writing without having all the facts before me, which, however, I have earnestly endeavoured, with some inconvenience and labour, to ascertain from various quarters, but without success, and these facts I am satisfied cannot all be got at without the assistance of a committee or commission of enquiry, which I trust may shortly be asked for—in the meantime, however, I venture to express the opinion on this *prima facie* case with great submission until