

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. VI.—CATHEDRAL REFORM.

THE appointment of a Royal Commission for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the conditions of cathedrals, and the manner in which that measure has been taken up by the Church and country generally, is sufficient to indicate that no common importance is attached to that inquiry, and no common amount of expectation created as to the result of the Commission's deliberations. It is true that, in the first instance, when the subject was introduced into the House of Lords, all that was apparently contemplated was the propriety of investing cathedrals of the new foundation with the same powers of revising and altering their statutes which is possessed by those of the old. But the significant observation of the then Premier, "that he intended the Commission to go much further than that," shadows forth a much larger field of investigation, and perhaps recommendation, than that originally contemplated, and, from the manner in which the suggestion has been taken up by the clerical circles, it seems clear that general desire on the subject of cathedral reform will not be by any means satisfied by any recommendatory results confined to so narrow a limit as that specified by the Prelate whose notice raised the debate. Nor is it possible to suppose, in reference to the spirit of the times in which we live, that such an opportunity for passing the question of cathedral reform through the crucible of public opinion should be overlooked and unused. It is the character of our age to reconsider all questions and all conditions, to bring all institutions to the test of practical utility, and to bring them into better accord with modern tastes and surrounding fitness. Nothing can shelter itself from the stern criticism of rigid inquiry under the mere plea of long established custom, or resist demands for alteration by an appeal to venerable antiquity. All things are now tried on the ground of their merits, and cannot evade that trial by setting up the defence of sentiment, or long usage, or even the sacredness of prescription.

In the presence of such an expectation the authority of great names will not count for much, nor will even the necessity which justified the retention of an order of things in former times be admitted as being equally stringent in our own. The political concession made to Romanists and Dissenters, the relaxation of prohibitions which appeared to be opposed to religious liberty, the disestablishment of the Church in the sister island—nay, even the bringing of the prerogative of the monarch into more supposed harmony with the Constitution of the country—these, and many other instances, show that no institution can expect to remain unassailed by the voice of criticism, or to bid defiance to, or stand untouched by, the general action of reform.

From such movements cathedral institutions cannot hope to remain excepted. The very prominence and dignity which attach to them, appear almost to invite them. They are "cities set on a hill which cannot be hid." We can entertain no doubt that the whole Establishment of the Church of England is destined, and that at no distant period, to be rudely assailed. Liberationists are marshalling their forces, preparing their implements of assault, sounding their notes of warning, and declaring themselves determined to fight to the knife for what they style religious equality. The connection of Church and State, the senatorial dignity of our prelates, the endowments of the parochial clergy, the necessity for the Sovereign being a member of the National Church, these and others are by-and-by to be resolutely dragged into the field of conflict. Is it possible that cathedrals standing in the exceptional position of wealth and dignity can remain unassailed? Nor, in the presence of signs around us is it likely that the cry for cathedral changes will be confined to the avowed opponents of the Church? Among ourselves are men speaking, if not perverse, at least hostile things. From many a Diocesan Conference and many a Ruridecanal Chapter are Royal Commissions receiving, if not judicious, at all events ingenious suggestions, which, if they do not exhibit a perfect acquaintance with the points on which they undertake to offer advice, show at least a charitable desire to instruct the Commissioners in their duty. It may, therefore, not be out of place to consider, as briefly as our space will admit of, the subject which is in these several ways brought before the public mind.

It may be assumed, from the detailed and minute questions submitted by the Royal Commissioners to the several Cathedral Chapters, that their inquiries will embrace a very wide field of examination, including not only that of the statutes by which cathedrals are governed, but every thing relating to the administration of the cathedral, the nature and duties of the several offices, revenues, services, music, choristers, education, residence, the relation of the Visitor to the chapter, and the part taken by the several members of the chapter in the government and conduct of the cathedral. And no doubt a large amount of information upon these and other points will be obtained by the Commissioners, enabling all who are curious in such matters to understand more of the constitution and management of a cathedral than at present they appear to do; and from it in general the public will learn this, that a cathedral is a peculiarly complicated institution, requiring a great deal more of thought, of care, of anxiety, of accuracy, than persons for the most part conceive. The regulation of the services, the selection of the music, the enforcement of rules for church efficiency, the education of the

