

# British American Presbyterian

Vol. 5—No. 48.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1876.

[Whole No. 286

## Contributors and Correspondent

For the Presbyterian.

Psalmody under the New Testament Dispensation.

BY REV. JOHN DUNBAR, DUNBARTON.

### No. III.

Following the Reformation into Britain we find that in its spread the poets of that period began to turn their attention to the versification of the Psalms. In imitation of the version begun by Merot, and completed by Belza, a courtier of the King, by the name of Hemhold, published in 1549, thirty-seven of the psalms in English metre. Another fifty were about the same time rendered into English verse by one Hopkins, a clergyman and schoolmaster in the county of Suffolk. Among the others who aided in completing the metrical version of the psalmody, the chief was one Whyttingham, successor to John Knox in the congregation of Geneva, and afterwards Dean of Durham. This dignitary carried the love of versification to such an extent as to turn into metre the ten commandments, the creed, and the Lord's prayer, and had them all sung in his cathedral in Durham. The entire book of Psalms in English metre was first published by the above Hemhold and Hopkins in 1562. Among the most noted composers of the period was one Tallis, whose fame soon became European, for not only then, but even to this day his works are esteemed as models of excellence. Belonging to the Romish Church, he in the earlier part of his life, wrote sacred hymns in Latin for the use of that church, but afterwards becoming a convert to the Reformation doctrine, he composed to English words some of the finest sacred music in existence, and especially in its solemn devotional gravity, it has never been surpassed. He was a man of deep and earnest piety, and he consecrated all his musical accomplishments to the service of the church. In such ways metrical psalm singing was introduced into England in the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. This was first practised in St. Antholin's, London, where, after prayer a psalm was sung in the Geneva fashion, all the congregation both young and old singing together, and thus, says Bishop Jewell, "the singing of psalms begun in one church in London, did quickly spread itself not only through the city, but in the neighbouring places, and sometimes at St. Paul's Cross as many as 6000 people were singing together." It appears that so popular and wide-spread had this practice become, that all the more distinguished musicians of the day gave their attention to the subject, and laboured so assiduously and successfully as to leave to posterity but little to do. Among the more noted composers of the day was one Ravenscroft, whose book of psalm tunes has been, with all compilers, from that day to this a standard of reference. He was at an early age chorister of St. Paul's, and afterwards Bachelor of Music in the University of Cambridge. In 1621 his collection of psalm tunes, on which his fame rests, was published, and entitled "The Whole Book of Psalms, with Hymns Evangelical and Songs Spiritual, composed into four parts by sundry authors, to such several tunes as have been and still are usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands, and never as yet before in one volume published." To this was appended a directory by which it might be "known what tune each proper psalm may be sung unto." In preparing this collection Ravenscroft employed the most eminent musicians of his time to assist him, amounting to twenty-four in number, and in consequence the book contains the best tunes of all former collections, and justly regarded as the fount of English psalmody. In this the tunes are all extremely simple in their construction, and although the harmonies are always masterly and scholar-like, yet they are such as the least learned singers may execute. While many masters were employed on the book, yet they were mostly all of one school, and the great aim of all seems to have been to produce an easy fluency or a tuneful progression of the parts; indeed, some of these parts are so melodious as to form tunes or airs of themselves, and have not unfrequently been employed as such. All this shows not only the exquisite taste and skill of these old musicians, but the great care and labour bestowed upon the work, for while many have followed it, yet in many respects it has not yet been surpassed.

