'Neither the enjoyment nor the capacity of producing musical notes are faculties of the least direct use to man in reference to his ordinary habits of life.' So says Mr. Darwin;* and yet, a little further on, we read:—'I conclude that musical notes and rhythm were first acquired by the male or female progenitor of mankind for the sake of charming the opposite sex.' We may leave the reader to reconcile these two ingenious statements, the last of which seems to be in contradiction to the first. To 'charm the opposite sex' is surely now, as it has ever been, one of the most 'ordinary habits' of man, and we ought to admit that if the 'capacity of producing musical notes' is calculated to help him in this arduous undertaking, then this 'capacity' is of some 'direct use' to him. That music has a great many other uses, it is our object on the present occasion to prove: meanwhile, we have quoted the above statements, not because they appear to be in one respect contradictory, but because in them we have the latest scientific testimony concerning the uselessness and the usefulness of music.

The origin of Vocal music has been the subject of much conjecture. Whether we think, with Mr. Darwin, that music was developed from cadences used to charm the opposite sex and expressive of strong emotion; or, with Mr. Herbert Spencer, that music was developed from the cadences of emotional speech—whether speech preceded music, or music preceded speech—is of little importance to our present inquiry; in either case, the Singing Art would have to be traced to one and the same root, viz. the vocal expression of emotion through sound. The famous hairy creature with a tail and pointed ears may have been the first distinguished vocalist, for aught we know—at all events, we are not in a position to dispute the fact.

The origin of Instrumental music is not far to seek. We need hardly quarrel with the mythic account. Very likely, the
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* 'Descent of Man,' vol. ii. p. 293.
wind blowing into broken reeds as they stood up stiffly in some low marsh-land or river may have suggested the first rude Pan-pipe, of which the flute would be a later modification. Dried sea-weed, stretched on rocks or shells, may possibly have been the primitive Æolian lyre, from whence came the harp and guitar. The clapping of hands, or the knocking of two bits of stick together, may have suggested the numerous drum tribe, from whence would come, in due time, every variety of percussion instrument. It is true, when we think of a percussion instrument like the grand piano-forte as derived from knocking two bits of sticks together, or an Erard harp as descended from sea-weed fibres stretched on rocks, or the Crystal Palace organ as having originally come from a few rotten reeds blown upon by the fitful wind, the missing links seem innumerable, but a musical Darwin would make very light of the difficulty; and, indeed, the difference between Nature's musical instruments and the latest attempts of man in a similar direction is not nearly so great as the difference between that early Ascidian from which the progenitors of man are said to be descended and the highest, not to say the lowest, representative of man with which we are acquainted.

We need hardly have recourse to the Egyptian or Assyrian monuments to prove the immense antiquity of wind instruments. In one of the tombs at Poictiers, Dr. Cannes, of Paris, and M. Lartet have discovered an undoubted flute, belonging, in all appearance, to the later stone period, and at all events pre-historic. M. Fétis, in his 'History of Music,' gives an exact representation of it. It is made out of a bit of stag’s horn, and lay surrounded by flint arrowheads and other stone implements. Another excellent flute, of reindeer’s bone, four holes, and a blow-pipe—inecontestably a flute and nothing but a flute—was found by M. Lartet in a cave, amongst the bones of extinct races of animals.

Nearly three thousand years before the Christian era the first Emperor of China, Fo-hi, is said to have invented the stringed instrument called kin, which consists of a strip of wood, over which silken cords are stretched. The kin is laid on a table, and played like the modern cither, with the fingers of both hands: its sound was held in China to calm the passions and inspire the mind with virtuous sentiments.

Percussion instruments, such as drums, sonorous bits of wood or metal struck with hammers, are the most universal of all instruments. The shock produced by them upon the rude nervous system is found most useful in promoting a kind of frenzied ardour for battle; nor is it less favourable to the paroxysms of ascetic
ascetic devotion common amongst uncultured races. Most pagan
gods are supposed to be delighted with the noise produced by
yelling, clapping, and banging gongs about; and amongst
savage tribes, sacrifices and religious ceremonies are usually
accompanied by percussion instruments of every description.
Most savages are deeply alive to the charms of accentuated
rhythm, expressed by a hammering on drums. The tribes of Cen-
tral Africa have a habit of stringing half-a-dozen drums between
two poles, and strumming six at a time, whilst an ebony enthusiast
stands opposite this demoniac orchestra to mark the rhythm.

It is impossible to say when stringed instruments played
with bows were first invented. Some such instrument has been
known in India from time immemorial; it is also to be found
amongst many savage tribes, and, although apparently unknown
to the Greeks, or rejected by them as too barbarous, some kind
of bowed instrument appears, from a very early period, to have
been known to the Northern races of Europe.

Now, regarding as we do all the above methods of howling,
blowing, twangling, and hammering—in other words, all delib-
erate attempts to express emotion through sound, as so many
rough elements of music—we may fairly affirm that the art of
producing musical sounds is the most ancient and universal of
all the arts. It is the most ancient, because, according to Mr.
Darwin, it is a quality common to the animal creation as well
as to the earliest races of mankind; and it is the most universal,
because we can find no race, ancient or modern, which has
been entirely without it.

Hitherto we have spoken of all kinds of sound as musical;
but it would be more correct to say that most of the sounds
found in nature, or used by savages, are the mere rough ma-
terials out of which musical notes have to be manufactured. It
is true that any noise acts, in some way or other, upon the emo-
tions by setting the auditory nerves in vibration; but for the
purposes of musical art we must select only those kinds of
sound, those forms of vibration, which possess certain properties
of pitch, intensity, and quality.

First, then, what constitutes Pitch? When we speak of the
pitch of a note, we mean that the sonorous body or instrument
from which it comes is vibrating so many times a second.
These vibratory movements are communicated to the air, and
the air communicates them, through the elastic pressure of its
waves, to the complex system of fibres stretched upon the drum
of the ear, which collects them for transmission, through a
winding labyrinth, to the auditory nerve, from which they are
passed on to the brain. But the perceptive powers of the human
ear
ear are limited. No sound can be heard if the vibrations are too slow, or less than four or five (or, according to M. Savart, six or seven) to the second; or too quick, that is to say, more than 67,000 to the second. Shril sounds of 30,000 are very unpleasant; but cats and other animals, whose ears are in some respects more highly organised than ours, can hear many sounds inaudible to human beings. As to pitch, then, the limits of musical sound will be within about six octaves.

Secondly, what constitutes intensity? As pitch is regulated by the number, so intensity is regulated by the force of the vibrations. This force is communicated to the air, and the air-waves produce, in proportion to their force, a greater or less degree of tension in the membrane of the tympanum. A very feeble sound is not sufficient to make the tympanum vibrate at all, and a very violent one—such as the explosion of a cannon—sometimes cracks it; and thus it is no mere metaphor to speak of the drum of the ear being broken. The intensity of musical sound will, therefore, be found to lie in the mean between the too feeble and the too forcible.

Thirdly, what constitutes quality? The quality or timbre of a sound, i.e., the quality which makes the difference between the same note played on a flute or on a violin, depends neither upon the force nor on the rapidity of the vibrations in the instrument—in the air—in the ear. Upon what, then, does this all-important attribute of sound depend? We must try and imagine a vibrating body, such as the back of a violin or the tube of a diapason, to consist (as is actually the case) of a vast number of lines distributed in a vast number of different layers of matter. All bodies are composed of such countless different molecules, arranged in layers and packed in different degrees of density. When we set our board, violin, or organ-pipe in vibration, these molecules begin to move; some vibrate feebly, some strongly, whilst certain others remain at rest. By strewing sand on the back of a violin whilst in vibration, or affixing a pencil to an organ-pipe, the form of the vibrations representing the disturbance of the molecules may in either case be obtained in lines. These lines then indicate the different arrangement of the molecules of matter in violin, wood, or organ-pipe, which yield a different order of molecular vibration, and transmit to the air differently formed waves, and consequently a different stroke and quality of sound to the ear.