choristers, the maintenance of a system which provides for the due appearance and fulfilment of their functions of all the officiators of all ranks, and for the observance of that order, decency, and propriety due to the sacredness of Divine worship and to the place in which it is conducted, the (ofttimes difficult) adjustment of the respect due to the diversity of views and opinions entertained by the members of a chapter, where all are equally potential, the necessity of deference to individual judgment in points of "doubtful disputation," these and many more which might be mentioned may help to warn the advocates for cathedral reform that they may, by suggesting alterations which, if adopted, may be found injurious to, if not destructive of, the value of an intricate machinery which has cost much wisdom in former times to construct, and no small measure of care to preserve in efficiency, damage that which they hope to improve. The truth is that few outside the working of a cathedral know how delicate and arduous the task is to maintain discipline without awakening insubordination, to obtain regularity without despotism, and to effect improvement without departure from all observed custom, and a disregard to statutes which men are sworn to obey. Nor can outsiders fully understand the delicacy and patience which are required to secure that an oligarchy of equals shall unite harmoniously without the surrender of individual right or the assumption of disproportioned power. The theory of cathedral administration is that of an equality of power conjoined to an equality of labour, not of an equality of power apart from that of labour.

The question of the utility of cathedrals has often been presented to the public, and is very likely to be repeated in our days with increased emphasis. It is, therefore, well to weigh the force of the argument by which that utility is maintained. For if everything now is measured by its use, it will become cathedrals to show to the satisfaction or at least to the reduction of the vehemence of those who question it, what may be said in its favour. One argument on the side of their retention is a popular one—viz., that they serve as retiring-places of dignity and emolument for those who have done good service to religion, either by contributions to literature, or ability in the pulpit, or hard work as parochial ministers. And it does seem hard that the Church should not have such means of rewarding men who have served her faithfully and efficiently, especially when we recollect how disadvantageously the clergy of the Church are placed in this respect as compared with other professions. The soldier and the sailor have their half-pay; the hard-working barrister, if he does not ascend to the bench, has, because he has been hard-working, accumulated a fortune; the successful physician can retire with at least a competence.

The Church (except in the few instances where infirmity and incapacity are taken into account) has no retiring pension to offer to her worn-out or zealous labourers. Is there not a sort of reason in this that she should have a few?—and they are but few—places of ease and competency to offer them, especially when we remember that they who are thus promoted do not retire to be idle or unoccupied, but to work on still after a different fashion. The clergy of the Established Church are computed at 23,000, and of deans and canons we have but 162. The proportion is modest enough, and the duties to which they pass are no sinecures. The dean must reside eight months in the year at his post, and the canon takes part in the daily services for ninety days. We may much question whether, if the point were put in this form before the public, many hands would be raised up in condemnation of it. It may be that the murmur of dissent would not rise against the abstract, but the concrete, arrangement; not against such places being existent for eminent or laborious men, but for men neither eminent or laborious. That is a question not as to the provision, but the application of the provision, and consequently the reform would lie not in the destruction, but in rectification.

A second doubt about the utility of cathedrals takes the form of objection to the unnecessary number of men employed in services which might be conveniently discharged by fewer—that is, that a dean and one or two canons might fulfil the offices performed by double or treble the number. Part of that objection has been already met by the plea of having these canonries for the reward of former services. Yet, in candour, it must be confessed that nine months' non-residence does open a wide breach for attack in "the walls of our Sion," and that we can hardly afford to furnish such facilities for attack. Were a year, or a very considerable portion of it, spent in the cathedral town, the canon adding importance to the services by his habitual presence, taking his part in the cathedral management, in its promotion of religious objects, in lending help by advice and co-operation to institutions, boards, &c. &c., half, if not all, the objections would vanish. It is true that it does not follow that where a canon is non-resident for nine months he is eating the bread of idleness, for he is not unfrequently found in his parish discharging parochial duties. Yet at that point the rejoinder arises as to why such a plurality should exist? That, however, is a question of use or abuse of patronage which belongs not to our present subject, except in so far as it opens the question as to the expediency or otherwise of a cathedral canon being at the same time one of the parochial clergy of the diocese—a point this which may arise with another topic of our general subject.

