

Britain, did he call it the Anglo-Catholic? Do not let us, in answer to this, have any of the modern unhistorical bosh of a branch of the Christian Church being in Britain prior to Augustin's time,—a theory gotten up to patch up the Apostolical-succession business when it was inconveniently urged that Rome had excommunicated the English Bishops.

Again, I grant that "an enemy in disguise was permitted to enter the Church, which in after years proved to be as deadly a foe to truth as the Papacy had ever been." Your correspondent has failed to name the enemy, but I shall not, *they are the Ritualists*. Romanists in disguise, however with Jesuitical sophistry they deny it, their doctrines and symbols proclaim them, and soon the disguise now so thin will be discarded. If the Reformers taught the truth, then certain it is the Ritualists do not teach what the Reformers did. They discarded error; Romanists in the Church of England brought it back, and the Ritualist is busy now teaching it by symbols, and the High Churchman is only the timid Ritualist who fears for many *considerations* to act as he thinks, but is content to bide his time and let ultra men be pioneers, men whom many think are merely Jesuits at work in the Anglican fold.

"Ritualist" says "It is true a few objectionable things were retained" (in what he terms the last revision in 1662), "but this was the result of Puritan machinations, and all true churchmen are anxiously looking forward for the time when the ancient liturgy shall be restored and the Anglican Church freed from all Puritan innovations, be as she was in the 'glorious morn' of the Reformation." Mr. Editor, Protestant Episcopalians, readers of the SPECTATOR, what does this mean? It is acknowledged that the tendency to evil-living of Charles the Second and his corrupt trio of revisionists, Bishops Sheldon, Gunning and Morley, was to go back to "first principles," in other words un-Protestantise the Prayer Book; and now we hear that some objectionable things were left in as the result of Puritan machinations. Does this not mean the Thirty-nine Articles, which are Protestant but inconsistent with the services and offices? So, then, the Anglican Church to be as she was in the "glorious morn" of the Reformation simply means back to the first year of Edward's reign, when everything in ceremonies was Romish and the dawn of Protestantism was only in a few hearts, and these faint rays Anglo-Catholics would have striven to obscure.

I now shall reply to "Ritualist's" assertions concerning the Reformed Episcopal Church, and before I prove him guilty of stating what is utterly false, as I said I would, I desire to inform him that we find the possession of the "Apostolic Succession" very valuable, in as much as it stops Anglican twaddle about the non-validity of Orders; the highest Ritualistic authorities in England's Church say we have got it, and, as I said in my former communication, if we thought it conveyed any spiritual grace we would give it free as water to all who wanted it; nay, more than this, I think I know the feeling of the Reformed Episcopal ministry, and I can safely say we would send men to our sister Churches and beg them to take it at our hands; but now we look on it as a little family matter that while it pleases us does not puff us up. In as much as we of the Reformed Episcopal Church do not differ one whit from the evangelical brethren still in the Anglican fold, but "hold the faith once delivered unto the saints," I am amused considering the great lights of the evangelical party in the Church of England, not to mention any of my own Christian brethren in the Reformed Episcopalian ministry that the world does not deem either unlearned or dishonest nor yet lacking in brains, I say I am amused at the cool effrontery that tells us we have adopted as articles of faith doctrines unknown alike to the New Testament and to the Church Catholic for nearly seventeen centuries.

Perhaps it will lighten the darkness of "Ritualist" when I tell him that in 1785 Bishop White of the Protestant Episcopal Church took the revision made in the reign of William the Third, Prince of Orange, which was but little different from Edward the Sixth's second book having the error of baptismal regeneration corrected, and making it suited to the United States Republic, offered it to the convention; it was rejected by sleepy Evangelicals and stubborn, wide-awake Ritualists, and that is the revision we have in the Reformed Episcopal Church to-day. We hold the same doctrinal views as the Ryles, the Alfordes, the Grossets, the Baldwins, the Bonds, the Tyngs, the hosts of evangelical men the world over, and it remains for "Ritualist" to tell us all that we hold doctrines unknown to the New Testament.

Now as to conversion, we believe that the repentance required by scripture is a change of mind toward God, and is the effect of the conviction of sin wrought by the Holy Ghost. Shame or self-reproach will not do; any more than a murderer's grief at his unfortunate position when under sentence of death will release him from the consequences of his crime. The sinner comes to Christ through no laboured process of repenting and sorrowing, but he comes to Christ and repentance both at once by means of simply believing; and ever afterwards his repentance is deep and genuine in proportion as his faith is simple and childlike. So much for our views on conversion or repentance. (See Article XIII., Reformed Episcopal Prayer Book.)

