

for the following Sunday. But if in some parishes in this province such a scheme could not at present be carried out, why could not the choir be restricted to the use of a certain number of good sound chants and hymn-tunes for a certain length of time,—until the congregation became familiarised with them? Then a new selection could be made, and so, after a while, the list would become a very large one.

The chanting which is now so thin and weak in nearly all our churches would, when taken up by the congregation, become full, hearty, and vigorous. The psalms would then become more impressive, and more of a delight to repeat in a musical manner than the mere reading of them, in response, can ever be. In a Church paper, lately, we met with some very sensible words on this head:—

The Chant is adapted to a clear enunciation of the words, and thus tends to make music subordinate to thought, and song to religious worship. It is totally dissimilar to all the forms of secular music, and seems to preclude the very idea of display. It leaves the mind open to the full impression of the sacred text, and is most favourable to a heart-felt expression. It furnishes the most simple form in which many voices may unite in a simultaneous utterance of words, and hence is admirably adapted to the Congregational method, to which it properly belongs. Children easily acquire it, and take a great delight in it.

The anthem, indeed, is intended by the Church to be sung by the choir alone but this direction if it points out anything shews that the congregation are expected to sing at all other times with the choir; and, as we have seen lately remarked:—

The Congregational is *nature's* method of praise. It is in a great degree independent of art culture, being indeed above art. It is adapted alike to the voices of the young and the old, of the uncultivated and of the cultivated. It engages all in the simultaneous exercise of the same emotion, furnishes something for every one to do, admits of no listeners, and thus excludes that bane of all true worship, criticism. As individual voices are lost in the chorus of the many, one is naturally led to feel his own insignificance. That essential feature of Chorus Singing, the blending of voices, by which the impurity of individual tones is neutralized, and dissonance harmonised, and in which consists in a great degree its strength and its beauty is obtained almost without effort when many voices (even fifty or a hundred) join in one melody.

It is the earnest desire, no doubt, of every clergyman in New Brunswick that congregational singing should be established in every church. But until a better system of government for their choirs than the unsettled one (if any) which now obtains is carried into effect, no hope for the congregational method can be encouraged.

How is it, for instance, to be supposed that the members of a congregation, either individually or collectively, can ever be sure on entering the church with the intention to join in the musical portions of the service that they will be permitted to do so? And whose permission, it may be asked, will be required for such a purpose? The clergyman is willing, of course, that his congregation should take their part in singing the praises of God—then, who is to prevent them? Why, the organist, or the choir-master; and simply in this way: To please the choir as well as himself the organist, or choir-master, (as the case may be), will select the newest chants and tunes with which he can meet. And now-a-days these are for the most part adaptations of the most florid description,—often taken from either the liveliest opera, or else from some Roman Catholic source. It will surprise some of the ultra-Protestant worshippers in New Brunswick not a little that some of those very tunes they hear so often and admire so much are taken from the musical services of the Roman Catholic Church. Yet such is the fact. The best tunes in the "Shawm," "Dulcimer," and kindred publications are from this source. At the same time