Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Canadian Journal of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_canadian-journal.php

working on the Sabbath: 'Blessed art thou if thou knowest what thou doest.'

What conclusion can we draw from our discussion of language and liturgy? I must content myself here with a few dogmatic statements, in the hope that they may provoke fruitful reflection upon this important theme.

1 Words as such are not sacred. There are no 'sacred' languages, not even Hebrew and Greek. It is the meaning which language conveys which is vital. Whether the same meaning can be adequately expressed in many different linguistic forms cannot be decided a priori, but must be discovered in experience as Christian men seek to communicate with each other and to proclaim the gospel to the unbeliever.
2 A radical substitution of new language for that of the Bible or the traditional liturgical forms will not, of itself, necessarily solve the problem of enabling modern men to understand better the import of the gospel. This is not to say that experiment is forbidden; it is rather a warning not to overestimate what a new language can do.
3 Modern man's difficulties with the gospel are primarily a matter, not of words, but of the nature of theological truth and the evidence for it. What evidence is there for a holy and loving God who cares for his children one by one? How can this belief be reconciled with evil, both natural and moral – with sin, suffering, and death? Do we really know anything for certain about Jesus, and if we do, does what we know justify us in calling him divine and accepting him as our ultimate authority for life? Can men view the world through the eyes of science and still believe that Jesus could rise from the dead? This is the kind of question that inhibits faith and makes worship difficult.

Changes of language will not of themselves solve these tormenting problems for us.

In my judgment, therefore, the basic question concerns the truth of the gospel. Once we have clarified this issue, we are free to experiment with all kinds of language, with symbols verbal and non-verbal, to make Christian truth relevant to men in changing cultural situations. If, however, we do not know what Christian truth is – if the gospel itself is a problem rather than an answer to our problems – then radical changes of language may only hide the poverty and confusion of our belief.

Any church musician will tell you what good church music is, but the kind

2 GODFREY RIDOUT

Orpheus in Ecclesia, or, The Riven Lute

When I undertook to write this piece I thought that, if I did not know all the answers, I knew enough to write an article. Now I am convinced that I do not know any answers at all, only a lot of questions.

Any church musician will tell you what good church music is, but the kind

[CJT, xv, 3 & 4 (1969), printed in Canada]

of definition he gives you will depend not only on what church and congregation he serves, but also on the kind of music he likes. Were you to ask any clergyman or layman the same question, the answer, though perhaps differing slightly, would be conditioned by the same factors, plus one other – whether or not he likes music. You can be sure that the hymns and canticles that moved St Augustine to tears, 'touched to the very quick by the voices of thy sweet church songs,' were not the same ones that General Booth appropriated while asking why the Devil should have all the best tunes. Four bars of 'Saint Gertrude' would have caused poor Augustine's toes to curl, yet who dares to say which kind serves God better? Only individual taste, with all its variants, can decide whether, after all, 'Saint Gertrude' is a bad tune or not.

The church musician, as artist, feels that God deserves the best he can give him, just as, in the Middle Ages, the craftsman executed his beautiful carvings in the churches even in places completely invisible to mortal man, to the greater glory of God. As Father Peter Sheehan has said:

> The art principle [of the Renaissance liturgy] is golden in its splendour, ornate in its execution, lofty in its concept of divine worship. The music, for example, brings to the service of prayer the highest skill and art of the human spirit. The ceremony which it accompanies is almost as florid, intricate and stately. It is derived from the ceremonial of royal and papal courts. Above all we find that it gives us another awareness of God than that which is inspired by our contemporary liturgy.
>
> The worship of the middle ages and the renaissance ... was man's turning to a divine person who is essentially transcendent. Man recognizes God's fearful majesty and his awe-inspiring might.[1]

So the church music of the middle ages and the renaissance was aristocratic and splendid, sophisticated and austere, and very much in the hands of the professionals. The congregation was, so far as it could understand, at best moved to religious contemplation, or at worst entertained. Indeed, until the late middle ages, the congregation could not even see the celebration of mass and usually drifted out of the church after the elevation of the host.[2]

The performance of music by the choir at the expense of the congregation was a departure from the pattern of worship in the early church. In the age of the church fathers, music was for the congregation to sing. Both Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, and St Basil, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, were enthusiastic about congregational singing, where the people could surrender themselves to the pleasures of music 'to the end that their souls and minds may be enlightened.'[3] Even earlier, when the early Christians still worshipped with the Jews, it was the custom of the synagogue rather than that of the temple that they followed; the temple was too aristocratic, with its

1. From a sermon preached in St Thomas Aquinas' Chapel, University of Toronto, in connection with a symposium on the Renaissance.

