THREE LATIN HYMNS
By C. E. Pocknee

(i) Te Deum Laudamus

In a previous article we wrote on one of the most ancient and widely used hymns of Christendom, namely the Gloria in excelsis. We now propose to say something in regard to the equally celebrated canticle, Te Deum.

Unlike most of the ancient canticles of the Church, this one is not drawn from, nor directly inspired by, the words of Holy
Scripture. It was not written in Hebrew, Syriac or Greek, but in Latin, a fact of which the revisers of the Book of Common Prayer failed to take note in 1662. Consequently, *Te Deum* does not conform to the 'parallelisms' of the psalms and other canticles as the Anglican revisers alluded to mistakenly supposed by inserting a colon in every verse. It will be helpful if we provide a translation of the original Latin text as follows:

We praise thee, O God, we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.
All the earth doth worship thee, the Father everlasting.
To thee all angels cry aloud, heaven and all the powers therein.
To thee both cherubim and seraphim continually do cry:
‘Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts;
Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of thy glory’
The glorious company of the apostles, the praise-worthy band
of the prophets, the white-robed army of martyrs, praise thee.
The Holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge
thee the Father of an infinite majesty; thine adorable, true
and only Son:
Also the Holy Ghost, the Comforter.
Thou art the king of glory, O Christ.
Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father.
Thou didst take upon thee to deliver man. Thou didst not
abhor the Virgin's womb.
When thou hadst overcome the sting of death thou didst open
the kingdom of heaven to all believers.
Thou sittest at the right hand of God in the glory of the
Father:
We believe that thou shalt come as judge.
We therefore pray thee, help thy servants whom thou hast redeemed
with thy precious blood.
Make them to be numbered with thy saints in glory ever-
lasting.

It is at once obvious that the canticle is somewhat shorter than
the version provided in the Book of Common Prayer and the
Roman Breviary. The termination of the hymn at 'Make them
to be numbered' etc. shows that the original hymn was a canticle
to the Blessed Trinity with a final section on the Incarnation
of Christ and his high-priestly intercession and mediation. All of
which accords with the objective aspects of early Christian praise.
The verses commencing 'O Lord, save thy people' are a later
addition and there was some variation in their text. Also they
were intended to be sung in the form of verse and response.
They introduce a penitential note which is absent from the original
canticle.

Who was the author of this noble hymn? Tradition says it
was St Ambrose of Milan (d. A.D. 397), and that it was sung on the
occasion of the baptism-confirmation of his friend, Augustine of
Hippo, who became the outstanding figure in the North African
Church. This tradition is to be traced back to Hincmar of Rheims
writing in 870. Dr Julian in his Dictionary of Hymnology dis-
misses this as 'destitute of any other authority than that which
may be given it by the reference to Hincmar'.

Eminent modern scholarship including Zahn, W. H. Frere,
Cagin and A. E. Burn, has ascribed this canticle to Nicetas, bishop
of Remesiana (A.D. 392–414).

But in 1938 Dr Ernst Kähler published at Göttingen, *Studien
des Te Deum und zur Geschichte des 24. Psalms in der Alten Kirche.*
In this there is a very thorough investigation of the structure
and content of the canticle and a study of its liturgical sources.
Dr Kähler's conclusion is that *Te Deum* in its original form belongs
to the Vigil Mass of Easter Even which concluded the rite of bap-
tism-confirmation; and at this Mass the newly-initiated would be
making their first Communion. The verses 'We therefore pray
thee, help thy servants whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious
blood. Make them to be numbered with thy saints in glory ever-
lasting' having special reference to the newly baptised.

The tradition as to its use at the baptism of Augustine would
not, therefore, seem so improbable as the pundits have tended
to suppose. Moreover, the traditional melody associated properly
with this canticle is always termed the 'ambrosian' melody, and
certainly Ambrose was a composer of plainchant. The reader may
conveniently see this melody set to the English text in *A Manual of
Plain-song*, edited by J. H. Arnold (Novello). In the same book
there is also the simplified version of this melody which was pro-
vided when the canticle was first sung in English in 1547, prior to
the appearance of the first English Prayer Book of 1549.