A third objection assumes a form economical. It grudges

the emoluments consumed by cathedrals, and recommends their application to the augmentation of the income of small livings, or the formation of additional parishes. As to the propriety of either of these objects in themselves, there cannot be a second opinion. The incomes of a very large number of our parochial clergy are painfully small; and no one who notices the rapid growth of our population and the rapid growth of infidelity and irreligion will have a doubt that parishes need to be divided, and the number of ministers increased. But one questions the propriety and advantage of attempting to effect that object by the means suggested. We say nothing of the unseemliness or the irreverence of doing away with the cathedral services of the Church of England, of the offence it would offer to the national feeling, of the disgust which would be universally excited in the extinction of one of the great features of the religious services of our country. We say nothing of this, because the suggestion meets us rather in an economical than ecclesiastical form, and, because so regarded, the objection answers itself. The salaries of the dean and canons of the Church of England amount but to a sum (£142,494 a year) which if divided among the many thousands of underpaid clergy would add not materially to their incomes; while withdrawn from its present application it would leave those stately edifices, and their no less stately services, reduced to the mere condition of parish churches. A great blow would be inflicted on the most imposing order of our ceremonial worship, a great doubt would be inspired as to the stability of institutions which owe so much to the faith and piety, the truth and munificence, of men of other days, while a very insignificant advantage would be afforded by the transfer of the emoluments of the mother church to her parochial children. Nor should it be forgotten that the resources which are to be subjected to this rude reform come not from national endowments, but the religious generosity of those who gave or bequeathed manors and estates for the very express purpose of supporting the cathedral establishment. In commercial justice the act would be an unfair one, and in economical adjustment it would be but the bestowal of a very trifling gain effected by the disturbance of a long existent order of things, and a serious encroachment on the efficiency of a high and appreciated orderly worship.

It has been urged as an objection to the religious efficiency of the cathedral system that it does not admit of the exercise of the pastoral relation between the minister and the people, that congregations come to listen to music, to enjoy a choral service, and to attend (or not) to sermons not having that continuity of doctrine or treatment which is found in our parish churches;

that, in fact, deans and canons are not pastors but ministers. There is, no doubt, truth in this, and truth that opens out the question of the comparative advantages of the two systems. But then it must be recollected that cathedral ministrations do not affect to be parochial. They are not meant to be substitutional but supplementary. Welcoming all who come to join in the services, and doing its best to make those services auxiliary to religion and holiness, the cathedral leaves the pastoral care of a congregation drawn from many parishes to the pastorship of their own clergymen. It wishes not to break the tie which binds minister and parishioners to each other, but to help the parish minister by attempting to deepen the religious feeling of his people. It may be that the service it presents may be in some respects more attractive than that of the simplicity of the neighbouring churches, but that it cannot help, for it is part of its constitution that it should be so. Yet surely that should not be charged against her as a defect, which is, after all, but an endeavour to meet the emotions and sympathies of a large number of worshippers. It might be possible, indeed, to convert a cathedral (by making it the centre of a large populous district) into a mere parish church, to strip it of much of the impressiveness which is derived from musical renderings, and the relief found in the conduct of the services by several officiators. But that would be in reality to extinguish a cathedral, and to create a huge parish church instead. We very much question, moreover, having our eyes turned to the many indications which meet us of the increasing desire for ornate in place of bald services, whether such a change would not be viewed as a deliberate and unwise encroachment on the tastes, wishes, and privileges of our people.