2. Cf. Johannes Wagner, 'Liturgical Art and the Care of Souls,' in *The Assisi Papers* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1957), p. 64.

3. St Basil, quoted by Gustave Reese, *Music in the Middle Ages* (New York: Norton, 1940), p. 63. (Reese's identification of Basil as Eusebius' 'successor' is of course incorrect.)

choirs and instruments. The tunes they sang were probably folk or folklike songs.[4]

As the church grew in size, wealth, and power, there developed ample opportunity for men to exercise to the fullest their artistic creativity, through beautiful and great buildings, gorgeous interiors, and magnificently trained musical establishments. Certainly church arts and architecture were well out of reach of the layman; he could only witness and hear, for what singing he could do was in the simplest responses and the increasingly less frequent hymns.

There seems to have been no official conspiracy to rob the laity of its role in the musical parts of the services; the people were quite willing to become auditors. Composers, such as Josquin, were famous and popular; their works were sought out and performed in widely separated areas, which in those days of poor communication, when the printing and publishing of music was limited and costly, was indeed remarkable. It is clear that the church building, during the middle ages and the renaissance, was more than a religious institution; it was a community arts centre. What other building of the time could house music and the visual arts on such a scale?

The Reformation did little to change this situation, except in one or two instances. Masses continued to be sung in the first stages of the Anglican and the Lutheran churches, the latter even retaining Latin. (It is true that, in the case of the Lutherans especially, because of the high quality of musical education in the German city schools, a noble body of hymn tunes arose, but it was not until later that the Pietists insisted on the exclusive use of simple congregational music.)[5] The outstanding exception was Calvinism. Despite the fact that he did not strenuously object to singing 'properly practised,' Calvin did not really like music, and his utterances on the subject successfully stifled art music, both sacred and secular, in many areas almost to this day.[6] In Calvinism the middle-class philistine found a powerful spokesman.

During the baroque period, which coincides with the Counter-Reformation, we see in both the Roman Catholic and reformed churches the last magnificent blow-out in church arts. Nothing could have been more splendid:

And so there was produced the dramatic design for the Church of the Gesù in Rome, a building which was planned as the epitomic symbol of the growing power and glory of the Church. This particular structure became the prototype for hundreds of Baroque churches scattered over the European landscape during the succeeding century. On its walls, tumbling over each other in their anxiety to impress and overwhelm the beholder, are multitudes of cherubs, saints, and angels grouped about the symbol of the Holy Name of Jesus, which bursts in a glow of radiant light from the center of the picture. So crowded and so violent is the movement of the figures that they are thrust outside the frame and down into the interior of the church ... Not far away in another Roman church is Bernini's sculp-

4. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 57, 66f.
5. Cf. Paul Henry Lang, *Music in Western Civilization* (New York: Norton, 1941), pp. 210–13, 468–75.
6. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 257f.

tural realization of the mood of mystic exaltation and fervid rapture felt by the sixteenth-century Spanish Saint Theresa, an angel transfixing her body with an arrow of ecstasy as she dreams of heavenly felicity and bliss.[7]
In music there were the Gabrielis and Monteverdi in Venice; Praetorius, Schütz, and the Bach family in Lutheran Germany; Lully in Paris and Purcell in England; and from all these came a repertoire of untold riches.

But the situation of the musician was drastically changing. New rivals for his care and affection were making seductive noises – especially one, the opera, that healthy hybrid spawn of the baroque. The composer had a new, and often more lucrative, form of employment and a new channel of mass communication, and the performer a vehicle whereby he could exploit his talents, either histrionic or musical, or both, without offending religious sensibilities.

From this point onwards we witness the slow decline in the role of the church in music. It is safe to say that since the death of J. S. Bach (and he was a civil servant rather than a direct employee of the church) no composer of first rank has devoted the bulk of his time and energy to the music of the church. The German word *Kapellmeister*, which once meant chapel-master, and as such denoted an honoured and coveted position in musical life, has now lost its meaning and, as in the term *Kapellmeistermusik*, has come to mean all that is stodgy, pedantic, and unimaginative. Composers did, and still do, contribute to the liturgy, and more of them to nonliturgical religious music, but such works are a mere fraction of their output.