It is by many centuries of use at the Office of Matins in the
Latin Breviary and later in the Book of Common Prayer that this
great hymn is most widely known and used. But it has been used
at the coronations of emperors and kings, at the enthronement of
popes and bishops, as well as at the celebrations of victories all
through the Middle Ages and down to modern times.

It is one of the few Latin or Western hymns that has been
adopted by the Byzantine or Eastern Orthodox Church, where it
is used on occasions of thanksgiving and has been translated into
Greek and Slavonic.

*(2) GLORIA LAUS ET HONOR*

The English-speaking world has become familiar with J. M.
Neale's translation of *Gloria laus et honor* by St Theodulf of
Orleans as 'All glory, laud and honour'; and the hymn rightly
enjoys a very widespread use in its English dress.
But its reputation was widely and firmly established long before Neale’s translation appeared in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was regarded as an essential part of the Latin ritual on Palm Sunday and was an invariable feature of the procession that took place on that day. Every parish church, cathedral, monastery and abbey had such a procession, as we can see in the rites used in England, France, Italy and Germany throughout the Middle Ages.

The authorship of the hymn has never seriously been questioned. Indeed, Lupus de Ferrières (d. c. 862) ascribes it to Theodulph; and this must be considered contemporary evidence as the latter died in 831. But recent commentators have been guilty of some strange and careless aberrations in regard to the provenance of this hymn. Thus Anton Baumstark, the celebrated German liturgist, in his Comparative Liturgy (page 159) says ‘The hymn betrays its Orleans origin’ and he then quotes line 43 as evidence, quos habet Andegaviis venerabilis ambitus urbis. But he seems to have confused the Latin name of Angers (Andegavum) with that of Orleans (Aurelianum). Also the editors of (American episcopal) The Hymnal Companion (page 47) state that the hymn was composed at Angers or Metz. It is true that Amalarius of Metz (d. 890), who was an observant and prolific commentator on the liturgical customs of his age, has three chapters on the observance of Palm Sunday in his De ecclesiasticis officiis; but he says nothing in regard to Theodulph’s hymn. Also Metz is in eastern France and not in the Loire valley where Angers and Orleans are situated.

A careful reading of the complete poem, which consists of 78 lines in couplets (see Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetarum Medii Aevi, Tome 1, pp. 538–9), will show that it was undoubtedly composed at Angers, where, in 820, Theodulph had been imprisoned by King Louis the Pious. Not only does the line we have quoted mention the city of Angers, but in lines 49–56 there is a lengthy enumeration of the places in that city which the Palm Sunday procession passed on its way to the cathedral church of St Maurice, which is also mentioned by St Theodulph in line 73, hinc pia Mauricii veniamus ad atria sancti.

Neale’s translation, like the text in the Latin Missal, consists only of the first twelve lines of the poem. While the legend that the King heard Theodulph singing this hymn out of his prison window at Angers on Palm Sunday, and thereby ordered the bishop’s release, may be fictional, there can be no doubt that it was composed at Angers by Theodulph. The later custom of having a group of boys singing the refrain from a gallery or high position in a church is to be traced back to the fact that at Angers the singers were stationed on the city wall as the procession passed through the city gates on its way to the cathedral.

(3) Veni Creator Spiritus

Probably the most celebrated and widely used of all Latin hymns is Veni Creator Spiritus, whose authorship remains uncertain; but it is generally agreed that it was written in the ninth century, most probably in northern France or the Rhineland. Its ascription to Rabanus Maurus (d. 856) is very doubtful. Used first of all as the Office Hymn at Terce during the octave of the feast of Pentecost, it came to enjoy a wider and more celebrated use in connexion with the ordination of bishops and priests and the coronation of emperors and christian kings. It was also used at the Mass of the Holy Ghost which was celebrated before great Councils and synods were held. It is found in the ordination rites of a group of eleventh century pontificals of northern France, including that of Soissons. From there it spread over most of western Europe.

The hymn has been used continuously in the coronation of English sovereigns down to Elizabeth II. It makes its appearance in the English coronation rite in the Liber Regalis used first at the sacring of Edward II in 1307.