In the foregoing remarks we have probably met all the principal arguments or objections advanced against our cathedrals as they stand, and may therefore turn to another side of the subject in the consideration of the benefits which they confer. We have already dealt with one of them in the plea advanced for the fitness of having in the Church positions of dignity and rest for men who may be considered to have earned their reward, and therefore need not reproduce it in the aspect of an advantage. But we may add to the force of that plea by regarding such positions as helps to literary efforts. It often happens that, in the midst of the occupation and the anxieties of pastoral life, a man has little time and mental strength left to him for the prosecution of deep study and the production of works intended to benefit, instruct, and enlighten his fellow-creatures. It is seldom that in the midst of pastoral cares, school superintendence, pulpit preparations, and benevolent offices, a man can command that time and quiet, mental activity, and painful

thought, necessary for the fulfilment of the duties of a student or an author. Such men should be above the pressure of the *Res angusta domi* and the vexations and interruptions of pastoral life; and were such use made of the facilities which the calm retreat of the cloister affords, the world would probably confess, that the emoluments are well bestowed which rendered such a result possible. We are not forgetful indeed that many of our most prized literary contributions to the cause of religion have proceeded from the parsonage. But these were gigantic struggles of great minds against great impediments, struggles which might be successful in the quiet of a rural parish, and the small demands on time and anxiety of a small and simple population. It may be laid down as a general truth that the distractions of a large and harassing parochial cure are not favourable to the culture of deep thought and masterly investigations. The critic must be undisturbed, the theologian must be meditative, the historian must be laborious. They must, beyond this, be near sources of scholarly supply, such as are afforded by the city, university, or cathedral libraries, and if such advantages are not within their reach, it is right, at all events, that the Church, as a fostering mother of literature, should be prepared to afford them. We cannot entertain a doubt that however some men (and there will always be such men) have, like David, fought with the shepherd's homely implement, and flung upon the world treasures accumulated in unpropitious obscurity, yet that it were unsafe to trust so sacred a cause to such exceptional contingency. But as to the real worth of such emoluments and accessaries to the cause of sacred literature as cathedrals present, we cannot better express our convictions than by quoting the eloquent language of Chalmers:—

Doubtless the scholarship has been well employed that rescued from the entanglements of sophistry the precious truth of the Divinity of our Saviour. And well may England rejoice in those lettered ecclesiastics who have put down, as far as argument could do it, the infidelity that decried the truth of His high and heavenly Apostleship. And worthier far than all the revenue of all her colleges, is the return of criticism and of demonstration that they have made in behalf of His great sacrifice and of His unchangeable and ever during Priesthood.

Nor can we be wrong in including among the advantages afforded by cathedrals the facilities for the cultivation of that which deserves to stand side by side with literary effort—the purity and elevation of a devotional spirit. It is something, it is much, in the midst of the cares and excitements, the haste and secularity, of a heartless and irreverent world to find men who live above it in the serene elevation of a heavenward and

sanctified soul—such men as were Andrews and Leighton, Howe and Baxter, and, with all their errors, Fénelon and à-Kempis. They were not of the world even as their Lord was not of the world. No doubt the plant of God's high grace will grow anywhere, and fountains will spring up in the desert. But our Christian poet speaks out the real truth when he said—

The calm retreat, the silent shade,
With praise and prayer agree.

And a higher than he spake it out, "When He went up into a mountain and continued all night in prayer." To spirits who humbly copy their Lord, the calm of the cathedral, the oft-repeated service, the cloister walk, the release from entangling cares, offer congenial soil and invigorating atmosphere. It is something, were it but for the force of its example, that such should live and grow to cast the fragrance of sanctity around them. If they do not do much in busy activity for the spread and power of God's truth, they do much in showing what saintship is. And the cloister life of the cathedral is worth something, for such flowers grow there.

