

"Therefore, if the General Assembly is not able to raise the pay of its poorer clergy to such a figure as will make them comfortable, the inevitable alternative would seem to be to reduce their expenses. By all odds the simplest way of doing that is to ordain only celibates. An unmarried man can deny himself till his bones come through, and live on nothing in particular a year, and board around and preach, and put in his time bettering his fellows, and if he has the root of the matter in him he will love the work. But to deny your wife good clothes, and to neglect your family, and see your children grow up half-fed perhaps, half-educated more likely, is a hill of beans of an entirely different blossom."

We do not in the least approve of the style of writing employed in these vigorous instances, and we should be very sorry to have it adopted as a model for writing or speaking. But there is a good deal of solid truth and common sense in these words, and we may as well face them.

And here we must listen to what the ordinary layman says in reply. He tells us that men do not go into the ministry not because they are underpaid, but that they are underpaid and are failures just because they are incompetent or wanting in devotion to their work. Whatever truth there may be in remarks of this kind, it may be truly said that the full bearing of them is not easily taken in. On the other hand, it is quite certain that such sentiments are widely propagated. What did a certain American Bishop mean when he said he did not want societies for encouraging men to enter the ministry. "I would prefer," he said, "a society for the decrease of the ministry;" and, although he partly recanted his statement, he meant it, and we know what he meant. He meant that greater pains should be taken to get the right kind of men; and that it is a very short-sighted policy to accept any kind of man as a candidate for orders. Incompetent and ill-qualified men reduce the estimation in which the whole class is held; and so better men are prevented from joining their ranks.

On what principle are men now selected for the ministry? The answer would probably be: On none. And in the outset this can hardly be avoided. A man goes to college of his own accord or by his parents' advice and assistance; and no one else has anything to say on the subject. But it is different when a student has entered the Divinity Class. He has then given to his teachers and to the bishop of his diocese a right to enquire into his qualifications. Does any one do this in any effectual manner? Is there a case (we are asking—we are unable to answer as to whether there is a case) of any student being kindly told that it would be better for him to seek some other kind of employment.

Are there cases of the tutor saying to a young man: I would ask you seriously to consider whether you are fitted by tastes, habits, general qualifications, for the ministerial life. It is a life involving much self-denial and little earthly reward. Do you think you are prepared to endure hardness as a good soldier of Christ? There would be no unkindness, but much kindness in such words. To put a man into any office for which he is unfit is to do him an injury; but it is doing a very grievous wrong to the man himself, as well as to the church and society, when he is encouraged to undertake the work of the ministry without a reasonable prospect of success.

"There seems little doubt," says another American writer, "that we have two things concurrent—extensive machinery for the artificial increase of the ministry, and a low average pro-

duct. That the other elements in the case are many, and that some of them which are of great consequence arise from the condition of thought in our times and are vital, not having the least relation to methods, we may be well persuaded. But after allowing for everything else that seems related to the matter, enough remains at least to raise a doubt whether the systems devised in good faith, and with good purpose to bring men into the ministry who otherwise never would adopt that profession, are in the long run useful; whether, on the contrary, they do not tend to depreciate a calling which should be the highest of all, and which perhaps might continue to be so, and to be esteemed so in spite of divergencies of standards, shifting of modern opinion, and changes of temporal relation, if the members of it were chosen only by the rule of natural selection."

These remarks may supplement our own; and we imagine that all this and much more needs to be taken into consideration before we get at all the roots of the evil. We have, however, certain phenomena to deal with in the actual life of the Church. We have many manifest failures in parochial work, some of them proceeding from unfitness, sloth, or bad temper on the part of the clergy, some from no such causes, but from adverse circumstances of many different kinds; and we have a sprinkling of men of real ability of whom no proper use has been made. Whether by accident (in which we are slow to believe), or because our people do not want the best men, but prefer indifferent ones, or because the bishops have not kept track of their clergy and the needs of their dioceses, these men have been neglected, and, in some measure, lost to the Church.