And now, Mr. Editor, just compare the following statement of "Ritualist" with the XIXth Article of the Reformed Episcopal Church, and judge is it worth while to waste valuable time in answering the oft-repeated misstatements of men who have no principle and less brains. I quote from "Ritualist." He accuses us of adopting the doctrine of "human perfection, teaching that he that is born of God in this sensible conversion *sins not ever after*." Were this from any but a Jesuit, who believes "the end justifies the means," I would not credit it. Our Article XIX. reads as follows:—"The grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as *fall into sin after conversion*, etc., for after we have received the Holy Ghost *we may, through unbelief, carelessness, and worldliness fall into sin*, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives." Also see Collect for grace, p. 15, in the 1st Prayer Book. Thus is the unwarrantable misrepresentation of your correspondent met by our printed standards of religion. I am quite used to it, as are the most of my brethren, and were it not that many in our city might be misled, I would not trespass on your valuable space, or jeopardize my dignity as a man to notice it.

I remain, yours very truly,

B. B. USSHER,  
Rector St. Bartholomew's Reformed Episcopal.

## MUSICAL.

### COMING EVENTS.

Montrealers will have no reason to complain of a scarcity of good music next month; we will have plenty of it, and that of the very best. Hitherto we have had to listen to second and third rate artists,—some of these, too, only deigned to visit us when their powers were on the wane,—but in music, as in other things, Montreal is steadily advancing, and now we are to have quite a musical feast.

Mr. Strakosch has evidently learned that we will not patronize second-class performances, but are just as hard to please as his patrons in Boston and New York; he accordingly has made arrangements to give two concerts with his complete troupe of artists, which is certainly the best he has yet brought to this city. We are glad to know that the seats are being rapidly taken; it will encourage the great impresario to visit us again, and may perhaps have the effect of inducing Mr. Mapleson to follow his example.

The performance of "The Creation" by the Philharmonic Society promises to surpass any of their former efforts. The choir is immensely improved since last year, and is much more evenly balanced; the orchestra is the finest we have yet heard in Canada, being immeasurably superior to that of last season, particularly as regards the wind instruments. With some of the first artists of the day as soloists, we cannot but expect an excellent performance, and will be greatly disappointed if we do not have to record the finest musical performance which has ever been given in this city.

Mr. Whitney, the great American Bass, is engaged for this concert. The greatest Bass in Europe is supposed to be Signor Foli, Mr. Whitney being without a rival in America; Mr. Strakosch, however, brings a Mr. Conly, whom he claims is the "premier basso in the world." We have never heard Mr. Conly (even his name being unfamiliar to us), but if he can sing nearly as well as either of the two gentlemen mentioned above, we anticipate for him a brilliant reception. As these two gentlemen (Messrs. Whitney and Conly) appear within a short time of each other, the public will have a capital opportunity of judging for themselves as to their respective merits.

There is to be a public rehearsal previous to the grand performance of "The Creation," the solo parts being taken by amateurs. This is a new departure, and it seems to us a sensible one. The orchestra will become fully conversant with the solo parts before the arrival of the artists, so that their magnificent singing may not be marred from want of proper knowledge of the solo parts by those who are to accompany them; the choir, too, will second the efforts of the soloists more efficiently if they have a thorough rehearsal of the whole work.

With regard to the public, we would say that they too derive benefit from the new arrangement. In order to thoroughly enjoy a great work such as "The Creation," it is necessary to have some previous knowledge of its general character and framework, which can be best obtained by hearing it performed as nearly as possible in its entirety; and we feel sure that those who attend the full rehearsal, and thus obtain an idea of the beauty and grandeur of the work, will not, on any account, fail to attend the "Grand Performance" and hear the sublime work interpreted by the best exponents of oratorio music on the continent.

In addition to the performance of "The Creation" and the two concerts mentioned above, we are promised a visit from the Mendelssohn Quintette Club, of Boston, and later from the "Marie-Koze" concert troupe, so that, as we predicted, Montreal will have no reason to complain of either the quantity or quality of the musical entertainments offered this season. We would suggest that all who take an interest in the progress of art in our city (and who doesn't?) should support these concerts liberally; otherwise we may relapse into the old state of affairs, and we will certainly not be able to throw the blame on Mr. Strakosch, Mr. Ryan, or the Committee of the Philharmonic Society.