In the music of that period there is a peculiarity which distinguishes it from that of the present day, and that is this, that the melody or plain song, as it is sometimes called, was given to the tenor

voices and not, as in modern music, to the treble. This mode of arrangement was derived from the Romish Church, where the melody or plain song is to this day always sung by the men. It was, no doubt, intended that the congregation should sing the tune, as the tenor from its pitch and compass would suit any kind of voice, and that the other parts should be sung by those who had suitable voices and the requisite skill. Thus the tenor of the tune is always plain and equal, and although the bass is generally of the easier kind, the two upper parts are often learnedly ornate. In an age when psalms were sung with great energy by large masses of the people, the men's voices predominating by their power would engross the ear and clearly sustain the melody. The devout musician, therefore, leaving the melody to be sung with all simplicity and fulness, employed a few superior voices to encompass it with rich and agreeable harmony. A trace of this old Roman custom is even yet to be seen in many remote places of Scotland, where, as customs are long in changing, the melody is still called the tenor or church part. In this respect, however, all music, sacred and secular, has since that time undergone a change, and the melody is invariably assigned to the treble voices which, so far as the music is concerned, is a manifest improvement. About the end of the seventeenth century a curious controversy seems to have arisen among some of the Dissenters in England on the subject of sacred song—whether singing in public worship had been partially discontinued to avoid informers, or whether the miserable manner in which it was performed gave persons a distaste to it history saith not, but it appears that at that time a Mr. Keach published a tract entitled "The breach repaired in God's worship, or psalms, hymns, etc., proved to be a holy ordinance of Jesus Christ." It may appear strange to us that such a point had ever been disputed, but it is said that Mr. Keach had long to labour very earnestly and prudently to obtain the consent of the people to sing a hymn at the conclusion of the Lord's Supper. After six years more they agreed to sing on thanksgiving days, but it required fourteen years more ere he could persuade them to sing on every Lord's day, and then only after the last prayer, so that those who were opposed to the singing might withdraw. But even this did not suffice, for the opposing party left the congregation and formed a new one, in which upwards of twenty years elapsed ere the singing of the praises of God could be endured.

(To be continued.)

## MARITIME PROVINCES.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

The demand on the part of leading congregations down by the sea for ministers from the west still continues. St. Andrew's Church, St. John, has called Mr. Mitchell of Montreal, and St. James' Church, Charlottetown, has made a temporary engagement with Mr. McLennan of Peterboro, but a settlement will very likely be the result. Both of these are Old Kirk congregations; the former is the oldest charge in the Province so far as is known. The first settled minister was George Burns, one of the four brothers of that name, who in 1818 opened the first Scotch Church in St. John, and ministered there for some fifteen years. It is not yet a year since Dr. Burns passed away, although it is not far from sixty years since he came to St. John. St. Andrew's is still an influential and desirable charge, though relatively it does not now occupy the place in St. John it once did. The largest and most influential congregations of our connection in St. John now are St. David's and St. new Stephen's, presided over by Dr. Water and Mr. D. Macrae. St. Andrew's Church is a wealthy corporation; fully half the salary offered to the new minister comes from rents. St. James' Church, Charlottetown, is for wealth and social influence the first in the island. Rev. Thomas Duncan, the present Moderator of Synod, has just left there to take charge of a congregation in Halifax. In many respects the Island is a very attractive sphere of labour. For one thing the rate of living is cheaper there than in any other of the Provinces, a very important element to ministers. Besides it is very much to the credit of the Island people that no Presbytery in our Synod can show for the last eight years such a relative advance of ministerial income.

We are not fated to have done with the question of Sabbath Observance and the railways yet. The discussion of the question and the remonstrances forwarded by Presbyteries effected something. Promises were obtained from the authorities that special trains on the Sabbath would not be