The real difficulty of a subject like this is, that every one is trying to lay the blame upon some one else—the bishops assuming that the clergy and laity are in fault; the clergy blaming either the bishops or their people; and the people not doubting that the explanation of the failures in the Church is to be found in the incapacity or want of devotion in the bishops and clergy. Would it not be better for us all to confess our own sins, and try to improve ourselves?

MUSIC IN WORSHIP.

It may not always be easy to settle the question practically which has arisen respecting the place of music in the public service of the Church. But there is no great difficulty in laying down the fundamental principles upon which these things should be regulated. And it is of some importance that an attempt should be made to do this with some amount of clearness and decision for the sake of the Church at large, and especially in the interests of congregations who are in danger of being turned from worshippers into spectators or auditors of the service in which they desire to take part.

Now, there are certain fundamental points on which all thinking (not to say devout) Christian men and women are agreed. We are not now thinking of prejudiced partisans. We are not now thinking of the man, on the one side, who is scandalized by a black gown in the pulpit, or the man, on the other side, who thinks that the chanting of the psalms (which were written in order to be sung) is a step towards Rome. It is of no use arguing with people of that sort. They must be reckoned with by wise parish priests; and in some cases they must be humoured "for the peace of Jerusalem;" but they must not be argued with—at least, not at first.

We are, at present, thinking rather of the common-sense Anglican Christian; and such an one will have no difficulty in accepting our fundamental positions. We begin, then, by saying that public worship should be of such a character as to be the proper vehicle for the offering of the prayers and praises of Christian men to the God whom they come to worship. We might add a good deal to this. We might say that it should be reverent, devout, dignified, joyous, animated, and a good many other things; but these are matters of detail. If a service is only such as a devout soul can profitably use—if, besides, it may help to stir up devout emotions and aspirations—then it has some of the principal qualities of a true public worship.

So far there would be general agreement. But here comes in the question as to the place of music in such a service; and we must be aware that a great revolution has taken place, in this respect, during the last half century. Fifty or sixty years ago, the ordinary English parish church had hardly any singing, except that of the Tate & Brady version of the psalms. Even the Te Deum and the other canticles were usually read. It was the Evangelicals who were the first innovators, especially by the introduction of hymns, which old-fashioned Churchmen denounced as "methody," and often refused to sing.

Gradually the movement crept on, until not only were hymns and canticles sung, but, here and there, the psalms began to be chanted. Curiously enough, this was resisted by many as Romanizing; although it was thought quite Protestant and Evangelical to sing the same psalms when reproduced in metre and in rhyme (and, we may add, in doggerel). Perhaps it is easier to sing a tune in a regular metre; but there seems to be no difficulty in singing the canticles, which are taken up very heartily by our ordinary congregations; and when the psalms are sung with a good pointing and with a fairly judicious selection of chants, congregations join in singing them quite easily. If we add that the singing of the versicles is also quite easily taken up by the congregation, we think that few will differ from us.

We are not, of course, recommending the adoption of all these practices everywhere, or anywhere. Some of them may be practicable in one place and others in another. A wise and humble priest will see that all things are done to edification. We are only saying that all the usages noted above are quite congregational; and, when people get accustomed to them, are seldom objected to on the ground either of theory or of practice.

But now we come to a cross-way. We have to consider the singing of anthems, the use of elaborate settings of the canticles in the form of what are called services. It must be remarked, at the outset, that church singing of this kind has to be done by the choir, and that the congregation are listeners. We do not say mere listeners; because it is possible for people to join in the worship which is articulately expressed by another. If one man can follow a collect, another an extempore prayer, then a third can make the singing of the Te Deum or of an anthem a vehicle for devotion.

Let all this be freely conceded; and, moreover, an occasional anthem is not only useful for the choir, but may be distinctly edifying to the congregation. Yet it is a simple matter of fact that, when this kind of service prevails, there is an ever growing tendency in the congregation to become mere listeners, perhaps critics, enjoying or dislik-