



## CHURCH MUSIC AND CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

BY THE HONBLE. EDWARD P. THESIGER, C.B.



“CHURCH Music” was selected as one of the subjects to be discussed at the recent Church Congress held at Rhyl in the autumn of last year. The topic had not previously been considered at any Congress, and the wisdom of the Committee in including it on the last occasion was fully justified, and the interest in such a subject proved, by the fact that a larger audience was drawn together to hear the discussion than was attracted to any other meeting of the Congress.

This shows a very marked change in public opinion. It is not so long ago that the subject of Church music not only excited no interest, but a choral service was looked upon with suspicion even by those who could not be accused of holding ultra-puritanical views. The Dean of Rochester in the course of his humorous speech at the Church Congress, amused his hearers very much by telling them that in his own time, a bishop, afterwards an archbishop, informed certain of his clergy that it was not *lawful* to chant the psalms except in cathedrals, and that an old lady once said to him, “My husband and I were always High Church, but we could not go any longer to St. Barnabas when they began to sing the psalms.” Such stories appear to us almost incredible in the present day, for music has now been adopted by Christians of all denominations in their churches and chapels, and carefulness in its rendering is no longer regarded as an attribute of Popery. It is therefore unnecessary to waste time in arguing in favour of adopting some form of choral service in our Anglican churches, since not only Churchmen, but Dissenters also have borne testimony to the value of music as an aid to religion by the very real musical improvement which in recent years has taken place in their services. We have but to go back a very few years for the commencement of this improvement; for though the power of music as an incentive to religion was recognized by the Methodists, their exercise of this power was characterized rather by quantity of sound, by the hearty congregational singing of an easily learnt hymn-tune, than by an intelligent and musical rendering of a choral service; and it remained unacknowledged by the English Church until the mighty and far-extending influence of the Oxford Movement re-introduced into our services something of the choral ritual which the Church of England enjoyed in the early days of the Reformation.

I can myself just remember the old-fashioned country choir, with its accompaniment of a squeaky fiddle, a droning violoncello or bassoon, and a self-asserting clarionet, or still worse a barrel-organ only capable of grinding out four or five wheezy tunes. When we consider the advance that has been made in musical education in our national schools, and the common practice of forming village bands, I cannot help sometimes feeling regret that these old-fashioned accompaniments to Church music have disappeared from our village churches, as they might by this time have arrived at being a more effective support to the choir, than the more modern buzzing harmoniums or even than the organ when its beauty is marred, as it so often is, by



the uncertain fingers and blundering feet of the village schoolmaster. I could wish that some country clergyman would have the courage to try this experiment: it would have I think, a material bearing on the difficult question of inducing the young men to come to church, by making them feel, as the members of the choir already do, that they are necessary for the due performance of the services. But though for weal or for woe, these instruments have been banished from our country churches, the violin, the violoncello, the bassoon, the clarinet, and "all kinds of instruments" still exist in our church music, but they are found joined in harmonious union with the choir in those glorious services, which, we are now from time to time privileged to hear in our metropolitan cathedral, and in many other cathedrals, and even parish churches throughout England. In the devout and reverent performances of these full choral services, we seem to attain to the highest type of Church music.

"Church music" divides itself naturally into two divisions: "Congregational" and "Cathedral" or "Uncongregational." I do not pause at the present moment to guard myself from misconception by the use of the epithet "Uncongregational," as applied to cathedral music. I hope to deal with this question in a later portion of this article. At the present moment I will merely say that I use it as a convenient and popular epithet, expressing the fact that the congregation is unable to join, or at any rate is not expected to join, in the music *with their lips*. With these few words of explanation, I pass to the consideration first of that form of service to which we are all more or less accustomed in the majority of our parish churches, in which not only the choir, but the congregation also are able to join "with cheerful voice."

