THE ORGAN QUESTION

RITCHIE & PORTEOUS

THE BENSON LIBRARY OF HYMNOLOGY

Endowed by the Reverend

LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D.D.

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
6005

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/organ00ritc

THE ORGAN QUESTION:

STATEMENTS

BY

DR. RITCHIE, AND DR. PORTEOUS,

FOR AND AGAINST THE USE OF THE ORGAN IN PUBLIC WORSHIP

IN THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW, 1807-8.

With an Introductory Notice,

BY ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D.D.,

EDINBURGH.

TO WHICH IS ANNEXED,

A Memorial to the Presbytery of Toronto,

IN CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

TORONTO:
PRINTED BY LOVELL & GIBSON, YONGE STREET.
1859.

THE ORGAN QUESTION:

STATEMENTS

BY

DR. RITCHIE, AND DR. PORTEOUS,

FOR AND AGAINST THE USE OF THE ORGAN IN PUBLIC WORSHIP

IN THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW, 1807-8.

With an Introductory Notice,

BY ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D. D.,

EDINBURGH.

TO WHICH IS ANNEXED,

A Memorial to the Presbytery of Toronto,

IN CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

TORONTO:
PRINTED BY LOVELL & GIBSON, YONGE STREET.
1859.

THE ORGAN QUESTION.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

I HAVE two reasons for this republication. The one is the alarm I feel at certain recent movements on behalf of instrumental music in Presbyterian worship. The other is the anxiety I feel for the success of the movements now in progress for the improvement of our Presbytery Psalmody. I have a deep conviction that movements in the former of these directions will prove fatal to movements in the latter. That, however, is not the consideration which chiefly weighs with me. I dread the agitation of the question in our Presbyterian Churches. I dread it because I believe that it inevitably tends to schism. And on the merits of the question, I hold a decided opinion, which I think I could myself maintain in controversy, but which, for the present, I mean to defend by the arguments of another; and that other, a man whose ability and competency cannot easily be disputed.

I wish I had for a little the quiet ear of our friends who are occasioning, if I may not say causing, the discussion of this subject in Presbyterian Church Courts. I would like to point out to them the very serious responsibility which they unwittingly incur. I am not easily frightened by the name of schism. Nor would I frighten others. But there can be no harm in a timely warning. And the warning is timely, at any rate. For as yet no one, I believe, is irrevocably committed.

In the first place, let the peculiar constitution of Presbyterian Churches be kept in mind. Where Congregationalism prevails, either avowedly, as among the great body of English Nonconformists, or virtually, as in the English Establishment, uniformity of worship is not necessarily a condition of union. Among our Independent brethren great diversity may be tolerated, for no one is responsible for what another does; and in the Church of England, all sorts of hymns are allowed, and the service is conducted in all sorts of styles, from the richest ritualism to the baldest and tamest routine. On the Congregational system, every pastor with his people may take his own way,—one using instrumental music, and another condemning the use of it; and yet the harmony of any association they form among themselves may remain unbroken. This may or may not be a recommendation of that system. That is not now the question. It is

enough to say that it is inconsistent with Presbyterianism. Those Presbyterians who disapprove, on conscientious and scriptural grounds, of a particular mode of worship,—as, for instance, of the Organ,—cannot divest themselves of responsibility by merely excluding it from their own Congregations. They are bound to resist the introduction of it in all the other Congregations of the Church as well as in their own.

Hence I would suggest, in the second place, the impossibility of the question, if it be once raised, being left to the decision of individual Kirk-sessions and Congregations. It is easy, of course, for those who are ready to sanction the use of instrumental music, or who reckon it a matter of indifference, to consent to its being left as an open question, on which Congregations may agree to differ from one another. But if there be any, as there undoubtedly are many in all the British Presbyterian Churches, who, rightly or wrongly, have come to entertain strong convictions against the lawfulness of the practice, it is impossible for them to acquiesce in the introduction of it, even in Congregations to which they do not themselves belong. On Presbyterian principles, it is unreasonable to ask them to do so. A controversy in the Courts of the Church becomes, in these circumstances, inevitable. And if it is an unnecessary controversy,—if it is a controversy which on either side might be compromised or avoided without violence to conscience,—it involves more or less the guilt of schism, or at least of what tends to schism.

I have to admit, in the third place, that if the use of instrumental music in public worship had been the rule hitherto in our Presbyterian Churches,—if it had been hereditary and common,—and if the opponents of it were the innovators, professing to have received a new light, and acknowledging therefore a new obligation, I would have not a little sympathy with parties indicating a reluctance to sacrifice their own customary and constitutional freedom to the new-fangled notions and scruples of weaker brethren. I suppose that, in the case of the Church of England, an act of comprehension, allowing all who chose to dispense with surplice and chanting, the sign of the cross in baptism and the posture of kneeling at communion, would have appeared a fair concession, if it had been made in time, to what they would have called the strait-laced piety of the Puritans. Even in a Presbyterian Church, in which the organ, or its substitute, the fife or fiddle, had been authorised for generations as lawful and right, I do not know that I could well insist on any thing more, if I were now beginning to have conscientious difficulties, than that I should be permitted to set up a worship of plain Psalmody for myself, and to do so without forfeiting my position in her communion.

But, in the fourth place, while making this concession, I cannot but maintain that the case is entirely different when the proposed innovation is on the other side. It is not conceivable, at least among Presbyterians, that any of those who are for calling in the aid of instru-

ments in worshipping God, can plead reasons of conscience. Here, in Scotland, England and Ireland, they have had no objection hitherto to *in-Organic* Psalmody. It is not, in their case, liberty to comply with what they hold to be a peremptory obligation that is asked, but merely liberty to enjoy what they hold to be a lawful privilege or pleasure. And the Churches which are asked to grant that liberty within their communion, are Churches, I repeat, which, by their very Presbyterianism, are precluded from the easy expedient of devolving the question summarily upon particular Congregations. They must as Churches, in their collective capacity, take up the question and dispose of it. No doubt they may, upon full deliberation, come to the conclusion that the question had better, after all, be left an open one, and that Kirk-sessions and Congregations should be allowed to exercise their discretion in regard to it. It is manifest, however, that this is a conclusion which could satisfy none but those who either approve of instrumental worship, or reckon it a matter of indifference. All who are conscientiously opposed to it,—who regard it as inexpedient and unlawful, unauthorised and unscriptural,—must feel themselves bound, as Presbyterians, to do their utmost against a proposal to have it even tolerated. In their own judgment it is an act of will-worship;—and their is no plea of conscience on the other side to which they might be bound to let their own judgment defer. Nay, were it ultimately settled, by a majority of the Church collective, that the question should be left an open one, still, in the face of a minority holding a decided opinion on the subject, peace would be impossible. The controversy would be handed down to Kirk-sessions and Congregations; disputes would be interminable; and, in all probability, almost as often as a party of strong-minded instrumentalists succeeded in erecting an organ-loft, and displaying the "*Kist o' whistles*," some unmanageable handful of impracticable psalm-singers would be driven away in sore disgust, to set up a tabernacle of their own, where they might lift up their unaided voices in the praise of God, after the good old fashion of their fathers.

On such grounds as these I greatly dread, and would most earnestly deprecate, any procedure fitted to raise this question in our Presbyterian Churches. It is a question that, if raised, will certainly distract and divide us. And can we afford the luxury of a new intestine quarrel on such a point? Is this a time for it? Surely Presbyterianism in these kingdoms has exhibited enough of the weakness which a tendency to dispute, and split, and separate, occasions. Surely, if we must fall out among ourselves, we might find some worthier cause, in a day of rebuke and blasphemy, than a wrangle about such a poor innovation on our hereditary mode of worship as our *Organic* friends are for introducing. That it is an innovation, no intelligent man can deny; for I will not condescend to recognise intelligence in any man who at this time of day would quibble about pitch pipes and tuning forks, or who could make game of the whole

affair by some abstract and recondite disquisition on the identity of wind instruments, whether living or dead. The plain and simple fact that it is an innovation, is the strongest of all reasons for forbearance on the part of those who are in favour of it. They ought to desist from the agitation of it; and I cannot doubt that they will desist from it, when they are made aware of the strong and conscientious feelings which many, probably a very large majority, in our Presbyterian Churches, entertain upon the subject. Even if these feelings were mere blind bigotry and senseless prejudice, they are entitled, in such a matter as this, to be respected, especially considering that there is no case of conscience on the other side;—for even those who ask most loudly for the Organ, cannot say that its abscence hurts their sense of moral and religious obligation. Much more if, as I am prepared to maintain, cogent arguments can be urged, founded both on reason and Scripture, against the practice which they seek to introduce, I would calmly and earnestly put it to them, whether for such a cause they really are prepared to risk the peace and harmony, already sufficiently broken, of Churches which still, amid all their differences, acknowledge a common reverence for the memory,—a common attachment to the principles,—of the reforming fathers of the Church of Scotland and the puritan divines of the Church of England.

It is chiefly with a view to show my brethren how serious the question was in the estimation of learned and able theologians of a former generation, that I republish the arguments on both sides in the once famous, but now almost forgotten, case about the introduction of the Organ in St. Andrew's Church, Glasgow.

The history of the case may be given in a few sentences:—

In the month of August 1806, the minister, Dr. William Ritchie, addressed a letter to the Lord Provost, transmitting a "petition subscribed by a great number of gentlemen who possess seats in St. Andrew's Church," and asking permission, on the part of himself and the petitioners, to make certain "alterations in the seats behind the pulpit," at their own expense and risk, with a view to accommodate an Organ which they proposed to introduce. Both the minister and his people were anxious to guard themselves against its being supposed that they meant to submit to the city authorities the question of the lawfulness or expediency of that mode of worship. They held the question to be an open one in the Established Church, to which they belonged. They considered themselves to be at full liberty to use the Organ if they chose. At all events, they did not think that in such a matter they were bound to ask the sanction of the civil magistrate; and they wished it to be understood that their application had reference exclusively to the arrangements in the seating of the edifice, necessary to make room for the instrument. At the same time, they take care to throw in a little of what Brother Jonathan calls "*soft sawder*." They are confident that the Town-

Council will "observe with pleasure their attempt to advance in the knowledge and practice of Psalmody, and will gladly concur in the endeavour to rescue our national character from the reproach of having almost entirely neglected the cultivation of Sacred Music." "Our Heritors," they add, in language approaching the sublime, "Magistrates of one of the first commercial cities of Europe, will thus give new evidence to mankind that the genius of commerce is not the contracted spirit of hostility to the liberal arts, but the enlivening sun of science, dispelling, in its progress, the gloomy fogs of prejudice, that have too long benumbed the energies, and untuned the feelings of our country. Glasgow has the honor of having first made the public proposal of introducing into one of its Churches the most perfect of musical instruments, and of employing it for the generous purpose of tuning the public voice for the exercise of praise. And the present Lord Provost, and Magistrates, and Council, will, we doubt not, eagerly embrace the opportunity of accomplishing a measure which will give additional lustre to their names, and render the period of their administration the opening of a new era in the annals of our national advancement." And they conclude with an appropriate musical benediction, "imploring upon the heads" of the authorities "the blessing of Almighty God, who hath formed the ear for the delights of harmony, and whom we are bound to serve by the culture of every faculty which it hath pleased Him in his goodness to bestow."

Before submitting the matter to the Town-Council, the Lord Provost and Magistrates thought it right to have the opinion of their legal assessor, the first town-clerk, Mr. Reddie. The opinion of that gentleman is given in a paper well worthy of his high reputation as an eminently judicious, learned, sound and able lawyer. Personally, he avows his sympathy with the Minister and Congregation. But in his official capacity he advises, in substance, that the Magistrates and Council should decline complying with the prayer of the petition until the sanction of the ecclesiastical authorities was sought and got.' The following passage from this document is deserving of notice:—

"That there is any express act of the Legislature prohibiting the use of Organs in our Established Churches, I am not aware. But that the introduction of Organs into our Churches would be a material alteration, and innovation in our external mode of worship, there cannot be a doubt. The argument which would identify an Organ with a pitch-pipe, does not merit a serious answer.

"Whether the use of Organs in our Established Churches would be an expedient, or an inexpedient measure, in a religious and ecclesiastical view, it is unnecessary here to inquire; because your Lordship and the other Magistrates are not an Ecclesiastical Judicature, and have no right to take cognizance of the matter in that character. But, as Civil Magistrates, you are legally bound to maintain our Constitution, in Church and State, in its present condition; and by

express statute, you are bound 'to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church.' That there is great danger of the introduction of Organs disturbing the peace, and interrupting the harmony of the Church of Scotland, I should be sorry to suppose. At the same time, such an event is possible. Whether for the auricular gratification of one Congregation, ground of offence should be afforded to other Congregations, is a matter that requires serious thought. Some respect is due by the Civil Magistrate, even to what many individuals may be disposed to term the prejudices of their weaker brethren. And at all events, if any innovation in our external mode of worship be expedient and salutary, the reform, or improvement, ought to originate with the Ecclesiastical Branch of the Government, with the constitutional Guardians of our conduct and our welfare in such matters. When the use of Organs in our Established Churches has been sanctioned by the Ecclesiastical Legislature, then it will be the duty of your Lordship and the other Magistrates, not merely to permit the use of these musical instruments, but to protect in that use those Congregations who may conceive such instruments to minister to their edification. Till the Ecclesiastical Branch of the Constitution have sanctioned the use of Organs in our Established Churches, I do not see that the Magistrates and Council can, with any propriety, directly or indirectly, approve of such an Ecclesiastical innovation."

Mr. Reddie scouts the notion entertained by Dr. Ritchie and his people, "that the Magistrates and Council have the power of granting or refusing the present application, 'merely on the ground of expedience or inexpediency as to the removal of the seats' in the Church." "With me," he says, "this opinion has no weight." He tells the Magistrates and Council that they have "a right to judge of the application in two characters, as representative Heritors and as Civil Magistrates." In the former of these characters, they have to consider the probable bearing of the proposed change of the interests of the community which they represent. In the latter, they are required, in terms of the Confession of Faith, to "take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church." In the discharge of this last duty, they are entitled, and if the matter seems to them to be of importance, they are bound, to bring under the notice of the Church Courts whatever in their apprehension may have a tendency to disturb the Church's "unity and peace." And Mr. Reddie clearly holds, that, in the case submitted to him, this was the proper course for the Magistrates and Council to follow. He advises that "they should recommend to the gentlemen subscribers and to the able and learned Pastor of that most respectable Congregation, before proceeding farther, to apply for the permission and sanction of the Ecclesiastical Branch of our Constitution." Mr. Reddie's views give a reasonable and just interpretation of that phrase in our Confession which has occasioned not a little controversy,—the phrase, namely, about the

Civil Magistrate "taking order." He shows how, without interfering with the jurisdiction of the Church, the Civil Magistrate may see to it that "unity and peace be preserved," by bringing any matter which seems to threaten disunion or dispeace under the notice of the proper ecclesiastical authorities.

Such, accordingly, was the conduct of the Lord Provost, when, a year after, the question again arose. For Mr. Reddie's conclusive opinion, which the Town Council, on the 8th Sept. 1806, adopted as their reply to Dr. Ritchie and the petitioners, seems to have arrested the progress of the movement for a year. But in the autumn of 1807, the smothered fire of *Organic* zeal once more began to burn with increased intensity.

Happening accidentally to hear, "in a conversation which took place in a company where he was," on Friday 21st August 1807, that the Organ was to be used in public worship on the following Sunday, the Lord Provost wrote to Dr. Ritchie on Saturday, inquiring "if such really was his intention," and warning him that "if so, he would consider it his duty to enter a solemn protest against him for all damages which might be the consequence." On the same day Dr. Ritchie replied: "I shall embrace the first possible opportunity of laying the Lord Provost's letter before the Committe of the Congregation, to which the business of the Organ has been committed, that they may know at what risk such an attempt as that which they have in view must be made. They will, as becomes them, pay all due deference to your Lordship's declaration." Next day, Sabbath, 23rd August, 1807, "through the long-drawn aisle and fretted vault" of St. Andrew's Church, "the pealing" Organ "swelled the note of praise."

On the 26th August the Lord Provost's letter to Dr. Ritchie was laid by him before his Musical Committee. On the same day the Lord Provost made a formal communication to the Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow, intimating the fact of the Organ having been used. He also wrote to Dr. Ritchie, telling him that he had done so, and repeating also more fully his former protest. On the 2nd September he writes again to the Moderator of the Presbytery, mentioning that, on the 29th August, "a deputation from the St. Andrew's Congregation waited upon him." "They intimated," he says, "verbally, that they had come to the determination of giving up the use of the Organ for the present if I would withdraw the communication which I had made to the Presbytery." His Lordship adds, that he made no immediate answer to that intimation, but that he had since laid before the Magistrates and Council "the whole of his correspondence about the Organ." In conclusion, he announces the final resolution of the whole body: "They unanimously approved of all that I had done, and agreed that the matter should now rest with the Reverend Presbytery."

The proceedings in that Court were short and summary. On 2nd

September the Presbytery resolved to thank the Lord Provost; and, at the request of Dr. Ritchie, delayed the case till their next ordinary meeting. On the 7th October Dr. Ritchie was heard, and "judicially declared, That he would not again use an Organ in the public worship of God without the authority of the Church." Thereupon two motions were made. The first was, "That the Presbytery are of opinion, that the use of the Organ in the public worship of God is contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of our Established Church, and therefore prohibit it in all the Churches and Chapels within their bounds: and with respect to Dr. Ritchie's conduct in this matter, they are satisfied with his declaration." The second was, "That in consequence of Dr. Ritchie's judicial declaration, the Presbytery find it unnecessary to proceed further in this business; declaring, at the same time, their judgment, that the introduction of an Organ into public worship is inexpedient, and unauthorised in our Church." The first motion carried, Dr. Ritchie declining to vote; and there being no complaint or appeal to the Superior Court, the judgment of the Presbytery was final, and the case took end.

It took end,—that is, in one sense, but in another sense the discussion then began. The minority lodged reasons of dissent. They were willing to condemn the use of Organs in public worship, as inexpedient and unauthorised; but without going so far as to pronounce it, either civilly or ecclesiastically, unlawful and unconstitutional. Of the four names attached to the Reasons of Dissent, Taylor, Ranken, Davidson, MacGill—the last, that of the late Professor of Divinity in Glasgow, will probably carry most weight. Elaborate answers were prepared by a Committee of Presbytery, consisting of Drs. Porteous, Balfour, M'Lean, and Mr. Lapslie; and separate papers were given in by Dr. Taylor, junior, by Dr. Lockhart, and by Dr. Ritchie himself. This last paper raised again the whole question on the merits, being a long and able argument for the use of instrumental music in public worship. The Presbytery recorded a Reply to it, prepared by the same Committee who had answered the Reasons of Dissent. At last, on the 4th of May 1808, this war of protocols within the Presbytery ceased.

Out of doors, the controversy raged in newspapers, pamphlets, and caricatures. Of the pamphlets, several, including one by that most strenuous and uncompromising foe to innovation, the late Dr. Begg of New Monkland, are very valuable, and will deserve attention if the fight is to be seriously renewed. Before the friends of the Organ renew the fight, they would do well to study the records of that former conflict. Of the caricatures, that which is best remembered is the one which represents Dr. Ritchie, who was about the time of these proceedings translated to Edinburgh, travelling as a street-musician, with a barrel-organ strapped across his shoulder, and solacing himself with the good old tune, "*I'll gang nae mair to yon toun.*"

The two papers now republished are the last of those received and

recorded by the Presbytery. They are both of them papers of no ordinary ability. And they have this advantage, that they discuss the question gravely upon its general merits, without mixing up with it almost any of the details and episodes of the particular case which raised it. Dr. Ritchie writes as a gentleman and a scholar; he reasons with much ingenuity; he shows great dexterity in evading or covering the weak points in his argument; he skilfully selects the most plausible and telling topics, and presents them in a graceful form, well fitted to impress men of accomplishments and men of taste and feeling. The writer, as is well known, continued for many years to occupy respectably the position of a Minister and Professor in Edinburgh. The other production is that of a learned and profound Divine, "mighty in the Scriptures." It goes much more fully and thoroughly into the subject. It is not, perhaps, written in so attractive a manner as Dr. Ritchie's. Fastidious or superficial readers may find it less inviting. But by those who can understand and relish the formal discussion of a theological topic, it will be felt to be the work of a master. Long ago, when I first studied it, I remember how it impressed me with the sort of sense of completeness which a satisfactory demonstration gives; and a recent perusal has not lowered my opinion of it. I think it would not be easy to meet any of its propositions in fair debate; although, of course, it may be open to cavilling and special pleading. Its style is clear, simple, and strong. The author,—for it is known to be mainly, if not altogether, the work of Dr. Porteous,—was no ordinary man. He was Minister of the Wynd Church, in the old town of Glasgow,—a Church which, towards the close of his ministry, was transferred to a new locality, and received the new name of St. George's.* He was held in high esteem among his contemporaries; and if this treatise be almost the only literary remains we have of him, it is of itself quite sufficient to prove that their estimate of him was not too high.

My task, for the present, is done. I do not intend to argue the matter myself. I have great hope that the argument as conducted by Dr. Porteous will make many, who have been almost led away by the plausibilities that are so easily got up on the side of Organs, pause at least before they lend themselves to what may cause a most perilous agitation. It is not that I am afraid of a controversy on this subject,

* After this transference, the site of the old Wynd Church became a market, with which, in former days, I used to be very familiar. Within the last few years, the market being given up, the site was purchased by Dr. Buchanan of the Free Tron Church, and his Congregation, for the erection of their new Territorial Church for the district of the Wynds, one of the worst in Glasgow. I preached in that new Church on the day on which it was opened, and several persons present told me they remembered worshipping in the old Wynd Church. One gentleman in particular said he had found himself seated in the very spot where he was accustomed of old to sit, in the time of Dr. Porteous. These are things worth noticing, not only for the interest that attaches to them as linking the past and the present together, but also, and chiefly, as pointing a higher moral. Forty or fifty years ago, the way was to take a Church out of the Wynds and plant it in a fashionable and wealthy street; and the Church among the poor became a flesh-market. It was a common infatuation, of which we are now reaping the fruits. It is some consolation, at the same time, to think that we are also trying to repair the mischief. The new Territorial Wynd Church, occupying the forsaken site of that old Wynd Church, is surely one of the hopeful signs of the times.

or of its issue, so far as the merits of the question are concerned. I believe that it is a question which touches some of the highest and deepest points of Christian theology. Is the Temple destroyed? Is the Temple worship wholly superseded? Have we, or have we not, priests and sacrifices among us now? Is the Temple or the Synagogue the model on which the Church of the new Testament is formed? Does the Old Testament itself point to anything but "the fruit of the lips" as the peace-offering or thank-offering of Gospel times? Is there a trace in the New Testament of any other mode of praise? For my part, I am persuaded that if the Organ be admitted, there is no barrier, in principle, against the sacerdotal system in all its fulness.—against the substitution again, in our whole religion, of the formal for the spiritual, the symbolical for the real.

