

hymn to have its own tune, as the ideal of dress is for every man to have his own coat. One pulpit gown may fit many ministers, but hymn tunes are not so accommodating as gowns. The ideal of hymn composition would be what we have in Frances Ridley Havergal—words and notes entering her soul with poetic inspiration about the same time. Toplady wrote no music to "Rock of Ages," but Petra, the first tune in our Hymnal to these words, fits the hymn so exactly (in the first verse especially), that the poet and the composer might have been the same person. This being the ideal of hymnology, surely no one could say that the plan of the *cut* book is anything more than provision for the "present distress"—the present distressing inability of our congregations to sing, and the present distressing inability of musicians to wed the right notes to the right words.

"Hymns Ancient and Modern" has hoisted a noble flag in refusing to give permission to use its copyrighted tunes to any but its own appropriated words. Only think what congregational singing would be if a Pan-Musical Council would meet somewhere, and agree to follow the principle of this flag. If we cannot have a union of the Churches in the meantime on the higher platform of creeds, let us make the platform of hymn book catholicity as broad as we can consistently make it. But so far are we in the meantime from the attainment of this musical ideal, that it is only when the doxology, sung to "Old Hundred," "All hail the power of Jesus' name," sung to "Coronation," "Greenland's Icy Mountains," sung to the tune that Lowell Mason wrote; "Hold the Fort," sung to its own *uncut* tune, that the lamented P. P. Bliss wrote, and some few more hymns that could soon be enumerated, are given out at great gatherings of the non-sectarian Church of Christ, that we ever have that ocean-like spontaneity of song which is only possible where tunes and words are so thoroughly known that art is left to take care of itself, and the devout heart is undividedly absorbed in the expression of its love to Christ.

The just way to criticize our new Hymn Book is to begin with the Church *Universal*, then to come down to the narrower circle of our own denomination, in the midst of which we desire not only a uniformity of doctrine, but also of hymns and tunes. There can only be two valid objections to an uncut book. First, that the choice of tunes is not good. This objection, we feel confident, will pass away when the book is fairly tried. Second, that our congregations are not able to sing many hymns to few tunes, as they would be able if the book were a *cut* one. This I feel is an objection that has to be dealt with very sympathetically, and in your next paper I hope to do so by giving some analysis of the tune adaptations. Meanwhile let me say that we cannot at the same time have quantity and quality; and by quantity I mean a high sense of adaptation between notes and words. I know that a minister might give "Jerusalem the Golden" in all its four divisions to a precentor, and tell him he could sing everyone of them to "Greenland's Icy Mountains;" but I ask would this be a gain comparable to the gain of waiting till the first part was learnt to its own tune, "Pearsall," the second to its own tune, "St. Alphege," the third to its own tune, "Munich," or "Blessed Country," the fourth to its own tune, "Ewing" or "Endsleigh?" The high enjoyment of tasting words thus nobly wedded to notes is well worth waiting for. What in the meantime may be done, besides committing the words to memory, or at least studying them prayerfully and in the light of Scripture, and learning the more difficult tunes—the difficulty of which is greatly over-estimated—I must reserve for a future letter. JOHN THOMPSON.

Ayr, 29th November, 1881.

MR. EDITOR,—I am exceedingly sorry to learn from THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN, these last two issues, that the New Hymnal with tunes is on the "fixed tune" system. Unfortunately for the musical portion of the congregation to which the writer belongs, we have been annoyed with a book of fixed tunes for the last three or four years. It was introduced by a man from Liverpool. We got quit of the man, but the book has been used till now, waiting for our new Hymnal. The "fixed tune" plan is not adapted to congregational singing, as there is not one precentor in a hundred that will sing the tune that is set to the words, and the members of a congregation who sing bass or tenor will be annoyed with having the words on one page and the music on another. If Rev. D. J. Mac-

donnell or anyone else had tried it, he would not write as he has done in your issue of the 25th ult.

The fact of the Moody and Sankey book being used in the Sabbath schools is no reason why a "fixed tune" book should be used in the Church, as the children all sing the air. If this book is pushed into our church in the "fixed tune" form, it will have the effect of doing away in a great measure with congregational singing. For a minister to tell a congregation to praise God with the understanding, with the words on one page and the music on another, is something, generally speaking, that cannot be done. If the music was published without words, it would be perhaps the best form, but the book with words, to be a success, must be cut in the middle of the page. I believe, with "Precentor," the book with "fixed tunes" for congregational singing is "practically useless." The book has been got up for choirs and instrumental performers, and not for congregational singing.

LOVER OF CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

ROMISH ORDINATION.

MR. EDITOR,—From the report of the proceedings I learn that on October 25th the Presbytery of Montreal resolved to apply to the General Assembly for leave to receive Rev. B. L. Quinn, an ex-priest, as a minister of this Church. The Presbytery found "no case of practical difficulty" involving the question, and no need of receiving "direction" from the Assembly, as the decision of last year provides for; so that the application comes up "on its own merits," to be dealt with by next Assembly. I am glad that the "merits" will now come up. Last year the majority of the supreme court did "not find it necessary to come to any deliverance on the general question of the re-ordination of ex-priests of the Church of Rome," and so the issue was postponed. Next Assembly will find it necessary to come to a deliverance on a *particular case*, and to say whether Mr. Quinn, as an ex-priest, is to be received without re-ordination, and to direct the Presbytery what to do in the case. So far, all parties will be satisfied. If an intelligent decision is not given, it will not be because the question has not been considered. The decision of 1882 will be regarded by most men as the mature opinion of the Presbyterian Church in Canada on the general question.

