

Hence it is that the easy "tuncy" affairs to be found in such miserable apologies for Church Music Books, as the "Harp," the "Dulcimer," and the "Shawn" have found such favour with some of the choirs in this province. In the tunes in these books (trashy, indeed, though most of them are) there would appear to be something to tickle the ear and the fancy of those who have previously heard little or nothing better. One of the greatest abominations in some of these tunes is that which causes the fourth line of a common or long metre hymn to be repeated,—a thing repugnant to either rhythm, rhyme, or reason. This is quite as bad as that other impertinence which has hitherto been quite too common in our churches, viz.—a long-spun out interlude on the organ between the verses of a hymn. This has not unfrequently been performed in the very middle of a sentence (so to speak) as, for instance, where the meaning or expression is carried from one verse to the other and cannot be complete without the verse that follows. Sometimes the chain of expression extends to the third verse. Especially is this the case in parts of the metrical version of the psalms sung in our churches. What more out of place, then, than such trifling on the organ keys during this solemn act of worship. Why should priest or people, or choir, endure it any longer?

Another faulty arrangement in the collections just named is the introduction of duetts—to sing which, it is often necessary to repeat the third line of a four line verse. And this in nearly every case weakens the effect of both words and music. The full choral singing of psalm and hymn tunes has now become the "order of the day" in the mother country, and may be heard in those churches in the United States, where the best attention is paid to real Church music. It is that style, and that style alone, which can ultimately lead to the great desideratum of congregational singing. On this head we cannot do better than quote the following remarks by the Rev. Charles Daymond, Principal of St. Peter's (Training) College, Peterborough:—

"It is not seemly that worship should be inaudible, save the feeble response of a clerk, or the dull monotony of the school gallery. It demands our most careful, most earnest service, and cannot be adequately represented by such forms. Therefore we place in our churches bodies of singers, who shall lead the worship of the people with such fulness and earnestness of sound as shall draw out the voice of the congregation. The congregation are themselves worshippers, their own voice should assert itself; they must not worship by proxy, but should make an audible sound, each for himself. We do not say that inaudible prayers are insincere or unaccepted. God forbid! But we put it to you earnestly and humbly, to consider whether the public worship of God should not be audible and united, earnest in sound as well as in heart. * * * Rest not content with the coldness of representative worship. Think not that choir or clerk can worship for you, but pray your own prayers, and sing your own prayers, and your own songs of praise, so that the sound of your worship may fill the temple of the Lord."

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Correspondence.

August 15, 1866.

MR. EDITOR.

In the last number of the *Church Magazine* you noticed in a few words a most painful subject, which caused some remarks at the time among many of the laymen who visited St John, in the beginning of July. "*There was no religious service held during the week which the delegates were invited or expected to attend.*" Willingly would I let this miserable fact be buried in oblivion,