We have touched already, in our comparison of the cathedral and parochial systems, on the grandeur of the one and the simplicity of the other. And in that grandeur we see a direct benefit conferred by the cathedral. It exhibits to the diocese, to the nation, what the higher type of service is, suggesting how its example might be imitated and an order of worship more elevating and attractive (not more solemn and spiritual) may be introduced into our parish churches. Without the resources, the emoluments, the history of our cathedrals, this on an equal scale cannot of course be obtained, but *intervallo* it may be imitated. For without intending or assuming to teach the parish churches of the diocese what worship might be, it yet may safely hold on its own course, and leave that to furnish hints or ideas to others. And we doubt not that at such times as the choral festivals of the diocese, or a convenient portion of the diocese, are celebrated in the cathedral, many a village choir returns home with a more accurate idea of the extent to which the conduct of services may be advanced by the more natural and instructed renderings of cathedral music.

We may conjecture from the opinions expressed at diocesan conferences, letters to public prints and ruridecanal meetings, that many have already assumed the office of the Royal Commission, and pronounced upon reforms expected or demanded. It is clear from some of those debates which have reached the public eye that a large amount of ignorance as to the constitution, rules, and principles under which cathedrals are administered prevails. The truth is that no one unconnected

with a cathedral knows much on the points on which men allow themselves to decide so unhesitatingly. Even the Commissioners are feeling their way step by step to the information on which their expected report is to be based ; though no doubt they will receive much assistance in their investigations from the advices which have been so considerably and gratuitously tendered to them. But as far as we can ascertain the opinion of these reformers, who yet do not appear to exhibit a remarkable harmony of sentiment among themselves, a broad improvement is expected by which the cathedral should be brought into a closer relation to the diocese. What that relation is it is somewhat difficult to understand, whether it means that the cathedral should open wide her arms and take within her hitherto limited circle the parochial clergy, in whole or in part, or whether the cathedral should, as a sort of theological essence, diffuse itself amongst them, or both. If the former, the cathedral will receive a large increase of ministerial strength, whether auxiliary, reformatory, contradictory, or compliant will remain to be seen. If the latter, the question will deserve consideration how far the fulfilment of diocesan functions is compatible with the offices discharged by the cathedral clergy, or their capacity to fulfil such functions. To this point let us address ourselves.

In some suggestions which have been thrown out on this subject it has been recommended that the appointment of the clergy to prebendal stalls, which in some cathedrals lies entirely in the hands of the bishop, should by him be delegated to clerical election. It is of course for the bishops themselves to determine how far they are justified in resigning a privilege which law and custom have placed in their hands or transferring that privilege into other hands. It is a trust committed to the bishop, and for the execution of which he is responsible. It is a part of the episcopal prerogative which a bishop might be ready to part with, but which his successor might regret that he had parted with, and which possibly he himself might live to be sorry that he had resigned. As matters at present stand, it is a power placed in the hands of the governor of the diocese to mark by a token of distinction his sense of the fitness, character, and services of a clergyman preferred to a prebendal stall ; and we cannot avoid thinking that such a mark of commendation would come to its object with more grace and more satisfaction, if taken from the hands of its diocesan than out of those of a number of his co-pastors. And if, as has been suggested, the electors are divided into archdeaconries, a certain number of prebendaries growing out of one archdeaconry, it may admit of a question whether the numerical distribution will be throughout the diocese acceptable. At all events, that method of appointing to a vacant stall carries with it the evils and the discords of that

not very harmonious thing, a clerical election. We cannot, certainly, congratulate a diocese or a section of a diocese on the importation into it of such a possible cause of excitement, strife, and contention; nor should we, for a time at least, envy the position of a prebendary living in the midst of neighbours who were, perhaps, strongly opposed to his election. No one can doubt that, in such a body as the clergy of a diocese, any man elected would do honour to the choice which had distinguished him; but it might be that modest sterling worth might not weigh so much in the balance as active bustling pretension. Anyhow, we should be disposed in this case to question whether change be an improvement or reform an advantage.