Permit me, then, to say a few words on this case. This Church has an Act for the "admission of ministers and licentiates from other Churches" (Book of Forms, page 36). Now, Mr. Quinn's case either falls under this Act or it does not. If it does not, then our Church deals with the Roman Catholic Church on a different footing from other Churches, and we have no regulations to guide us. The case then becomes a special one, and must be argued on "its own merits," involving among other points. Is the Church of Rome a Church of Christ? If not, can a priest of Rome be a minister of the Church of Christ? If she is a Church, is Romish ordination to the priesthood so identical with and equivalent to ordination by a Reformed Church, to the office of presbyter, as to make the call of the people and the orderly setting of the priest apart to the work of the ministry by the presbyters of the Church uncalled for before recognizing him as a presbyter of the Church? These questions have been partially discussed, at least on one side. So far, no one has been prepared to hold that a Romish priest was ordained to the work of a Reformed presbyter, or to deny that he was ordained to do what the Presbyterian Church regards as blasphemy. The furthest any one has as yet gone is to assert that he is an officer of the Church of Rome, corresponding in some things to the presbyter, and that it is of no importance whether the ordination he had was sufficient or not. Further discussion on both sides perhaps will do good, and help to form opinion on the subject before the decision has to be given.

But if the case is one falling under the Act (and from the dealings of the Presbytery with Mr. Quinn, and the reference to testimonials, I judge that the Presbytery so regards it), then it is assumed that the Church of Rome is a "sister Church," and that her ordinances are to be respected, so far, at least, as the ordinances of Christ. In particular, it follows that the priest (*sacerdos*) is the presbyter of the New Testament, and the sacrifice of the Mass is the Lord's Supper. On this understanding Mr. Quinn is, by our Act, required "to produce documentary evidence of his good standing as a minister in the Church to which he belonged."

I venture to question the possibility of his having such a document. There may be evidence that at a certain date he was a priest in good standing, but it is manifest that an ex-priest has not that standing at the present time. We did indeed at one time receive an ex-priest, while under sentence of deposition for contumacy by a Presbytery, and we can again exercise a large discretion, and receive an ex-priest who has no standing as a minister of any Church. This can be done, but will not be carrying out our Act for admitting ministers. I have no doubt the Presbytery has faithfully required answers to the questions further specified in the Act, such as the course of study he passed; when, where, and by whom he was ordained; his connection with any other Church since he ceased to be a priest; his reasons for seeking admission to this Church, and for changing his views; the length of time he has resided within the Montreal Presbytery. I have no doubt that they are "satisfied" with his answers, have inquired as to his success as a minister while a priest and since, and are satisfied as to his Christian character and good report, and the probability of his usefulness in this Church. "These answers and the information obtained, embodied in a report," will, I presume, be duly "transmitted to the General Assembly," and will, along with the documents, be the ground on which the Assembly will decide for or against his reception. Of course it is not in the power of anyone not belonging to the Presbytery to ascertain the fullness of the above information until the documents are before the General Assembly; but if that information is satisfactory, there can be no objection to the reception of Mr. Quinn. Still, the question remains, is the ordination which he received as a priest equivalent to Presbyterian ordination? If so, he will be received as a minister. If not, he will be received as a licentiate under the Act. I may ask you at another time for a column or two to say a few more things on this subject. JOHN LAING.

Dundas, Ont., November 26th, 1881.

THE YORKTOWN CELEBRATION.

MR. EDITOR,—One of your Toronto newspapers sneers at the honours paid to the British flag at Yorktown, Virginia, by the United States, immediately after the celebration of the centenary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. This is both unreasonable and in bad taste. I am a Briton through and through. It would be impossible to make a thorough "Yankee" of me, though I see many very excellent qualities in His Majesty's Brother Jonathan. Still, I fully sympathize with the United States in doing honour, last October, to the memory of those brave men who suffered, fought, bled—of whom many fell in the strife—and at last gained their country's independence. If we listen to facts, we must admit that Britain was in the wrong in the Revolutionary War. Had she treated the States which separated themselves from her in 1776 as she has treated, for example, the Dominion of Canada—though I do not suppose they would still have belonged to her—the separation would have taken place very differently from the manner in which it did, and very possibly the Government of the United States now would have been considerably different from what it is. But to go on. The account of the salutes in honour of our flag from the military and naval forces of the United States, and the loud cheers of the onlookers for the same end, to which add the salutes from the French war-ships, should be most gratifying to every true Briton. There is not the least inconsistency between these and the proceedings which had just taken place. Suppose a Presbyterian minister one evening takes part in a meeting held to do honour to the memory of our Covenanted forefathers, who struggled—and did so successfully—against the attempt to force Episcopacy on Scotland. That, of course, would be quite right. Well, suppose he attends the following evening an Episcopalian meeting, at which he expresses his great respect for the Episcopal Church on account of her Calvinistic creed, the many of her sons and daughters whom she has given to "the noble army of martyrs," the eminently godly and learned persons that have been, and are, found in her communion, and the good work she is doing in many parts. Would there be any inconsistency between these two things? Not the least.

Metis, Quebec.

T. F.

LIBERAL PREMIUMS to canvassers for THE PRESBYTERIAN. Write for particulars.