

public. Dr. Pusey, writing on this subject, and on that of attendance at Roman Catholic churches, from Christ Church, on August 19, 1878, said: "An English clergyman would do very unjustifiably if he ventured to tell communicants that he would rather they (the communicants) did not go to communion unless they had first been to private confession. I hope that such a case (which I fear from your letter must have happened) is very insulated. Such things make it impossible to defend the new school as a body. It is beyond Roman doctrine. For even the Romans do not confess of necessity before each communion. There are hundreds of thousands of pious English communicants who never felt any occasion for confession, and God only can tell who is nearest to Him—those who use it or those who do not. I cannot conceive how any English clergyman can say such things. It is quite wrong for any member of the Church of England to worship in Roman churches in England." The late Dr. Lid- don, writing on the same date, said:—"The Church of England offers the relief of confession before communion to those whose consciences tell them they need it. This gives no authority to the clergy for insisting on confession as a necessity before communion. If a clergyman expresses a wish that people would use confession, it does not necessarily follow, I suppose, that he says they must use it. Everything, indeed, turns upon the exact language which is employed; but the line between the offer of confession, if felt to be needed, and the compulsory enforcement of it, is plain enough. The latter is a system of the Roman Church; but a clergyman may say that he thinks confession a good thing before communion without saying that it is a *sine qua non*. It is, as I have said, a question of the terms employed. Certainly I do think it schismatical to join Roman Catholic worship in England. It is impossible to do so without denying by implication that the English bishops have a true jurisdiction from Christ our Lord; I think the existence of the R.C. worship is a contradiction of that claim."

THE BENWELL MURDER.

It would be something of a relief if we could feel that the vast amount of money and ink spent over the most shocking murder of young Benwell had proceeded from any other cause than the gratifying of a morbid curiosity. But however this may be, it is the business of the journalist to point the moral of these startling events which arrest in an unusual degree the public attention.

The papers have been ringing the changes on human depravity and capital punishment; and if ever the existence of the one and the necessity for the other could be demonstrated, it would be done by the facts elicited in the trial of Birchall.

In the first place, however, it may be remarked that there is, in the present instance, no doubt of the justice of the verdict. As far as we know, there is not a single voice raised in protest against it. The jury were unanimous, the summing up of the judge showed clearly, as was inevitable, what he thought of the evidence and the defence. It is said that the prisoner admits that no different inference could have been drawn from the evidence.

The barest outline of the facts suffices to bring conviction of the guilt of the condemned man. He had deceived his companion and was waiting to rob him of his money. He professed to have gone no further than Niagara Falls on the 17th of February; and it is certain that he went fur-

ther, and in the company of his victim. He had possession of Benwell's keys, which, he said, had been sent to him from London; but he had no letter to attest his assertion. Even if he had not been seen at Eastwood, he might, on such grounds as these, have been required to clear himself by showing where he was throughout the day, February 17. But not only could he give no evidence of being in any other part of the country; credible witnesses swore that they saw him travelling between Eastwood and Niagara Falls, and one spoke to him at the Eastwood station.

It was a terrible crime, conceived with a cold, diabolical indifference seldom shown by any criminal, old or young. And the chances, at first, were greatly in favour of the culprit. The body might have lain where it was left for many days before it had been found. But for the cigar case, with the name of the victim, his identity might never have been discovered, or discovered too late for the evidences to be brought to bear on the murderer. Of course, he committed indiscretions of word and deed; yet he had taken his precautions with a horrible coolness; and the deliberate manner in which he removed the name from every article of clothing demonstrated the cold-blooded apathy with which the whole work was consummated.

How shall we account for such utter, callous recklessness, persisted in through the whole trial, during the uttering of the sentence of death, and after his doom had been spoken? The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. When the will of man becomes the slave of the devilish passion of selfishness, there is no possibility of computing the lengths to which it will go. Doubtless, something of the criminal's apparent apathy is to be set down to constitution and training.