This, however, bears but indirectly on the question of the relation of the cathedral to the diocese. Other suggestions have met our eye which bring that general idea more prominently into shape and form. We have seen it intimated that it might be for the advantage of both that certain offices, some of them already in other hands, and some only in embryo, should be imposed upon the dignitaries of the cathedral. And there can be but little question that, supposing canons do not hold any other preferment than their canonry, there is ample time at their command for the discharge of suggested duties. A canon, released from cathedral residence at the end of ninety days, has a large residue of unemployed months at his disposal. The difficulty does not lie in that direction, but probably in the aptitude of the canon for the especial duty to be assigned to him. As far as we can learn from the various suggestions by which the Commissioners are likely to be enlightened, the programme runs something after this fashion, to make one of the cathedral staff inspector of schools throughout the diocese, another a diocesan lecturer, a third a sort of organizing secretary for the advancement of religious and charitable associations, a fourth "the precentor," the superintendent of diocesan choirs, and the dean the visitor or superintendent of a theological college. The programme is a comprehensible and somewhat attractive one, and shadows forth, no doubt, a large amount of important work to be imposed on canons supposed to be signing for occupation. It shall be our business to examine how it is likely to work.

It must be remembered that we have a right to assume that men appointed to canonries should be men who, by long service or peculiar eminence in some branch of the profession, have proved their claim to such distinction. That presumes that they are (except in some very remarkable instances) men of mature age, and past that period of life when a man's flexibility of mind enables him to take up and succeed in hitherto untried spheres. And the question at once arises whether such men are

likely to be competent for the new duties which it will be their province to discharge. And another question arises at the back of that one, whether the selection of a man for a cathedral dignity will not be inconveniently fettered by the special requirement. Let us place before us the office of a Diocesan School Inspector. That is an office requiring very peculiar knowledge, capacity, and penetration, and one to which many a man, otherwise accomplished, might be found palpably unfitted. We think that we could pronounce the names of several men who, for ripe scholarship, pulpit ability, or long patient public service, might fairly expect cathedral rest and position, but who would be signally out of place in conducting the examinations of an elementary or middle-class school, and who, it may be, would decline an honour to which such an inconvenient appendage was attached. Nor are we at all sure that the clergy of the diocese would be contented to surrender their right to appoint the Diocesan Inspector into the hands of the patron of the canonry. The case, no doubt, might be simplified when the appointment to the canonry lay with the bishop, who could take care of both interests. But what if the canonry lay with the Crown or the Lord Chancellor? Are we justified in expecting that the duplicate consideration would be thoughtfully weighed by the patron? and if not what then? Why, that the diocese may have imposed upon it a school inspector quite unsuited to the office, and unable ever to be equal to it. We ought surely to think twice before concluding that a good sculptor must necessarily be an admirable landscape painter.

The same kind of objection does not lie against the office of the lecturer, for a man who can fill a pulpit and instruct a congregation ought to be adequate to the occupation of a lecturer's chair. But it may be somewhat difficult, while looking into the practical realities of the suggestions, to apprehend what he is to lecture about, and to whom he is to lecture. The scene of the lecture would of necessity be about a dozen principal towns of the diocese. Are lectures, in these days of overdone lecturing, so attractive, as that after the novelty of the thing has passed away he may expect to command an audience? If the subject were a line of travels illustrated by diagrams or magic lanterns, or some scientific disquisition made popular and assisted by experiments, it might be that the hall would exhibit, if not a large, yet select circle of listeners. But a cathedral dignitary could scarcely be expected to present such a bill of fare. Learned criticism, Scriptural exposition, sketches of ecclesiastical history (subjects grave and solemn, and properly befitting the visitor), would naturally be the complexion of the lecture. We may be sceptical as to the literary curiosity, or the keen appetite for instruction of such a kind in our provin-

cial towns, but should hail it as a promising symptom of the increase of a thirst for knowledge if lectures of this order in such places were acceptable. We should be surprised if the experience of six vacant months spent in such efforts prove to be so encouraging as to beget a question whether next year it would be wise to repeat them. And if not, what then? Why, that the duty still clings to the canonry, to be discharged lifelessly, hopelessly, a necessary part of an accepted obligation, but a labour that "satisfies not."