We have now refined our rough element of sound by determining its pitch, its intensity, and pointing to the existence of various qualities or timbres; but we have yet to distinguish properly between musical sound and Noise.

M. Beauquier
Music: its Origin and Influence.

M. Beauquier gives the following explanation of the difference between noise and musical sound.

A true note, or musical sound, contains in itself a third, a fifth, and an octave. In addition to the fundamental note, a cultivated ear will be able, under certain experimental conditions, to recognise these other three, like faint musical emanations. These three are called the fundamental harmonics of a note, and every sound is thus complex, just as white light is complex, containing within itself what may be called the three harmonical colours, blue, red, and yellow. Now, when the ear receives one distinct sound, and the accessory harmonics are at the same time of very faint intensity and very high in pitch, then we have a pure or clear musical sound called a note; but when the accessory or harmonical sounds are so loud, confused, and so near to the fundamental note that we have difficulty in separating between them and the note itself, then we have the negation of musical sound—that is to say, noise. The Chinese gong is an admirable example of unmusical sound, or noise, and a well-tuned kettle-drum is almost as good an example of a true musical note.

But when we have thus manufactured our materials we have not arranged them. We have got the threads, but we have not woven them into any fabric—we have not invented any pattern—we have not given them any form—we have not created any work of art. We might as well give a man a bundle of coloured threads, and expect him without machine or instruction to produce an Indian shawl, as give him musical notes without teaching him the secret of the scale, or of symmetrical arrangement, and expect him to produce melody and harmony. We are still a long way off from what we call music.

Now before we enter upon any further account of the rise and progress of the musical art, the question naturally arises, What claims has it upon our attention? What wants does it meet? Why is it worth studying?

We might point to the fact that people nowadays spend much time and money upon music. But why do they do so? Because it gives them very keen enjoyment. Why does it give them enjoyment? what is the enjoyment worth? Is it pleasure and nothing more, or is it pleasure and something besides? What right have we to speak of Beethoven in the same breath with Goethe? In what sense is the musical composer a teacher or an intellectual and moral benefactor? All such questions, and many more like them, which are asked more frequently than they are answered, may be summed up in a single sentence,— What is the dignity of the musical art? To this question we hope to give some definite reply.

Speaking
Speaking generally, all the arts may be said to have arisen out of a certain instinct, which impels us to make an appeal to the senses, by expressing our thoughts and emotions in some external form. When a man is haunted by the beauty of the outer world, when he has been for a time purely receptive, watching the light upon summer fields or through netted branches, or at evening the floods of liquid fire that come rolling towards him upon the bosom of the sea, at last before his closed eyes in the dreams of the night there arises within him the vision of an earth, and sky, and sea even more fair than these; and seizing his palette and canvas in the morning, he endeavours to fix the impalpable images which have almost pained his heart with their oppressive loveliness. Who can look at some of Turner's pictures, and see there 'the sunshine of sunshine and the gloom of gloom,' without feeling that the picture stands for the deliverance of a soul's burden? It is its own justification. No one asks first why it gives us joy, or why it is so good; that questioning may come afterwards and may have to be answered, but our uppermost thoughts are such as these:—'I, too, have had such visions, but never till now have they lived and moved before me: henceforth their life is doubled because revealed; their beauty is painless because possessed: now that I have imprisoned this fleeting memory, it is mine for ever—κτιμα εις αει. In freeing his own soul the painter, the orator, the poet has freed mine; I shall not suffer in this direction from the void and the agony of the unattained, for it is there worked out for me and for all men to rejoice in and to love.' Therefore the great justification of all art is simply this—that all life tends to outward expression, and becomes rich in proportion to the degree and perfection with which it is mastered inwardly and realised outwardly.

It is evident that the artistic instinct is involved in the constitution of our nature, and only waits for the peculiar times and seasons favourable to each of its several developments. Hence in all sorts of ages and countries we find traces of the arts, but only in certain countries and at certain epochs the full development of any. The seed of a political system, of a religious creed, or of a new art, may lie long in the fallow ground of history, waiting for the mysterious and happy combination of circumstances necessary to its special development. By and by this nation will be ready for such a government; and that form of government, which may have tried in vain to spring up before, will then rise. Such has been the history of representative government in England. By and by a nation will feel the need of a new intellectual form for its religion; and then,
then, and not before, will the new system prevail. Such has been the history of the Protestant Reformation. By and by the æsthetic and imaginative impulses of a people will demand a certain appropriate channel of expression; and then the art which can best express the imperative mood of the popular life is certain to spring up. That is the history of all Literatures, and also of the directly sensuous arts of Sculpture in Greece, of Gothic Architecture in modern Europe, of Painting in Italy, and, finally, of Modern Music in Italy, France, Belgium, Germany, and England. Each art has been strikingly appropriate to its own age, and each art has more or less exhausted the impulses which it was destined to express. We will now endeavour to show the real position and speciality of music amongst the arts, by a general glance at some of the art developments of the past.

No doubt the art of sculpture existed in a rude form amongst those Eastern nations from which Greece derived the germs of all that she ever possessed. Yet we do not admit any high development of sculpture to have taken place before the period of Grecian art, or about B.C. 500; nor do we venture to say that the works of Phidias and Praxiteles have ever been surpassed. The fact is, that sculpture was the art which rendered concrete, or gave outward expression to, the Greek's highest idea of what was desirable and excellent in life. He was passionately enamoured of the external world. Beauty had no hidden meaning for him; the incompleteness or insufficiency of life never occurred to him; there seemed no moral, no aspiration written upon the face of man or nature: hence he loved outline better than colour, and cared more for form than for expression. His life was exceedingly simple; his intellect remarkably clear and active and subtle; he lived much out in the open air, gossiping incessantly, learned a little Homer and a few lyrics, sometimes peeped into a work of Anaxagoras or Zeno, at other times amused himself with the disputations of the Sophists, or listened to the orators in the Agora. But whatever else he did, his body was his first care. The staple of his education consisted in gymnastic exercises and the cultivation of rhythm as applied to motion. His greatest admiration was lavished upon a beautiful human body, and in Greece there was never the slightest difficulty in studying the human form divine. What every one was proud of, every one was prone to exhibit; and what was universally exhibited and admired naturally became the object of the most elaborate and successful cultivation. Hence Greece, in her eager simplicity, her exquisite perception, her naïve enjoyment of life, and her material prosperity,
prosperity, found an appropriate expression for her ideal in the Art of Sculpture.

If we glance at Rome in her best days, we shall hardly be surprised to find that she had no original leanings in the direction of the sensuous arts. The art expression, if such it can be called, of her ideal is to be found in the Justinian code. Her notion of life was not beauty, but law, in its most prosaic aspects: stern patriotism, regulated by military despotism; stern justice, regulated by civil law. She had no time to design her own public buildings; she borrowed the designs from Greece. Her statues and her ornaments, when not actually made by degenerate Athenians, were but the cold parodies of Grecian art. It was not until centuries later, when the old Empire had been split up into a thousand fragments, that a new and genuine art began to arise in Italy,—but an art responsive to a new age, and to an utterly changed state of political life and religious feeling. We allude, of course, to the Art of Painting, which culminated in the sixteenth century in the schools of Padua, Venice, Umbria, Verona, Bologna, Sienna, Florence, and Rome.

But there is one growing characteristic of the art of the new world after Christ as contrasted with the art of the old world before Christ, which it is highly important for our present purpose to notice. That characteristic is its ever-increasing tendency to express complex emotion. The Greek schools which succeeded Phidias indeed supply numerous expressions of suffering, such as the Laocoon; action, such as the Discobolos; and occasionally some simple and strong emotion, such as the Niobe.

