

## Musical Times Publications Ltd.

---

Notation

Author(s): Fred. W. Wareham

Source: *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, Vol. 30, No. 559 (Sep. 1, 1889), pp. 556-557

Published by: [Musical Times Publications Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3360227>

Accessed: 27-10-2015 03:57 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Musical Times Publications Ltd.* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

proper thing to have ladies in choirs. As for the remark of one of your correspondents about St. Paul's injunction for "Women to keep silence," he must know perfectly well that that alluded to "preaching," and if we are to take it *literally* women should not audibly join in the Service at all—whether in the choir or not. I think your correspondent would hardly like to go so far as that. Surely women's voices were given them for something higher than singing to amuse concert goers, and what nobler use could they be put to than in the worship and service of God?

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

SAMUEL DAY, Hon. Choirmaster.

St. John's Church, Wakefield,  
August 10, 1889.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—I have very carefully followed up the correspondence in your valuable and instructive paper upon the above subject, and I think the most absurd objection that has been put forth as yet is the one in the current issue, where your correspondent says, "The dictum of St. Paul—'Let the women be silent in the church'—covers the whole question." Now, Sir, my humble opinion is that those words of St. Paul do not even touch the question, let alone cover it. I have looked at the passages in the Bible and I do not think St. Paul in any way referred to singing. It seems to me that the writer of the passage (St. Paul) meant that women were not to preach in the church. If your correspondent will turn to 1 Cor. iv. 34, also to the 1st epistle of Paul to Timothy, ii. 11, 12, I think he will admit the truth of my statement above.

Looking at another side of the question, I would like to ask, does your correspondent wish us to think that it is wrong for all women in a congregation to uplift their voices in praise of God? Are they to go to church simply to listen to others praise our Lord? I think he must have written his opinion without having given the subject due thought.

Again, I cannot see the objection to having ladies in a church choir any more than in a chapel choir; and I do not think it is possible to find one chapel in a hundred where there are not ladies in the choir.—Yours faithfully,

August 10, 1889.

TEMPO.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—I have read with considerable interest the correspondence which has been recently carried on in your columns on the subject of "Ladies' Surpliced Choirs." The letter in the current number, which appears over the signature "Geo. Dixon," should surely not pass unnoticed. The writer, in a lordly and off-hand manner, settles the whole question to his own satisfaction by quoting (not very accurately either) the well known direction of St. Paul concerning women speaking in the church. He should, however, complete the quotation and not mutilate it to serve his own purpose. The verse runs thus:—"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak." The Apostle, as the context shows, obviously refers to preaching, and I challenge your correspondent to point out a single passage in Holy Scripture forbidding women to sing praises to the Almighty either in the church or out of it. If Mr. Dixon has a logical mind and follows out his own argument to its legitimate conclusion, he must forbid women to take any part in the Psalms, hymns, and responses.

If this view be correct we had better at once revise the instructions in the Prayer Book, and instead of "The people shall answer," &c., write "The men only shall answer," &c.

Mr. Dixon asks, "What authority has a nineteenth century clergyman to invent a new ecclesiastical vestment?" Why not ask at the same time, "What authority had a nineteenth century tailor to invent the present style of dress coat?" The authority in either case, I should think, is the very commonplace (and commonsense) one of modern requirements. I cannot call to mind any passage in the writings of St. Paul, or any other of the Apostles, which gives directions as to the use of cassock, surplice, alb, cope, stole, &c. If these are the inventions of man's wisdom, unaided by the authority of Holy Writ, why

should it be such a heinous offence to invent others? "What man has done, man may do," is an old saying which is true in more senses than one.

In conclusion, I should like to ask Mr. Dixon by what authority he arrogates to himself the right to represent the views on this or any other subject of "Any true member of the church, male or female."—Yours truly,

J. HENRY HOWELL.

Rock Ferry, Cheshire, August 21, 1889.

## MUSICAL DIPLOMAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—I beg to address you on a subject which I have not yet seen referred to in your columns—namely, the multiplication of colleges, &c., professing to grant diplomas in music after examination.

It seems one of the special delights of the present day to be examined and to add letters after one's name; and I suppose it is only to satisfy this craving that new examination machinery is set going, and so in time, at the present rate, we shall be the most "examined" nation on earth.