granted again, and that as far as possible Sabbath work of any kind would be restricted within narrow limits. Of course this did not please the secularists and others. A correspondent who was so lacking in manliness as to fire a pop-gun from behind a hedge, vented some personal spleen against a brother who was somewhat energetic in his Presbytery and otherwise. In the same company appeared the speaker of the House of Commons, who tried to hold up to ridicule the fanaticism of the Sabbatarians. The hatred manifested by some to the Bible word Sabbath is significant. But right on the back of the check which we thought was put on Sabbath traffic comes the establishment of Halifax as a winter port, an event in which we all rejoice, just as we rejoiced in the completion of our national railway, and with that the running of a Sabbath train with the mails for the steamer. In a communication which the Presbytery of Miramichi received from Mr. Brydges the statement was made that no trains were started on Saturday night. It is notorious that from May last up till the present trains were dispatched every Saturday night from St. John and Halifax respectively. In a timetable issued not long since the public were informed that the train leaving St. John on Saturday night would stop at Truro over Sunday, and the train from Quebec which reaches Moncton at 5 a.m., would stop there over the day of rest. In a week or two after that table was issued the whole thing is changed because of the winter port; both trains now thunder into Halifax, the one arriving at 9.15 a.m., and the other at 1.30 p.m. That with the arrival of the steamer in the evening goes far to rob Halifax of its Sabbath altogether. Such is the reverence which politicians, railway managers and steamboat proprietors have for the day of rest. LEUMAS.

## COLLEGES AND THEIR CONSTITUENCIES.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—The communication in your issue of the 15th inst., to which my letter in your last number adverts, is mischievous in its tendency. By suggesting an appropriation from the western, for the benefit of the eastern, constituency, it reflects upon the authority of the Assembly. Ignoring the grounds upon which the recommendation adopted by the Assembly, respecting the territorial arrangement for the support of Colleges in Quebec and Ontario was based, it questions the fairness and justice of the arrangement on grounds that are new, unreliable and misleading. Before the arrangement has been tested by any practical results, for it came into force only in June last, it is virtually declared to be worthy of rejection because of its partiality. At the very time that College authorities in the western constituency, impressed with the magnitude of financial needs, are endeavouring to induce earnest efforts to make the ordinary revenue for the year at least equal to the necessary outlay, it is represented in the interest of the eastern constituency, and, one is constrained to feel, by direct inspiration therefrom, that much less is required for that laudable purpose—a purpose which the Assembly has ordered to be kept in view—than what has been officially declared to be "the very lowest estimate for current expenditure."

It is by such means as those that acknowledged difficulties are to be overcome, that the peace and prosperity of the Church are to be promoted? Is it conceivable that any tactics, deliberately designed for mischievous purposes, can be more effectual in the production of widespread distrust, or more fruitful of the worst evils of a demoralizing sectionalism?

Further, the article requires the application of some powerful solvent to remove from it all evidence of dishonesty.

I. It is more than suggestive of what is false. The estimated amount at present required to be raised annually by collections, for Knox, is said to be \$8,750.

(1.) For the allegation that the sum mentioned must be raised annually there is no authority whatever. The estimate should be the equivalent of the amount required for the year. This is the sense in which \$11,900 is, by the Knox Board of Management, said to be required. Next year it may be more or less. Who can certainly tell, although all may think it probable that not so much will be needed? The amount of the collections this year is one of several circumstances that will cause it to rise or fall, as the case may be.

(2.) When the writer of the article speaks of "the estimated amount at present required to be raised," the impression most likely to be produced on the reader's mind is, that he is about to give the amounts as they have been estimated by

October 21, 1876. Were there no corrective information to refer to, this impression would remain. But there is an announcement of the true estimate by the only authority competent to make it, namely, the Board of Management. The Board says \$11,900, not \$8,750, is the estimated amount required.