But even in the post-Phidian period, when emotion is expressed at all, it is usually of a simple and direct kind; the fever of the new world had not yet set in. Upon the religions of the past the accumulated moral influences and religious feelings which we are in the habit of expressing by the one word Christianity, broke like a second flood, submerging the old philosophies and the old faiths. The rise of that tide was irresistible, and it brought with it the elements of a new ideal life, in violent antagonism to the traditions of many an earlier civilization. Thanks to this antagonism, which drew hard and fast the line between the Church and the world, the emotional life of the early Christians was also simple and strong. Missionary work afforded an ample and sufficient outlet for feeling; there was little time for anything else. The New Church shrank from Heathen art, as the Jews had shrunk from Egyptian images; and although a reformed Orpheus cropped up later in the character of the Good Shepherd, preference was given to mere symbols, and
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and only a few coarse representations of Christ, His apostles or His miracles, were allowed to grace a religion which was intended to appeal to the spirit more than to the senses. Then, when the Christian seed had been sown throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire, the beginning of the end drew nigh; and we have heard to satiety how the Gothic hordes came down from the Northern Alps upon the plains of Italy, and how the worn-out organization of the Empire fell like an avalanche before the breath of spring. But the imperial sceptre had only passed from the Emperor to the Bishop of Rome, and it was under the timidly admitted presidency of the Pope that the Christian Church first stepped forward as the inspired guide, ready to reduce to order the confused life and weld together in new combinations the heterogeneous elements of the old and the new worlds.

The rise of the Roman Church and the rise of the nations of modern Europe after the death of Charlemagne (814) gave birth to what we call the modern spirit, which is emphatically the spirit of a complex emotional life. In Italy, after the close of the ninth century, the stiff forms of Byzantine art had entirely ceased to have any charm for a nation distracted with wars, and in the eleventh century Italian art had reached its lowest condition.

But another art had already begun to assert itself in France, in Germany, and in England—an art which, taking its rise amongst the masonic guilds, found its perfection in the cloister, yet mingled freely with the world, and became in a remarkable degree the monumental expression of its 'lights and shadows, all the wealth and all the woe.' Gothic architecture received some of its finest developments at the hands of priests, but the Gothic temples were the darlings of the people and became the models of popular architecture for the nation. Into them, as we can see to this day, were woven the miseries and the joys, the wild fancies, the morbid tendencies, and the confused aspirations of a spiritual faith, struggling with new and untried aspects of social and political life. It is unnecessary to describe all that the Gothic architecture of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries strove to express. How highly emotional it became they know who have marked the faces that peep out between the network of leaves or clustering fruit in florid architrave and capital. When the art began to lose all temperance, and assumed wild and flamboyant forms, it was simply because the artist was in despair at not being able to transcend the plastic limits of his material—to express the varied emotions which were daily becoming more numerous and more oppressive, and which
which neither stone-carving nor any other known medium could suffice to express. But a more highly emotional art was already preparing to take its place—the art of Italian painting—which, beginning with Cimabue (born 1240), gradually rose along with the decline of Gothic art until, with the successors of Titian and Tintoret, that too had exhausted its emotional functions and began to decline along with the rise and sudden ascendency of the latest and most perfect art-medium of emotion—MODERN MUSIC.

There never was a time in the history of the world when life was so rapid and human emotion so complex as it has become during the last three centuries. The printing press, the discovery of America, the increase of commerce, the general circulation of thought, have given rise to abnormal combinations and changes of which the old world never dreamed. This has generated a peculiarly restless and feverish temperament of life. Can we wonder that art should try to keep pace with these developments—that in its own region, that of the emotions, it should twist stone into every conceivable shape, and then cast it aside as inadequate; then seize upon colour, and after depicting through its aid every possible scene capable of exciting the imagination, still pine for some more complete expressional medium? And now what more could be done by art than Raphael, Titian, Michael Angelo, had accomplished? What still cried out for direct expression which they had not been able directly to express? Something there was in those independent states of consciousness generated within the mind—something there was in what we call emotion, and especially complex emotion—which called for direct expression, and which found it not in carved stone or limited canvas. What was that something? In a word, it was Movement or Velocity. That is a fundamental property of all emotion. There was no direct expression for that in sculpture, or architecture, or painting: the stone did not move; the scene on canvas, however excited, required an effort of the imagination before it became a thing of motion; the battle raging on canvas was an aesthetic fiction—it acted upon that inner movement of the mind, which is so fundamental a property of emotion, not directly but only through the imagination; the colours did not change; the canvas was as still as the stone. For a perfect emotional art actual velocity was indispensable, and it is the addition of this one property which the art of music alone possesses in combination with all the other properties of emotion that makes music the supreme art-medium of emotion.

One thoughtful glance is sufficient to show us that the rough elements of emotion and the rough elements of musical sound have
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have all the common properties which fit them for meeting upon a common ground and for acting upon each other.

Emotion is never long at the same level; it has its elotions and depressions. Sound, as manipulated by the art of music, has its elotions and depressions—musical notes go up and down in the scale.

Emotion has various intensities. Musical notes, as has been seen, directly communicate various intensities of sound to the drum of the ear; music has its *ff* and *pp*, its *crescendos* and *diminuendos*, its loud and soft combinations of instruments.

The progressive steps in a continued state of emotion have something like form; they can be arranged; they have a beginning, a development, an end, or, at all events, somewhere a transition to a different region of feeling altogether. Music has a form, obvious even to the eye; the notes indicate a theme or subject which is developed and brought to a close; the words *unity, proportion, development*, are sufficiently familiar to all readers in connection with music.

The meeting of two or more emotions—such, for instance, as is the case when we pass out of a dark room into the light, or when we hear a sudden burst of laughter in the midst of intense grief—these are simple enough forms of complex emotion; but in all complex emotion we get simultaneous variety. Need we say how wonderfully harmony in music, even a simple chord, possesses the property of such simultaneous variety?

And lastly, the progress of emotion is fast or slow; at all events, it is incessantly beating out time with every pulse and throb of the blood; in other words, it has its velocity; and this is the important quality which makes the 'Sound Art,' of all arts hitherto discovered, the great medium for the expression and for the generation of emotion, simple or complex. No outward presentation of scene or action is needed, as in the drama—no aid from imagination, as in painting or sculpture—in order to supply velocity or movement. The sound vibrates directly upon the drum of the ear; the auditory nerve receives pulse after pulse, and transmits it to the emotional region of the brain. Emotions, simple or complex, are thus generated directly and physically by the power of sound, without the aid of imagery or thought; and, again, emotions already working in the brain find relief in the sort of outward and concrete expression which the art of music procures for them.

If, then, at this stage of our disquisition it be asked what is the use of music, we ask in reply, What is the use of stimulating, regulating, and disciplining the emotions? What is the use of providing for them a pcyho-physical outlet, when they are
are excited or roused? Music excites, expresses, regulates, and relieves the life of emotion. These are its functions and these are its uses. Life is rich almost in proportion to the fulness of its emotional activity. As a physical fact, music re-creates exhausted emotion by nerve currents generated through direct vibration of the nervous tissues; and by the same means music arouses and cultivates emotion into its highest activity. Again, life is noble almost in proportion to the strength and balance of emotion. Control of emotional activity is as essential to worthy life as the abundance of emotion. Noble music possesses this power of controlling and disciplining emotion to a consummate degree. The notion that music is only intended to please and tickle the ear is a notion worthy of a savage. To listen to a symphony of Beethoven is not all amusement. The emotions aroused are steadily put through definite stages, just as definite and just as salutary to the realm of feeling, just as well calculated to bring it into discipline and obedience, as the athlete's progressive exercises are calculated to strengthen and discipline the muscles of the body. The emotions are not allowed to run wild. The music, if we put ourselves to the strain of following it, checks them here, rouses them there, holds them as it were in suspension, gives them a fair vent at times, shows them the way out of unrest into rest, and out of varied and apparently inconsistent states of discord to harmonious development and unity. The mere intellectual task of appreciating the technical form and excellence of a truly great musical work or Tone-Poem is no light one, but it is a highly refining one. Nevertheless, the intellect in music must be held subordinate to the plain purpose of elaborating schemes of complex and simple emotions: it is this power which raises music, through, but beyond, connection with the senses, into a moral agent.