The most familiar English translation is that of Bishop John Cosin, ‘Come Holy Ghost our souls inspire’, which came to be included in the ordinal of the 1662 Prayer Book. But Cosin’s version is a very loose paraphrase which misses much of the significance of the Latin original. A more accurate and preferable English version is that which appeared in Hymns A & M, 1904 edition, No. 181, ‘Come Holy Ghost, Creator blest’, which was the work of W. H. Frere and A. J. Mason based on an earlier version by E. Caswall. This version has now been included in the ordinal of the American Episcopal Prayer Book as well as The Hymnal (1940) of that Church. It also appears in the office books of a number of Anglican communities including The Monastic Diurnal, edited by the late Winfred Douglas. We are glad to note that the authentic version of the melody of this hymn is provided in the foregoing books. In England the editors of English hymnbooks still provide the debased ‘Tichbon’ version of the melody, although at the coronation of the last two English sovereigns the authorities at Westminster Abbey have used the proper and authentic melody.
AN 'HONEST TO GOD' CONTROVERSY, 1866
(This is a rough transcript of material used recently at a service one Sunday evening in Augustine-Bristo Church, Edinburgh.)

Lord, thy word abideth,
And our footsteps guideth
Who its truth believeth
Light and joy receiveth.

Who can tell the pleasure,
Who recount the treasure
By thy Word imparted
To the simple-hearted.

Henry Williams Baker, 1861.

The Bible was the pleasure of the pious and the treasure of the simple in 1861, when those lines were written. This is the story of how the Bible became a centre of controversy and grief, and it must end with the question whether we can ever recover our innocence: or if we cannot do that, whether we can recover the pleasure: or if we cannot even be sure of that, whether we are bound, if we are simple, nowadays to miss the treasure.

In a poor family in Cornwall a boy was born in 1814. His name was William Colenso. (If anybody has a name as curious as that you can usually count on his having come from either Cambridgeshire or Cornwall.) Colenso became a diligent, and then a brilliant, scholar, and in due course was elected a ‘sizar’ of St John’s, Cambridge, where he read Mathematics and became a ‘wrangler’. He became a schoolmaster at Harrow (1839), then returned to be a tutor at St John’s (1842), then vicar of Fornett St Mary in Norfolk (1845). He published textbooks on arithmetic and algebra, and edited, with a colleague, W. H. Coleman, a famous, no doubt notorious, school book called 'Examples in Arithmetic and Algebra'. In 1853 he was appointed, at the age of 39, Bishop of Natal.

For the rest of his life he remained a missionary bishop; he died in Africa in 1883 after thirty years of it. Scholars do not go to the mission field now as frequently as they did then; but those were days of primary pioneer work, and Colenso's thrusting scholarship became one of the main tools of his missionary trade — and also the cause of an alarming dispute. For his scholarship was of the inquisitive kind, not the contemplative kind, and it was no time at all before the pattern of things to come made itself clear.

In the first place, he lost no time in teaching Kaffirs to read, to write, and then to print their own books: and, of course, he translated parts of the Bible for them to read in their own tongue, including the opening of Genesis and parts of the Books of Samuel.

It was also no time at all before he made his first controversial decision, which was, against Christian public opinion, to allow polygamous converts to the Faith to keep their wives.

Colenso's was an inquisitive mind because he was, in a mild sense, a man of the new science. He had lived in his student days with the habit of enquiry, and of proof. Studying the Old Testament with this new missionary purpose, he came to certain conclusions which he published in a massive 'Critical Examination of the Pentateuch', whose first part appeared in 1862. The previous year, 1861 (what a year! the death of the Prince Consort, the publication of Hymns Ancient and Modern, the building of Augustine-Bristo Church), he had published a commentary on Romans in which he threw doubt on the church's sacramental habits; this was scandalous enough, and to some extent made him a man to be watched for heresy.

When he came out with the (at that time) staggering theory that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, and that the first five books of the Bible were, in his perhaps unfortunate words, post-prophetic forgeries (Deuteronomy he claimed to be a forgery by Jeremiah himself), scandal was so sore that his archbishop (Gray of Capetown) deposed him from his bishopric. Colenso consulted his lawyers, who took the matter to court, and the court found for Colenso to the extent of confirming his right to control certain church properties in Natal. Colenso therefore disregarded the archbishop's inhibition, and continued to minister among people who held him in the highest regard.

