

"said or sung;" and if any importance is to be attached to the position of the words, the Nicene creed and the Litany are to be "sung or said."

I have been unable to discover whether there is any canonical authority for a full choral service whether as regards the intoning of the clergyman's part or the singing of the responses by the people, but inasmuch as with or without rubrical authority a full choral service is the form adopted by those of advanced Church views, (I am of course not speaking of Cathedrals), the alarmists and obstructionists that I have already alluded to, who are always very low church in their ideas, imagine in their ignorance that the introduction of music in any uncouth place in the service is an advance in ritual which cannot fail to land them in the ranks of Rome, and allow their reason to be clouded by their prejudice to the complete disregard of where or when music is or is not to be used.

There is no warrant for singing the responses to the commandments, a custom so common as to be thought nothing of by people who are horrified by the mere idea of singing or even intoning the creed, which is enjoined. Where the congregation respond heartily of their own accord there is no need for musical responding, but where the congregational responses are almost inaudible, at best only an indistinct murmur, I cannot help thinking that hearty unisonal responding from the choir, with perhaps harmonized accompaniments from the organ during the Creed and Lord's Prayer to keep up the pitch and ensure it being done decently and in order, is most likely to lead the congregation unconsciously into a more hearty participation in their own part of the service.

As regards the acceptability of the worship, we know it matters nothing to the Lord whether the people sing or whether they speak their praises, so long as the lips express the sentiments of the heart. Indeed it seems natural that in those parts of the service which partake of the character of prayer or reflection rather than of praise, a hearty response with the natural voice is more in place than singing, but surely singing is better than monotonous and lively mumbling. As a rule musical people and educated musicians are apt to lose sight of this fact, because music means and says more to them than to the ordinary public, but it is a question one should try and consider in a public spirit, not from either a musical or an antimusical standpoint.

SURPLICED CHOIR OR OTHERWISE.

We hear often discussed which is best, a surpliced choir of men and boys, or a mixed choir of ladies and gentlemen. I say most unhesitatingly, where there are sufficient funds to maintain a surpliced choir; i.e., pay all the members, and to provide for the musical education, vocal training, and choir practising of the boys, a surpliced choir is preferable. I do not wish to raise the question of clothing the choristers in white or otherwise, but merely mean a body of paid singers, men and boys.

In discussing this question people always refer to the exquisite singing of Cathedral choirs in England and think that the same should be adopted here, regardless of the fact that each of the choirs they allude to costs hundreds of pounds yearly, not only to pay the members, but to train the boys. In old country choirs of any excellence the boys are trained in music from childhood, their voices are cultivated like ladies' voices; they practice every day and sometimes twice a day in addition to their two daily services and choir practices. Compare with this the boys' choir in this country. In most cases two practices a week and two Sunday services, little or no music teaching, very rarely any real vocal training. What can be hoped for from this? There is a great tendency in children, especially in this country to use the chest register of the voice entirely. They naturally use this for the lower notes of course, and as the melody rises they force this up to the destruction of their own voices and of the ears of the listeners. The higher they get the more they scream, and the more certain they are to get out of tune. The only chance for a boys' choir to be successful is for the boys to have their voices individually trained to a certain extent at any rate, and for them at least to be all acquainted with the rudiments of music instead of being in the habit of learning most of the music by ear. There seems to be a peculiar fitness to Church music in a well trained boys' voice, which is counterbalanced by the peculiar unfitness for leading others in worship of the discordant screaming of a boy who has no idea how to use his voice.

CHANTING.

The expressions of some of my opinions on the subject of chanting will I fear call down on me the wrath of a great many, while I take great pleasure in it myself, and have always found it a source of pleasure to those who are participating. I cannot help thinking it exceedingly ungregorian. There are so many different pointings and so many different speeds of singing the same pointing that it seems to me impossible for any one who has not practised with the choir to do more than get in a few syllables here and there. The very nature of the case, that is, the taking of syllables up to a certain point to one note, and then fit-

ting the rest to three or five notes, as the case may be, seems to me to be a premium on disorder and muddle. It has of course the authority of extreme antiquity, and is to this day adhered to probably more for that reason than any other. From a musical point of view chants whether Anglican or Gregorian are unsatisfactory, for they are the attempt to make the best of a bad business. Words which are not rhythmical have to be sung and music of irregular form is made to sing them to. The Anglican chant is deficient in respect of the division of the phrases into proportionate length, to say nothing of the obvious weakness of the frequent repetitions of such short musical phrases as ordinary chants. The Gregorian chant disregards another requirement which the gradual development of musical knowledge has proved essential, namely, the even proportion of the notes themselves. The fault of Gregorian music to my mind lies not in the melodies, for they are for the most part grand, but in the very point which Gregorian lovers claim as an advantage. They say it expresses the sense so much more; by which they mean, that you are not tied by bars or counting on the relative length of notes, put accents and pauses where required, cut notes short where they are unimportant, and so on. This makes it of course little more than speaking in tune. Any one can put an accent where he thinks emphasis due, and as we know "*quot homines tot sententie*," as a congregation is made up of many individuals who have not practised together, there will be various ways of emphasizing and consequent confusing.

The divisibility of music into certain divisions of time had not been discovered when Gregorian music started and has been ignored by its adherents ever since. From the time of the discovery of the laws of perspective we have given up drawing objects as if no such laws existed, or rather we see that representations of objects drawn in disregard of the laws of perspective are not representations at all but burlesques. So in music, to continue the manner of singing practised before the adoption of musical measure in the 13th century seems to me to be wilfully ignoring the progress of musical art, and perpetuating the barbarities of former ages. If we adhere to the gothic architecture of the designers of that period it is because no one has been able to produce anything approaching their designs in beauty of form and detail. But music is the latest of the arts, and is only now reaching its fullest development. Why then persistently ignore the discoveries of these late years, that form and time are necessary for musical composition and offer to the Lord in worship music that can no longer be considered music but as harmonious speech.