I do not judge others. The case is very different with those who never reached our measure of reformation from what it is with us. A Church which, stopping short in the process of its emancipation from a false system, retains certain of the usages of that false system, is in a very different position from a Church which, having advanced farther in the direction of purity and simplicity, voluntarily retrogrades and returns to these usages. To the one they may be comparatively harmless, while to the other they may prove deeply hazardous. In the former instance, the continuance of them indicates no new leaning towards ritualism, no decline from what is more pure and spiritual. In the latter instance, the adoption of them may have a significancy, and may exert an influence, of a serious character indeed. A landing-place which is tolerable for those who are going forward, may be the reverse of tolerable for those who are retreating. This is a consideration applicable to not a few matters of practical concern, in which Puritans and Presbyterians have been led to entertain views somewhat stricter than those which some other Christian bodies hold. And it is a consideration which makes zeal and anxiety in defence of our own ways, perfectly consistent with a charitable and liberal construction of the ways of those who have never learned to think and feel as we do.

I have said that I do not dread controversy on this subject, for the truth's sake. But I own I deprecate it for the sake of our common Presbyterianism. It cannot fail to raise questions painfully affecting the relations of Presbyterian Churches to one another. It may break us up even more than we are broken up already. It must interpose a new obstacle to union. Our friends who would like to see the Organ introduced cannot possibly consider it a necessity. At the most, it is a luxury. Let them not purchase it too dearly. I hope they will read these papers. They may not be convinced by the reasoning of Dr. Porteous, in which his brethren of that day largely agreed. But if they are intelligent and candid, they must surely see that there is more to be said on his side than perhaps they were prepared to expect. And at any rate they must own, that strong convictions, founded on such grounds of Scripture, are not to be treated lightly. It rests

with them, through what cannot be to them a very difficult exercise of forbearance, to preserve the peace of the Presbyterian Churches in these realms. If they will not, or cannot, consent to exercise that forbearance, they can scarcely now complain that they have not been warned in a friendly spirit,—and warned, I repeat, in time.

DR. RITCHIE'S STATEMENT.

A WISH had for years, for more than thirty years, been cherished by the Congregation of St. Andrew's Church, to have an Organ erected, and employed in Public Worship. After the proposal for such an erection had been repeatedly made to me, by respectable members and heads of families belonging to that Congregation, I at last gave my assent, with the full approbation of my own mind. The principles upon which this my assent has been and still is founded, I have now the honour to lay before the Presbytery. In doing this, I take no charge of the Reasons of Dissent from the sentence passed by the Presbytery against the use of Organs. These Reasons, though not fully to my mind, are yet, in my opinion, valid, as to the main point which they are meant to establish. Neither do I enter the lists with the Answers to these Reasons, with many of the positions in which I perfectly agree, while yet, in many respects, my opinions are different from those of the Respondents. But it becomes me, in vindication of my Congregation and myself, to open up the grounds upon which we think we had the right to employ an Organ in Public Worship.

There is one, and but one, fixed and infallible standard for all that regards Public Worship. Whatever is not agreeable to, and founded upon the Word of God, ought to have no place in the Worship of Christians. Now in looking into our Scriptures, we find that before the giving of the Law, Instrumental Music was employed by the twelve tribes of Israel, to whom, through the fathers, the promises had been given. When we look into the history of nations that were strangers to Divine Revelation, there too, we find universally the use of instruments in giving praise to their gods. Such use, then, appears to be something that belongs not to sects or parties, but to human nature. It is dictated by the best of those feelings which the God of Nature hath implanted in every bosom, prompting men to employ with reverence, according to the means which they possess, all their powers in expressing gratitude to their Creator. It appears to be such, from its existence prior to all positive religious establishments, and from the universal practice of mankind.

When we advance in our inquiry, and look into the covenant of peculiarity introduced by the ministry of Moses, no mention is made of Instrumental Music among the ritual observances of the Law. In a

system of merely temporary institution, it was not deemed necessary, by positive enactment, either to forbid or to enjoin the use of Instrumental Music in Public Worship. But it was left to the will, and situation, and circumstances of the worshippers. Yet, while the ritual law, in all its branches, forms a majestic whole, guarded by most solemn sanctions, Instrumental Music was not found to interfere with its rites, to break its unity, or to be inconsistent with the perfect pattern furnished on the mount. What was the practice of the Church of Israel in this respect, from Moses to David, has not been recorded. David, of whom was to come, and of whom, according to the flesh, is come, Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant was raised from keeping his father's flock, to fill an eminent station, and to act an important part in the great scheme of Providence. He was richly endowed with gifts and graces for maintaining and promoting, in the conspicuous station to which he was exalted, the pure Worship of the true God. Many are the prophecies that he uttered, as he was moved by the Holy Ghost ; many are the sublime strains of praise which he poured forth by the Spirit ; and in some of the most sublime of these strains, when rapt up in the majesty of the King he adored, he invites, exhorts, enjoins, not merely the congregation then assembled, not merely the twelve tribes of Jacob, but all nations, all the earth, to praise the Lord as he did, with Psaltery, and with Harp, and with Organ, and with the voice of a Psalm. Was his language and his conduct an infringement of the Law of Moses, so awfully hedged in on every side by curses and by blessings ? Was not he zealous for the Law ? Was he compelled by any superior authority to adopt a practice which he felt to be inconsistent with the purity of instituted worship ? Was he not seated on the throne ? Was he not anointed of the Lord ? Was he not animated by the pure Spirit who alone kindles in the pious heart the flame of living praise ? These Psalms of David have ever been held in such high estimation, not only by Jews, but by Christians, that they have been adopted by all sects and parties ; they have, by sovereign authority, been appointed to be sung by all National Churches. They have been, and are appointed by the Church of Scotland, to be sung in Congregations and in Families. And can it be a sin to sing them, as was done by the original composer, with the accompaniment of an Organ ? If these strains ever flowed warm and pure from a human heart, we cannot deny that they must have done so from the heart that first conceived them, warmed by the sound of his Harp and his Organ, under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Shall any Church, shall a Protestant Church, condemn the singing of the Psalms of David as they were sung by the man according to God's own heart ?

But it may be said, that the Church was then in an infant state, and that, now become men, we should put away childish things. Let us then consider what we have to learn from the conduct of our Lord and his Apostles. Now we no where find the great Head of the Church,

the Lord Jesus Christ, repealing the injunctions pronounced by the Psalmist David. Jesus was continually going about, was often in the temple and in the synagogues, often was present at Public Worship and the reading of the Law. He often administered reproof to the Jews for their attention to minute rites, and the traditions of the fathers, while they neglected "the weightier matters of judgment, mercy, and faith." He was zealous for the honour of the temple, his Father's house; he cast out the money-changers, and overturned their benches; but he never once opened his lips against their Music and their Organs. Would Jesus have been silent on this subject, had Instrumental Music been a gross profanation of sacred things? Can we suspect him of winking, through weakness, at what he knew to be a corruption of Worship? The Apostle Paul, in his journeyings, frequented ever the synagogues. There he met and disputed with the Jews. Ardent was his zeal against the beggarly elements of rites and ceremonies. Many are the important practical rules of life that he has laid down; many are the exhortations to praise that he has given; and is it not strange, that, amidst all his warnings, he never warns his Gentile converts against Harps, and Psalteries, and Organs? At Jerusalem, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Athens, and at Rome, he must have often seen and heard Instrumental Music in Worship, and yet not a single reproof of it has ever dropt from his pen. If ever a human being breathed the pure spirit of his Master, it was John, the beloved disciple. In his Gospel, written towards the evening of his days, and in his Epistles, we read not one sentence in condemnation of Organs. When we advance to the Book of Revelation, that deeply mysterious book, which shuts up the visions and the prophecy, we find that John, now fifty years after the ascension of his Lord, while he himself was an exile on the isle of Patmos, when the forms of Christian Worship must now at least have been as familiar to his mind as ever had been the Worship of the temple;—when we read this book, we find, not one, but frequent allusions so made to Instrumental Music in Worship, as lead us to infer on his part high approbation of it. Nay, in one passage, he expressly declares that he heard "Harpers harping with their Harps" in heaven.—(Rev. xiv. 2.) Words cannot be simpler, nor convey more plainly an unequivocal meaning; and that meaning clearly is, that Instrumental Music is at least not inconsistent with the purity of Evangelical praise. And whatever value or meaning men may now attach to the imagery of that prophetic book, it certainly stood high in the estimation of the Westminster Divines. I adduce but one example. In support of that paragraph of the 23rd chap. of our Confession of Faith, which asserts the right of Christian Sovereigns to wage war, they give the following passage from the Book of Revelation, as one of their authorities, (chap. xvii. 14, 16,)—"These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them; for he his Lord of lords, and King of kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.... And the ten horns

which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire." Now, if the bold imagery of this passage be, and what Minister or Presbytery of our Church can deny it to be a solid foundation on which to build so important a doctrine as that of the right of Kings to make war, then, surely, the simple language of the passage to which I refer clearly establishes this truth, that Instrumental Music accords perfectly with the purest praise that we can conceive. For it is an eternal truth, that the Holy Spirit of God never did and never could, suggest to the mind of David, or of John, or of any created being, an image or a sound that has the most distant tendency to promote impure thoughts, and to corrupt religious Worship. Here, then, is one fundamental point established : the use of Instrumental Music in Public Worship is not in itself sinful, is not forbidden by the Word of God, but, on the contrary, is expressly encouraged, perhaps enjoined, in the Old Testament, and is clearly authorised by the New.

Supported by this high authority, let us next trace what we have to learn on this subject from the history of the Church. Was Instrumental Music employed in their Worship by the Christians of the first age? There is every reason to believe that it was not. No mention is made of it by the earliest historians ; and perhaps no mention would have been made, although it had been in general use, because such Music in Worship was neither striking nor strange, either to Gentiles or to Jews. That Harps and Organs could not then be employed, must be evident, from the severe and unremitting persecution to which the Church was subjected. How could men think of employing Harps and Organs, while they were fleeing from city to city, and hiding themselves in holes, and dens, and caves of the earth? Even when, by the conversion of Constantine, a Christian Emperor was seated on the throne of the Roman world the peace of the Church was far from being secured. Wars and revolutions, and inundations of barbarous nations, succeeded each other with a ferocity and rapidity, and to an extent, of which we, even in these eventful times, can form only a very inadequate conception. Mingled with these wars, and promoted by them, controversy arose after controversy, and sect after sect in multitudes, and directed the attention of mankind to matters of far more importance than Sacred Music. Modes of Worship were forgotten, amidst the keen contention for modes of Faith. Yet, even in defiance of the stern barbarism and fierce superstition of those ages, some attention was paid to Psalmody ; for we find that controversies on this subject arose between Church and Church, and among the members of the same Church. But, as might be expected, little progress was made by a people whose throats were more accustomed to the hideous cry of war than to the soft notes of praise. About the middle of the eighth century, an era of flattering promise seemed to begin. Something like order was introduced among the Western nations, and some faint gleams of light began to dawn, struck out by the vigorous admin-

istration of Charles Martel, of Pepin, of Charlemagne. While Pepin, in the year 757, was holding a council of his clergy at Compiegne, for the reformation of manners, there arrived an Organ, sent him in compliment to his high reputation, by that Constantine Emperor of the East, who is so famous as the Iconoclast, the fierce enemy of images in Churches, of Convents, Monks, and Nuns. This Organ,—the first, it is said, that had been seen in Europe,—the French King presented to the Church of St Corneille at Compiegne. Struck with the majesty of the instrument, and the solemnity of its sound, the heroic soul of Pepin thought he could not better employ it, than by devoting it to the service of his God. Charlemagne, son and successor to Pepin, continued the use of Organs, and we learn from a poet of the ninth century, who, describing the effects of that instrument in that age, says, that a woman was so transported with the Music, that she fainted and expired under the sweetness of the sound. His words are,—

Dulce melos tantum vanas illudere mentes
Caepit, ut una, suis decedens sensibus, ipsam
Fæmina perdiderit, vocum dulcedine vitam.*

This instrument seems still to have been employed, and to have spread at last in fame, if not in numbers, during the reign of Louis the son of Charlemagne. For there exists a letter from the then Pope, John VIII, in which, towards the end of the ninth century, is this request to a German Bishop, "Precamur autem, ut optimum Organum, cum artifice qui hoc moderari et facere ad omnem modulationis efficaciam possit, ad instructionem musicæ disciplinæ aut deferas, aut mittas."† Such was the state of the arts even in Italy, during the ninth century, that not a man could be found who could make, or tune, or play upon an Organ. And the Pope requests, as a singular favour, that a man who *could* do so, might be sent to him from Germany, for teaching the Italians Music. From the death of Louis, and even during his reign, the prospect of dawning reformation in government, in science, and in religion, was darkened by a cloud that thickened ever deeper over Europe for more than two hundred years; during which we learn nothing of Instrumental Music in Churches. At last, Europe was roused by the Papal summons to the Crusades, Thousands travelled for conquest to the Holy Land. This fanatical frenzy continued to drain Europe of its inhabitants for a couple of centuries. Though most of the crusaders fell in Asia, yet some were continually returning, and by their observations on what they had seen, contributed not a little to awaken the human mind from the lethargy into which it had been sunk. Then began the age of scholastic philosophy, and of scholastic theology, which, exercising the human understanding on points of the nicest and most perplexing subtilty, paved the way for that bright day of sound literature, and pure

* "The sweet melody began to exercise such a charm on dreamy minds, that one woman, lapsing into insensibility, lost life itself under the sweetness of the voices."

† "We ask you to bring or send, for the purposes of musical instruction, a first rate Organ, with an artist competent to regulate it, and make it available for all musical modulations."

religion, which now shines over Europe. At this era, so auspicious to the human race, it is worthy of remark, that we again find Organs beginning to appear, and walking side by side with the other improvements of the age. So far, then, were Organs from being the invention of the dark ages, that it was ever during periods of dawning light that they began to be employed, not by the authority of a Papal decree, but by the dicate of pious feeling, prompting the enlightened mind to consecrate the labours of genius to the devout exercise of praise. The dark ages had neither the head to invent, nor the hand to make, though they might have had the heart to enjoy them. During the fourteenth and fifteen centuries, great were the exertions of the human soul, struggling for knowledge, for liberty, for employment suited to its powers. The pressure of superstition, and of Papal oppression, counteracted their own ends, and, through the unseen workings of a gracious Providence, were overruled to bring on the Reformation. Organs did not shrink from the scrutinizing zeal of that keenly-searching age ; for Luther and Calvin, and the other enlightened Reformers, discovered in them nothing of the idolatry of a corrupted Church, which they so nobly laboured to overturn. And, indeed, upon the slightest attention by the most superficial inquirer, it must be discovered that Instrumental Music forms no essential part of Popery ; that it is founded upon principles widely different, indeed, from the ceremonies of the Church of Rome, because it is consonant at once to sound reason and the Word of God. Accordingly, it was retained, and it is still employed, by all the Reformed Churches on the Continent of Europe. A stronger argument in its favour cannot be produced, except that which I have already mentioned, the sacred authority of Scripture.

Why, then, has it not been employed by the Church of Scotland? The reasons are strong, as they were pressing ; and in tracing them we shall discover the origin of that prejudice which still remains against Organs. Whatever our Psalmody might have been under the Popish power, we know that in the reforming Church of Scotland it must have been almost annihilated. Religious truth had to work its way amidst poverty and oppression, in opposition to the power of an arbitrary Government, and to the persecuting spirit of the Church of Rome. There were neither houses for the celebration of religious ordinances, nor Ministers to preside in the celebration of them, nor funds for the support of Ministers. No wonder that, in these circumstances, every thing was laid aside, but the pure preaching of the Gospel, and the performance of Worship in the best manner which the necessity of the times would allow. From this state of degradation it was long before our Church was able to emerge. The doctrines of the Reformation, it is true, were generally embraced, and a system of ecclesiastical policy settled agreeable to the general wishes of the country. But the wealth of the Church had been seized by the landed proprietors, and long and arduous was the contest, before even liberty of conscience, and

Presbyterian government, could be fixed upon a permanent foundation. The causes of this contest are easily ascertained, and its effects are deeply felt, even in our day. The troubles unavoidable from the factious spirit of a feudal nobility, under a female Popish reign;—the bigoted partiality of a pedantic King for Prelatic splendour, which he deemed favourable to absolute monarchy;—the mistaken piety of a virtuous Sovereign, contending, by unhallowed means, for what he thought agreeable to the Word of God;—the hypocritical ambition of a bold usurper, wading through the dark fanaticism of his contemporaries, to the possession of a kingdom which he affected to decline;—the unprincipled treason of a lawful Prince, restored to the throne of his ancestors, straining by force and fraud to impose upon our country a yoke which its brave inhabitants were determined never to bear;—the weak infatuation of a Popish Sovereign, urging him on not merely to the destruction of Presbytery, but of the Reformation;—this unbroken series of persecution, maintained with such unrelenting obstinacy, through such a number of years, impressed, engraved, wrought into the very soul of our Presbyterians, a fear, a dread, an abhorence, not only of Popery and Prelacy, but of every thing that had been connected with Popish and Episcopal Worship.

Under these circumstances, our forefathers thought, and felt, and contended honourably, nobly, as became patriots and Christians. What Scottish heart does not sympathize with them, asserting, at the expense of fortune and life, those high privileges which we now enjoy! What mind but must approve of a conduct dictated by manly feeling, by religious principle, by the love of all that they held sacred on earth and in heaven! Under the irritation to which they were subjected, they acted wisely, when, in obedience to that strong impulse of what they owed to moral, political, religious existence, they wreaked, as they did, their vengeance on Altars, Crosses, Organs, on every the most distant seeming appendage of a form of Worship which they were determined not to embrace. And if an infatuated Government should attempt, in any future age, a similar mode of infringing the sacred rights of man, it is to be hoped that the spirit of our ancestors would revive in their descendants, and animate them to contend, as their fathers did, even to the death, for liberty of conscience, and for pure religion.

It is then evident, that from the Reformation down through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was not possible for our Church to pay much, if any attention to Sacred Music. A new era commenced at the Revolution; from which period downwards our Presbyterian Establishment has, under a limited monarchy, enjoyed all the peace and protection which Government can bestow. During a century of uninterrupted prosperity, it is to be expected that legal independence, and perfect security against the encroachments of Popery or Prelacy, may have disposed Churchmen and Laymen among among us to consider calmly what is, and what is not, essential to

those forms of Ecclesiastical Government, and to rise superior to the weakness of rejecting improvements in things indifferent, merely because they are employed by Churches whose modes of Worship we reject. This, in a very considerable degree, has taken place. National and religious antipathies are yielding to the lenient hand of time. A liberality of spirit pervades our enlightened Church. Improvements even in our Psalmody are begun, which prognosticate favourably for farther advancement. The tide of human affairs is strong. The hand of God, guiding the progress of mind, cannot be resisted. The steps will be made, which yet remain, for vindicating our Church and our country from the reproach of neglecting one of the best means that has ever been devised for the improvement of Sacred Music.

'And shall Organs,' it will be asked, 'shall Organs be introduced into any of our Churches in Scotland?' And why not? Have not we, the disciples of Calvin, as good a right to Instrumental Music in our Worship, and all its advantages, as his disciples in Geneva, in Switzerland, and in Germany? 'But has not our Church been always hostile to Organs?' Of such hostility no evidence exists, or can exist, in a case similar to the introduction of the Organ into St. Andrew's Church.

For this is a singular case, the first attempt of the kind that was ever made according to the pure principles of Presbytery. The people of that Congregation, respectable both from character and from number, and steady as any of their countrymen in the attachment to the religion transmitted to them by their fathers;—the people made the proposal, not dictated to them by a domineering priest, not imposed upon them by a tyrannical government, but as their own unbiassed wish, cherished among them for years, before they ever knew the man who is their present Minister. The Organ was introduced upon principles as free from any connection with Episcopacy and Popery, as the principles of our Directory for Worship are from connection with the Church of England and of Rome. Against such an introduction our Church could not possibly enact laws, or discover a hostile spirit, because it had never hitherto taken place. Laws are a remedy provided against past or present evils. The sagacity of Legislators cannot pierce into futurity and provide against what may arise in the course of ages.

'But did not an Assembly of our Church, in the year 1644, re-echo to the Scotch Divines at Westminster their expressions of triumph over the destruction of the great Organ at St. Paul's? Yes; but those were times of fierce and furious war against the Church of England. An invading army who have no antipathy to hedges and villages, and corn fields, yet, while they are advancing to battle, may level cruelly with the ground every obstacle that impedes their progress to victory. The enemy which our Divines of that age had chiefly at heart to subdue, was not the helpless, harmless Organ, but

the hierarchy and Service-book of our Sister Kingdom. And from their success in destroying what they regarded as the *outworks*, they might with joy anticipate their reducing to subjection the last resort of the adversary. Antipathy to Organs in this country has ever been associated with antipathy to Episcopacy. Organs and Prelates have, by a surprising want of discrimination, been involved in one common condemnation. But what have Organs to do with Bishops? Nothing more than with John Calvin, John Knox, or Mr. Andrew Merville. They are never once mentioned in the Book of Common Prayer. The canons of the Church of England never touch them. Instrumental Music in Worship is not the property of any one particular Church or Kingdom. It is the hereditary right of every Church and Country under Heaven.

'But has not our Church an Act of Security incorporated with the Act of the Union of the two kingdoms, and Acts of the General Assembly against Innovation, which completely guard us against the introduction of Organs?' The Act of Security, of Union and against Innovation, had more important objects in view, with which Organs have no concern. By the Revolution, the Act of Security, and the Act of Union, there has been secured to us, to our Church, and to our Country, all *that* for which our fathers fought, and for which so many shed their blood. The purity and uniformity of the Doctrine, and Discipline, and Government, and Worship of the Church of Scotland, are to be preserved to the people of Scotland, without alteration, to all succeeding generations. This is the firm foundation on which we stand, and shall stand, as long as human laws, and human power, and British liberty, can support us. From this foundation it is my hope, and it shall be, through God, my endeavour, that no power on earth or hell shall be able to move us. Here we are guarded by high and strong bulwarks against every Hierarchy, whether of Popery or Episcopacy. On this ground, no Liturgy, or Service-book can, or dare invade us. We are an Established Church, fenced round by all that can render us independent and free. Our purity and uniformity in Doctrine we declare by our subscription of our Confession of Faith. Our attachment to the Discipline and Government of the Church we attest by our subscription of our Formula. Our purity and uniformity of Worship we prove by our adherence to the rules laid down in our Directory. To each, and to all of these I trust, I have uniformly adhered as faithfully as my neighbours. I am not conscious of a wish having ever arisen within me to depart from any of them. And in the use of an Organ in our Church during public praise, I cannot for my life, after long and serious attention to the subject, discover even an approach to any violation either of the purity or uniformity of our Worship. For who will or can allege that an Organ is an innovation upon the great object of Worship? We all, I trust, worship the one God, through the one Mediator. Or upon the subject of praise? For we all sing the same Psalms and

Paraphrases in the same language, all giving thanks for the same mercies. Or upon the posture of the worshippers? For we all sit, as becomes true Presbyterians. Or upon the tunes sung? For we sing only such as are in general use. Or upon the office of the Precentor? For he still holds his rank, and employs the commanding tones of the Organ for guiding the voices of the people. What then is it? It is a help, a support given to the Precentor's voice, for enabling him more steadily, and with more dignity, to guide the voice of the Congregation; and thus to preserve not only uniformity, but that unity of voice which is so becoming in the public service, which so pleasingly heightens devout feelings, and prevents that discord which so easily distracts the attention of the worshippers. And shall the addition of a certain quantity of modulated sound to the Precentor's voice, in perfect union with his, and therefore incapable of disturbing the current of devotion, shall this be magnified into the monstrous crime—the presumption of worshipping God by images—of violating the Articles of the Union—of demolishing the barriers for the security of our religion—of committing a deed of perjury to ordination vows? Such insinuations against the People and the Minister of St. Andrew's Church I can express by no other terms, than that they are a total perversion of the meaning of words, utterly confounding the nature of things.