Although there are some few persons who will, even here, take up the cry against capital punishment, there is no one who will question the propriety of its being inflicted on this man, if it is ever to be inflicted. There is indeed a question with many as to whether life-long imprisonment is not a more fearful punishment than death; whilst the thought of death is more deterrent to the evil doer. A common argument against capital punishment is the alleged danger of cutting off a criminal in his guilt and impenitence; but here again it is urged quite as plausibly that the shock of the near approach of death may have a greater effect upon a hardened evil doer than a long confinement in prison. It is useless to argue questions like these in view of any particular case. Unless a man is to escape the gallows because he is what is called a "gentleman," there can be no plea for Birchall.

And the moral? It is the eternal moral, that evil yielded to grows and increases until it works its complete work in one form or another. And what we have all to learn is not so much that even murder may be the end of indulged avarice or worldliness; but that there may be moral states, unknown to others or perhaps to ourselves, which may be as bad as that which comes out in murder.

One thing should be added. It is high time that the interviewing of the condemned man should cease. We have had enough of Birchall's sketches and breakfasts and other doings. It might be of interest to the public to know that on the night of his condemnation, within half an hour of his going to bed, he was sleeping soundly, because it is part of the astonishing history which reveals the strange character of the man. But it can serve no good purpose to record the number

of mutton chops he eats at breakfast and the like; and it is to be hoped that the authorities will put an end to this kind of thing.

MUSIC IN WORSHIP.

(SECOND ARTICLE.)

The discussion of the kind of worship most suitable for our ordinary congregations is bearing fruit in many ways. Since the publication of our former article on the subject we learn that an association has been formed in England, called the "Church Congregational Music Association," for the express purpose of discouraging the sacred concert style of service which is getting too widely introduced. The secretary of this society Mr. Edward Griffith, writes to an English paper, setting forth the aims of the society; and some of his remarks seem to us so good that we reproduce them here.

We seek, he says, in the first place, to abolish the practice of intoning on any note higher than E—certainly for the congregation, if not for the minister—and, by the use of Responses as simple and devotional as possible, to secure the "full voice of the congregation." In all chanting, the chants we issue have low recitation notes, rarely, if ever, above B, and in style they are both solid, simple, melodious, and devotional. Our clergy and organists do not go to work in this important work in a systematic and hearty manner. If, as Dr. Allon tells me, his congregation can be brought together weekly for practice in a psalmody class—for the practice, let me add, of oratorios, &c., why should our parochial machinery fail to do likewise? I will give one hint for perfect success. Let the vicar request the organist to make it his business to find out every man, woman, and child in the possession of a singing voice. Make special arrangements for the supply of music used in the services (good, solid, and simple) to every one of these, being regular worshippers. This is the secret of good and effectual congregational practices. An organist who values his reputation should make friends of the whole congregation, and not depend upon spasmodic efforts with a chancel choir.

Our incomparable Liturgy is rarely heard as it is designed. Once only, in a church of North London, did I hear the mighty voice of a couple of thousand people sing the hymns and chants without the aid of a choir, the organ only leading, and never will the thrilling effect be effaced from my memory. Asking the honoured vicar how this was brought about, he tersely said, "I have an organist whose heart is in his work, and whose art is shown in leading the congregation." Bishop Stillingfleet said that "a dumb congregation is a disgrace to any parish," but, admitting this, if all the music in use was simple and congregational, I unhesitatingly assert that the prevailing ornate compositions effectually make us "all dumb dogs," and not till there is a steady and judicious reform in Church music will any effectual rendering of the services by a congregation be possible. Arch-deacon Farrar says, "The spirit of professionalism in a choir is the ruin of the spirit of devotion in a congregation."

Can we be surprised that in the most important service in our Liturgy—the office of Holy Communion—many earnest and devout members of our Church go to the opposite extreme and banish music altogether? "If anything," says an earnest layman, "could help to restore the Eucharistic office to its pristine dignity, surely it would be the grand out-burst of praise from all communicants,