Besides the Universities, College of Organists, Royal Academy, Trinity College (which one would think were sufficient), we have lately seen added the "Guild of Organists" and the "Church Choir Guild." I should be glad if you could inform me of the value of the diplomas given by these two concerns. They are not training institutions. One thing about them seems rather funny to me. The Secretary of the Organists' Guild (according to information to be seen in your columns) was dismissed for insubordination, and in revenge he sprung on an unoffending profession an opposition shop called the "Church Choir Guild," and elected himself (he *must* have done it himself) manager, or, as he calls it, "Warden."

If an unknown man can do this, surely there is nothing to prevent me and other unknown men from setting up Examination concerns, until the country is flooded with them, and there is no one left to be examined, and then I presume that the evil will cure itself.

I admit that examinations in music, when conducted by a body of musicians of high rank attached to a *bona-fide* institution, do good service to scholastic musical art; but when Tom, Dick, or Harry set up in examination business, the thing seems a trifle ridiculous.—I remain, yours truly,

August 12, 1889.

M. KINGSTON.

## NOTATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—I am glad to see your remarks in THE MUSICAL TIMES (page 400), on music in elementary schools, and the effect of Notation on orchestras. The management of these schools is guided by a code of regulations, the spirit of which is to implant, if possible, in each child, sufficient knowledge and power of communication to make him a useful member of society, whilst developing in him sufficient mental ability to secure him a fair start in the exhilarating race for life's prizes. With these ends in view the Code has been made to refuse exclusive recognition of a decimal system of computation, with its attendant advantages of sublime ease to the teacher, since such a system completely fails to maintain commercial intercourse; and, again, for somewhat similar reasons it has refused an exclusive recognition of phonetic systems. Now the framers of the Code are not generally musicians, and therefore in musical matters have been compelled to act in accordance with the advice received from musical men. At the proper moment Tonic Sol-faists pressed their claims on the attention of the Education Department; the musical profession, much to its detriment, made no reply, and so we have had duality in Notation established. When this was secured Mr. S. Curwen stated that within ten years a complete musical revolution would be accomplished among the masses of the people. We are nearing the end of this period. Can Mr. Curwen point to any promise of the fulfilment of his prophecy? I am fully persuaded that he cannot, and that his failure to do so is to be attributed to the fact that his second Notation fails to put its disciples in communication with musicians. But this is the one purpose of Notational teaching, and yet, probably for the want of organisation, English musicians have neglected

their simple duty, and the interests of what they are pleased to term their divine art, and have, without remonstrance, allowed the expenditure of what may ultimately become millions on the teaching of a Notation which altogether fails in its purpose, and which, for its inutility, should have been rejected without one moment's hesitation.

No doubt the difficulties of Staff teaching were at one time very considerable, but as a result of experience its teaching has been rendered so rapid that Mr. Curwen with just one lesson of ten minutes, and, if I recollect rightly, in one case of five minutes, has been able to teach children who had never before attempted anything beyond Sol-fa to sing perfectly from the Staff. Here is most conclusive and satisfactory evidence that the inherent difficulties of the Staff are not insurmountable. Many of us, however, are inclined to doubt the general marvellous results of this one solitary lesson; but we feel deeply that for want of Staff teaching the music results in elementary schools are not satisfactory, since all the boys are leaving school with a knowledge of vocal notation only, whereas they are unable to use their voices for two, three, or four years, at the end of which time their musical knowledge and zeal will have evaporated. With an acquaintance with the Staff thousands at this very susceptible age would be flocking to teachers of instruments with whom they would have been put in communication, and thus the one purpose of Notation being fulfilled we might hope for the multiplication of orchestras and music in the people's homes in addition to the simple creation of a few choirs such as are the possible present result of a very immense expenditure.

I am, Sir, faithfully yours,  
FRED. W. WAREHAM.

South Norwood, July 13, 1889.

