

The Art of the Organ Programme

Author(s): Luther L. Jupp

Source: *The Musical Times*, Vol. 51, No. 811 (Sep. 1, 1910), p. 588

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/905680>

Accessed: 01-12-2015 18:01 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*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Correspondence.

DR. ARNE'S RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE MUSICAL TIMES.'

DEAR SIR,—I am afraid that my article in your June number must have been rather badly worded if Dr. Grattan Flood can see in it any corroboration of his statement that Dr. Arne acted as organist of the Sardinian Chapel in Lincoln's Inn Fields. There is nothing as to this in Mawhood's diary, and considering how good a Catholic and how enthusiastic an amateur Mr. Mawhood was, one would naturally expect to find it mentioned if Arne had held the post of organist at the Sardinian Chapel during the period (from 1764) covered by the diary. But Dr. Grattan Flood apparently has some new source of information about Arne. His detailed account of the death-bed recantation and reception back into the church by Father Peter Browne has, so far as I know, not previously appeared in print. The Rev. John Kirk's 'Biographies of English Catholics in the eighteenth century,' indeed, states that Father Browne, in 1778, received the Rev. George Chamberlayne, but it says nothing about his having performed a similar office to Arne. Dr. Flood would therefore be doing a kindness to reveal the source of his information.

As to Arne's will having been made in order to avoid the penalties under which Catholics laboured, I have always understood that the inability to bequeath only applied to real property, and what Arne left to his wife and son consisted in personalty of the smallest value. But as to this I write subject to correction, and Dr. Flood probably can inform your readers what the law exactly was in 1777.

I notice that my article needs correction in one point. Francis Barthélémon was married to Mary Young, who was a niece (not a sister) of Mrs. Arne's.—Your obedient servant,

WM. BARCLAY SQUIRE.

THE ART OF THE ORGAN PROGRAMME.

TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE MUSICAL TIMES.'

SIR,—As a humble student of the King of Instruments and also a recitalist in a small way, I should like to take exception to a considerable amount of what Mr. Grew says in his interesting article on the Art of the Organ Programme (July number, p. 436).

I do not agree that the average programme is inartistic in its construction; but I mainly take exception to Mr. Grew's idea as to how programmes should be arranged, and venture to think that if his suggestions were carried out, they would have the effect of alienating the musical (as well as the unmusical) public from the none too well patronised organ recital. He says that 'changes must only be partial,' and regards 'unity' as *the* thing to be borne in mind. Although agreeing that there should be unity in the sense that every item should be of the highest class of music, I submit that *variety* is the secret of an artistic (and attractive) organ programme.

Mr. Grew opines that many organists neglect the higher branches of their art for the shallower details of displaying their agility and the variety of the resources of their wonderful instrument. What does he mean by this? If he refers to second-rate compositions and works totally unsuitable for organ performance, I am with him; but if he means some of the modern magnificent organ music and transcriptions, I fail to see that, if these are artistically played, he has anything to complain of. Surely he has admiration for fine organ technique, clever registration and stop control. He also thinks that the organ is an impersonal instrument; but is this quite consistent in the light of his previous remarks in reference to registration, &c.? The personality of the player is very forcibly demonstrated to me at recitals I attend every week in town, given by various performers on the same organ.

Why should not Lemare's dainty Andantino be placed after a Bach item? I have heard Mr. Lemare himself play Bairstow's Scherzo after the Toccata in F.

I have also heard another fine performer play Tchaikovsky's 'Romance sans paroles' in F immediately after Guilman's Funeral March and 'Hymn of Seraphs,' and, to me, it was a pleasing contrast, as against (as I presume Mr. Grew would have it), say, a Choral Prelude of Bach.

Neither do I think it is a question whether Lemare's Romance in D flat is a companion piece to Bach's Toccata in F or not. We do not *always* adhere to the principle of putting like with like. Supposing the movements of the great symphonies and sonatas of Beethoven were constructed on the 'unity' as against the 'contrast' principle, would they be so enjoyable? That is mistaking uniformity and monotony for unity. I think that the beautiful Romance in D flat is a well-contrasted piece to be set against the glorious Toccata in F. And because a piece of a lighter character precedes or succeeds a very important Bach item, it does not necessarily infer that the latter will be played half-heartedly, as Mr. Grew seems to suggest. I should rather imagine the reverse would be the case, as, if it were not for variety, our lives would hardly be worth the living.

Then he praises the programme starting with Guilman's Grand Chœur in D, followed by the overture to the 'Messiah.' To my mind, this is monotony itself. Surely a piece of a particularly subdued character (preferably one of the *cantabile* type) would best follow Guilman's Grand Chœur. And apart from this, although I am a fervent admirer of Handel, I do not think the overture to the 'Messiah' is a suitable recital item, although quite admissible as a church voluntary.

Then he eulogises the placing together of Mendelssohn's Sonata No. 3 and Franck's Prelude, Fugue and Variation, both of which are very fine, but nevertheless essentially erudite works, thus tending to monotony. Following this come Chauvet's 'Les Cloches' and Rheinberger's 'Visione,' *both in the same key*, thereby starting with two pieces of the same style, and proceeding in a similar manner. He would also have, in one programme, no less than three pieces by one composer, namely, the Prelude and Fugue in D minor and the Passacaglia in C minor, besides an Aria of Bach, two of which, at least, are in minor keys, whilst the Passacaglia finishes with a fugue. And yet another fugue is thrown in, by Liszt. Has he not lost sight of the fact that, to some, the appreciation of many of the superb organ works is an acquired taste, and that giving too large a dose at a time is not likely to increase such appreciation? Three fugues in one recital would get on one's nerves.

But ideal organ programmes, to my way of thinking, are to be found in those provided at recitals given by an ideal organist, whose playing I was pleased to see your valuable paper praised so highly recently. The programmes always show a great amount of forethought, there being no monotony of key, style, time taken to perform, &c., but everything beautifully contrasted.

Programmes on such lines as these, admitting of latitude and variety, yet every piece of the highest class, constitute, in my humble opinion, ideals in the organ recital programme.

Yours, &c.,

Cricklewood.

LUTHER L. JUPP.

At the Royal Academy of Music, the following awards have recently been made: The Charles Lucas Silver Medal (composition) to Emma Lennox; the Schloesser Prize (accompanying) to Evelyn Cook; the Anne E. Lloyd Exhibition (singing) to Gertrude Walton; the Parepa-Rosa Gold Medal (contraltos) to Bella Newstead; the Julia Leney Prize (harp) to Violet M. Scotts; the James Tubbs & Son's Prize (violin) to Nellie Fulcher; the Hill & Sons' Prize (violin) to Willie Davies; the Dove Prize (for general excellence) to Phyllis Norman Parker; the Charlotte Walters Prizes (elocution) to Lily Fairney and Violet Leonard; the Betjemann Gold Medal (operatic singing) to William J. Samuëll; the Westlake Memorial Prize (piano-forte) to Elsie Jones; the Hannah Meyer Fitzroy Prize (violin) to John Spink; the Alexander Roller Prize (piano-forte) to Dorothy Craske; the Ridley Prentice Memorial Prize to Lucy Ehrmann; the Bowen Gift to Willie Davies; the Lesley Alexander Gift to Benno Pitt; the Challen & Son Gold Medal to Adela Hamaton; the Chappell Pianoforte Prize to Frank Hutchens.