

[October 9th, 1890.]

breakfast and the like; the authorities will put

DRSHIP.

TABLE.)

ind of worship most congregations is bearing the publication of object we learn that and in England, called "Music Association," discouraging the sacred is getting too widely of this society Mr. n English paper, set society; and some of od that we reproduce

first place, to abolish any note higher than egation, if not for the f Responses as simple, to secure the "full In all chanting, the citation notes, rarely, if they are both solid, votional. Our clergy work in this important arty manner. If, as egation can be brought e in a psalmody class dd, of oratorios, &c., machinery fail to do int for perfect success. anist to make it his un, woman, and child g voice. Make special of music used in the mple) to every one of pper. This is the ngregational practices. is reputation should ongregation, and not orts with a chancel

is rarely heard as it a church of North ty voice of a couple hymns and chants e organ only leading, ffect be effaced from honoured vicar how ersely said, "I have his work, and whose gregation." Bishop nb congregation is a admitting this, if all congregational, Iun-revailing ornate com- is "all dumb dogs," and judicious reform ffectual rendering of n be possible. Arch-rit of professionalism spirit of devotion in a

n the most important e office of Holy Com- l devout members of e extreme and banish ing," says an earnest tore the Eucharistic urely it would be the n all communicants,

thereby giving to the only Divinely-instituted office a brightness and reality which can never be realized by mere listeners." This is truth, and can only be attained by the simple unisonal settings of those parts of this great office which are designed to be said or sung—not by the injudicious performances of Mozart's Twelfth Mass, &c., as advertised by some of our musical clergy for the purpose of gratifying the sensuous appetites of concert goers, and filling their churches by means of sensationalism. Those of your readers who believe that whatever is not clearly consistent with the simplicity of the Prayer-book must be held to be a violation of its spirit, will feel that the very artistic and elaborate music now used is, to put it mildly, injudicious, impolitic in the long run, if not an absolute pandering to sensationalism. We want—and it is an immediate and crying want—our Church composers to study more how to comply with the intention of our Reformed Prayer-book in its broad and liberal designs for congregational prayer and praise.

Let our clergy, in the interest of their congregations, exercise, where needed, their undoubted authority as supreme directors of all that concerns the service and its ideal interpretation—that by the people only. If this is to be done at the expense of the loss of any ambitious choir, be it so, and begin at once with the people. In such a case the gain to the church would infinitely exceed the loss of any choir, simply by rousing the apathetic and imparting a spirit of reality into the services which is far from observable in the majority of our churches. If perilous times for our beloved Church are in the near future, the strengthening from within is the surest defence, and nothing can prove more irresistible to the attacks of the enemy than a genuine enthusiasm and love for our glorious Liturgy, held next in reverence to the Bible itself, encouraged by the privilege of a hearty participation in our services of prayer and praise. For this object, our association is formed, and, although young, is making itself known both at home and abroad. We are, however, much in want of the active support and sympathy of the clergy; they only can bring about the grand desired result by the gentle but firm use of their undoubted authority. Many of them shelter themselves behind their ignorance of music, and so leave everything to the organist, with the usual results: but surely they must know if they have that "disgrace to a parish"—"a dumb congregation." Is it not a good and encouraging sign to find that the laity are taking an active interest in our work? And one more word, which I have found to be very important to inquirers—we are of no party in the Church.

With the substance of all this we are in thorough agreement. Here and there we might express ourselves somewhat differently; but in general we not only agree with the writer, but regard his statements as of the greatest importance. This is no slight question touching only the accidents of religion, it strikes down to the very foundations. If worship, if public worship is to cease religion will not tarry long behind.

#### TRINITY UNIVERSITY DIVINITY DEGREES.

It is well known to many of our readers that University of Trinity College, some time ago, at the request of some of the Australian bishops, held, and have continued to hold, examination in Australia for the degrees of B.D. and D.D. It would appear that some of the enemies of the University in Australia or in Canada (alas!) have

taken occasion from the dispute concerning the musical degrees in England to make what we must call an unfair and unworthy attack upon Trinity in the Melbourne *Argus*. It may be interesting to our readers to read part of the defence as given by the Melbourne *Church of England Messenger*.

Out of justice to the institution so ungenerously assailed, and to Bishop Moorhouse's arrangements for placing the Toronto Divinity Degree within reach of Australian students, we propose, briefly, to clear up certain points in which Trinity College, Toronto, has been misrepresented by the *Argus* in the recent controversy. To begin with, Trinity College is not a college calling itself a university, and conferring undeserved degrees upon unqualified persons, nor is it, again, a theological institution, like Knox College, to which the *Argus* compared it, with power from the provincial legislature to grant one degree in one subject, but a university with a Royal Charter, able to grant all degrees in at least five faculties.