That all music is not of this kind, is not calculated to stimulate and arrange the emotions beneficially, may be taken to be a self-evident fact. Much of Italian and French music is so wedded to languishing sentiment or absolute frivolity that the best-disposed musician cannot treat it au sérieux, as the presentation of emotion in any salutary or re-creative order. Place any Italian love-song by the side of one of Schubert's Romances, and the emotional difference will be apparent to any one at all capable of enjoying music. The Italian view of love and the German view of love are well represented in the different emotional atmospheres of Italian and German songs. The music of Italy expresses passion without restraint; and then follows of necessity sentiment vamped up with artificial shocks and thrills to supply the place of exhausted passion. That, with all its exquisite gift of melody, with all its cunning
cunning appropriation of melting, though limited, harmonies, is
the morale of modern Italian music:—of course we do not
allude to the great schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth
centuries.

But when we pass to Germany, we have to come to the ‘true
and tender North.’ Life is there no dream on a Venetian balcony,
love is there no short-lived rapture of summer days and starry
nights; but ‘life is real, life is earnest,’ and love is of such fabric
as will last out a lifetime and be true to the end; and, therefore,
there must be restraint and economy of passion, there must be
the middle tints as well as the glowing lights, there must be mid-
night watches as well as noonday dreams. Parting must be real
pain, and meeting must be real rapture: the fount is so full, there
is no need of pumping up sentiment; the life is a life within as
well as a life without: and hence the German music is not de-
pendent upon external scenes or exciting stories; it can be cast
in the mould of opera, but it can also do without it: above all, it
can play upon the whole key-board of existence, instead of con-
fining itself to a few tragic octaves of passion; it can carry out
symphonies as well as operas, and can make songs for every event
and preludes and sonatas for every phase of feeling—from its most
glacial intensities to its most glowing heats—and for every gra-
dition of delicate emotion which may lie between the two.

Much more might be advanced in support of the moral and
emotional functions of music, but we trust enough has been
suggested to vindicate the almost passionate conviction of
thoughtful musicians, that music is more than a pastime; that
it holds a distinct, a legitimate, and clearly defined position
amongst the arts; and that it is capable of exercising the most
powerful and beneficial, as well as the most delightful, influences
upon the cultured few and upon the uncultured many.

We shall now glance rapidly at the dawn of the great Sound
Art of modern music.

It may be a relief to the reader to be told at once that he
need not trouble himself about the music of the Greeks, the
Hebrews, or the peoples of Asia and Africa. The traditions
about Greek music contributed a little towards the formation of
the modern art, and a great deal towards its hindrance. Those
who have studied the subject have come to the conclusion that
Greek music, with all its apparatus of modes and rhythms, was
nothing but a kind of monotonous intoning, accompanied by
various instruments, which served to emphasize the time and
movement of the intoned or spoken cadences. No doubt the
poetry of motion was much more studied and much better under-
stood by the Greeks than by us, and Greek pipes and lyres were
copiously
copiously employed in regulating, by gradations of sound and complicated intervals of time, the action of all who wished to excel in the Greek games, or take part in any public performance. Instruments were, no doubt, of the greatest use to the gymnast; but the recitative or Greek melody must after all have been but a lame accessory to Greek poetry and declamation. Of Greek harmony there is not a trace.

It is very improbable that the music of the Hebrews, or that of any of the highly civilized nations of antiquity, differed materially from that of the Greeks. We may get some idea of Greek, and probably Hebrew, intoning from the extant Gregorian chants, although of course Gregorian is a vague term which covers all sorts of modern adaptations. St. Ambrose, about A.D. 374, notoriously founded his new church music at Milan on a few of the Greek scales; and St. Gregory, about 590, who revived as much as he could find of the Ambrosian music, simply gave his name to Gregorian chants which had been in use long before his time. Hucbald, a Belgian monk about 920, has left a musical treatise, in which we may see how far music had got in his day. Up to that time we find no bars, no flats or sharps indicated, and no time; we might add, no harmony, for the diaphony employed by him is to our ears most terrible discord. Let us fancy any melody harmonized with the assistance of an eighth above or below, or with the fourth above or the fifth below. It is fair to add that this music was executed by singing the top and bottom lines soft, and the middle or principal melody loud. We need hardly say that the notion of playing two different notes in successive harmony to one of longer duration, or the art of descant, had not yet occurred to any one. In Hucbald's harmony all the notes played together are of the same length, so that we have chords of consecutive fifths and fourths and so on. The inventions attributed to Guido of Arezzo are without number, and perhaps it is impossible now to determine precisely what he really did or did not invent. It is safer to say that he adopted a system of notation, which enabled his pupils to connect written notes with sounds much more easily than before, and hence gave an enormous impulse to the study of music throughout ecclesiastical Europe. There can be no doubt that Greek traditions still hung like lead about the neck of church music. In many respects the productions of secular musicians, the songs of jouleurs and the troubadours, were in advance of the monks, simply because they were unshackled by any respect for, or even knowledge of, Greek models. Who can tell how the rise of harmony was retarded by such a Greek dictum as that a third, the most agreeable
agreeable of intervals, is inadmissible? Such rules were doubtless disregarded by the wild players at fairs and tourneys; indeed, it was their rude instruments which in all probability first opened up the mystery of sweet chords, for many of their bowed viols of six or more strings were so constructed that it was next to impossible to play upon one string without sounding some of the others; and as the player had only his own ears to consult, he doubtless stumbled upon many combinations that he practised habitually, but was either too ignorant or too lazy to record.

Thus, like so many great movements, modern music was in the air, and yet year after year its development was suspended. The monks were beating about the bush, blinded by a false system; the jougleurs went their own way without any system at all. But certain discoveries had not only to be stumbled upon, but to be recognized and formulated, before the foundations of the real art of modern music, as we have it, could be laid. The first and greatest of these discoveries was the discovery of a scale system or tonality, based on natural laws and a symmetrical division of the octave. All that could be done without our modern fixed system of tonality was done between the great Gallo-Belgian, Josquin des Pres, at the beginning of what Mr. Hullah calls the Second Period of Music, or about 1400, and Palestrina at the end of that same period, about 1600. And it is remarkable how often, by following the inspirations of natural instinct, the combinations of both these great men leave the impression of a fixed tonality upon the ear, although it was not yet generally accepted.

The old masters would begin a scale on any one of the eight notes of the octave, their intervals of tones and semitones would be in different places in each scale, and thus leave upon our ears the impression of an unfinished scale. The modern scales are all complete, because, although begun on different notes, the semitones fall in the same places in each scale. Each major has a minor, but in each minor the semitones also fall in the same places. In each major the semitones fall between the third and fourth sound; in each minor they fall between the second and third sound. This, and the consequent discovery of what is called the perfect cadence, or the discord of the dominant seventh and its resolution, which was once considered monstrous, but which has now become the most common of all modulations,—these two discoveries, and the new laws which they reveal, form at length the firm natural and scientific basis of our modern music.

One great name stands out as the genius that presided over these new and startling developments; it is that of Carissimi, 1581—1672.
1585—1672. This great man has been called the very type of the Transition Period, that bridge over which we pass from the old tonality to the new, or from ancient to modern music. Carissimi might have seen Palestrina, and he lived to hear Corelli. The germs of every style of music known since arose during his lifetime—he witnessed, as Mr. Hullah points out, the bloom and gradual decay of the madrigal in England and Germany, the birth and adolescence of the musical drama in France under Lulli, the invention of the oratorio in the oratory of San Filippo Neri at Rome, and lastly the rise and progress of instrumental music as an independent branch of art.

We have now fairly launched the reader into the ocean of Modern Music. It would be quite beyond our present purpose to follow its rise and progress in France, Italy, and Germany. We have said enough to show that it is not a revival of any old art, but essentially a new art with recently discovered principles, and unique capacities for the direct expression of emotion. It may now be interesting to inquire—1st, how far England is or ever has been a musical country; 2nd, how musical culture may be improved and extended in this country; and lastly we may point to some of the more popular and practical, or, as Mr. Darwin would say, 'direct uses' of music 'to man in reference to his ordinary habits of life.'

