

harmony, such as only pleaseth the ear, and doth not naturally serve the very kind and degree of those impressions, which the matter that goeth with it leaveth or is apt to leave in men's minds, doth rather blemish and disgrace that we do, than add either beauty or furtherance unto it. O the other side, the faults prevented, the force and equity of the thing itself, when it drowneth not utterly, but fitly suiteth with matter altogether sounding to the praise of God, is in truth most admirable, and doth much edify, if not the understanding, because it teacheth not, yet surely the affection, because there it worketh much. They must have hearts very dry and tough, from whom the melody of psalms, doth not sometimes draw that wherein a mind religiously affected delighteth."

This, reduced to modern English, is just as apropos to-day as when first written.

In the service of the church we are to sing "with the spirit and understanding also." And it would be well for choirmasters to confine the development of the understanding to practice nights, and leave some opportunity for the spiritual in the services.

The chief points to keep in view are—first, the Holy Being to Whom praises are directed; second, the Sanctity of the House of God, consecrated to His service; third, the hallowed words which should come from the hearts of the worshippers; and last of all, the utter insignificance of our own part, in the great congregation.

If these are well impressed upon the hearts and minds of our church singers, concert room conventionalism will never intrude. The finer the religious sentiment in the singer, the better will it be expressed in music. Melody from the heart does not as a usual thing, require to be, as it were, wriggled out by shaking the body, or embellished by facial distortion; and a swirl of both arms with a conceited jerk of the head is not a dignified manner of finishing."

We have taken the above from "*The Toronto Musical Journal*," which is highly creditable to the publishers for its contents and general appearance.

In regard to the severe criticism of certain Toronto choirs, we would remark that such scandals do not occur in surpliced choirs.

#### MISSION PROBLEMS.

WE will mention two burning questions which have necessarily engaged serious concern. They are Islam and Polygamy. In regard to Islam we were glad to hear from Sir W. W. Hunter his emphatic repetition of the conclusion he has arrived at, and already announced, after most painstaking sifting of Indian statistics. He declares that, all things being duly weighed, there is no sign that Islam in India is spreading either more or less rapidly than the rate at which the population itself is increasing. Actually, upon paper, the figures at the last census disclose an extra increase of one-tenth, but this is balanced by the fact that whilst a terrible famine during the decade decimated a large tract of Southern India, this did not affect the more strictly Mohammedan

regions of the North. Meanwhile Christianity has been growing at a ratio of sixty-four per cent., and if this be maintained up to the next census of 1891, it will constitute, according to Sir W. Hunter—and there can be no higher authority—one of the most amazing phenomena of our time. In Dutch India Dr. Schreiber gloriously testified to the hundreds of Mohammedans who have been baptised, whilst Professor Post, from Syria, asserted that the contest of the far future will be between the Bible and the Koran, the Arab and the Anglo-Saxon.

Polygamy is a thorny topic. There is an unfortunate variety of treatment by different societies, which is both melancholy and embarrassing. All are agreed in prohibiting polygamy to those already baptized, and also in excluding a polygamist from Church offices, according to an exposition of the command that a Bishop should be the husband of one wife. Some, however, do not hesitate to baptize the polygamist convert. Even the Moravians permit this, although exceptionally. Some missionaries encourage the man to put away all his wives but one. Yet which of the wives shall be retained? There are persons who argue that it should be the wife the man first married. Others, that it should be the one he loves best. Others again, that it should be the one who first bore him children, at least they point out cases where a second wife has been taken because there was no family by the first. One speaker, an American, contended that there was no such thing as valid heathen marriage, because there was no mutual bond to cleave only to each other; and, if we understood him right, he would permit a baptized convert to contract a new marriage altogether, and to repudiate all his previous wives. Several would refuse baptism to the polygamous husband, but sanction it for the wives and the children. Then the subject is further complicated by the existence of different and strange marriage customs in different countries. An infant may be a wife in some lands. In China there is only one wife, but there may be any number of secondary wives. All the children, however, regard themselves as children of the legitimate wife, and she is the only one who is called mother. Dr. Cust contended that there was but one possible and right line of action. We ought not to baptize the polygamist. We ought not to tell him to discard any of his wives; that would be to drive them into the most unhappy position, and to entangle them in nine cases out of ten in immoral courses. What we ought to do is to continue him always in the catechumen stage. The subject is, indeed, a painful one. In most countries it would be nearly impracticable for the husband to attempt to make satisfactory separate provision for the wives who were put away. A woman must be either with her father or with her husband or with her married children. A woman in a separate establishment bringing up her children by herself would be something altogether amazing to most heathen, and in some places it would be socially impossible. The matter is to be debated at the

forthcoming Pan-Anglican gathering of Bishops, and it is precisely one upon which their opinion will have immense authority. In fact, so far as the Church of England is concerned, they can, if they decide in one way, virtually settle it, for if they agree in their several dioceses to prohibit the baptism of polygamists they are in a position to enforce their rule. No clergyman could act against the command of his Bishop, whatever his individual opinion might be. We pray that they may be guided to a right decision, one that shall contribute to the progress of Christ's kingdom, and shall be for the peace of the Church.—*The Rock*.

#### THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER ON UNION.

IN his speech at the Home Re-Union Society meeting the Bishop of Winchester spoke of the feeling growing up for re-union with the Church amongst the Presbyterians of Scotland. The address continues as follows.

"It will be the desire of all who know the dangers of disunion that there shall be union amongst Christians of all kinds. There are dangers on both sides of the question which must be carefully avoided. On the one side there is the danger into into which the Roman Church has fallen of making no concessions, but demanding full submission to the dictates of authority. Disunion in the Western Church is due to the Church of Rome. We ought to take warning from this, and being ourselves a great Church and a strong Church, from which concessions may be asked, we ought to make all concession that can be made, and it is the desire of this Society to do so as long as it can be done lawfully and rightly. On the other side there is the danger of losing our own catholicity by making concessions which compromise our own position as the Church of Christ. In asking our brethren to join us we wish to give them all the blessings which belong to us as Churchmen 'Let him that giveth, give with simplicity,' or as it rightly means, 'with liberality;' but if we give up our gifts we cannot offer them to those with whom we would unite. We cannot give up, for instance, the three Catholic Creeds, or our Orders, and Apostolic Succession; if we did we should put ourselves on a parity with those who dissent from us, but should not be able to give the blessings we hope to bestow on them. If we compromised our orders by lapse of future ordinations, or allowed our Creeds to fall into disuse, we should lose the power of conciliating others. There are bodies on the other side with which we may hope that we may be united. There are also bodies which hope for union and communion with us, although they want us to concede all to them. I know, too, that many Wesleyans yearn for some of our blessings, and do not ask us to concede all. On the Catholic side there are certain bodies who are in a position to look favourably upon a near approach to ourselves; unhappily, one great body which would have joined us has passed away. The great Gallican Church had a great leaning to us. This Church has now merged into the Ultramontane Church; their Bishops are Ultramontanists. The old Jansenist Church of Holland, which was excommunicated by the Pope some time ago, has shown some sympathy with us. Two of our Bishops visited Holland lately and pointed out the constitution of the Church of England, and they showed great interest in it. Then there is the Eastern Church, which may