'But as all Congregations will not, or cannot employ Organs, therefore the national uniformity is broken.' Does our national uniformity consist in nothing more substantial than a certain fixed quantity of sound, beyond which no Congregation has authority to pass? What is the subject to which this uniformity relates? There can be no *mode* without a subject to which it adheres. And shall our national uniformity be said merely to relate to things unsubstantial, ever varying, even while the ear is labouring to hear and the mind to catch them? To attach perpetuity of form to things from their nature incapable of uniform duration, would be a solemn mockery of our venerable Legislators. Have all Congregations, or can all Congregations have, an equal number of voices, the same height, or depth, or force of sound, for expressing themselves in praise? All Congregations have not bands of singers to guide them in praise. But do these things, the result of situations and of circumstances which no human law can prevent, break in upon the national uniformity of Worship? No more than the difference between a plain, untutored country Congregation, where almost every man and every woman sing honestly their own tune, and the well-regulated harmony of a Glasgow Kirk, guided by a highly-cultivated band. And there is not an abuse of which Organs are susceptible, nor an objection to which they are liable, nor an improper influence which they may be supposed likely to produce, which may not, in an equal degree, be ascribed to a band of human singers; which is literally an Organ, composed of the throats of moral agents, converting themselves for hire into pipes and whistles.

But it is not against these petty distinctions, which are unavoidable in every large society, when French equality is not the order of the day; it is not against these that the wisdom of our Church and State has so anxiously guarded us;—but against the Hierarchy and the Service-book. From inattention to this, combined with the distracted state of the country in former times, has arisen the prejudice against Organs, while the mistaken idea has been cherished that they form a component part of Episcopacy. That this is mistake and prejudice is proved beyond all possibility of doubt, by the conduct of the most purely Calvinistic and most strictly Presbyterian Churches on the Continent. Not free, I am disposed to presume, from the influence of this mistake,* the Respondents seem never to have inquired what was done in St. Andrew's Church. They conjure up to themselves some horrid prostitution of sacred things, and then fight against it, as, *pro aris et focis*, wielding their arms against a shadow. What took place in our Church is literally this. The Precentor, as usual, was in his place: The Organ joined him, and so did the Congregation. The Organ never struck a note but at the same moment with the Precentor; it proceeded along with him, pausing from line to line in the ordinary method, maintaining throughout the whole that grave melody which our Directory enjoins; and with him it ceased. Who can discover here the monstrous profanation of worshipping God by images? Another mistake which, in my apprehension, runs through the opinion maintained by the Respondents is, that we, the Minister and Congregation of St. Andrew's Church, were assuming to ourselves the sovereign prerogative of enacting a law for the whole Church, for obtruding Organs upon all the Congregations in Scotland. This surely is a gigantic idea; such a thought never arose in our minds. We exercised what we believed to be our sacred private right, and we will ever allow to others the free exercise of theirs. Acting under the influence of these, which I regard as mistaken apprehensions of the subject, the Respondents have contended strongly against Episcopacy; which I have never undertaken to defend. They have passed a sentence which, in my apprehension, goes far beyond the object which they meant to condemn. For that cannot be illegal, against which no law exists, or *could exist*. That cannot violate, which touches not the Constitution. That cannot be against the law of God, which is authorised by his Word. That cannot be against the spirit and the genius of our Church, which she habitually recommends to the people, by her appointment of the singing of David's Psalmns. Before declaring her prohibition of Organs, it is incumbent on the Church to expunge from the Sacred Records those passages which seem clearly to recommend the use of instruments in Worship; that thus the worshippers may be delivered from the inconsistency of

* The author employs the term "Respondents," in referring to the Presbytery's Answers to the Reasons of Dissent given in by members voting in the minority. The Answers were drawn up, as usual, by a Committee, and adopted by the Presbytery. The Respondents therefore are the Presbytery.

promising and exhorting each other to do, what in their hearts they resolve, and by the Church are forbidden, to perform.

Such being the principles and sentiments which I had long entertained with regard to Instrumental Music, I felt myself fully warranted to concur with my people, in their scheme of erecting an Organ in St. Andrew's Church. With this view application was, in autumn 1806, made to the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council,—*not for leave to erect* an Organ in the Church: it became us not to present a request which the Civil Power had not the right to grant. All matters of Worship belong exclusively to the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. The request was, that the Lord Provost, and Magistrates, and Council, as our Heritors, would allow certain alterations in certain seats, that there might be room for setting up an Organ;—the petitioners at the same time binding themselves to defray the expense, and to make good all damages that might be *supposed*, but which they *apprehended* not to arise from the introduction of the Organ. This request the Magistrates, upon principles which to them seemed just, thought proper to refuse. The petitioners submitted, as became them, to the Civil Power, and never presumed to think of touching the seats in question. In this situation the business lay, until, in the beginning of June last, it was resolved by the Minister and a few heads of families, to have a meeting one evening in the week, of such members of the Congregation as might find it convenient to attend in Church, for the purpose of improving themselves in Sacred Music. This practice I believe existed in other Churches of this city, and the idea was borrowed from our neighbours. After finding that this proposal was relished by a number of the hearers, and that they gave regular attendance, it was next proposed by some of the attendants to introduce a Chamber Organ, as a help to the Precentor, for guiding the voices of the singers. For such an introduction it never once occurred to us that leave should be obtained from either the Civil or Ecclesiastical Power. This was the matter of merely private accommodation. We did not meddle with the seats;—we made no alterations whatever on any part of the Church. The Organ was introduced, was employed regularly one evening in the week; and the use of it never did, as far as I know, excite even the appearance of a tendancy to disturbance. We walked to and from Church in peace and quietness. No body minded *us;* they were better employed in attending to their own affairs. While we were thus meeting together, as members of one family, it was suggested that our edification might be promoted, and our improvement surely not retarded, by concluding our meeting with Family Worship. This was done; and in praise, we employed the Organ. The people present were highly gratified, and became loud and urgent in their requests for the use of that instrument in Public Worship. The resolution to employ it was adopted. But before our resolution was put in practice, I received from the Lord Provost of Glasgow the official letter of the 22d of August, which is

now in the Presbytery Record. This letter had not the effect of making me shrink one moment from what I believe to be my right,—from the privilege of directing all that concerns Public Worship in the Parish Church of which I am Minister, independently of Civil Power. I did not betray the cause of the Church, in yielding up to the Civil Magistrate what can only fall under the jurisdiction of my Ecclesiastical Superiors. I maintained the privileges of this Court; and I am now in my proper place, accounting for my conduct to the Presbytery of which I am a member. The Organ was employed in St. Andrew's Church, in Public Worship, on 23d of August last. No explosion took place. No damage ensued. All was done decently and in order. According to my promise, in my answer to the Lord Provost, I embraced the first opportunity of laying his Lordship's letter before a number of the gentlemen who have commonly acted with me in this matter. They all with one voice agreed that his Lordship's terms were fair, were just, were what they expected; and nothing more than what, upon a former occasion, in conversation with the Magistrates of the former year, they had engaged to perform. Three gentlemen were named for waiting upon the Lord Provost, and giving him the assurance which he required. Here, surely, there was no mark of disrespect to the Civil Power. This our meeting was on the 26th of August, and on that day I received the Lord Provost's second letter, conveying the official information, in full form, that he had taken the legal protest against us, which we never doubted would take place, and giving notice that he was to lay the whole matter before the Presbytery. Wishing, as from the beginning I had done, that every thing might be avoided that might have the most distant appearance of an interference between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; and fully persuaded that information not only might, but certainly would be lodged in some other way; for how could a deed be concealed, done in a Parish Church in the face of a Congregation, during Public Worship on the Lord's day?—with this wish, and under this persuasion, I sent two gentlemen twice in one day to request of the Lord Provost, that the Civil Power might no more be seen in this business; because, whatever opinion the Presbytery might form of the cause, they might perhaps be jealous of an encroachment on the rights of a Minister, since to them belongs, exclusively, the judgment in such cases, and the privilege of calling in the Civil Power in aid of their judgment, against refractory and obstinate Ministers. On this principle I acted, from the most sincere respect for both branches of this Constitution. The information was lodged; and when the Presbytery was about to enter on its discussion, I, not knowing in what light the Civil Power was to be regarded, craved a delay; which the Presbytery obligingly granted. At next meeting the business received so very unexpected a direction, and was hurried on by such a storm of zeal, that I have no desire now to reagitate the subject. The result stands upon record. And it is my hope that what I have now submitted shall also be committed to

record; that thus both sides of the question may be subjected to the review of future generations. And whatever opinion men may form of the merits of either side, I trust that every insinuation against the loyalty to Magistrates and to the Church, of us who are advocates for an Organ, will be found groundless. We, the Minister, and Elders, and Congregation of St. Andrew's Church, are loyal citizens. We honour and we obey our Magistrates. We vie with our fellow-citizens in our exertions to maintain the Civil Power in that dignified respectability which the interests of good order in Glasgow may require. We are steady in our attachment to our Ecclesiastical Establishment, as transmitted to us by our fathers, and secured to us by the law of the land. In what we have done on the subject of an Organ, we have had ever in view our own edification, without even the imagination of doing injury to an individual, of being disloyal either to Church or State. We have acted as a united people,—not a voice from among us having been raised against those who have stood most forward in the business. The subscribers to the petition had the concurrence and the good wishes of the whole people for success in their scheme. The example is singular, of a Minister, and Elders, and People, uniting as one man for promoting their own improvement in Sacred Music, by means which they deemed fair, and legal, and honourable; while yet, by those to whom they were looking up for encouragement, they have been exhibited to the world as violating the law both of the Church and of the State. Feeling, as we do, the harshness of the sentence pronounced against us, we have confidence that the judgment of a candid public will be, that guilt has been imputed where there was no crime, and that we have become the victims of a prejudice which we wished to remove,—the prejudice that Instrumental Music in Public Worship is inseparably connected with Popery and with Prelacy. In combining my efforts for this end with those of my Congregation, I have made no sacrifice of judgment, or even of opinion; for I have acted from the full approbation of my own mind, confirmed by the judgment and the practice of men of the most cultivated understandings, and of the purest hearts, that have ever adorned the Reformed Churches. And though, on this occasion, no sacrifice has been required of me for complying with the wishes of my hearers, yet I am persuaded they will consider what is past as a pledge on my part, that, if future circumstances should require it, in whatever can contribute to their liberal enjoyment, as well as to their religious improvement, no sacrifice shall be refused by me to my people, to whom my labours and my life are devoted.

(Signed,) WILL. RITCHIE.

Glasgow, 6th January, 1808.

DR. PORTEOUS' ANSWER.

Your Committee, in obedience to the appointment of the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow, beg leave to submit the following Answer to a paper given in to the Presbytery, by the Rev. Dr. Ritchie, on the sixth day of January last, entitled, "Statement of the Grounds on which the Minister of St. Andrew's Church thinks kimself vindicated in permitting, and the Facts connected with his employing an Organ in Public Worship on the Lord's day."

Your Committee beg leave to preface their Answer with the following request: That it may be explicitly understood by all parties, as a fixed principle, that in this discussion between our brother and us we are to avoid all general speculation about what might or what might not be a proper form of Religious Worship to be adopted by an infant Church, met for the first time to model its establishment. For the minister of St. Andrew's Church, and his Congregation, and we, your Committee, either in the character of teachers or in the capacity of hearers, are defined constituent parts of the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and have pledged ourselves, each of us, to defend its Doctrine, Government, Discipline, and Worship, as contained and specified in its standards, and confirmed by the public law of the land.

If that paper, which we are appointed to answer, had been written by a man entirely unacquainted with our Sacred Records, and only dictated by those feelings which, as the Statement expresseth itself, "the God of Nature hath implanted in every bosom, abstract from all positive religious establishments;" or, had it been written by a professed Episcopalian, inclined by education, and influenced by habit, to prefer the pomp of cathedral worship to the simplicity of the primitive times of the Church of Christ; or, had it even been written by a Congregationalist, who conceives that the will of his particular flock is a law paramount to all Confessions, or Liturgies, or Directories—your Committee, in their Answer, would have considered themselves as called on to have adopted a very different mode of reasoning. But let it be remembered, that our Answer is directed to that Statement given in by the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, for himself and his Congregation, component parts of the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland. And while we shall allow the most liberal toleration, in matters of public worship, to other bodies of professing Christians in this part of the United Kingdom, in no shape whatever do we consider ourselves at liberty to infringe the Presbyterian Establishment of our country, as contained in her standards, making a part of the public law of the land, acquiesced in for a hundred and twenty years, often recalled to our memory by the solemn decisions of our Church, and sanctioned by the decided approbation and veneration of the people of Scotland. Holding it, therefore, as an

undoubted principle, that neither the Reverend Presbytery nor the Minister of St. Andrew's Church are entitled to legislate a new form of Worship for their respective Congregations, but that they are expressly bound to defend and practise that form which was demanded by our forefathers in the Claim of Rights, established at the Revolution, and declared to be unalterable by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union,—your Committee flatter themselves that they shall be able to convince the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, and the world at large, that the judgment passed on the 7th October last, by the Presbytery of Glasgow, was agreeable to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of this our National Church. And should we, in our reasoning, use any language which may seem to a stranger to condemn any practice of Public Worship used by other Churches of Christ, let it be remembered, that it is our object solely to defend our own practice; and whatever argument of defense may assume the appearance of attack, it ariseth from the scantiness of language to express our ideas, not from any desire on our part to hurt the feelings of our Christian neighbours.

Our brother commenceth his Statement by observing, that a wish had been entertained for more than thirty years to have an Organ erected and employed in Public Worship in St. Andrew's Church. Though this may be literally true, it can be of no importance whatever, when judging upon the legality or even expediency of this measure. During that period it is well known this Congregation have had two very respectable Ministers, who were as desirous of pleasing their people as faithful Presbyterian Ministers ought to be. They were men of wisdom and prudence, as well as of taste. Neither of these ever attempted to bring forward a measure of this kind. Ought not this circumstance to have put our brother on his guard, especially if he be well informed, when he says that for thirty years this Congregation have wished for an Organ? The wish of any Congregation ought to have no weight whatever to induce the Minister of that Congregation to infringe the fundamental laws and constitution of our Established Church, to which both Minister and people have covenanted to adhere, and which they have promised to obey. The simple wish of a Congregation might be an argument to influence the Minister of English Independents, or Scotch Seceders; but in our Established Presbyterian Church, where the direction and superintendence of the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, are committed to Ministers and Elders, the office-bearers of our Church, acting in their legislative and judicial capacity, such an argument seems improper, and is most certainly unconstitutional. For our brother, therefore, to have so unprecedently given ear to the wishes of his Congregation, and hastened to obtain for them their favourite object, without even consulting the Presbytery of Glasgow in their official capacity, we do not trespass the rules of charity and politeness when we say, was, on his part at least bordering upon something

like unconstitutional conduct. Had the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow carried their opinion no higher than the dissentients did, on the 7th of October last, who declared the introduction of Instrumental Music *unauthorised* and *inexpedient*, your Committee would still be justified in saying what they have now said, relative to the conduct of our brother, when he talks of having yielded to the wish of his Congregation. Your Committee are afraid that this strong desire to please his Congregation, may have imperceptibly warped our brother's better judgment, and induced him to view that opposition which he has met with from the Presbytery of Glasgow to his favourite measure, as an opposition founded merely in prejudice; and to affirm such things in vindication of himself and his Congregation, in that Statement which he gave in, and which is now upon record, as fair logical reasoning will not support.

Considering the polite and candid manner in which the Presbytery of Glasgow accepted at once of the declaration of our brother, that he would not again use the Organ without the authority of the Church; and the indulgent spirit which they manifested, in granting him liberty to give in an explanation after the matter was decided, and even recording the whole of his argument in behalf of his opinion; your Committee did not expect to have heard of such expressions as these,—"The discussion was hurried on with such a storm of zeal"—"Such insinuations against the People and the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, I can express by no other terms, than that they are a total perversion of the meaning of words, utterly confounding the nature of things"—"Not free from the influence of this mistake, I am disposed to presume, the Respondents" (he must mean the Reverend Presbytery, because they had adopted the paper of the Respondents prior to the giving in of his Statement) "seem never to have inquired what was done in St. Andrew's Church; they conjure up to themselves some horrid prostitution of sacred things, and then fight against it, as *pro aris et focis*, wielding their arms against a shadow."

Your Committee are disposed to forgive irritation even in a liberal, philosophical, and Christian mind, when disappointed in a favourite measure. Even the best human characters are not free from imperfections. And to the imperfections incident to humanity they are disposed to ascribe the unguarded language used by the Minister of St. Andrew's Church in his Statement. Perhaps your Committee would be justified in saying, that, in point of form, our brother had no legal title to have uttered one syllable after our sentence was pronounced. He declined voting in the cause. He dissented not from the judgment, of the harshness of which he now complains. And therefore, had the Presbytery adhered strictly to ecclesiastical form, our brother could not have been indulged in having recorded his laboured defence of his favourite opinion; nor would we, your Committee, have now been called upon to answer a voluminous Statement, comprehending in some parts of it rather an attack upon the judgment

of the Presbytery, than merely an indulged explanation of his own conduct upon the twenty-third of August last.

The world, to which our brother appeals, shall judge between us.

We find some difficulty in ascertaining exactly the arrangement adopted by our brother in his Statement. But after the most attentive consideration on our part, we are inclined to believe that it resolves itself into the five following heads, which we shall analyse and answer in order :—

I. "That the use of Instrumental Music in Public Worship is not forbidden by the Word of God, but, on the contrary, is expressly encouraged, perhaps enjoined, in the Old Testament, and is clearly authorised by the New."

In his reasoning to support this, his first conclusion, our brother sets out by observing, that "There is but one fixed and infallible standard for all that regards Public Worship. Whatever is not agreeable to, or founded on the Word of God, ought to have no place in the Worship of Christians." To this position we most heartily assent. It is with particular pleasure that we observe this great Protestant principle, the foundation of our Reformation from Popery, and by which the door is for ever shut against all the will-worship and superstitious rites of the Church of Rome, recognised and gloried in by the author of the Statement.

With respect to his reasoning adjected to this fundamental principle ;—namely, that "before the giving of the Law, Instrumental Music was employed by the twelve tribes of Israel ;"—and that when we "look into the covenant of peculiarity introduced by the ministry of Moses, no mention is made of Instrumental Music among the ritual observances of the Law ;"—we dare not give such positive assent. For a great variety of opinions have been entertained by learned men, as to the precise period when Instrumental Music was introduced into the Jewish Church, in the Public Worship of God. Some have conceived that it had no existence prior to David, who, having a great genius for Music, and being himself a masterly performer, incorporated it with the Tabernacle service. Others suppose, from a passage in the eighty-first Psalm, and from another in Exodus (xv. 20), that Instrumental Music in the Worship of God was practised by the Israelites prior to the giving of the Law, "Sing aloud unto God our strength : make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob. Take a Psalm, bring hither the Timbrel, the plesant Harp with the Psaltery. This he ordained in Joseph for a testimony, when he went out through the land of Egypt." "And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a Timbrel in her hand ; and all the women went out after her with Timbrels and with dances." While there are others who are of opinion, and perhaps with equally good reason, that Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God was chiefly instituted by Moses, and that it forms an enactment of the Ceremonial Law. Thus, Num. x. 10, "Also in the day of your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in

the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the Trumpets over your burnt-offerings, and over your peace-offerings; that may be to you for a memorial before your God: I am the Lord your God." Of which last opinion is Calvin; for in his Commentary upon Psalm xxxii. 2, he pronounces Instrumental Music a part of the "*Pædagogia Legalis*; that is, a Levitical institution.

But whatever opinion be adopted concerning the precise period when Instrumental Music was introduced into the Hebrew Church, we can never assent to the averment of our brother, "That in a system of merely temporary institutions, it was not deemed necessary, by positive enactment, either to forbid or to enjoin the use of Instrumental Music; but it was left to the will, and situation, and circumstances of the worshippers." For whether we are of opinion or not, that every circumstance relative to the Ceremonial Law and the Tabernacle service was shown to Moses on the Mount, it is certain that David, who was raised by Divine Providence to be king over Israel, having a great genius for Music, did either amplify what he found in the institutions of Moses, with regard to Instrumental Music, or did himself introduce it into the Tabernacle service, believing it would contribute to soften the rugged temper of the people.

If the last opinion be the just one,—namely, that it was David who, either to gratify his own genius for Music, or from believing it would contribute to soften the rugged temper of the people, added the pomp of Instrumental Music to the Tabernacle service, which was afterwards adopted by his son in the service of the Temple;—then we shall be entitled to say, from a strict examination of the history of the Hebrew Republic, that, like the first appointment of a king in the person of Saul, and like the building of a temple, suggested by David himself, this was a form of a Worship neither *commanded*, nor even highly *approved* of by God, but simply *permitted*. This view of the matter seems to be countenanced by that marked and accurate distinction which is kept up in Scripture, when speaking of the Temple service, betwixt what was positively enjoined by the Ceremonial Law, and what was commanded by David the King: "And the priests waited on their offices: the Levites also with the Instruments of Music of the Lord, which David the King had made to praise the Lord."* "And when the builders had laid the foundation of the Temple of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel, with Trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with Cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of David King of Israel."†

If, on the other hand, authorities are not wanting to countenance the opinion that there are positive enactments in the Law of Moses in favour, at least, of one kind of Musical Instruments, with which "all the earth" is exhorted to "make a joyful noise unto the Lord"‡ the conclusion must be, that it is a constituent part of the Ceremonial Law. "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with Cymbals,

* 2 Chron. vii. 6. † Ezra iii. 10. ‡ Psal. xcviii. 6.

with Psalteries, and with Harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet: for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets. And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the Trumpets. And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began also with the Trumpets, and with the instruments ordained by David king of Israel. And all the Congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded: and all this continued until the burnt-offering was finished."*

Whichever of these opinions we adopt, it is evident that the regulations relative to Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God are as much incorporated with the Mosaic or Jewish Constitution as Circumcision, which was instituted long before the giving of the Law; or as the Temple itself, which was not built till after the death of David. Therefore, we are entitled to conclude that Circumcision, Sacrifice, Instrumental Music, and the temple—the whole of these institutions, must stand or fall together.

We shall allow to our brother that David was a prophet, and that he was actuated by the purest motives, when he set apart a particular class of people to sing those hymns which he composed, with the accompaniment of Instruments of Music, improved or invented by himself. Still, it does not follow that the Worship of God should have any such an accompaniment under the Gospel.

We shall even allow that under the *Pædagogia Legalis*, all the instruments mentioned in the hundred and fiftieth Psalm were daily used in the Temple, and that the whole ritual Worship prescribed by the Law, by David, and the prophets, was in full authority, and in uninterrupted observation until the publication of the Gospel. It remains still to be considered, whether Christianity did not dissolve the obligations of the Law, and entirely change many of those institutions which relate to the Worship of God.