Great and laudable exertions have from time to time been made by English writers to show that the English possess a real and not a borrowed genius for music; that they have originated great improvements, such as harmony and counterpoint, and invented new forms, such as the glee and madrigal, or at least been the first to bring these to perfection. Further on, Purcell and Pelham Humphrey are quoted; and after them—well, then, of course, there is a pause, and we take refuge in old English songs of doubtful origin, for all attempts to prove the existence of a real English school of music for the last 200 years must of course fail.

About 1400 the complex elements which have entered into the composition of England may be said to have been fairly welded together into a kind of national life; at all events we can then speak of the English people with some degree of correctness, and examine their tastes, their pursuits, and their industries as natural products. There can be no doubt that about the year 1400 an English name, that of John Dunstable, stands out and represents a great musical force in this country. Yet there is no reason to suppose that he invented anything essentially new, or that he did more than systematize the musical movement then going on in Belgium under Dufay, who was born forty years before,
before, and who carried counterpoint to Rome at the close of the thirteenth century.

Then, in speaking of English church music, it is impossible to forget that all its early rudiments and developments came over with the Christian Church from Italy. St. Ambrose, and after him St. Gregory, whose influence in England is sufficiently notorious, put their stamp indelibly upon the earliest chants; whilst such men as Hucbald, Guido of Arezzo (1050), and Franco of Cologne reduced the still confused notation to some sort of order. If, then, we suppose the English nation to date from about 1400, or even somewhat earlier, chronology itself forbids the supposition of England having contributed to the invention of church music, because it had already been invented by Italy. We are aware that a good deal has been made of the alleged fact that Alfred the Great, in 866, instituted a musical professorship at Oxford; but unfortunately we have no proof of the existence of the University till the twelfth century. Also the origination of part-singing has been claimed for the inhabitants of these isles on the strength of a statement that Hereward and his sons sang in three parts at the bridal feast of a Cornish king. In 1159 we hear of part-singing in connection with the choirs which accompanied Thomas à Becket to Paris; and in 1250 the six men's song, 'Sumer is a cumen in,' has been quoted ad nauseam to prove how far the secular music was in advance of the sacred music of the period. In all this there may be some truth. We have no doubt that many chords were discovered and played on popular instruments, such as the crouth, of which the Church took no account; but when we hear of three-part songs, we must know wherein they were supposed to differ from the barbarous diaphony in Hucbald's 'Musica Enchiriadis,' which dates as far back as 932, and where we find real harmony, as in 'Sumer is a cumen in,' we must remember that the art of descant was known in the Church as early as 1150, or at least a hundred years before the date ascribed to that famous song. As to the popular music in vogue here in the fourteenth century at fairs and tourneys, no one can doubt where that came from. It came from Provence, Northern France, and Belgium. In 1400 an immense romantic and poetical literature already existed, and the trouvères were all over Europe.

Later on, as regards the essentially foreign origin of all the forms of modern music, we cannot do better than quote the following succinct statement, which, coming from so conscientious and distinguished an authority as Mr. Hullah, will carry its own weight. After doing full justice in a previous part of his Vol. 131.—No. 261.
volume to the Belgians and the French in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and to the Germans in the last and present centuries, he adds, 'The Italians are the inventors of some, and the perfectors of most of the instruments used in the modern orchestra. The resources of these instruments were developed in Italy, and the earliest great performers on them were Italians. Not only were the oratorio and opera born and bred in Italy, but every distinct form of musical compositions, instrumental as well as vocal, is the invention of Italians.'

But if we must, as a nation, surrender our claims to musical originality, the next question is, Have we ever so assimilated the productions of foreign art as to carry on, for any length of time, any continuous and characteristic development of musical composition? Our madrigal and motet writers will then, of course, be quoted: but, unfortunately, the very words madrigal, *mo dre gala*, song of the Virgin, and *motett*, are Italian. However, between 1500 and 1600, the names of Tye, Tallis, Farrant, Byrd, Bevin, Morley, Weelkes, Wilbye, Ward, Dowland, Bull, and Orlando Gibbons, formed the glory of music in England; and we are bound to confess that nothing so fine as the compositions of these eminent men was produced by Englishmen until the post-Restoration period graced by the names of Henry Purcell and Pelham Humphrey.

But although English madrigals were composed and appeared simultaneously in England and Italy during the sixteenth century, so that it may not be easy to derive them in the first place from Italy alone, we must remember that both countries owed the development of counterpoint and harmony to the previous Belgian wave of musical progress, which, under Josquin des Pres and his successors, appears to have reached Italy and England about the same time. At all events the obligations of the Englishmen Tallis, Farrant, Byrd, and their Italian contemporary Palestrina, to Josquin des Pres will hardly be denied. We may also remark that Luca Marenzio and Orlando Lasso, heads of the Italian madrigal school, both resided in England. 'The madrigal,' says Mr. Chorley, 'comes from the south.' This Reformation period was our golden opportunity. Never until the present century has there been such a taste for music in England as existed from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of James I. Singing at sight in those days became a common accomplishment; and large numbers of musical instruments, chiefly manufactured in Italy, were imported into England. 'Most kinds of musical instruments,' says Carl Engel, 'in use at the time of Queen Elizabeth, were evidently introduced into Northern Europe from Italy and Spain.' But the increased suppression
suppression of highly ritualistic services dealt one blow to the church music, and the severe Puritan feeling dealt another to its more secular culture. Still people were much merrier under Cromwell than might have been expected; and it is remarkable that in 1656 the first English opera was performed at Rutland House, in which Mrs. Henry Coleman also appeared as the first female singer, it is said, who ever performed in public.

With John Jenkins and Henry Lawes the great Elizabethan school of music—the nearest approach to a national school which England has ever had—died; and all through the Commonwealth, until the restoration of Charles II., musical art, though still cultivated in private circles, lay to some extent under a public cloud.

Then arose in this country what we may call the Anglo-French school, with which must be connected the great names of Pelham Humphrey and Purcell; and once more there seemed a chance of something like the rise of a real English school: but the music of the Restoration was not a revival or even a development of the Elizabethan schools. Our composers had once more gone a-begging. The King hated the old masters, and was all for French tunes. 'He was a brisk and airy Prince,' and did not like the 'grave and solemn way of Tallis and Byrd;' so he encouraged his young choristers to compose in the French style, and Humphrey, who had lately come back from France, as Pepys says, 'an absolute French monsieur,' promised to give the King's old-fashioned choirmaster a lift out of his place. The fact was that 'Master Humphrey' had been to Paris to study under Lulli the French composer, and came back to form a school of French music in England.

His greatest successor, Purcell, a man who in originality and fertility must be ranked with Mozart, attempted to blend the grace of the French school with the science and severe learning of the old Elizabethan masters,—and he succeeded; but he left no followers at all comparable to himself—none that were not soon compelled to yield the palm in music to Scarlatti, Pergolesi, and Marcello in Italy, and to Handel, Gluck, and Bach in Germany. Against such names it is almost superfluous to remark we have only to set talented and worthy composers like Croft, Greene, Arne, and the greatest, Boyce. Our later developments are, beside the colossal strides of Germany, of a still more dubious and meagre description. To quote a recent author, 'The so-called English school had not life enough to survive the paralysis of the civil wars, nor memory enough to continue its own traditions, and France and Italy alternately contended
contended for the honour of carrying off the musical prizes in England, until Germany, like a very David, arose and slew both the lion and the bear.'

We are sometimes told that the Hanoverian Georges crushed native talent by encouraging the Germans; but neither Italy nor Germany was encouraged at the expense of England. On the contrary, English talent was for a long time protected. For many years great efforts were made to encourage our native musicians; and their ballads were as much bought, and sold, and sung as they are now. As late as George II.'s reign, only an Englishman could fill the post of King's organist; and almost every English composer of any note was Doctor of Music, and installed in some place of honour or emolument. Englishmen have for centuries taught our cathedral choirs: nor was there ever any serious attempt made to keep their operas off the stage, such as they were, nor is there now. Mr. Balfe, Mr. John Hullah, and Mr. Vincent Wallace have all been successful writers of opera in our own day. Yet for all this England has originated nothing, or next to nothing. Pistocchi and Goudemel founded singing schools, as Stradivarius and the Amatis created the modern violin, and thus made the modern orchestra possible. Italy, again, gave us the opera; Handel elaborated the highest form of the oratorio; and Haydn may be said to have created the symphony and the quartet.