We also witness a profound change in the music itself. If the composer deserted the church for the wicked world of opera, he also, in his lessening contributions to the liturgy, brought the operatic language into church, especially the Roman Catholic. This resulted in a severe reaction, culminating in the famous *Motu Proprio* (1903) of Pope Pius X, which led to the turfing out of works by Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Gounod, and a host of others, because they were judged unliturgical. (In view of some present-day practices, it seems likely that the late Holy Father is executing cartwheels in his tomb!) It attests to the vitality of these dislodged works that they readily find their way into the concert hall.

As has already been suggested, the *style* employed by composers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was substantially the same, whether they were writing for the church or for the opera and concert hall. The secular style of, say, Purcell, Bach, Handel, Mozart, Haydn, Schubert, or Gounod is the same as that of their sacred music. Granted, they may show some restraint in the latter, but not always. A wry commentary on some church music practices is made by Berlioz in his opera *Beatrice and Benedict*, where, after the oboist of the stage band executes a brilliantly ornamental passage, he has the *Kapellmeister* say: 'Très bien! Peste! à première vue! Oh! tu es un gaillard! *J'écrirai pour toi un joli saltarello dans ma nouvelle messe.*' (my italics) There is no doubt, however, that there is no stylistic difference between Bach's

7. Howard D. McKinney and W. R. Anderson, *Music in History*, 2nd ed. (New York: American Book Company, 1957), p. 271.

Peasant Cantata and the *Passion according to St Matthew*, between Cherubini's *Medée* and his *Requiem*, or between Verdi's *Aïda* and his *Manzoni Requiem*.

Every now and then over the span of history, objections, both official and unofficial, were raised about church music. In the earliest days the main reason was that, for many, music had pagan and base associations or simply was unsuitable. As the fourth-century Egyptian abbot Paulo said: 'When we stand in the presence of God we should assume an attitude of contrition and not employ the voice of praise. Can there be any spirit of penitence in a monk who, in church or cell, makes his voice resound like that of a bull?'[8] Either the good abbot disliked music or the singing he had heard was very bad. In later times the objections were not altogether against music for itself (although Wyclif made noises, which later were more fully articulated by Calvin), but against the treatment of words; the more complex the musical textures the less likelihood there was of the words being heard.

In recent times the major upheaval was caused by the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X. Its impact was felt in nearly all of the western churches which used formal liturgies. Coinciding with the rise of the Gregorian Association in the Church of England, it provided that body with a gratuitous shot in the arm. Many of the document's recommendations were so sensible that church musicians were loud in their approval. As I have already noted, one of the negative factors was the removal of much fine music as being unliturgical. This was the price paid in the effort to rid the music of the Roman Catholic church of a repertoire of musical garbage which had accumulated throughout the nineteenth century. Since taste is too nebulous a factor to legislate, prohibitions had to be levelled at a genre as such. On the positive side we may reckon the seal of approval set on the efforts of the monks of Solesmes regarding plainchant and the encouragement of the revival of polyphony, especially the works of Palestrina. Church composers were urged to emulate the old masters.

A major result of this piece of advice was that church musicians now drew, more than ever, on 'our glorious heritage' – that is, they wallowed in Palestrina, Byrd, Victoria, and Gibbons, or undertook to compose after their manner. That this policy led to the writing of some good music there is no doubt, but it served further to set church music apart from the musical mainstream. The church musician found himself – quite willingly, it should be said – committed to an anachronistic limbo. 'Quires and places where they sing' became museums where memories of things past could be cherished undisturbed by time, and their masters became the curators.

We are now in the midst of another upheaval. With the recent switch to the vernacular, Roman Catholics have again displayed their penchant for throwing out babies with the bathwater. The reasons are varied and sound, but to an outsider what is now happening within Roman Catholicism appears as a symptom of the agony that is plaguing all church musicians of all denominations, and can be termed 'getwithitism.' (But more of this later.)

Except for my remarks about the early church, I have said little about

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 81f.

the active role played by the congregation in church music. It is indeed difficult ground to deal with. Most denominations now have one thing in common: hymns. These provide the principal musical means whereby the people can raise their voices in unison in praise of God, and most people enjoy a good sing – as witness any convivial gathering, either sacred or secular. Consequently, hymns are the most democratic feature of church music; it would be useless to ask a congregation to sing words which they could not understand or deemed unsuitable to a tune which they might find hard to sing or difficult to remember, or another congregation to sing altogether too unsophisticated words to a tune which they might consider cheap and meretricious.