The subject of congregational Church music in relation to its use in the Church of England again subdivides itself into two divisions, viz. the "Gregorian" and "Anglican" form. What are known as "Gregorian chants" are a collection of chants made by Pope Gregory the Great about the year 600. They had already been used by the Christian Church for centuries before his time, and it is even asserted—though the evidence of the fact is so slight as to leave it little better than conjecture—that they were used in the old Temple worship. Pope Gregory, however, did not only compile them; he caused them to be re-arranged and improved and added several new tones to them, and they have ever since been used in the services of the Catholic Church, having been in our own days again harmonized according to the more recent laws of music.

The Anglican chant is of much more modern invention. It is used in two forms, the single and the double chant. The former form dates from a considerably earlier date than the latter, which indeed does not appear to have come into existence before the reign of Charles II., and it is not without interest to know that the double chant is peculiar to the Church of England.

Now I know that in dealing with the consideration of these two forms of Church music I am treading on delicate ground, and touching on a theme fruitful of discussion. There is, perhaps, no subject on which so much diversity of opinion exists, and in relation to which the principle that there may be something to be said on both sides is so fiercely disregarded. The partizans of "Gregorians" are as intolerant towards "Anglicans" as if some vital question of Christian faith or Church doctrine were involved in their use, and in the sublime pride of old age, wilfully close their eyes to the possibility of the musical intellect of the present day being able to produce a chant equal to that composed, when, as it has been expressed, "music was in her swaddling clothes." While, on the other hand, the adherents of "Anglicans," in the superciliousness of youth, fail to recognize the singular gravity and devotional sentiment which is undoubtedly possessed by "Gregorians." They forget that, "although none of our standard musicians were ever servile followers of this system, much of the old English Church music is based upon it, and they cannot, without detriment to their own cause, disown its relationship to a very venerable if somewhat old-fashioned parent."

This heat of controversy is not confined to our own times; for even Mendelssohn seems unable to discuss the subject with that calmness which we should wish to see brought to bear upon its consideration by so great a master of the art of music. In one of his letters occurs a passage which, for strong denunciation of Gregorian chants, would satisfy their bitterest opponents in the present day. He says—

"I cannot help it, but I own it does irritate me to hear such holy and touching words sung to such dull drawling music. They say it is *canto fermo*, Gregorian, &c.; no matter—if at that period there was neither the feeling nor the capacity to write in a



different style, at all events we have now the power to do so, and certainly this mechanical monotony is not to be found in the scriptural words, they are all truth and freshness, and moreover expressed in the most simple and natural manner. Why then make them sound like a mere formula? and in truth such singing as this is nothing more! Can this be called sacred music? There is certainly no false expression in it, because there is none of any kind; but does not this fact prove the desecration of the words? A hundred times during the ceremony I was driven wild by such things as these; and then came people in a state of ecstasy, saying how splendid it had all been. This sounded to me like a bad joke, and yet they were quite in earnest."

This denunciation might seem exaggerated even to those who are not numbered among the admirers of Gregorian music, but those who are acquainted with Mendelssohn's Church music, such as his anthem *Hear my Prayer*, or his oratorios of *St. Paul* and *Elijah*—and who is not?—will not be surprised at the strong views held by him, for as well might one expect oil and water to mingle as for a master of religious melody like Mendelssohn to tolerate the severe monotony of a Gregorian chant.

Another eminent composer, the late Sir George Macfarren, President of the Royal Academy of Music, in a lecture before the Royal Institution in 1867, inveighs against this type of music in equally strong terms. He says—

"Those well-meaning men who would resuscitate its use in the Church of England evince mistaken zeal, false antiquarianism, illogical deductiveness, artistic blindness, and ecclesiastical error," and the feeling of probably a large majority of Churchmen on the subject in the present day is illustrated by the somewhat well-worn *bon mot* of the eminent divine who, on being informed that it was very probably to the Gregorian chant that the psalms of David were sung when they were first composed, replied that he now "perfectly understood why Saul threw his javelin at him."

