Mr. Wilfrid Dunwell, organist and choirmaster, Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds.
Miss Doris Fenner, organist and choirmaster, St. Cuthbert's, West Hampstead.
Mr. Henry C. Hart, organist and choirmaster, Kentish Town Parish Church.
Mr. Frederic Lacey, organist and choirmaster, St. James-the-Less, Westminster.
Mr. G. McNaughton Harvey, organist and choirmaster, Wallasey Parish Church.
Mr. J. L. Slater, assistant-organist, York Minster.
Mr. B. M. Waugh, organist and choirmaster, Christ Church, Bootle.

---

**Letters to the Editor**

**THE CONDUCTOR AND HIS FORE-RUNNERS**

Sir,—In your January number Mr. Wyatt challenges my accuracy. He has overlooked a somewhat material point, namely, that he, in the 20th century, is impugning the statements, not of myself, but of writers from the 12th to the 17th centuries, or even later. He does not support his argument with those categorical references without which historical research is valueless. I must refer him to my earlier chapters for an attitude in this respect.

Two further quotations may be of help to those of your readers who have been interested in those chapters:

1. *Ipsil [i.e., Alleluia] nomen tribuentur Antiqui. Ab alis sequentes dictae sunt quia sunt quaedam veluti sequela et appendix cantici Alleluia, quae SINE VERBIS [my capitals] post ipsum sequuntur.* Mr. Wyatt can find this and a dozen similar references in one of the authors whom I have mentioned. It is not unreasonable to believe that these were the sources of the almost literal statement in *Grove* (2nd ed., iv., 416): ‘Sequentia originally was a long jubilus or melody without words.’ Whatever the later meaning of the word ‘sequence,’ at first it had nothing to do with words. Paradoxically the Prose ‘followed’ the Sequel.

The second quotation is this, which touches upon a far-reaching question of philology quite as much as of history:

[my capitals] post ipsum sequuntur.’ Mr. Wyatt can find

Mr. B. M. Waugh, organist and choirmaster, Christ Church, Bootle.

---

**MUSIC IN WORSHIP**

Sir,—I think the reasons for drawing upon the *English Hymnal* for illustrations, rather than *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, are:

1. The latter book so often plays fast and loose with the ‘old’ tunes. Compare, if you will, such examples as:

   8 A. & M. with 250 E.H.
   439   "   " 202 "
   86   "   " 86 "
   201   "   " 277 "

2. It is scarcely necessary to point out how impossible the plainsong tunes become as set out in A. & M. Compare:

   15 A. & M. with 263 E.H.
   45 "   " 1 "
   99 "   " 94 "

The 1889 edition of A. & M. is indicated here. The 1904 book is infinitely superior to the old, but this very fine hymnal has not received the attention it deserves.

In answer to Mr. Marriner’s aspersion, may I refer him to the Preface, which reads: 'It is not a party book, expressing this or that phase of negation or excess, but an attempt to combine in one volume the widest expressions of all that lies within the Christian creed.'

History repeats itself. Fifty years ago it was said, ‘Ah! that book A. & M., which is administering popery to our people in homoeopathic doses.’—Yours, &c.,

WILLIAM WALLACE.

11, Ladbroke Road, W.11.
January 7, 1924.

---

**DO COMPOSERS UNDERSTAND THE TRUMPET?**

Sir,—Mr. H. A. Marriner’s letter in the last issue of the *Musical Times* surely advises a difficult task to those responsible for the careful selection of our church hymns and tunes, when the *English Hymnal* is so infinitely superior to *Hymns Ancient and Modern*.

The beautiful Bach settings to such hymns as *Wachet auf* and *Nun frest Euch*, mentioning two only, to say nothing of the delightful collection of plainsong hymns and melodies, and the Communion hymns, the majority of which are quite congregational, in the *E.H.* bear no comparison with such a quantity of bad hymns and ironed-out tunes as are found in the *A. & M.* collection.

Our congregations sorely need healthy and robust hymns, full of melody, not sickly sentimentalism.

Many people are apt to cling tightly to the things they learnt in their youth without pausing to ask whether such are now worthy their riper experience.—Yours, &c.,

Frensham.

VICTOR J. C. G. BALL.
Surrey.

---

Sir,—I have just finished a close perusal of *Hymns of the Kingdom*, edited musically by Sir Walford Davies, and if we have not at last the ideal hymn-book (there are only some two hundred hymns in the collection), I venture to say we are now nearer to it than we have ever been before.

Those of us who, while agreeing that the sentimental part-song type of tune so largely represented in the old *A. & M.* book has now fulfilled any purpose it ever had, yet refuse to bow the knee to the secular and other monstrosities which form so large a proportion of the much vaunted *English Hymnal*, will find in this new book a real *via media* between the two extremes, and *no fades—folk-song, sugar, or any other variety!* On the other hand there is evidence of real musicianship in the setting out and arrangement of practically every tune in the book.

I write this letter quite as an outsider, entirely unacquainted with any of the promoters of the book; but in the hope that it may perhaps cause an organist or clergyman here and there to obtain a copy, and above all to read and if possible act upon the inspiring suggestions set out in the *Musical Editor’s* preface.—Yours, &c.,

Wells, Somerset.

M. P. CONWAY.
Then, again, where is the sense in writing \( \texttt{\textit{ff con sordino.}} \)? A trumpeter can blow his hardest, and is hardly audible with that sort of music about—any sort of music, against a full orchestra. No doubt the piercing quality of the high notes is wanted at times, but why so much?

In Lalo's Le Roi D'ys there are fifty-four consecutive bars of one recurring note, viz., B above the staff, in triplets. I don't know how it sounds to the listener. I know it is very difficult to play. I should think it sounds something like a siren or steam whistle. I wonder whether Lalo knew what he was writing. No doubt he was aware of the compass of the instrument, and he wrote half a tone from the top note. He couldn't know the difficulty, the high and tiring tension of the lips. It is something like writing pages of A's and B's for tenors to get on with. We know how much they would enjoy them!