No one can say who or what is right. The so-called gospel hymn, with its catchy, facile tune, its apt but primitive harmony, its easy (and often 'worldly') rhythms, and its simple and usually highly emotional words, has proved a powerful weapon in the battle for men's souls. Although I find it musically offensive much of the time, I can not in conscience condemn it. As Donald Francis Tovey has said somewhere: 'Good bad music is better than bad good music!' The gospel hymn has never pretended to be anything more than it set out to be – an 'Open sesame.' The reasons for its success are not hard to find. For one thing, the gospel-hymn tunes were directly related stylistically to the shop ballads prevalent in front parlours during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and so possessed a comfortable familiarity – 'Extraordinary how potent cheap music is'[9] – and their preservation reflects the comfortable and complacent conservatism of so many congregations. A further reason for their initial popularity can be found in the state of Protestant hymn-singing before their introduction.

The Calvinist suppression of liturgical music and the destruction of the church organs, regrettable and insensate as these actions were, resulted in the channelling of musical energies into the creation of a body of fine and dignified tunes. Who indeed could resist the majesty of many of the tunes in the Genevan and Scottish Psalters? These were not hymns in the accepted sense, however, but psalm paraphrases. Nonetheless, as Puritanism came to prevail in all the English-speaking churches, the psalm paraphrase became almost the exclusive musical ingredient of worship.

Despite the beauty of the tunes themselves, their performance was a long way from becoming a meaningful musical experience. There was, for instance, the practice of 'lining out,' for the benefit of those who could not read, where the clerk or the precentor would read aloud the text, line by line, before each phrase of music;[10] also, the tunes were sung very slowly. Of course there were

9. Noël Coward, *Private Lives*, Act I, in N. Coward, *Blithe Spirit, with Two Other Plays* (London: Pan Books, 1954), p. 134.

10. Cf. Charles Dickens, *Sunday under Three Heads* (1836), in the Gadshill Edition of *The Works of Charles Dickens*, vol. XXXIV (London: Chapman and Hall, n.d.), p. 328: 'The hymn is sung – not by paid singers, but by the whole assembly at the loudest pitch of their voices, unaccompanied by any musical instrument, the words being given out, two lines at a time, by the clerk. There is something in the sonorous quavering of the harsh voices, in the lank and hollow faces of the men, and the sour solemnity of the women, which bespeaks this a stronghold of intolerant zeal and ignorant enthusiasm.'

no instruments much of the time, and until the introduction of the pitch-pipe the pitch level was unpredictable. Yet, Puritanism notwithstanding, man's creative impulse and (for shame!) his vanity caused him to subject the tunes to so much ornamentation that the tunes often became unrecognizable. The reintroduction of organs or other instruments did not always improve matters. In the nineteenth century, at St James' Church (now Cathedral) in Toronto, before there was an organ, the sexton led the hymns with a bassoon, executing elaborate cadenzas at the end of each line!

It is true that, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there was an increase in the writing of new hymns and the creation of many new tunes. For example, Handel composed 'Gopsal' ('Rejoice, the Lord is King') for the Methodists. But the old customs persisted, and it is not surprising that many found welcome relief in the worldly, lively, and swinging gospel hymns.

Several events in the nineteenth century served to improve matters: the revival of the music of J. S. Bach, dormant for well over half a century; the Oxford Movement; the restoration of organs as essential to worship (except for the Presbyterians, who maintained their suspicion of the 'carnal instrument' until recent times); and the re-emergence of the professional church musician. Even this last development was viewed with some degree of apprehension.[11] (In some places, of course, the professional musician had never really disappeared – for instance in the cathedrals and other great churches, although his activities were restricted.)

The return of the professional musician to the church cannot be considered a complete restoration. The church has to compete with the outside world for its talent, and it very frequently finds itself at a severe financial disadvantage. The salaries of organists in most churches are low, so that the posts become at best part-time, the incumbent either working at a job outside the profession or augmenting his income by teaching; in the latter event he has to put in a seven-day work week of long hours (school-age pupils and workers usually taking their lessons in the late afternoon or in the evening). Consequently, the church can only attract either the very dedicated, who will put up with the conditions of their work – and these are rare enough – or the mediocre, who can in no way compete in the more lucrative professional field outside the church. If the better musicians finally reach the top of their profession, they will have posts which, although not proportionately remunerative, give an enormous prestige, as well as such tangible 'perks' as recitals, examining, and adjudicating. But there is not much room at the top, since cathedrals and large churches in metropolitan areas are not very numerous.