But then, on the other hand, we see many authorities on Church music, of whom Mr. Redhead and the late Dr. Helmore are distinguished instances, showing by the introduction of this class of music into the services of the churches of which they are or were the directors of the choir, their appreciation of the Gregorian chant, harmonized, however, in accordance with our advanced knowledge of the art of music, and not made discordant by that frightfully free organ accompaniment which is indulged in by some organists. It seems to me, then, that hard words and biased partizanship are unnecessary in the discussion of this question, and at the risk of not satisfying either side, and being told that so undecided an opinion is worth nothing at all, I shall maintain that the respective excellence of Gregorians and Anglicans is very evenly balanced, and that their use ought to depend to a great extent on the particular class which may worship in each particular church.

For myself I will freely confess that I find the simplicity and naked ruggedness, nay, even the "mechanical monotony" of which Mendelssohn speaks, of the Gregorian chant, more conducive to *devotional feeling* than the more artistic and melodious Anglican chant. But taking congregational participation in the services as the standard at which we should aim, I believe that it is more likely to be attained by the use of the latter than of the former type of music. I find from observation that with the poorer classes and with all persons whose ear has not been musically educated, the slight differences in the various Gregorian chants, sometimes only to the extent of one or two notes, are hopelessly perplexing, and therefore in most congregations I should be inclined to adopt Anglican chants, carefully chosen (and the choice is practically unlimited), with a more sparing use of the double chant than is usually found. Not that I desire to link myself with those who would altogether banish the double chant, but I would point out that the effect of its application to many of the psalms is to ride rough-shod over full-stops, and to elicit a totally false impression from many of the verses, by connecting two together which are wholly independent of, and sometimes antagonistic to one another. The compilers of the *Cathedral Psalter*, to whom the greatest praise is due for the careful and intelligent manner with which they have performed their task, have endeavoured to meet this difficulty by using freely the second part of the chant where the sense of the words requires it. A very strong instance of this may be seen in the thirty-first psalm, where no less than three verses are marked to be sung to the second part of the chant, but, while it must freely be admitted that the meaning of the psalm is rendered more intelligible by this process, it cannot, I think, be denied that from a musical point of view the result is far from satisfactory. Three



times in the course of a not very long psalm the flow of the double chant is arrested, the second part is repeated, and the transition in the case of many of the double chants is most inartistic. I would therefore plead with those who have the choice of appropriate chants to the various psalms that they should exercise wisely and rationally this discretion. As a general rule a double chant should not be used for a psalm which has an uneven number of verses, or where the sense of the words requires (as in the thirty-first psalm, to which I have already called attention) the change to the second part of the chant in the middle of the psalm. If it is feared that the use of a single chant to a long psalm would be tedious to the congregation, the chant itself may be changed as often as is thought desirable: such a change, especially if it be from a minor to a major key or *vice versâ*, is often very effective in arresting the attention of a congregation and emphasizing the alteration in the tone of the psalm itself.

One exception to this rule I should be disposed to permit, viz., the use of Sir Herbert Oakeley's beautiful quadruple chant for the Seventy-eighth Psalm, to which it is very commonly sung and for which, I believe, it was originally composed.

The great length of the psalm and the wonderful suitability of this chant to the words, seem to demand the relaxation of the rule in this case, though, for the sake of the music, it is much to be wished that the number of verses in the psalm coincided exactly with the quadruple chant.

But whether the taste of a congregation may lie in the direction of "Anglicans" or "Gregorians" I would contend most earnestly for more *consistency* than oftentimes at present exists in our Church music. The form of our service does not permit us, perhaps, to arrive at quite such a high pitch of consistency as is attained by the Roman Catholic Church. Absolute perfection in this direction is found in the glorious masses of Mozart, Beethoven, and Gounod; but surely it would be possible to approach more nearly to these models than we at present do. In our full cathedral services, the uniformity is, as a rule, maintained. We hear in their integrity the beautiful services of our English composers of Church music (a school surpassed by none in the whole world), but when we come to congregational music, all idea of unity seems often to vanish. I have myself heard in the course of the same service the psalms sung to a Gregorian chant, the *Te Deum* to a service and the *Benedictus* to an Anglican chant.