One great argument used in favour of Gregorian music is that the tones are the direct outcome of the old temple music. By all means then let us use them if they are musically beautiful as many of them unquestionably are; but make them conform to the laws which have been evolved by the advance of time and which are nothing more than a delineation of what is or is not pleasing or edifying to the ear and the musical sensibility.

For congregational singing something of decided rhythm and measure is wanting. A large body of worshippers are never heard lifting up their voices in such unity or with such glorious effect in chanting the Psalms and the canticles, as when singing some well-known hymn tune, and the reason is obvious:—The measured tread of the hymn keeps all together and almost impels every one to join, especially when the tune is familiar; while the unevenness of the divisions and the multiplicity of the syllables to be dealt with in chanting carry with them an element of an uncertainty that makes hearty singing impossible.

These remarks may sound as if I advocated the abolition of chanting, which is far from my mind. I have merely stated the reasons of its ungregorian nature; but I think it might be made congregational if the chanting were slower than it actually is, if one pointing could be adopted; if the congregation could be induced to provide themselves with pointed Psalters like those used by the choir, and so all could be certain of using the same kind of book and finding the same in other churches.

HYMNS.

In the matter of hymn singing, there are such a numerous array of hymn books that anything like uniformity is here, I am afraid, out of the question. The three principal books, H. A. & M., Church Hymns, and Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer contain almost all the most familiar hymns, and in most cases the tunes usually connected with them.

I strongly advocate singing always the tune chosen for each hymn in the book adopted unless there is some much better or more popular tune, or one peculiar to any church. This will always give the congregation the opportunity of following the tune and joining in the singing of the hymns.

The hymns should always be chosen by the clergyman, so as to ensure their being in keeping with the subjects of the service and sermon, but with the co-operation of the organist or with the understanding that he is at liberty to change any that are impractic-

able or inadvisable from a musical point of view. Hymn tunes only should be used that are of a strictly devotional character. I hold it to be unworthy of our Liturgy if not insulting to the Lord to use in His Church light gaudy tunes that are made to catch the ear of the public like the airs of a comic opera. Such music is as unworthy of any good composer as it is out of place in the Church of God. But some allowance must be made for children's hymns, yet these need not be adopted in the services of grown up people.

ANTHEMS.

Anthems are authorized by the rubrics and by antiquity, but their character should not be too florid. They should not be too long for an ordinary service, and should be always chosen if possible to suit either the day or the subjects treated of during the service.

SOLOS.

The use of solo singing during service is open to question. I think myself that if performed in the right spirit, it is elevating in a high degree, but it too often degenerates into mere display for the vocalist. Of course this whole subject is viewed in two very different aspects—from the side of the musical and of the unmusical worshipper. The former will tolerate—may wish—for a great deal that the latter will consider uncalled for and out of place. Who shall arbitrate between them, and decide how far each is right? As a rule the musical are much more ready to give way to the objections of the unmusical than these latter to accede to the wishes of those who would have more music. Before closing my paper I must say a few words from the organ stool, so to speak, about the organ and the organist.

ORGANISTS.

I maintain that there is just as much importance in the selection of appropriate organ music for use in church as of suitable hymns and anthems. It is very hard indeed to draw a line as to what is or is not sacred music or music suited to the services of the Church. There is much music written to secular words, sometimes even to comic words, that would have a most devotional influence if one were ignorant of or could forget the original words or associations of the music. Again, there is unfortunately much music written to sacred words that is preeminently undeveloped and unsuited to sacred words and sacred places. In purely instrumental music the division of sacred and secular can only be made by judging of the frame of mind the music is likely to engender. I have myself often played in church a march from Weber's opera "*Der Freischutz*" knowing well that if the church authorities knew I was playing operatic music I should be asked to vacate my seat. But they thought the music sounded very solemn, so it was all right. I am very strongly opposed to the use of noisy or brilliant pieces during the offertory. If a voluntary is played then it should be exceedingly quiet and of a character likely to help reflection rather than to interrupt and attract attention too much to the display of the player and the instrument. Oratorio choruses and solos, organ fugues and sonatas are most suitable for service use. People are far too apt to want the organist to show off concert pieces in church time. Let him have occasional concerts to produce the more elaborate compositions for the organ, but by all means let the organ music during service be unobtrusive or at least of a character to harmonize with the rest of the services, and let the members of the choir as well as the organist remember that they are not there to display either themselves, their musical ability, or the art they represent, but either to lead the rest of the congregation in those portions of the service in which it is their duty to join, or when the people join by listening only, to carry their hearts heavenwards on wings of music and make them look forward to the time when all will join in wondrous harmony around the Great White Throne.

CHURCH MUSIC.

BY T. DAWSON JESSET, ORGANIST OF CHURCH OF THE ASCENSION, TORONTO.

Church Music embraces so large a field that, although a vast number of books have already been written concerning it, still many more might be. To give a sketch of the history of Church Music from the earliest known period down to the present day would occupy more time than I am able to give or you would grant; indeed, it would be more easy to put Lake Ontario into a scent bottle than to give a complete history of the music of the Church in the time allotted me. I will, therefore, only call your attention to a few practical points that are presented to my notice in conducting the musical part of the service week after week.

The division of opinion among Churchmen as to what should constitute the proper performance of our service is most disastrous to the unity and strength of the Church. All who have her welfare at heart must deplore the differences that exist, and it is a subject well worthy our thoughts, as to how we can each assist in the good work of bringing Church services to a higher level of worthiness and uniformity. It will be of no use