

Co.¹ He held no academic degrees, but was knighted in 1892.

His published compositions include two cantatas, "Rebekah," brought out at Hereford in 1870, and "The Lord is King," at Leeds in 1883; several services, the first written at seventeen; many anthems, of which "King All-Glorious" and "O Lord, how Manifold," are the most familiar; several hundreds of hymn-tunes, very many of which have already entered into common use; many songs and part-songs, among the latter being the well-known "Sweet and Low" (to Tennyson's words). He was the musical editor of the important collection, "The Hymnary" (1872), and of other hymnals. He also prepared many noteworthy addresses and articles on musical subjects.

Though as a composer he does not rank among the greatest, since he seems not to have aspired to the more elaborate forms of instrumental and orchestral writing, he was always active in progressive undertakings, especially in the elaboration of choral services in parochial churches, in the giving in churches of the largest works, like the two best-known "Passions" of Bach, with full orchestral accompaniment, in the production on the grandest scale of new works, like Wagner's "Parsifal," Dvorak's "Stabat Mater," etc., or forgotten ones, like Händel's "Jephthah," and in the building up throughout England of the present universal interest in choral societies of amateurs.

He was thoroughly identified with the new ideas of musical education. His position at Eton was an influential one, and was diligently used for years together in making music something of a personal possession to the six hundred boys annually gathered there. His removal thence to the Guildhall School involved very large pecuniary sacrifice, but seems to have been dictated by a desire for a broader field as a popularizer of music. In choral leadership he was almost without a rival. The hold he had on his singers and his audiences was princely, and the spirit of catholicity, of artistic refinement, and of noble ideality with which he exerted his power cannot be too highly valued. He thus impressed upon the English musical world, on its choral side, the stamp of a vigorous, well-poised, and deeply earnest personality. In manner he was quiet and dignified, but he had the power of very sharp and determined expression on occasion. His capacity for work was great, his fidelity to appointed duties constant, and his patience and assiduity unflinching. He was accomplished as an organizer and administrator.

His style as a composer is not marked by great originality, nor were his works ambitious. He seems not to have desired to win fame for himself as a writer or an executant. He rather set himself to widen the musical knowledge, experience, and skill of others. Yet in many of his works, particularly his part-songs, he revealed an enviable aptitude for lyrical beauty of melody, for polished elegance of structure, and for a distinct delicacy and charm of poetic sentiment. His whole attitude toward sacred music was instructive and beneficial. He cast his immense influence on the side of dignity, solemnity, and spiritual truth in worship music. He helped to work great changes in the style of choir music in England, and perhaps dwelt upon its artistic perfection to an extent that reacted somewhat unfavorably at times on congregational music. But he was explicit in his declarations that the ideal church music is a balanced union of both expressive and impressive music.

Such a life as this is peculiarly worthy of affectionate remembrance and of enthusiastic honor for its devotion to

the cause of musical education, largely among those somewhat outside of professional circles, and for its conspicuous success in advancing the interests of music as a genuine factor in social life and in popular culture. It would be difficult to name any one on either side of the Atlantic who has done more to promote the science of song in the Church of God in the last half-century. It will be strange indeed if his death does not call forth from many quarters expressions of regard and admiration of which any artistic worker, or any religious ministrant, might well be proud in the highest sense.



The Educational Question in England

The action the Salisbury Government will take in the new session of Parliament on the vexed question of elementary education will be interesting from two points of view. In the first place, whatever course the Government adopts will involve a reopening in Parliament of the compromise of 1870; and, in the second place, a vote in the House of Commons is certain to bring with it a strain on the Tory and Liberal-Unionist alliance, and also a greater strain on the alliance between the English Radicals and the Irish Nationalists. One fact should be made plain at the outset. The demand for the reopening of the compromise comes directly and solely from the bishops and clergy of the Church of England and from the bishops and priests of the Roman Catholic Church. The two Churches are agreed in this demand. At the meetings and conferences which have been going on since the general election, their representatives have appeared on the same platform, and have also published their appeals side by side in the columns of the same newspapers. The settlement of 1870 established a public-school system of a dual character. Under it day-schools, partly maintained by the churches, were to exist side by side with board schools, maintained entirely out of public funds. It was a compromise in which all the advantages fell to the Churchmen. The result of it has been that, while Churchmen have not subscribed more than one-sixth of the cost of maintaining their schools, they have been left all this time in possession of their exclusive control and management. Board schools are controlled by popularly elected bodies; Church schools are managed by committees nominated by the clergymen, and in most parishes the management of the school is entirely in the hands of the clergyman. Some three million pounds sterling a year is paid out of the Imperial Treasury for the support of these schools; but none but Church people are accepted as teachers, the doctrines of the Church are taught, and the schools are under no local public control. The settlement of 1870 was an unsatisfactory one for the Nonconformists. It was forced upon them by Mr. Gladstone and the late Mr. Forster. Protests were made at the time; but ultimately the Nonconformists settled down to the new system. Most of their then existing schools were placed under school boards, and for a quarter of a century the Nonconformists have loyally worked to the compromise and made the most of the board schools.