This, I maintain, is altogether inartistic, and therefore has the appearance of carelessness or thoughtlessness, which Church music should never have. Even the compilers of the chants to be used with the *Cathedral Psalter* have not escaped this inconsistency, as the second of the proper psalms appointed to be sung at evensong on Easter Day is set to a Gregorian chant, the "Tonus Peregrinus," while the other psalms are set to Anglican chants. The suitability of the "Tonus Peregrinus" to the words of the Fourteenth Psalm, does not to my mind justify such an arrangement. If an Anglican service is in use in a church, the introduction of a Gregorian chant is as much out of place as if in a Roman Catholic Mass, the *O salutaris Hostia* by Mozart should be followed by a *Gloria in excelsis* by Gounod.

Although in the last few years a great improvement has taken place in this respect, there are still in the Church of England too many of what I have heard called "piebald Services." At some churches, for instance, the Psalms for the day, the Canticles and *Kyries* are all sung by the choir, but the versicles, the Confession, and the Creed are said in the natural voice, not intoned, making the chanting of the Amens at the end of each prayer a perfect incongruity and absurdity. In others there is a full choral service throughout as far as the choir is concerned, but the clergyman reads the prayers and even the versicles in his natural voice. Now I should prefer that there should be no choir in the church at all, and that the psalms and versicles should be simply said by the congregation than be present at one of these "piebald services." The words of the psalms are beautiful enough whether said or sung, and the meaning of them is often injured rather than improved by the inappropriate chants to which they are sung. But if we are to have a choral service, let us have consistency in it. It is nowhere said that the clergyman is to *say* one versicle and the choir to *sing* the response. The Creed is ordered to be said or sung, but this does not surely mean that it is to be *said* by the officiating minister and *sung* by the officiating choir. If then the versicles and Litany are sung, the priest should sing those parts which are allotted to him; if they are merely intoned, the priest also should use the monotone.



This observation naturally leads to the consideration of the custom of "intoning," to which many persons, including in the number many who are sincerely anxious that the Church services should be devoutly and reverently performed, strongly object. The reasons urged against the practice are (1) that it is unnatural, and (2) that it prevents the clergyman from putting any expression into the words of the prayers. Now let us deal with the first contention, and see whether it is really true to say that intoning *is* unnatural. If we listen to any one talking, we shall, if we have any ear for music, very soon discover that he has some prominent tone or pitch of the voice to which, through all the inflections with which he is striving to emphasize what he is saying, he is always recurring; and it is perfectly easy for a choir to take a note from an officiating clergyman and chant the Amen at the conclusion of the prayer, even if he is only reading the prayers in his accustomed voice. I think that it is fair to maintain that this tone or note is a man's natural voice and all the inflections are *unnatural or artificial*.

We must all have observed that in public speaking where the speaker desires to emphasize some statement or drive some argument home into the hearts or minds of his hearers, this artificial use of the voice is more frequent than in ordinary conversation, in which, as a rule, the monotone practically prevails. In preaching therefore, and in reading the lessons, what I have ventured to call the artificial voice is rightly used. There is in each case a lesson which may be drawn out by the modulations of the human voice and when I hear (as I have heard) such a chapter as the fifteenth of the first Epistle to the Corinthians intoned, I am not surprised at the existence of a fear lest the use of intoning may lead to its abuse.

But with the prayers the matter is altogether different, and I would meet the second objection by contending that the less expression that is put into them by the clergyman the better. It must be distasteful to every one to hear the prayers mouthed and emphasized like a sermon; the expression is given to them by the uplifted hearts of each member of the congregation, and each individual worshipper may have a different shade of meaning while repeating in his heart the same prayer. A devotional feeling is what we ought to aim at arousing, and this is, I believe, attained by the use of the monotone if rightly pitched. It is very much the fashion with choirs to contend for a high pitch in intoning, and I hardly know a church in which the reciting note is lower than G. It is very commonly A, and in some extreme cases rises even to B. The argument in favour of a high note is that it gives brightness to the service, but even admitting that this object may be thereby attained, surely it is obtained at the expense of devotional feeling. The tone of the human voice, to which I have already alluded, ranges ordinarily from C to F and hardly ever rises higher than the latter note, so that if we do not wish to make intoning artificial, we must make use of a note which exists naturally in a man's *speaking* voice. I certainly do not wish to hear the prayers *sung*, though I advocate their being intoned, and I am persuaded that you cannot expect united and harmonious congregational responding if a note is adopted which compels the majority of those present to pray in a voice several tones higher than they would use in ordinary conversation. In our intercourse with the great upon *earth* we are accustomed instinctively to show our respect by a *lowering* rather than by a *raising* of the pitch of the voice; why should we act contrary to this instinct when we render homage to our heavenly King?