The duty proposed for another dignitary, that of promoting the interests of religious and charitable associations, is unquestionably one of much importance; for many of our religious societies are languishing for want of energetic efforts to support them. But the more we examine the functions of this office, the more we find a difficulty of apprehending them. Are they to be different from those of the organizing secretaries of our missionary, Jewish, curates' aid and pastoral aid, seamen's, shipwrecked mariners', idiots', blind, deaf and dumb societies, and a score or two of various agencies for good which appeal to public sympathy and implore public assistance, and whose interests find employment for as many agents as represent them. If this is to be the duty of a cathedral officer in addition to his cathedral functions, we cannot but regard with wonder, the man whose mind and memory are filled by the history and ever-recurring details of these innumerable channels of charity. To master a missionary report of a single year is no small achievement. To master those of a score of them would be almost superhuman. The man who could do it accurately and efficiently must have sat for Goldsmith's portrait—

and still the wonder grew

That one small head could carry all he knew.

But if this personification of organized activity should find such duties incompatible with others of the cathedral or pastoral life, what can we say of the office to which the canon precentor is to be called? To superintend the choirs of the diocese, visit them, correct, perhaps discipline them—this requires that the man be an accomplished musician. Accomplished—for if not, his deficiencies will soon be discovered and his advice rejected as worthless; accomplished—for his superior knowledge and judgment must tear down ignorance, insubordination, and musical improprieties. In our days most parishes educate their own choirs and advance step by step in choral efficiency, and not merely in that, but in the acquisition of musical science. And over all this our itinerant Orpheus is to preside. But it may be that the difficulty does not lie so much in the discharge of the duty as in that of finding a man eligible for a cathedral dignity, and at the same time competent for the musical position. That which

distinguishes a man in the latter respect, may not be found united in qualifications for the former. Cathedral inefficiency may be overlooked in order that musical ability may be exalted.

On the whole we cannot but feel that in the attempt to carry out reforms which are to draw the diocese and the cathedral near to each other, or, as the phrase is, to effect relations between them, there is a serious danger that the individuality of the cathedral may be surrendered, and that, just in proportion as she is blended into the diocese, the especial object of her institution may be lost. And that, we conceive, would be a serious encroachment on the symmetry and balance of the Church itself. They are separate institutions, each moving on its own lines, and each to a great degree independent of each other. The prominent marks which divide them are clear and intelligible, and it may not be well to efface or diminish them. The cathedral does not invade the parochial system, nor should that invade the cathedral. On the other hand much may be done, and, we hope, will be done, to meet diocesan expectations without the obliteration of those functions and privileges which make the cathedral a state in itself. There may be too much of cathedral exclusiveness, the result not of arrogance or selfishness, but of honest respect for ancient rules and a due deference for venerable customs. But that exclusiveness, the subject of many a harsh charge and many an unfair insult, admits of much abatement, and will, we think, be regarded with more candid indulgence when its true character is better understood. But in whatever shape reform may come we cannot but trust that it will not trench upon cathedral independence and self-administration, that the diocese may never be merged into the cathedral nor the cathedral evaporated into the diocese. Our bishops have large power and privilege enough in their hands. That power has not long since been considerably augmented by the transfer to them in many instances of appointments to canonries formerly vested in the chapter, and of livings attached to suppressed canonries; and we do not, we confess, desire to see our cathedral dignitaries converted into diocesan officers. If it be found that canons have a superfluity of time on their hands, by all means let "more work be laid upon them," so that it be consistent with a due regard to canonical functions and in accord with the special purpose for which those places of dignified rest have been founded. There are many ways in which they might find ample scope for unused energies without having recourse to offices for which they might be found unsuited, and in the discharge of which they might not be found acceptable to the parochial clergy. And there are many ways by which the diocese and the cathedral might be brought into happier relations without encroaching on the independence of the one or the free action of the other.

A. BOYD.