It seems to be acknowledged, by all descriptions of Christians, that among the Hebrews Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God was essentially connected with Sacrifice—with the morning and evening sacrifice, and with the sacrifices to be offered up on great and solemn days. But as all the sacrifices of the Hebrews were completely abolished by the death of our blessed Redeemer, so Instrumental Music, whether enacted by Moses, or introduced by the ordinance of David,—or, if you will, of Abraham, or any other patriarch,—being so intimately connected with sacrifice, and belonging to a service which was ceremonial and typical, must be abolished with that service; and we can have no warrant to recall it into the Christian Church, any more than we have to use other abrogated rites of the Jewish religion, of which it is a part. Nor was there any need for a particular commandment to abolish it, as our brother seems to

* 2 Chron. xxix. 25-28.

think, seeing that the whole service, of which it is a part, is completely abrogated.

But as our brother states it as his first and great argument, "That Instrumental Music is not forbidden in the Word of God, but is expressly *encouraged*, perhaps *enjoined*, in the Old Testament, and clearly *authorized* by the New,"—your Committee conceive it their duty to bring forward the following reasoning from Scripture, in opposition to the last part of his averment, viz., that it is "clearly *authorized* by the New."

We find, in Scripture, much information concerning great changes to be made respecting religious services under the Gospel. These were foretold in the Old Testament, and they are explained in the New. The Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, declares, that the priesthood being changed, "there is made of necessity a change also of the law."* We are informed by the same inspired writer, that "the first covenant had ordinances of divine service;" which he describes as consisting chiefly "in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances;" which, he says, were "imposed until the time of reformation."† The "carnal ordinances" include all the ritual, which was addressed to the senses and imagination, but neither enlightened the understanding nor purified the conscience. By whatever authority these were imposed, they were only to continue till "the time of reformation." And whatever is meant by "the time of reformation," it cannot be doubted that it is now past; and consequently, that the carnal ordinances imposed under the former covenant are no longer obligatory. They were the rudiments of the world—the shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ. The substance, which all these things represented, is to be found in the New Testament. The apostolic decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles,—the ministrations and epistles, of St. Paul, and particularly his strictures on the doctrines of Judaising teachers,—show that Christians are not under the Law, but under Grace.

From the beginning of the world there has been a Moral Law and a Spiritual Worship; which remain unchanged under every dispensation. Whatever is to be found in the Old Testament with regard to either of these, is of permanent and everlasting obligation. But with respect to the modes of external Worship, there was to be an entire change; which was announced by our Lord himself in a very early period of his ministry:—"The hour cometh, when ye shall neither on this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;"‡—not according to the old institution, in the hour that was past, but according to the new

* Heb. vii. 12. † Heb. ix. 1-10. ‡ John iv. 21, 23, 24.

institution, in the hour which cometh, and now is. Nor must it be forgotten, that it is not the ordinary manner of the writers of the New Testament to inform us what Divine institutions were to be abrogated, but only what observances were to take place under the Gospel. They do not tell us that the Passover was no longer to be observed, but only that the Lord's Supper was to be administered. So, with respect to praising God, they do not expressly say that Instrumental Music is to be silenced, but they do expressly say that God is to be praised and worshipped by singing psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, with understanding and grace in the heart, for the purposes of instructing and comforting one another. This is to be the change under the Gospel, as far as Psalmody is concerned.

The only point which remains to be ascertained is, whether this necessary change of the law extends to Instrumental Music, as a concomitant of the New Testament Psalmody. On this point our brother has given a most decided opinion,—that "Instrumental Music is clearly authorized by the New Testament; and that, before declaring our prohibition of Organs, it is incumbent on the Church to expunge from the Sacred Records those passages which seem clearly to recommend the use of instruments in Public Worship; that thus the worshippers may be delivered from the inconsistency of promising and exhorting each other to do, what in their hearts they resolve, and by the Church are forbidden, to perform."

In the support of these assertions, our brother exclaims, in his Statement, "Nowhere do we find the great Head of the Church repealing the injunctions pronouced by the Psalmist David. And it is impossible to think that our blessed Saviour would have been silent on the subject, if Instrumental Music had been a gross profanation of sacred things. Nowhere do we find St. Paul warning against Harp, and Psaltery, and Organ. Nay, we find St. John declaring that he heard harpers harping with their Harps in heaven."

Without saying any thing more severe on this mode of reasoning adopted by our brother, we conceive that it is neither agreeable to the rules of just Biblical criticism nor to sound philosophy. We have already observed, that it is not the ordinary manner of the writers of the New Testament to inform us what Divine institutions were to be abrogated, but only what observances were to take place under the Gospel. And does not every Christian know, that during our Saviour's abode upon earth, the "time of reformation" was not fully come—that Jesus was not yet glorified—that it was the money-changers, not the priests and Levites, that our Lord cast out of the Temple; and, of course, that it was the benches of the former, not the Altar, Sacrifices, Organs of the latter, which he overturned? If Jesus did not destroy the Temple, but only foretold its destruction, is it not self-evident, that its Ministers, and all the instruments employed by them, whether musical or sacrificial, must remain along with it? We shall transcribe the judgment on this point of an eminent Protestant divine, who is al-

lowed by all parties to have been one of the soundest and most judicious Biblical critics: "The Holy Ghost is here mentioned as the great gift of the Gospel times; as coming down from heaven not absolutely—not as to his person,—but with respect unto an especial work, namely, the change of the whole state of religious worship in the Church of God. Whereas we shall see, in the next words, he is spoken of only with respect unto external actual operations. But he was the great, the promised heavenly gift, to be bestowed under the New Testament; by whom God would institute and obtain a new way and a rite of worship, upon the revelation of himself and will in Christ. Unto him was committed the reformation of all things in the Church, whose time was now come.—(Heb. ix. 10.) The Lord Christ, when he ascended into heaven, left all things standing and continuing in religious worship as they had done from the days of Moses, though he had virtually put an end unto it. And he commanded his disciples, that they should attempt no alteration therein, until the Holy Ghost were sent from heaven to enable them thereunto. (Acts i. 4, 5.) But when he came, the great gift of God promised under the New Testament, he removes all the carnal worship and ordinances of Moses,—and that by the full revelation of the accomplishment of all that was signified by them,—and appoints the new, holy, spiritual worship of the Gospel, that was to succeed in their room. The Spirit of God, therefore, as bestowed for the introduction of the new Gospel-state, in truth and worship, is the heavenly gift here intended."*

As to the authority borrowed from St. Paul, by interpreting his silence as expressive of his approbation of Harps, Psalteries, and Organs,—our brother seems not to be aware that Instrumental Music belonged entirely to the Temple service, and never was employed in the Synagogue. Hence Paul, in all his journeyings, could not find a single Harp, or Psaltery, or Organ, in any of the religious assemblies of his countrymen, beyond the precincts of the Temple at Jerusalem; of consequence, warning or reproof on this subject, from that Apostle, is not to be expected. This circumstance accounts for the Jewish converts never betraying, as far as we know, the least predilection for instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, while they discovered a strong attachment to Circumcision and other Levitical institutions. Had St. Paul, therefore, approved or admired Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, however poor and persecuted the Apostolic Church might be, it is not to be supposed that he would have preserved such profound silence on the subject. On the contrary, he would have disburdened his oppressed mind,—he would have recorded his principles,—he would have deplored the direful calamity of the times, and earnestly recommended the introduction or the revival of Instrumental Music in the Churches, the very first moment that the wealth, and safety, and peace of the Church, rendered it practicable. But St. Paul has recorded no

* Owen on the Hebrews, Chap. vi. 4.

such sentiments. Instead of speaking in commendation of Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, we find him on one occasion borrowing an allusion from it, expressive of some thing like contempt: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling Cymbal." *

But our brother imagines that he is particularly countenanced in his favourite measure by a passage in the Book of Revelation, where St. John expressly declares, that he heard "harpers harping with their Harps in heaven"† "Words cannot be simpler," says our brother, "nor convey more plainly an unequivocal meaning; and that meaning clearly is, that Instrumental Music is at least not inconsistent with the purity of evangelical praise." The author of the Statement, then, can produce only a negative conclusion, and that from a single highly figurative passage of the New Testament, in support of his favourite measure,—a negative conclusion, too, repugnant to the principles and practice of the Church of Scotland, and countenanced by nothing but what we apprehend is a mistaken commentary of Scripture. Even supposing for a moment, that, apparently to short-sighted mortals, any usage is not inconsistent with divine revelation, are we on that account to blend that usage with the Worship of God? The Established Church of Scotland allows no such latitudinarian principle. This was precisely the mode of reasoning by which the Popish corruptions were introduced into Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and by which any system of Worship may be vindicated.

Our brother likewise cannot be ignorant that commentators are by no means agreed, that the celestial state, and the exercises of the redeemed in heaven, are the subject of this vision of St. John. Whatever be in this, it is evident that the imagery of the context is *terrestrial* and *Levitical*, and not *Evangelical*. The scene of the vision is upon Mount Zion, and the voice from heaven is described as "the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder,"—evidently alluding to the region whence the water descends, and in which the thunder rolls. A Lamb, Mount Zion, harpers and their Harps, an hundred and forty-four thousand, Elders, first-fruits,—do not all these images, in their *literal meaning*, carry back the mind to Jerusalem, and place us among the Jewish worshippers in the courts of the Temple? It would be in vain to expect, that, in a vision, "the forms of Christian worship" would present themselves in as familiar a manner to the mind of St. John as the worship of the Temple. For no man, no author, sacred or profane, takes his allusions invariably from what is modern or familiar. The mantle of antiquity must often be thrown around allusions and illustrations, to render them venerable and majestic; and this, we apprehend, is most judiciously done in the passage before us, whether the subject

* 1 Cor. xiii. 1. † Rev. xiv. 2.

of the vision recorded in it refer to the Church MILITANT or TRIUMPHANT.

Your Committee, therefore, are bold to contend, that no better authority for instrumental Music can be drawn from this highly figurative language of St. John, than there can be deduced from his allegorical description of the new Jerusalem, that heaven, the place of happiness for the righteous, is literally a splendid city, "having twelve gates, and every several gate of one pearl; and that its walls are of jasper, and its streets of pure gold."

If your Committee were to borrow any thing concerning the form of evangelical praise to be used by Christians from the Book of Revelation, they would take it rather from the 6th and 7th verses of this fourteenth chapter, than from the 2nd verse:—"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Here he saw no harpers, no Psalteries, no Organs. And in that beautiful and sublime description of the Church Universal, in the seventh chapter (9–12):—"After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; saying, Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen;"—here again he saw no "harpers harping with their Harps."

Far, then, from finding Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God "clearly authorised by the New Testament," your Committee contend that there is not a vestige of such authority, unless we violate the laws of sound criticism, and confound the literal and figurative meaning of language. Our blessed Lord did not condemn Instrumental Music, because it was a constituent part of the Temple service, which, with other Levitical institutions, was to outlive himself, and only to be nailed to his cross, or abolished by his death. The Apostle Paul could not speak against the Synagogues, for in them it never existed. He could not warn or reprove the Jewish converts, for, as far as we know, they never betrayed a desire to employ it.

The truth seems to be this, as far as your Committee can speak positively from the writings of the New Testament,—there are, in that sacred record, but two ways enjoined of offering up our praises to God in Public Worship: the one by thanksgiving, without the vocal melody of the Congregation; the other by the Congregation singing, with the human voice, Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs.

Thus, in the First Epistle to Timothy (ii. 1), we have an express commandment for thanksgiving to be a stated part of our Public Worship:—"I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers,

intercessions, and *giving of thanks*, be made for all men." And it is believed, that this giving of thanks varied according to the nature of the mercies which the Church was daily receiving; and that the people performed no other part in these thanksgivings than saying, Amen.*

The second method is what the Scriptures enjoin relative to praising God by singing Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs. Your Committee believe that there are only four passages in the New Testament which speak distinctly and directly on this subject: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord."† "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord."‡ "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms."§ "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name."‖ In all these passages, it is an *undeniable matter of fact that the primitive Christians understood singing with the human voice alone*, as enjoined; for this, and this only, they employed in singing to the Lord, making melody in their hearts. Among them the *accompaniment of any Instrument of Music* in the Public Worship of God was never *known nor named.*

You Committee are aware that Bishop King would wish to persuade us that the Apostles, in the passages above quoted, recommend the use of Musical Instruments in the Public Worship of God, seeing they use a word which, in the original language, he says, signifies singing with an instrument, (ψαλλω.) But this very criticism serves to show upon what slender foundation the patrons of Instrumental Music build. Thus, the word generally used in the New Testament for *worshipping* (προσκυνεω), signifieth, in the original, to pay homage by the *kissing of the hand*; of course, if we are to follow the analogy drawn from the original meaning of a Greek word, Christian worshippers would only have been obligated to have paid their homage to God by the kissing of the hand. This is not all, for it is evident that these injunctions, be their meaning what it may, are directly and expressly addressed to *all Christians*, either considered as assembled for Public Worship, or in their private, individual capacity. Now, is it at all credible, that each individual Christian in those times, or at any other time, was capable of using a Musical Instrument, or that a suggestion, which involves a moral impossibility, could be made to the mind of the Apostles by the infallible Spirit of God?¶

* Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3. † Col iii. 16. ‡ Eph. v. 19.

§ James v. 13. ‖ Heb. xiii. 15.

¶ The following is the translation given in Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of Paul: "Let your singing be of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and make melody with the music of your hearts, to the Lord." And in a note it is said: "Throughout the whole passage there is a contrast implied between the heathen and the Christian practice,—e.g., *When you meet, let your enjoyment consist not in fulness of wine, but the fulness of the Spirit: let your songs be, not the drinking songs of heathen feasts, but psalms and hymns, and their accompaniment, not the music of the lyre, but the music of the heart,*" &c.—Ed.

When, therefore, we concentrate all the part of our argument together, viz., that Instrumental Music was confined to the service of the Temple, and most intimately connected with the offering up of the sacrifice, and that we have no warrant to transfer it into the Christian Church, any more than other rites of the Jewish religion; that the silence of our blessed Lord and of his Apostles upon the subject affords no presumption that they approved of the measure; and finally, that the passages in the New Testament which relate expressly to the praises of God, either allude to thanksgiving pronounced by the Minister, without the vocal melody of the Congregation, or to singing with the human voice alone, Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs;—we have no hesitation in pronouncing a judgment in direct opposition to the first and the *chief* argument of the Minister of St. Andrew's Church. We say that the use of Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God is not authorised by the New Testament—that whether it was enjoined by Moses, or only introduced by David, it was appropriated to the Temple service, and of course, abrogated with it. The *singing of Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs* in the heart to the Lord, not the *playing of them*, is the express language of the New Testament. Therefore, Instrumental Music is neither *enjoined*, nor *authorised*, nor *encouraged* by the Word of God, in the Public Worship of Christians.

As to the observation made by our brother, that "When we look into the history even of those nations that were strangers to divine revelation, there we find universally the use of instruments in giving praise to their gods;"—we consider any reasoning founded upon heathen examples as of no weight whatever in deciding this question, and even as hardly requiring a serious answer. According to our brother's own principles, "the fixed and infallible standard" for the Worship of Christians is the *Word of God alone*. What he is pleased to say proceeds from "the unadulterated light of nature," we affirm, ariseth from a blind and corrupt superstition; and if we were disposed to indulge in conjecture about the origin of manners and customs amongst the heathen, we would tell him that Jubal, of the race of *cursed* Cain, a race which early began to corrupt the Worship of the Supreme Being, was "the father of all such as handle the Harp and Organ."* And there is no doubt that Ham, who was born long before the flood, and of course was acquainted with many of Cain's posterity would transmit some of their corrupt, superstitious notions of religious Worship to Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan, the fathers of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Phœnicians,—those nations which ancient history informs us, first set up idols, and introduced Instrumental Music into the Public Worship of their gods.

II. Let us now proceed to the second argument of our brother the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, and examine those conclusions which, he affirms, may be drawn from the history of the church in

* Gen. iv. 21.

behalf of his favourite measure. He affirms, that although Instrumental Music in the Worship of God was not known till "about the middle of the eighth century, yet then it was introduced through the dictates of the pious feeling prompting the enlightened mind to consecrate the labour of genius to the devout exercise of praise." He further affirms, that "Instrumental Music forms no essential part of Popery, being founded on principles widely different from the ceremonies of the Church of Rome; and therefore retained and employed by all the Reformed Churches on the Continent." "A stronger argument," continues he, "in its favour cannot be produced except that which I have already mentioned, the sacred authority of Scripture." We have fairly stated this second argument. Our brother's reasonning in support of these bold conclusions your Committee conceive to be very unsatisfactory.

According to his own statement of the matter, Instrumental Music was not used for the first seven centuries. This period, it is well known, comprehends along with the apostolic age, not only the *poorest* and *most persecuted*, but also the most *splendid* and prosperous times of the primitive Church. The practice of such a period will more than counterbalance any thing that even the *Reformed Churches* on the Continent can furnish. To pretend to account for this remarkable fact upon the ground that the Church had, during so many centuries, no leisure, or means, or knowledge to attend to Sacred Music, is a very unphilosophical and inaccurate mode of reasoning. They had both leisure and inclination to form the most abstruse and metaphysical opinions concerning the doctrines of the Gospel. They had means to build the most splendid churches. The emperors of the West were devout, to a degree bordering upon superstition. The truth is, they considered it as unlawful to employ Instrumental Music in the Worship of God. In their eyes, it was so intimately connected with the Temple service, that both Arians and Orthodox would have regarded themselves as returning back to Judaism, if they had permitted it in their Public Worship.

But we do not wish to support this branch of our argument by abstract of speculative reasoning, or mere dogmatical averments. It must rest upon authorities, which authorities we draw from the accounts of the primitive Christians, as recorded in the Fathers, and from the opinions of the Schoolmen, and from the judgment of the Reformers. If they knew their own sentiments, or have honestly recorded them, your Committee are confident that the following authorities ought to set this question for ever at rest.

Thus, in a treatise among Justin Martyr's works, we have the following testimony:—"*Q.* If songs were invented by unbelievers, with a design of deceiving, and were appointed for those under the law, because of the *childishness of their minds*, why do they who have received the perfect instructions of grace, *which are most contrary to the foresaid customs*, nevertheless sing in the Churches, as they did

who where children under the law? *A.* Plain singing* is not childish, but only the singing with lifeless Organs, with dancing and cymbals, &c. Whence the use of such instruments, and *other things fit for children,* is laid aside; and plain singing only retained." †

The memorable testimony of Pliny, as quoted by Tertullian, combines at once Christian and heathen authority on this subject:—"We find it has been forbidden to make a search after us. For when Pliny the younger was governor of a province, and had condemned some, and made others comply, being disturbed by the great multitude of the Christians, he consulted Trajan, acquainting him, that besides an obstinate aversion to sacrificing, he could discover nothing concerning their mysteries, but that they held assemblies before day to sing to Christ as God." ‡

Thus, Basil, though he highly commends, and zealously defends, the way of singing by *turns,* or what is styled *antiphonal singing,* does not deny that the manner of singing in use during the Apostolic times was altered by him in his Church. On the contrary, he explicitly admits that the former practice was, for the people rising before daylight to go to the house of prayer, and having made confession to God, to rise from prayer, and betake themselves (*εἰς τὴν ψαλμωδίαν*) to the singing of psalms. But now, indeed (*διχῇ διανεμηθέντες ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις*), they sing to each other alternately, in parts, Ep. lxiii. And so far from approving Musical Instruments in the Worship of God, he calls them "*the inventions of Jubal of the race of Cain,*" and thus expresses himself concerning them: "Laban was a lover of the Harp and of Music, with which he would have sent away Jacob. *If thou hadst told me,* said he, *I would have sent thee away with mirth, and Musical Instruments, and a Harp.* But the Patriarch avoided that Music, as being a thing that would hinder his regarding the works of the Lord, and his considering the works of his hands.—In such vain arts as the playing upon the harp or pipe, or dancing (*παυσαμένης της ἐνεργείας, τὸ ἔργον συναφανίζεται καὶ ὄντως κατὰ τὴν ἀποσολικὴν φωνὴν τὸ τέλος τούτων ἀπώλεια*), as soon as the action ceases the work itself vanishes; so that really, according to the apostle's expression, *the end of these things is destruction.*"—(Comment in Isaiam cap. v. apud opera tom. i. p. 493, 491. Ed. Paris, 1618.)

*A confusion seems to have crept into the minds of many relative to singing the praise of God. They conceive, that because the Church of Scotland is hostile to the use of Musical Instruments in the Public Worship of God, she denies the antiquity of Vocal Music in the Church of Christ. There is ground to believe that the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, his coadjutors, and anonymous advocates, have fallen into this mistake. Now, there are three things which the Church of Scotland carefully and accurately distinguishes:—First, Plain Singing, which she affirms has been in use from the beginning of the Church. Secondly, Cathedral or Antiphonal Singing, which she takes to be neither useful nor very ancient, being the device of the fourth century. Lastly, Musical Instruments, joined with Singing in the Church, she maintains is the invention of a much later age—certainly not earlier than the eighth, and not in general use till the thirteenth century.

† *Διὸ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλμσίαις προαίρσται ἐκ τῶν ᾀσμάτων ἡ χρῆσις τῶν τοιούτον ὀργάνων ὀργάνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν νητίοις ὄντων ἁρμοδίων, καὶ ὑπολέλειπται τὸ ᾄσαι ἁπλῶς.* —(Justin. Qu. et Resp. ad Orthod., Qu. 107.)

‡ Tertul. Apol. The rendering, "having made others comply," is questionable. The original is, "damnatis quibusdam Christianis, quibusdam gradu pulsis."

Chrysostom, who flourished in the fourth century, often expresses his disapprobation of Instrumental Music, and explicitly declares, "that it was only permitted to the Jews, like sacrifice, for the imbecility and grossness of their souls, God condescending to their weakness, because they were lately drawn off from idols." "But now, instead of Organs, Christians must use the body to praise God." *

Jerome, in his Commentary on Eph. v. 19, thus delivers his judgment on this point:—"We must therefore sing and make melody, and praise the Lord rather with the heart than the voice. For this is what is here said: *Singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.* Let young men mind this, let them mind it whose office it is to sing in the Church. We must sing to God not with the voice, but the heart. They are not artfully to supple their jaws and throat, after the manner of the tragedians, that theatrical notes and songs should be heard in the Church; but they are to praise God with fear, with good works, and the knowledge of the Scriptures. If a man has an unpleasant voice, if he has good works, he is a sweet singer in God's ears. Let the servant of Christ so sing, that not the voice of the singer, but *the thing sung*, may please; that the evil spirit that was in Saul may be cast out of those who, in like manner, are possessed by him, and not be led into those who have turned the house of God into a stage."† This shows, as has been remarked by Dr. Whitby, that Choristers had then obtained an office in the Church, though Jerome seems not much to approve of them. If he disliked Choristers, what would he have thought of Organists?

Augustine, Confess. lib. 10, cap. 33, gives his testimony in favour of plain song in the Worship of God:—"I wish all nice singing of David's Psalms were removed from mine and the Church's hearing; and that seems safer to me, which I remember I have been told of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, who made the Reader of the Psalm sound it with so little alteration of his voice, that he was more like to a person delivering a speech than singing."