The reciting note should not be varied during the service. It is a very common practice to recite the General Confession on a comparatively low note, and then for the priest to pronounce the Absolution on a very much higher one. The meaning underlying this practice is obvious, but I cannot think that the practice itself is justifiable, for if I am right in thinking that intoning is merely reading without the introduction of artificial inflections in the voice, it is plain that the note employed either for the Confession or the Absolution must have been a non-natural one. Again, it is common to commence the intoning of the Litany on a high reciting note: the voices of both priest and choir tire as it proceeds and, at the close of it, have fallen by a whole tone or more. Instead of drawing the right inference that he had started by pitching the note too high, and making a wise resolution to intone it on a lower reciting note for the future the minister waits for the Lord's Prayer, and then raises his voice again to his former unnatural pitch, producing a most disturbing effect on the congregation, and calling attention to the shortcomings of the choir in their failure to keep up to the note on which he had started.



There is probably no branch of Church music in which a more marked improvement has taken place in recent times than in the hymns. The curious fancy which converted every single verse of every single psalm of David into rhyme, and the unaccountable taste which brought such into almost general use in the Church of England have at length yielded to a more artistic feeling and a greater musical knowledge. The poetical genius and spiritual minds of such men as Faber, Newman, or Keble have now given us a collection of hymns unsurpassed by any other in the world, while such modern composers as Sullivan, Dykes, Oakeley, Redhead, Goss, Barnby, Stainer, and many others have added music worthy of such a collection. One great want, however, at the present moment, a want which appears as far from being supplied as ever, is one uniform hymn-book. When the collection of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* first appeared, it was received with so much favour, and its introduction into churches where all shades of Church teaching, high, low, and broad, were represented was although gradual, so marked, that there seemed a reasonable prospect of the realization of this idea. The appearance of the first Appendix did not shake this expectation, for there was an obvious necessity for adding from time to time to any collection, however good, such new hymns as by their intrinsic merit claimed a place in our services, and this was a convenient mode of making such an addition, and the recent issue of a second Appendix may of course be justified on similar grounds, though it may be open to doubt whether the gain to the collection by this recent addition is sufficient to counterbalance the obvious inconvenience of being obliged to carry to church two hymn-books instead of one. But *Hymns Ancient and Modern* were soon followed by the *Hymnary* and *Church Hymns*, while the issue of a new edition of the first-named collection, by the incorporation of the first appendix, some sixteen or seventeen years ago, by which all the numbers of the hymns were altered, struck a death-blow to the idea, as both *Church Hymns* and the *Hymnary* have been adopted in many churches, and the old edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* is still used in a large number of country parishes.

But not only has an improvement taken place in the hymns themselves, and in the music to which they are set, but quite as much in the singing of them. We have outlived the prejudice that sacred music must necessarily be "drawled" and admit that the time to which two hymns may respectively be sung may differ as much as that of two movements of a symphony. Do not let us, however, forget that hymns are not necessarily being "drawled" unless they are being "gabbled." The tendency of a reaction from one extreme is often to induce us to run into the opposite extreme. The dismally slow reading of the prayers which prevailed five-and-thirty years ago has given place in too many instances to a rapid, unintelligible intoning which borders on irreverence. The cold dreary services, with nothing but the nasal response of the antiquated clerk to show that the congregation had a part to perform in the worship of our Church, have disappeared, but in some cases have been succeeded by an ornate and florid ritual which partakes more of the nature of a musical performance than of a religious service.