At any level, the organist-choirmaster often finds himself in an anomalous position, that of serving three masters. The first master he would call God, although we might also say that it is his own musical conscience. Since – to hark back to my opening paragraphs – he believes his task to be *ad maiorem*

11. Cf. George Meredith, *Sandra Belloni* (1864), ch. x, in the Memorial Edition of *The Works of George Meredith*, vol. III (London: Constable, 1909), p. 87: '"An organist an accomplished man!" Lady Gostre repeated Adela's words. "Well, I suppose it is possible, but it rather upsets one's notions, does it not?"'

Dei gloriam, only his very best will do. The second master is the congregation. Here the organist-choirmaster has a bad time. The congregation is not a homogeneous body. Some members will be musically informed; some will not know anything about music, but will know what they like; while others will have no liking at all for music. One thing uniting the congregation is the feeling that he who pays the piper should call the tune, but rarely is there agreement on what that tune ought to be. The third master is the clergy. In the 'good old' authoritarian days, the clergy was the only mortal factor worth considering. If the organist and clergy agreed, the congregation could lump it, and often did. Charles Peaker rather fancifully remarks that the rector is the captain of the ship and the organist-choirmaster the chief engineer. (This brings to mind a newspaper article which I read back in the thirties, written by a Cunarder, Captain Bissett, who said in effect that if the chief engineer had his way the engines would be in New York two days before the ship!)

The good church musician knows that the church service may include two categories of music with distinct roles. In the first place, there is the music in which the congregation takes part, such as psalms, responses, and (perhaps) canticles. Secondly, there is music whose principal function is that of adornment. There is always the real danger of the second function trespassing on the first. Let me illustrate this point with an anecdote.

The story has it that, when John Varley Roberts was organist at Magdalen College, Oxford, one day a member of the congregation dared to sing out during the responses at Evensong. Roberts rose from his bench and shook his fist at the offender. After the service the man approached Roberts and asked why he could not take part. After all, was this not God's house? 'This, sir,' thundered Roberts, 'is Magdalen College Chapel!'

The musical part played by the congregation has been frequently defined (and almost as frequently ignored) over the whole span of church history. The more recent declarations include *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955) and *Mediator Dei* (1947), both issued by Pope Pius XII. In the latter, three principles are spelled out:

1 The congregation that assists at the Sacrifice with intent mind ... without doubt cannot be silent: because 'to sing is characteristic of a lover.'
2 It cannot be affirmed that modern music and song must be entirely excluded from Catholic worship.
3 We therefore exhort you, Venerable Brethren, that you take care to promote congregational religious singing.[12]

In *Musicae sacrae disciplina* Pius XII says that the people should be taught Gregorian chants – the easier and more familiar ones, at any rate. At the time, this proposal was quite successful, and many parishes adopted the practice. With the subsequent dropping of Latin, Roman Catholics have been scurrying about, looking for substitute means of musical participation. What they are now coming up with closely resembles Anglican chant.

12. Quoted by Albert Stohr, 'The Encyclical "On Sacred Music" and its Significance for the Cure of Souls,' in *The Assisi Papers*, p. 187.

The reaction of the professional church musician to the restoration of congregational participation in those parts of the service rightfully belonging to the people has been natural enough. He feels robbed and fettered, and limited in scope. For instance, an American musician writes: 'Fancy settings of canticles and masses are being jettisoned in favor of more music for the congregation to sing. Some of the oldest and finest traditional canticles are now seldom heard ... The very length of these works set to a "simplified" form (particularly Anglican chant sung in unison) makes them unbearable.'[13] We must ask, however: unbearable to whom? To the musician, of course. Except from those members of the congregation (like myself) who claim some musical sophistication, I hear no complaints. To sing the canticles and the psalms (at Mattins) in what appears to be an endless stream of Anglican chant is an experience not to be borne with equanimity by the musically sensitive. Yet to exclude the congregation completely from participation, while the choir does its stuff, is just as frustrating to others. Surely one 'setting' of a canticle – perhaps the *Te Deum* – is enough. The people, after all, are gathered together, not for a music appreciation class, but for spiritual edification.