Thus it is evident, from the authority of the Fathers, that it was simply vocal melody which was used in singing the praises of God,

---

* Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκεῖνο ἂν ἔιποιμι ὅτι τὸ παλαιον ὑντῶς ἤγοντο διὰ τῶν ὀργάνων τούτων, διὰ τὴν παχύτητα τῆς διανοίας ἀυτῶν· καὶ τὸ ἅρτι ἀπεσπάσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐιδώλων. Ὥσπερ οὖν τὰς Θυσίας συνεχώρησεν οὕτω καὶ ταῦτα ἐπέτρεψε συγκαταζαίνων ἀυτῶν τῇ ἀτθενείᾳ.—(Ps. cxlix) Αλλὰ τότε μὲν ὄργανα ἦν δι' ὧν τὰς ᾠδὰς ἀνέφερον. Νυνὶ δὲ ἀντὶ ὀργάνων κεχρῆσθάι ἐστι τῷ σώματι.—(Ps. cxliii.)

† "Et canere igitur et psallere, et laudare Dominum magis animo quam voce debemus. Hoc est quippe, quod dicitur *cantantes et psallentes in cordibus vestris Domino.* Audiant hæc adolescentuli: audiant hi quibus psallendi in Ecclesia officium est, Deo non voce, sed corde cantandum: næc in Tragædorum modum, guttur, et fauces dulci medicamini collinendas, ut in Ecclesia theatrales moduli audiantur et Cantica; sed in timore, in opere, in scientia scripturarum. Quamvis sit aliquis, ut solent illi appellare, , si bona opera habuerit, dulcis apud Deum cantor est. Sic cantet servus Christi ut non vox canentis sed verba placeant quæ legentur· 1 Reg· 16. ut Spiritus malus qui erat in Saüle, ejiciatur ab his qui similiter ab eo possidentur, et non introducatur in eos qui de Dei domo scenam * fecere populorum."—(Jerom. in Eph. v. 19.)

* "Vetus hæc damnataque licet a Patribus consuetudo viget hodie in Ecclesiis ubi audiuntur theatrales moduli et dulcia cantica, quæ de domo Dei scenam faciunt populorum, convenientium ad mulcendas aures vocibus et modulis Tragædorum, quos vulgo *L'Opera* vocant."

during the primitive times of the Church. And should we analyse the writings of Ecclesiastical authors in the middle or scholastic ages, we shall find that Instrumental Music is positively condemned. Thus, the celebrated Thomas Aquinas: "In the old law, God was praised both with Musical Instruments and human voices. But the Church does not use Musical Instruments to praise God, lest she should seem to Judaise. . . . .Nor ought a pipe, nor any other artificial instruments, such as Organ or Harp, or the like, be brought into use in the Christian Church, but only those things which shall make the hearers better men. For by Musical Instruments the mind is more directed to amusement, than to the forming of a good internal disposition. But under the Old Testament such instruments were used, partly because the people were harder and more carnal,—upon which account they were to be stirred up by these instruments, as likewise by earthly promises,—and partly because these bodily instruments were typical of something."*

Others of the Schoolmen might be quoted, but conceiving this to be unnecessary, we proceed to state the judgment of the Reformers.

Pareus, in 1st Cor. xiv. 7, declares, "That in the Christian Church the mind must be incited to spiritual joy, not by Pipes, and Trumpets, and Timbrels, with which God formerly indulged his ancient people on account of the hardness of their hearts, but by Psalms, and Hyms, and Spiritual Songs."†

Zepperus, De Leg. Mosaica, lib. 4, says, "Instrumental Music, in the religious worship of the Jews, belonged to the ceremonial Law, which is now abolished. It is evident that it is contrary to the precept of St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv.), who wills, that in Christian assemblies, every thing should be done for edification, that others may understand and be reformed: so even that of speaking in unknown tongues should be banished from the Church; much less should that jarring, Organic Music, which produceth a gabbling of many voices, be allowed, with its pipes, and trumpets, and whistles, making our Churches resound, nay, bellow and roar." And the same Author, speaking of this practice being retained in some of the Reformed Churches, in direct contradiction to the judgment of their founders, thus expresseth himself: "In some of the Reformed Churches these Musical Instruments are retained, but they are not played until the Congregation is dismissed, all the parts of divine worship being

---

* "Neque fistula ad disciplinam est adducenda, neque aliud aliquod artificiale Organum, puta Cithara et si quid tale alterum est; sed quæcunque faciunt auditores bonos. Hujusmodi enim Musica Instrumenta magis animum movent ad delectationem, quam perea, formatur interius bona dispositio. In Veteri autem Testamento usus erat talium instrumentorem, tum quia populus erat magis durus et carnalis, unde erat per hujusmodi instrumenta provocandus, sicut et per promissiones terrenas; tum etiam quia hujusmodi instrumenta corporalia aliud figurabant."—(Thomas Aquinas, Secunda Secundæ, Quæstio xci. Conclus. iv.)

† "In Ecclesia excitandus est animus ad Deum et letitiam spiritualem, non tibiis, tubis, tympanis, quod veteri duræ cervicis et stupidæ mentis populo Deus olim indulsit, sed sacris concionibus, psalmodiis et hymnis."

finished. And they are then used for a political purpose, to gratify those who seek pleasure from sound and harmony."*

Molerus in his prelections on the 150th Psalm, says, "It is no wonder, therefore, that such a number of Musical Instruments should be so heaped together; but although they were a part of the *Pædagogia Legalis*, yet they are not for that reason to be brought into Christian assemblies. For God willeth, that after the coming of Christ, his people should cultivate the hope of eternal life, and the practice of true piety, by very different and more simple means than these."†

Erasmus, who was certainly a friend to the Reformation, complained of Instrumental Music as an abuse, and pronounced it unsuitable to the gravity and solemnity of Christian Worship. His words are, "We have brought a cumbersome and theatrical music into our Churches, such a confused disorderly chattering of some words, as, I think, was never heard in any of *the Grecian or Roman Theatres*. The Church rings with the noise of Trumpets, Pipes, and Dulcimers, and human voices strive to bear their part with them. Men run to Church as to a Theatre, to have their ears tickled. And for this end, Organ-makers are hired with great salaries, and a company of boys who waste all their time in learning these whining tones. Pray now, compute how many poor people, in great extremity, might be maintained by the salaries of these singers."‡

It is curious to observe how little our brother seems to have attended to the history of the Protestant Churches, for it appears that Instrumental Music would not have been retained even *among the Lutherans*, "unless they had forsaken their own LUTHER, who (by the confession of Eckhard, a German Doctor of Theology) *reckoned Organs among the ensigns of Baal*. His words are, *Lutherus organa musica inter Baalis insignia refert*."§ And, from record, it is evident that if Instrumental Music is used in some of the Dutch Churches, it is *decidedly against the judgment of the Dutch pastors*. For in the National Synod at Middleburg in the year 1581, and in the Synod of Holland and Zealand in the year 1594, it was resolved, "*That they would endeavour to obtain of the Magistrate the laying*

* "Instrumentalis Musica in sacris et cultu divino populi Judaici ad cæremonialia Mosaica pertinuit quæ nunc abolita sunt. Utut sit contra præceptum et regulam Pauli factum est, qui 1 Cor. xiv. 26, vult, ut in conventibus Ecclesiasticis ad ædificationem omnia fiant, atque alii intelligant et informentur, quo quidem nomine linguas etiam in Ecclesia ibidem rejicit, nedum confragosa illa organa musica quæ varium vocum garritum efficiunt et Templa lituis, tubis et fistulis personare, imo perboare et remugire faciunt.—In quibusdam Ecclesiis Reformatis organa illa musica retinentur, non autem nisi omnibus cultus divini partibus peractis, et dimisso cœtu Ecclesiastico, pulsantur;—ad finem politicum, propter illos qui ex sono et numeris oblectationem quandam quærunt, quibusque huic instrumentali musicæ interesse libet."—(Zepperus, de Lege Mosaica, lib. 4.)

† "Non mirum igitur tot musica instrumenta hic coacervari. Quæ cum pars pædagogiæ legalis fuerint *non sunt hodie* in Christianorum cœtibus inducenda. Aliis enem mediis, et simplicioribus, spem vitæ æternæ et pietatis exercitia, post Christum exhibitum, suos colere vult Dominus."—(Molerus in Psalm 150.)

‡ "Operosam quandam et theatricam Musicam in sacras ædes induximus, tumultuosam diversarum vocum garritum, qualem non opinor in Græcorum aut Romanorum Theatris unquam auditum fuisse," &c.

§ Vide Eckhard Fasciculus contra Tho.

aside of Organs, and the singing with them in the Churches, even out of the time of worship, either before or after sermons. So far are those Synods from bearing with them in the worship itself."

As our brother seems to lay so much stress upon the practice of the Church of Geneva, where Beza and Calvin had their chief influence, your Committee conceive it proper to give at some length the opinion of these great Reformers.

Beza thus expresses himself, "If the Apostle justly prohibits the use of unknown tongues in the Church, much less would he have tolerated these artificial musical performances, which are addressed to the ear alone, and seldom strike the understanding, even of the performers themselves."*

Calvin, in many different parts of his works, gives it as his deliberate judgment, that Instrumental Music ought to have no place in the Public Worship of God under the Gospel.

1*st*. In his exhortation to Charles the V. concerning the necessity of reforming the Church, he says, "Unless we intend to confound every thing, we must constantly distinguish between the Old and the New Testament. That although the observation of a ceremony under the Law might be useful, now it is not only superfluous, but absurd and pernicious." †

2*nd*. Calvin elsewhere declares, "That Instrumental Music is not fitter to be adopted into the Public Worship of the Christian Church, than the incense, the candlesticks and the other shadows of the Mosaic law." ‡

Lastly. In his Homily on 1 Sam. xviii. 1–9, his deliberate judgment on this subject is expressed at length; where Organs are particularised by him as *a profanation* of the Word and Worship of God under the Gospel. His words are:—

"In Popery there was a ridiculous and unsuitable imitation (of the Jews). While they adorned their temples, and valued themselves as having made the Worship of God more splendid and inviting, they employed Organs, and many other such ludicrous things, by which the Word and Worship of God are *exceedingly profaned*, the people being much more attached to those rites than to the understanding of the Divine Word. We know, however, that where such understanding is not, there can be no edification, as the Apostle Paul teacheth, while he saith, 'How can a person give testimony to the faith, and how can he say Amen at the giving of thanks, if he does not understand?' Wherefore, in that same place, he exhorts the faithful, whether they

* "Si Apostolus meritò peregrinarum linguarum usum in cætu Ecclesiastico prohibuit, multò minùs sonos illos Musices Harmonicos, quibus aures solæ, iis quæ cantantur nullo modo, ne ab iis quidem, qui cantant plerumque intellectis, feriuntur, in Ecclesia tolerasset." —(Beza in Colloq. Mompelg. parte 2, p. 26.)

† "Nisi enim omnia velimus confundere, tenendum est semper discrimen illud Veteris et Novi Testamenti: quod ceremoniæ quarum utilis sub lege erat observatio, non superfluæ modo nunc sint sed absurdæ quoque et vitiosæ."

‡ "Non aptiora esse Cultui Divino in Ecclesia Christiana Instrumenta Musica, quam suffitum, luminaria, aliasque umbras legis Mosaicæ."

pray or sing, they should pray and sing with understanding, not in an unknown tongue, but in that which is vulgar and intelligible, that edification may be in the Church. What, therefore, was in use under the Law, is by no means entitled to our practice under the Gospel, and these things being not only superfluous, but useless, are to be abstained from ; because *pure and simple modulation* is sufficient for the praise of God, if it is sung with the heart and with the mouth. We know that our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared, and by his advent has abolished *these legal shadows.* Instrumental Music, we therefore maintain, was only tolerated on account of the times and of the people, because they were *as boys,* as the sacred Scripture speaketh, whose condition required these puerile rudiments. But in Gospel times, we must not have recourse to these, unless we wish to destroy the evangelical perfection, and to *obscure the meridian light* which we enjoy in Christ our Lord." *

Whatever, therefore, may be the practice of some Protestant Churches on the Continent, whether Lutheran or Reformed, it is evident, from the *clear* and *decided* judgment of the great founders of these churches, given by your Committee, in the very words of these eminent Reformers, that Instrumental Music ought to have no place in the Public Worship of God under the Gospel.

Perhaps it may not be improper here to take notice of what has been considered by the best informed historians as the ancient and genuine opinion of the Reformed Church of England relative to Instrumental Music. In her Homily, " Of the Place and Time of Prayer," we have these remarkable words:—" God's vengence hath been and is daily provoked, because much wicked people pass nothing to resort to the Church ; either for that they are so sore blinded that they understand nothing of God or godliness, and care not with devilish example to offend their neighbours ; or else for that they see the Church altogether scoured of such gay gazing sights as their gross phantasia was greatly delighted with ; because they see the false religion abandoned, and the true restored, which seemeth an unsavoury thing to their unsavoury taste ; as may appear by this, that a woman said to her neighbour, " Alas ! gossip, what shall we now do at Church, since all the Saints are taken away ; since all the goodly sights we were wont to have are

* " Quare fuit in Papatu ridicula nimis et inepta imitatio, quum templa exornare, Deique cultum reddere celebriorem existimarunt, si Organa et alia istiusmodi multa ludicra adhiberent: Quibus maxime Dei Verbum et Cultus profanata sunt, populo externis istis ritibus addicto potius quam Verbi Divini intelligentiæ. Scimus autem ubi nulla est intelligentia nullam etiam ædificationem esse; quemadmodum Paulus Apostolus docet, quum ait, 'Quomodo potest idiota reddere fidei testimonium, aut quomodo dicturus est Amen ad gratiarum actionem, nisi intelligat ?' Quare fideles hortatur eo loco ut Deum precantes et ipsi psallentes et precentur et psallant intelligentia, non lingua peregrina, sed vulgari et intelligibili, ut sit in Ecclesia ædificatio. Quod itaque fuit in usu Legis tempore, nullum hodie locum apud nos obtinet: et rubus isti, non modo superfluis, sed inanibus etiam, abstinendum est: quod sufficiat pura et simplex divinarum laudum modulatio, corde et ore, nostro singuli idiomate ; siquidem scimus Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum apparuisse, et umbras illas legales suo adventu dissipasse. Musicam itaque illam Instrumentalem teneamus tunc ratione temporis illius et populi fuisse toleratam, quod essent ut pueri, quemadmodum sacra Scriptura loquitur, qui puerilibus istis rudimentis indigerent, quæ hodie non sunt ultro revocanda, nisi perfectionem evangelicam velimus abolere, et plenam lucem quam in Christo Domino nostro consecuti sumus obscurare."—(Calv. Hom. 66, in 1. Sam. xviii. 1-9, p. 570.)

gone; since we cannot hear the like Piping, Singing, Chaunting, and *playing upon the Organs*, that we could before!' But, dearly beloved, we ought greatly to rejoice and give God thanks that our Churches are *delivered out of all those things which displeased God so sore, and filthily defiled* his holy house and his place of prayer."

We find also that the thirty-two Commissioners appointed by Edward VI., the most eminent men then in England either for Divinity or Law, complained of Cathedral Singing, and advised the laying of it aside. Their words are:—"In reading Chapters and singing Psalms, Ministers and Clergymen must think of this diligently, that God is not only to be praised by them, but *that others* are to be brought to perform the same Worship by their counsel and example. Wherefore, let them pronounce their words distinctly, and let their singing be clear and easy, that every thing may be understood by the auditors. So that 'tis our pleasure, that the quavering operose Music, which is called *figured, should be wholly laid aside*, since it often makes such a noise in the ears of the people, that they cannot understand what is said."*

And it is a remarkable fact, perhaps not commonly known by the advocates for Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, that in the English Convocation held in the year 1562, in Queen Elizabeth's time, for settling the Liturgy of the Protestant Church of England, the retaining of the custom of kneeling at the Sacrament, the cross in Baptism, and of Organs, carried only by the *casting vote*.†

Burns, in his Ecclesiastical Law, under the title "Public Worship," says, "The rule laid down for Church Music in England almost a thousand years ago, was, that they should observe a plain and devout melody, according to the custom of the Church, while the rule prescribed by Queen Elizabeth in her injunctions, was, that there should be a modest and distinct song, so used in all parts of the common prayers of the Church, that the same may be as plainly understood as if it were read without singing. Of the want of which grave, and serious, and intelligible way, *reformatio legum* had complained before."

From these quotations, therefore, from the Fathers, from the Schoolmen, and the Reformers, we are entitled to say that the history of the Church affords no countenance to the introduction of Instrumental Music into the Public Worship of God. That it was not admitted in the first seven centuries can never, as our brother affirms, be accounted for by the poverty and the persecution of the Church, nor by the calamities and convulsions of the times. For even supposing that Organs were too expensive and cumbersome instruments, was not the Pipe, the Cymbal, and the Harp, a cheaper and more portable substitute? Could not Christians have carried these along with them in their flight from city to city, and hid them

* Reform Leg. de Div. Offic. † Vide Dr. Henry's Hist. Strype's Annals, p. 363.

with themselves in holes, and dens, and caves of the earth. The Jewish captives had their Harps at the rivers of Babel, and why might not persecuted Christians have used theirs if they had thought them lawful, even in the most distressing scenes of the ten persecutions? Had they believed Instrumental Music to be "enjoined in the New Testament," would it not be a foul aspersion on their character to suppose that death, in its most direful form, would have deterred them from the duty of employing it? Every person acquainted with the history of the martyrs of the primitive Church, must know well that they never shrunk from a single article of Faith or Worship which they believed to be enjoined by Divine authority. Paul and Silas, at midnight, in the prison of Philippi, sang the praises of God, regardless of them who could only kill the body. But the truth is, that the primitive Christians considered Instrumental Music neither as *lawful*, nor *expedient*, nor *edifying*. If, therefore, at least seven or eight centuries did elapse before Organs, or by whatever name you are pleased to call these instruments, were introduced into Christian Worship, and the want of them, during all that period, was never regretted by the Church, it is a most decisive proof that the primitive Christians regarded them as inconsistent with the purity of Evangelical praise.

Your Committee, therefore, cannot go along with the assertion of our brother, "that it was ever during periods of *dawning light* that Organs began to be employed. They consider his assertion as rather problematical, nor can they well comprehend what he means by the *dawn of light* in the eighth century. Its light, in the language of the poet, may be considered as little more than "darkness visible." But whether there was a dawn or not in the eighth century, and whether King Pepin, who devoted that Organ, the present of the Greek Emperor, to the service of the Supreme Being, notwithstanding the heroic soul ascribed to him by our brother, perfectly understood the nature and spirit of the Gospel of Christ, your Committee cannot positively determine. But they are confident that Instrumental Music began to be introduced into the Church when ignorance, superstition, and the love of external pomp, had made men more desirous of having their ears delighted, than their hearts improved,—at a time when all authors are agreed that Antichrist was already come into the world. When our brother, therefore, affirms that Organs were not at first "employed by the authority of a papal decree, but by the dictates of pious feelings, prompting the enlightened mind to consecrate the labours of genius to the devout exercise of praise," he ought to reflect, that from a desire to consecrate the labours of genius in painting and statuary to the service of God, first admiration, then devotion, and at last worship, came to be paid to images. From allowing pious feeling to hurrry the mind too far respecting the manner in which Gospel should be taught or the service of God performed, we may date almost every corruption which has disfigured Christianity. The conception that

we should be more at leisure to serve God, if we could abstract ourselves from the cares of the world, paved the way for the *monastic* life. The conception that we never could mortify the body and the lusts thereof too much, gave rise to penance, and its train of absurdities. Mistaken pious feeling, therefore, may have led men, in every age, to add many extraneous circumstances to the Worship of God, and may still induce Protestant Reformed Churches on the Continent to retain them. But wise men must always despise that pomp which is merely designed to amuse children or the vulgar. With Protestant Churches abroad we have no bond of communion. We shall apply to them the words commonly used in the public evening prayer of our Presbyterian Wership, "May the Reformed Churches be reformed more and more!"

III. We shall now proceed to examine the third argument adduced by the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, containing his reason why Instrumental Music was not employed in Scotland since the reformation, and his account of that prejudice, as he is pleased to style it, which still remains against it. He affirms that it arose from the peculiar state of the Civil Government of the country, which, during the whole of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was of such a nature as to grant no *leisure* to the people of Scotland to attend to Sacred Music; but that the tide of human affairs is now so strong, *the hand of God guiding the progress of mind*, in matters relative to the improvement of Psalmody, as cannot be resisted.