It would require a great deal of time and patience to establish beyond a cavil all of the foregoing positions; however, it may be well to state them here, as the results of some research, and to sum them up briefly as follows:—

In speaking of Music in England, let it be clearly understood that we allude to modern music, and that we start from about 1400, at which time England possessed a distinct national life; and we say that her church music came from Italy, and her secular music came from Provence. The schools of Henry VIII. were deeply indebted to the influence of Josquin des Pres; and the schools of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. were as deeply indebted to the influence of Palestrina. Nevertheless, between 1500 and 1650 there flourished in England a very illustrious series of composers who will bear comparison with any of their contemporaries in Belgium, France, or Italy. The Restoration music was mainly of French origin, deeply infected with the genius of Lulli; and although Purcell broke away from many French forms, and endeavoured to chasten the English school by an admixture of the old Elizabethan severity, yet he left none capable of carrying out the new development, and from his time to our own, as far as we have had any composers capable of writing
writing anything beyond a ballad, we have been mainly influenced by the Italian writers of the early part of the eighteenth century, and by the German writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, of whom many have been hospitably received in this country, and one, Handel—according to Beethoven the greatest musician who ever lived—dwelt for many years in London, and made England his adopted home.

If, then, we say that England is not a musical country, let us not be misunderstood. We are speaking of its actual products, not of its latent capacities. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Germany itself had no school to speak of, nor could she during the seventeenth century at all compete with her Italian rival. The most fatal point against England is this, that twice it has missed rare opportunities for developing a national school. The schools of the Reformation and the schools of the Restoration both died, and have never been revived. And now once again there is a great musical impulse in England. This time it comes from Germany. We have at this moment a number of talented English composers living, from Cipriani Potter and Sterndale Bennett to Arthur Sullivan, composing German music in England. Shall we end by developing a really national school? Shall we be able not only to copy, to paraphrase, to adopt, but to assimilate the foreign elements, and blend them together with something which is not foreign, as Germany once assimilated grace and melody from Italy, as France is even now taking science and counterpoint from Germany? Shall we be able so to take and make our own as to become creators of national music?

If we review the history of music in England during the last half-century, we shall be greatly encouraged to hope for the best. Appreciation must precede production. England has always been famous for paying others to do what she could not do for herself, but she generally ends by learning the trick. England in the last fifty years, if she has not produced so many fine vocalists and instrumentalists as Italy, has, at all events, had several worthy to be placed quite in the front rank. In a curiously conceived book written by the Earl of Mount Edgecumbe, and published in 1828, in that nobleman's old age, we may still read of the profound impression which such singers as Mrs. Billington and Mrs. Storace made; and those who wish to carry the record of great names almost up to the present date may refer to Mr. Ella's 'Musical Sketches.' But the great test of musical progress in England is to be found in the enormous multiplication of concerts and subsequent growth of musical societies, not only in London, but throughout the country. At the beginning of this century
century the Haymarket, the Pantheon, and the Hanover Square Rooms were the chief scenes of musical action. From time to time there was a Handel festival in Westminster Abbey or York Minster. English operas were produced profusely larded with ballads, and Italian, occasionally German and French, operas were adapted for the English public, with additional bravura and comic points; and last, but not least, there were the symphonies of Haydn, regarded by the enthusiasts with the same sort of favour as Schumann's music is now by amateurs, and stigmatized by the general public as the music of the future. Such was the state of affairs about the year 1800. Towards 1816 the opera-goers, being terribly tired of the old Italian and French operas, began to discover the merits of Gluck and Mozart. Soon afterwards Rossini arrived in England, and was immediately proclaimed to be the greatest musician that ever lived.

The connoisseurs still held fast to Beethoven and Mozart, but for a time the brilliancy of the new Italian school eclipsed everything. Then came Weber, who, with the assurance of a bold and eclectic genius, preferred to serve two masters, and succeeded to some extent in producing the most fascinating compromise between the scientific harmonies of Germany and the sensuous melodies of Italy. As a natural consequence, neither country has ever forgiven him: he has been weighed in the Italian balance, and found too heavy; and in the German, and found too light. His success was, nevertheless, very great in this country, and the English showed their appreciation of him by singing nothing but the 'Huntsman's Chorus' for years, and hissing all through the first performance of his chef d'œuvre, the overture to 'Euryanthe.'

Meanwhile to the Philharmonic Society belongs the glory of keeping alive the sacred flame of the highest German inspiration. It was in 1820, before the Italian mania, that this honourable Society invited over Spohr, who wrote expressly for it his G-minor symphony; it was in 1827, in the full flush of Rossini's and Weber's popularity, that they sent the ever-memorable 100. to Beethoven, then on his deathbed; nor is it necessary for us to remind our musical readers how, through evil report and good report, the Philharmonic Society has held on to this day with two symphonies at each concert, so that the echoes of Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven for more than half a century have never been allowed to slumber in the Hanover Square Rooms. The Society's concerts now take place in St. James's Hall. Cipriani Potter, Sir George Smart, and Sir Henry Bishop were all good friends of music in England; and Mr. Moscheles,
Moscheles, who settled in London in 1821, and remained here until 1846, did as much as any one to diffuse a sounder musical taste amongst the upper classes. But between the years 1830-40 three new influences made themselves felt almost simultaneously. They were connected with three names of very different calibre, all of which were destined to have the most far-reaching and beneficial influences upon musical taste and musical education in England. These three names are Dr. Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, with whom we must connect the name of his gifted friend and pupil, Sir Sterndale Bennett; M. Jullien; and Mr. John Hullah. On these three heterogeneous influences we shall now make a few remarks.

The presence of Mendelssohn was in itself a power. His was a bright, sunny, and at the same time energetic personality, which took possession of people wherever he went; and everywhere he carried with him the same single-hearted devotion to art, the same tireless faculty of creation, the same intense activity, and the same lofty ideal. Once more England, the refuge of Luca Marenzio and Orlando Lasso, the adopted home of Handel, the hospitable host of Haydn, the reverent patron of Beethoven, Spohr, and Weber, was happy in securing the affection of the great, the gifted, and the lamented Mendelssohn. Seldom have so many amiable and endearing qualities met in any one individual as were to be found in Mendelssohn.

Many now living remember the shock of grief that ran through the musical world when the announcement of the great composer’s death reached these shores. People who had never seen him felt as though they had lost a friend; those who had known him were overcome by a sorrow so deep that even now they cannot pronounce his name without emotion; whilst all felt the vast, the irreparable injury done to art by the removal of that brilliant centre round which for twenty years all the best living musicians had been revolving.

In 1829 Mendelssohn first came to England, and brought with him the wonderful ‘Midsummer Night’s Dream’ overture. In the same year he visited Scotland, and celebrated that country whilst enriching the world with one of his most lovely and original compositions. The strange echoes of Fingal’s Cave, where the water comes eddying in over the singular rock formations that lie clearly visible beneath it, the wild concourse of sea-birds, and the musical winds—how much of all this is woven into the Hebrides or the overture to Fingal’s Cave we all know.

In 1832 Mendelssohn again came to England, and played his G-minor concerto at one of the Philharmonic concerts. In the following
following year he brought over his A-minor symphony, which was not either played or understood thoroughly until some years later. The trumpet overture in C and the 'Melusine' were both heard during that year, but the 'Midsummer Night's Dream' long remained the popular favourite; and, indeed, it was the key which first opened up to the English public the rich and fertile treasures of Mendelssohn's genius.

In 1837 Mendelssohn brought over his 'St. Paul,' which was that year performed at Birmingham and London. In 1842 we first heard his Scotch symphony, and he himself played his D-minor concerto at the Philharmonic.