#### PIANOFORTE FINGERING: A PLEA FOR GREATER UNIFORMITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—I do not suppose that teachers will ever agree about the fingering of irregular passages—such as cannot be referred to any *one* technical head. But with scales in single and double notes, and arpeggi—matters of technique, pure and simple—the case is quite different. Here uniformity would be a boon indeed, and to this end may I suggest a few points which cry aloud for settlement. First, with regard to scales. The principle of Kalkbrenner, Plaidy, and Hallé was to finger every scale, whether commencing on the tonic, mediant, or other degree, like C major wherever possible. Tauzig, an essentially modern authority, favoured this view, which, nevertheless, is generally supposed to have been exploded when Herz put forward his rule of "the same finger for the same note, whatever degree the scale may begin with." The latter is doubtless the easier to remember, but this advantage is more than counterbalanced by the awkward positions of the hand which it induces. Herz's system is adopted by Messrs. Lebert and Stark in their "School," and with petty modifications, which destroy its characteristic feature, by Messrs. Macfarren and Pauer. Here then we have a practical issue. Which system is best? Is that of Herz generally adopted? If so, has it been adopted from a conviction of its merits, or merely from fashion? The relative advantages of the two systems should be discussed and threshed out. Were a consensus of opinion on this and kindred points obtained from celebrated players—Madame Schumann, Messrs. Brahms, von Bülow, de Pachmann, Reinecke, Henselt, Rubinstein, and Saint-Saëns would make an excellent jury—a system might be established which should command the assent of every reputable professor, and thus put an end to the multiplication of muddle which now goes on.

Then in the matter of arpeggi, there is a point which wants settling. Should all common-chord arpeggi, major and minor, which begin on a white key be fingered 4 3 1 + in the first position (left hand)? Plaidy says they should, but Mr. Macfarren fingers 4 2 1 + in the arpeggi of D, A, E, B, and F sharp; and, alternatively, in A flat, E flat, and B flat. Lebert and Stark make still more use of the second finger. This point is considered trivial by some teachers; others again lay great stress upon it.

Next, with regard to "double" scales. These are much

practised now-a-days, and rightly so. They are the best of all technical exercises. Yet here the different manuals present most glaring discrepancies in fingering. These scales cannot be played absolutely legato. "Es genügt wenn in aufsteigender Scala beim Uebersetzen der obere, in absteigender Scala der untere Ton des Doppelgriffs gebunden wird" (Lebert and Stark). At best there must be an auricular illusion. Then why not go a step further, and allow the use of the thumb on consecutive keys in executing double thirds? In actual practice it is often so employed by very good players. There is a wide field here for scientific discussion. Previous to Chopin, double thirds and sixths were not much written except in Toccatas and Studies. Even in Beethoven's Sonatas I can call to mind no extended scale passage of this kind.

Another moot point is the fingering of the chromatic scale in double minor thirds. Comparing Tauzig's fingering of these with Mr. Macfarren's, I can only wonder.

Just a word on the melodic minor scale. A crotchet has got abroad that this should not be practised in thirds, in sixths, nor in contrary motion. The opinion of the best authorities, from Clementi downwards, has ever been that they *should* be so practised. I must protest against the dogmatism and assumption of infallibility which prevail among the authors of technical studies. I contend that no teacher has a right to set forth new fingerings without adducing reasons for discarding the old.—I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

WALTER BROOKS.

2, Gladys Road, N.W.

#### AUTHORS' NAMES ON PROGRAMMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—It is the custom now-a-days to give, on a Concert programme, the name of the composer *only* of a song, and no acknowledgment whatever of the author's work is made. Now I think it may be fairly acknowledged that the words of a song are of as much importance as the music, so why should not the author's name as well as the composer's be given?

A song written in collaboration would be given in the programme thus:—

SONG .. .. "Star of Bethlehem" .. { F.E. Weatherly.  
Stephen Adams.

the first name being that of the author and the second that of the composer.

A song written and composed by one person would be given thus:—

SONG .. .. "Ehren on the Rhine" .. { M. Hutchinson



with the name in the middle of the bracket.

I hope, with your assistance, to induce Musical Directors of Concerts in future to give authors due credit for their labour.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

12, Pier Head, Wapping, E.,  
August 16, 1889.

#### MUSICAL SIGNS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE MUSICAL TIMES."

SIR,—I should feel obliged if you would correct an error in relation to my Organ piece mentioned in your July number. Your writer says that I dispensed with the clefs. I have not done so, but I have given the original correct meaning to those signs which have been so absurdly corrupted in the course of centuries that it is difficult now to recognise in  and  the letters G and F. The G clef

has gone through about nineteen changes and the F clef at least twenty-seven since their use. Now as these hieroglyphics express letters, why not give them in an intelligible manner? Surely the learner of music has quite sufficient difficulties, and sometimes even absurdities, to contend with; why should the right representation of such important signs be withheld from him? For a long time I have used real letters and also omitted the superfluous repetition of signatures. In a long composition, say with five sharps or flats, the engraver has several hundred, *thousands* in some cases, of these signs to engrave without benefit to any one except to those deprived of memory. If the repetitions can