(3.) Was the writer of the article under review ignorant of the printed statement which contains that announcement? It is not conceivable that he was, since it is beyond question, that the estimate for Queen's, which he gives correctly, is to be found only in the same printed statement. The figures—\$2,450—which express the estimate for Queen's, are so peculiar as to be beyond the reach of mere conjecture, and no informant could have fairly supplied them to your contributor, without, at the same time, associating with them the estimate for Knox. If we must conclude that the writer was not ignorant of the printed statement, then it follows that he either closed his eyes to everything in it except the estimate for Queen's, determined not to be enlightened on any other point, or else extracted that estimate, and took upon himself to reduce the estimate for Knox, which appears in immediate conjunction with it, from \$11,900 to \$8,750. Either consequence is a proof of dishonesty. But now, let the reasonable supposition be adopted, that he saw and read the printed statement, the supposition becomes substantial truth, when it appears, from what the writer says, that he subjected some estimate for Knox to a process of reduction, and that the manipulation of the true estimate, namely, \$11,900, by deducting from it interest on the bequest from the Hall estate, specially mentioned by him, gives very nearly his estimate of \$8,750. Interest at 8 per cent. on \$40,000 subtracted from \$11,900 gives \$8,700. It is much easier to account for the difference of \$50, than to reject the belief that the process indicated was resorted to.

But if the writer of the article saw and read the printed statement, with what notion of honesty can the reduction of the officially declared estimate of \$11,900 to \$8,750 be reconciled, when it is positively asserted in the statement that the former amount is required "this year," and that it is "the very lowest estimate for current expenditure."

II. The article suppresses truth which is of material consequence. It does not mention the bequest from the Hall estate to the Montreal College. It makes no allowance for interest from it. It deducts nothing from the given estimate of \$7,000 for the College, on account of interest. Were the subject of much less importance than this, a writer with a desire to submit a whole truth essential to a fair and honest statement, would have omitted none of these particulars, the omission of which cannot be accounted for except by a resistance of suggestions and promptings to be as communicative with regard to the bequest to the Montreal College, as with regard to the bequest to Knox College.

These things being so, the disclosure of your contributor's name, (for his communication, ambitious to rank as an editorial, is anonymous,) would be attended with one of two results. It would either reveal some one possessed of a marvellous capacity for explanation, or it would introduce us to a fit subject for a process by libel, for practices plainly contrary to the Word of God and the Confession of Faith.

I believe the effusion, which is the occasion of this and a former letter, is the culmination of a plan, to which sundry "gushing" paragraphs recently made public through newspaper columns and by telegraphic aids, have been working up, the object being, in the first instance, to attract special attention and favour to the Montreal College, and next to amass support for the opinion that the said institution has been unfairly dealt with in the existing arrangement for the pecuniary sustenance of the Colleges, and that it is entitled to a larger recognition than it has received. Hence particularly frequent references to the attendance of students, and the parading of numbers and classification, the purpose of which, until the article under review appeared, was obscure and doubtful. And so, with refreshing simplicity, the author of the article adverts to "last week's BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN" for the number, and to "a late issue of the BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN" for a classification of the "students enrolled," as if, prior to the appearance of such statistics in your pages, he had no connection with the working out of the scheme; and now, struck with the figures that have been catching his eye week after week, he for the first time assumes the role of a contributor to the gathering volume of literature on the subject, puts his hand to the business, and, in the manner we have seen, settles the question so very carefully and satisfactorily that never after can it have two sides.

And what are some of the supplementary notes by which his great exposure of injustice is carried triumphantly beyond the region of doubt and disputation?

This matter of numbers and classification is one. These prove the success of the College, and success "unmistakably" proves the necessity for it. Just think of it! 84 students from Ontario! In that Province there are two Theological Halls. One of them, namely, Knox College, is in "the very heart of Canadian Presbyterianism;" and it is manned by Professors deserving of "the highest respect." Do not these facts, with reference to College accommodation and efficiency, certify exclusively that there is no alternative open

to the young men of Ontario, but to flock to Montreal, which, your correspondent assures us, "has few congregations finding it difficult to maintain ordinances and meet current expenses at home—whatever at home may mean,—and in which, by latest accounts, (see your last No.) "the multiplication of Presbyterian Churches" is going on so rapidly that one energetic, popular minister, and he too a lecturer last winter in the College, has found in that circumstance a reason for retiring to another more easterly Province. And since it will never do to burden still more a community already ecclesiastically overburdened, by making it provide for the wants of the western constituency, it is of course but right that the said constituency should increase its contributions in behalf of the city of refuge in its straits. This arrangement, if complied with, will at least afford ecclesiastical statisticians a novel illustration of the laws which regulate demand and supply, for as ministers, through stress of Church extension, retire in one direction, students and money will flow in from another, and thus no merchant province or princely benefactor, no orthodox Professor for exiled clergymen, once a resident in Canada's chief City, shall ever have occasion to wail in such touching words as those of Virgil:—