In 1844 he was invited by that Society to conduct six concerts, and all the élite of London crowded into the Hanover Square Rooms to see and hear him. His very cadenzas and marvellous improvisations on the piano are remembered to this day as events of importance in the history of music in England. Mendelssohn may be said to have invented a new school for the pianoforte—unlike that of Beethoven, unlike that of Weber, very unlike Thalberg, whose compositions he nevertheless warmly admired: the 'Lieder ohne Worte' turn the piano into the artistic chronicler of every passing emotion, sad or joyous or capricious or hasty or solemn. How many reveries, five minutes long, live and die and are clean forgotten; yet they too would fain have found expression, and are often remembered with a certain pain, as unrealized moments in the eternal silence. Mendelssohn has, as it were, embalmed a few of such precious waifs and strays of time in sound; and he has thus shown the way to others. Is it too much to say that half the pianoforte music reveries, momens musicales, &c., published during the last thirty years are reflections of the style and manner of the songs without words?

In 1846 Mendelssohn, already failing from the strain and excitement produced by overwork, conducted for the first time the 'Elijah' at Birmingham. It was to be the bright and fitting crown of his short life. He might have lived a little longer if he had given up all work; but, as it was, the 'Elijah' rehearsals at Exeter Hall, in 1847, destroyed him. He died at Leipsic in September of that year.

His influence on the music of this century is second only to that of Beethoven, and his influence over the English musical world has been second to none. He has taught our professional musicians that their art is more than a trade, and our amateurs that music is more than a pastime. The great improvement in the social status of professional musicians in England is largely due to the fact that Mendelssohn, who lived and laboured so much
much amongst us, was not only a perfect musician but a perfect gentleman.

It is difficult either to estimate or to over-estimate the influence of Mr. John Hullah on music and musical taste in England, which we have the more pleasure in recording, as many persons seem now to forget the services he has rendered. In 1840, under the sanction of the Committee of Council on Education, Mr. Hullah brought over from Paris the French system of Wilhelm, and singing schools soon sprang up throughout the country. Exeter Hall was the scene of the first great Hullah Concerts, and in 1853 St. Martin's Hall was built and fitted up by Mr. Hullah's own exertions. Here was performed every then existing work of importance, many for the first time. He brought out a large number of the best living singers—Madame Sherrington, Sims Reeves, Santley, Thomas, Cummings; and many of our best instrumentalists made their first débuts under him. He also inaugurated the class-teaching in schools under his charge, and a large number of the students in the training schools who have shown special talent for music have become choir-masters and organizing masters in different parts of the country, and real centres of civilization. Mr. Hullah is the author of several operas which were produced with success in their day; he has also written songs and part-songs, besides numerous exercises and vocal studies of all kinds for the instruction of his classes.

It is impossible not to mention here the name of the Rev. John Curwen, who within the last few years has introduced the Tonic Sol-fa system into this country. The notation he employs is a letter notation, and the prominent tonal difference between the Hullah and the Sol-fa methods turns on this one important fact that Do is a fixed sound in Hullah's system, but Do stands for the keynote of any key whatever with the solfaists. Thus Mr. Curwen's method is based on the principle of key relationship, which regards tones not as high or low but as grouped about the governing or keynote. The rapid spread of this system in schools, factories, and the rural districts would seem to indicate that it is especially well adapted for teaching the more ignorant masses the elements of music. But upon this subject there is a great difference of opinion amongst good musicians. However, the Committee of Council on Education announced in 1869 their resolution to accept 'the Tonic Sol-fa method and the Tonic Sol-fa notation upon the same terms as should from time to time be applicable to the ordinary method and notation.' In connection with the progress of singing in England, it must be noted for the honour of our country that Mr. Henry Leslie has produced out of English voices
voices and English enthusiasm a choir so perfect that we may doubt whether anywhere in the world there exists or ever has existed such a body of trained voices both male and female. To hear Bach's motet, 'The Spirit also helpeth,' Mendelssohn's 43rd Psalm, or Schubert's 23rd Psalm, by this choir, is to listen to a delicacy of execution which has probably reached the limits of choral perfection. Mr. Leslie is also known as the author of a fine oratorio, 'Immanuel,' and numerous songs and part-songs.

Jullien (Louis Antoine) was too popular for his own fame—a scornful smile is apt to pass over the sound musician's face at the very mention of it—yet no man did more than Jullien to kindle the love of music, good, bad, and indifferent, throughout the length and breadth of England. Let us be pardoned if we pause to pay a passing tribute to one who has been a little underrated. Jullien arrived here in 1838, with a prodigious reputation as a popular chef d'orchestre, and his promenade concerts soon became the rage. The music played was at times extravagant; pistols, crackers, and even blue and red fires and musketry, were employed to enhance the powers of the orchestra and astound the audience. A new polka by Jullien was an event—for no mortal could tell what would take place before the end of it. But Jullien was also a lover of good music: he knew his public, and stooped to it, but he also to some extent trained it. At his concerts thousands heard for the first time in their lives, for the small sum of one shilling, some of the finest overtures of Weber and Mendelssohn, and parts of the immortal symphonies of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. But these classical pills were so excessively gilded in every programme with sensation dance music, that poor M. Jullien to this day passes with many as a mere charlatan. In justice to him we ought at least to remember that he secured for popular hearing almost every great soloist of his day, and that such men as Vieuxtemps, Sainton, and Sivori were to be found amongst the violins of his band. This band, with their _mises en scène_ and voluminous _impedimenta_, was as ubiquitous as a corps of Garibaldians in the great days of Garibaldi—they overran the kingdom—they were often announced at one time for a dozen different concerts in different parts of the world—they even went bodily to America, and were back again before they began to be missed here. M. Jullien had many followers but no rivals. After running through several large fortunes and making many disastrous speculations, he at last went mad, and cut his throat at Paris, in 1860, at the age of forty-eight.

For many years the influence of Mendelssohn, which at one time
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time threatened to extinguish even that of Spohr or Weber, kept the works of many excellent composers in the background. Chopin and Thalberg succeeded in establishing a speciality for the piano, and in these last years the merits of Schubert, Schumann, and let us hope we may soon be able to add Richard Wagner, have been amply acknowledged. If in this place we do not refer at length to the labours of Cipriani Potter, Sir Sterndale Bennett, Mr. Moscheles, Sir Michael Costa, Sir Frederick Gore Ouseley, Sir J. Benedict, Sir M. Balfe, Mr. Henry Leslie, the brothers Macfarren, Mr. Arthur Sullivan, and a few other important names, it is not from any want of respect, but simply from want of space. Most of them Englishmen, they have all worked for and in England. The immense progress of music, owing to the above-mentioned causes, will be realized by these two facts,—that in London alone there exist at the present time no less than 104 well-established musical societies, and 2150 resident musical professors; and London supports at least eight musical journals. The most powerful and accomplished orchestras are those of the Crystal Palace (conductor Mr. Manns), the old Philharmonic (conductor Mr. W. G. Cusins). The best quartet concerts are the Monday Popular, the Musical Union concerts at St. James's Hall, and Mr. Holmes' Musical Evenings at St. George's Hall. For refined choral singing there is no choir equal to Mr. H. Leslie's. The Sacred Harmonic under Sir W. M. Costa and Mr. Barnby's Choir give annual splendid performances of the principal oratorios at St. James's and Exeter Hall; and the Albert Hall promises to be a formidable rival to the Crystal Palace as a new and magnificent centre for giant concerts of all kinds. The late Handel Festival has been a great pecuniary and choral success above its predecessors, but the superiority of the Albert Hall for the execution of solos was never more apparent. We may also well ask why the seats in the area blocks are always the highest in price, as they are undoubtedly the worst for hearing. Being so much below the level of any part of the orchestra, the sound floats over the listener's head. The Birmingham Festivals and the Cathedral Festivals at Gloucester, Hereford, and Worcester, have done an incalculable amount of good to the cause of music in the English provinces; and musical societies abound all over the country. England, therefore, at this moment is rich in the most splendid raw material for a great national organization for the promotion of the musical art. There is plenty of private enterprize, but there is great want of union, of system, of organization, and we must add of generosity and goodwill. There are three ways in which,
which, if the Government were convinced that music is as good for the nation as picture galleries, it might further the cause of music in England:—1st. By the encouragement of a sound system of musical instruction in schools. 2ndly. By supporting or aiding to support a central academy for musical instruction, with a select band for regular concerts, similar to the Conservatoire in Paris or the Gewandhaus in Leipsic. 3rdly. By supporting or aiding to support a much larger pension list than at present exists, for superannuated or eminent musicians in reduced circumstances. We will explain each of these proposals in a few words. First as to musical education.