A strict and accurate attention to the history of the Church of Scotland will indeed authorise us to conclude, that our forefathers in matters of religion were often tyrannically used by the ruling powers, and that they had much to struggle with before they obtained that form of Ecclesiastical polity established at the Revolution, secured at the Union, and invariably acted upon since that time. But the same history will show, that the reason why Instrumental Music was not employed in Public Worship in Scotland was because both people and teachers looked upon it as the offspring of Judaism, and abhorred it as a relic of Popery, and too intimately connected with that Prelatic form which our forefathers never could endure. If we consult the Second Book of Discipline, framed in the sixteenth century, and the Directory composed in the seventeenth, we will find that our forefathers entertained the most clear and distinct ideas of what they esteemed Scriptural and Evangelical in Church Government, in Discipline, in Doctrine, and in Public Worship. And during all the struggle, from the Reformation to the Revolution either with the Popish or Prelatical Sovereigns of the House of Stewart, they never for a single moment lost sight of these four great branches of Ecclesiastical polity. They declared, in the most energetic terms, that they *were reformed by Presbyters*,—that they were determined to copy from no model but that of the Scriptures, as understood by the primitive Church. And from their conduct, as illustrated by the

Acts of Assembly, 1638, and from their directions to their Commissioners to the Westminster Divines, to be found in their letters published in the year 1644, you clearly perceive that they most decidedly and unequivocally condemn Instrumental Music to be an antichristian mode of Worship. Why, then, does our brother endeavour to parry the argument by saying, "that the aversion which the Scotch nation discover to Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God proceeded from the circumstance of their having no *leisure* to attend to it." In this vague manner of accounting for customs and modes of Church Government, you might affirm that the *Magna Charta*, the Bill of Rights, and the Revolution Settlement, so much gloried in by the inhabitants of these lands, were all devised and obtained by *mere accident*. The truth is, the Scotch nation has no objection to Instrumental Music in the common amusements of life. It has been allowed by authors, foreign and domestic, that as a people, their genius is much more musical than that either of the English, the Dutch, or the French. But the people of Scotland abhor the blending of the inventions of men with the Worship of God. They conceive Instrumental Music inconsistent with the purity of a New Testament Church. It is not strictly true, that Psalmody was almost annihilated in the Reformed Church of Scotland. For, in direct opposition to the assertion of our brother, there is the most satisfactory evidence, that from the Reformation, down through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, our Church had leisure to pay attention to Sacred Music;—schools were appointed for teaching it, and even the Government gave their countenance, by Acts of Parliament, for the same laudable purpose. Thus, in the 6th Parliament of James the VI., 1579, "Our Sovereign Lord, with advice of his three Estates of this present Parliament, request the Provost, Baillies, Council, and communities of the maist special Burrows of this realm, and the Patrons and Provosts of the Colleges, where Schools are founded, to erect and set up *ane Sang* School, with a master sufficient and able for instruction of the youth in the said science of Music; as they will answer to his Highness, upon the peril of their foundations, and in performing of this his Highness' request, will do unto his Majesty acceptable and good service." Thus, it is matter of history and statute, not of opinion or conjecture, that both the Church and Civil Government of Scotland were not inattentive to Psalmody. During the whole of that violent struggle, which existed for more than a century after the Reformation, betwixt Prelacy and Presbytery, the people found abundance of *leisure* in the year 1592 to frame the great Charter of Presbytery; and betwixt the years 1638 and 1660, they had *leisure* to join in framing a Confession of Faith and Directory, and *leisure* to put that Directory into practice. Why, then, does our brother affirm, "that the reason for Instrumental Music not being introduced into the Public Worship of God in Scotland proceeded chiefly from this circumstance, that the people had not much *leisure*

to attend to Psalmody?" Knox and Melville, Rutherford and Henderson, men to whom we owe much, were of too active a disposition of mind, and too anxious to settle our Presbyterian polity upon a firm foundation, to leave us any room for imagining that they had not attended to the minutest form of Public Worship. That laboured and oratorical description given us by our brother of the character of our Scottish Sovereigns from the Reformation to the Revolution, may, indeed, serve to show that they were a most unprincipled race, but it can never serve to establish what he means to prove by it, that neither the people nor the Presbyterian Established Church of Scotland had any aversion to Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, but were hindered from adopting it merely by the want of *leisure* to attend to that object, from the peculiar political situation of their country. Your Committee beg leave to call your attention to the following remarkable fact, as narrated by Calderwood, in his Church History, p. 674:—Upon Saturday the 17th of May, 1617, the English Service, singing of queristers, and playing on Organs, and Surplices, were first heard and seen in the Chapel Royal. On the 25th December, same year, Mr. William Cooper, Bishop of Galloway, preached as Dean of the Chapel Royal, where there was playing upon Organs: so the Bishops practised novations, before ever they were embraced by any General Assembly, and therefore ought to have been secluded from voting afterwards in that matter, and condignly censured." Thus, it is matter of history, not of opinion or conjecture, that the Church of Scotland was not inattentive to Psalmody; that an attempt was even made by the King and his courtiers to revive the use of Organs; and that this was deemed an innovation so odious that it shrunk before the scrutinising and commendable zeal of our forefathers. This attempt was made in the year 1617, when Prelacy was established in Scotland; but notwithstanding all that royalty could do, the attempt was abortive, and the practice never extended beyond the walls of the Chapel Royal: so hostile was this Church, even in Episcopal times, to Organs in Divine Worship. The same invincible hostility appears in the year 1644, after Presbytery had been restored. It continues to operate from the Restoration to the Revolution, during the time when Prelacy had again supplanted Presbytery in our native land. It bursts forth with renewed vigour from the Revolution to the Union, when Presbytery was once more restored and settled for ever as the Ecclesiastical government of this part of the United Kingdom. This invincible hostility procured the Act of Parliament, styled the Act of Security and the Act of Assembly against innovations, as barriers to preserve the purity, the simplicity, and the uniformity of our public worship. And from the Union, down to the present moment, the project which was formed a few years ago of introducing an Organ at Aberdeen, and this late attempt at Glasgow, are the only indications of a desire to undermine

the invincible spirit of our forefathers against Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God.

Your Committee most cordially go along with the panegyric which our brother pronounces upon our venerable Reformers; but are at a loss to comprehend how this panegyric can be reconciled to the opinion which our brother says he has long entertained relative to Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God. Does our brother seriously think, that Knox and Melville, and Rutherford and Henderson, were of his mind? Knox was educated under Popery, and habituated to the use of Organs from his infancy. He had travelled on the Continent; he had resided at Geneva; he had sojourned in England. All these circumstances were calculated, as our brother knows, to form and cherish a predilection for Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, had Knox not considered it as unlawful.

It has been said that both Knox and Melville were obliged to yield up their own judgment to the fury of the times, and to overlook those outrages against the ancient Worship which in their hearts they condemned. Granting that they could not control the fury of the populace in its first paroxysm for destroying the Cathedral service, could they not afterwards teach their countrymen to discriminate the *harmless* Organ, as our brother terms it, from the idolatrous image? Could they not have persuaded their countrymen, if they had thought proper, to restore the *harmless* Organ to its place in the Church, as easily as they persuaded them to occupy those edifices which had been polluted by Popery? At least, if this was impracticable, could they not have regretted the perverseness of their countrymen in banishing from Public Worship such an *enchanting instrument of edification?* But Knox and Melville, Rutherford and Henderson, offer not one word in its behalf. They allow it to perish unnoticed, as a portion of that trumpery which ignorance and superstition had foisted into the house of God. Your Committee are conscious of neither religious nor political antipathies, founded in prejudice operating in their minds. From attending to the history of the Church of Scotland, and from studying the genius of its people, they are perfectly convinced, that the fixed, determined opposition to the use of Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, both in the Established Church and amongst the various bodies of Dissenters ariseth from *legal*, *political*, *moral*, and *scriptural* grounds—not from the want of *leisure* in our Ecclesiastical Patriots to attend to Sacred Music—not from the want of money to purchase such instruments—not from the want of accommodation in our Churches to use them. And when our brother is pleased to say, that the time when the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Directory were composed were times of fierce and furious war against the Church of England, he ought, in the spirit of fair and candid reasoning to have added, that they were times to which Scotland is much indebted,—times in

which a bold, free, devout, and thinking people opposed an attempt to enslave their consciences and entangle their affections in the labyrinth of foolish and useless rites and ceremonies, which neither they nor their fathers could bear.

IV. We now proceed to scrutinise our brother's fourth argument, viz., That the Act of Security, the Act of Union, and the Act against Innovations, had more important objects in view, with which Organs have no concern—roundly asserting, "that that cannot be illegal against which no law exists—that cannot violate which touches not the constitution."

Your Committee cannot help saying, that the reasoning of our brother upon this part of the subject appears to them very vague and desultory. He at one time applauds the spirit of these Acts, and vindicates the character of our Scotch Patriots, who had wisdom to frame them, courage to demand them, and perseverance to obtain them. At other times, when these Acts seem too pointedly and too conclusively to oppose his favourite measure, he starts off at a *tangent* from the legal argument, and striveth to amuse, and even to perplex us, with subtle and mytaphysical reasoning, "about the nature of sound—about a mode without a subject—and about the ever-varying, unsubstantial nature of musical tones;" exclaiming, "that our national uniformity can never be broken in upon by introducing a certain quantity of modulated sound in the pipes of an Organ; and to attach perpetuity of form to things from their nature incapable of uniform duration, would be a solemn mockery of our venerable Legislators." And therefore, what the wisdom of our Church and State has anxiously guarded against, in the Claim of Rights, in the Act 1693, for settling the peace and quiet of the Church, accompanied by the Acts of the General Assembly against Innovations, was entirely directed against the *Hierarchy and the Service-book, and not against Instrumental Music.* And in no less than three different places of his Statement, he has been pleased to say, "That the Respondents (of course the Presbysery), from not attending to the spirit and meaning of these Laws, have argued strongly against Episcopacy, which our brother never wished to defend; and that the Presbytery have passed a sentence, which, in his opinion, goes far beyond the object they meant to condemn. That cannot be illegal against which no law exists, *nor could exist*,—that cannot violate which touches not the constitution,—that cannot be against the genius and constitution of our Church which habitually recommends to her people the singing of the Psalms of David." As your Committee, however, conceive that the judgment of the Presbytery upon the 7th October last was well founded, that the *ratio decidendi* was legal and constitutional, and that the prohibition of Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God, in all the Churches and Chapels under its jurisdiction, was a wise and salutary measure, they shall take the liberty of stating, at some length, what they conceive to be the Law of the Land, the

Law and the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, upon this subject. For your Committee believe, that it is this argument chiefly which must determine the question between our brother and us.—Every opinion founded upon the history of the Church in general, or taken from the practice of foreign reformed Churches, or from speculative notions of public utility or private edification, must, comparatively speaking, be vague and desultory; but the argument drawn from the Law of the Land, and the Law and Constitution of our own Church, must be clear, positive, and conclusive. To this argument your Committee wish particularly to direct the attention of the Reverend Presbytery, of Dr. Ritchie, and of the world.

When James the VII. had forfeited the crown, and when his throne was declared vacant by the Scotch Convention, agreeably to the Claim of Rights made by that Convention, the Presbyterian Religion was established by William and Mary; and agreeably to the same Claim of Rights, Prelacy is *for ever abolished within the kingdom of Scotland,* and a form of Worship differing from the form which at that time was exercised by the Established Church of England was to be adopted. Now, though the use of Instrumental Music is certainly not enjoined by the Canons of the Church of England, and though it is practised on the Continent, in Churches which are not Episcopal, yet it is well known, that all denominations of Christians, both in England and Scotland, did, at that period, when the Claim of Rights was framed, consider Instrumental Music a characteristic of Prelacy, and directly opposed to the Vocal Music, for which the Reformed Church of Scotland had uniformly contended. Therefore we conclude, from the sweeping clause contained in the Scotch Claim of Rights, that Instrumental Music was abolished along with Prelacy. And from attending to the history of the disputes which took place in England between the Puritans and the Episcopalian Church, we are entitled to say, that the Puritans considered Instrumental Music as intimately and essentially incorporated with the Public Worship of the Prelatical Church. This will be found to be their opinion, as recorded in Strype's Annals, and Neal's History of the Puritans.

When, therefore, the Scotch Patriots demanded at the Revolution, in their Claim of Rights, that Prelacy should be abolished, they had no reserve in behalf of any one part of it whatever, whether essential to it or merely accidental; but fairly and candidly meant, that not only Prelatical government, the Liturgy, and Service-book should be abolished, but likewise that kneeling at the Sacrament, the sign of the Cross in Baptism, and Instrumental Music in Public Worship, should share the same fate. But as some form of Worship was to be substituted in room of the Prelatical, now abolished, the people of Scotland demanded, with great earnestness, in their Claim of Rights, that the Doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, including the *sum and substance* of the Doctrines of the Reformed Churches, and that the Church Government specified in the great

Charter of Presbytery, 1592, and a Discipline as practised in the purer times of the Church, should be granted unto their request;—all which claims were heard with attention, reduced into proper form, and enacted accordingly.—Now, your Committee beg leave to observe, that the *outline of the Public Worship of God*, to be used in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, is specifically and clearly stated in the 21st chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith; which, in fact, contains the sum and substance of the Directory relative to the reading of the Word—to Prayer—to Preaching—to the celebration of the Sacraments—and to Praise,—the five distinct heads under which the Reformed Presbyterian Churches arrange Public Worship. The Confession of Faith was framed in the year 1647, confirmed by Act of Parliament 1649; and therefore it is certain that the framers of it had distinctly in their view the Directory for Public Worship, approved by the General Assembly in February, 1645, and confirmed by Act of Parliament in the same year.

In the 21st chapter of the Cofession of Faith, we have the most decided and unequivocal language relative to that part of Public Worship styled Praise: "It is the singing of Psalms with grace in the heart." But as the Westminster Confession of Faith is not only the standard of our Church, but forms an Act of Parliament, now in force,—a part of the Public Statute Law of the Land,—your Committee, therefore, are entitled to conclude that our forefathers intended, by the Claim of Rights, that Instrumental Music should be condemned and abolished along with the other rites and ceremonies of the Prelatical Church; and that the form of Worship, "the singing of Psalms with grace in the heart," as now in use, should be substituted in its room. Your Committee affirm, that when our forefathers framed the Claim of Rights, they had the most *clear*, *distinct*, and *accurate idea* of a form of Public Worship, from which Instrumental Music was utterly excluded.

Your Committee next proceed to analyse those other Acts of Parliament relative to our Presbyterian Church, which flowed from, or are founded upon, the Claim of Rights.

It is more than probable, if we knew every particular relative to the practice of the Clergy in those times, that some discrepancy of opinion relative to Public Worship had begun to appear betwixt the year 1688 and the year 1693: most likely between the Ministers who had been ejected at the Restoration and now restored to their Kirks,—men who may be considered as strict and conscientious Presbyterians,—and some of those Conformists who had been educated under the Episcopalian Church of Charles and James, but who, by taking the oaths to King William, were continued in their *cures*, and who had a hankering after the rites and ceremonies of the Prelatical Worship which was practised in England. Thus, in an Act passed 1693, entitled, an Act for settling the peace and quiet of the Church, "Their Majesties, with the advice and consent aforesaid, statute and ordain, that uniformity

of Worship, and of the administration of all Public Ordinances within this Church, be observed by all the said Ministers and Preachers, as the same are at present allowed and performed therein, or shall hereafter be declared by the authority of the same; and no man shall be admitted, unless he subscribe to observe, and do actually observe, the foresaid uniformity." But where is that form of Worship specified if it be not in the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, in which it is declared to be the "*singing of Psalms* with grace in the heart?" But if there should remain the least dubiety concerning what idea is to be attached to the expression, "*singing of Psalms* with grace in the heart," the last chapter of the Directory for Public Worship completely explains it: "In singing of Psalms, the voice is to be tunably and gravely ordered: and that the whole Congregation may join herein, every one that can read is to have a Psalm Book; but for the present, where many in the Congregation cannot read, it is convenient that the Minister, or some other fit person, appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the Psalms, line by line, before the singing thereof." Your Committee, therefore, with the most perfect confidence affirm, that the uniformity in Public Worship enjoined by the Act 1693, among other things, signifies the singing of Psalms with *the voice alone*.

Had the Kingdom of Scotland remained an independent Kingdom, possessing a separate Parliament, as it possessed distinct Laws, and a separate Ecclesiastical Establishment, it is probable that the Scotch nation would have been completely satisfied with the regulations and Acts already quoted, in favour of its *Worship*, Doctrine, Discipline, and Government; seeing that there was but little danger now of its form of Worship being corrupted or altered by its own inhabitants. But the moment that there was a plan in agitation for a Union of the two Kingdoms under one Parliament, the people of Scotland foresaw that if this Union took place, there would be greater intercourse than formerly betwixt the two nations. Besides, from the circumstances of our Legislators being called upon to reside, occasionally, in a country where the Prelatical form of Worship was established, and from the obligation of obeying the Test Act before they could enjoy the public offices of the State, there might be some risk that our Presbyterian mode of Worship would, by degrees, and imperceptibly, come to be not only *corrupted*, but *altered*. The nation, therefore, became exceedingly jealous, lest the Union, so much desired by Government, should prove prejudicial to the form and purity of our Presbyterian Worship. Accordingly, in Queen Anne's first Parliament, it is enacted, "That it should even be high treason, in any of the subjects of this Kingdom to quarrel, impugn, or endeavour by writing, or advised speaking, or other open act or deed, to alter or innovate the Claim of Rights, or any article thereof." Most likely this Act was passed in order to crush the rash hopes which the *Nonjurant* Church of Scotland was indulging, that the Union would gradually introduce

Prelatical Worship. When, therefore, in 1705, the Parliament of Scotland took into their consideration with what earnestness the Queen's Majesty had recommended an Union betwixt her two independent Kingdoms, and that Commissioners were now appointed for the purpose of treating, they expressly enjoin, "That the Scotch Commissioner shall not treat of or concerning any alteration of the *Worship of the Church of this Kingdom, as now by Law established.*" This clause, therefore, most certainly had in view the form of Worship expressed in the Directory, engrossed in the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, founded upon the Claim of Rights, and ordered to be uniformly observed in all the Established Churches of the Land, and approved by the Act 1693, and ratified by the Act of Assembly 1705. Accordingly, in the next Session of Parliament, 1706, in pursuance of these principles and views of our forefathers, the celebrated Act of Security was passed, containing these words: "That the form and purity of Worship, *presently in use* within this Church, shall remain and continue *unalterable.*" And, in order to avoid all ambiguity, the expressions in the Act are varied, that the one may be a clear and distinct comment upon the other. In the first clause of the Act, the words are, "As *presently professed* within this Kingdom;" and then it adds, "As now by law established;" then it adds, "*As presently in use in this Church.*" And in the clause which ordains the same to be observed by all Regents and Masters in every University, the words are, they "*shall practise and conform themselves to the Worship presently in use in this Church.*" And it is further enacted, that the Sovereigns, on their accession to the Crown, shall swear and subscribe to maintain, and preserve inviolable, the Worship, Discipline, Rights, and Privileges, of this Church, as above established by the Law of this Kingdom, in prosecution of the Claim of Rights. And it is likewise statuted and ordained, "That this Act of Parliament shall be held as an essential condition of any Union to be concluded betwixt the two Kingdoms, *without any alteration* thereof, or any derogation thereto, *in any sort, for ever.*" All of which clauses were engrossed in that Act styled the Treaty of Union, and now considered as the Public Law of the Land, for a century past.

Now, when you analyse the counterpart of this Act, as passed by the English Parliament, for the security of their Church, before they allowed their Commissioners to treat of any Union; when you observe the jealousy expressed by their Parliament for the preservation of their form of Worship, and the accurate manner in which they describe that form; you cannot hesitate a moment in concluding, that the Scotch Patriots, at least equally enlightened and equally zealous with their English neighbours, had a clear, accurate, and precise idea of what was meant by *the form* and purity of Public Worship *then in use in Scotland.*

The English, attached to the Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Ecclesiastical Establishment of their own country, *enact,* that

their Commissioners "shall not so much as treat of or concerning any alteration of the Liturgy, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Prelatical Church, as by Law confirmed;" quoting the 13th of Queen Elizabeth, and the 13th of King Charles II.; which Acts the King is sworn to observe at his Coronation. Too many people, by not attending exactly to the state of the Religious Establishments in the two different countries, at the time of the Union—two independent Kingdoms under one Sovereign, each jealous of the other; the Southern part of the Island remembering with disgust what they had seen practised under the government of Cromwell; and the Northern recollecting with horror what they had suffered under the Episcopal administration of Charles II.—have formed partial and erroneous views concerning the spirit of the Acts of Security of the two different Countries, at the time of the Union. While each nation was exceedingly jealous that no alteration should take place in their own form of Worship, it was not necessary, that they should step beyond their proper ground, and *verbatim et literatim*, condemn the practice of their neighbours, who were now to be connected by an incorporating Union, under one Parliament. While the English nation expressly *enact*, that no alteration should take place in their Liturgy, Rites, and Ceremonies, as by Law established, they would consider it as both injudicious and indelicate, to condemn our Directory, our Presbyterian Worship, and our Confession of Faith, in open and avowed expressions. Still, however, if in the present day, an English Bishop should, of his own accord, attempt to introduce the Presbyterian form of Worship into the Established Church of England, your Committee have no hesitation in saying, that it would be contrary to the express Law of the Land. By parity of reasoning, though Instrumental Music in the Worship of God is not, *totidem verbis*, condemned or forbidden in our Act of Security, out of regard to the feelings of the Church of England, still, by that Act, *the form and purity of Worship then in use in Scotland is to remain unalterable*. Will any man, therefore, pretend to say, that if Instrumental Music shall be attempted to be introduced into our Public Worship, it is not contrary to the Law of this part of the United Kingdom? That very form of Worship *then in practice* was to continue *in all time coming*. Now, it is known to the whole world, that betwixt the Revolution and the Union of the two Kingdoms, the singing of the praises of God in Public Worship with the voice alone was the use and practice of the Established Church of Scotland.

Your Committee have been at the more pains to illustrate the Scotch Act of Security, as they apprehend that both their Brother and the Congregation of St. Andrew's have allowed their judgments to be misled in this question by a mere *quibble;* conceiving, that because they did not read in the Act that *Instrumental Music was forbidden, totidem verbis*, therefore that there is no law against it. But your Committee maintain that they have not interpreted the Act of Security more strictly than its history, spirit, and enactments, will justify, agreeably

to the authorised interpretation of any public Act relative to privilege. When a positive defined practice is commanded to be observed by any class of men, any other practice, altering the former, is most certainly prohibited by the spirit of that Act, though not expressed in words. And therefore, if the form of Worship in use and practice at the Union was to continue unalterable in all time coming, Instrumental Music is most clearly, and to all intents and purposes, forbidden and condemned. And the Civil Magistrate hath authority to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in our Church, and that all innovations in Public Worship be prevented or reformed. Such your Committee hold to be the Law of the Land, and what they are confident in affirming that neither the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain nor the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland can alter, without infringing the civil and political constitution of this part of the United Kingdom, as understood and ratified by the treaty of Union. Surely, then, our brother hath not attended carefully to the spirit and meaning of those Acts of Parliament now quoted, when he so roundly asserts, "That cannot be illegal, against which no Law exists—that cannot violate, which toucheth not the Constitution."

Let us now examine the Ecclesiastical Constitution of this part of the United Kingdom, as specified and confirmed by the Acts of her General Assemblies; and your Committee flatter themselves that they will be able to show that Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God is contrary to the spirit and principles of our Presbyterian Church; and that the very bold and extraordinary assertions of our brother, contained in his Statement, are erroneous and improper. His words are, "That cannot be against the spirit and genius of our Church, which she habitually recommends to the people, by her appointment of the singing of David's Psalms.—Before declaring her prohibition of Organs, it is incumbent on the Church to expunge from the Sacred Records those passages which seem clearly to recommend the use of Instruments in Worship; that thus the Worshippers may be delivered from the inconsistency of promising and exhorting each other to do, what in their hearts they resolve, and are forbidden by the Church to perform."

In treating this part of the subject, your Committee wish it to be understood, that every Established Church is entitled to arrange, in the form of a Creed, a Confession of Faith, or a Catechism, her explanation of the doctrines contained and set forth in the sacred Scriptures. This was done in the earliest times of the Church of Christ; and has, with great propriety, been imitated by the Church of Scotland. Every Church has likewise a right to settle her form of Public Worship, and to commit it to writing. By some authors, this writing has been styled a *Missal*; by others, a *Liturgy*; and by the Scotch, a *Directory*. If once these Creeds, and Confessions, and Catechisms, and Directories, are recognized, established, and put under the protection of the State,—that Church, so protected, has it not in its power

to alter or infringe the fundamental principles contained in these writings, if they mean to live under, and claim the protection of Civil Authority.

It is true, that we in Scotland acknowledge no temporal head in matters of religion. We deny the supremacy of the King over our Presbyterian Church. The executive, judicial, and legislative powers, in matters purely ecclesiastical, are vested in our Church, following the gradation of her various Courts. But still she must legislate, judge, and execute, agreeably to her Confession of Faith, her Directory and Presbyterian Government. These are fundamental principles, acknowledged and protected by the State ; which every minister and Elder is sworn to obey ; and which the Civil Magistrate is bound to see observed, in the most full and literal sense.

When, therefore, we take into our consideration the Directory for Public Worship, and the 10th Act of Assembly 1705, recognising that Directory ; the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, and the Act against Innovations, passed 21st April 1707 ;—in connection with the practice of the Church of Scotland for at least a hundred and twenty years, following out what it believed to be the constitution of our Presbyterian Establishment ;—your Committee affirm, that Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God is contrary to the principles and spirit of the Church of Scotland.

The Act of Assembly 1707, against Innovations, which your Committee are afraid their brother, in his Statement, has somehow or other overlooked, begins by observing, "That the introduction of Innovations in the Worship of God has been of fatal and dangerous consequences." It then goes on to state, "That the purity of Public Worship hath been expressly provided by divers Acts of Parliament;" and after intimating "that Innovations either have taken or are about to take place," it therefore adds, "The General Assembly, being moved with zeal for the glory of God and the purity and uniformity of his Worship, do hereby discharge the practice of all such Innovations; and order Ministers to represent to their people the evil thereof; and instruct the Commissioners to use all proper means, by applying to Government, or otherwise, for suppressing or removing all such Innovations."