Occasionally music is met with that is impossible. There are some passages for trumpets in a Suite by one of our foremost composers which I should say are unplayable. These consist of several recurring bars of eight semiquavers, in two-four time, \( \texttt{Presto} \) (I quote from memory, but correctly, I feel sure):

![Presto](image)

The Suite is taken at about the same tempo as, or perhaps a little faster than, the well-known quick-step in William Tell. At moderate tempo or even allegro there is not much difficulty—but \( \texttt{Presto...!} \). It is like the rattle of a side-drum. A piccolo might manage it, but not a trumpet. I think it would surprise some of our conductors if they asked their trumpets to play it and similar passages alone, without the cover of the full orchestra. In this instance it is taken too fast to render correctly, or to tongue it really as it should be tongued. The player simply scrambles in here and there, coming in well on the last note.

In another composition, \( \texttt{Kítzhara} \), by Liadov, the composer seems to have no use for any but top notes. He has written bar after bar of monotonous repetitions of one note, the highest on the instrument. Writers like Liadov may be gifted or talented in other directions, but they would not seem to know much about the trumpet. (\( \texttt{TRUMPETER.} \))

**THE DOH-MINOR: A WARNING**

*SIR,—I feel the letter in your January issue should not pass unanswered.

I have no personal or other interest in Doh-minor or La₁-minor, but as a teacher of sight-singing, ear-training, and harmony, all of which subjects must be linked together for purposes of study, I have an interest in discovering the most musical and the most logical method of presenting pitch-relations to the minds of young music students. Your correspondent quotes a short melodic extract with its translation in Sol-fa notation. Taking that as his text, he holds up to ridicule what is known as the Doh-minor method of representing in Sol-fa the minor key. I know nothing more of the extract or of its source than what is stated in the letter. From the Sol-fa translation supplied, those responsible for this regard it as belonging to C minor. Their decision is, I suppose, based upon a study of the complete piece, melody and harmony. That is the way a musician would instinctively approach the subject. If the Tonio Sol-fa College, intent upon demolishing a method with which it does not agree, can find condemnation only in short melodic extracts of a quantitative character, then its case must indeed be a weak one. Believers in the Doh-minor are not yet reduced to methods of this kind. Only recently there came before me a piece of evidence in support of the Doh-minor which to my mind is conclusive. In the Cathedral Psalter Chants, the first

Psalm for the sixth morning is set to the following chant by Hayes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a) Major:} & \quad D \quad D \quad D \quad D \\
\text{(b) Minor:} & \quad D \quad \text{ mas} \quad \text{ mas} \quad \text{ mas} \quad \text{ mas}
\end{align*}
\]

The first six verses are sung in the major key (a), then five in the minor key (b), and the last verses and Gloria in the major key (a). The harmonies are simple, and identical in each key, allowing for the difference between major and minor. Can anyone who has a feeling for the mental effect of the different notes of the scale feel that when we pass from the major form to the minor form, and back again to the major, with similar harmonies in each form, that the Doh has been altered? Surely if the major form is

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(c) Major:} & \quad \text{D} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas} \\
\text{(d) Minor:} & \quad \text{D} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas}
\end{align*}
\]

then the musical and logical representation of the minor must be:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(e) Major:} & \quad \text{D} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas} \\
\text{(f) Minor:} & \quad \text{D} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas} \quad \text{mas}
\end{align*}
\]

To link up the minor version to the key of C and call it

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(g) Major:} & \quad L \quad L \quad L \\
\text{(h) Minor:} & \quad L \quad L \quad L
\end{align*}
\]

seems to me opposed to musical feeling and to common sense. Surely this latter is the method which all who aspire to be musicians rather than Tonic Sol-faists should be warned against, even if it is true, as your correspondent states, that 'all the leading music publishing firms in this country adhere to it.'—Yours, &c.,

Sydenham, S.E.

FREDERICK G. SHINN
January, 1924.

*SIR,—Referring to Mr. Walter Harrison's letter (January number, page 64), one would like to know exactly what he means when he says, 'out of this simple phrase of ten notes, not one of which is out of the key, no less than four are chromatically altered in the Doh-minor version.' To what key does he refer?

If he considers the passage as being in E flat major there is nothing more to be said. But if he regards it as being in C minor, as presumably he does, it cannot be correct to call the intervals of a minor third, minor sixth, and minor seventh from the key-note 'chromatic.'

We shall all agree as to the construction of the minor scale, the difference of opinion being in the nomenclature of the various degrees.

It is my humble opinion that until the key-note is called Doh in both major and minor modes, the real differences existing between the two modes will never be thoroughly understood by the majority of students. The method is difficult only because it is new.—Yours, &c.,

Forest Gate, E.7.

LOUISE DUGDALE

**VOICE FAILURE**

*SIR,—I have read with interest and considerable puzzlement, Mr. David Houston's letter in your issue for October last.

It seems to me that all these arguments about reeds and vocal cords, as well as false vocal cords, referred to by Mr. Hunt in the same issue, are swept aside by the established fact that Mr. White tested his Sinus tone-production theory, before proclaiming it as a fact, by restoring the voice of a man of twenty-eight years, who had had his vocal cords totally excised as a child. The restored voice was a normal man's voice, and as Mr. White alone has given us a constructive alternative in his Sinus tone-production, the vocal cord enthusiasts are placed at a disadvantage at the very outset—and Sir James Cantlie's teaching gives them the 'knock-out.'

Mr. White restored my voice after my throat had been pronounced incurable, an operation being suggested...