In England opinion ran strongly against Colenso: the bishops, with one dissentent, called for his resignation and gave their support to the archbishop of Capetown. Samuel Wilberforce is reported to have said that 'the Mathematical Bishop could not forgive Moses for having written the Book of Numbers', and there was more in that than a dash of episcopal wit, for one of the stages of Colenso's critical argument was an examination of the use of numbers in the Pentateuch, and a demonstration of their unreliability. Colenso's method was audacious. As we now realize, those already very familiar to German scholars: but Dean Stanley, says a modern English historian, 'recorded the horror created in rural districts by the rumour that a book had appeared in which Abraham was described as a “sheikh”'. By contemporary standards, Colenso's views were both crude and mild, but they were enough to cause a schism. A schism it literally was, for not only did Colenso carry on until his death in 1883, but the schism was not properly resolved until the Reverend A. Hamilton Baynes was appointed Bishop of Natal in 1891. Colenso left behind him a 'party' which refused to support the legally consecrated bishop until that year.

This has brought us to the year 1866, and it was in that year, just a hundred years ago, that a young London curate, aged 27,
was moved to express his reaction to this affair in lines which have become one of the primary folk-songs of the church:

The church’s one foundation
is Jesus Christ, her Lord;
She is his new creation
by water and the word;
From heaven he came and sought her
to be his holy Bride,
With his own blood he bought her
and for her life he died.

Though with a scornful wonder
men see her sore opprest,
By schisms rent asunder,
by heresies distrest,
Yet saints their watch are keeping,
their cry goes up—“How long?”
And soon the night of weeping
shall be the morn of song.

Young Samuel John Stone, curate to his father at Haggerston, London, was among the young conservatives who keenly felt the grief of schism. He took down his Bible—the Bible which, as he felt, the pestilent Colenso was robbing of all its authority (and thereby robbing the simple of their pleasure in it)—and opened it at Ephesians 5, 24—6:

Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it: that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.

Out of that text he constructed one of the most evocative verses in all hymnody—the first verse of this hymn. From there he went on to pour out his soul in that third verse—a verse whose omission by some hymn books robs the hymn of so much of its splendour and tragedy. (I cannot forgive myself for allowing my colleagues on Congregational Praise to commit this unhappy error.) Stone’s hymn was written in 1866, and the first hymn book to publish it was Hymns Ancient & Modern, in its edition of 1868. It at once became so popular that Stone was invited to revise it and extend it for use in large processions, and Julian’s Dictionary prints out the whole ten-verse hymn to which by 1885 it had grown. But the new verses have little merit compared with those that first became familiar, and still are socelebrated.

Now the remarkable thing is this: whereas we all love, accept, and profit by Stone’s splendid hymn, we all to a greater or less extent accept the principles on which Colenso stood. We don’t talk now of ‘juries’ and we don’t claim that Jeremiah wrote Deuteronomy, but we do accept (most of us) the aim of Colenso that the Bible should ‘be read like any other book’. The history has been painful enough. There were times when godly men had to revive the old protest against those who treated the Bible with such ruthless and philistine academicism that it seemed that nobody could be sure where to find authority, let alone ‘treasure’, in any part of it. There were times when men took advantage of what they thought were the results of scholarship so far as to say that only those parts of the Bible which appealed to themselves as preachers need be regarded as authoritative.

But what Colenso got into such trouble for saying, and what others were saying with less disastrous effects to themselves, is something which we cannot now unlearn. Moses did not write the Pentateuch: nobody seriously thinks he did. All this is a quite remarkable example of how church history really works: of the strange ways in which the Holy Spirit uses human error and human defect and somehow builds them into the fabric of history. For look at Stone’s hymn again, and at that verse in Ephesians again, and consider what Colenso might have said (may well have said) about it. Stone has taken a profound verse from Ephesians; but he has used it not in the new way as if Ephesians was a part of a book, but in the old way as if every separate verse was an oracle. The subject of Ephesians 5 is morals, and of Ephesians 5, 22—33, marriage. The love of Christ to his church is an illustration of what marriage ought to be like. It is, indeed, the best thing on marriage in all the New Testament outside the Gospels, for all its strange-sounding emphasis on the dominance of the male. Stone, in the manner of all ordinary parsons of his time (and of eighty per cent of parsons of our own) has lifted words from their context and hung high doctrine on them.