We propose that a competent Committee be asked to decide on the best method of popular instruction, and that one uniform method be adopted in all schools receiving Government grants. Every school would then be properly taught music, instead of most schools, as is now the case, being taught badly. The difficulties raised about examination are so puerile that no one having the smallest acquaintance with the subject would ever have raised them. There is no difficulty which an ordinarily intelligent inspector, whether he knew music or not, could not with a little assistance from the schoolmaster or local organist easily and satisfactorily surmount. Besides, why not make a certain knowledge of music henceforth incumbent upon all school inspectors? After all, schools are not made for the benefit of inspectors, but inspectors for the benefit of schools.

Secondly, we ought to have a central academy for musical instruction supported in great measure by Government. The Royal Academy of Music would form an excellent nucleus, and is highly favoured in receiving at present 500l. a year from Government. Therefore the Government, by this slender endowment, has admitted the principle for which we plead. The scholarships should be increased in number and value, and the society should confer different diplomas or degrees of merit after the manner of our universities. These should be coveted by our musicians as a B.A. degree is coveted by our scholars. Instead of anybody calling himself professor, and hundreds professing to teach singing and the piano who have never been properly taught themselves, we should soon have a class of well-taught and able professors, organists, and pianists, properly certificated. No church would engage a man without some degree, and every parent would have some guarantee that the person who taught his children bad himself been taught. We should soon have a great and beneficial weeding in the musical profession. Persons whose only merit consisted in a foreign nationality and a limited acquaintance with the English language would presently be at a discount,
Music: its Origin and Influence.

discount, and the social position, standard, and tone of our native musicians would quickly rise throughout the land.

This academy should be always training a band of its own pupils, and might thus supply bands all over the kingdom with well-trained and certificated musicians. The musicians in all our metropolitan societies should bear certificates of merit, and thus be members of the one large society; and then the societies’ great performances, say at the Albert Hall, might consist of the best men chosen out of all the affiliated bands and choruses in London.

Before any such scheme can be got to work it is necessary that all existing societies should cease to be rivals and learn to be friends. And this might be. Our central society would displace no one, and encourage and strengthen all existing organizations. Its professors would be chosen from amongst able leaders and musical directors, who now stand too often in bitter rivalry towards each other; and the richer the central society became the more scholarships could be founded, and the more funds would there be wherewith to make grants to other societies and promote the general prosperity of numerous affiliated branches in the provinces.

And, lastly, the scope of the present Royal Society of Musicians might be immensely extended. When a musician is too old for his work, he ought to be allowed to retire honourably on a pension; and the Government, which occasionally places on its civil list some very peculiar specimens of literary merit, should certainly aid such a musical pension fund as we propose. There is no hope of retaining an efficient orchestra anywhere, for any length of time, owing to the impossibility of getting rid of old, prejudiced, and often incompetent men. Many old orchestral players are invaluable, but others simply cannot play their parts, nor can they well be turned out without a retiring pension. Such bands of splendid players as the old Philharmonic and the Crystal Palace should be kept efficient in this way, and their musicians, after years of faithful work, should be able to look forward to an honourable retirement accompanied by something better than penury or starvation. In all cases our central society should, through its committee, examine the claims and award the pensions to retiring or indigent musicians of merit.

And, let us observe, we are suggesting nothing new or strange: much of our scheme has been carried out with success on the Continent. It cannot be said when the Government expends such vast sums on pictures that it is intentionally indifferent to the interests of Art, and as regards music the germs of our three propositions
propositions already exist in England, they only await fertilization and development.

Music is already officially acknowledged in our schools; let it be well taught under Government. The Royal Academy of Music is already on the right track, and is assisted with official funds; let it be expanded into a great central organization—for instance, either let it absorb the South Kensington scheme, or let it be itself absorbed into the Albert Hall. The Society of Musicians already provides pensions and pecuniary aid to many deserving musicians all over the land, with an honourable maintenance; let them be encouraged to establish a claim upon it by the payment of a small annual fee. And, lastly, let the general public, as well as the Government, awake to the importance, musically and philanthropically, of such a pension fund as we suggest, and contribute accordingly. We have no fear for the prospects of music in England. Our professors and amateurs have borne down much opposition, and have already obtained from an unmusical Government several unwilling concessions. Let them persevere, and if they are asked by Mr. Lowe himself, in the words of Mr. Darwin, 'Pray, what do you consider may be the direct uses of music to man in reference to his ordinary habits of life?' let them answer in some such words as these, 'There is no class of society which music is not calculated to recreate and improve. The lowest are brought most easily under its dominion, and the highest cannot escape its influence. Thousands of poor children who are being daily gathered into our schools acknowledge practically the helpfulness of music. We may convince ourselves of this by entering any national schoolroom on some hot summer's day. Who can estimate the fatigue and listlessness that come over the spirits of children wholly unused to mental application? Soon the teacher's voice rings in their ears without conveying any definite meaning—the mind, 'like a jarred pendulum, retains only its motion, not its power;' the master exhausts himself in vain, and the already overworked mistress grows disheartened to see that no authority she can exercise will revive the worn-out attention of the pupil. But, the music lesson—or perhaps only one song is thrown in—the little faces brighten up, the listless hands are raised to beat time, the eager eyes are turned towards one of Mr. Hullah's big boards with big music and words, and, in a moment, the room resounds with music from a hundred fresh voices; and the wearied teacher forgets with a smile the toil and the toil, whilst the children, by music, are drawn more closely to the teacher and the task; as if by magic the emotional atmosphere of the room is changed, and the spelling or arithmetic is
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is attacked with as much vigour as if the little students had only just come in from the green fields or pleasant playground. Has music been of no direct use to these children?

Again, is it nothing that the innocent pleasures of our poor should be indefinitely increased? These school children throughout the land carry home their songs; they sing them to the labourer when he comes back at nightfall, the mother sings them to her fractious babe, the eldest daughter sings them as she goes about her household drudgery or farmwork, the very animals prick up their ears, and it is notorious that horses are cheered by the sound of their tinkling bells, and encouraged by the cheery songs of the ploughman. Many animals have good ears for time, and can be got to labour better with some musical accompaniment than without it. Let our poor have musical homes, and they will be less likely to go to the public-house for society, as well as for the music they find there. Let us train our poor children to music, and we shall have got one transforming element into the poor homes of the future.

But let us enter the workrooms of our great cities. Ought we not to be glad that through the long hours thousands of poor girls in crowded factories should be taught to sing together in parts over their work, and thus refresh themselves with an emotional life beyond the reach of the grinding machinery around them and the fumes of overheated workrooms? The fingers will speed none the less swiftly, but the young frames will not suffer so much, because the work will become more mechanical, less mental, and the mind refreshed by sweet sounds will be less apt to brood over morbid and unhealthy themes.

Like a good physician, like a tender friend, music comes to the aid of all classes, a gentle minister of consolation—sweeping clear the sky and showing the blue beyond, making grief bearable and loss tolerable. Music soothes the fever heat of the sick man, and ministers strangely to the disordered mind when other remedies fail; it enables the soldier to accomplish forced marches and fight battles at the end of them, it draws the bands of social and family life more closely together, it recreates the wearied professional man, it kindles new fervour in the sluggish soul, and is, moreover, ready to bear on high the inarticulate aspirations of many a toiling and careworn spirit.

These, and a thousand others, are amongst the benefits which Music is able to confer upon her votaries. Is it strange that those who are impressed with her power, and are aware of her infinite resources, should labour for the extension of musical education, and try, meanwhile, to provide some real answer to the objection which