It is evident, then, that the adornment factor can be carried too far. In liturgical churches the music must fit the actual business at hand. In *Mediator Dei* Pius XII has something to say on that score: 'Great prudence and care should be used ... in order to keep out of churches polyphonic music ... [which might] interfere with the conduct of the liturgical service ...' He also warns against choirs biting off more than they can chew: 'It should hardly be necessary to add the warning that, when the means and talent available are unequal to the task, it is better to forego such attempts than to do something which would be unworthy of divine worship and sacred gatherings.'[14] In the nonliturgical churches, especially those endowed with a good choir, the opportunity for musical display is such that the peril lies in the service becoming a sacred concert with prayerful and homiletic interludes. Such evidently was the case in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto. This church had a strong musical tradition, and over the the turn of the century had the good fortune to have had A. S. Vogt (the founder of the Mendelssohn Choir) as organist and choirmaster. Under his successor the choral content of the service grew in length until it usurped the time allotted for the sermon. Some members of the congregation and the pastor revolted, forcing the organist to resign.[15]

Through all these changes in taste, conditions, and practices the church

13. John McCreary, 'The Quick-Tempered Choirmaster,' *Music* (New York), 1, 3 (December 1967), 18.

14. Quoted by Stohr, 'The Encyclical "On Sacred Music" and its Significance for the Cure of Souls,' p. 197.

15. Cf. Leslie K. Tarr, *Shields of Canada* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), p. 73. The author does not name the organist in question, who was Edward Broome (1868–1932). Apparently Dr Shields and Dr Broome remained on the friendliest terms despite the upheaval. I have, incidentally, seen sample calendars for the year 1915, and it is clear that the choir did indeed take the lion's share of the service.

musician has had to steer a tortuous course – in other words, he has had to be a musical Vicar of Bray. Surveying the long history of his profession, he has seen that nearly every time music reached its heights in his eyes, the church authorities felt he was getting too big for his boots, and that every reform to check him, regardless of the goodness of the intentions, caused something to be lost – a loss which outweighed what was gained in many cases. Of course, some compensation has been found in the fact that art flourishes in adversity, because adversity challenges the ingenuity of the artist; if he cannot do it his way, he has to do it some other way. The Reformation forced the Anglican composers to set English words, which, after the fluid and graceful Latin, they found angular and awkward; they also had to render the words in such a way that they could be heard. These things required a new approach, since composers could no longer safely weave long and complicated fabrics; they had to worry about definite and indefinite articles, and they had to abandon their tendency to be complicated. The proof of their achievement is the success of such composers as Byrd. Roman Catholics are now faced with the same problem – but exacerbated by a brand of English which, while modern, is less poetic and even harder to set than the language of the Prayer Book. It remains to be seen whether they can come up with a latter-day Byrd or Gibbons.

It is hardly likely that a Byrd or a Gibbons would appear, and if they did so they would soon be discouraged, and would exercise their talents in places other than the church. As I have already pointed out, the church lost its hold on the first-class composers years ago. Perosi, Stanford, and Wood are all good composers, and they often achieve wonderful moments; Messiaen can sometimes emerge from his confused and woolly mysticism and lift us out of our pews; but as composers go they are relatively small beer. The occasional sallies into liturgical music by Stravinsky, Britten, Poulenc, and Somers show us what might have been if the church was still the principal employer of creative musical talent. The problem is not that composers could not adapt their music to the needs of the church; it is not that composers generally are atheists; it is that the church has proved a notoriously bad customer, that it cannot, by and large, guarantee adequate performance or income, that it cannot create an ideal audience. People wishing to hear music may go to a concert or listen to radio or recordings, and be it said, be just as spiritually rewarded as if they had gone to church. A masterpiece of music is a divine revelation; the act of its composition is a miracle and a mystical experience; and through it the audience glimpses God. It is small wonder Haydn inscribed all his scores 'In nomine Domini' at the beginning and 'Laus Deo' at the end!

The church musician's role has indeed changed. No longer, except in collegiate churches and other scarce places, can he expect support from an aristocracy – ecclesiastical, temporal, or intellectual. His practice must of necessity be that of spiritual *Gebrauchsmusik*, music for use – and music very broadly based, since a more plebeian piper is calling the tune.