We can be sure that the mathematical Colenso, who was probably as short on poetry as all radical religious conservatives tend to be, would have disapproved as irrelevant the clever (and perhaps unintentional) transformation of the ‘marriage’ theme in Ephesians 5 into the theme of the Bride of Christ, more directly associated with Revelation. And Colenso might have been ironic about the identification of the backwoods bishops with the ‘saints’ in verse 3.

But who shall say, in the end, whether Colenso was ‘right’ or whether Stone was ‘right’? Colenso said, in effect, ‘I will not teach these innocent negroes in Natal what I cannot myself believe’. In a missionary situation he placed honesty before piety. Stone went to the Bible and did the one thing with it which Colenso probably never did, nor wanted to do—he made it lyric: he made it sing. Colenso brought the Bible up to date. ‘Abraham was a sheik’ is just the kind of thing that does make the Bible ‘live’. Stone threw
the Bible out to a distance and made it shine from there, uttering an unforgettable phrase that would send people back to Ephesians 5 and urge them to get new ‘pleasure’ and ‘treasure’ from it in that way.

What do we conclude?

First: that in the world as we have made it, the work of the Holy Spirit in taking the things of Christ and showing them to us is accompanied with a certain amount of groaning and travelling: and some of that groaning and travelling is ours to suffer. One thinks of such things when one sings those lines which had been written at about the same time, in a very different context of tragedy and controversy, by the young American divinity student, John White Chadwick.

We would be one in hatred of all wrong,
One in our love of all things sweet and fair,
One in the joy that breaketh into song,
One in the grief that trembleth into prayer:
One in the power that makes the children free
To follow truth, and thus to follow thee.

John White Chadwick, 1864.

When the American Civil War was still raging (and we are not done with it yet), the young student, aged 24, wrote that hymn for his graduation day: he wrote the date above it—June 19th, 1864. One in the joy; one in the grief. That they may all be one—our hope and our Master’s prayer—but through what dispute and disaster that oneness must come, only our own history can teach us.

Second: there really is a sense, and this is what our whole treasury of hymnody tells us, in which the artist can be the reconciler. We are the heirs of the scientific age, the age of enquiry and evidence and proof: we live in the technological age: we are about to enter the age of automation. Anesthesics—aeroplanes—computers (computers which some have used to demonstrate that Paul did not write Stone’s text)—that is the pattern. Men ask questions, they seek practical answers, they wonder what exactly is going to be the role in the future of human creativeness and decision. Well — Stone wrote what we all sing, whatever our theology. Colenso told us to come close to the Bible and scrutinize it; Stone told us to stand away from it and let it speak dramatically, symbolically, but not necessarily with its human authors’ voice. I am myself convinced that in our own time, when there has been a new dimension of godly thought opened up by a Bishop who has been much reviled for his pains, but who has said things which he can never unsay, and which the rest of us cannot pretend we have not heard even if we hate them, the reconciling answer may yet come from those who remind us that there is a fundamentalism of mathematics, as it were, as well as a fundamentalism of piety. The answer to both is the ability to listen, and the person who really uses that faculty in himself and who demands it of others is the artist.

Therefore (third), what our hymn-writers do for us is to gather us together under a vision, leaving us to interpret it each as best he may. The hymn-writers are not there primarily to instruct us, though they often do that. They are there to enable us corporately to stand at a distance and allow the vision to play on us. You can now forget all I have said about Samuel John Stone and Bishop Colenso, if you are so disposed. Certainly when you sing ‘The church’s one foundation’ you are not required to think consciously of the sorrow and dispute out of which it came. But you most certainly are required to notice its reference to the Bible, and the way it uses the Bible: and you are required to be receptive to its mounting passion, even if you find its closing verse something of a period-piece. Don’t expect your hymns to do for you what your preachers are there to do, or what the writers of your commentaries are there to do. The hymns play their part: they do not take the whole task on themselves. The part they do better than the commentators or the preachers is in restoring the sense of ‘pleasure and treasure’ to the Scriptures which they adorn.