In conformity to this Act of Assembly, the Church of Scotland, ever since the year 1711, have peremptorily ordained the following questions among others, to be put, in the most solemn manner, to every Minister at his ordination ; and his answers to these questions are known by the name of his ordination vows.

"Will you adhere to and maintain the purity of Worship, as presently practised in this National Church, and asserted in the Act against Innovations ?"

"Do you promise to submit yourself willingly and humbly to the admonitions of the Brethren of this Presbytery, and that you will follow no divisive courses from the Established Worship and Doctrine of this Church ?"

And in the Formula, which every Minister subscribes at his ordination, he "sincerely owns the *purity of Worship presently authorised and practised in this Church, and that he will constantly adhere to the same; and that he will neither directly nor indirectly endeavour the prejudice and subversion thereof.*"

If such, therefore, be the Ecclesiastical Statutes of our Church,—if our Acts of Assembly and Formula be not mere *waste paper*, and if language has any meaning,—we solemnly and positively affirm, that the introduction of Instrumental Music into the Public Worship of God, within the kingdom of Scotland, is contrary to the Law and Constitution of our Established National Church.

We cannot help taking notice of a circumstance which tends to corroborate what we understand by the Principles and Constitution of the Church of Scotland. The numerous bodies of Seceders, under the various names of Covenanters, Associate and Relief Synods, which have left our Establishment and declined its authority, were surely at full liberty to indulge the humour and wish of their respective Congregations; yet in no one instance has that wish or humour led them to introduce Instrumental Music into the Public Worship of God. Why? Because they conceive it is contrary to the principles of Presbytery. They have uniformly adhered to that mode of religious Worship enjoined by the Directory,—the singing of the praises of God by the human voice alone. This attachment to simple Worship is so strong and so universal, and the habits connected with it so predominant, that we may consider it as the common consuetudinary Law of the Country.

V. Let us now proceed to analyse our brother's fifth and last argument.—He affirms, that the Organ "was introduced into St. Andrew's Church upon *pure Presbyterian principles, and that no Law exists, or can exist, against such use of it as took place upon the 23rd of August last;* and that, after the most serious attention to the subject, he cannot discover the most distant approach to any violation, either of the purity or uniformity of our Public Worship."

His mode of reasoning upon this part of the subject your Committee cannot help considering not only as metaphysical, but also tinctured with something not unlike sophistry. He says, "It could not be an innovation upon the object of Worship, for we worship the one God;—or on the subject of Praise, for we all sing the same Psalms;—or upon the posture of the Worshippers, for we all sit, as become true Presbyterians; or upon the tunes, for we sing only such as are in general use;—or upon the office of the Precentor, for he still holds his rank, and employs the commanding tones of the Organ for guiding the voices of the people."

We may allow it to be perfectly true, that, upon the 23rd of August last, the Minister of St. Andrew's and his Congregation worshipped *the one God;* that they sung the same Psalms as usual; that they sat as became Presbyterians, when they praised the Lord; and

that the Precentor held his place in the desk, &c.; yet, after all, by introducing an Organ as an appendage, they manifestly made an innovation on the form and purity of our Public Worship, in direct opposition to pure Presbyterian principles.

Such conduct was not agreeable to pure Presbyterian principles; because, in the first place, it was an innovation on the ordinary external form of Worship. For by blending Instrumental Music with the human voice, that the Congregation might better express the emotions of their heart, the simple melody of our forefathers becomes immediately changed into a medley, composed of animate and inanimate objects. Of course, the *very external form* of Praise in use at the Revolution is no longer continued unalterable in our Presbyterian Church.

2. It is an innovation upon what our Laws of Church and State denominate the purity of worship. Man being a reasonable creature and a reasonable service being demanded from him by God, that reasonable service cannot so properly be performed by man as when he useth his voice alone. This is the vehicle which God hath given him to convey to his Maker the emotions of his soul. Musical Instruments may, indeed, tickle the ear and please the fancy of fallen man. But is God to be likened to fallen man? Are we taught by the letter or spirit of the Gospel that inanimate instruments are capable of conveying to the Father of Spirits the emotions of a pious and virtuous mind, animated with religious joy, filled with religious gratitude, and awed with religious veneration, pouring forth the varied and enraptured impulses of an enlightened, converted and sanctified soul? Organs are the mere inventions of men, played often by hirelings, who, while they modulate certain musical sounds, may possess a heart cold and hard as the nether millstone. You may, if you please style such Music the will-worship of the Organist; but you surely cannot, in common sense, denominate it the praise of devout Worshippers, assembled in the Congregation of Saints, to praise their God and Redeemer in Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, singing with grace, and making melody to the Lord in the heart.

When, therefore, our brother asks (in what your Committee conceive a *sneering manner*), "Does our national uniformity consist in nothing more substantial than in a certain fixed quantity of sound, beyond which no Congregation has authority to pass? What is the subject to which this uniformity relates?"—is not this a species of sophistry, which we should not have expected from the known good sense of the Minister of St. Andrew's? But we shall not answer such trifling, by opposing sophistry to sophistry. Your Committee will answer it by this bold, but plain and honest assertion, that the uniformity of our National Worship consisteth in the following things:—1st. In the Minister reading the Scriptures, and lecturing upon these Scriptures. 2d. In preaching to his Congregation from

a text of Scripture. 3d. In Prayer to God, not confined to the cold and lifeless phrases of any fixed form, merely of human invention. 4th. In the celebration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's supper, agreeably to the words and commandment of Christ himself. And Lastly, In the whole Congregation singing the Praises of God, with the voice gravely and tunably ordered, as expressed in the Directory. These things compose the uniformity of our Public National worship, not a certain fixed quantity of modulated sound.

When, therefore, our brother indulges in such metaphysical reasoning as the following: "What is the subject to which this uniformity relates? There can be no mode, without a subject to which it adheres. And shall our national uniformity be said merely to relate to things unsubstantial, ever varying, ever vanishing, even while the ear is labouring to hear, and the mind to catch them? To attach perpetuity of form to things incapable from their nature of uniform duration, would be a solemn mockery of our venerable Legislators" —your Committee are almost tempted to say, that this mode of reasoning is no better than *solemn* trifling, though assuming the garb of philosophical *acumen*. For your Committee affirm, that there is a precise, marked and fundamental distinction, both in point of form and substance, between the Praises of God sung by the voice,—the means bestowed on rational man by his Creator for expressing the religious sentiments of his heart,—and a tune of modulated sound extracted from a Musical Instrument. Mankind must be dull indeed, who cannot perceive that there is a fixed and eternal difference betwixt these two things, which no metaphysical reasoning can ever confound or amalgamate.

With respect to that part of his argument where our brother affirms that he is countenanced in his opinion by the custom of admitting Bands of Singers into some of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, your Committee conceive that it can avail him but little. There is no innovation here whatever upon the external form of Worship; for still the Praises of God are sung with the human voice alone. And if ever it should happen, that this custom shall induce any Congregation to neglect their duty, in joining devoutly in the Praises of God, then we say that this custom ought instantly to be abandoned. We do not deny but that Bands of Singers, directing the public Praise of God, have been abused; and we certainly give it as our opinion, that if ever at any time they shall encourage our enlightened Congregations to neglect the singing of Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, and to sit mute, and listen to the harmonic warblings of a Band, then they ought to be dismissed at once, as not only unpresbyterian, but highly pernicious. But the person must be very much inclined to yield his judgment to sophistry, who does not perceive a vast difference betwixt a Band of Singers, singing the Praises of God with the voice, and completely blended with the Praises of the Congregation at large, and an Organ *tickling* the ear of the audience.

In the attempt of our brother to prove that he introduced the Organ into St. Andrew's Church upon pure Presbyterian principles, he desires us to attend to the conduct of what he styles the *pure Presbyterian Calvanistic Church esupon the continent*, which employ that instrument in the Public Worship of God. Most likely he borrows his examples from what may have taken place in Holland or Geneva. We have no bond of union with either of these Churches. They are establishments totally independent of us, and are entitled to chalk out a plan for themselves. On the other hand, their practice can have no authority whatever with us; and indeed, from what we know of the opinions entertained by some of these Churches, we should be very unwilling to consider them as a proper model to copy from, either in Doctrine or in Worship. But be this as it may, having a right to form standards for ourselves, your Committee therefore wish that our brother had confined his views on this question to the principles of the pure Presbyterian Church of Scotland; which we conceive to have been animated by the purest principles of any Church upon earth. "In our Church the generous spirit of liberty breathes with universal vigour, and the noble soul of the Reformation animates every part of our establishment; so that no distinction was made by our forefathers of days and ceremonies, which were alike destitute of Scripture support. Our Church believes it to be the great design of the Gospel to raise the Christian Worshipper above the airy grandeur of sense, and, instead of a laborious service, to introduce a Worship worthy of the Father of Spirits."

Our brother is pleased to say, "That he is disposed to presume, that the Presbytery never seem to have inquired what was done on the 23rd of August in St. Andrew's Church. They conjure up to themselves some horrid prostitution of sacred things, and then fight against it, as *pro aris et focis*, wielding their arms against a shadow."

Your Committee know perfectly well what was done on that day in St. Andrew's Church. They know that an Organ accompanied the Public Worship of God. They know that Musical Instruments are the invention of men. They know, that though neither authorised by the New Testament nor by the Law of the Land, nor countenanced by the Presbytery, *his Ecclesiastical Superiors*, nor approved of by the Civil Magistrates of the City—the attempt was made to introduce a Musical Instrument into the Public Worship of God; which, since the Reformation, hath, in this Land, been considered as *illegal and unconstitutional*. Your Committee, therefore, know perfectly well what was done; and their opposition to the measure hath arisen from the most complete conviction that they were only doing their duty when they *nipped* such innovation in the bud. Why, then, does our brother affirm, that the attempt was made according to the pure principles of Presbytery? Was not the Presbytery of Glasgow the radical Court by which such an attempt could be sanctioned? But your Committee affirm, that this Ecclesiastical Court was never consulted on the business.

Indeed, from the narrative given by our Brother, this appears; for he says, "That it was resolved by the Minister, and a few Heads of Familes, to have a meeting once in the week, for improving themselves in Sacred Music. Finding that this proposal was relished by a number of the hearers, and that they gave regular attendance, it was next proposed by some of the attendants to introduce a Chamber-Organ, as a help to the Precentor for guiding the voices of the singers. The Organ was introduced, and was employed regularly one day in the week. When we were thus meeting together, as members of one family, it was suggested, that our edification might be promoted by concluding our meetings with *Family Worship*. This was done, and in praise we employed the Organ. The people present were highly gratified, and became loud and urgent in their requests for the use of that instrument in Public Worship." All this is gravely related by our brother; *as a specimen, we presume,* of the pure principles of Presbytery. Now, even from his own Statement, your Committee are bold to maintain, that there never was procedure held by an Independent Congregational Society more subversive of, or incompatible with, the pure principles of Presbytery.

It can hardly be spoken without exciting a sardonic smile: "A few Heads of Families," first march in procession before us—then comes a number of hearers—these are followed by a Chamber-Organ and Precentor: all these companies are constituted *a family,* who join in Family Worship within the Church—employ an Organ in praise—are highly gratified,—and become clamorous for similar gratification, when, by meeting on the Sabbath day, *this Family shall resolve itself into a Congregation.* Is there the most distant reference here to the Kirk-Session, or Presbytery, or any constituted authority in the Church of Scotland? Nor were even the Magistrates consulted in this stage of the business, which commenced about the beginning of June last, though occasional hearers in St. Andrew's Church.

Perhaps our brother thought this would have been downright Erastianism, and inconsistent with the pure principles of Presbytery. For he again gravely tells us, that "he conceives it to be his right and privilege to direct all that concerns Public Worship, in the Parish of which he is Minister, independently of the Civil Power." In this assertion your Committee conceive that our brother is mistaken. No Parish Minister has any rights but what he derives from his Presbytery; and these cannot be legislative and judicial,—they are purely ministerial. He is entitled to perform ministerial duties—to preside in Public Worship and Sessional business, according to the rules of the Church; but he has no power to depart from these rules, or to *direct* in any of these capacities. And when our brother talks so confidently of his title to *direct* all that concerns Public Worship, independently of the Civil Power, it would not have been amiss that he had carefully perused and studied the language and spirit of the 23rd

chapter of the Confession of Faith.* He would have found that the Law of Scotland has declared, That it belongs to the office of a Magistrate to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of this commonwealth. He hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, "that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that all corruptions and abuses in Worship be prevented or reformed, and the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed." "It is the duty of the people to pray for Magistrates, to honor their persons, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority: from which Ecclesiastical Persons are not exempted." And as it is the proper duty of Magistrates to execute the laws, so they are bound, and it is their right and duty, to execute those laws which secure the uniformity of our National Public Worship, as practised in the year 1707. This they may do by inflicting civil penalties; and if they omit any part of their sacred duty, they must answer for it to God and to their country. Your Committee, therefore, have no hesitation in saying, that the Magistrates of this City might have legally and constitutionally ordered their servants to have taken possession of that Organ which was used upon the 23rd of August last, in Public Worship in St. Andrew's Church, without the authority of the Presbytery, until a satisfactory pledge was given that it should never be employed again in a similar manner.

But as our brother in his Statement seems to lay so much stress upon the averment, that the Organ was introduced into St. Andrew's Church upon pure Presbyterian principles, your Committee deem it proper to give a short abstract of what was the real progress of this business:—About two years ago, application was made to the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council, of the City of Glasgow, then in office, "That they would allow certain alterations in certain seats in St. Andrew's Church, that there might be room for setting up an Organ; the petitioners at the same time binding themselves to defray the expense, and to make good all damages which might be supposed to ensue, but which they apprehended could not arise from its introduction."

When we examine the letter accompanying the petition, and the petition itself containing this extraordinary request, we cannot help thinking that our brother has been disposed to treat our Presbyte-

* A ridiculous quibble has been resorted to, in order to blunt the argument drawn from the 23rd Chapter of the Confession of Faith. It has been averred, that by the Civil Magistrate in this chapter can only be meant the King; because the power of waging war and calling Synods are ascribed unto him. Is it necessary to repel such a quibble by reasoning? Who does not know that all the Executive Power of the British Empire is understood to dwell in the King, and to emanate from him? Does not a common summons run in his Majesty's name, as well as a declaration of war? Does not his Majesty annually delegate whatever power he has to call Synods, as well as to be present at them, to his Commissioner in the General Assembly? Has it not been understood, by the most eminent Divines of our National Church, from the Revolution downwards, that the Judge Ordinary of the bounds, or first Principal Magistrate of a City, hath an inherent right, as invested with constitutional authority, "to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, and all corruptions and abuses in Worshhip be prevented or reformed?"

rian, patriotic forefathers in rather too cavalier a manner. He speaks of them as men misled by passion, and as an ignorant, bigoted people, labouring under prejudice;—language, to say no more of it, requiring stronger arguments in its support than our brother has yet been able to advance. Before the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and City Council, returned an answer to this extraordinary request, they asked and received the opinion of their Legal Assessor; who, in a very manly and candid paper, now upon the Presbytery's record, gave it as his judgment, "That the introduction of Organs in our Churches would be a material alteration and innovation in our external mode of Worship; and recommended to the Minister of St. Andrew's and his Congregation, before proceeding farther, to apply for the permission and sanction of the Ecclesiastical Branch of our Constitution."

Your Committee would have thought that the refusal of the Magistrates to grant the request of removing the seats, founded upon the opinion of their Legal Assessor, a gentleman so well known for his candour and constitutional knowledge of the laws of his country, might have damped this musical mania for introducing an Organ into the Public Worship of God. But our brother tells us, in his Statement,—to which your Committee beg leave particularly to call the attention of the Reverend Presbytery,—that although he received from the Lord Provost an official letter, upon the 22nd August last, now upon your record, the purport of which letter was to dissuade him and his Congregation from making the attempt, yet he, Dr. Ritchie, "did not shrink one moment from what he conceived to be his right." The Organ, accordingly, was employed in Public Worship on the Lord's day, in St. Andrew's Church, upon the 23rd August last.

There is here a little ambiguity in our brother's Statement, which your Committee do not exactly understand. Whether did Dr. Ritchie lay the Lord Provost's letter before the Committee of Gentlemen upon the evening of the 22nd, or not till the 26th, the day on which he received the Lord Provost's second letter? If the first letter was only laid before these gentlemen upon the 26th, your Committee solemnly declare, that our brother did not discover proper respect to the Civil Power, if he used the instrument after he received his Lordship's first letter, and before he had an opportunity of submitting it to his Musical Council. But be this as it may, the naming of three gentlemen to wait upon the Lord Provost, and the sending two, twice in one day, to request of the Lord Provost, that the Civil Power might no more be seen in this business, was a piece of conduct not at all like the good sense which our brother has displayed in the more private concerns of his life. It was, apparently, first setting the Civil Power at defiance, and then apparently requesting them to shut their eyes to the contempt of their authority. Your Committee, taking all these circumstances into consideration, cannot help think-

ing, that the conduct of our brother upon this occasion did not discover proper respect, either to the Civil Power or to the Presbytery of which he is a member.

Our brother, surely, was not ignorant of the official opinion pronounced by the Legal Assessor of the City Council; neither was he ignorant of what is contained in the twenty-first chapter of the Confession of Faith, relative to Public Worship; neither could he be ignorant of the power with which the Civil Magistrate is invested, to preserve uniformity of Public Worship; neither could he pretend ignorance that about two years ago, the City Council had refused to allow the seats to be removed for the accommodation of an Organ. Why then, did he, upon the twenty-third August last, authorise and direct the employment of an Organ in St. Andrew's Church in Public Worship,—taking the whole responsibility upon himself, as the director of all that concerns Public Worship in that Parish Church of which he is Minister?—a line of conduct which your Committee positively condemn. When our brother received the first letter from the Lord Provost, it was certainly high time for him to have stopped till once he got the authority of his Ecclesiastical Superiors; and then, legally and constitutionally, he could have said to the Civil Power, When you interfere with Public Worship, you are proceeding *ultra vires.* When, therefore, our brother sent two gentlemen, twice in one day, to request of the Lord Provost that the Civil Power might no more be seen in this business, is there not something more like a desire to dictate what the Civil Magistrate ought to do, "than *a sincere respect* professed for both branches of the Constitution?"

According to the Statement given in by our brother, relative to his conduct upon the 22d, 23d, and 26th August last, or even from the commencement of the business about two years ago, we bid defiance to any man to point out a *single Presbyterian principle* in the whole of it. Whereas, on the other hand, the interference of the Lord Provost was strictly Presbyterian. It was the legitimate exercise of that formal power in ecclesiastical matters, which the standards of our Church and the Laws of the Land uniformly assert and maintain.

As to the conception of any Presbyterian Minister of the Established Church of Scotland having an inherent right of directing all that respects Public Worship in his own Congregation, it is perfectly wild, visionary, and untenable. No Minister has a legal right to perform a single judicial or legislative act without the sanction of the Kirk-Session; and no Kirk-Session has a right to innovate on the general laws and universal practice of our Church. Instead, therefore, of your Committee admiring those gradual steps which our brother says were taken by the Congregation of St. Andrew's, since the 1st of June last, for the purpose of improving themselves in Sacred Music, they are rather disposed to imagine that these gradual steps were intended to accustom the mind imperceptibly to innovation, and to the reception

of Instrumental Music into the Public Worship of God, in this our National Established Church, without surprise and astonishment. Perhaps, if the Presbytery had done its duty, they should have stepped forward and nipped such innovation in the bud, convincing both our brother and the world that the house of God in this Presbyterian Country was not to be turned into a Concert-room. But we flattered ourselves that the good sense of our brother wonld have kept this musical ethusiasm within proper bounds—We were disappointed. When innovation begins, no man can say where it will stop. A man may perform an action fraught with consequences the most pernicious to his country. It may proceed from the most complete *bona fide* intention on his part, or it may even arise from an invincible error of judgment. Your Committee does not wish to speak harshly upon the motives of any human being; but the *consequences of an action*, affecting our Ecclesiastical Establishment, they are entitled to investigate, and to approve or comdemn, as truth and justice shall demand.

With respect to that pompous declaration made use of in the Statement, to show the utility of the measure, and how wonderfully calculated an Organ is to increase the devotion of a Congregation of Christians, and "that the time is now come when we had it in our power to vindicate our Church and our Country from the reproach of neglecting one of the best means devised for the improvement of Sacred Music,"—your Committee must beg leave to say, that they entirely withhold their assent. Our brother's argument is a mere *petitio principii*—a mere begging of the question—assuming as a principle what remains yet to be proved. Your Committee are no enemies to Instrumental Music being used to exhilarate the mind in scenes of conviviality, or employed to animate the soldier to march with ardour to the field of battle; nay, they even allow that the poet is not altogether fanciful when he says, that

"Music hath charms to soothe the savage breast."

But still, they can by no means allow it to be an improvement of the Public Worship of God, in singing the Praises of that God who is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Your Committee affirm, that the tones of the human voice, while they are the most simple, are at the same time, the most perfect, the most accurate, the most pathetic, and the most sublime, and the best qualified to convey the sentiments of the devout heart, in solemn Praise to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Your Committee have heard your *Amateurs* and *Dilettanti* assert, that their nerves have been completely overcome with the powerful tones of the Organ, and the sublime *crash* of Instrumental music in the oratorios of Handel. Your Committee are willing to allow this musical effect; but they believe, at the same time, that all the Musical Instruments that ever were used can never produce upon the devout and contemplative mind that sublime and pathetic effect, which the well-regulated voices of 8000 children produced, when sing-

ing the Praises of God in the Cathedral of St. Paul's, upon the recovery of our good old, religious King. Away, then, with the cant of an Organ's being so wonderfully calculated to increase the devotion of Christians! Your Committee have sometimes had an opportunity of listening to Instrumental Music, in what is styled Cathedral Worship. It might for a little time please, and surprise by its novelty; the effect, however, was very transitory, and sometimes produced ideas in the mind very different from devotion. "It is but too common for persons to deceive themselves, by imagining, that when they are greatly moved by airs of Instrumental Music, that they are then, and for that reason, in a temper of mind most pleasing unto God; because pleasing to themselves;—a most unhappy delusion; for men sometimes of very little piety can enjoy all that sort of pleasure with as high a *gusto* or relish as persons of a more virtuous character."

Your Committee believe, that when the Praises of God are sung by every individual, even of a plain, unlettered country congregation (which has been spoken of by some persons rather in a taunting manner), where both the heart and voice are engaged, the effect is much more noble, and much more salutary to the mind of a Christian audience, than all the lofty artificial strains of an Organ, extracted by a hired Organist, and accompanied by a confused noise of many voices, taught at great expense to chant over what their hearts neither feel nor their heads understand.

When our brother, therefore, bewails the want of the power of discrimination in our countrymen to perceive the advantages which would result to Religion by introducing Instrumental Music into the Public Worship of God, we, your Committee, rejoice in the thought, that our countrymen will not suffer when compared with the inhabitants of any country upon earth, as to their discriminating powers with regard to what is useful and proper in matters of Religion.