*Fuinus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens Gloria Teuorum.*

I have said that for the proper conception of a subject or the practical application of a principle, mere numbers are usually "a delusion and a snare." There are other classifications than the one made public, about which a desire for information might prompt some pertinent questions, and with regard to numbers, if the writer of the article under review will send me his name and address, I shall communicate to him some facts (character not particular) which to a certain extent may serve to account for them being so large.

Another supplementary note gives prominence to the teaching of the professors in the Montreal College, which says your correspondent, "is as orthodox and as loyal to the standards of the Church as either of the two who unitedly derive their support from one and the same constituency." The shouting of loyalty, and shouting of heresy have turned many a curious wheel, and created many a strange copartnership. Really one cannot get past this puerile, significant appeal by your contributor, without experiencing an inordinate excitement of curiosity. The writer connects himself with the teaching he describes. He constitutes himself an authority for his character. A sort of Siamese affinity is revealed. However intimately or remotely he may be related to the staff of professors, orthodox and loyalty are found to be, where they have often been before, unshaken of the association and risking all danger of contamination—in suspicious company; and for that reason they expose themselves to suspicion. Doctrinal orthodoxy cannot count for much, when it joins hands with practical heterodoxy. All the orthodoxy and loyalty that can be found in any college, not excepting the one at Montreal, can never atone for such falsifications as have been made, by the writer who testifies to the efficiency and soundness of the Montreal Professors. Yours, etc., W. SNODGRASS.

Queen's College, 23rd Dec., 1876.

## The Wonderful Revolution in Japan.

No civilization, it may be said, springs into existence like Athens from the head of Zeus. In this solitary case (Japan), however, we see the curious spectacle of "two hundred and seventy-eight princes, possessing regal power, vast wealth and separate armies, abdicating, from purely patriotic motives, the stations which their families had held for twenty centuries." Their Tycoon, Shogun or Vice Emperor, consents to become a mere Daimio or county chief; next, to abdicate even that position. He quietly spends his time in sketching and shooting game, and now Sir Charles Dilke tells us that his ex-imperial Majesty may some of these days accept a portfolio from the Ministry of the revolution that overthrew him.

That same Cabinet is fashioned on the European model, with Ministers of Justice, War, Marine, Finance, Education, Public Worship, Foreign Affairs and Affairs of the Interior, all of them the growth, or rather the creation, of the last eight years. And over them all stands the heir of the oldest dynasty in the world—a cloistered emperor whose house "dates from Nebuchadnezzar"—who before 1868 had never seen the outside of his own palace at Kyoto; who, in fact, was deemed too sacred to touch vulgar earth; but who has just been existing at the opening of a new railway; and who, perhaps, will lay many a first stone before he departs to the realm of the Sun God, from whom both he and his house have descended.

These are sober realities of the Japanese revolution. That they are not superficial realities—that their results are likely to be permanently beneficent—that, at all events, there is no reason why they should not be so, will, we think, be admitted by most people who study the subject with care and impartiality.—*London Examiner.*

WHAT assurance can I have that Jesus died for me if I am not living truly unto Him?—*Dr. Cuyler.*

CHRIST and His cross are not separable in this life; howbeit, Christ and His cross part at heaven's door, for there is no room for crosses in heaven. One tear, one sigh, one sad heart, one fear, one loss, one thought of trouble cannot find lodging there.