I used to be told, and to be told by people I revered so much that I believed it, that hymns that do not use Biblical language are to be avoided. I was brought up to despise ‘City of God’ and felt guilty whenever I was moved to choose it in a service. Even that I do not now believe. Rounding off our praises with a hymn written again in 1864 by another American of enquiring and independent mind, I choose ‘City of God’ because I believe that it has not driven a single soul away from the faith by being unbiblical as certainly as some far more biblical-sounding hymns have done. At least there is a vision there. At least there is urgency and hope. It is no more literal history than Genesis 3 is, or the Book of Daniel. But its craftsmanship is such as few writers of that time could rise to. It comes from a protest against the in-group stuffiness of the church, against the temperament that persecutes any who threaten its comfort. It is, in its way, a great hymn that needs to be vindicated. At any rate, it is the right hymn for this occasion.

In vain the surge’s angry shock,
In vain the drifting sands,
Unharmed upon the eternal Rock
the eternal city stands.
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HAS ANYONE ELSE NOTICED...?

By K. D. SMITH

1. That what used to be the first tune in *Hymns A & M* (No. 11 in Revised Edition), described by Frost/Frere as a 13th cent. melody given by Guidetti’s Directorium for the Office Hymn at the Lesser Hours, is the melody for the Responsories at the Lesser Hours in Eastertide. In other words, that AMS 1/AMR 11 = EH 740.

2. That the plainsong melody at EH 61, described by J. H. Arnold as “Source uncertain, probably English”, is the carol *Ein Kind geboren zu Bethlehem* (Oxford 85; Cowley 1; and another version in EH itself 44). Which came first? Is the plainsong version a ‘back-formation’?

3. That the old 120th, from Day’s Psalter of 1570, which Ravenscroft (1621) called an “Italian tune” is in fact made up of phrases from the simpler melody to *Alma Redemptoris Mater*. Cf. AMS 770/AMR 259; EH 464; with WH 261.

The six lines are thus derived: 1. Alma
2. Redemptoris Mater
3. Stella maris & Virgo prius
4. Ac posterus
5. Gabrielis ab ore
6. [Miserere]

4. That in Holst’s setting of *Lullay my liking* (Oxford 182) the melody of the words in verse 5 *all his blessing that now maken cheer* is the second phrase of *veni emmanuelli*. The two can be consulted together in *University Carol Book* 79 and 13.

5. (But surely everyone has spotted this?)—That in Henry Smart’s tune *gloria* (AMS 436 i) the first 4 bars are *The Vicar of Bray*.

**Editorial interpolation**

6. The affinity between *Nun komm der heiden heiland* and *Auctori-tate saeculi* (Compare EH 110 with EH 176 or AMR 387 i).

WHY PLAINSONG?

A review-article on the re-issue of J. H. Arnold’s *Plainsong Accompaniment*, reprinted from the *Church of England Newspaper*, August 13th, 1925, by kind permission of the Editor

By CHARLES CLEALL

No more important book than this on music is ever likely to reach these offices. First published by Oxford University Press in 1927, it has been out of print long enough for its unofficial second-hand price to rise to ten guineas a copy.

We must be quite clear about this: *Plainsong Accompaniment* is one of the world’s classic texts. The beauty of its thought, and the literary merit of its style, make it delightful as a piece of English, no matter what one’s indifference to its subject. As a piece of instruction, it is superb: the number of musical examples (well over 300 short or full-line before the extended versions at p. 107 are reached); the simplicity of its gradation; the intricacy, thoroughness and comprehensiveness of its detail; the perceptiveness with which the author sees into the mind of a beginner; make it above price, and very nearly beyond compare.

Is not 25s. a big sum to put down for one book?

In these days, no. Two books at 15s., five books at 10s., 20 books at 5s. will not prize us for the work as well as this one.

Is not its subject quite outside the range of skills necessary for an Evangelical organist?

By custom and the accident of history, perhaps. By the measure of the fullness of the riches of Christ, no.

Here is food for thought, and nourishment for our emotions, and sustenance for our immortal souls.

In the first place, it teaches us how to chant those portions of God’s Word which were written to be chanted: “The basic principle is, that all the notes have equal time value... Plainchant takes the rhythm of the words by enunciating certain syllables with a stronger emphasis than others; but it is an emphasis of stress, or weight, or pressing: not of lengthening the time-value... The student who has been lucky enough to have made his first acquaintance with plainsong by hearing a competent choir sing psalms cannot fail to be most forcibly impressed by two outstanding characteristics: one is the pause of silence at the colon making the half-verse—long enough, it has been suggested, mentally to repeat the words ‘deep breath’: *the pause here must be jealously guarded*; there is a tendency for it to disappear altogether, but it should be retained even if the psalms are being said without music.”