They inherit that discriminating talent from their forefathers. It was a legacy conveyed to them as purchased by their blood; and they will not abandon it for the puerile amusement of Pipes and Organs. If our countrymen have not Organs, and wish not to have them, they have Bibles, and can read them; they have Churches, and they attend them; they are distinguished for their attainments in arts and sciences; they can study the history of mankind, and can reflect upon it; and they know well that Organs and Instrumental Music have been abused to the purposes of voluptuousness and impiety. They know, for Job hath told them, that the wicked among his contemporaries "took the Timbrel and the Harp, and rejoiced at the sound of the Organ," and yet said unto God, "Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways: what is the Almighty, that we should serve him? and what profit should we have, if we pray unto him?"* And they have read

* Job. xxi. 12, 14, 15.

in the Book of Amos the prophet, of a woe pronounced upon them "that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria; who put far away the evil day; and cause the seat of violence to come near; who lie on beds of ivory, who eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; who drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments." But this very numerous description of men in affluent circumstances, and addicted to luxurious habits, our countrymen have read, "chanted to the sound of the Viol, and invented to themselves Instruments of Music like *David*."* And they have also read in the Book of Daniel, that when Nebuchadnezzar dedicated his golden image in the presence of a numerous and loyal assembly, "they all fell down and worshipped the golden image, at what time they heard the sound of the Cornet, Flute, Harp, Sackbut, Psaltery, Dulcimer, and all kinds of Music."†

Thus we have endeavoured, step by step, to answer the various arguments adduced by our Reverend Brother, the Minister of St. Andrew's Church, in his Statement.

We have in the first place shown, That Instrumental Music is neither enjoined, nor authorised, nor encouraged, by the Word of God, to be used in the Public Worship of Christians.

In the second place, That, from the history of the Church, it appears that the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and the greatest of Reformers, condemned it.

In the third place, That the reason assigned by our brother why Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God was not used in our National Church, (viz., That it arose from the want of leisure to attend to such things, or the want of money to purchase such instruments, or the want of accommodation for using them,) is consistent neither with historical fact, nor with fair and candid investigation.‡

---

* Amos vi. † Dan. iii.

‡ Whether, in the period immediately after the Reformation, the Public Devotional Music was an object of so very little attention in the Church of Scotland as our brother is pleased to represent, may be determined even by a very slight inspection of the Psalm-Book which was used in the Church during that period. In our present version of the Psalms there are six varieties of measure; with the knowledge of six different Psalm Tunes, a Congregation may sing all the Psalms which it contains. In the old version there were twenty-five or twenty-six different measures; which implied a knowledge of Psalmody, and a mode of singing, which could not have existed amidst that ignorance and inattention to Church Music which is supposed then to have characterised and disgraced the Church of Scotland. Copies of that Psalm-Book are now very rare. That which most generally occurs, is an edition printed by Andro Hart, 1635, and makes part of a volume which includes directions for different parts of Public Worship, as agreed on by John Knox and other eminent Ministers, whose recommendation is annexed. So much was this part of the Devotional Service of our Church an object of attention to those good men, that the particular Tunes, proper for particular Psalms, are commonly annexed to them in the musical characters of the time. And as books were not to be had so easily in those days as in ours, an ingenious device has been employed, in order that one copy of the Book might accommodate the four different persons who sang the four different parts of the Music. A considerable variety of Psalm Tunes, set in the different parts, make a portion of this volume. Far be it from us to blame our reverend brother for his ignorance of this subject; perhaps he will blame himself for writing so decidedly upon a subject in which he must be conscious he has been at little pains to obtain information. He may perhaps see cause to regret, that, upon mere hypothetical reasoning, he should have pronounced such a severe judgment against his countrymen respecting their ignorance of Psalmody in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

A pleasing little anecdote occurs, sufficient to show that eminent men in the Church of

Your Committee have proved that it arose from the opinion entertained by our Scotch Ecclesiastical Patriots, that Instrumental Music was contrary to the genius and constitution of Presbytery in this Kingdom, and to the Word of God.

In the fourth place, we affirm, that from attending to the Act of Security, to the Treaty of Union, to the Directory and to the Act against Innovations, all confirmed by the consuetudinary and common law of our Church and State, acted upon for more than these hundred and twenty years, the Presbytery passed a just sentence on the seventh October last, when they gave it as their judgment, that Instrumental Music was contrary to the Law of the Land, and to the Law and Constitution of the Church of Scotland.

And Lastly, Your Committee have shown, that the argument advanced by our brother, viz., That the Organ was introduced into St. Andrew's Church upon pure Presbyterian principles, is supported by mere metaphysical and sophistical reasoning, only calculated to mislead those who have not paid sufficient attention to the subject.*

If your Committee had been disposed to measure out to their brother such language, and such reflections as he hath been pleased to make upon his Ecclesiastical Superiors, the Presbytery of Glasgow, they would be justified in saying, that there are some remarks in the conclusion of his Statement, which, in politeness, he should have avoided. Thus, "Feeling as we do," says he, "the harshness of the sentence pronounced against us, we have confidence that the judgment of a candid public will be, that guilt has been imputed where there was no crime, and that we have become the victims of a prejudice which we wished to remove;"—and, "Instead of receiving encouragement, we have been exhibited to the world as violating the Law both of the Church and of the State; while we, the Minister, and Elders, and Congregation of St. Andrew's Church, are both loyal citizens and steady in our attachment to our Ecclesiastical Establishment." Your Committee will cheerfully allow the Minister and Congregation of St. Andrew's all the benefit of this pompous encomium passed upon their own conduct by one of their own number. We cordially approve of the appeal which our brother has made to the judgment of the candid public. For, if the spirit and principles of the fathers animate the children,—if the universal and almost uninterrupted practice of our Church, in the midst of its greatest re-

---

Scotland were not so ignorant of, and so insensible to Music, as the representations given by some persons in our days would imply.

Mr. Robert Boyd of Trochrig was Principal of the College of Glasgow. "He was a man of an austere-like carriage, and yet was a most tender-hearted man. He was of a sour-like disposition. He would sometimes call me, with other three or four, and lay down books before us, and have us sing Tunes of Music, wherein he took great delight."—*Livingston's Life.—Characteristics.*

We believe that a copy of the above Psalm-Book is in the possession of an eminent Clergyman of this neighbourhood, well known for his scientific knowledge in every branch of the fine arts.

* We beg it may be remembered, what we stated in the commencement of this Answer to Dr. Ritchie, that we have been all along arguing with a Minister of the Church of Scotland, bound by the same Laws of Church and State which bind the Presbytery of Glasgow.

verses, since the Reformation down to the present moment, (except in three solitary instances,—the attempt made in the Chapel Royal 1617, by the King and his Courtiers, which never extended its influence farther than the walls of the Chapel; an attempt which was made a few years ago by a respectable Congregation in Aberdeen, but instantly abandoned; and this late abortive attempt at Glasgow,) can consolidate the Constitution, and furnish an authoritative commentary on the Law of the Church and the Law of the Land,—if the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, illustrated by the example of Christians for upwards of seven centuries,—if the standards of our Church, explained and corroborated by the testimony of our venerable martyrs, be solid and unexceptionable documents;—then the Presbytery need not shrink from the impartial tribunal of a candid public. If what is agreeable to, and founded on the Word of God, shall regulate the Worship of Christians,—if historical fact, and statute law, and constitutional principle, and immemorial usage, all sanctioned by an enlightened conviction, shall determine this question;—then the Reverend Presbytery may go with confidence, and demand a verdict in their favour.

With respect to those sacrifices which our brother hath pledged himself to make for the loyal, enlightened, and respectable Congregation of St. Andrew's, your Committee do not wish to restrain our brother in the smallest degree. If a sincere desire to benefit that Congregation, which hath discovered such an uncommon attachment to his ministry, hath prompted him to speak in such glowing language, your Committee most sincerely pray, that wherever Providence may order the lot of our brother, he may always experience a similar attachment from his Congregation. If, on the other hand, this pledge "of his readiness to make sacrifices," was thrown out merely to announce to the Presbytery and to the world his fixed and resolute determination to use every lawful method to carry his favourite measure, your Committee are equally ready and equally determined to use every *legal and constitutional* method to oppose him; and they have no doubt of the result.

In fine, our brother has repeatedly admitted, that in Scotland there is a prejudice against Organs, which he says has grown into antipathy. It was, no doubt, bold and manly in him to undertake, *single-handed*, to cure that prejudice and to remove that antipathy. And though we do not wish to infringe what he styles his sacred, private, hereditary rights, there were many objects of no small importance, to which he ought to have paid some attention, before he engaged in this difficult enterprise. For though we have not indulged in the mistake, which he says we have, of maintaining that the Minister and Congregation of St. Andrew's were assuming to themselves the sole prerogative of enacting a Law for the whole Church; yet we certainly have affirmed, that, in his bold attempt to remove that prejudice, he had no title, either directly or indirectly, to undertake such a business

without consulting his Ecclesiastical Superiors. And we likewise most certainly say, that however peaceable his designs might be, they have been conducted in such a manner as to have a tendency to produce disputes with his Presbytery, with the Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow, with the people of Glasgow, and with the people of Scotland. But we will not allow that, since the Reformation, our countrymen have laboured under prejudice. We will contrast with the sentiments of the Minister of St. Andrew's the sentiments of the late Principal Dunlop of the University of Glasgow.

This venerable man, whose singular piety, great prudence, public spirit, universal knowledge, and general usefulness, are celebrated in Wodrow's History, acted a conspicuous part in the affairs of our Church, from the Revolution downward for many years. He had suffered for his attachment to the *pure principles of Presbytery*, he understood them well, and thus expresseth himself on the point at issue :—

"We celebrate the goodness of God, which carried our Reformation to such a high pitch of perfection with respect to our Government and Worship ; and delivered them from all that vain pomp which darkened the glory of the Gospel service ; and the whole of the superstitious or insignificant inventions of an imaginary decency and order, which sullied the Divine beauty and lustre of that noble simplicity which distinguished the devotions of the apostolical times ; and our Church glories in the primitive plainness of her Worship more than in all the foreign ornaments borrowed from this world, though these appear indeed incomparably more charming to earthly minds.

"We are sensible that it is a necessary consequence of the nature of our Reformation in these particulars, that there is nothing left in our Worship which is proper to captivate the senses of mankind or amuse their imaginations ; we have no magnificence and splendour of devotion to dazzle the eye, nor harmony of Instrumental Music to enliven our Worship and soothe the ears of the assembly. Pomp, and show, and ceremony, are entirely strangers in our Churches ; and we have little in common with that apostate Church whose yoke we threw off at the Reformation, or with the exterior greatness and magnificence of the Jewish Temple and its service.

"For which reason we know we must lay our account to be despised *by the men of the world*, who value nothing that is stripped of the allurements of sense, and fancy that a rich and gaudy dress contributes to the majesty and raises the excellency of religious service ; who seek for the same dazzling pomp and splendid appearances to recommend their Worship, which they are so fond of in their equipage and tables ; and think that a veneration and respect to the service of the Church is to be raised by the same methods that procure an esteem and fondness for a Court. We have nothing to tempt persons of such inclinations ; we know they will entertain the meanest thoughts and most disdainful notions of a Worship too plain and homely for them, and fit

only for the rude and unmannerly multitude, who have not a taste delicate enough for what is truly great and noble.

"But how much soever, upon this account, we may be despised by the great and learned, the Church of Scotland, we hope, will always publicly own the simplicity and plainness of her Worship as *her peculiar glory;* and believe that these, to a spiritual eye, are beautified with a lustre which external objects are incapable of, and of too elevated a nature for the senses to look at. She is not ashamed to acknowledge her sentiments; that the devotions of Christians stand in no need of the outward helps afforded to the Jews; and that the triumphs of all-conquering love, the mighty acts of a Redeemer, all the powers and glories of an immortal life, which are represented to our wonder and meditation under the Gospel, are far nobler springs of devotion, and fitter to animate with a cheerful zeal, and inspire the most fervent affections, than the meaner helps afforded under the Law—the costliness of pontifical garments, the glory of a magnificent Temple, *the ceremony of Worship, and power of Music.*

"Our Church believes it to be one design of the better reformation of things, to raise the Christian Worshippers above the airy grandeur of sense, and, instead of a laborious service, to introduce a Worship worthy of the Father of Spirits, that should be truly great and manly,—the beauty and the power whereof should be spirit and life; and which, instead of a *servile imitation of the Temple, should be all purified reason and religion,* and make the nearest approaches to the devotion of the heavenly state, where there is no Temple. And how despicable soever this may appear to earthly minds, and distasteful to the senses that are pleased with show and appearance, we are not afraid to own, that we believe that an *imitation of our blessed Redeemer and his Apostles,* in the *plainness and spirituality of their devotions,* and an endeavour to copy after example of those truly primitive times, will ever bear us up to all the just decency and order of the Gospel Church; and that, in conformity hereto, the *naked simplicity of our Worship* is beautified with a superior lustre, and shines with a brightness more worthy of it, than when dressed in the gayest colours and busked up with the richest and most artful ornaments of human fancy and contrivance."

(Signed,) WILLIAM PORTEOUS,
ROBERT BALFOUR,
JAMES LAPSLIE,
JAMES M'LEAN.

Unto the Reverend the Presbytery of Toronto of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland.

THE MEMORIAL and complaint of the Subscriber, being a Member of St. Andrew's Church Congregation, Toronto, within the bounds of said Presbytery,

HUMBLY SHEWETH:

That your Memorialist and complainant has been connected with the congregation of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, for the last twenty-four years, and that he and his family have been admitted to the full enjoyment of religious privileges therein.

That recently he has for a season been compelled, from conscientious objections to the use of instrumental music in public worship, to discontinue his attendance on the means of grace in said St. Andrew's Church.

That he has on more than one occasion, quietly, to individual members of the congregation, and also to the Minister, stated his dislike to a melodeon being used in the praise of God, and that, for the sake of peace and out of esteem for the Minister, he has not until lately taken the important step of calling the attention of the Session of said Church to the matter, and to his remonstrances and complaint.

That your Memorialist and complainant, on the ninth day of March last, addressed the following *reasons* of dissent to the use of a musical instrument in public worship in said Church to the Rev. Dr. Barclay, as Moderator of the Kirk Session of St. Andrew's Church:

"First. That the Church in Canada, of which you and your Ses-
"sion are members, is in connection with and professes to be governed
"by the whole Standards and Acts of the Established Church of
"Scotland.

"Second. That the Established Church of Scotland does not re-
"cognize the use of musical instruments of any kind in her Psalmody.

"Third. That notwithstanding such professed adherence, and con-
"trary to the discipline of said Church of Scotland, an organ, or, as
"it is called, melodeon, has been introduced into St. Andrew's Church,
"of which I am or have been an humble, member.

"Fourth. That the use of such an instrument, or any other, is a
"gross innovation for which there is no precedent, and ought not to
"be tolerated by any true Presbyterian, claiming connection with the
"venerable Church of Scotland, the brightest gem in the history of
"our country, and whose discipline and standards have, notwith-
"standing many severe trials, stood the test of ages, nor is it too

"much to say that at this moment she stands on the pinnacle of her "glory in the hearts of her many thousand adherents.

"Fifth. That I cannot conscientiously continue to attend upon "the public worship of God in a Church where a musical instrument "is used in praising God, whether as an accompaniment or other-"wise.

"Lastly. That I would deeply regret leaving St. Andrew's Church, "where I have sat so long, and where I had hoped to remain undis-"turbed until the close of my earthly career, but as it has otherwise "happened, I hesitate not to say that I prefer to leave the Church "rather than submit to what has become to me intolerable."

To which the following deliverance was sent in reply to your Memorialist:

"At Toronto, and within St. Andrew's Church there, the 20th day "of March, 1859, the Session of St. Andrew's Church met, on the "call of the Moderator, and was duly constituted. Present: Rev. "Dr. Barclay, Moderator; Judge McLean, and Messrs. Cameron and "Thomson.

"The Moderator stated that he had called the present meeting in "consequence of the receipt of letters from John Robertson, Esquire, "complaining of the employment of a Melodeon in conducting the "Psalmody of the Church, and embodying a statement of his reasons "for objecting to its use, his aversion to which he assigns as his sole "reason for discontinuing his attendance at public worship in St. "Andrew's Church. Said letters were read, and are of the following "tenor: [Here the letters are engrossed at length.] After length-"ened conversation on the subject, and all the Members of Session "having given expression to their views thereupon, the Moderator "was requested to draw up a Minute in accordance therewith, and "submit the same to the Session for approval, at a meeting to be "held in the Church, on Saturday, the 26th March, at four o'clock "p. m., until which time the Session adjourned, and was closed with "the benediction.

"Saturday, the 26th March, 1859.—The Session could not proceed "to the despatch of business, from the want of a quorum, owing to "the absence of members from town · and the meeting was accord-"ingly declared adjourned, to await anew the summons of the Mode-"rator.

"On the 3rd day of April, 1859, the Session met and was consti-"tuted; all the Members were present. The Session resumed consi-"deration of Mr. Robertson's letter, and after mature deliberation, "agreed to the following deliverance:

"The Session regret that anything connected with the mode of con-"ducting public worship in St. Andrew's Church should be distasteful "to any member of the congregation. The Session have no desire to "introduce or sanction any improper innovation. They expressly dis-

"avow the introduction or sanctioning of what may properly be called "instrumental music as part of the Church service.

"It is true that a melodeon was introduced into St. Andrew's "Church, about eight years ago, by the choir, with the express object "of its being used as an accompaniment to help in sustaining the "voices of the singers, and thus to improve, as was generally thought "and desired, the style in which that part of divine service was con- "ducted. If not absolutely or indispensably necessary, it was yet "regarded as so important and yet harmless an adjunct, that the Ses- "sion never thought of prohibiting its use, but on the contrary felt "that it was generally regarded as well fitted for, and that it did to a "considerable extent attain, the object for which it was adopted. "Besides, had the Session been disposed to object to it as unneces- "sary, they might still very properly have hesitated to require its "removal now, from the consideration that it really seemed but a "small concession to the expressed wishes of those Ladies and Gentle- "men who had for so many years given their services in the Choir, "and who, although acting in this from a sense of duty to the Church, "have not the less strong claim upon the other members for the "thankful recognition of services which it is believed the congrega- "tion at large duly appreciate, and would not be slow on all proper "occasions to acknowledge. The arrangement at present existing, "having gone on for nearly eight years, during which a melodeon has "been in use for the purpose stated, without, so far as the Session "are aware, its being other than acceptable to the congregation, it "seems undesirable, except for sufficient reason, to deprive the choir "of the aid which they deem indispensable to the proper discharge "of their important duties in conducting the Psalmody of the Church.

"It is true that whilst the present instrument, just introduced to "replace the old and inferior one, is of a larger size and requires "greater experience to play it properly, the choir at the same time "happened to be diminished in numbers, and thereby weakened by "the temporary absence of several of its members, so that in this way "the melodeon may for a few Sabbaths have been more prominent "than was formerly the case, and thus some ground may have, unin- "tentionally, been given for the objection that a step was in contem- "plation towards instrumental music taking the lead and becoming "predominant in the praises of the Sanctuary. But these causes are "only temporary, and there is not, so far as the Session are aware, "any intention or desire to use the instrument permanently for any "other purpose than that for which it was introduced—namely as a "simple accompaniment to aid and sustain the voices of the members "of the choir, who feel and represent it to be highly desirable. Cer- "tainly no attempt to turn the church music into what may be pro- "perly styled *instrumental*, or to give, as erroneously supposed was "the intention, a greater prominence to the melodeon than what is "indicated above, would meet the approval of the Session.

"Had the Directory of Public Worship prohibited the use of an "instrument in connection with the Psalmody, the Session, of course, "as obedient sons of the Church, would not have given even the "modified sanction of their tacit consent to its introduction. But "no such prohibition, so far as they are aware, is to be found either "in the word of God or in the standards of the Church of Scotland. "And the Session are persuaded that the use of an instrument, espe- "cially to the extent and for the purpose to which, in the present case, "it is restricted, may well be regarded as one of those things non- "essential, respecting which a difference of sentiment may exist "among the members of a congregation, without involving the neces- "sity on the part of any one, on that account, of taking the extreme "step of severing his connection with the church.

"So far as the members of Session are personally concerned, they "would be satisfied to have the Psalmody in the congregation con- "ducted either *with* or *without* the aid of an instrument, as they trust "that in either way they could profitably, and with the true feeling of "devotion, join with their fellow-worshippers in the praises of God. "But the question as presented for their consideration is not one re- "specting the *introduction* of an instrument, but, about the *removal* "of it *after nearly eight years' use*. And whilst they are given to un- "derstand that the forced discontinuance of the very simple instru- "mental aid to the choir in conducting the Psalmody would be very "unacceptable to the congregation generally, and would draw forth "the strong remonstrances of many of its members, the Session "(while entertaining every desire to meet the wishes of those who "may seek the change) yet feel convinced that for the peace and "harmony of the congregation it would not be advisable, except for "the gravest reasons, to insist on its expulsion now.

"In view of the explanation already given as to the reason for the "original introduction of the melodeon and its present retention, and "considering the assurances as to the mode of employing it for the "future, the Session are reluctant to surrender the hope that the ob- "jections expressed by Mr. Robertson may be so far obviated as to "enable him with propriety to continue his connection with St. An- "drew's Church, from which they would with great regret see him "withdraw. They are unwilling to suppose that his conscientious "scruples, as stated in his letter of complaint, and which appear to "have been drawn forth into practical expression by the circumstance "already referred to as recent and temporary, would lead him to con- "sider that part of the service during the last eight years impure and "unbecoming, merely because of the slight aid the choir have sought "and found in the employment of a melodeon; and certainly it can- "not be properly regarded as more objectionable if used for the same "purpose for the future than it has been for the past period during "which it has been so employed.

"In thus declining, in present circumstances, to require authorita-
"tively the removal of the melodeon, the Session trust that Mr. Ro-
"bertson will receive their assurance that it is from no desire on their
"part to slight his views, nor any intention to treat lightly his con-
"scientious scruples as expressed in his letter, that they have adopted
"this resolution. And while in the introduction of the instrument
"there has at least been no mere wanton desire for useless innovation,
"—but a felt necessity has led to its use to enable the choir to per-
"form their important duties, as already stated, with greater facility
"and effect,—the Session are persuaded that its removal would occa-
"sion general dissatisfaction and remonstrance, and would be in itself,
"at present, inexpedient.

"The Session was then closed with the benediction.

"(Signed) "JOHN BARCLAY, Moderator.

"A true extract,

"J. BARCLAY, Acting Clerk of Session.

"St. Andrew's Church, Toronto,

" April, 1859."

That your Memorialist and complainant fails to discover the relevancy or cogency of the decision of the Kirk Session of St. Andrew's Church as tending even in an indirect way to meet his conscientious objections or to satisfy his scruples, and that in consequence, being sincerely desirous of worshipping God according to the manner of the church into which he was baptized, and deeming it a great hardship to be forced to leave a communion to which he is firmly attached, and judging that it might tend to allay all future differences in the mode of conducting public worship within the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, he appeals to the Presbytery for redress.

May it therefore please your Reverend Court to take the foregoing statements and reasons into consideration, and, if found sound and warrantable, to adopt or direct such means as you may think expedient for removing the evil complained of, or otherwise to do in the premises as to you may seem best; and your Memorialist and complainant, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

JOHN ROBERTSON.

Toronto, 17th May, 1859.