A Church university it unquestionably is, and in that fact lies at once the explanation of the interest we ourselves take in it, and of the bitter jealousy at the hands of other denominations of which it is the mark. That it belongs to only one section of the Church, as the *Argus* insinuates, is disproved by the composition of its governing body, which consists of the Corporation, including all the five bishops of the old Diocese of Toronto, and a Council, two-thirds of the members of which are appointed by the same bishops, either by individual nomination or collective election. Its degrees have certainly the merit, as we must regard it, of being inexpensive. It must, we should say, have surprised others besides us to find the *Argus* appraising university distinctions by their money cost. If that rule is to be followed, the Canterbury degrees, instead of being lowest in esteem, ought to take top rank, for the fees paid for them are the heaviest of all. The number in residence at Trinity College, we admit, is small, but what has that to do with the standing of the university? How many resident students, we should like to know, does Adelaide or Melbourne, or, for that matter, London, count? The number of undergraduates is more to the point, and that is considerable—over 400—or, if we omit the students in music, 320.

The *Argus* declines to accept Canon Chalmers' testimony that the Divinity Examinations are severe. Well—Canon Vance and Dr. Wilson are no novices in university examinations, and may be trusted to report accurately as to the standard required from candidates, and they are perfectly satisfied with the examination papers, and are of opinion that no clergyman, even though a Master of Arts, unless he has made theology a special study, need hope to pass the preliminary for the Toronto B.D. on less than two years' hard study. We wish to repeat what we have said on former occasions, that we set store by these degrees only because we find in them the inducement which our young men need to make them apply themselves to the study of systematic Divinity. We are jealous for the science of Theology that it should not be neglected for pursuits that bring more immediate repute and lead to academic rewards. We are jealous for the Church in these colonies that it should be served by a learned ministry as well as a godly one. We are hopeless of attracting any large number of men to the study of Divinity unless we can offer them a degree, or of getting them a Divinity Degree except through a University in connection with the Church. All this talk about a Theological Faculty at our Melbourne University,

or of a Board of all sects to examine in Divinity, is wild nonsense, as none should better know than those who utter it. A committee of the General Synod, appointed for the purpose, have been trying for five years in all possible directions, and can find no nearer road to Theology Degrees for the clergy than that obtained for us five years ago by Bishop Moorhouse, through the local examinations to be held annually in Melbourne, by Trinity College, Toronto.

#### SOME LITURGICAL STUDIES.

BY REV. DR. GAMMACK, EAST TORONTO.

No. 15.

For a very obvious reason we must confine ourselves to the rubrical and ceremonial side of the Consecration Prayer, and this may be summed up in the familiar idea of the *Manual Acts*. The Sarum and the Roman Missals are at this point loaded with directions, which to us would seem to be burdensome, and no doubt it was one of the objects before Cranmer and his fellow reformers to simplify this service and make it more easily joined in and understood by the people. "The Order of the Communion" of 1548 was only for the distribution of the elements already consecrated according to the former rites, and we can but guess at a reason for this arrangement. By 1549 the questions at issue were more matured, and we then see the Priest at the front of the altar arranging the bread upon the corporal (corporas), the wine and water placed in the chalice, and himself put in order for the Eucharistic service. Twice he crosses "these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine" at the Invocation, and at the words of Institution "Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands," "Here the Priest shall take the cup into his hands." There is no direction for breaking the bread either now or afterwards, although the solemn fraction has always been regarded as an important part of the ceremonial action: a later rubric gives instructions as to the form, quality, and size of the bread, that it may be divided "in divers pieces . . . in two pieces at the least or more, by the discretion of the minister, and so distributed." But in 1552 the rubrics of the *Manual Acts* were not inserted, and the clergy were left to their own discretion until the last revision, when the present rubrics were adopted and a greater uniformity ensured. The Communion Office is begun by "the Priest standing at the north-side of the table," but there is a noticeable change of position, "When the Priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth." This was taken from the Scotch Office of 1637 and slightly transformed, perhaps simplified: it is also in the present Scotch Office, though with a minute exchange in the order, and is in the American Office as in the English. The only difference in the rubrics of 1637 and 1662 is, that in the former the position of the Holy Table is to be such that at the consecration he may with more ease and decency (that is, comeliness) use both his hands, while in the latter the leading idea of the rubric is for the proper placing of the bread and wine for the employment of both the Priest's hands. The difference may not be great and it is hard to say in how far there was any purpose in it, but the rubric may have been thus slightly altered in order to meet the cavil that had been used, though not