What is required to effect a more perfect rendering of the hymns is *expression*. Without it a hymn, however beautiful in words and music must become monotonous, and yet in very few choirs, and those are for the most part paid choirs, is sufficient attention paid to it. In most it is the habit to sing every verse *mezzoforte*, if not *forte*. In some a slight variety is attained by singing one verse *fortissimo* and another *mezzo-forte*, but in hardly a single voluntary choir have I ever heard a true *pianissimo*, much less any regard to the *crescendo* and *diminuendo*. And yet without variety of expression the stirring power which hymns undoubtedly possess is to a great extent lost.

This absence of expression is even more noticeable in the singing of the psalms in the *words* of which every variety of expression occurs. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who will prepare himself for the battle?" and how can a choir tune, so to speak, the congregation to a devotional pitch if jubilant songs of praise and devout accents of prayer are equally shouted out with all the strength of the voice? The same thoughtlessness, for I can only imagine that it proceeds from this cause, is apparent in the use of the monotone; for not only occasionally, but generally, the words of the Confession are vibrated forth in a manner which makes the clergyman's exhortation to a *humble* voice an idle mockery.

It is much to be wished that congregations would follow the lead of their choirs



by chanting the psalms antiphonally, a practice which relieves monotony and rests the voices. Every choir is divided into two parts. The choristers on the one side of the chancel are called "Decani" (those who sit on the Dean's side) and those on the other side "Cantoris" (those who sit on the side of the chanter or reader of the prayers). In chanting the psalms they sing the verses alternately according to a very ancient custom considered by some to have biblical authority (Ex. xv. 20, 21; Isaiah vi. 3).

The simple rule to be observed by the congregation is for those on the right of the centre aisle facing the altar to sing the verses with uneven numbers, those on the left the alternate ones, the *Gloria* being sung by both sides. In churches where Gregorian chants are in use, it is a common practice for the men to sing one verse and the boys and women the alternate verses, and this mode of antiphonal singing is very effective indeed, but it is obvious that this arrangement is only suitable for unison singing, and could not be effectively introduced where Anglican chants are used.

I have hitherto dealt solely with congregational music, with that form of service in which the congregation is able to join its voice with the voices of the choir in the praises which are offered up in church, and I have purposely devoted the major part of this article to this form of service, because it is the one usually found in our parish churches, and its consideration is likely to be of more interest and of more service to the readers of this magazine than a discussion on the more elaborate forms of Church music. But an article on this subject would be incomplete if no regard were taken of a class of musical services, which prevail not only in all our cathedrals but also in many parish churches in London and other large towns, and I am further tempted to say a word on the subject, because it seems to me that many of the speakers at the recent Church Congress at Rhyl, took an altogether erroneous view of the relation which should exist between the congregation and the choir. I am not disposed to differ with Canon Body when he says: "Whenever our holy services become instruments to the gratification of singers, and when they become a simple amusement to the worshippers, the worship becomes dangerous to spiritual life, and a mere mockery to God in heaven;" and if taken merely as a *general* proposition would concur with Canon Jacob, that "if in music we strive to offer our best, we shall never forget that the glory of our parish church is a hearty congregational service, and we shall do all in our power that the choir may lead and not be substitutes for the congregation;" but both these speakers and others who addressed the Congress seemed to me to identify themselves, with the contention which was advanced by Mr. Edward Griffith, who spoke as editorial secretary of the Church of England Congregational Music Association, and stated that its object was to bring about the reform of Church music, viz., "the restoration to the people of the right which, with the best possible intentions, has been largely taken from them by the parish choir." Where does Mr. Griffith find this assumed *right* of the congregation to join with the choir in all portions of the service which are appointed to be sung? Certainly not in the rubrics of the Prayer Book! These are significantly silent on the point, though if any inference is to be drawn from them, it would be against this contention. For instance, the Apostles' Creed is appointed to be said or sung "by the minister *and the people*," and the Lord's Prayer following is to be said by the "minister, clerks (*i.e.* choir) and people." Here then the right of the congregation is distinctly recognized and care should therefore be taken that these are not set to such an elaborate musical setting as would deprive them of that right; but the psalms, the *Te Deum*, and the *Venite* are only appointed to be "said or sung," and it is an interesting and significant fact that in the only rubric which gives any direction *by whom* the psalms are to be said or sung, viz. in that preceding the psalms appointed for use in the Marriage Service, it is distinctly laid down as follows: "Then the *minister or clerks* . . . shall say or sing this psalm following." The right of the congregation to join with the choir is ignored, and the inference to be drawn is that the same rule applies to all the psalms. Let me however guard myself from being misunderstood. I have no desire to restrict the congregational character of the services which prevail in the majority of our parish churches, nor to close the mouths of those members of the congregation who are capable of joining in the musical portions of the service; but it seems to me that there is a subtle and dangerous error underlying the contention that the congregation have an inherent *right* to join their voices at all times with those of the choir. If it means anything, it means that a worshipper is not joining in an act of praise or prayer unless he is repeating the words audibly with his lips, and if the right is admitted, it