In the second place, it carries us into a realm of experience in which, musically, “He hath made all things new”: in which, for
Jesu's sake, the world is furnished as it was before, but so changed in its alignment and priorities as to be free from all compulsion of worldliness, and free to embrace the Risen and Ascended Lord; for "the ideals which we have set before us are no mere revival of an antique fashion; still less the shibboleth of a moment; but fundamentally the unique method of answering questions and fulfilling desires which are rightly uttered now, and have been so uttered throughout the Christian ages."

Do we want plainsong to supplant all other types of music?

Of course not!

The Church contains saints; but not only saints. "Babes in Christ" need the "pure milk of the Word," and the nursery songs of the Gospel, if they are not to bite off more than they can chew.

Even so, we must have some plainsong, "to set a standard, and to guide us," if we are ever to acquire a taste for holiness in music. It brings all subsequent music to the bar of judgement; and that, Divine judgement. Even the pop-merchants know the unique power of its idiom to evoke the numinous; to express "an odour, wilder than the sense," of heavenlyness; to rouse a hunger of the heart for that which abideth and is sanctioned.

Listen again to the Righteous Brothers singing: "You've lost that Lovin' Feelin'"; to the introduction to Roy Orbison's solo, "P{rove, as a land to explore. At first, he will go as he is hidden. Later, his practical experience will help him to move about in them with increasing familiarity; and so he will come to learn their full

THE HYMN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

We are asked to convey the apologies of the American Hymn Society to those of our members who subscribe to its funds and expect to receive its publications. Difficulties of an unexpected kind have surrounded the American Society during 1965, and supplies of their publications have been held up. We are assured by Dr. Deane Edwards, President of that Society, that the issues of The Hymn for 1965 will be sent to subscribers quite soon. An issue dated January, 1966, has already been distributed.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE FOUNDLING HOSPITAL HYMNBOOK?

Dear Editor,

I am anxious to refer to a copy of whatever hymnbook was in use at the Foundling Hospital in London in the 20 years or so after 1880, the year in which Myles Birket Foster became organist.

If any member of the Society has such a book (with tunes), or knows its title, I should be grateful to hear from him. If the book used was a standard one with a special Supplement, then the title and date of the Supplement are what I am seeking.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN WILSON.

30 East Meads,
Guildford, Surrey.

SUBSCRIPTION REMINDER

The Treasurer would be grateful to hear from those Members who have not yet sent him their subscriptions (15s.) for 1966.
CONFERENCE, 1966

Programme for the Conference of the Hymn Society of Great Britain and Ireland to be held in Cambridge, July 12th to 14th, 1966. Accommodation and lectures will be at Westminster College.

Tuesday, 12th.
2.30 p.m. Executive Committee at The Union Society
Tea at the Union Society
5.00 p.m. Lecture by Dr A. L. Peck:
“A critical appraisal of J. M. Neale as a translator”
Chairman: Dr F. Brittain
6.30 p.m. Evensong at St. John’s College Chapel
7.35 p.m. Dinner
8.30 p.m. Lecture by Revd John B. Geyer, M.A.:
“The intentions of some modern hymn writers”

Wednesday, 13th.
9.15 a.m. Executive Committee
10.45 a.m. Coffee
11.15 a.m. Lecture by Revd Dr Adam Fox:
“The place of Keble and Neale in Church History”
Chairman: The Bishop of Ely
1.00 p.m. Lunch
2.15 p.m. Annual General Meeting
Tea at Ely
5.00 p.m. Evensong at Ely Cathedral
7.00 p.m. Dinner
8.30 p.m. Act of Praise, led by Revd C. E. Pocknee, commemorating John Keble and John Mason Neale, at Little St. Mary’s Church, Cambridge

Thursday, 14th.
Breakfast

Accommodation charges. Full period, excluding afternoon teas, approximately £4 10s.od. Payment pro rata by those able to stay only part time.
There is ample out of doors parking space at Westminster College.
Make your bookings through the Secretary—as soon as you can.