Dr. MacLagan's organ recital on Monday evening was well attended. The programme was an excellent one, and was on the whole rendered with greater taste and finish than any of the preceding ones. Bach's A minor fugue was remarkably well played; subject, answer and stretto being brought out distinctly. Dr. MacLagan plays his pedals clearly and evenly, and seems to have great facility of execution, the finale (in fugue style) to "God Save the Queen" was performed in a thoroughly artistic manner, and reflected great credit on the performer. The "Coronation March" was played with precision and vigor; in the softer passages, however, the reeds "hung fire," giving to the melody an effect far from agreeable. The vocalists were Miss McLea and Mr. Redfern; the former received tremendous applause for her rendering of "The Message," by Blumenthal; the latter sang Gounod's "Nazareth" fairly, but seemed to be suffering from a cold. Previous to the performance of the last piece, Rev. Mr. Bray announced that the next recital would be the last for a time; we are sorry that they are discontinued, and hope that the doctor will receive sufficient encouragement next Monday evening to induce him to recommence them at an early date.

Mr. Alfred Deseve, the Canadian violinist, is about to give a concert in the Academy of Music, on the 10th October. We wish Mr. Deseve every success, but are sorry he should have fixed on the same date as the Mendelssohn Quintette Club; Montreal is not yet sufficiently musical to support two first-class concerts on the one evening.

We learn that a "grand concert" is to be given in the Rink this week on behalf of the sufferers in the South. Several of our local musicians have volunteered their assistance.

Whilst acknowledging the claims of the Southern sufferers on all who are able to assist them; admiring also the praiseworthy generosity of those who give their time and talents to so worthy a cause; on behalf of the musical profession we must protest against this mode of raising money for charitable objects. Is a "Benevolent Society" in need of funds, or an "Orphan Asylum" or "Female Home" verging on bankruptcy, they give a concert; that is, they importune the members of the musical profession to give their time, talents, and energies to prop up their failing institutions, although musicians, as a class are not supposed to be very wealthy or more able than other people to contribute either money or time (which to a man of ability is equivalent to money) to benefit their fellow-creatures, no matter how worthy the object they may be.

Let a merchant give twenty dollars to a charity, and he is lauded to the skies as a warm-hearted, generous man. Should a musician give *ten* it would probably be considered a liberal donation; but let that same musician give his services, which are worth perhaps five or six times that amount, he not only sacrifices that money, but from frequent appearance at charitable performances loses his commercial value as an artist, and is perhaps dubbed by the local press (vide Montreal Star, Sept. 23rd,) one of our "most talented amateurs." Now, why should musicians be expected to contribute more to charities than other people? We would not expect a grocer to open a shop in opposition to his own to benefit a charity! the thing would be preposterous. Yet that is what the public seem to expect of musicians; they not only organize amateur performances for charitable objects (which, of course, are a source of direct injury to professionals) but they seem to expect the artists to help in killing out their own profession by assisting at these performances, and, metaphorically speaking, to cut their own throats. If a charity is worthy of assistance let us aid it promptly and nobly, but if we wish to encourage art, and to give professional musicians an opportunity of making a living, let us not select their particular profession in order to raise the necessary funds; let us rather, having solicited a cash contribution in proportion to their means, call on the members of other professions, &c., not to buy tickets for a bazaar or concert, but to give an honest subscription to a worthy object, and leave the musicians to the free exercise of their own vocation. Were these propositions carried out in this city, we should see an improvement in the musical entertainments provided for us that would fairly astonish us; we should then be expected to patronize only those concerts which were of real artistic merit, and concert-goers would cease to be disgusted by frequent weak and inartistic performances.

We notice with pleasure that the Rev. Fredric Hinckley will visit this city and deliver two lectures on "Washington and its Institutions." The two lectures form a complete and exceedingly attractive description of "the Federal city," and we understand that the stereopticon views are so good that one seems to be transported to the places themselves. Those who have heard Mr. Hinckley, praise highly his descriptive style of speaking, which admirably adapts him to the work he has set himself. The lectures take place at the Mechanic Hall on Friday and Saturday at 8 o'clock in the evening, and as the price of admission is so small, a pleasant evening may thus be spent at very little cost.