In the large cities the Nonconformists and the friends of undenominational education have succeeded so well that the standard of education has been immensely raised, and in these places the board schools undoubtedly give a better education than is given in the Church or Roman Catholic schools. The board schools give this better education because the entire cost of it comes out of public funds, while, as has been shown, the Church schools are dependent to some small extent on subscriptions. In recent years

¹ The Outlook is indebted to the New York branch of this house for the photograph from which the portrait on our cover is drawn.

subscriptions have been harder to obtain, and the Church schools have fallen behind the board schools. For several years past the two Churches have been complaining of what they described as the undue competition of the board schools, and as soon as it was plain that the Tories were coming into power the bishops and clergy of both Churches prepared for another inroad on the Treasury on behalf of their schools. Neither Church will place its schools under local representative boards. Both desire to be left in control, and ask that their schools, like those of the boards, shall be maintained entirely out of public funds. "We will provide," they say, "the school-houses, carry on all the executive work of the schools, teach our own religious doctrines, and bring our children up to the required standard of education, if either the Government or the municipal bodies will provide us with the entire cost of maintaining the teaching staffs." Both Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour have committed themselves to satisfying this claim. How they will do so is a problem of which the present session of Parliament is to bring a solution. The Liberals are a unit in opposition to this new claim on the part of the clericals; and among the Liberal-Unionists in and out of the Salisbury Ministry there are a number of members of the House of Commons who sympathize with the Liberals and Nonconformists, and are opposed to any further endowment of either the English Church or the Roman Catholic Church in England. No inkling has yet been given as to how the Government will proceed in meeting the new claim; but respecting the Liberal opposition one important fact has been clear since November. In any resistance they make to this movement for endowing the Churches with more money for education, they can count on the support of none of the three groups into which the Irish Nationalists are divided. Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Dillon, Mr. Healy and Mr. Redmond, have all put themselves on the side of the Irish priests in England. The licensing question and the extension of the Irish land-purchase system are both to be dealt with in this session of Parliament, but among domestic questions the remodeling of the Education Act of 1870 is the question which is arousing the liveliest interest in England.



The Ultimate Test

There is no more subtle temptation than that which constantly leads us to foist upon others, or upon circumstances and conditions, a responsibility which really lies upon ourselves. When men fail in any undertaking, the first impulse of the majority is to try to discover the causes of failure in something outside of their own intelligence, skill, knowledge, or purpose. We are always tempted to find in others the defects which exist in ourselves, and to hold others responsible for the consequences of those defects. When a man discovers that his work is not gaining that effectiveness, skill, and perfection which it ought to have, his first duty is to bring home to himself with unsparing severity the question whether or not he is responsible. It sometimes happens that a man's failure to achieve the highest results is due to adverse conditions, to failure in co-operation, to lack of sympathy and intelligence on the part of others. This is sometimes the result of a candid examination, and then a man has a right to hold himself free from the responsibility of failure; but it oftener happens that when the search-light is turned inward, and we take account of ourselves with impersonal and impartial exactness, we discover that our own egoism has concealed from

us the defects in which lie the secret of our failure. The first step toward better work and higher success is a clear knowledge of our fitness or unfitness for the thing we are attempting to do; when we have discovered our error and laid a finger upon our weakness we are prepared to rectify the one and remove the other. The highest tribute we can pay to our best selves is to hold ourselves relentlessly to its judgment, for the success which gives satisfaction is never external. It is evidenced by external achievements, but the satisfaction lies in the possession of a quality which makes those achievements possible. No man need be discouraged by the discovery of his own defects, for the knowledge of a defect ought to be in itself an inspiration to new effort. The thing to be avoided is not this clear knowledge of our own limitations, but the ignorance which keeps us blind to faults which others discover, and which leads us to the injustice of laying upon others the responsibility which we ought to shoulder ourselves. A man's first duty, therefore, when he is confronted by criticism or by evidences of failure, is to subject himself to a searching and critical examination, to be absolutely and austere honest with himself. In this very act there is a tonic quality which makes a new resolve possible, and which predicts a finer success.



The Promise in Law

God's laws are promises. When he says, Thou shalt, he also says, Thou canst. For he never commands when he does not enable. He never requires the impossible. Nay! His law is less a requirement than a prophecy. It is the interpretation of a law which existed before it was formulated in words, and which would have proved its power if it had never been put into words. Thus his laws to humanity foretell what will yet be accomplished for humanity. Three thousand years ago, when there were thought to be as many deities as nations, if not as many as cities, he said, Thou shalt have no other God before me. It was not Israel alone which heard this message; the echoes have carried it far and wide, and polytheism is now unknown in the civilized world. The command was a prophecy, and the prophecy is fulfilled.

God's laws are God's purposes. God's purposes may be delayed, but cannot be prevented. A teacher takes a turbulent school. Strong in the consciousness of her moral power, she says to herself, You shall love, reverence, and obey me; and she sets herself to accomplish this result. For a little while the issue seems doubtful. Some rebellious boys fight against her influence; but they fight in vain. By the end of the term the ringleaders are her special bodyguard, and she rejoices in her triumph. So God says, Thou shalt love me with all thy mind and heart and strength and soul. It is as if he said, I will win the love of my children. For this he sends prophets; for this his Son; for this the ministries of love between husband and wife, parent and child, friend and friend. And when he has finished the seemingly long endeavor, love will be seen conqueror. God's calm declaration, Thou shalt love, is the Christian's ground of hope in love's final victory.



The Rev. James M. Whiton, Ph.D., who has long been a valued contributor to the pages of The Outlook, will hereafter be a member of its editorial staff. In making this announcement the editors of The Outlook wish to express their appreciation of the excellent and scholarly work heretofore done for The Outlook by Dr. Whiton, and their gratification at the closer relations which will from this time on exist between him and this journal.