And the broad base is broadening still. As Father Sheehan says in the sermon already quoted:

But the contemporary art principle is something different, and more valid for contemporary man. Its art principle is that of the cool, simple Scandinavian things which you might see in Jensen's windows on Bloor Street. The persons who take part create their own honest and direct atmosphere and action. The arts which decorate their worship take much more account of the materials at hand and their ability to create another atmosphere, a far different approach to God. God is not removed, he is present in the action at that altar which is the table of his supper. He is present in the community as a gathering of neighbours or family. It is intimacy and honesty between God and man which is sought and so the song is innocent, even primitive. The instrument is as simple as a guitar or recorder. Superfluity of effort or art is not welcome.[16]

Were it just a matter of a guitar or recorder and simple folk melodies, all would be well, for through them we return to the ingenuous practice of early Christian worship in Asia Minor. But the voice of 'Getwithit' is heard throughout the land. With the sanctification of the sitar, the beatification of bongos, the elevation of electric guitars, and the deification of drums, we have, not artlessness, but the inartistic. The bewildered but benign parson, looking down on his swinging congregation of youth, may thank God that all these people have been brought to church; but he might be better rewarded – if that is the word – if he asked them what brought them together, the word of God or the output of a hundred-watt amplifier. The young do not go for the still small voice; they have been deafened by the sound of many decibels.

Rock or baroque, it does not matter; again the congregation is back to square one, and is excluded from active participation. It would seem that, once there is a group in church convened to make music, either vocal or instrumental, something must be found for them to do. As they become more efficient, they want to do more, and they begin gently to elbow themselves into those areas proper to the congregation, because, if they are not performing, they feel that they are wasting their time. So starts another round of mutual frustration. One clergyman ruefully told me that he hoped that never again, once having gone through such an experience, would he have to take charge of a church which was governed by its organist and choirmaster.

It is quite obvious that one cannot please everybody, at least at the same time. The rigid conservatism of the older members of the congregations and the curator role of the organist-choirmaster conspire to maintain the status quo, while appeals from the younger members of the congregation and the longing of the clergy to attract the uncommitted youth exert pressure for change. Within physical limits, some churches have managed to accommodate various degrees of taste by offering a variety of services, although not at equally convenient times, and in the larger denominations there are churches

16. Sermon preached in St Thomas Aquinas' Chapel, Toronto (see n.1, above).

of all types in metropolitan areas. But there is no easy and comprehensive solution of the problem.

In churches other than Roman Catholic there is indeed a feeling of change – albeit gradual – while in the Roman Catholic church change has been forced simply by the shift to the vernacular, with all the attendant problems. Again Father Sheehan has the right words to describe our position:

> [Josquin's *Missa Pange Lingua*] ... reminds us that musically and artistically we are perhaps a culturally deprived and disinherited church, since English in the liturgy and liturgical reform have deprived us of our great Christian heritage of art and beauty. It challenges us ... to remember that we must, like Josquin des Prés and the anonymous monks who created our plainsong, fashion an art which serves and enhances our liturgy and directs us to the same divine persons who inspired those who have gone before us.[17]

If we cannot rise to the challenge, let us hear also what Monsignor Wagner says: '... The liturgy, in last analysis, is not dependent on the service of the arts ... it can function without them ... it can even dispense with them.'[18]

17. *Ibid.*

18. Wagner, 'Liturgical Art and the Care of Souls,' p. 59.

3 ULRICH S. LEUPOLD

*Worship Music in Ancient Israel: Its Meaning and Purpose**

There has never been any dearth of books on music in the Bible.[1] In spite of the fact that we know little or nothing of the actual music sung by Israel of old, the subject has elicited a considerable body of literature. In contrast, the theology of music in the Bible has received very little attention. And yet the Bible offers more information on the meaning and purpose of music than on its actual form. The present study is an attempt to open up this subject by dealing with the 'why' and 'what for' of worship music in ancient Israel from its beginnings to New Testament times.

In order to understand the meaning of music in pre- or non-western cultures, one must free oneself from two modern assumptions about the role of music. Our age takes it for granted (firstly) that music is made to be *heard* and (secondly) that it serves to express and to inspire *feelings*. Both of these

*This paper was the presidential address at the 1967 meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies in Montreal and has appeared in an abbreviated form in *Response*, 9 (1968), 116–24.

1. The most recent bibliography is in Eric Werner's article 'Music' in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, III, 469.