would abolish at once all cathedral services. A rubrical right cannot pertain to a congregation in a parish church, and be inapplicable to a congregation in a cathedral church, and therefore if the right exists at all, the usurpation of it by a cathedral choir is as unjustifiable as by a parish choir. And if this contention of the right of a worshipper to join in all the services of the Church is pressed to its logical conclusion, and it is urged that a person cannot be considered as taking part in the service unless he is repeating the words with his lips, it would be difficult to resist a claim on his part to join in an audible voice in all the prayers which are offered up by the minister on behalf of the congregation.

In these remarks on the paper read by Mr. Griffith at the recent Church Congress, I have to some extent met an objection which is often urged against cathedral services, that they are *Uncongregational*. The same fallacy underlies the use of this epithet. Mr. Haweis, in his interesting book entitled *Music and Morals*, has a passage which to my mind so exactly meets this objection, that I cannot do better than quote it here. He says :

"The charge brought against cathedral singing is that it is uncongregational, and this is held to be a fatal objection, especially to the anthems. The objection is only one more proof of how much the English people have still to learn concerning the real functions of music. There is a grace of hearing as well as a grace of singing; there is a passive as well as an active side of worship. In every congregation there must be some who cannot join even in the simplest tune. Some are too old, some have no voices, others have no ear for music; but it would be a great mistake to suppose that all who are thus reduced to the state of listeners get nothing at all out of the singing. If we take note of old and devout worshippers as some familiar hymn is being sung, we shall see their faces lighten up and their heads move in unconscious sympathy, and we shall know that although their lips are silent they are singing in the spirit. One day, noticing a very poor and aged person in tears during the service, I spoke to her at the close, and inquired the cause of her grief. 'Oh, sir,' she replied, 'that blessed, blessed, song in the middle of the prayers.' She said no more, but she was alluding to an anthem by Sir Sterndale Bennett, 'O Lord, thou hast searched me out.'"

But, it may be said, granted that to many persons the cathedral type of worship is most helpful, is it fair to force upon a considerable section of the worshippers in a parish church an elaborate musical service, which through no fault of their own, but owing to their want of education or absence of an ear for music, is wholly unintelligible to them? My answer would be that, where there are only one or two churches in a parish this would not be right, but in large towns where there are several churches within easy walking distance of every inhabitant, it is not only fair, but desirable that in one or two of the parish churches this type should prevail, so that those who are able to appreciate such services should have an opportunity of attending them, and that those who have good voices and musical knowledge may be able to utilise their talent as members of the choir. And if we seek for an ideal service of this nature which we may imitate, our thoughts turn naturally to St. Paul's Cathedral. Whether it be in the ordinary daily services or in the special oratorio performances with full orchestral accompaniment, during Advent or Lent, or on St. Paul's Day, or whether it be in the choral celebrations at midday on Sunday, we find in them all music performed indeed with an artistic skill, seldom if ever surpassed in any church, either in this country or abroad, but so subordinated to devotion that those who "go to hear remain to pray."

It would of course be impossible for such a high musical standard to be reached in many, if any, parish churches, but this is the ideal at which we should aim, and unless some reasonable approach can be made to it, it is better that a choir should not attempt elaborate singing, but should confine itself to an ordinary congregational service.