

“that it can play even equally well; nay, were it even as large and as fine an organ, — which it is not, — it would be inferior by a half and more, unless to an instrument such as ours you could add a Minster such as ours also.” — “Ah,” rejoin the Birminghamers, “fair play! organ to organ: you are coming *Yorkshire* over us now: the building is not in the case at issue. You are surely conscious your instrument, single-handed, is no match for ours, or you would never deem it necessary to back it in this style by so imposing an auxiliary.” But the argument of the York controversialists I must give in their own words: — “It is worse than idle in the Birmingham people,” say the authors of the “Guide to York Minster,” “to boast of their organ being *unrivalled*: we will by and by show how much it *falls short* of the York organ in actual size. But even were their instrument a *fac simile* of ours, it would not avail in a comparison; for it would still lack the building, which, in the case of our magnificent cathedral, is the better half of the organ, after all. In this, old Ebor stands unrivalled among all competitors in this kingdom. Even in the noble cathedrals that are dispersed through the country, no equal can be found to York Minster in dimensions, general proportions, grandeur of effect to the eye, and the sublimity and mellowness which it imparts to sound. It is true, indeed, that such a building requires an instrument of vast power to fill it with sound; but when it is filled, as with its magnificent organ *it now is*, the effect is grand and affecting in the highest degree; and yet there are in this organ *many* solo stops of such beautifully vocal, soft, and varied qualities of tone, as actually to *require* (as they fascinatingly claim) the closest attention of the listener. We beg it to be clearly understood, that we have not the slightest intention of depreciating the real merits of the Birmingham organ, as it is confessedly a very complete